



Cambridge International AS & A Level

HISTORY

9489/13

Paper 1 Document Question

October/November 2022

MARK SCHEME

Maximum Mark: 40

Published

This mark scheme is published as an aid to teachers and candidates, to indicate the requirements of the examination. It shows the basis on which Examiners were instructed to award marks. It does not indicate the details of the discussions that took place at an Examiners' meeting before marking began, which would have considered the acceptability of alternative answers.

Mark schemes should be read in conjunction with the question paper and the Principal Examiner Report for Teachers.

Cambridge International will not enter into discussions about these mark schemes.

Cambridge International is publishing the mark schemes for the October/November 2022 series for most Cambridge IGCSE™, Cambridge International A and AS Level components and some Cambridge O Level components.

This document consists of **12** printed pages.

Generic Marking Principles

These general marking principles must be applied by all examiners when marking candidate answers. They should be applied alongside the specific content of the mark scheme or generic level descriptors for a question. Each question paper and mark scheme will also comply with these marking principles.

GENERIC MARKING PRINCIPLE 1:

Marks must be awarded in line with:

- the specific content of the mark scheme or the generic level descriptors for the question
- the specific skills defined in the mark scheme or in the generic level descriptors for the question
- the standard of response required by a candidate as exemplified by the standardisation scripts.

GENERIC MARKING PRINCIPLE 2:

Marks awarded are always **whole marks** (not half marks, or other fractions).

GENERIC MARKING PRINCIPLE 3:

Marks must be awarded **positively**:

- marks are awarded for correct/valid answers, as defined in the mark scheme. However, credit is given for valid answers which go beyond the scope of the syllabus and mark scheme, referring to your Team Leader as appropriate
- marks are awarded when candidates clearly demonstrate what they know and can do
- marks are not deducted for errors
- marks are not deducted for omissions
- answers should only be judged on the quality of spelling, punctuation and grammar when these features are specifically assessed by the question as indicated by the mark scheme. The meaning, however, should be unambiguous.

GENERIC MARKING PRINCIPLE 4:

Rules must be applied consistently, e.g. in situations where candidates have not followed instructions or in the application of generic level descriptors.

GENERIC MARKING PRINCIPLE 5:

Marks should be awarded using the full range of marks defined in the mark scheme for the question (however; the use of the full mark range may be limited according to the quality of the candidate responses seen).

GENERIC MARKING PRINCIPLE 6:

Marks awarded are based solely on the requirements as defined in the mark scheme. Marks should not be awarded with grade thresholds or grade descriptors in mind.

Part (a)	Generic Levels of Response:	Marks
Level 4	<p>Makes a developed comparison Makes a developed comparison between the two sources. Explains <u>why</u> points of similarity and difference exist through contextual awareness and/or source evaluation.</p>	12–15
Level 3	<p>Compares views and identifies similarities and differences Compares the views expressed in the two sources, identifying differences and similarities and supporting them with source content.</p>	8–11
Level 2	<p>Compares views and identifies similarities <u>or</u> differences Identifies relevant similarities or differences between the two sources and the response may be one-sided with only one aspect explained.</p> <p>OR</p> <p>Compares views and identifies similarities <u>and</u> differences but these are asserted rather than supported from the sources Identifies relevant similarities and differences between the two sources without supporting evidence from the sources.</p>	4–7
Level 1	<p>Describes content of each source Describes or paraphrases the content of the two sources. Very simple comparisons may be made (e.g. one is from a letter and the other is from a speech) but these are not developed.</p>	1–3
Level 0	<p>No creditable content. No engagement with source material.</p>	0

Part (b)	Generic Levels of Response:	Marks
Level 5	Evaluates the sources to reach a supported judgement Answers are well focused, demonstrating a clear understanding of the sources and the question. Reaches a supported judgement about the extent to which the sources support the statement and weighs the evidence in order to do this.	21–25
Level 4	Using evaluation of the sources to support and/or challenge the statement Demonstrates a clear understanding of how the source content supports and challenges the statement. Evaluates source material in context, this may be through considering the nature, origin and purpose of the sources in relation to the statement.	16–20
Level 3	Uses the sources to support and challenge the statement Makes valid points from the sources to both challenge and support the statement.	11–15
Level 2	Uses the sources to support or challenge the statement Makes valid points from the sources to either support the statement or to challenge it.	6–10
Level 1	Does not make valid use of the sources Describes the content of the sources with little attempt to link the material to the question. Alternatively, candidates may write an essay about the question with little or no reference to the sources.	1–5
Level 0	No creditable content. No engagement with source material.	0

