CAMBRIDGE
International Education

Cambridge International AS & A Level

HISTORY **9489/12**

Paper 1 Document question **May/June 2025**

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 2025 series for most Cambridge IGCSE, Cambridge International A and AS Level components, and some Cambridge O Level components.

This document consists of **16** printed pages.

© Cambridge University Press & Assessment 2025

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 2025

Annotations guidance for centres

Examiners use a system of annotations as a shorthand for communicating their marking decisions to one another. Examiners are trained during the standardisation process on how and when to use annotations. The purpose of annotations is to inform the standardisation and monitoring processes and guide the supervising examiners when they are checking the work of examiners within their team. The meaning of annotations and how they are used is specific to each component and is understood by all examiners who mark the component.

We publish annotations in our mark schemes to help centres understand the annotations they may see on copies of scripts. Note that there may not be a direct correlation between the number of annotations on a script and the mark awarded. Similarly, the use of an annotation may not be an indication of the quality of the response.

The annotations listed below were available to examiners marking this component in this series.

Annotations

Annotation	Meaning
SEEN	Must be on all blank pages. Can be used to show rough notes have been seen
	Irrelevant material
Highlighter	Use in the text to show relevant comment / source use
On-page comment	Allows comments to be entered in speech bubbles on the candidate response, for example, Sim ID – identified sim/diff but not developed from source content
Off-page comment	Allows comments to be entered at the bottom of the RM marking window and then displayed when the associated question item is navigated to
diff	Valid difference supported with source content
sim	Valid similarity supported with source content
L0	Level 0
L1	Level 1
L2	Level 2
L3	Level 3
L4	Level 4
L5	Level 5

© Cambridge University Press & Assessment 2025

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**

© Cambridge University Press & Assessment 2025

Question	Answer	Marks
1(a)	**Read Source B and Source C. Compare and contrast these two sources as evidence about Bismarck's involvement in the Franco-Prussian War.** Indicative content **Similarities** • Both sources show Bismarck as being committed to the bombardment of Paris. In **Source B**, he does not have a moment's hesitation, would not consider sparing the art works. In **Source C**, Bismarck is so keen for Paris to be bombarded that it is suggested that he has written a telegram which purports to be from Berlin about the necessity for bombardment to strengthen his argument. • Both sources that Bismarck's mood is unstable as a result of the war and he is eager to achieve victory. In **Source B** he is nervous and irritable, being bad tempered with his secretary. In **Source C**, he is described as being fit for a lunatic asylum, resorting to devious tricks to get his own way. **Differences** • In **Source B** it is taken for granted that Bismarck will have a view on political and military matters. The source states 'if he considered the bombardment right from a political and military point of view' which suggests that Bismarck's opinion matters. However, in **Source C** this is portrayed as being unnecessary interference in military affairs. He is trying to take over negotiations with the French from Moltke and has made suggestions about military strategy. • Bismarck's involvement with the king is portrayed differently. In **Source B**, he is nervous and worn out by trying to persuade the king to see things his way. In **Source C** he complains bitterly and gets his own way very quickly. **Explanation** The differences between the sources could be explained by considering the position of the author. The Private Secretary supports Bismarck, despite his frustration at Bismarck's bad temper and presumably wishes to keep his position. The Prussian general, however, is frustrated by the fact that a mere diplomat is privy to military discussions and decisions (even before the generals know what is going on). Contextual knowledge could be used to explain the similarity between the sources. Napoleon III had surrendered after the defeat at Sedan on 2 September 1870. When news reached Paris on 4 September, Napoleon was deposed and the French Government of National Defence was formed. They wanted peace but refused to concede territory. Bismarck had already made it clear he intended to annex Alsace-Lorraine and so the war continued. Accept any other valid responses.	**15**

