Cambridge Assessment International Education

Cambridge International AS & A Level

HISTORY **9489/13**

Paper 1 Document Question **May/June 2021**

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 May/June 2021 series for most Cambridge IGCSE™, Cambridge International A and AS Level components and some Cambridge O Level components.

This document consists of **13** printed pages.

© UCLES 2021

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.

© UCLES 2021

Part (a)	Generic Levels of Response:	Marks
Level 4	**Makes a developed comparison** • Makes a developed comparison between the two sources. • Explains why points of similarity and difference exist through contextual awareness and/or source evaluation.	**12–15**
Level 3	**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.	**8–11**
Level 2	**Compares views and identifies similarities or differences** • Identifies relevant similarities or differences between the two sources and the response may be one-sided with only one aspect explained. **OR** **Compares views and identifies similarities and 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.	**4–7**
Level 1	**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.	**1–3**
Level 0	**No creditable content.** **No engagement with source material.**	**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**

© UCLES 2021

Question	Answer	Marks
1(a)	**Read Sources B and C. How far do these sources agree about what happened in Silesia in 1844?** Indicative content **Similarities:** • Both sources agree that the weavers revolted. • Both sources agree that there is 'misery in the factory districts' (**Source C**), with **Source B** showing the weavers to be cold, hungry and penniless. • Both agree that the weavers' revolt was put down using force. • Both agree that there is a sense of powerlessness about the weavers and that no one really cares what happens to them. In **Source A** the weavers have abandoned their religion and have been mistreated by the King and their country (the 'lying Fatherland'). In **Source B**, the general German population doesn't care about them either. **Differences:** • The weavers blame the king for neglecting them and making their situation worse. However, the writer of **Source C** says this is not the king's fault and is just a local problem which local authorities should have dealt with. • **Source C** says the revolt is harmless and won't have consequences as it didn't take much effort to deal with it and the German people aren't really interested. However, **Source B** seems to suggest that there is a wider impact. The weavers are cursing Germany and weaving her 'funeral shroud' which suggests that Germany will die because of the way it has treated the weavers. • Whether the revolt is political in nature (or impact) is a difference. **Source C** thinks not – Germany is an 'unpolitical' country, whereas there is a sense of political ideas in **Source B** which talks about inequality, poverty, the rich getting richer at the expense of the workers. *Candidates may know the context of the weavers' revolt and use this to explain the similarities / differences between the sources. They may also pick up on the reference to Engels. The poem was used as propaganda and the writer had an audience and purpose in mind.* *The context of **Source C** is two-fold. One is the reactionary writer who basically argues that it is up to the church and local authorities to sort out economic problems. The other context is that Marx published this for a reason.* **Accept any other valid responses.**	**15**

Question	Answer	Marks
1(b)	**Read all the sources. 'Economic problems were the cause of demands for change in Germany by 1848.' How far do these sources support this assertion?** Indicative content **Support** • **Source A:** Yes – there are savings to be made by having one state. There is a suggestion that economic growth is stunted by the Confederation with post and railways (both of which could encourage economic growth) being difficult and tied up in regulations. There is a reference to 'poor emigrants' trying to get work in different states and being turned away. • **Source B:** Yes – poverty and hunger have driven the weavers to revolt. They are weaving a funeral shroud for Germany and highlight the difference between their poverty and the wealth of the king and aristocracy. **Challenge** • **Source B:** There are political demands here as well as economic demands, the workers are being degraded and ill-treated by the state. The reaction of the state has turned the situation from merely an economic crisis to a political crisis. The source also suggests the weavers are turning their backs on the church which has been a force social stability. • **Source C:** No one in Germany is interested in the weavers and their economic problems. The revolt is just a local issue, which should have been sorted out by the local authorities or church, and it has been easily dealt with. The source goes so far as to say that there is no sense of impending revolt. That the author says this suggests that it is being discussed. While the author admits that poverty is a great 'crime', he does not see it leading to revolutionary thinking. Marx, publishing this, clearly had other ideas. • **Source D:** The desire for community and national strength is the main reason for calls for change. There needs to be a rebirth of Germany and Prussia should be at the head. There is a reference to class conflict which could be cross-referenced to **Source B**.	**25**

