



**Cambridge Assessment  
International Education**

Example Candidate Responses – Paper 1

**Cambridge International AS & A Level  
History 9489**

For examination from 2021



Cambridge University Press & Assessment 2021 v2 (updated December 2021)

Cambridge Assessment International Education is part of the Cambridge University Press & Assessment. Cambridge University Press & Assessment is a department of the University of Cambridge.

Cambridge University Press & Assessment retains the copyright on all its publications. Registered centres are permitted to copy material from this booklet for their own internal use. However, we cannot give permission to centres to photocopy any material that is acknowledged to a third party even for internal use within a centre.

---

# Contents

---

Introduction.....	4
Question 1.....	6
Example Candidate Response – high.....	6
Example Candidate Response – middle.....	10
Example Candidate Response – low.....	14
Question 2.....	19
Example Candidate Response – high.....	19
Example Candidate Response – middle.....	27
Example Candidate Response – low.....	32
Question 3.....	37
Example Candidate Response – high.....	37
Example Candidate Response – middle.....	43
Example Candidate Response – low.....	47

---

## Introduction

---

The main aim of this booklet is to exemplify standards for those teaching Cambridge International AS & A Level History 9489, and to show how different levels of candidates' performance (high, middle and low) relate to the subject's curriculum and assessment objectives.

In this booklet, candidate responses have been chosen from the June 2021 series to exemplify a range of answers.

For each question, the response is annotated with a clear explanation of where and why marks were awarded or omitted. This is followed by examiner comments on how the answer could have been improved. In this way, it is possible for you to understand what candidates have done to gain their marks and what they could do to improve their answers. There is also a list of common mistakes candidates made in their answers for each question.

This document provides illustrative examples of candidate work with examiner commentary. These help teachers to assess the standard required to achieve marks beyond the guidance of the mark scheme. Therefore, in some circumstances, such as where exact answers are required, there will not be much comment.

The questions and mark schemes used here are available to download from the School Support Hub. These files are:

**9489 June 2021 Question Paper 12**

**9489 June 2021 Mark Scheme 12**

Past exam resources and other teaching and learning resources are available on the School Support Hub:

[www.cambridgeinternational.org/support](http://www.cambridgeinternational.org/support)



## How to use this booklet

This booklet goes through the paper one question at a time, showing you the high-, middle- and low-level response for each question. The candidate answers are set in a table. In the left-hand column are the candidate answers, and in the right-hand column are the examiner comments.

Example Candidate Response – low	Examiner comments
<p>2 A Source A is clearly against the annexation of Texas "We of the North are opposed to it" while Source B is pro-slavery as the statement says "As the friend of the slave, Source A feels slavery the annexation of Texas is not worth it "a country disgraced throughout in all parts" while Source B sees it from an as beneficial from an economic point of view "Texas is necessary to the Commerce of the United States". Source A feels the South discussed to matter without alerting the North and to fact while Source B says everyone and every part of the Country is interested in the annexation of Texas "The whole Country is deeply interested in re-obtaining what was the annexation of</p>	<p>1 The candidate misreads Source B. It is not a pro-slavery source.</p> <p>2 A valid difference between the sources is shown with clear support from each source.</p> <p>3 This is a weaker attempt at contrast as the point is not made clear from Source A.</p>
<p><b>Answers</b> are by real candidates in exam conditions. These show you the types of answers for each level. Discuss and analyse the answers with your learners in the classroom to improve their skills.</p>	<p><b>Examiner comments</b> are alongside the answers. These explain where and why marks were awarded. This helps you to interpret the standard of Cambridge exams so you can help your learners to refine their exam technique.</p>

## How the candidate could have improved their answer

(a)

- The response would have been improved by showing the similarities and differences between the sources with relevance to the question, i.e., the views of New York regarding annexation.
- The candidate should have shown how these similarities and differences supported the question directly from the sources. This could take

This section explains how the candidate could have improved each answer. This helps you to interpret the standard of Cambridge exams and helps your learners to refine their exam technique.

## Common mistakes candidates made in this question

- (a) Candidates did not look for the similarities and differences related directly to the question, i.e., New York views of the annexation of Texas. Instead, they offered vague or unsupported comparisons which could not be credited.
- Candidates should not presume that a source will have a particular opinion just because it comes from a particular state or organisation. It is important to read the content of

Often candidates were not awarded marks because they misread or misinterpreted the questions.

Lists the common mistakes candidates made in answering each question. This will help your learners to avoid these mistakes and give them the best chance of achieving the available marks.

