



## Cambridge International AS & A Level

---

**HISTORY**

**9489/01**

Paper 1 Document question

**For examination from 2021**

MARK SCHEME

Maximum Mark: 40

---

**Specimen**

---

This document has **12** pages. Blank pages are indicated.

**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.

Part (a)	Generic Levels of Response:	Marks
<b>Level 4</b>	<b>Makes a developed comparison</b> Makes a developed comparison between the two sources. Explains <u>why</u> points of similarity and difference exist through contextual awareness and/or source evaluation.	<b>12–15</b>
<b>Level 3</b>	<b>Compares views and identifies similarities and differences</b> Compares the views expressed in the two sources, identifying differences and similarities and supporting them with source content.	<b>8–11</b>
<b>Level 2</b>	<b>Compares views and identifies similarities <u>or</u> differences</b> Identifies relevant similarities or differences between the two sources and the response may be one-sided with only one aspect explained.  <b>OR</b>  <b>Compares views and identifies similarities <u>and</u> differences but these are asserted rather than supported from the sources</b> Identifies relevant similarities and differences between the two sources without supporting evidence from the sources.	<b>4–7</b>
<b>Level 1</b>	<b>Describes content of each source</b> 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.	<b>1–3</b>
<b>Level 0</b>	<b>No creditable content.</b> <b>No engagement with source material.</b>	<b>0</b>

<b>Part (b)</b>	<b>Generic Levels of Response:</b>	<b>Marks</b>
<b>Level 5</b>	<b>Evaluates the sources to reach a supported judgement</b> 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.	<b>21–25</b>
<b>Level 4</b>	<b>Using evaluation of the sources to support and/or challenge the statement</b> 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.	<b>16–20</b>
<b>Level 3</b>	<b>Uses the sources to support and challenge the statement</b> Makes valid points from the sources to both challenge and support the statement.	<b>11–15</b>
<b>Level 2</b>	<b>Uses the sources to support or challenge the statement</b> Makes valid points from the sources to either support the statement or to challenge it.	<b>6–10</b>
<b>Level 1</b>	<b>Does not make valid use of the sources</b> 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.	<b>1–5</b>
<b>Level 0</b>	<b>No creditable content.</b> <b>No engagement with source material.</b>	<b>0</b>

Question	Answer	Marks
1(a)	<p><b>To what extent do these two sources agree about Bismarck's attitude towards France?</b></p> <p>Indicative content</p> <p><b>Differences between Sources C and D include:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• In <b>Source D</b> he is optimistic believing that France would not be belligerent, France would soon be 'accustomed' to German unity whereas in <b>Source C</b> he is much more pessimistic commenting that he 'believes in a war with France before long'.</li> <li>• In <b>Source D</b> he speaks of the economic ruin that can result from war and is concerned about both France and Germany in this respect. In contrast, in <b>Source C</b> he demonstrates concern for 'our youth struck down by wounds and disease' during times of war giving the impression that he is looking at the issue from Germany's perspective.</li> </ul> <p><b>Similarities include:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• In <b>Source D</b> Bismarck clearly indicates that war would not be in the interest of either France or Germany and would lead to 'ruining France and most likely ourselves into the bargain' and similarly in <b>Source C</b> he writes 'I do not know of any French or German interest requiring a resort to arms'.</li> <li>• <b>Source D</b> indicates that he might be swayed towards war when he states that German feelings must be respected, which ties in with <b>Source C</b> where it is stated he is prepared to advise war if the interests of the Fatherland require it.</li> </ul> <p><i>The sources are aimed at different audiences. <b>Source D</b> is written by a British journalist who interviewed Bismarck. Bismarck was obviously endeavouring to give the impression that he was a peace-loving statesman and not setting out to live up to his 'blood and iron' reputation whereas in <b>Source C</b> he was writing a private letter to a fellow conservative politician.</i></p> <p>Accept any other valid responses.</p>	<b>15</b>