Question	Answer	Marks
1(b)	**Evaluation/Context** • ***Source A:*** *This source suggests issues are being widely discussed and promotes the idea of union for economic purposes.* • ***Source B:*** *Audience/purpose are important here. Issues about reliability might be discussed. However, the source is useful in the fact that it was written, published and widely disseminated.* • ***Source C:*** *Contextual understanding of Marx might help candidates to evaluate this source. Alternatively, they could use their knowledge of the reaction to the revolt to explain the attitude of the writer.* • ***Source D:*** *Contextual knowledge of Radowitz and what he was up to here would be helpful to evaluate this source. He was sent to Vienna in November 1847 to reconstruct the Confederation.* **Accept any other valid responses.**	

Question	Answer	Marks
2(a)	**Read Sources A and C. Compare and contrast the arguments of James Polk concerning the annexation of Texas.** **Similarities between Sources A and C** • Both argue that Texas should be annexed by the USA. • Both see the annexation of Texas as a reunion, a 're-annexation', rather than the annexation of a separate state. • Both argue that the annexation of Texas would benefit the USA. • Both consider the consequences if the USA rejects the request of Texas to join the USA. **Differences between Sources A and C** • **Source A** says if Texas remains independent it could turn to Britain for protection whereas **Source C** argues that Texas remaining independent would mean war and economic hardship. Thus, **Source A** focuses on the external consequences of rejection, whereas **Source C** focuses on the domestic consequences. • **Source A** considers the views of Texas, which is seen as being keen to be reunited with the USA, while **Source C** concentrates solely on the interests of Americans**.** ***Source A*** *is a pre-election letter to a group of voters, presumably intended to gain their support***.** ***Source C*** *is a post-election public speech to the US Congress and people, presumably intended to gain their support for the passage of a Bill to authorise the annexation of Texas. Thus, both are partisan and unreliable.* **Accept any other valid responses.**	**15**

Question	Answer	Marks
2(b)	**Read all of the sources. 'The annexation of Texas was in the national interest.' How far do the sources support this view?** **Source A supports** this assertion, though rather half-heatedly. Its main argument is that Texas should be re-annexed by the USA, thus reversing a historical wrong, for example, in 1819 Texas was 'most unwisely given away'. Doing so would meet the wishes of the people of Texas. It would also prevent the UK from gaining influence over Texas. Nowhere does Polk identify the direct benefits of annexation for the USA. **Source B supports** this assertion more energetically. It argues that annexation would benefit the North as well as the South and that 'it would make us a more united people'. The source makes no mention of re-annexation, for example, it is not looking backwards. **Source C also supports the assertion.** It argues that annexation will bring peace and prosperity to the USA; Texas remaining outside the USA would result in more conflict and less trade. It also argues that annexation would fit within 'the broad principle' of the US constitution. **Source D strongly challenges** the assertion**.** It argues that annexation would mean the extension of slavery, which in turn would upset the delicate constitutional balance within the USA between slave and free states. It also says that many states, presumably Northern free states, have opposed annexation. **Evaluation/Context** ***Source A*** *is taken from a private letter from a politician hoping to run for federal government office which was (indirectly) elected, via the Electoral College. His description of the loss of Texas in 1819, though believed by many Americans at the time, was far from the truth Because this was an electioneering address and factually inaccurate,* ***Source A*** *is unreliable.* ***Source B*** *is published in a Southern newspaper soon after Polk had won the 1844 presidential election, and the annexation of Texas much closer. It asserts that the victory for Polk is a mandate for annexation.* ***Sources A*** *and* ***C*** *broadly support this assertion. The source also argues that the Whigs, seen as representing the North, also supported annexation.* ***Source D****, though not explicitly a Whig source, calls this assertion into question.* ***Source B*** *is a partisan source written soon after a partisan victory, so cannot be trusted.* ***Source C*** *is Polk's inaugural address following his election victory some five months previously. Putting a reasoned argument for annexation, it is not obviously triumphalist, as might have been expected. Polk is using the presidency as a 'bully pulpit' to educate the American people to accept his arguments. The arguments remain partisan, however. Polk still talks of 're-annexation'.* ***Source C*** *cannot be trusted entirely.*	**25**

Question	Answer	Marks
2(b)	***Source D*** *comes from a public petition to the US Congress, published a year after the election of President Polk. It shows that the annexation of Texas remains a divisive issue, despite Polk's best efforts as shown by* ***Source C****. As a statement of the opinions of a section of Northern society it is reliable, if unavoidably partisan. In its perspective on the issue of the annexation of Texas, it is an unreliable source.* **Accept any other valid responses.**	