## Question 1

### Example Candidate Response – high

### Examiner comments

1	(a)	Source A and C agree to a greater extent than they agree.
1		Source A and Source C agree on the fact that Frederick William partly refused the crown due to the fact that the Frankfurt Parliament doesn't have the rights to hand him the crown. Source A: "But crown, however, no one can grant except the Emperor Francis Joseph, myself," Source C: "I could not give an affirmative answer to the Frankfurt parliament's offer of a crown because the Assembly did not have the right to grant the crown," they were also both so both sources were from Frederick William hence the similarity in his reasoning will be similar. however slightly different.
		Source A and Source C disagree on the fact that on several things. Source A shows that the only reason that he didn't accept the crown is because the Frankfurt parliament doesn't have the right to grant the crown, the whole source emphasises the greatness of the crown and how only a select few can have power over it. However in source C, it states the same reason only at the beginning, however later on it proceeds to Frederick proceeds to offer several more reasons as to why he didn't accept
2		The crown, such as he could not accept the constitution offered: "Also, it was offered to me on condition that I accepted a constitution which was incompatible with the rights and security of the German states." Source A, however is more likely to be accurate as it's an exchange between him and a fellow politician, whereas source C is to the public, hence the A's source C was directed towards the public, he moulded his reasoning to seem like
3		he cares about the German people as he suggests to care about the ideas of justice, law and duty: "When the Assembly abandoned their ideas of justice, law and duty by which all ... it broke with Prussia."
4		In conclusion, source A and Source C disagree with each other to a greater extent than they agree because source A shows Frederick suggest that Frederick the character of Frederick was the main reason he refused the crown, as he felt disrespected by the fact that the Parliament thought they can offer him the crown, as if they were superior to him, whereas source C tells us that <del>how</del> he did refuse the crown as he could not possibly accept the constitution offered, as it would violate the rights and security of the German states, and that a good king like himself could not agree to that.

1 A clear agreement between the sources is shown which is relevant to the question, i.e., Frederick William's refusal of the German Crown. Quotes from each source are used to support the agreement.

2 A clear difference between the sources is shown here. Quotes from each source are used to exemplify the difference.

3 The candidate briefly discusses the nature of the sources here.

4 The differences between the sources are restated and refined with further comment.

Mark for (a) = 11 out of 15

## Example Candidate Response – high, continued

## Examiner comments

1	b)	Overall, the sources agree that the Frankfurt parliament was to blame for the failure of the 1848-49 revolution.
		Source A suggests that it wasn't really the Frankfurt's parliament's fault that the revolution failed, but rather the fact that only someone of the highest authority - such as himself - is able to decide where his crown belongs - or who gets to <del>take</del> be the ruler; not the part Frankfurt parliament. Hence, the reason the revolution failed is because Emperor Francis decided it would fail: "That crown, however, no one can grant except the Emperor Francis Joseph, myself, and our equals;" This may be a reliable source as this was written by this source seems to be quite reliable as it is from Frederick William IV to his friend, who is a conservative politician. This has no reason to be biased as he is fairly subjective as he may want to appear neutral and give his fellow conservative friend a sense of peace and confidence. Overall, this source doesn't support the statement.
		Source B seems to be saying that they were not to blame for the failure of the revolution as they are trying to claim their constitution mainly had minimal effect on events during this period of time: "At the same time, violence happened, nothing to do with the proposed constitution;" Here the Frankfurt parliament is trying to appear innocent, however they're also claiming that they are resigning not due to their own faults - perhaps their faults related to the constitution but rather, they're resigning there have been new decisions in the assembly which contradicted their previous beliefs! "A series of decisions have been taken by a new majority in the assembly, which are impossible to execute and quite contradictory to the course pursued by the earlier majority to which we belonged." They however have reasons to be and say that as they perhaps want to save their image to avoid being criticised by citizens of the members of the revolution had they been a reason for the failure of the revolution. Hence this source disagrees with the statement the content of the source disagrees with the statement.

5 The candidate clearly challenges the statement given in the question – ‘The Frankfurt Parliament was to blame for the failure of the 1848–49 revolutions.’ The candidate states this clearly and offers a quotation from the source to support.

6 Some general provenance on the source is given here.

7 Another challenge is shown to the statement given in the question, and a quote from the source is given suggesting that the violence had nothing to do with the proposed Constitution.