Question	Answer	Marks
1(a)	<p>Read Sources C and D. How far do these sources agree about the state of the Russian economy?</p> <p>Indicative content</p> <p>Similarities include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Both sources agree that the Russian economy was making huge progress around the early 1900s. Source C claims it was a period of ‘remarkable prosperity’ with rising government revenues. Source D agrees that production had ‘approximately doubled’ • Both sources show that transport development had been problematic. Source C explains the railways were a constant source of complaint whereas Source D shows how far behind the rest of Europe Russia was (and on the eve of war) • Both sources agree that the industrial workforce was increasing – farmers selling land and moving to the towns in Source C and the proletariat growing in Source D • Both agree that foreign capital was important to Russian economic development <p>Differences include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Source C is more positive about Russia’s prospects seeing potential for growth. Source D is more pessimistic, highlighting the poor state of the railways as a way of showing that Russia’s economy was not strong enough • Source C is more inward-looking, seeing evidence of development and positive improvements. However, Source D looks at competitors such as Germany and the US and sees Russia as far behind • There is a difference of opinion on the railways, although Source C admits to problems it stresses positive development whereas in Source D Trotsky concentrates on the lack of development • Source C suggests that increased investment from overseas is a positive thing showing greater confidence in Russia while Source D is more pessimistic, suggesting that foreigners take the profits but do nothing to help the workers <p>Explanation</p> <p><i>Source C is from a British writer who had lived in Russia and travelled extensively there. He tends to promote the work of the Duma, maybe reflecting his own belief in the Duma as a form of parliamentary government. He also suggests the government have a positive role to play in the development of the economy. Trotsky was writing in 1930 so knew Russia’s fate in the war and of the subsequent revolution. He was a Marxist and wanted to see the rapid development of the proletariat, hence his interest in the extent of agricultural labour in Russia as opposed to industrial labour in the United States.</i></p> <p>Accept any other valid responses.</p>	15

Question	Answer	Marks
1(b)	<p>Read <u>all</u> of the sources. ‘The Tsarist regime became more secure in the years up to 1914.’ How far do these sources support this statement?</p> <p>Indicative content</p> <p>Support</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Source B: there has been a great deal of repression in Russia since the 1905 revolution. The revolutionary movement has been ‘stifled’ and political criminals have been deported to Siberia (although the level of opposition could be used to argue this the other way). • Source C: the economy is developing rapidly. Railways are improving, agriculture is more productive and government revenues are going up. The Duma is shown to be important in this development and the government interested in the developments which are taking place. <p>Challenge</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Source A: the huge peasant wielding a club seems to indicate that the peasantry has grown more powerful. The Tsar by comparison is tiny and is shocked at the size / might of the peasants. This suggests the regime was growing less secure. • Source B challenges the view in that the Tsar was having to use repressive measures to keep control. The fact that ‘the number of those deported to the north of European Russia or Siberia’ was so great that ‘it cannot be established’ show that the Tsar must have been far from secure to support these actions. • Source D: although there is rapid development, the statistics from the eve of war show this was not going to be enough to save the regime. The proletariat grows rapidly and has no political rights while foreigners make profits from their labour. The last sentence shows how the workers become susceptible to radical ideas. • Source C: there are hints of weaknesses here such as with the railway system (but not the main drift of the argument). <p>Evaluation</p> <p><i>Source A, from 1906, is probably a comment on the 1905 revolution where concessions of a Duma were made. The cartoon might be motivated for concern about Russia’s strength as the two countries had been allied since 1894.</i></p> <p><i>Source B is clearly opposed to the Tsarist regime gaining power and wants to see reform and development of the middle class. The author was a member of the 1907 Duma and may well be disenchanted with the reactionary course Russia has pursued since. Contextual knowledge of Stolypin’s work in repressing radicalism could be used to evaluate the source.</i></p> <p><i>When using Source C candidates could use their contextual knowledge to explain the changes in farming which were taken in this period under Stolypin, also the author was familiar with Russia and had seen some of these changes for himself. His purpose, however, might be to promote the work of the Duma.</i></p>	25

Question	Answer	Marks
1(b)	<p><i>When using Source D candidates could use their knowledge of Trotsky's views to evaluate this source. It highlights Russia's shortcomings at the end of the war and the way in which the proletariat was developing (and Trotsky knew what happened next).</i></p> <p>Accept any other valid responses.</p>	