Question	Answer	Marks
3(a)	**Compare and contrast Sources A and C on German attitudes to the USSR.** Indicative content **Differences between Source A and Source C** • **Source A** shows great hostility to **'**Bolshevik Russia', while **Source C** emphasises 'the natural sympathy of the Germans for the Russians'. • **Source A** stresses that treaties with Soviet Union would be 'completely worthless' in contrast to **Source C**, which is proposing co-operation and identifying the real enemies as the 'the capitalist western democracies'. **Similarities between Source A and Source C** • **Source C** briefly acknowledges the **'**years of hostility' between the two nations, which is the focus of **Source A**. • **Both Sources A and C** indicate Nazi distrust of Communism. *The differences between the sources can be explained by the different interests of Germany in 1939 as opposed to 1937. In **Source A**, Hitler is using the full force of his rhetoric to emphasise his hostility to the Soviet Union, in the context of their support for opposing sides in the Spanish Civil War, his anger at the Franco-Soviet Treaty of Mutual Assistance of 1936 and his need to justify the Anti-Comintern Pact, which had been signed November 1936. At this time, Hitler was still hoping to improve relations with Britain.* *By August 1939, as shown in the secret message **Source C**, Germany was preparing to invade Poland, and in the face of Britain and France's pledge to declare war if this happened ('British agitation for war and attempts at an alliance'), the support and resources of the Soviets became crucial and urgent. This explains the conciliatory language of **Source C** and previous hostility.* **Accept any other valid responses.**	**15**

Question	Answer	Marks
3(b)	**Read all the sources. How far do all the sources support the view that the Nazi-Soviet Pact took the British government by surprise?** Indicative content **Source A supports** the view, as the international audience would be aware of Hitler's intense opposition to the 'Bolshevik state'. In this source, Hitler specifically rules out any treaty arrangements as 'out of the question'. **Source B challenges** the view. Low's cartoon suggests that, as early as June 1939, there were at least rumours of talks between foreign ministers Ribbentrop and Molotov, and an awareness of the improved relations between the two powers. **Source C can be used on both sides of the argument** • **Source C supports** the view as it shows that the agreement was still not concluded as late as 14th August and concedes that the two countries even 'today look at each other in distrust'. While this was a private communication, the British government was clearly aware of the conflict between outlooks to which Ribbentrop refers. • **Source C challenges** the view because it also explains some grounds for the pact, that were generally recognised. It sees Western policy as aiming 'to drive the U.S.S.R. into the war against Germany' and refers to the British guarantee to Poland. **Source D supports** the view. Chamberlain argues 'that announcement came to the government as a surprise' and they had been hoping 'to bring the negotiations with the Soviet Union to a successful conclusion'. **Source D** can also be used to **challenge** the view as it says that there had been some rumours of a change in circumstances. **Evaluation/Context** • ***Source A*** *is a reliable guide to the message Hitler wanted to deliver to the German people in early 1937, and it reflects the hatred of Communism he frequently showed. However, as with all his public speeches, he has a propaganda purpose which relates to the situation at that time, and which he would be willing to contradict completely as circumstances changed.* • ***Source B*** *is a remarkably accurate forecast, as the highly secret negotiations did not start until August, and even the more publicised economic agreement was only discussed in July. There was some earlier criticism of the slow progress made by Chamberlain, who was himself deeply suspicious of Communism in his attempts to make a deal with the Soviet Union. This is perhaps the main purpose of the cartoon.*	**25**

Question	Answer	Marks
3(b)	• ***Source C*** *was written by Ribbentrop, to persuade Molotov of the benefits of an agreement. He deploys strong arguments, referring to both countries' interests in expansion and 'clearing up the territorial questions of Eastern Europe'. By this time, the Soviet Union feared they would be left to face the armies of Nazi Germany unaided, so Ribbentrop's pressure was effective. However, his promises of 'German-Soviet friendship' proved short-lived.* • ***Source D*** *shows that the British Prime minister needs to avoid the responsibility for allowing this 'very unpleasant' development to occur, by protesting how surprised and unjustified it was. His assertion that the British government had 'shown a great amount of trust and a strong desire' to conclude a treaty with the Soviet Union is therefore predictable, but questionable in the light of the way in which the negotiations had been conducted.* The sources show there were some grounds for surprise, given the ideological hostility between Nazis and Soviets that is expressed in **Source A**. However, two factors which made the pact less of a surprise are indicated: common interests in carving up Poland (**Source C**) and suspicion towards the west, particularly as Chamberlain appeared to lack conviction in his negotiations with the Soviets (**Sources B and D**). **Accept any other valid responses.**	