8 General provenance of the source is described.

Example Candidate Response – high, continued

Examiner comments

	<p>Source C is <del>disagreeing</del> with the statement, as Source C tells us that the Frankfurt parliament:</p>
9	<p>Source C doesn't directly support or go against the statement, but rather it tells us that the Frankfurt parliament is to blame for the difficulties of achieving a united Germany: "I, as King, preserve my faith in German unity. Hence, the hope of seeing it attained through the Frankfurt Parliament was shattered by mindless intolerance." Here, the King suggests that the Frankfurt parliament set off decades of bitter conflict, which meant that there will be no German war and as a result, perhaps allies of each other will have to join in and help resulting in a full scale war - reaching the opposite of German unity. This however suggests that the Frankfurt parliament did attempt and make an effort to overcome F-reich willen II, hence it <del>is</del> the content of the source disagree with the statement, hence the reliability of the source can be doubted as it is a public message to his people, and the King is always under pressure of appearing to say what the majority want to hear, thus the source is unreliable. Hence, this source overall goes against the statement.</p>
10	<p>Source D strongly agrees with the statement. Here the source states that the Frankfurt Parliament often wasted time with pointless debates - and missing opportunities to achieve real results: "The national parliament at Frankfurt engaged in a dangerous tendency, to engage in more or less pointless debates. This wasted time which was sorely needed for prompt and decisive action", "The frittering away of the opportunities to create something real and durable". Here source quotes add point to the inability of the Frankfurt parliament, although there were members of the governing revolutionary times as a reason for the failure of the revolution, it was only <del>very</del> briefly mentioned whereas the broadness of the Frankfurt Parliament had <del>more</del> more emphasis: "The widely and consistently growing power of the revolutionary forces". This was a piece of writing from someone who used to study in Paris in 1848 (when the revolution occurred) and he was</p>
11	<p>The editor of a newspaper which promoted democratic reform. This shows that he is likely to be able to witness the revolution very closely. Hence the contents of the source is likely quite reliable. Overall, the source supports the statement.</p>
12	<p>In conclusion, although sources B and C disagree with the statement, their nature, origin and purpose <del>also</del> suggests that the contents of the sources aren't very accurate as their sources were meant for the public - and they all write whatever to appeal to the public, therefore sources B and C have little reliability. Source A, as <del>disagreeing</del> with the statement, however I believe Frederick William is trying to convince morale among conservative politicians. Hence, overall the sources support with the statement as source B, seems to be the most reliable as it was written by someone who witnessed the revolution firsthand.</p>

9 The candidate uses Source C to challenge the statement given in the question.

10 The candidate uses Source D to show support for the statement in the question. A clear quotation from the source is used to support the candidate's argument.

11 The provenance of the source is briefly discussed here.

12 The candidate gives a summary conclusion of whether the sources support or challenge the statement. Mark for (b) = 15 out of 25

Total mark awarded = 26 out of 40

## How the candidate could have improved their answer

**(a)**

- The candidate could have made a more developed comparison of the sources by looking at other similarities and differences between the sources.
- The comparison could also have been developed by using the provenance of each source (the nature, origin, or purpose) to directly explain why the sources might be similar or different. One way of doing this would have been to explain how and why the different purposes of the sources lead to differences in the content.
- Provenance was discussed in this response, but it was not used to directly explain comparisons.

**(b)**

- This is a good response which clearly demonstrates how the sources support and challenge the statement given in the question and begins to describe the provenance of the sources. To improve, this response needed to use the nature, origin, or purpose of the sources to test them against the statement.
- As well as showing how the sources support and/or challenge the statement by using direct quotations (which this response does) the candidate also needed to place the sources in context and evaluate them against the statement. This would also have allowed the response to consider which of the sources is the most useful for answering the question and how much weight the evidence holds.



Example Candidate Response – middle

Examiner comments

I (a) While Sources A and C are similar in nature. This is largely due to the fact that both sources are from King Frederick William of Prussia.

1 The main and key difference in the two sources is that of the tone used. Source A is more honest, casual and frank. As the King expresses his disgust at being offered a crown of 'mud and dregs of Revolution' which the Frankfurt Parliament has for sale!

2 While in Source C, he is less honest, attempting to appeal to a wider audience, claiming ~~that~~ he did not accept the crown. As 'the Assembly did not have the right to grant the crown'. He also states in Source A that he would only accept a crown that was granted by his equals. No one can grant that crown, except Emperor Franz Joseph, myself, and our equals.

It Source A he does not seem to support the idea of a united Germany, and shows no sign of wanting it himself. As I have mentioned before. These differences in Sources A and C are down to the setting and tone. Source A is to his friends. Source C to his people.

3 The sources differ however in Source C there is mention of a constitution that would be imposed upon him and other of German States. It also states in Source C, that he attempted to reason and negotiate with the assembly. There is no mention of this in Source A.

So to sum up both sources state that the Frankfurt Parliament's crown is illegitimate but they differ in tone and Source C attempts to further rationalise Frederick's Refusal. And puts more emphasis on the fact that the Frankfurt Parliament's constitution was unacceptable rather than Frederick's disgust.

