

# Cambridge International AS & A Level

---

**HISTORY**

**9489/13**

Paper 1 Document Question

**October/November 2024**

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 2024 series for most Cambridge IGCSE, Cambridge International A and AS Level components, and some Cambridge O Level components.

---

This document consists of **15** printed pages.

**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.

<b>Part (a)</b>	<b>Generic Levels of Response:</b>	<b>Marks</b>
<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>

**Annotation symbols**

ID	ID	Valid point identified
	EXP	Explanation (an explained valid point)
	Tick	Detail/evidence is used to support the point
	Plus	Balanced – Considers the other view
	?	Unclear
	AN	Analysis
	^	Unsupported assertion
	K	Knowledge
	EVAL	Evaluation
	NAR	Lengthy narrative that is not answering the question
	Extendable Wavy Line	Use with other annotations to show extended issues or narrative
	Horizontal Wavy Line	Error
	JU	Judgement
SIM	SIM	Similarity identified
DIFF	DIFF	Difference identified
N/A	Highlighter	Highlight a section of text
N/A	On-page comment	Allows comments to be entered in speech bubbles on the candidate response.

**Using the annotations**

- Annotate using the symbols above as you read through the script.
- At the end of each question write a short on-page comment:
  - be positive – say what the candidate has done, rather than what they have not
  - reference the attributes of the level descriptor you are awarding (i.e. make sure your comment matches the mark you have given)
  - be careful with your spelling

Question	Answer	Marks
1(a)	<p><b>Read Source C and Source D. Compare and contrast these two sources as evidence about the Peterloo Massacre.</b></p> <p>Indicative content</p> <p><b>Similarities</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Both sources agree that a large crowd had gathered to hear speeches.</li> <li>• Both sources agree that the cavalry charged at the crowd. They are seen brandishing their swords in Source C and 'knocked the mob about' in Source D.</li> <li>• Both sources seem to agree that some of the crowd may have been injured. Source C shows the crowd being trampled by the troops on horseback and Source D writes about the mob being 'rode over'.</li> </ul> <p><b>Differences</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Source D refers to events as the Battle of Manchester whereas Source C depicts a massacre. Source D's title glorifies the role of the troops, implying it is a military victory. Source C suggests innocents were murdered.</li> <li>• In Source D the Major claims that the mob fired shots at the soldiers from 'the tops of the houses and out of the windows', and the soldiers fired back. Although there are some people watching from windows on the left of Source C, they don't appear to be armed.</li> <li>• The crowd in Source C contains men and women, quite well dressed and respectable. However, Source D refers to them as a 'rabble' and a 'mob', both derogatory terms which suggest violent men have simply turned up to cause trouble.</li> </ul> <p><b>Explanation</b></p> <p>Contextual knowledge of the background to the Peterloo could be used to explain the similarities between the sources. The Combination Acts were widely disliked and there was widespread poverty caused by the Corn Laws. One of the most outspoken radicals was 'Orator' Henry Hunt. He spoke about the need for political reform to large crowds in many towns. Possibly alarmed by the size of the crowd, the magistrates ordered the troops to disperse the meeting. It is possible the troops were inexperienced, but 11 members of the public were killed and 400 were injured.</p> <p>The differences between the sources can be explained by their purpose. The picture was published by a supporter of a radical who was due to speak at the meeting. It is unlikely that he would have portrayed fellow supporters as a 'rabble'. From the perspective of the authorities, this was a justified suppression of a seditious gathering. Source D was published by one of those in charge of the troops and it is not surprising that he sees what he has done as a great victory for the authorities. The timing of the account, and congratulations given to them by the Prince Regent underlines that the Major felt actions by the troops were entirely proportionate.</p> <p>Accept any other valid responses.</p>	15

