Cambridge Assessment International Education

Cambridge International AS & A Level

HISTORY **9489/12**

Paper 1 Document Question **October/November 2021**

MARK SCHEME

Maximum Mark: 40

Published

This mark scheme is published as an aid to teachers and candidates, to indicate the requirements of the examination. It shows the basis on which Examiners were instructed to award marks. It does not indicate the details of the discussions that took place at an Examiners' meeting before marking began, which would have considered the acceptability of alternative answers.

Mark schemes should be read in conjunction with the question paper and the Principal Examiner Report for Teachers.

Cambridge International will not enter into discussions about these mark schemes.

Cambridge International is publishing the mark schemes for the October/November 2021 series for most Cambridge IGCSE™, Cambridge International A and AS Level components and some Cambridge O Level components.

© UCLES 2021

Generic Marking Principles

These general marking principles must be applied by all examiners when marking candidate answers. They should be applied alongside the specific content of the mark scheme or generic level descriptors for a question. Each question paper and mark scheme will also comply with these marking principles.

GENERIC MARKING PRINCIPLE 1:

Marks must be awarded in line with:

- the specific content of the mark scheme or the generic level descriptors for the question
- the specific skills defined in the mark scheme or in the generic level descriptors for the question
- the standard of response required by a candidate as exemplified by the standardisation scripts.

GENERIC MARKING PRINCIPLE 2:

Marks awarded are always **whole marks** (not half marks, or other fractions).

GENERIC MARKING PRINCIPLE 3:

Marks must be awarded **positively**:

- marks are awarded for correct/valid answers, as defined in the mark scheme. However, credit is given for valid answers which go beyond the scope of the syllabus and mark scheme, referring to your Team Leader as appropriate
- marks are awarded when candidates clearly demonstrate what they know and can do
- marks are not deducted for errors
- marks are not deducted for omissions
- answers should only be judged on the quality of spelling, punctuation and grammar when these features are specifically assessed by the question as indicated by the mark scheme. The meaning, however, should be unambiguous.

GENERIC MARKING PRINCIPLE 4:

Rules must be applied consistently, e.g. in situations where candidates have not followed instructions or in the application of generic level descriptors.

GENERIC MARKING PRINCIPLE 5:

Marks should be awarded using the full range of marks defined in the mark scheme for the question (however; the use of the full mark range may be limited according to the quality of the candidate responses seen).

GENERIC MARKING PRINCIPLE 6:

Marks awarded are based solely on the requirements as defined in the mark scheme. Marks should not be awarded with grade thresholds or grade descriptors in mind.

Please note, sentences in italics are intended as examples of evaluation.

© UCLES 2021

Part (a)	Generic Levels of Response:	Marks
Level 4	**Makes a developed comparison** Makes a developed comparison between the two sources. Explains why points of similarity and difference exist through contextual awareness and/or source evaluation.	**12–15**
Level 3	**Compares views and identifies similarities and differences** Compares the views expressed in the two sources, identifying differences and similarities and supporting them with source content.	**8–11**
Level 2	**Compares views and identifies similarities or differences** Identifies relevant similarities or differences between the two sources and the response may be one-sided with only one aspect explained. **OR** **Compares views and identifies similarities and differences but these are asserted rather than supported from the sources** Identifies relevant similarities and differences between the two sources without supporting evidence from the sources.	**4–7**
Level 1	**Describes content of each source** Describes or paraphrases the content of the two sources. Very simple comparisons may be made (e.g. one is from a letter and the other is from a speech) but these are not developed.	**1–3**
Level 0	**No creditable content.** **No engagement with source material.**	**0**

Part (b)	Generic Levels of Response:	Marks
Level 5	**Evaluates the sources to reach a supported judgement** Answers are well focused, demonstrating a clear understanding of the sources and the question. Reaches a supported judgement about the extent to which the sources support the statement and weighs the evidence in order to do this.	**21–25**
Level 4	**Using evaluation of the sources to support and/or challenge the statement** Demonstrates a clear understanding of how the source content supports and challenges the statement. Evaluates source material in context, this may be through considering the nature, origin and purpose of the sources in relation to the statement.	**16–20**
Level 3	**Uses the sources to support and challenge the statement** Makes valid points from the sources to both challenge and support the statement.	**11–15**
Level 2	**Uses the sources to support or challenge the statement** Makes valid points from the sources to either support the statement or to challenge it.	**6–10**
Level 1	**Does not make valid use of the sources** Describes the content of the sources with little attempt to link the material to the question. Alternatively, candidates may write an essay about the question with little or no reference to the sources.	**1–5**
Level 0	**No creditable content.** **No engagement with source material.**	**0**