4

1 General provenance comparison only.

2 A valid difference shown with some support from sources.

3 There is further exploration of difference although it is weaker as it is based on something not mentioned in Source A.

4 The candidate includes some further discussion of differences. Mark for (a) = 7 out of 15

Example Candidate Response – middle, continued

Examiner comments

4	(b)	<p>The Frankfurt Parliament, could not be said, that it failed as a cause of any one particular factor. Rather a combination of factors.</p>
		<p>Probably the most prevalent factor being King Frederick of Prussia's refusal to accept the crown or constitution.</p>
		<p>But what also played a significant role, was the divisions within the Parliament, over many aspects of this 'would-be' constitution. The most prominent division was between those who wanted a <i>Grossdeutschland</i> (Large Germany) with Austria as the main strength, with the power base in the Catholic South.</p>
		<p>Or a <i>Kleindeutschland</i> (Small Germany) with the Protestant Prussia as the main power body.</p>
		<p>This division caused substantial delays amongst the debates, slowing the creation of the constitution. Meanwhile the monarchies in the German states were recovering their power and preparing to revoke the reforms that had been implemented as a result of the 1848 Revolutions.</p>
		<p>With the refusal of the crown in 1849, at this stage many of the member states abandoned the Parliament with Prussia. Liberals had stopped supporting revolutionaries in many parts of Germany. This is because the revolts were becoming more radical in nature, posing a threat to the largely middle-class property owners.</p>
		<p>After the collapse of the Frankfurt Parliament, the German Confederation under Austria was re-affirmed and many of the reforms and constitutions that had been granted, were revoked.</p>
		<p>If only the Parliament acted quicker. Then maybe the effects of the Revolutions could be seen in a united Germany. But such as it was, this did not happen.</p>

5

5 Contextual knowledge of the Frankfurt Parliament is shown here, but it is not linked to the sources.

6

6 Continued general discussion of contextual knowledge.

Example Candidate Response – middle, continued

Examiner comments

As far as the sources support the assertion that 'The Frankfurt Parliament was to blame for the failure of the 1848-49 Revolutions'.

7 Sources A and C are mostly focussed on King Frederick William of Prussia's Refusal to accept the Frankfurt Parliament's crown or their constitution. However Source C does state that 'I as King preserve my faith in German unity. However, the hope of seeing it attained through the Frankfurt Parliament was destroyed by mindless violence'. This statement seems to blame the Frankfurt Parliament for the failure to create a unified Germany.

8 Source B 'At the same time, violence has arisen, nothing to do with the proposed constitution, yet ~~the~~ threatening one of its most important sections; its central power'. This suggests that the Frankfurt Parliament was not to blame for the failure of the Revolutions of 1848-49. While Source D seems to be more realistic in stating 'The National Parliament in Frankfurt, elected in the spirit, showed a dangerous tendency to engage in more-or-less pointless debates' and it also states that: 'what troubled me most was the visibly and constantly growing power of the reactionary forces and the frittering away of the opportunities to create something real and durable'. These notes would suggest that Source D states that the failure of the 1848-49 Revolutions was a result of the Frankfurt Parliament's inability to act quickly and the gradual regain of control by the monarchies of the German states.

10 So to summarise, Sources C and A hold and support the ~~stated~~ statement 'The Frankfurt Parliament was to blame for the failure of the 1848-49 Revolutions'. While Source B denies that this statement is true, rather stating that it was other factors that lead to the failure of the Revolutions.

11 ~~Source B~~ Source D takes the most practical approach and so states that it was a combination of the failure of the Frankfurt Parliament to create an acceptable constitution in time, and that the growing strength of the Reactionaries also played a significant role in the failure of the 1848-49 Revolutions. So all the sources support the statement to varying degrees in not all.

7 Asserted information from the sources are included here but there is no support from the sources.

8 This is a valid use of Source C to support the statement in the question.

9 A valid use of Source B to challenge the statement.

10 A valid use of Source D to support the statement.

11 A general discussion of sources without specific reference to answering the question. Mark for (b) = 12 out of 25

Total mark awarded = 19 out of 40



## How the candidate could have improved their answer

**(a)**

- The candidate only explained the differences between the sources and should have attempted to look at valid similarities in content as well.
- The provenance of the sources (nature, origin, or purpose) could have been discussed to show that the candidate understood how they might make a difference to whether the sources are similar or different.

**(b)**

- This mid-level response showed some awareness of how the sources support and challenge the statement, but it has clear areas for improvement.
- The response would have been improved if the candidate had used all the sources to show whether they support or challenge the assertion in the question. Support from the sources in the form of a quote or direct paraphrase should have been given.
- The candidate used the first page of the answer to describe general contextual knowledge of the period. This did not add to the answer as this is a source-based task. Instead, the candidates should have used this knowledge in combination with the sources to explain why they might support or challenge the assertion given in the question.