Question	Answer	Marks
1(b)	<p><b>Read all of the sources. ‘There was widespread support for working-class demands.’ How far do these sources agree?</b></p> <p>Indicative content</p> <p><b>Support</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• In Source A popular support for change was demonstrated by the formation of combinations among workers.</li> <li>• Source B suggests a number of outbreaks of violence ‘not twelve hours passed without some fresh act of violence’, so it could be inferred that support is widespread and this is not an isolated incident. He has sympathy for the workers who have been made destitute by the downturn in trade: it sees them as being driven to destroy the machines in their desperation. The speaker thinks that a more proactive approach on the part of the government might have prevented the worst excesses of the riots.</li> <li>• In Source C the portrayal of the large crowd being brutally attacked suggests there was support from the artist/publisher for working-class demands for change. The banners being held on the platform suggest support for giving workers more rights such as universal suffrage.</li> <li>• In Source D the ‘mob’ of 3000 people shows considerable popular support.</li> </ul> <p><b>Challenge</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Source A shows no support for working class demands. The petition by the millwrights who wish to stop the formation of combinations is taken up in Parliament and the application of the new law proposed to take in all working men’s combinations. The source expresses the views that ‘serious mischief’ will result if action is not taken.</li> <li>• In Source C the charge by the troops into the crowd suggests there was little support on the part of the authorities for the protest which was taking place.</li> <li>• In Source D the Major, who represents the views of the authorities, calls them a mob and a rabble and rejoices in the fact that they were knocked about by his troops. He also describes Hunt as ‘the enemy’ and implies that this event could be part of a bigger battle.</li> </ul> <p><b>Evaluation</b></p> <p><i>Source A: Parliament was a conservative organisation which generally represented the interests of the landed classes. Therefore, it is not surprising that it is more likely to listen to the demands of the mill owners than their workers. Wilberforce was widely criticised for his role in the passing of the combination acts. He had fought to end the slave trade but would not fight for the rights of the workers in Britain.</i></p>	25



Question	Answer	Marks
1(b)	<p><i>Source B: takes a different line from Source A. The speaker (Byron) is sympathetic and although he argues machine breaking should not be condoned, thinks the government should have taken a different approach. He blames the Napoleonic wars for the problems facing the textile industry and was influential in reducing sentences for convicted Luddites.</i></p> <p><i>Source C: the reliability of this source could be challenged as it was published by a well-known radical speaker who supported extending the vote to the working class. However, candidates might use their knowledge of events on 16 August to support his point of view.</i></p> <p><i>Source D: the Major displays a typically arrogant attitude towards the working class and this might be expected. Candidates could challenge the reliability of his views using their contextual knowledge of other working-class protests or reform movements.</i></p> <p>Accept any other valid responses.</p>	

Question	Answer	Marks
2(a)	<p><b>Read Source B and Source C. Compare and contrast these two sources as evidence about the Tennessee Valley Authority (TVA).</b></p> <p>Indicative content</p> <p><b>Similarities include</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Source C does mention that the TVA brought ‘benefits’ while Source D mentions that it was one of the ‘fine changes’ that came in.</li> <li>• Both sources mention that it assisted in the creation of cheaper and more available electricity.</li> <li>• Both sources mention that it assisted in job creation.</li> <li>• Both sources mention that it assisted in both flood control and dealing with soil erosion.</li> </ul> <p><b>Differences include</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Source B suggests measures were temporary while Source C indicates they will provide long-term solutions.</li> <li>• Source B maintains that the motivation behind the creation of the TVA was a government trying to get control of agriculture in the interests of its supporters. Source C argues that the intention was to create and save jobs, as well as deal with flooding and soil erosion.</li> <li>• Source B maintains that there was considerable compulsion involved while Source C says ‘there was no compulsion there.’</li> <li>• Source B suggests that there was limited and selective consultation while Source C maintains that the TVA was ‘debated and discussed’ by all.</li> </ul> <p><b>Explanation</b></p> <p>Both Sources approach the TVA from very different perspectives. Source B is a speech before the Supreme Court by a lawyer whose task is to persuade the Court that the TVA is illegal and should be closed down. He was in essence the ‘prosecuting counsel’ in the case and was hired purely to argue for the destruction of the TVA and all it stood for. He was suggesting to the Court that while some might see the benefits of the TVA, there were real flaws in what it did, as well as the fact that the Administration which created it simply did not have the power under the Constitution to actually create it.</p> <p>Source C is the view of Roosevelt himself on what he, perhaps rightly, saw as one of the greatest achievements of the New Deal. The impact of the TVA on several states, some of the poorest in the US, had been huge and beneficial. 1940 was also an election year, with Roosevelt standing for an unprecedented third term, so naturally he would be doing all he could to emphasise his achievements.</p> <p>Accept any other valid responses.</p>	15

