CAMBRIDGE
International Education

Cambridge International AS & A Level

HISTORY **9489/13**

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 Prussia's position in Germany.** **Indicative content** **Similarities** • Both sources suggest that Prussia is insecure within Germany. In **Source B** there is a threat that the south German states will ally themselves with France which would be a threat to Prussia. In **Source C**, the alliance with Austria means increased security for Prussia which implies that this is something Prussia lacked and has been seeking. • Both sources suggest there is hostility and tension towards to Prussia from the German states. In **Source B**, Prussia wants to end the hostility which exists between Prussia and the small states 'almost all the German states have cherished a hostile spirit against Prussia', 'It is a matter then of finding ways and means to put an end to German animosity against Prussia'. In **Source C**, the smaller states will 'conform as soon as they see the firm will of Austria and Prussia' which implies they have not conformed previously. • Both agree it would benefit Prussia's position in Germany to ally with Austria in **Source B** 'The necessity therefore arises that we should enter an understanding with Austria' and **Source C** 'The strong alliance of these two powers has been our aim from the outset'. **Differences** • **Source B** suggests that Austria has been stirring up trouble for Prussia in the smaller states 'Austria, with its own hostility to us, were not also the moving spirit of German opposition' whereas this is not the case in **Source C** where joint action between Prussia and Austria is planned against Denmark 'We consider combination (such as the joint action in waging war on Denmark) as the foundation of an enduring unity.' 'strong alliance of these two powers' • In **Source B** Prussia considers itself superior in 'moral and physical power'. However, in **Source C** Austria and Prussia are the 'two great powers' of Germany. **Explanation** The similarities and differences between the sources could be explained by using contextual knowledge. In 1860, Prussia was concerned about the possible threat posed by France. In 1864 Prussia was keen to make the best of the Schleswig-Holstein crisis to increase Prussian power in north Germany. Austria would be a useful ally in both situations. Prussia was not yet considered strong enough to stand alone and proposals for army reform were put forward by Roon in 1860. This led to a constitutional crisis in Prussia which may have added to the general sense of insecurity.	**15**

© Cambridge University Press & Assessment 2025

Question	Answer	Marks
1(a)	However, consideration may be given to the view that by 1864 Bismarck was feeling more confident about Prussia's chances should things come to war and was using Austrian support over Denmark to manoeuvre Prussia into a stronger position. Contextual knowledge of what happened between Austria and Prussia over Schleswig Holstein might be used to explain this further. Although Bismarck was writing to the Prussian Ambassador he would have been conscious that the positive tone he used about Austria in this letter would be reported in Austria. Accept any other valid responses.	

© Cambridge University Press & Assessment 2025

Question	Answer	Marks
1(b)	**Read all of the sources. 'Prussia pursued a hostile policy towards Austria.' How far do the sources agree.** Indicative content **Support** • **Source A** supports as it sees war between Prussia and Austria as inevitable. 'We will be obliged sooner or later to fight Austria for our existence.' The possibility of going to war with Austria is considered and dismissed. Bismarck understood that Austria would use Prussia for its own ends and to increase its own power. What Bismarck wants is to increase the power of Prussia. • **Source B** refers to Prussia's 'sharp opposition to Austria' which suggests that Prussia has pursued a hostile policy previously. • **Source D** supports the idea that Prussia always intended to fight Austria to establish its dominance over Germany. Moltke argues it was a struggle 'long foreseen and calmly prepared for.' **Challenge** • **Source B** challenges as Prussia wants an alliance with Austria for security against the French and also to subdue hostility towards Prussia from other German States • **Source C** also challenges. Bismarck claims to see Austria as an equal power in Germany and that the two powers will share leadership of Germany. He argues that Austria and Prussia should be united and that the 'strong alliance' of the two has been his aim from the outset. There is no suggestion of tension between the two at all. **Evaluation** ***Source A*** *is a relatively early statement of Bismarck's aims. His hostility towards Austria has increased since the reassertion of Austrian power over Germany after the 1848–49 revolutions. At this point Bismarck was Prussian envoy at Frankfurt. The situation being discussed was hypothetical although it shows Bismarck weighing options.* ***Source B*** *is a report of a council meeting and shows that Prussia was concerned about its own security and the threat of the small states siding with France. Therefore, it is expedient to try to mend fences with the German states and Austria and form a defensive alliance.* *In* ***Source C*** *Bismarck appears to have had a radical change of heart compared with his views in Source A. However, candidates could challenge this source using their knowledge of the dispute over Schleswig-Holstein and Bismarck's policy of dualism.* ***Source D*** *is from Moltke memoirs which were published long after the successful war waged by Prussia against Austria in 1866. Knowledge of Moltke's role involvement in planning the war and reforming the armed forces could be used to evaluate his views. Although Moltke was expert in military matters, his portrayal of events would certainly have been affected by considerations of justification for the provocation which led to the Austro-Prussia war, and burnishing his own reputation.* Accept any other valid responses.	**25**