© UCLES 2021

Question	Answer	Marks
1(a)	**Read Sources A and B. How far do these sources agree about the relationship between Austria and Prussia?** Indicative content **Similarities** • The relationship with Austria is strained. Source B gives the impression that Prussia is hemmed in by Austria and is not able to develop. In Source A Prussia is circling the elephant which suggests that Prussia is looking for a fight. • Both sources suggest there is tension building between Austria and Prussia. Source B refers to conflicting interests and Source A suggests Prussia is on the prowl, circling Austria. • Both sources suggest diplomacy has failed / will no longer work. In Source B Bismarck says that the differences between the two won't be resolved through diplomacy. In Source A, it looks as though conflict is inevitable. • Both recognise competition between the two countries. **Differences** • Austria could be argued to be more of a threat in Source A – the lion is prowling but the elephant is big and won't be an easy opponent. • Bismarck suggests the change in the relationship is recent and that Germany is suddenly too small for both (in 1856). However, 10 years earlier the cartoonist predicted conflict which suggests the relationship has not changed suddenly. • Source B blames Austria for the situation whereas there is no blame in Source A – the conflict to come is inevitable rather than Austria's fault and the lion can be seen as more predatory. **Evaluation** *Bismarck takes a long view whereas the cartoonist suggests war with Austria is likely to be soon. Source A is by a German artist so candidates might suggest that the elephant is made to look big and somewhat threatening. However, it is still the Lion that seems to be circling. This may suggest that the artist is not Prussian and is trying to portray Prussia as aggressive. Source B by Bismarck has the questionable qualities of all sources by Bismarck in that he is trying to position Prussia in order to gain more power. This source suggests a clear desire for war. The time difference between the sources is interesting and candidates could use their knowledge to explain the difference. The 1848 revolutions and collapse of the Frankfurt Parliament and Treaty of Erfurt might suggest the elephant won round one.* Accept any other valid responses.	**15**

Question	Answer	Marks
1(b)	**Read all of the sources. How far do the sources support the view that Austria was responsible for war with Prussia?** Indicative content **Support** Source B: supports the assertion as Austria could be responsible because it is preventing Prussian development (at face value). Source C: supports the assertion and blames Austria for stirring up hatred against Prussia within Germany and for being jealous of Prussia. The King implies that invasion is threatened. Source D: supports the assertion and blames Austria. It suggests that Austria has deliberately put Prussia in a difficult position over Schleswig-Holstein. Austria has provoked Prussia at every opportunity. **Challenge** Source A: challenges as it suggests that Prussia is responsible. The lion is circling the elephant. Source B: can also be a challenge as Bismarck sees war as inevitable. He isn't suggesting that there should be a war now but clearly sees that this will be the only option for Prussia to succeed in the long run. Source D: the end of Source D suggests it was actually William I who decided to attack as he sees it as his duty to take up arms. **Evaluation** *Source A: candidates can use their contextual knowledge of the causes of the 1848 revolutions to explain this cartoon and the growing nationalism of Prussia. Source A is designed to satirise the situation before 1848 and so cannot necessarily be taken as a reliable portrayal of the actions of Prussia.* *Source B: is a private letter so may be expected to be reliable of Bismarck's view? Candidates may also use contextual knowledge to suggest that Bismarck was in favour of war. Manteuffel was a Prussian statesman and likely to share Bismarck's view but B might be seeking to manipulate him. OLMUTZ* *Source C: The intended audience of this source undoubtedly has an impact on what is said and the tone of the source. It is a call to war and a defence of the circumstances which have arguable been manufactured. Therefore, what it says about Austria is not reliable. The timing of the source is important – it was only a few days before hostilities started.* *Source D: candidates could use their contextual knowledge to evaluate this source. As a private letter it may be reliable in conveying the true views of William and it is certainly in contrast to Source C (these ideas could be used together).* Accept any other valid responses.	**25**