Question	Answer	Marks
2(b)	<p><b>Read all of the sources. ‘The New Deal was a success.’ How far do these sources support this view?</b></p> <p>Indicative content</p> <p><b>Support</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Source B agrees that there has been partial success e.g. ‘We agree that it has assisted in the temporary provision of cheaper and more available electric power’</li> <li>• Source C can be used to support the assertion. New Deal legislation ‘assisted in the diversification of industry.’ They improved the lives and welfare of millions – and contextual knowledge should back that up. There was job creation, and the banking system was made more secure. Roosevelt rightly comments that the US was ‘on the road to the elimination of poverty’, especially acts like the Social Security Act.</li> <li>• Source D can also be quoted, when it says that New Deal organisations did ‘achieve much’. The New Deal also helped to restore confidence and reduced the danger of political extremism. Neither the Left nor the Right made serious headway. Like Source C there is mention of the reforms of banking.</li> </ul> <p><b>Challenge</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Source A challenges the assertion suggesting that the New Deal is wasting money and is not really fit for purpose.</li> <li>• Source B has the strongest challenge. The author argues that the price that business has paid for the New Deal is ‘too high.’ Competition has been destroyed. Investment has been damaged and the ‘temporary’ measures would not secure the long-term future for any business and its employees. It is strongly critical.</li> <li>• Source D while having some positive points about the New Deal, is also critical. Organisations could be ‘badly administrated and sometimes counterproductive’, and also bureaucratic and self-serving. They could also be used for purely political purposes and did little to assist Black Americans in the South.</li> </ul> <p><b>Evaluation</b></p> <p><i>Source A implies that New Deal was a failure because of its financial costs and wastage. This is supported by contextual knowledge: Republicans were aggrieved that \$8 billion was spent supporting emergency measures which prompted The Revenue Act in 1935 – (also known as the Wealth Tax Act). This was popularly referred to as the ‘soak the rich’ tax. The cartoon features the taxpayer shouldering the burden.</i></p>	25

Question	Answer	Marks
2(b)	<p><i>Source B is very obviously one-sided. The sources are a speech by a lawyer before the Supreme Court who had been hired to attack the TVA and was trying to persuade the Court to declare it unconstitutional (as well as much of the rest of the famous 100 Days legislation). This demonstrates the failure of the New Deal as it was too invasive into the lives of ordinary people. There is also a suggestion that the provisions of New Deal were politically self-interested.</i></p> <p><i>Source C is written by Roosevelt himself, so naturally he would be anxious to speak highly of what his administration had achieved. It was also an election year, and he was thinking of running for an unprecedented third term, so he was bound to emphasise the benefits of what he had done. He was also speaking in the context of the Second World War and attempting to distance himself from the state interventions of the dictatorships.</i></p> <p><i>The fact that the author of Source D was a Democratic supporter and had benefited from employment in the NRA and the CWA needs to be taken into consideration. However, he was also an investigative reporter and the fact that there are criticisms of the New Deal there, seen at first hand probably, show a degree of balance. Contextual knowledge suggests that what he wrote was accurate in terms of restoring confidence but also in his acceptance of the criticisms of the Alphabet administrations.</i></p> <p>Accept any other valid responses.</p>	

Question	Answer	Marks
3(a)	<p><b>Read Source A and Source B. Compare and contrast these two sources as evidence about the Aaland Islands question.</b></p> <p>Indicative content</p> <p><b>Similarities</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Both sources confirm that the dispute was about possession of the Aaland Islands and whether they should revert to Swedish rule.</li> <li>Both indicate that the solution – that the islands should be ruled from Finland – was finally accepted. In Source A ‘Sweden is ready loyally to accept the decision’ and in Source B ‘We have reached a settlement’.</li> <li>Both demonstrate that this has been a difficult and controversial process. In Source A, Sweden still hopes that ‘the Aaland Isles will at last have justice’ and the British representative in Source B reflects that ‘the dispute could never have been settled by the ordinary methods of diplomacy’.</li> </ul> <p><b>Differences</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Source A asserts the reasonable intentions of the Swedes ‘only to defend the right of an island population’ while Source B emphasises that both ‘the Swedes and the Finns were very obstructive’.</li> <li>There are differences regarding the reaction to the settlement. The message of Source A is that the solution has left the islanders unsatisfied and still hoping to ‘at last have justice’ as the ‘principle of self-determination’ has been ignored; Source B maintains that it ‘delights the Aalanders’ as concessions on their autonomy have been achieved.</li> <li>Source B’s contention that the outcome is ‘in the interests of European peace’ is contested by Source A’s claim that it ‘is unlikely to confer peace upon the Baltic area’.</li> </ul> <p><b>Explanation</b></p> <p>The Swedish leader sets out his country’s perspective quite forcefully. He had wanted the issue to be discussed at the Paris Peace Conference, in the hope that the principle of self-determination would ensure a settlement in Sweden’s favour. The Aaland Islands, along with the rest of Finland, had been part of the Russian empire. After the October Revolution, the islands’ Swedish-speaking inhabitants, freed of Russian rule, asked for reunion with their former mother country. The Allies were reluctant as it was seen as too difficult to decide, given that the Finns claimed it was an internal Finnish matter and refused to agree to a plebiscite involving only a fraction of Finland’s population. The Swedish prime minister sounds disappointed, and determined to explain why, but also acquiescent as he addresses the Council of the League of Nations.</p> <p>The British representative to the League Council clearly believes that the decision made by that organisation was fair and that important concessions were gained for the islanders. It was difficult for imperial powers to assert the right to self-determination consistently. As this is a diary entry, we can assume these were his genuine opinions.</p> <p>Accept any other valid responses.</p>	15