Question	Answer	Marks
1(b)	**Read all of the sources. 'France was defeated easily.' How far do the sources agree?** Indicative content **Support** • **Source A** shows France would be defeated easily as it is weak with few resources left, no rifles, guns or cavalry. They are concerned that they are about to be attacked, and the people are already suffering as a result of the siege. The comment 'Europe remains inactive' refers to the lack of support from other European powers. **Source A** suggests that Prussia has superior resources. There is a new German army on the way from Basle and French reserves will be unable to go to the support of Paris. • **Source C** refers to the Prussian victory at Sedan showing France being defeated on the battlefield (although France did not give up at this point). • **Source D** shows that the Parisians blame poor leadership by Napoleon for their fate and every blunder in the war. This also suggests that mistakes were made by the French which could have been avoided. Also, the source praises the leadership and skill of Moltke, suggesting military superiority on the part of Prussia. **Challenge** • This is not so much the French being easily defeated as Prussia being too strong for them. **Source A** suggests France with 'must fight to the bitter end' and defend Paris against the 'humiliation of foreign invasion', suggesting they would not easily give in to the Prussians. 'The siege has only been going on for four days' shows some resistance. • **Source B** shows the French are shown as being stubborn which suggests they were not defeated easily. They are blamed for not coming to reason and refusing to surrender. Prussia is forced to consider bombardment to defeat them. • **Source C** refers to resistance at Metz and Paris which suggests the French are not completely defeated and the war is not going in the direction which Prussian would like. The General dismisses the idea that 'the government in Paris is only awaiting the beginning of the bombardment to surrender' as 'possible but unlikely'. Bismarck had previously suggested taking up a defensive position in Alsace which suggests he didn't want to engage with French forces any more than absolutely necessary.	**25**

Question	Answer	Marks
1(b)	**Evaluation** ***Source A**: Paris was under siege by 20th September and the writer of this report shows a desperate situation facing those trapped in Paris. He complains that the Prussia wants to humiliate France and about the peace conditions. Contextual knowledge could be used to explain what is meant here and why France would not accept the terms of surrender which were offered.* ***Source B** is written by Bismarck's private secretary. He would have witnessed debates about the future of the war, and this might be considered to be a reliable account on that basis. However, he was in Bismarck's employ which might have an impact on what he says, and this could be argued to have an impact on the source as evidence.* ***Source C** is by a Prussian general who also witnessed arguments about policy and Bismarck's' attempts to control the direction of the war and military policy. Contextual knowledge of the battle of Sedan, the ongoing siege of Metz and the refusal of the Defence Council to surrender could be used to assess the reliability of what is said here. However, it is also clear that the writer resents Bismarck's intervention, and this might lessen the weight of the source as evidence.* ***Source D** is a report by an observer and might be described as unbiased because of this. However, it is clear from the source that the writer was on friendly terms with the Prussian leadership. The source credits Moltke's leadership of the Prussian military as the reason for their victory.* Accept any other valid responses.	

Question	Answer	Marks
2(a)	**Read Source B and Source C. Compare and contrast these two sources as evidence about Wilmot's reasons for introducing the Proviso.** Indicative content **Similarities include:** • Both sources suggest that it was local state issues that were an influence on him. **Source B** says that he 'hopes his Proviso will bring him political advantages in his state' and **Source C** says that because of the reaction to his tariff votes, he might lose his seat in Congress, and needed to make amends, 'He is anxious to show the citizens of Pennsylvania, and the country as a whole, that he is not a supporter of southern policies'. • Both sources suggest he was motived by a desire for political power, **Source B** saying it was his 'desire for personal power' and **Source C** refers to he was introducing it to retain 'any power in the House' by gaining support from the abolitionists. • Both sources suggest that he was motivated by his anti-slavery views. His 'attack' is mentioned in **Source B** while **Source C** mentions his desire to gain the support of those who supported abolition. **Differences include:** • **Source B** suggests that his opposition to slavery was of recent origin, and he did not have deeply held views on it. **Source C** mentions that he has 'long opposed slavery.' • **Source B** suggests that his strongest motives are the wide political context of a hatred of annexation and sectional rivalry, while **Source C** suggests he is much more driven by personal motivations and securing his own position. • **Source B** refers to 'this measure of his', suggesting that the introduction of the Proviso was his idea, while **Source C** says that he introduced the Proviso into the House of Representatives 'at the request of others.'	**15**

© Cambridge University Press & Assessment 2025

Question	Answer	Marks
2(a)	**Explanation** Candidates should consider the authorship of the two sources and bear in mind that both are written very soon after the Proviso was introduced and before it was finally rejected. Buchanan in **Source B**, although from Pennsylvania, was not a strong anti-slaver (he was later as President a keen supporter of the Scott decision) and felt strongly that it should be up to a State whether slavery should exist there – or not. Naturally he would be strongly critical of Wilmot for the Proviso, not only for its attack on states' rights which Buchanan supported, but also for the highly divisive potential of it if it passed into law. Given his position in the cabinet, as well as his long involvement in politics, he would be in a good position to comment on the likely implications of the Proviso's passing. **Source C** is by a prominent Free Soiler so could be seen as a fellow anti-slavery campaigner to Wilmot. Although the Free Soil Party did not formally start until 1848, the 'Free Soil' ideas had emerged from other abolitionist groups like the Liberty Party in the preceding years. The author (Gideon Welles) moved from the Liberty Party to form the Free Soilers and then join the Republicans under Lincoln. Although an opponent to slavery, he is suspicious of Wilmot and his motives, but for different reasons from Buchanan. His comments on the implications of the Proviso and what it might mean to the anti-slavery movement were perceptive. Accept any other valid responses.	

