GradeMax

CAMBRIDGE
International Education

Cambridge International AS & A Level

HISTORY **9489/12**

Paper 1 Document Question **February/March 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 February/March 2025 series for most Cambridge IGCSE, Cambridge International A and AS Level components, and some Cambridge O Level components.

© 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

GradeMax

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
	Evaluation
	Knowledge
	Not answered question
	Not relevant
	Indicates that the point has been noted, but no credit has been given.
	Difference identified
	Similarity identified
	Blank page
	Level one, Level two, Level three, Level four, Level five.
Highlighter	Highlighting areas of text
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 selected.
On-page comment	Allows comments to be entered in speech bubbles on the candidate response.

© 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**

Question	Answer	Marks
1(a)	**Read Source A and Source D.** **Compare these sources as evidence about Austrian attitudes towards war with Prussia.** Indicative content **Similarities include:** • There is enthusiasm for war in both sources (although less so in **A**). In **Source A**, Esterhazy states that 'we must show our teeth.' The position is even more clearly stated in **Source D** with the envoy stating that 'we need war, only war.' • Prussia is blamed for raising the tension. In **Source A**, Prussia has a 'threatening attitude' and in **Source D**, Austria rejects the peace Congress which has been proposed by Prussia to limit the power of Austria. • There is a suggestion in both sources that public opinion is against Prussia. In **Source A** the Austrian chancellor argues that the war against Prussia would be very popular. In **Source D**, the Austrian envoy argues that mistrust towards Austria will disappear implying that public opinion is turning against Prussia. **Differences include:** • **Source A** reflects a desire to find a diplomatic solution to the situation. The Emperor rejects making warlike preparations in favour of diplomacy and maintaining the honour and security of Austria. In **Source D**, to hold on to a united Germany, Austria must fight Prussia. The implication of the last three lines is that if Austria does not fight they will lose out to Prussia. • There is nervousness in **Source A** about Prussia's military advantages. However, in **Source D**, Prussia is portrayed as being overstretched and losing the support of the people. **Explanation:** Contextual knowledge could be used to explain the similarities between the sources. Over the winter of 1865-66, tensions between Austria and Prussia had grown increasingly intense. Prussia accused Austria of breaking the Convention of Gastein, signed in 1865 giving Austria administrative control of Holstein and Prussia administrative control of Schleswig. Bismarck provoked Austria over Holstein and made proposals to reform the Confederation. He knew that these would be unacceptable to Austria as they included the expulsion of Austria from the Confederation. The differences could also be explained using contextual knowledge. By the time **Source D** was written Austria had mobilised its forces and was preparing for war. In February, the Emperor was too concerned about Austria's lack of allies and lack of funds to want to engage in a costly war. However, by May, Bismarck had thoroughly annoyed Austria, they had begun to mobilise their forces in April, and it was only a matter of time before he provoked them into war. Accept any other valid responses.	**15**

Question	Answer	Marks
1(b)	**Read all of the sources.** **'Before war broke out in June 1866, it was clear that Prussia held the military advantage over Austria.' How far do these sources support this statement?** Indicative content **Support** • **Source A** suggests that Prussia had the advantage. Austrian politicians were aware that Prussia was stronger militarily than Austria and the railway system was an advantage which would allow them to move their troops more quickly. By comparison, Austria's forces have been on a peace footing. • **Source B** backs up this point. Moltke wants the war to start as quickly as possible to deprive Austria of any advantage. He is aware that Austria will be slow to mobilise and dismisses Austria's potential ally Bavaria as poorly equipped and not ready to mobilise their troops. He calculates that Austria and Prussia will have already fought the first battle by the time Bavaria is ready to fight. **Challenge** • **Source D** suggests that Prussia does not have the advantage. The source claims that public opinion and the governments of the Confederate states are on the side of Austria. Added to that, they see Bismarck's position in Prussia weakening as mobilisation has been unpopular and is increasingly expensive. The Prussian government is described as 'financially exhausted'. • **Source C** argues that Prussia is not in a dominant position. It shows Prussia about to smash on the rocks which represent the joint forces of the Austro-Hungarian empire. Bismarck, rowing the boat, has over-reached himself in Schleswig-Holstein and is about to pay the price. • **Source B** (although not the main drift of the argument) admits that if Bavaria joins with Austria, there is a railway line which could be used to the detriment of Prussia. **Evaluation** ***Source A*** *shows a divided cabinet in Austria. The financial state of Austria was not strong and the armed forces, although larger than those of Prussia, were not so well-equipped. At this point neither side had mobilised and the Emperor's decision to pursue diplomacy seems reasonable.* ***Source B****: knowledge of Moltke's role in military planning, the strength of the Prussian economy, or details of army reforms, could be used to assess the weight of the arguments made in this source. It is also interesting that Moltke claims not to know if war is 'probable or inevitable' but was making detailed plans anyway. Moltke's claims could be seen as questionable as Bismarck had announced in February 1866 that war with Austria was inevitable.*	**25**

Question	Answer	Marks
1(b)	***Source C**: by the time this cartoon was published, both Austria and Prussia had mobilised their forces. However, war between the two had not yet broken out. There was some reason for optimism as many of the states which Bismarck expected to join Prussia, started to mobilise against it. However, Italy had secretly agreed to fight on the side of Prussia, and this would mean Austria had to fight on two fronts. However, the context and origin of the cartoon might be used to question its weight as evidence.* ***Source D**: contextual knowledge of the argument about the reforms to the Confederation which Prussia had proposed, or Austria's rejection of the peace Congress, could be used to support the argument in this source. However, it is also possible to see an element of wishful thinking in Austria's response. Austria's position was weaker than that of Prussia. Candidates could use knowledge of Roon's army reforms and the industrial power of Prussia to challenge the arguments made and assess the weight of the source as evidence.* Accept any other valid responses.	

