CAMBRIDGE
International Education

Cambridge International AS & A Level

HISTORY **9489/12**

Paper 1 Document question **May/June 2024**

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 2024 series for most Cambridge IGCSE, Cambridge International A and AS Level and Cambridge Pre-U components, and some Cambridge O Level components.

This document consists of **14** printed pages.

© Cambridge University Press & Assessment 2024

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 descriptions 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.

© Cambridge University Press & Assessment 2024

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**

© Cambridge University Press & Assessment 2024

Part (b)	Generic Levels of Response:	Marks
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**

Annotation symbols

ID	ID	Valid point identified
	EXP	Explanation (an explained valid point)
	Tick	Detail/evidence is used to support the point
	Plus	Balanced – Considers the other view
	?	Unclear
	AN	Analysis
	^	Unsupported assertion
	K	Knowledge
	EVAL	Evaluation
	NAR	Lengthy narrative that is not answering the question
	Extendable Wavy Line	Use with other annotations to show extended issues or narrative
SIM	SIM	Similarity identified
DIFF	DIFF	Difference identified
N/A	Highlighter	Highlight a section of text
N/A	On-page comment	Allows comments to be entered in speech bubbles on the candidate response.

© Cambridge University Press & Assessment 2024

Using the annotations

- Annotate using the symbols above as you read through the script.

- At the end of each question write a short on-page comment:
  – be positive – say what the candidate has done, rather than what they have not
  – reference the attributes of the level descriptor you are awarding (i.e. make sure your comment matches the mark you have given)
  – be careful with your spelling

© Cambridge University Press & Assessment 2024

Question	Answer	Marks
1(a)	**Read Source A and Source B. Compare and contrast these two sources as evidence about the growth of towns.** **Similarities** • Both sources suggest that towns have developed very rapidly. **Source A** shows the builders as robots and the brick manufactory spewing out bricks which and suggests growth is relentless. **Source B** claims that factories and houses have 'sprung up'. • Growth is unplanned 'built according to no definite plan' in **Source B** and haphazard building in (**Source A**). • Urban growth has led to unhealthy living conditions. There is no green space left and conditions are polluted. 'There is no public park or place where people can walk and breathe the fresh air' (**Source B**). Manchester has no public parks and the workforce live very close to the factories. In **Source A**, the countryside around London is disappearing as the town grows and a dense pall of smoke hangs over the town. **Differences** • There appears to be no regulation to the growth of London as the town grows rapidly across the countryside. However, there has been an attempt to pave and drain Manchester after cholera and some of the central streets have building regulations. 'There was no provision for paving or drainage until the town was invaded by cholera' (**Source B**). **Source B** suggests that there are 'authorities' which can impose these features but building seems haphazard in **Source A** and there is no paving. • The brick manufacturer holds the lease on the land and it appears that he will benefit from the profits of selling or leasing new houses. In Manchester the factory owners are the ones who benefit the most as they want their workers living close at hand. **Explanation** The similarities between the sources can be explained by reference to contextual knowledge. Both sources were produced at a time when there was rapid growth of towns and concern for the welfare of their inhabitants was beginning to develop. Overcrowding and poor quality building led to the rapid spread of diseases such as typhus and smallpox and epidemics were common. However, many politicians and local councillors believed in the doctrine of laissez-faire and did not want to regulate urban growth for fear of damaging the economy or having to pay higher taxes themselves. As a result, the growth of towns was unregulated and the poor often lived in badly built rooms in large tenement buildings (seen in **Source A**). Factory owners wanted their workforce close at hand (**Source B**) and this meant they lived in crowded and unhealthy surroundings. In **Source A** the brick manufacturer stands to gain, presumably the more houses he builds, the more profit he will make, and so housing quality was probably a lesser concern than quantity. Again, this meant poor living conditions.	**15**

© Cambridge University Press & Assessment 2024

Question	Answer	Marks
1(a)	The differences between the sources could be explained by the impact of the cholera epidemic of 1832 which is referred to in **Source B**. Cholera spread very rapidly and affected rich and poor. Research into the causes of cholera led to some town councils applying to Parliament for an Improvement Act which allowed them to raise the rates and spend the money on paving and drainage. However, this was dependent on the councillors deciding to address the issues and there was no legal requirement for towns to make improvements. There appears to be no regulation at all in **Source A**. That was Cruickshank's point when he made this engraving. The expansion of the town is unchecked and the greed for new land for building is rapacious. The 1835 Municipal Corporations Act made some changes in terms of local powers to regulate conditions. The Act established a uniform system of municipal boroughs, to be governed by town councils elected by ratepayers. Councils, could take over social improvements such as proper drainage and street cleaning. However, the Act did not compel the new councils to make social improvements and by 1848 only twenty-nine boroughs had taken any action in terms of public health. Accept any other valid responses.	