Question	Answer	Marks
2(b)	**Read all of the sources. How far do the sources agree that the main impact of the Proviso would be changes to American political parties?** Indicative content **Support** • **Source A** is well aware of the considerable implications that the Proviso might have and stresses the political changes that might come about. There could be an alliance between the Northern Whigs and Northern Democrats against their southern variants. The usual dividing issues between the two parties, which had gone back for decades, are no longer there, and new divisions which will 'dominate' the country are coming in. • **Source C** suggests that the Proviso will have no effect on the great issue of slavery but mentions 'considerable changes to the two major parties' as well as dividing the Northern and Southern Democrats and may 'destroy the Whigs.' **Challenge** • **Source B** suggests that while Wilmot hoped that his Proviso might bring him some political advantages, it was 'unlikely to.' The real impact would be to make the supporters of slavery 'more determined' and, above all, it could well lead to the 'constitutional crisis we all fear' and also 'hasten disunion.' • **Source D** the main impact is that it is likely to cause a 'profound constitutional issue' which could possibly divide and destroy the nation. There is a sub-message that there will be a wider societal impact because of the Proviso mentions the 'great impact' on the 'public mind' on the whole issue of slavery that the Proviso will have. **Evaluation** ***Source A*** *is from a Northern and obviously Whig supporting newspaper and while not being critical of the Northern Whigs, its views of Northern Democrats should be seen as possibly suspect. The rivalry between the two groups could be virulent at times. It is a perceptive comment however, as both the two major parties were in the process of splitting badly, with the Republicans beginning their slow but sure rise.* ***Source B*** *is naturally hostile to Wilmot and his Proviso as Buchanan would see what he had done as damaging to both the party of government, the Democrats, and highly disruptive to the operations of the government as a whole.*	**25**

Question	Answer	Marks
2(b)	***Source C** is a perceptive comment by a politician who could be expected to support the Proviso with its anti- slavery intention. However, the author clearly, and rightly, suspects Wilmot's motives, and his comment about it probably not having any effect on the issue of slavery is perceptive.* ***Source D** is from a Michigan (northern) Senator and probably aware of the likely implications of the Proviso, especially in the Senate, where it was to be rejected. He would also be only too aware of the activities of the 'F Street Mess' group of Southern Senators and the extremes to which they would be prepared to go to defend slavery.* Accept any other valid responses.	

Question	Answer	Marks
3(a)	**Read Source A and Source B. Compare and contrast these two sources as evidence about the Non-Intervention Committee and intervention in the Spanish Civil War.** Indicative content **Similarities** • Both sources agree that there was considerable intervention. Source B concentrates on the activities of Italy and Germany, 'Mussolini was sending whole combat divisions into Spain' and all Hitler's 'pilots flew there'. **Source A** also shows these counties were involved from the start, as Hitler decided that 'aircraft should be put at Franco's disposal' and 'Mussolini was also in favour of Franco'. • Both indicate the ineffectual nature of the London committee which was meant to enforce non-intervention. **Source A** claims it would have been better named the 'Intervention Committee', and **Source B** shows the hypocrisy of 'the dictator governments' there. • They agree that some efforts were made to hush up the 'respective countries' intervention in Spain' (**Source A**). **Source B** gives the example of 'the so-called volunteer pilots returning from Spain' to Berlin. • Both sources recognise Germany and Italy to be concerned about communism, if only as their reasoning to the other members of the Non-intervention committee. In A Germany could not tolerate a communist Spain Mussolini was also in favour of Franco and • combatting the peril of communism. In B 'The dictators built a fellowship which joined them in defence before it was to unite them in conquest'. **Differences** • **Source A** presents the policy of non-intervention as under threat from all countries. The Germans had to challenge France and Britain which 'often sided with the Reds,' and their 'main job' was to 'oppose intervention by the USSR'. **Source B** sees such accusations as spurious, dismissing the accusations that France was 'failing to keep its pledges' as hypocritical, and showing it was 'the dictator governments' who were breaking the agreement. • **Source A** shows Hitler's motives for intervention as making a stand against Communism 'Germany could not tolerate a communist Spain', and that he was joined by Mussolini in 'combatting the peril'. **Source B** indicates the aim of using 'the battlefields of Spain to test his planes and tanks'.	**15**