Question	Answer	Marks
2(a)	**Read Source A and Source C.** **Compare and contrast the sources as evidence of Clay's role in the Compromise of 1850.** Indicative content **Similarities include:** • Both sources stress the fact that Clay's presence was important and helped bring the spirit of compromise to the whole process. He had been a vital part in earlier compromises. **Source A** mentions he 'calmed the passions of the South' and fought a 'glorious and patriotic battle' to get the Compromise done. **Source C** also stresses the important role that Clay played in the Compromise and mentions that 'his wish for compromise and not conflict was vital to the final outcome.' • Both sources mention that the actual measures he proposed in the early stages of the process were unsuccessful. The work of Douglas was needed. Source A mentions 'his proposals' over both individual aspects and for a single overall measure 'were rejected'. **Source C** is perhaps being a little kind when it says, 'some of the measure he advocated did not pass', in reality none did. **Differences include:** • **Source A** mentions that 'it is doubtful whether any of his speeches changed a single vote' while **Source C** says, 'his great, and many say his finest, speeches led many away from the road to disunion.' There was and still is a debate on Clay's contribution to 1850. • **Source A**, while mentioning the overall part that Clay played, says 'with this Compromise he did not provide the leadership he has done in the past' while **Source C** says, 'he became our leader in the great fight, and we rallied round him,' Quite a contrast in views. **Explanation** Candidates should consider the very different purpose of the two sources. **Source A** is by a Democratic Senator from a Southern Slave State in an election year, speaking just after the passage of a series of measures which might well influence his electorate. Naturally he would show support for Jefferson Davis, but motives for ensuring that criticism could be directed against the Northern Democrat, Douglas, should be considered. There was a growing split between the two sections of the party, and the Whigs waiting in the background to try and benefit. **Source C** was part of an election speech when Douglas was not only out for re-election but also trying to defend his role in the Compromise. By 1858 the tension over the issue of slavery was growing, the Compromise was clearly not working, and elements of the Compromise, such as the disaster in Kansas and the Fugitive Slave Act were causing problems in the North and inspiring the growth of the abolitionist movement there. Accept any other valid responses.	**15**

Question	Answer	Marks
2(b)	**Read all of the sources.** **How far do these sources support the view that the Compromise passed principally as a result of the cooperation between the Whig and the Democratic parties?** Indicative content **Support** • **Source A** does support the hypothesis. There is the reference to Douglas 'convincing the Whigs of the need to co-operate' and 'collaborating with Pearce and the Whigs' over the Texas Bill. Also, there is the reference to his 'remarkable' ability to 'persuade many to forget their partisan divisions.' • **Source C** also strongly supports the hypothesis with the reference to 'We Democrats joined with the Whigs and forgot our old fights'. Douglas also uses the word 'we' when 'we managed to oppose the Abolitionists successfully' and 'united together', and there is the final reference about the measures passing 'because of the joint actions of our two parties.' **Challenge** • **Source A** can also be used to challenge the hypothesis. It mentions the work of Douglas as it was 'his suggestion', and there is also the endorsement from Jefferson Davis. • **Source B** makes several points which challenge. There was considerable pressure from the electorate for compromise and this had an impact with the mid-term elections looming. The replacement by Fillmore after the death of Taylor could also have been significant, as a President could always veto Bills landing on his desk from Congress, • **Source D** does make a valid point. Cash certainly did play a part, but it would be unlikely that any Senator or Representative would admit to being influenced in such a way! The source is correct however. A large number of members of both Houses were involved, especially in the South, and the introduction of that part of the Texas Bill proved to be a great lubricant to the whole process. **Evaluation.** ***Source A** is a speech by a Democrat from the South, and this needs to be borne in mind. Virginia of course was a 'slave' state, and it could be argued that in praising Douglas (from a Northern State, Illinois) he could be ensuring that any fallout from the 'slave' states could be placed on Douglas. There was also some dislike in the South towards Clay. Even though he was from the South, he was not always liked because of his tendency to advocate compromise. This was not appreciated by many slave owners.* ***Source B**, from a Northern newspaper does give an important point about the role of public opinion at the time, which was a restraining factor on some of the more extreme members of Congress. It is balanced and objective.*	**25**

Question	Answer	Marks
2(b)	***Source C*** *is by Douglas himself, in an election campaign for his own seat in Congress. He might be anxious to downplay his own role in some respects as there were elements of the Compromise, such as the Fugitive Slave Act, which were not popular in parts of the North, and place responsibility on Clay. The growing split between the Northern and Southern Democrats needs also to be borne in mind at the time of the speech.* ***Source D*** *does make a valid point, but it was written at a critical stage of the Civil War, when of course compromise had failed, and the Congress at the time (1850), dominated by opponents of the now ruling Republican Party, perhaps warranted this sort of criticism.* Accept any other valid responses.	

