Cambridge Assessment International Education

Cambridge International AS & A Level

HISTORY **9489/13**

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

1 hour 15 minutes

6489577979

You must answer on the enclosed answer booklet.

You will need: Answer booklet (enclosed)

INSTRUCTIONS

- Answer **one** question from **one** section only.
  - Section A: European option
  - Section B: American option
  - Section C: International option
- Follow the instructions on the front cover of the answer booklet. If you need additional answer paper, ask the invigilator for a continuation booklet.

INFORMATION

- The total mark for this paper is 40.
- The number of marks for each question or part question is shown in brackets [ ].

This document has **8** pages.

© UCLES 2025

Answer **one** question from **one** section only.

Section A: European option

Liberalism and nationalism in Germany, 1815–71

1 Read the sources and then answer **both** parts of the question.

Source A

We will be obliged sooner or later to fight Austria for our existence. It does not lie in our power to evade the fight because the course of events in Germany can have no other outcome.

If it came to a point when France threatened war with Austria in Italy, we should not join Austria in opposing it because we should probably be defeated. Even if we were victorious, we would have spent our blood only for the benefit of Austria. What in the end should we have fought for? For the maintenance of Austria's superiority in Germany and the pitiful constitution of the Confederation. We cannot possibly exert our last reserves of strength for that. Were we to seek, in co-operation with Austria, to alter the German Confederation in our favour, every trick would be practised, preventing Prussia from reaching a higher standing in Germany.

From a letter written by Bismarck to Prussian Minister-President Manteuffel, April 1856.

Source B

All were agreed that France, with its unpredictable Emperor, was the greatest threat to Europe, Prussia and Germany. However, for the last forty years, almost all the German states have cherished a hostile spirit against Prussia. This has been decidedly on the increase for over a year. Therefore I must admit the sad possibility that the south German states may seek to preserve their neutrality by means of separate negotiation with France, leaving Prussia to endure the struggle alone and be defeated. It is a matter then of finding ways and means to put an end to German animosity against Prussia. By virtue of Prussia's superiority in moral and physical power, this would be easy if Austria, with its own hostility to us, were not also the moving spirit of German opposition. The necessity therefore arises that we should enter an understanding with Austria so as to make such an extreme eventuality impossible. Nothing then remains but to give up our sharp opposition to Austria and the German states.

From a report of a Prussian Council meeting written by the Prince Regent to the Prussian Foreign Minister, March 1860.

© UCLES 2025

Source C

A true German policy is only possible when Austria and Prussia are united and take the lead. The strong alliance of these two powers has been our aim from the outset. We consider combination (such as the joint action in waging war on Denmark) as the foundation of an enduring unity. We consider the uncontested leadership of Germany by its two great powers as an essential requirement both for Germany and for Austria and Prussia. If they are united, leadership belongs to them of right. At the same time, they gain an increase in their own strength and security.

If we hesitate on the path we have so far trodden, timidity or disunity will be thought to weaken our resolution. If we come forward firmly and energetically, the other German states will hardly dare to oppose us. They will understand the danger of such decisions. They will conform as soon as they see the firm will of Austria and Prussia.

From a letter written by Bismarck to the Prussian Ambassador in Vienna, August 1864.

Source D

The war of 1866 between Prussia and Austria did not begin because the existence of Prussia was threatened, nor was it caused by public opinion and the voice of the people. It was a struggle long foreseen and calmly prepared for. It was recognised as a necessity by the Cabinet, not for territorial expansion, nor the extension of our influence, nor for material advantage, but for an ideal end – the establishment of power. Not a foot of land was taken from Austria but it had to renounce all part in the leadership of Germany. Prussia felt itself called upon and strong enough to assume the leadership of the German races.

From the memoirs of General Moltke, published in 1893.

Answer **both** parts of the question with reference to the sources.

(a) Read Source **B** and Source **C**.

Compare and contrast these two sources as evidence about Prussia's position in Germany. [15]

(b) Read **all** of the sources.

'Prussia pursued a hostile policy towards Austria.' How far do the sources agree? [25]

Section B: American option

The origins of the Civil War, 1820–61


2 Read the sources and then answer **both** parts of the question.

Source A

We cannot have the Nebraska Territory organised along the lines laid out by this Act. Missouri could be surrounded by a Free Territory and by the agents of the abolitionists. Our property would become insecure. We would rather see Nebraska sink in hell before allowing it to organise itself as a Free Territory. We must extend the institutions of Missouri over the Territory at whatever the sacrifice of blood or treasure. Force will have to be used. We must ensure that there will never be a ban on slavery there, or place slaveholder and non-slaveholder on equal terms.

From a letter by Senator Atchison of Missouri to the Governor of Missouri, July 1854.

Source B



A New York newspaper cartoon published in 1856, commenting on the effects of the Kansas–Nebraska Act.

© UCLES 2025

Source C

Mr Douglas fully understood the implications of the Act, and he supported the broad principles which underlay it, even though he knew they contradicted those of 1850. Leaving the decision to be Free Soil or not to the citizens of those Territories was his idea. He was more interested in developing the Territories than in sectional harmony. National expansion was, and is, a high priority for him. He was prepared to abandon the Compromise in order to get Southern concessions for territorial reorganisation, and also get Southern support for his presidential aspirations.