Question	Answer	Marks
2(a)	**Read Sources A and B. Compare and contrast the inaugural addresses of the two presidents.** Indicative content **Similarities include:** • Both use the 1776 Declaration of Independence to support their [opposing] positions. Source A says secession was 'a right which the Declaration of Independence had defined as inalienable' and Source B 'It follows that no state can of its own volition get out of the Union' because the Union is perpetual and was developed by the Declaration of Independence. • Both show a reluctance to go to war. Source A 'anxious to cultivate peace' and Source B 'there will be no using of force', except in limited situations. **Differences include:** • Source A says that secession is lawfully based – 'they merely asserted a right defined as inalienable' – whereas Source B sees secession as unconstitutional – 'no state, on its own mere motion can lawfully get out of the Union' • Source A says secession is a result of 'a peaceful appeal to the ballot box' whereas Source B talks of secession involving 'acts of violence'. • Source A identifies no situations in which it would initiate the use of force whereas Source B says the federal government will use force to carry out federal duties. **Explanation** *The sources are similar in content and origin. Both are attempting to justify the position being taken by the two sides of the about-to-be Civil War. The main difference is the dates of the two sources. Source A dates from February 1861, when Lincoln was president-elect. Seven slave states had rushed to establish the Confederacy, pre-empting any action by Lincoln. It makes no mention of the Confederates' willingness to fight and thus is not fully reliable Source B is the first public statement of Lincoln's position on secession. It is a more accurate account of the Union's position, which was to use force only to implement federal responsibilities. Note that even in March 1861, eight slave states still had to decide which side to join. Both leaders were trying to win them over.* Accept any other valid responses.	**15**

Question	Answer	Marks
2(b)	**Read all of the sources. 'In early 1861, war was unlikely.' How far do the sources support this view?** Indicative content **Support** Source A: supports this assertion. It argues that secession was legitimate and that the Confederacy would not start a war because it was 'anxious to cultivate peace and commerce'. If one side was so reluctant to fight, then war was unlikely. Source B: can be seen as both supporting and challenging the assertion. It supports the hypothesis by saying 'there will be no using of force against or among the people anywhere.' Source C: supports the assertion. It argues that Lincoln has not been as aggressive as expected, that the issue of federal property within the Confederacy can be settled peacefully. Stephens wants peace. Though he argues for the need to prepare for war, in the main he thinks it unlikely. Source D: supports the assertion. The military orders sent to the commander of Fort Sumter, located in Charleston, South Carolina, talks of the need to surrender if it is necessary to avoid excessive 'danger or hardship'. Even the expedition to Fort Sumter is one of relief. Reinforcement is mentioned but only to defend the fort, not to attack the Confederacy. **Challenge** Source B can be seen as both supporting and challenging the assertion. It challenges the assertion by saying force will be used 'to hold the property belonging to the government and to collect duties and taxes.' The distinction is misleading, however. By defending federal property, Lincoln made conflict more likely as some property lay within confederate states, e.g. Fort Sumter. **Evaluation** *Source A: is taken from Jefferson Davis' inauguration speech, a speech intended to rally support for the Confederacy. At the time Lincoln had yet to take office and so the federal government's response was unknown. Certainly, the Confederate states hope to secede without having to fight.* *Source B is from Lincoln's inauguration address as the established US President, governing all US states. He did not want to provoke war, not least because to do so would be to risk key border slave states joining the Confederacy. And yet he also had to claim authority over the seceding states as well, even if doing so risked war. Hence the fine but misleading distinction he makes. In terms of assessing the likelihood of war in early 1861, Source B is not that reliable.*	**25**

Question	Answer	Marks
2(b)	*Source C is an extract from a speech by the Confederate Vice-President a few weeks after Lincoln's inauguration speech. It is a public address in a slave state and the audience response is enthusiastic, especially on the need to prepare for war. A crowd-pleasing speech at a time of national crisis is unlikely to be reliable when considering the likelihood of war.* *Source D: is a confidential military order from the federal government at a time of great tension to the key army officer whose decisions would take the crisis to the next stage. The order shows that the federal government is not preparing to attack the Confederacy. Given its confidential nature, its importance to the military conflict and the clarity of its message, this source can be seen as reliable, finally.* Accept any other valid responses.	