GradeMax

Question	Answer	Marks
3(a)	**Read Source C and Source D.** **To what extent do Sources C and D agree about the treatment of the Sudeten Germans by the Czech authorities?** Indicative content **Similarities** • Both sources indicate that there is a long-standing issue – **Source C** talks of the 'problem' having 'existed for many centuries' and **Source D** mentions 'the atrocities committed in the distant past by the ancestors of the Czechs'. • Both also describe the German speakers' claims of poor treatment. These 'injustices' are referred to in **Source D** and explained as 'tactlessness and discrimination' in **Source C**. • They link the expression of this resentment to the circumstances in Germany – to the 'rise of Nazi Germany' and Hitler gaining power. **Differences** • **Source C** sees the complaints as 'largely justified' and gives some examples, while the tone of **Source D** is much more sceptical, saying the claims 'reeked of evil intent'. • The complaints are seen as largely arising from the situation within the Sudetenland in **C**, but as being provoked by the 'German press' and Nazis in Germany in **D**. **Explanation** Neville Chamberlain sent Runciman on a mission to Czechoslovakia to try and see if there was a solution which accommodated the demands of the Sudeten Germans. This took place in the weeks before the Munich agreement, and the conciliatory tone of Runciman's report is in step with Chamberlain's aim to conciliate and appease. The French ambassador, in contrast, clearly sees German wishes to expand as a much more pressing threat. This reflects the French view at the time, and their fear that Hitler would overturn all the territorial settlements made at Versailles. It is also written after the war, which confirmed these French fears. Accept any other valid responses.	**15**

© Cambridge University Press & Assessment 2025

Question	Answer	Marks
3(b)	**Read all of the sources.** **How far do the sources support the view that the reason for German hostility towards Czechoslovakia was the issue of the Sudeten Germans?** Indicative content **Support** • **Source B:** Hitler claims this as a second motive, when he asserts 'seven million Czechs oppress' the Sudeten minority. • **Source C:** This offers the strongest support, as it shows how, from a Sudeten perspective, it is 'hard to be ruled by a foreign race' and maintains that 'a very large majority' of the Sudeten German population 'wishes to merge with Germany'. The **'**breakdown of negotiations between Czechoslovakia and Germany' was caused by the demands of the Sudeten Germans and their supporters 'at home and abroad', which implies that the Germans were acting to support this minority group, although there is also a suggestion that the riots and unrest were 'provoked' by extremists. **Challenge** • **Source A:** This makes clear that the real motives are military, and the situation of the German minorities would simply serve as a pretext by giving 'the moral justification for military measures'. • There is also the suggestion of an economic motive in the reference to the 'decisive importance' for the 'economic war effort' of 'Czech industrial and engineering establishments'. • **Source B:** Hitler expresses the belief that the very existence of Czechoslovakia is an insult, and that it poses a strategic threat to Germany as 'Czechoslovakia points like a dagger at the heart of Germany'. He blames the arms race on German fears of an attack from this territory. • **Source D:** There is strong denial here. The claim is mocked and linked to Nazi aggression as it 'incidentally had never been mentioned before Hitler gained power'. Göring 'at dinner at the French Embassy' is alleged to have echoed Hitler's claim in Source B, that the way Czechoslovakia impacted on Germany meant there was a need 'to eliminate it'. **Evaluation** ***Source A****: This document, signed by Hitler, demonstrates that the occupation of Czechoslovakia had been planned before the Munich conference and that the treatment of German speakers was to be used as a moral justification, in a similar way to Austria and Poland.* *There is evidence that this was a part of Hitler's long-term intentions – the annexation of Czechoslovakia is a key part of the Hossbach Memorandum of November 1937.*	**25**

GradeMax

Question	Answer	Marks
3(b)	***Source B**: Here Hitler is presenting his claims in a way designed to appeal to a sympathetic British audience, in his references to the Czechs as Soviet allies, as provoking the arms race and as racially inferior. All these ideas fed into right wing fears and demonstrate Hitler's skill in exploiting the situation and concealing his much less acceptable aims.* ***Source C**: This view from a largely sympathetic British observer shows that there was some mistreatment but that the unrest which Hitler would exploit was largely incited by Nazi supporters.* ***Source D**: The French view shows fear and suspicion of Germany and paints the presentation of Sudeten hardship as exaggeration and hypocrisy, while Göring is willing to divulge the real aims of the German government. There is, of course, an element of self-justification in a post-war context here, as the French had been more openly aware than Britain of the dangers posed by the Nazi regime, though equally unable to take decisive action.* Accept any other valid responses.	

© Cambridge University Press & Assessment 2025