Question	Answer	Marks
2(a)	**Read Source C and Source D. Compare and contrast these two sources about Douglas' support for the Kansas-Nebraska Act.** Indicative content **Similarities** • Both sources suggest that Douglas' own political ambitions played a part in his decision. **Source C** mentions his wish to get Southern support for 'his presidential aspirations', while **Source D** mentions his ambitions for 'high office'. • Both sources suggest Douglas supported the concept of popular sovereignty. In **Source C** 'Leaving the decision to be Free Soil or not to the citizens of those Territories was his idea' and in **Source D** 'leave the decision about slavery to the people of those Territories'. • Both sources mention that he was particularly interested in the organisation and development of the new Territories in westward expansion to align with his business interests. **Source C** mentions his interest in 'developing the Territories' and also in 'territorial reorganisation'. **Source D** mentions his 'wishing to see the Territories developed in the way he favoured'. **Differences** • **Source C** suggests that Douglas 'fully understood the implications of the Act', while **Source D** suggests that 'he may well have lacked awareness of what the Act could lead to.' • **Source C** mentions that Douglas was aware that the Act would go against the principles which underlay the Compromise of 1850, while **Source D** mentions that he felt the Act would 'still support the principles of the Compromise of 1850.' **Explanation** Consideration might be given to the different purpose of these documents as a reason for their difference. **Source C** is from a leading newspaper in the principal city in Douglas' own state of Illinois, the state which he represented in the Senate. It was written soon after the passage of the Act, so aware of the passions which its passage had caused. It is also perceptive about the ambitions of Douglas and reflected well the opinion of many in this leading, industrial, Northern State. The comment about 'the interests of his state' is important. **Source D** is written by a leading Northern newspaper owner and historian, [Horace Greeley] in 1864. Obviously, he had the advantage of hindsight and knew what the implications of the Act were and the part it had played in the outbreak of the Civil War. Like many Northerners he viewed Douglas, also from a major Northern State, with some scepticism, especially in the light of what happened to 'bleeding Kansas' in the years immediately after the passage of the Act. Contextual knowledge can be used to defend Douglas – he did try and get a solution to what was obviously becoming an intractable and highly divisive problem which had dominated the US for decades. He was trying to get a compromise to a challenging problem along the lines of his great achievement with the Compromise of 1850. Candidates should be aware that he was the principal author of the final Compromise of 1850.	**15**

Question	Answer	Marks
2(a)	Stephen A. Douglas had personal and financial motivations for supporting the Kansas-Nebraska Act. One of his key interests was the construction of a transcontinental railroad, which he hoped would pass through Illinois, particularly Chicago, where he had significant real estate investments. By organizing the Kansas and Nebraska territories, Douglas aimed to facilitate the expansion of the railroad, which would boost economic growth in the region and benefit his own holdings, using the idea of popular sovereignty to gain support from the southern senators. Accept any other valid responses.	