He must not be surprised with the opposition it has aroused in this city and throughout Illinois as a whole. Some oppose as they argue that he has subordinated the interests of his own State to his personal ambitions. However, the great majority of those opposing the Act do so as it will ensure not only the continuation of, but also the possibility of extending, slavery in America.

From the 'Chicago Tribune', September 1854.

Source D

It was Mr Dixon of Kentucky who moved an Amendment to the Kansas Bill in January 1854. As a result, the guarantee given by the Missouri Compromise of free labour in the Territories was abandoned. A strengthened slavery took full effect. This was received with great surprise by both those who supported and opposed slavery. The Democrats in Washington saw it principally as a Whig device to divide and disorganise the Democratic Party and opposed it for that reason. They were little interested in what else it might lead to, and tragically led to.

This inspired Mr Douglas, thus outbid and frustrated in his ambitions for high office, to introduce a new bill which would create two new Territories, Kansas and Nebraska. This would, he felt, still support the principles of the Compromise of 1850 and leave the decision about slavery to the people of those Territories. He may well have lacked awareness of what the Act could lead to. He was more concerned with his railroad interests in the West and wishing to see the development of the Territories in the way he favoured.

From a book by the Northern newspaper owner, Horace Greeley, published in 1864.

Answer **both** parts of the question with reference to the sources.

(a) Read Source **C** and Source **D**.

Compare and contrast these two sources as evidence about Douglas's support for the Kansas–Nebraska Act. [15]

(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? [25]

© UCLES 2025

[Turn over

Section C: International option

The League of Nations and international relations in the 1930s

3 Read the sources and then answer **both** parts of the question.

Source A



A cartoon in a British newspaper, 2 October 1933.
The men on the left are the British Foreign Minister, the Prime Minister of France, and Mussolini.

Source B

A secretary who liaises between Hitler and the Minister for Foreign Affairs emerged from the prolonged Cabinet meeting, at which all sorts of experts – legal, military – were present. One of my staff had no difficulty in discovering that disarmament and the Geneva position had been under discussion all the morning, but that the Cabinet had not come to any decision.

The decision to leave seems to have been reached in the evening. On learning that the attitude of Britain and France was unchanged, Hitler acted with his usual promptness. President Hindenburg and a few generals probably shared the secret. Hitler was freeing himself from what was becoming a straitjacket for Germany at Geneva. At the same time, he was doing something which would be enormously popular throughout Germany, namely quitting the League. Germany had left the room in which friendly conversations had taken place and had banged the door.

From a letter written by the British Ambassador in Berlin to the British Foreign Ministry, 18 October 1933.

Source C

The military spirit is constantly growing. The leaders of Germany today have no desire for peace unless it is a peace with complete compliance with German desires and ambitions.

Just what Germany will do on the disarmament question I think it is too early to predict, but it has a definite aim. It will avoid all conferences but will make constant protests of a desire to cooperate and of a will for peace. Germany will particularly embarrass France with the hope of making trouble between France and England and the United States. I believe it will be exceedingly difficult to pin it down. In the meantime, it will go on rearming. Germany may make all sorts of protests about the failure of other countries to reduce their armaments, but it is not really interested in this. It wants a free hand or rather time to rearm itself.

From a report by a US diplomat in Berlin to the US Foreign Ministry, November 1933.

Source D

Above all, we wanted an agreement on equality of armaments between Germany and the rest of Europe. Hitler was determined to achieve this either by European disarmament or by German rearmament. Unfortunately, our efforts were frustrated by the Geneva resolutions of October 1933, which meant that Germany was expected to wait virtually another eight years for the concession of equality in armaments. Hitler was indignant at this unreasonable demand and declared that negotiations were fruitless and that he would walk out of the Disarmament Conference and leave the League of Nations. His decision, he said, was final; he always took decisions of this magnitude entirely on his own.

On the following day it was officially announced that Germany was leaving the League and would play no more part in the Disarmament Conference. Subsequently, I went to London to explain unofficially to statesmen and politicians of my acquaintance that Hitler was ready to hold arms talks.

From the memoirs of Ribbentrop, Hitler's Foreign Minister, written while on trial for war crimes, 1946.

© UCLES 2025

Answer **both** parts of the question with reference to the sources.

(a) Read Source **B** and Source **D.**

Compare and contrast these two sources as evidence about Germany's decision to leave the Disarmament Conference. [15]

(b) Read **all** of the sources.

How far do the sources support the view that Germany wanted agreement on the issue of armaments? [25]

Permission to reproduce items where third-party owned material protected by copyright is included has been sought and cleared where possible. Every reasonable effort has been made by the publisher (UCLES) to trace copyright holders, but if any items requiring clearance have unwittingly been included, the publisher will be pleased to make amends at the earliest possible opportunity.

To avoid the issue of disclosure of answer-related information to candidates, all copyright acknowledgements are reproduced online in the Cambridge Assessment International Education Copyright Acknowledgements Booklet. This is produced for each series of examinations and is freely available to download at www.cambridgeinternational.org after the live examination series.

Cambridge Assessment International Education is part of Cambridge Assessment. Cambridge Assessment is the brand name of the University of Cambridge Local Examinations Syndicate (UCLES), which is a department of the University of Cambridge.

© UCLES 2025