Question	Answer	Marks
2(a)	<p>Read Sources C and D. Compare and contrast the opinions about President Grant in the two sources.</p> <p>Indicative content</p> <p>Differences include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Source C argues that Grant is simply not doing his job and not asking for more powers to deal with problems. His silence is criticised and suggests he is lazy, ‘away on a pleasure exercise’ in Philadelphia, and on a ‘trip to California’. Whereas Source D criticises Grant, but for different reasons. It is not Presidential inactivity that it criticised, but the wrong sort of activity. Grant has sent troops in to support ‘the unstable and corrupt’ administration in Louisiana, but not the ‘more honest’ administration in Mississippi. It suggests that the motives for Grant’s actions, or lack of action in some areas, are political, rather than the laziness as is the case with Source C • Source C suggests that the inaction is solely the fault of Grant whereas Source D lays the responsibility with Grant and the federal government <p>Similarities include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Source C is strongly critical of the President and places the blame firmly on Grant for all that has gone wrong with Reconstruction. Source D also places much of the blame for the violence and defiance of federal law on Grant. There is also mention of his lack of action by ‘turning a deaf ear’ to the problems of Mississippi which allowed the Amendment to be ignored and the rights of American citizens to be openly violated • In both Grant is avoiding difficult situations e.g., in Source C he has been on a trip to California even though everyone is worried about the situation whereas Source D suggests that he is ignoring Mississippi because he sees Reconstruction as a political liability <p>Explanation</p> <p><i>Source C, a correspondence between two northern Congressmen, takes the view that the President is very much responsible for the problems in the South. This is quite a biased view, as contextual knowledge would indicate that part of the problem lay with Congress and its many internal divisions. There was as much a lack of will in Congress as there was in the White House for taking the sort of action that was necessary to deal with the Ku Klux.</i></p> <p><i>Source D, written by the Governor of Mississippi suggests that both Congress and the Presidency are responsible for the problems he faces. Of course, he might well be trying to pass the blame for his own failings in his state onto others, but he was given limited resources to try and overturn deep-rooted attitudes. He was, however, faced with a growing reluctance on the part of the whole Federal Government, as well as much of Northern opinion, to have anything more to do with the South and race relations generally.</i></p> <p>Accept any other valid responses.</p>	15

Question	Answer	Marks
2(b)	<p>Read <u>all</u> of the sources. ‘Reconstruction failed.’ How far do these sources support this view?</p> <p>Indicative content</p> <p>Support</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Source B does largely support the hypothesis with its report of the activities of the Ku Klux Klan and the fact that their supporters were in a large majority in the State. Also, there was only one loyal Republican congressman now representing the State in Washington • Source C can be used to support the hypothesis. The author feels that public affairs are ‘growing about as bad as the Devil would wish’ • Source D supports makes it clear that as far as Mississippi is concerned, Reconstruction has failed. A ‘revolution’ had taken place and that a variant of slavery had returned. Law and order had broken down in the South and the 15th Amendment ignored. The fact that Grant apparently viewed Reconstruction as a ‘political liability’ would also suggest failure <p>Challenge</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Source A firmly challenges the hypothesis. The new state constitutions required by the reconstruction process produced in many cases ‘modern democratic documents’. They were based on ‘liberal principles’ and included positive innovations such as free public education, compulsory school attendance and care for orphans • Source B can also be used to challenge – it does indicate that there were some Union supporters left in the State and there were the means, the ‘Coloured Soldiers’, available to deal with the issue <p>Evaluation</p> <p><i>Source A – contextual knowledge confirms what the writer says, and of course he was a newspaper editor of a ‘reconstructed’ state at the time. The source does not of course go on to say that these commendable principles were not actually put into practice.</i></p> <p><i>In Source B, it is possible that the author was exaggerating the problem in order to get the support he felt he needed, but there is plenty of evidence that his situation was not unique in several states.</i></p> <p><i>In Source D, the author, obviously well aware of events in the South through his position, might of course be trying to place the blame for his own failings on others and exaggerate the situation in order to get help.</i></p> <p>Accept any other valid responses.</p>	25