© Cambridge University Press & Assessment 2025

Question	Answer	Marks
2(b)	**Read all of the sources. How far do the sources agree that the main reason for opposition to the Kansas-Nebraska Act was hostility to slavery?** Indicative content **Support** • **Source B** is clearly opposed to slavery and in particular to the possibility that the Act could lead to slavery being imposed on, or legally brought in to, States which wished to remain free from slavery. 'Forcing slavery down the throats' denotes imposition. • **Source C** stresses that 'the great majority of those opposing the Act do so as it will ensure not only the continuation of, but also the extension of, slavery in America.' **Challenge** • **Source A**, Aitcheson opposes the Act, not because of his hostility to slavery (he is a supporter as Missouri is a 'slave state'), but for what it could lead to in terms of the abolitionists. Missouri possibly could be 'surrounded by a Free Territory' and his (slave) property might become 'insecure.' He is arguing that the Act does not do enough to protect slavery. • **Source C**, while mostly supporting the hypothesis, does suggest there were those who opposed the Act as they saw it as a ploy by Douglas to further his own ambitions. • **Source D** is firmly of the view that much of the opposition was there for political reasons. The Democrats, one of the two major parties, opposed it as they saw it 'principally as a Whig device to divide and disorganise the Democratic Party.' Also, the Democrats were' little interested in what else it might lead to.' It certainly had a major divisive effect on the Democrats. **Source D** also has opposition on grounds that Douglas's is seen to be acting on his own interests. **Evaluation** ***Source A*** *is written by one of the strongest supporters of slavery and advocates of disunion in America at the time. Missouri is a 'slave' State which candidates can explain using their contextual knowledge of the Missouri Compromise. The fact that he was already, in 1854, advocating the use of force in order to extend slavery indicates the nature and extent of his extremism on the subject.* ***Source B*** *is a cartoon from September 1854 which is commenting on the probable implications of the Act. The newspaper is from the north and would have a largely Republican and abolitionist audience. New York was violently opposed to the Fugitive Slave law 1850, so this line is unsurprising in that context.* ***Source C*** *is from a newspaper published in Chicago, the leading city in Douglas' own state of Illinois, where slavery was finally banned in 1848 as part of its Constitution. Douglas's proposals could cause continuation and expansion against the interests of Illinois. Candidates could use Douglas's involvement in the 1850 Compromise in their evaluation.*	**25**

Question	Answer	Marks
2(b)	*In **Source D** the author is writing this book during the Civil War from a northern perspective. Those factors need to be borne in mind for evaluation. However, he might be seen as generous towards Douglas when suggesting that 'he may have lacked awareness of what the Act could lead to.' Douglas had been in the Senate long enough to know exactly what the Act could lead to. The points about Douglas's railroad interests and the development of the Territories are also accurate.* Accept any other valid responses.	

Question	Answer	Marks
3(a)	**Read Source B and Source D. Compare and contrast these two sources as evidence about Germany's decision to leave the Disarmament Conference.** Indicative content **Similarities** • Both sources agree that Hitler took the decision to leave the conference himself; **Source B** records 'Hitler acted with his usual promptness', and **Source D** 'His decision, he said, was final'. • They agree that Germany leaves the conference because of unfairness and the restrictiveness of the conference, They agree that this was because Germany felt that insufficient concessions had been offered; in **Source D** 'Germany was expected to wait virtually another eight years for the concession of equality in armaments' and **Source B** concurs that, despite German protests 'the attitude of Britain and France was unchanged'. • They both indicate that the decision to leave the League took place at the same time. **Differences** • In **Source D**, Hitler is shown to take the decision to leave 'entirely on his own'. **Source B** indicates more prior consultation, including a 'cabinet meeting, at which all sorts of experts – legal, military – were present'. • There are contrasts in Hitler's motives. In **Source B** the responsibility to leave is Hitler's – it is suggested that the conference was a constraint on Hitler, and that he left partly because of this, and also because it gave him a pretext to leave the League, which would be a popular decision in Germany. In **Source D**, Hitler is presented as blaming the other participants for triggering his decision to leave. He was hoping to achieve an agreement and only left because of the 'unreasonable demand' of the other countries. **Explanation** The similarities mainly relate to the sequence of events, which was well documented at the time. The German breaches of Versailles were of increasing concern to the participants of the members of the Disarmament Conference. It had adjourned in late June because of deadlock over French demands for a guarantee of security, and when it reconvened a French proposal for a probationary period of international supervision was rejected by the Germans. The crisis was precipitated by the British support for the French plan. German delegates were recalled to Berlin for discussions, and Germany's withdrawal from the Disarmament Conference and the League of Nations was announced. The differences derive from the British and German perspectives.	**15**