Question	Answer	Marks
3(b)	<p><b>Read all of the sources. How far do the sources support the view that, in the early 1920s, the League of Nations inspired confidence?</b></p> <p>Indicative content</p> <p><b>Support</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• In Source B there is clear pride in the role of the League in the settlement of the Aaland Islands question in a way that ‘is just and fair’. Support also is suggested by the claim that important concessions were achieved through ‘a little steady pressure’ by the League Council. In general, the League achieved a settlement that ‘could never have been settled by the ordinary methods of diplomacy’.</li> <li>• In Source C League success is also highlighted here; it is claimed it can ‘promote peace and confidence’ as it has already ‘settled many controversial questions’. Various examples are given where the work of the League led to solutions which prevented ‘further trouble’. The idea that this only works when small powers are involved is refuted with the reference to the dispute over Silesia as ‘Germany is no small nation’.</li> </ul> <p><b>Challenge</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• In Source A challenge is offered in the claim that the decision on the Aaland Islands ‘has shaken confidence in the League of Nations’. The reason given is that this fails to respect ‘the principle of self-determination’.</li> <li>• In Source C, while largely positive about the League, there are some reservations. Limited membership is an issue and it ‘can attain full powers only when it includes all nations’. There is also a recognition that not all decisions have been popular – the Silesian question was settled ‘very badly according to some’, and no settlement was found to the ‘case of Poland and Lithuania’.</li> <li>• In Source D Lloyd George indicates various failures of the League, and the way that its directives are ignored. This means it is unrealistic to ‘expect Germany and Russia to have confidence in this organisation’.</li> </ul>	25

Question	Answer	Marks
3(b)	<p><b>Evaluation</b></p> <p><i>Source A The peaceful settlement, in June 1921, of the dispute between Sweden and Finland over possession of the Aaland Islands (which are in the Baltic Sea, mid-way between the two countries) is seen as an early success for the League of Nations.</i></p> <p><i>Source A shows that this success depended on the contesting nations' willingness to accept an unpopular decision. While the Swedish leader is clearly disappointed, he is not going to defy the organisation. There were suggestions that this awareness influenced the decision makers in this and other disputes.</i></p> <p><i>Source B Those working for the League were likely to put a favourable interpretation on its achievements. Here the League is seen as even handed and constructive in its decision, so contributing to international peace. The nations involved are criticised as 'obstructive' in contrast. The clear implication is that the League merits more confidence.</i></p> <p><i>Source C This is another writer who is deeply involved in the work of the League, and mainly positive about its ability to resolve disputes. Nansen is not blind to some of the issues but sees the League as crucial to the avoidance of war. He is also clearly very committed to its humanitarian role.</i></p> <p><i>Source D Lloyd George had supported the formation of the League of Nations as the British leader in the Paris peace process, and here he is showing concern at its lack of ability to enforce its decisions. He is also pointing out that countries outside the League, such as Germany and Russia, will not value membership if they lack confidence in it. His concern that these two countries, through their exclusion and dissatisfaction with the peace treaties, would be driven into alliance had been proved justifies at Rapallo in 1922.</i></p> <p><i>It is notable that the two sources which assert that the League is deserving of confidence are written by people deeply involved in the organisation. This reveals their good intentions, but not that they represented public opinion. The issues of no means of enforcing compliance with unpopular decisions and restricted membership are very apparent.</i></p> <p>Accept any other valid responses.</p>	