Example Candidate Response – low

Examiner comments

Section A: European option

Since 1806 there was no real king ruling and leading Germany. So after ~~the~~ the German revolution from 1847-1848 where ~~people~~ <sup>\*peasants and workers</sup> were suffering, due to bad harvests, rising food price, and low working conditions. And the middle class and many students from universities called Burschenschaften demanded more nationalism, rights and a unified Germany. Therefore after the revolution the Frankfurt Parliament was established where many Burschenschaften were members of it, and decided to offer the German vacant crown (since 1806) to Frederick Wilhelm IV.

Source A is a letter to his friend who was a conservative Prussia politician, written in December 1848. At this letter Wilhelm IV showed his views about the ~~the~~ German vacant crown offered to him.

On the one hand he disagrees with the statement by saying that crown needs a king which has the strenght for it, who has an authotarian power and one's whose own duties allow it. These only people having all these characteristics would be only the Emperor Francis Joseph <sup>and himself</sup> Wilhelm IV. ~~and~~ This shows that he sees himself as the future king leading of Germany.

However on the other hand Wilhelm IV

1 This is a general introduction using some contextual knowledge, but this is not related to the sources.

2 This is a basic description of Source A.

3 Some discussion of the issue is given here but the task in this question is to compare the sources against each other, whereas this only looks at Source A.

## Example Candidate Response – low, continued

## Examiner comments

4

also mentions that "a noblemen, who bears on his coat of arms a cross or a bar, is a hundred times to good to accept such a crown".  
~~the~~ In this sentence Wilhelm IV clearly shows that would never accept such a crown which been moulded out of the dirt and drags of revolution, disloyalty and treason.

4

This shows some description and paraphrase of Source A, but it is not contrasted with Source C.

5

For instance Source C is written by Frederick William IV himself to his people, ~~the~~ three years after revolution ended in 1851. Wilhelm IV agrees with statement mainly. On the one hand Wilhelm IV does not want to ~~support~~ lead a country whose Assembly abandoned all ideas of justice, law and duty by decisions which are opposing mankind. Therefore the relationship with Prussia was broken because they had different expectations from the German government.

5

The candidate gives a basic description of Source C.

However on the other Wilhelm did not completely refuse the crown in the beginning, but after the abandonment of ~~the~~ rights by the Assembly Wilhelm refused.

6

In conclusion Source A has arguments on both sides such Wilhelm supporting the statement but also saying he would be exactly the rise for leading Germany. Where Source C is mainly against the statement ~~due~~ due to the fact that the Assembly abandoned all rights of mankind.

6

A discussion that is not related to the focus of the question which is to compare and contrast the sources.

Mark for (a) = 3 out of 15

Example Candidate Response – low, continued

Examiner comments

7	<p>After the revolution in Germany which happens due to bad harvests, rising food prices, and low working conditions for the workers and peasants. And the middle class such as Burschenschaften students demanding more rights; nationalism and a unified Germany causing a break of the revolution from 1847 to 1848. Where after the end of the revolution the Frankfurt Parliament</p>
8	<p>was established were many of its members were Burschenschaften but also some conservatives and monarchist.</p>
extend	<p>Therefore Source A agrees with the statement to an extent showing that the Frankfurt Parliament made unclear and inefficient through offering a crown moulded out of the dirt and legs of revolution, disloyalty and treason on the one hand. However on the other hand Wilhelm IV is very pleased with the decision that the constitution made by choosing him as the next King of Germany. In his opinion he would be the perfect leader offering all the leadership characteristics needed.</p>
9	<p>Source B agrees with the statement that the Frankfurt Parliament was to blame. It's written by the sixty five members of the National Assembly of the Frankfurt Parliament in 1849. It's mentioned in the text that</p>

7 Part (b) of the question begins here.

8 A general introduction is given using contextual knowledge but not linked to the sources.

9 A valid use of Source A to show support for the assertion in the question.



Example Candidate Response – low, continued

Examiner comments

10 a series of wrong and inefficient decisions were taken by the assembly which are impossible to execute and are quite contradictory. Therefore the assembly must have to renounce its constitution or tearing apart the last legal bond between all German governments and peoples. However the option of changing the constitution was chosen which definitely a sign that the Assembly and the Parliament failed.

11 In addition Source C also clearly agrees with the statement it is written by the public address by Wilhelm IV to his people in 1877. He ~~clearly~~ mentions that the Assembly abandoned ~~the~~ all their ideas of justice, law and duty by decisions which are impossible to change. Therefore the Assembly clearly failed banning all ~~the~~ rights from German citizens.