© Cambridge University Press & Assessment 2025

Question	Answer	Marks
3(a)	Ribbentrop wanted to give all the responsibility to Hitler for the breakdown of negotiations. He himself was central to the Nazi strategy on disarmament. Ribbentrop was involved in diplomatic efforts to prevent sanctions against Germany, including meetings with British and Italian leaders to postpone the next meeting of the Bureau of Disarmament. In April 1934 after Germany had left the disarmament conference, he was appointed Delegate of the Reich Government in matters of Disarmament. After this he was elevated to German Minister 'Plenipotentiary at Large'. In this role he sought to negotiate agreements that would allow Germany to rearm while maintaining diplomatic relations and it was in that capacity that he negotiated the Anglo-German Naval Agreement of 1935. Here, the contemporary British account, which shows more consultation, seems likely to be more accurate. Each side is of course motivated to blame the other for the failure to achieve disarmament. Accept any other valid responses.	

Question	Answer	Marks
3(b)	**Read all of the sources. How far do the sources support the view that Germany wanted agreement on the issue of armaments?** Indicative content **Support** • **Source A** acknowledges, in a mocking way, the German assertion that their nation did want general disarmament. In this source, Hitler is flourishing a paper with 'Allies dishonoured disarmament pledge', to support the German claim that it had disarmed in accordance with the provisions of Versailles but that the Allies had not followed suit, which had also been specified. • **Source B** evidences a 'prolonged Cabinet meeting' indicating long discussions and serious consideration of the issue of armaments. • **Source D** maintains that Germany wanted 'an agreement on equality of armaments between Germany and the rest of Europe'. Hitler was willing to achieve this 'either by European disarmament or by German rearmament'. The source also claims that, despite the German exit from the negotiations, 'Hitler was ready to hold arms talks'. **Challenge** • In **Source A** German sincerity in seeking disarmament is clearly questioned in the cartoon. Hitler is heavily armed, spitting in fury, and has overwhelmed a powerless League. However, the European statesmen he is addressing are depicted as indecisive and passive. Their pledges, scattered on the ground, are labelled as hypocrisy futility and evasion. • In **Source B** the British ambassador reports that there had been German discussion of the disarmament proposals, but that these had been rejected and Germany 'had banged the door' on the talks. • There is clear challenge in **Source C**. In this report by the US ambassador. German tactics and motives are summarised, with the conclusion that it is determined to rearm and therefore 'is not interested' in other countries cutting down their armaments. **Evaluation** ***Source A:*** *Mistrust of Hitler's motives and an awareness of his ability to be aggressive while he depicts Germany as a victim are very evident here. Low also shows the weakness of the diplomats and leaders who failed to respond effectively to the threat of Hitler, which characterises many of his cartoons in the later 1930s.* ***Source B:*** *There is largely a straightforward account, reporting on events. It finishes with some comment on Hitler's motives, to evade the constraints of the talks and to win popular approval. It also concludes that Hitler is rejecting any opportunity to achieve progress in disarmament.* *British views of the process were quite complicated and there was certainly an element of the evasiveness and hypocrisy which is criticised in the cartoon. The British government understood French fears of German military strength but was determined not to disarm to an extent which threatened its imperial possessions. At the same time, there was considerable sympathy for the German challenge to what was seen as harsh treatment at Versailles.*	**25**

Question	Answer	Marks
3(b)	***Source C:*** *This analysis from the US ambassador in Berlin shows considerable insight. Messersmith was one of the most perceptive observers of the emerging Nazi regime. Here he shows that he can predict the tactics that would characterise Hitler's regime – a wish to evade clear agreements and to divide the opposition.* ***Source D:*** *Ribbentrop is motivated to minimise any responsibility he and other diplomats may have had in the decision to leave the disarmament talks, and to indicate his own part in continued negotiations, as he was about to be tried for war crimes, including the planning of an aggressive war. He himself was central to Nazi strategies. Ribbentrop was involved in diplomatic efforts to prevent sanctions against Germany, including meetings with British and Italian leaders to postpone the next meeting of the Bureau of Disarmament. In April 1934 after Germany had left the disarmament conference, he was appointed Delegate of the Reich Government in matters of Disarmament. After this he was elevated to German Minister 'Plenipotentiary at Large'. In this role he sought to negotiate agreements that would allow Germany to rearm while maintaining diplomatic relations and it was in that capacity that he negotiated the Anglo-German Naval Agreement of 1935.* Accept any other valid responses.	

© Cambridge University Press & Assessment 2025