© Cambridge University Press & Assessment 2024

Question	Answer	Marks
1(b)	**Read <u>all</u> of the sources. How far do the sources show that regulation was needed to improve public health in the towns?** Indicative content **Support** **Source A**: the quality of the housing in the picture is very poor. There are large cracks in the houses even though they are presumably newly built. The countryside is being destroyed and there is a huge pall of smoke over the town. The implication is that living conditions must be dreadful. **Source B**: Although there have been some developments in paving and drainage, the writer of this source thinks that more needs to be done. He comments on the lack of green space and implies that only the wealthy streets are properly regulated. **Source C**: not the main drift of the argument but there is an admission that some people support the introduction of sanitary regulations. **Challenge** **Source B**: there have been some improvements in Manchester already. Shocked by the impact of cholera, the authorities of the town have started to pave the streets and provide drainage systems. **Source C**: the speaker thinks change is not necessary. There has been much exaggeration about the 'evils resulting from defective sanitary regulations' and the government should not interfere in 'everybody's business'. **Source D**: complains that the investigator has lied about the poor water supply and the state of the streets and that a health board is not necessary. Some ratepayers have been hoodwinked into supporting the health board and are now concerned about how expensive it will be. **Evaluation** ***Source A*** *is an exaggerated picture of how towns developed with the builders show as primitive robots. However, contextual knowledge could be used to support the source – for instance Bradford grew twenty-fold in the 1800s.* ***Source B*** *is from a report to a Parliamentary Committee on the Health of Towns. As the writer is a surgeon, he might be expected to be a reliable source about the state of health in Manchester. His account is balanced but it is not surprising that he considers that further improvements would be beneficial. In spite of the cholera epidemic, the authorities in Manchester had to apply for an Act of Parliament to raise the rates to improve the town.* ***Source C*** *speaks against the introduction of the 1848 Public Health Act and expresses a commonly held view that central government should not interfere. Given the occupation of the speaker, it is not surprising that he is against government intervention and this might reduce the weight of his argument.* ***Source D*** *is a petition against the Public Health Act. It may be that some of the ratepayers were concerned about the cost of establishing a local board of health as paying for it would undoubtedly lead to an increase in rates. This might be considered to weaken the strength of their argument about the necessity for public health measures.* Accept any other valid responses.	**25**

Question	Answer	Marks
2(a)	**Read Source C and Source D. Compare and contrast these two sources as evidence about the Schechter 'Sick Chicken' case.** Indicative content **Similarities** • The sources agree on the details of the Schechter case: Schechter had broken the law, had been dishonest, and had been guilty of selling diseased chickens to their customers. 'Schechter had broken the law; it sold diseased meat.' (**Source C**), 'Schechter had been convicted for breaches of NRA rules not only for dishonesty, but also for selling diseased chickens to their unsuspecting customers.' (**Source D**) • The sources agree that the Supreme Court declared the NRA unconstitutional in the Schechter case. From **Source C**, 'it was declared unconstitutional.' 'The Court felt that the actions of the NRA were unconstitutional' in **Source D**. • The sources agree that the Schechter case was damaging to the New Deal and benefitted its opponents. 'The Court has not interpreted the Constitution in the interests of all Americans, just in the interests of those who oppose the New Deal.', 'The judges support the political opponents of the New Deal in their wish to declare unconstitutional any legislation that displeases men of property.' **Differences** The sources disagree on the reasons why the Supreme Court declared the NIRA unconstitutional in the Schechter case. • **Source C** says the Court struck down the NIRA in Schechter because: The Supreme Court decided the case on purely political grounds to benefit the New Deal's opponents 'in the interests of those who oppose the New Deal.' The Supreme Court aimed to increase the power of the Court 'suggests the judges are aiming to give the Court a position of influence in our system of government, which was never intended.' • **Source D** says the Court struck down the NIRA in Schechter because: the Supreme Court acted on constitutional grounds – Congress had no right to grant such powers to the NRA. 'The Court felt that the actions of the NRA were unconstitutional, and that Congress had no right to grant such powers to the NRA.' The background of the judges affected their decision in the case '. . . the current judges, all bar one having been commercial lawyers, will interpret our Constitution narrowly. . . .' The Supreme Court also acted to defend the wealthy – 'will interpret our Constitution narrowly in the interests of property and business.'	**15**