Question	Answer	Marks
3(a)	**Explanation** Germany and Italy were heavily involved in supporting Franco, and this is confirmed in both sources. The inability of the Non-intervention Committee to manage either this, or the less significant Soviet and other contributions to the Republican cause, was also notorious. Ribbentrop was closely involved, often appearing at the Committee as he was based in London at the time, serving as Germany's ambassador to the United Kingdom from 1936 to 1938. His tenure in London was marked by diplomatic failures and tensions, as he struggled to build strong relations with British officials. On trial for war crimes, he is clearly motivated to show the problem of intervention as general and to indicate his motive as anti-Communist. Hoare, in contrast, is disposed to blame the wartime alliance of Germany and Italy, and to show their motives as military preparation. Accept any other valid responses.	

Question	Answer	Marks
3(b)	**Read all of the sources. 'Germany and Italy developed a strong bond after 1936.' How far do the sources support this view?** Indicative content **Support** • **Source A:** There is support in the expression of the countries' joint interests in supporting Franco and working together on the London committee. The animosity shown is personal rather than a criticism of the relations between Germany and Italy, as the Italian delegate was 'an intriguer'. • **Source B**: This is the most overt support. Hoare is explicit that the 'Spanish Civil War tightened the bonds between Germany and Italy' and they were 'accomplices' on the Non-intervention Committee. • **Source C:** The two countries are closely linked by their creation of the Axis. **Challenge** • **Source C:** There is some question of how good the relations are here. Mussolini does not look happy with his role as Hitler is shown to be so dominant that he has left the Italian powerless and the 'Future plans for Italy' are in Hitler's pocket. • **Source D:** The clearest challenge is here**.** By the summer of 1939, Italy clearly felt aggrieved and insulted. The Foreign Minister 'bitterly resented' the 'lack of courtesy' shown by Hitler, and his failure to consult over the Nazi-Soviet pact. **Evaluation** ***Source A*** *Ribbentrop is trying to evade responsibility for German intervention in Spain by showing this as general and also as motivated by the need to combat Communism. His difficult relations with the Italian representative reflect the animosity shown towards him in* ***Source D****. Contextual details should focus on Ribbentrop's role in London as ambassador.* ***Source B*** *The British diplomat sees the issues as the joint conspiracy of the dictators, rather than the weakness and confusion shown in London. Hoare was notorious for the pact with Laval in 1935 which allowed Mussolini to take over Abyssinia and his support of appeasement. On 29th July 1936, the Luftwaffe began transporting Franco's Army of Africa from Spanish Morocco to Spain in an operation known as 'Magic Fire' and nine Italian 'Savoia-Marchetti 81'bombers sent to assist the Nationalists arrived near Melilla on July 30th, 1936. So, it is reasonable to suggest they were deployed at the same time, not that Mussolini was first to help and then Hitler was persuaded to do the same, as asserted by Hoare*.	**25**

Question	Answer	Marks
3(b)	***Source C*** *is a cartoon by Low, who mocked the Fascist leaders with such insight that his work created diplomatic incidents and was banned by Hitler. He intends both to amuse and warn the British public*. *The alliance shown originated in a series of agreements between Germany and Italy, including their tacit support for each other over Abyssinia and Austria. Italian involvement in the Stresa front 1935, and action by Mussolini in 1934 stationing troops in the Brenner Pass as a message to Hitler against German interference in Austria, after Austrian Nazis attempted a coup, storming the Chancellery and assassinating Dollfuss in July 1934 evidence Mussolini's initial positioning. This gave Mussolini international prestige with the League, but his stance changed over the course of 1935, mostly due to the League's stance on Abyssinia. This position is shown by the backing of Franco in Spain, followed by the proclamation of an 'axis' joining Rome and Berlin on October 25, 1936. The cartoon shows Hitler to be very much the dominant partner by 1939, a supposition supported by* ***Source C****.* ***Source D*** *is a reliable report of Ciano's views from the American diplomat who spoke to him. His comments are shown as open and unguarded. While the Pact of Steel was signed between Germany and Italy in May 1939, Mussolini agreed to this under pressure from Hitler. Mussolini did not believe that Italy was ready for the war to which the agreement committed it. Mussolini and his son-in-law, Ciano, were also not informed about the negotiations with Stalin and still hoped to prevent Italy from being drawn into war.* *Overall, the sources indicate that there was agreement over policy in Spain but that the Italians came to resent their subordinate role in the Axis alliance.* Accept any other valid responses.	