12 Source D is ~~written~~ from the book "The Reminiscences of Carl Schurz" 1913. Writing about 1848 about being a student in Prussia. He also ~~clearly~~ agrees with the statement. He ~~was~~ mentioned that he was scared of the Frankfurt Parliament gaining more power showing that he did not trust the Parliament and the Assembly.

13 In conclusion most of the sources ~~clearly~~ agreed with the statement that the Parliament had to blame for the failure in 1848-49 revolutions. Source A agrees to an extent with the statement because the Parliament made inefficient decisions. ~~Source B~~ however Wilhelm was very pleased with the decision. The Parliament made and offering him the crown. Source B also agrees with the statement because a series of wrong and uncleser decision were taken. Source C also clearly agrees showing that the Assembly was to blame because they failed in making decisions and abandoned the right of the people. And Source D also agrees because Schurz mentioned in his book that he was afraid of the Parliament gaining too much power.

10 A valid use of Source B to show support for the assertion in the question.

11 A valid use of Source C to show support for the assertion in the question.

12 Some support is shown from Source D although it is not made entirely clear.

13 A summary conclusion of the ideas already stated.  
Mark for (b) = 9 out of 25

Total mark awarded = 12 out of 40

## How the candidate could have improved their answer

### (a)

- The candidate could have improved the response by showing the similarities and differences between the sources with relevance to the question, i.e., Frederick William's refusal of the German crown.
- The candidate should have shown how these similarities and differences appear in the sources by using support directly from the sources. This could take the form of a short quotation or a paraphrase.

### (b)

- The response would have been improved by showing that the candidate understood that the sources show support and challenge for the assertion in the question about the failure of the Frankfurt parliament. The response was also one-sided.

## Common mistakes candidates made in this question

- **(a)** Candidates did not look for similarities and differences related directly to the question asked, i.e., Frederick William's refusal of the German crown. Instead, they offered vague or unsupported comparisons which cannot be credited.
- **(b)** Candidates often wrote long sections attempting to evaluate the sources, but this was not related to how useful the source is for answering the question which was asked. Provenance should have been used to place the sources in context and discussed how this affects their evidential weight in the question.
- In both parts of the question, candidates sometimes included long sections of contextual knowledge which, although relevant to the topic, did not help to answer the question. Contextual knowledge should be used directly to explain the similarities and differences in **(a)**, and to analyse the sources in **(b)**.

## Question 2

### Example Candidate Response – high

### Examiner comments

2 A The views of Sources A and B regarding the annexation of Texas vary. However there are certain similarities between the two, both make reference to the essence of the Union with Source A stating that referencing 'federal principle' and the Constitution and B mentioning 'Texas can be annexed without a violation of national faith'. It is clear that both sources agree that the annexation of Texas will require some review with the compatibility with the grounds to which the nation was built on. Both sources also agree that the annexation of Texas would be in the interest of the South. Source A says 'it is for their [the South's] interest' and Source B confirms this in 'Texas is important for the protection of the cotton-growing states'. This shows how both A and B recognize the value of Texas to the South, from the position of New York newspapers.

There are a number of differences between the sources on their view and perspective of

There are a number of differences between the sources and their view of the annexation of Texas. In terms of the measure as a piece of legislation Source A describes the annexation as a Southern measure and that 'they [the South] have been separately negotiating for its admission'. Whereas in B the source proclaims that 'the whole country

1 A valid comparison of sources with support.

2 The candidate provides a further explanation of comparison here.

## Example Candidate Response – high, continued

## Examiner comments

3 is deeply interested in reclaiming what was once ours' suggesting that the entire Union is behind the measure rather than it falling amongst a sectional divide rather than Source A which claims that 'The South wishes to have Texas annexed to the Union' rather than the entire nation. The sources therefore disagree as to whether the support for the measure is nationwide or sectional. Source B also disagrees on the extension of slavery that the annexation of Texas would imply. Source A says that 'it would leave us a country not worth living in ... by the voluntary adoption of the practice of slavery'. Source B on the other hand believes it will have a positive effect for the slave describing New York as the 'friend of the slave' and that 'we can prevent the smuggling of slaves from the West Indies. This shows a large contrast in how A and B perceive the annexation of Texas with regards to its consequence to slavery. Source B going as far as to believe it will be beneficial.