© Cambridge University Press & Assessment 2024

Question	Answer	Marks
2(a)	**Explanation** The question is focused on the Schechter case. Therefore, answers must focus on the details of the case and the reasons for its outcome. The similarities between the sources' views can be explained by the fact that they both represent Democratic points of view on the Schechter case. **Source C** is a speech by FDR at a Democratic rally. The NRA had been a core part of Roosevelt's recovery plan during the First New Deal and when the Court declared it unconstitutional in Schechter this undermined the New Deal. It is therefore to be expected that Roosevelt would be critical of the decision. **Source D** is a report on how Democrats responded to FDR's Court packing plan. Most Democrats supported the NIRA and NRA and were angered by the Court's decision in Schechter, which they viewed as too conservative. The differences between the sources can be explained by the nature of the sources. **Source C** is a speech by FDR in which he is attempting to justify his Court packing plan. He therefore aims to present the Court's decision in Schechter as politically motivated and as against the interests of the American people as this would strengthen the case for reform of the Court. **Source D** is a journalist's report on how Democrats responded to FDR's Court packing plan. The journalist is not aiming to justify the Court packing plan or discredit the Schechter case, and therefore attributes a wider range of motives to the judges rather than explaining Schechter as the result of party politics. Accept any other valid responses.	

© Cambridge University Press & Assessment 2024

Question	Answer	Marks
2(b)	**Read <u>all</u> of the sources. 'Opposition to the Supreme Court packing plan was based on a fear that it would give too much power to the President.' How far do the sources support this view?** Indicative content **Support** • **Source A** supports the view. It makes it clear that the President [FDR on the left of the cartoon] is moving on from his reorganisation of the government to implement the New Deal – then onto the 'revision' of the Supreme Court and ultimately ending up as a dictator sitting on a throne. • **Source B** also supports the assertion. Hoover maintains that the plan will subordinate the Court to the 'personal power of the Executive' of which the President is the Head. He does stress that his opposition is not just that he is a member of another Party, but also goes on to say that he opposes it as he sees it as an attack on 'fundamental liberties'. The final sentence also supports the point made in Source A that in various welfare cases where the President was trying to 'increase his personal power.' **Challenge** • **Source C** does not support this assertion. Roosevelt suggests other reasons for the opposition. One is that the Judges fail to understand the intentions of the writers of the Constitution. Then he becomes more critical of the opposition, suggesting that they are doing it for 'political and personal' reasons and are simply trying to destroy the New Deal. • **Source D** does not support the assertion, but for different reasons. Some Democrats feel, quite understandably, that the plan will offend conservatives, (understandably as many Democrats were in fact quite conservative), and also give 'ammunition to their political opponents.' Their opposition is for political reasons, and not constitutional ones. **Evaluation** ***Source A** is an obviously one-sided cartoon, aiming to make a specific point. There is no indication anywhere that Roosevelt may have wished to revise the membership of the Supreme Court in order to deliver legislation which Congress had passed, and he clearly had a mandate for.* ***Source B** comes from an opponent of all that Roosevelt stood for and did from March 1933 onwards. Hoover was angry about the way Roosevelt had deflected any responsibility for the economic crisis away from himself and his Party and ensured that it fell largely on Hoover and the Republican administrations he had been involved in since 1921.* ***Source C** comes from a speech made by Roosevelt to Democratic supporters in defence of his increasingly unpopular 'Court Packing' plan. He had been surprised by the degree of opposition to it within his own party and was doing his best to justify his actions.* ***Source D** is a newspaper report which is quite balanced and contextual knowledge suggests that it is accurate and reflects the feelings within the Democratic Party at the time.* Accept any other valid responses.	**25**