Question	Answer	Marks
1(b)	<p><b>‘Bismarck always intended to use war to achieve German unification.’</b> <b>How far do the sources support this view?</b></p> <p>Indicative content</p> <p><b>Source D can be used on both sides of the argument</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Source D challenges</b> the hypothesis as it conveys the message that he will do all that he can to prevent war with France. He focuses on the negative side of war referring to the harm it can do to the economies of both countries.</li> <li>• <b>Source D supports</b> the hypothesis to an extent when Bismarck refers to respecting German feelings and that he cannot answer for the people or the King indicating that he would respect their will. However, it gives no indication that he always intended to use war.</li> </ul> <p><i>Source D is an interview with a British journalist presumably with a British audience in mind. He would want to portray himself as a great statesman who wanted to avoid war. In addition, Bismarck would be reluctant to go to war so soon after war with Austria.</i></p> <p><b>Source C can be used on both sides of the argument</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Source C challenges</b> the hypothesis as it argues that war would not be in the interests of either France or Germany. He shows concern for the youth ‘struck down by wounds and disease’. He would not allow himself to make war for ‘personal ambition or national vanity’.</li> <li>• <b>Source C supports</b> the hypothesis as Bismarck is clear that he would advise the King to go to war if ‘vital interests of the Fatherland require it’.</li> </ul> <p><i>Source C was written in March 1867 only a few months after war with Austria at a time when Bismarck was concerned with establishing the North German Federation. It was a private letter written to a fellow right-wing politician. War would not serve his interests at this time.</i></p> <p><b>Source B supports</b> the hypothesis to an extent. Although it was Bismarck’s intention not to wound Austria ‘too severely’ so as not to push the French and Austrians into an alliance, it was clear that he had waged war with Austria. He wanted Austria to be excluded from all German affairs so that he could form the North German Federation.</p> <p><i>Source B is from Bismarck’s memoirs and as such needs to be tested for accuracy. In fact Bismarck’s fear of a Franco-Austrian alliance did prevent him from inflicting too much damage on Austria and the way was left open for renewed friendship in 1879.</i></p> <p><b>Source A supports</b> the hypothesis maintaining that Bismarck was bent on mounting a great Prussian action abroad which could mean war to ‘satisfy his ungoverned and daring thirst for achievement’. This was needed as a diversion to enable him to accomplish change internally. This was written in February 1866 prior to the Seven Weeks War with Austria, which began in June.</p> <p><i>The Austrian ambassador in Source A would have been in a position to observe events in Prussia and his reference to internal strife is correct when referring to the budget.</i></p>	25

Question	Answer	Marks
1(b)	<p>While there is some support for Bismarck's use of war when he deems it necessary as part of his plan, the sources provide little indication that he always intended to use war.</p> <p>Accept any other valid responses.</p>	

Question	Answer	Marks
2(a)	<p><b>Compare and contrast the accounts of the Freeport meeting given by Sources B and D.</b></p> <p>Indicative content</p> <p><b>Differences between Sources B and D include:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Source B</b> criticises Douglas by referring to his 'double dealing and cowardice' while <b>Source D</b> regards him as 'aggressive and defiant'.</li> <li>• <b>Source D</b> focuses on what he saw and heard commenting on Lincoln's physique and bearing as compared to Douglas' while <b>Source B</b> is much more concerned with exposing Douglas for adapting his speeches to suit his audience.</li> </ul> <p><b>Similarities include:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Source B</b> suggests that Lincoln won the debate as he 'utterly demolished Douglas' while <b>Source D</b> also talks of Lincoln having the upper hand leaving the author 'afire with enthusiasm' for the new Republican Party.</li> <li>• Both sources regard Lincoln as superior to Douglas.</li> <li>• Both sources are critical of Douglas but in different ways.</li> </ul> <p><i><b>Source B</b> is from the 'Galesburg Semi-weekly Democrat' a contemporary paper whereas <b>Source D</b> is an autobiographical account written 59 years later. They must both be treated with caution. The author of <b>Source B</b> clearly has a purpose to discredit Douglas while <b>Source D</b> is the memoirs of a man recalling his experience at the debate nearly 60 years ago and presumably with some nostalgia towards a man seen as a great president and something of a martyr – and the author's ability to say 'I was there'. Both accounts are useful to gain the perspectives of the different authors.</i></p> <p>Accept any other valid responses.</p>	<b>15</b>