4 The editor of the New York Daily Tribune was Horace Greeley, a man who would play a role in setting up the Republican Party and held very anti-slavery and anti-expansion of slavery views. This implies that A comes from a highly partisan perspective which lowers its trustworthiness. My contextual knowledge tells me that during the 1840s men like Greeley and the views they held would be deemed radical which suggests from a historical

5

3 A valid contrast of sources is given here showing a supported difference.

4 Further explanation of differences is given here.

5 A useful contextual knowledge is given here to explain the source.



## Example Candidate Response – high, continued

## Examiner comments

perspective that the views expressed in Source A are likely not representative of New York as a whole, thus lowering its weight. Source B has a less emotional-tone and the way it lists the reasons for Texas's importance gives it a more factual feel, its reference of 'our duty to annex her' is consistent with the Manifest Destiny ideology sweeping the continent during the mid 19<sup>th</sup> century and the way it places emphasis on adherence to the constitutional rule of law as a condition for its annexation makes the source more balanced as this is usually the source more is greater than A/B but is lowered by the claim over slavery, a far-fetched idea that the average slave would benefit. My contextual knowledge tells me that the US abolished the trade in 1808 and the annexation of Texas was by no means the solution to prevent illegal smuggling.

In conclusion, Source A and B disagree to a large extent over the views of New York regarding the annexation of Texas. My contextual knowledge of New York as a state and city tells me Source B is more representative with those economic ties to the South tells me B is more valuable as it is more representative of public opinion.

6 The candidate provides a brief outline of the role of railways in bringing about industrialisation without explanation.

7 The candidate provides the other side of the argument in the examination of access to resources, such as coal and iron ore, vital to industrialisation.  
Mark for (a) = 12 out of 15

Example Candidate Response – high, continued

Examiner comments

2	B	<p>Source A disagrees with the assertion saying 'we in the North are opposed to it' and that the extension of slavery the annexation would result in would leave 'a country not worth living in' and that there will be a 'struggle' regarding its admission to which 'the end is not easy to foresee'. Source A therefore strongly disagrees with the assertion that the annexation of Texas would benefit the US, suggesting social and moral turmoil.</p>
		<p>Source B agrees with the idea that the annexation of Texas would be beneficial. It says Texas 'is important for the protection of the interests of the cotton growing states' and that it is 'necessary to the commerce of the United States'. It goes as far to say that it will be a positive influence on the thorny issue of slavery 'prevent[ing] the smuggling of slaves from the West Indies'. Source B therefore believes that the annexation will have beneficial economic and social consequences so long as it is done 'without a violation of national faith'.</p>
		<p>Source C agrees with the assertion that the annexation of Texas would benefit the United States. It says that attempts to stop it have invited 'our manifest destiny to overspread the continent for the free development of our multiplying millions' therefore suggesting that</p>

8 A valid use of Source A to challenge the assertion in the question.

9 A valid use of Source B is given to support the assertion in the question.

10 A valid use of Source C is given to support the assertion in the question.

## Example Candidate Response – high, continued

## Examiner comments

11 Its annexation would finally let that process truly begin and the 'development' bring prosperity to the United States. It also describes Texas as a 'gem province' suggesting it is valuable. But the source also reveals the struggle surrounding its admission says that 'now is the time for opposition to the annexation of Texas to cease' which suggests how the subject may have had a caused damage upon the unity of the nation by provoking argument and debate. It also mentions how dissenting ideas have been 'amply refuted' which shows how the issue has been prominent and extensively talked about. The source at face value suggests good will come out of the annexation but inadvertently reveals the tension it has caused and the threat this may entail to the Union.

11 A further discussion and analysis of Source C is given here.

12 Source D disagrees with the assertion. Webster claims that 'there must be some limit to the extent of our territory if we are to make our institutions permanent'. This suggests that westward expansion and the annexation of Texas may pose a threat to the state's political stability of the Union by making its institutions temporary and thus lacking in legitimacy. He also believes 'the spirit of expansionism' cannot be synonymous compatible with a truly great nation, suggesting it may reveal an insecurity or intolerance that

12 A valid use of Source D is given to disagree with the assertion.

## Example Candidate Response – high, continued

## Examiner comments

13 suggests otherwise. The source is against the admission of other states as 'slave states' which again suggests that it will disrupt the proportional representation under the existing constitution. Source D therefore perceives the annexation of Texas to a firm extent of having a negative political effect, but also upon the character of the nation.

13 A further discussion and analysis of Source D is given here.

14 The trustworthiness and weight of the sources vary. Source A's editor then helping set up a party devoted to limiting the extension of slavery explains its anti-annexation perspective, its emotional tone and partisan/sensory nature lowers its ~~weight~~ trustworthiness. Yet its weight is bolstered by its warning of a struggle to which my contextual knowledge supports - the westward expansion would elevate the importance of slavery to the point where it divided the nation in two, playing a role as a long-term factor of the outbreak of Civil War in 1861. Source B's less emotional and more pragmatic tone makes it more trustworthy, and its mention of reluctance to the constitution makes it more valuable by pointing out that when assessing the benefits of Texas' admittance to the Union and giving a clear conclusion for its doing so, rather than the outright rejection in A. Source C comes from a 'Democratic Review' which suggests it is either supportive of the Democrat party or is an assessment of the political state of the US and its democracy.