Question	Answer	Marks
3(a)	**Compare and contrast Sources A and C on German relations with Poland.** Indicative content **Differences include:** • Source A claims good relations with Poland, whereas in Source C, Hitler says the relationship 'has become unbearable'. • In Source A, Hitler shows understanding of Poland's need for 'an access to the sea' and a willingness to strive for agreement on this, but in Source C 'Danzig and the Corridor' are the focus of his anger. **Similarities include:** • Both sources show the Polish Corridor to be the main problem. • Hitler is determined to negotiate with Poland on his own terms and shows scorn at the idea of any other country or body intervening; in Source A he mentions 'the idle talk in the League of Nations' Palace' and in Source C, his plans were 'blocked by Britain's intervention'. **Explanation** *The differences in the attitude expressed by Hitler can be explained by the eleven months that separate the two sources. In Source A, he refers to the German-Polish non-aggression pact of 1934 as proof of his peaceful intentions. In the context of the negotiations in Munich, he wanted to present himself as a reasonable leader, whose territorial ambitions would be satisfied by recovering the part of Czechoslovakia occupied by Germans: 'We have no interest in violating the peace'. The agreement permitting Germany's annexation of the Sudetenland was signed on 29 September 1938.* *By the following August, he had invaded all of Czechoslovakia, facing no effective opposition, and was stirring up unrest in Poland, with a view to repeating the process there. In Source C, he urges his military leaders to show 'ruthless determination' and minimises the risk posed by the agreement between Britain and Poland. Unlike Source A, Source C is a private meeting, so he can set out his true intentions.* *In both sources, there is a focus on the Polish Corridor, as this was where there were German speakers, so Hitler could justify his interest in the area. His wish to avoid outside intervention was inherent to his tactics of creating unrest and then claiming the need to intervene to protect ethnic Germans living in neighbouring states.* Accept any other valid responses.	**15**

Question	Answer	Marks
3(b)	**Read all of the sources. How far do the sources support the view that Germany and Britain would go to war over Poland?** Indicative content **Support** Source B: supports the view as the British ambassador is very clear about his country's intention to support Poland if Germany attacked **'**there was not a shadow of doubt that we would give them our full armed support'. Source D: largely supports the view. Hitler expresses the determination to invade, regardless of the international consequences. In this, he is bolstered by Russian support. Henderson, the British Ambassador, emphasises British backing for Poland and the impossibility of making deals without Polish agreement. **Challenge** Source A: challenges the view. It minimises Germany's aggressive intentions towards Poland, and Hitler claims his agreement with Poland (1934 German-Polish non-aggression pact) is 'truly in the service of peace'. There is a plea to 'those who gain the upper hand in England' to be equally peaceful. Source B: challenges the view as the German official doubts, or pretends to doubt, this commitment, claiming 'the attitude of the Poles should free the British Government from any obligation'. He also hints at the likelihood of Soviet support, which he believed would deter the British. Source C: challenges the view, by showing Britain's weakness in some detail. Hitler suggests that British rearmament, and the pledge to Poland**,** are **'**only propaganda'. He claims, 'there still is a great probability that the West will not intervene.' Source D: challenges to some extent. There are some indications that Hitler still feels he might be able to proceed with his plans without provoking war with Britain. **Evaluation** *Source A: is an example of Hitler's public rhetoric. He is proclaiming his wish to co-operate with Poland, to demonstrate the modesty of his ambitions. This is in the context of the final stages of his negotiations with the European leaders, which would deliver the Sudetenland to him, without the need to fight. The message to England suggests his hope that the supporters of appeasement would allow Germany to continue its territorial expansion unopposed. Source A is before Britain made the specific pledge to go to war over Poland in March 1939.*	**25**

Question	Answer	Marks
3(b)	*Source B: the British government wanted to be clear about the seriousness of their pledge to Poland, which had been publicly stated by Chamberlain after Hitler had taken over all of Czechoslovakia in defiance of the Munich agreement, in March 1939. Hitler's unscrupulous and increasingly repressive behaviour contributed to this, as did the French willingness to endorse support for Poland. There was also a belief that a lack of clarity about pledges of support contributed to the outbreak of the First World War, alluded to by the ambassador 'Germany would be making a tragic mistake'. The challenge reflects German beliefs that Britain might be persuaded to renege on another promise, and suggests that Soviet co-operation would be decisive – this can be cross-referenced with Source D.* *Source C: Hitler wants to persuade his army leaders that invading Poland is a risk worth taking, as there is minimal likelihood of a declaration of war by Britain and France. He had previously, and successfully, overcome the reluctance of his generals to gamble on the democracies not mobilising, in the re-militarisation of the Rhineland.* *Source D: Despite the clarity of the British message, Hitler seems to have some of the same doubts about the reality of the British guarantee to Poland as in Source C, only three days previously. Now, however, support from the Soviet Union has been secured, by the Molotov-Ribbentrop Pact, signed in Moscow on 23 August, so he can openly belittle any potential response from the western allies.* Accept any other valid responses.	