Question	Answer	Marks
3(a)	**Read Source B and Source C. Compare and contrast these two sources as evidence about the arrangements for the Saar.** Indicative content **Similarities** • Both sources agree on the main facts: they show that the Saar will be separated from Germany for 15 years. • Both indicate that the population will be consulted at the end of this period. • They agree the purpose is to compensate France by providing coal. **Differences** • **Source B** maintains that the Allies will occupy the area and suggests the inhabitants will be oppressed and manipulated, with the aim to 'cut the economic and moral links' with Germany. **Source C** is far more positive; it emphasises that the people of the Saar will have 'control of local affairs' and that the regime will be 'the governing supervision of the League of Nations'. • The French leader in **Source C** emphasises the population's 'complete freedom to decide' their situation after 15 years. **Source B** claims that the Allies may 'misrepresent the wishes of the local population'. • In **Source B** the Saar is presented as a 'purely German district' but reference is made to its 'mixed population' in **Source C**. **Explanation** The similarities reflect the fact that the main arrangements for the Saar were set out in the Treaty of Versailles, including the 15-year period of government by League of Nations, the plebiscite at the end of this period and the French ownership of the mines. However, the contrasting views of the French and German negotiators about these arrangements show the tensions between France and Germany over the Saar. The French wanted reparations in 1919. One of their demands was for the coal-rich Saar basin, which had been French in the 18th century, although almost all of the Saar's 650 000 inhabitants were German. Britain and the United States would not accept this. Wilson said to Clemenceau: 'You base your claim on what took place 104 years ago. We cannot readjust Europe on the basis of conditions that existed in such a remote period. 'Clemenceau accused the president of being pro-German and threatened to resign rather than sign the peace treaty, while Wilson threatened to abandon the negotiations and sail back to America. A compromise was finally worked out, whereby France got ownership only of the mines and the Saar was placed under the control of a League of Nations Commission consisting of a Frenchman, a German Saarlander and three members, who must not be either French or German. It was specified that a plebiscite would be held in 1935 to decide to which country the Saar should belong. Accept any other valid responses.	**15**

Question	Answer	Marks
3(b)	**Read <u>all</u> of the sources. How far do the sources support the view that German anger about reparations was justified?** Indicative content **Support** • **Source B**: There is clear support here, on various grounds. The demands of the Treaty, which include reparations, are described as 'victorious violence' towards the Germans. The idea of 'all the war expenses of its enemies' is shown to be particularly unreasonable and excessive as these expenses 'exceed many times over' the total German assets. This is also linked to the loss of territories, such as the Saar, as it means Germany is 'weakened'. • **Source D**: This denounces the 'financial burden' as reducing Germany to 'economic slavery'. This is also linked to German expectations of the peace treaty being betrayed. **Challenge** • **Source A**: The report paints a detailed picture of the devastation of France and of German responsibility for this. It concludes that, as a result, French demands are that Germany 'will pay', so the clear implication is that substantial reparations are only just. • **Source C**: Clemenceau sets out an argument that Allied demands are quite reasonable, so challenging the right of the Germans to feel anger over reparations. He claims this anger is because the 'German Delegation has seriously misinterpreted' the demands, which were set out in the Armistice and are compensation for 'damage caused to Allied civilians'. The mines in the Saar are explained as an example of this. **Evaluation** ***Source A*** *is from an American observer, who had witnessed the devastation and suffering of the French people first-hand. The reports of German atrocities in Belgium had created considerable sympathy for civilians affected by invasion in American public opinion, even before the US joined the war against Germany in 1917. As a Red Cross worker, it is not surprising that Ruth Gaines is moved by the suffering of the local population, and aware of French opinion about how this should be redressed, in terms of demanding that Germany should offer compensation.* ***Source B*** *expresses the views that were current in Germany, and would later be exploited by the Nazis, that Versailles was a betrayal and that reparations were vindictive and unrealistic, given all the territorial losses also imposed by the Treaty. Brockdorff-Rantzau was clearly delegated to try and gain the most favourable terms possible for Germany and he put forward alternative proposals which were rejected by the Allied negotiators. He was opposed to the German government's ratification of the Treaty of Versailles, and he resigned his post as foreign minister in June 1919.*	**25**

© Cambridge University Press & Assessment 2024

Question	Answer	Marks
3(b)	***Source C** is a response to **Source B** and aims to refute the argument that reparations demands were excessive. Clemenceau was of course pushing for stringent terms; the context for this includes memories of 1871 when Germany forced France to pay compensation and took control of the province of Alsace-Lorraine. He also believes the actions of German forces as they retreated through Belgium and France in the autumn of 1918 were 'deliberate destruction'; the destruction of factories, homes and livestock, as well as mines, is supported by **Source A**.* ***Source D**, in contrast, is a seemingly neutral source but much more supportive of **Source B**. The points made echo those of Brockdorff-Rantzau very closely. The Netherlands had been neutral in the war, and there was some suspicion of Belgian demands at Versailles, which had included territories belonging to the Netherlands to strengthen its borders, and this may have created some Dutch sympathy for Germany. Continued trade relations with Germany were also crucially important to the Dutch, so it was not in their interests to see Germany economically crippled.* *These polarised views demonstrate the difficulty in achieving a satisfactory outcome.* Accept any other valid responses.	

© Cambridge University Press & Assessment 2024