Question	Answer	Marks
2(b)	<p><b>How far do the sources support the view that, in the debates with Douglas in 1858, Lincoln showed all the talents needed to be a leader of the new Republican Party?</b></p> <p>Indicative content</p> <p><b>Source A can be used on both sides of the argument</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Source A supports</b> the view as it speaks of Lincoln’s ability as a debater maintaining that he had no equal as an election speaker, which may indicate leadership qualities. It maintains that the Republicans of Illinois have chosen a worthy opponent for Douglas.</li> <li>• <b>Source A challenges</b> the view in that it questions whether Lincoln showed all of the talents needed to be a leader of the new Republican Party. It comments that he has ‘no superior as an election speaker’ but does not mention any other leadership qualities.</li> </ul> <p><i>Source A is full of praise for Lincoln’s skills as a debater. The reporter is quite persuasive when he maintains that he listened ‘calmly and unprejudiced’, giving the impression that he was reporting what he saw from a neutral stance when he may well have been promoting the Republican cause. Its sole focus on his ‘genius’ as an election speaker does not support the view of ‘all the talents’.</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Source B supports</b> the view referring to Lincoln who ‘utterly demolished’ Douglas. It suggests that he was a shrewd politician in that he exposed Douglas’ ‘double-dealings and cowardice’. It demonstrates Lincoln’s ability to exploit his opponent’s failings, which is considered to be an attribute of a good leader.</li> </ul> <p><i>Source B supports Source A writing that Lincoln ‘utterly demolished Douglas and exposed his double-dealing and cowardice’. However, it could be equally partisan in that the reporter is likely to want to convey a positive message in support of his readers’ political affiliations.</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Source C challenges</b> the view maintaining that Lincoln used his opening speech ‘in vain attempts’ to extricate himself from the difficult position that Douglas had placed him in Ottawa. It describes his speech as being made up of ‘lame and incompetent’ conclusions. It suggests he did not meet the expectation of his friends and was no match for Douglas.</li> </ul> <p><i>Source C stands out on a limb from the other sources, referring to Lincoln’s Freeport speech as ‘lame and impotent’ while Douglas’s effort was ‘masterly’. It is difficult to believe that Source B and C are reporting on the same event. The fact that Douglas won the election against Lincoln in 1858 does indicate that this source may be more trustworthy but it is also equally partisan. Even though Lincoln was the compromise candidate for the Republicans in 1860, he did achieve victory against Douglas in the presidential election, which could also cast doubt on Source C’s enthusiastic portrayal of Douglas.</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Source D supports</b> the view. It refers to Lincoln as a ‘man of the people’, which is praising Lincoln’s creditability as a leader. It also speaks of his popular appeal with both Democrats and Republicans, which contrasts well with Douglas who is depicted as aggressive and intimidating.</li> </ul>	25



Question	Answer	Marks
2(b)	<p><b>Source D</b> is full of praise for Lincoln's ability to appeal to both Democrats and Republicans with his direct arguments. This expresses his enthusiasm about the new Republican Party, which gives some credence to the view that Lincoln had the talents to be a good leader of the party. Thus, there is independent support for the views of the two newspapers; the problem is that it is based on the memories of a professor writing nearly 60 years after the event. Lincoln's subsequent success in winning the presidential election in 1860 and his civil war victory might have clouded the judgement of this writer.</p> <p>Though three of the four sources support the assertion, they are all in their ways unreliable. Contextual knowledge of the debates and their outcome supports <b>Source C</b>, which is more reliable in challenging the assertion. However, <b>Source C</b> is just as partisan as <b>Sources A and B</b>, if on the other side. We now know that Lincoln did have all the skills to be Republican leader. However, that was far from evident in 1858.</p> <p>Accept any other valid responses.</p>	

Question	Answer	Marks
3(a)	<p><b>Compare and contrast Sources A and B as evidence of the USA's attitude towards disarmament.</b></p> <p>Indicative content</p> <p><b>Differences between Source A and Source B include:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Source A</b> reflects the self-interest of the USA while <b>Source B</b> presents a much more diplomatic picture of the USA supporting the aims of the conference.</li> <li>• In <b>Source A</b> Swanson's attitude towards disarmament is depicted as negative while he appears to be positive in <b>Source B</b>.</li> </ul> <p><b>Similarities include:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Source A</b> defends the rights of the USA and Britain 'to maintain their mighty war fleets' and in <b>Source B</b> Swanson indirectly recognises that, like the USA in <b>Source A</b>, some countries will want to retain aspects of their defence.</li> <li>• <b>Source A</b> suggests that Swanson was prepared to consider arms reduction and this agrees with <b>Source B</b> when he supports the agreements that are being made; stating that it was 'encouraging' that some of the nations did not think that the resolution went far enough.</li> </ul> <p><b>Source A</b> is a US newspaper report aimed at a US audience, which may be a better reflection of the USA's true attitude and desire to act in the national interest. <b>Source B</b> was a press release by Swanson himself who wants to create a good impression of the USA as a supporter of arms limitation so may be less reliable. Both sources are from 1932 at the interim stage of the conference when no final decisions had been made. Both accounts are useful to gain the perspectives of the different authors.</p> <p>Accept any other valid responses.</p>	15