Question	Answer	Marks
3(a)	<p>Read Sources A and B. Compare and contrast Sources A and B as evidence about the actions against the Communists in 1927.</p> <p>Indicative content</p> <p>Differences include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • In Source A, the action was initiated by Chiang Kai-shek, and was ‘clearly planned’. In Source B, the attack on the Communists was a response to their action in taking over Guangzhou • In Source A, there were many arrests but only ‘between fifty and one hundred people were killed’ and these were unionists ‘who resisted arrest’. In Source B, the dead from street battles amounted to at least 300, and ‘more than 2500 people have been executed’ • The government is praised for the action in A (‘most encouraging development’) whereas B is clearly sympathetic to the ‘the workers and peasants’ and sees the actions as ‘frightful’ <p>Similarities include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The success in repressing the Communists – in Source A, the US ambassador says ‘the crisis of destructive Soviet activity in China has ceased’ while Source B reports that the ‘Communists were able to hold on for only 48 hours’ • There was fierce fighting in both cases – ‘members of the railway unions who resisted arrest’ were killed in the first action, and there were ‘prolonged street battles’ in the second • The approval of the great powers, implicit in the satisfaction shown in Source A, and criticised by the author of Source B ‘the officials of the great powers approved and even encouraged these outrages’ <p>Explanation</p> <p><i>The differences partly arise from the two different incidents being described – the first, an attempt to purge Communists in the spring of 1927, while the second is the failed Guangzhou Uprising of December in the same year. They are also rooted in the opposing perspectives of the authors: the US would support the Kuomintang against the Communists, while the author of B clearly has Communist sympathies, shown in his preference for Soviet casualty figures.</i></p> <p><i>The similarities reflect the start of a period of intense rivalry between the Kuomintang and Communists, as seen in the Shanghai Massacre in April 1927, and the early disadvantage of the Communists against the forces of the government and its supporters.</i></p> <p>Accept any other valid responses.</p>	15

Question	Answer	Marks
3(b)	<p>Read <u>all</u> of the sources. How far do the sources support the view that Chiang Kai-shek was responsible for destroying the United Front with the Communists?</p> <p>Indicative content</p> <p>Support</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Source A supports the view, as it describes the ‘move against the communists’ being ordered by Chiang Kai-shek. This is seen as making ‘a fundamental break between the right and left wings of the Kuomintang’ • Source D supports the view. Mao Zedong is very clear in his view that ‘the treacherous and reactionary policies of ‘party purge and massacre’ were to blame for breaking ‘the national united front’. It was these actions, he claims, which caused the civil war. Communist defiance is shown as a courageous response, in which they resorted to ‘armed resistance and set up people’s governments’ <p>Challenge</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Source B challenges the view. It indicates that the Communists took the step of breaking with the Kuomintang. Their first slogan was ‘Down with Chiang Kai-shek, enemy of the peasants and workers!’ • Source C challenges the view. Chiang Kai-shek criticises the behaviour of the Communists and places the responsibility on them for the split with the Kuomintang. He speaks of ‘the promotion of divisions’ and blames the Communists for encouraging workers to stop production and young people ‘to despise the ancient virtues of our nation as reactionary’. All this ‘forced the Kuomintang to re-examine its policy of tolerating Communists as members’ <p>Evaluation</p> <p><i>The US ambassador, in Source A, is supportive of what he sees as Chiang Kai-shek’s initiative to eject the ‘the Russianised extremists’ from his government. This represents not only American fear of Communists and Soviet links, but also a belief that they threatened western interests in China; they allegedly planned ‘to move against foreign settlements’.</i></p> <p><i>This contrasts with Source B, the view of a Soviet communist, who naturally sees the events from the Communists’ perspective, and wants to show their revolutionary fervour and popular support.</i></p> <p><i>Chiang Kai-shek has strong reasons to present the breakdown of unity as entirely caused by the actions of the Communists. He refers to the divisions created ‘during 1926 and 1927’ but not to the Shanghai massacre and the other violent purges in places such as Guangzhou.</i></p>	25

Question	Answer	Marks
3(b)	<p><i>Mao Zedong criticises the Kuomintang and praises the reaction of the Communists. He speaks of massacres and purges, and ‘treacherous attack’. He emphasises the positive aspects of unity. He is speaking near the end of the Second World War, when the fragile pact with Chiang Kai-shek broke down, and he addresses his audience with his – rhetoric of the ‘great flag of revolution’ prevailing over the Kuomintang.</i></p> <p><i>The two contemporary sources show each author supporting the action of the side he sympathised with, by claiming the actions against the opposing side were justified. Neither sees the breakdown of unity as a problem; Source A actually applauds the ‘fundamental break between the right and left’.</i></p> <p><i>The two leaders writing retrospectively, in contrast, both identify unity as a positive, and emphatically blame the opposition for destroying it. They are aware of the suffering caused by prolonged struggle between the two groups and neither accepts responsibility for provoking this conflict.</i></p> <p>Accept any other valid responses.</p>	