Question	Answer	Marks
3(b)	<p><b>‘The World Disarmament Conference was a failure.’ How far do the sources support this view?</b></p> <p>Indicative content</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li> <p><b>Source A supports</b> the view as Swanson defended the right of the US to maintain its ‘mighty’ war fleet and to maintain a fleet of big submarines. He was only prepared to make a concession if all submarines were abolished.</p> <p><i>Source A was written before the conference ended so it does not reflect the final outcome. It was aimed at a US audience and as such, unlike Source B, did not need to be diplomatic in its approach. It implies that the USA was determined to put national interests first and its defence of Britain’s right to also maintain its fleet suggests that other countries would do the same. This source is more likely to be a true reflection of Swanson’s belief in maintaining a large US navy and his prediction that there would be a naval war in the Pacific between the US and Japan.</i></p> <p><b>Source B can be used on both sides of the argument</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li> <p><b>Source B challenges</b> the view. Swanson is very positive about the ‘substantial achievements which give great promise for success’ when the Conference reconvenes. He refers to the Conference pledging itself to a ‘substantial reduction in land, air and sea armaments’.</p> </li> <li> <p><b>Source B supports</b> the view because it also showed that it had doubts. It writes of ‘diverse interest and varied needs for defence’ and refers to the ‘adverse conditions’ under which the Conference assembled. It expresses doubt about plans for the complete abolition of all bombardment from the air by saying ‘provided means can be devised to make it effective’. Some countries were also dissatisfied as the draft resolution ‘did not go far enough’.</p> <p><i>Source B was written by Swanson to convey the idea that the US was in support of the Conference. It is positive in tone and was written for release to the world’s press at the end of the first phase of the Conference. Public opinion was desperate for it to succeed in the hope it would prevent another war and the American Representative wanted to present the US in a good light with a positive press release. However, his speech also hints that nothing is final with carefully chosen words; it gives no hint of any US commitment.</i></p> </li> </ul> </li> <li> <p><b>Source C supports</b> the view. It is a British cartoon published after the Conference and makes it quite clear that ‘we have failed’. The cartoonist mocks the politicians showing them blaming the people for the failure. He depicts the people as sheep whose ‘warlike passions’ they were unable to control; hence he adds the caption ‘the Conference excuses itself’. At the same time the national representatives on stage are depicted as aggressive and uncompromising. The cartoonist is blaming the politicians for its failure but they are full of excuses.</p> </li> </ul>	25

Question	Answer	Marks
3(b)	<p><b>Source C</b> is clearly based on the opinions of the artist, but his criticism of the politicians was also reflected in public opinion at the time. It depicts a very poor opinion of politicians who are prepared to blame anybody but themselves. Arguably, the failure of the Conference was evident by 1934 and subsequent events galvanised the opinion that the politicians were unable to control the ‘warlike passions’ of Germany, Italy and Japan.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Source D supports</b> the view. It argues that the conference was doomed from the start and questions whether the conditions existed for ultimate success. It alludes to the difficult times during which the Conference was meeting; there was political unrest as well as the economic difficulties caused by the depression. These events all contributed to undermining the confidence of the Conference.</li> </ul> <p><b>Source D</b> is the official Report of the World Disarmament Conference written in 1936 when there was no denying that it had failed. By this time Hitler was well on his way to rearming Germany. The refusal to allow him to be on a military par with other nations had led to him withdrawing from the League of Nations in 1933 and, according to the report, the circumstances of the time made any lasting agreement difficult to achieve. The report, therefore, comes across as a series of excuses blaming the circumstances of the time as well lack of preparation and ‘fruitless’ discussions for the ultimate failure of the Conference.</p> <p>Thus, only <b>Source B</b> offers a degree of hope that the Conference will realise some of its aims but sets this hope in the context of problems facing the world and before the Conference reconvened in January 1933. <b>Source A</b> suggests that there will be lack of support for disarmament from some nations implying that it may fail. <b>Sources C and D</b> reflect on its failure after the Conference had ended.</p> <p>Accept any other valid responses.</p>	

**BLANK PAGE**