14 Some useful discussion of provenance is included in this section but not used to directly evaluate the utility of the sources for answering the question.

## Example Candidate Response – high, continued

## Examiner comments

It ~~contrast~~ contradicts itself. By referring to the idea that the annexation of Texas is one of 'military conquest and territorial expansion' whilst advocating for the fulfilment of our 'manifest destiny' which effectively implies this and the Mexican War of 1846-48 would then demonstrate. Its trustworthiness in this sense is lowered and along with it its weight when placed in contrast with my contextual knowledge. Source D may be less trustworthy as a political speech but the informative history of its negative consequences is consistent with my contextual knowledge and the concerns are more reasonable concerns - rather than spiteful rejection giving it historical weight.

In conclusion Sources A to D are split as to whether the annexation of Texas would be beneficial to the United States but Source C does reveal to an extent the not underlying issues it had provoked which would not resurface thereafter and as the US continued to expand. My contextual knowledge leads me to support sources A and D more although from a historical perspective D is more valuable as A is highly subjective emotional and not an objective depiction of the context surrounding the debate on whether Texas should be annexed. Sources B and C agree with the view that it would be beneficial.

15 The candidate has included a useful summary conclusion. Mark for (b) = 15 out of 25

Total mark awarded = 27 out of 40

## How the candidate could have improved their answer

**(a)**

- The comparison could have been further developed by continuing to use the provenance of each source (the nature, origin, or purpose) to directly explain why the sources might be similar or different. One way of doing this would have been to explain how and why the different purposes of the sources lead to differences in the content. This response began to do this, but it could have been done more systematically.

**(b)**

- This was a good response which clearly demonstrated how the sources support and challenge the statement given in the question and began to describe the provenance of the sources. To improve, this response needed to use the nature, origin, or purpose of the sources to test them against the statement.
- So, as well as showing how the sources support and/or challenge the statement by using direct quotations (which this response did) it also needed to place the sources in context and evaluate them against the statement. This would also have allowed the candidate to consider which of the sources was the most useful for answering the question and how much weight the evidence holds.



Example Candidate Response – middle

Examiner comments

2 a Source A, From the 'New York Daily Tribune' which was published in March 1844, talks of how the South wishes to have Texas annexed to the union. Though New York claim to be opposed to it due to the annexation of Texas being 'a southern measure' and that it is for their interest. In the source New York clearly states that they regard it as a clear violation of the Federal principle. The New York ~~now~~ believes that there is no authority for it in the Constitution and if Texas is annexed to the union it would leave the country not worth living in, a country ~~divided~~ ~~throughout~~ in all its parts. New York believes that as Texas was a slave state and the New York being in the North opposed ~~to~~ slavery in the southern states where Texas had located. They could not accept the "voluntary adoption of the practice of slavery" in their beloved free union. So much so that they claim 'Texas will not be admitted into this union without a struggle', a struggle that will begin peacefully but the end of which is not easy to foresee. From my own knowledge and reading I know that New York was right in ~~staying~~ ~~up~~ saying and standing by what they had said at numerous public ~~and~~ debates and compromises arise ~~that~~ though it eventually ended in four years of civil war in which over 62000 American men died.

1

2

1 The candidate provides a simple description of Source A.

2 Only Source A is described on this page.

Example Candidate Response – middle, continued

Examiner comments

In Source B, which is from The 'New York Courier and Enquirer' published in November 1844, New York's views are similar contrast from those of which are in Source A by saying 'we have always considered that whenever Texas can be annexed without a violation of national faith, it is our duty to annex her' here New York claim that is only there is no violation to national faith then Texas may be annexed, as they believe it is their duty. This contrasts from Source A in which it says Texas can only be annexed to the union is only there is a struggle whereas Source B claims Texas can be annexed only if there is no struggle. From my own knowledge I know that the Northern States, including New York deemed it their duty to help the Southern States into the union believing that they were helping slavery or bettering the Southern States. This is further evident in Source B as it says 'Texas is necessary to the Commerce of the United States'. Also for New York also believes that by annexing Texas it can also save or help the slaves, the North being a 'friend of the slave' believes that by the annexation of Texas into the union they can then better prevent the smuggling of slaves from the West Indies. They believe that it is the duty of any man of seeking to help Texas and prevent smuggling of slaves.

Source A and Source B are both similar in the sense that they both share their views of slavery and how they are both against it. The both sources are also similar in thinking that Texas can be admitted into the union, though their reasons on why and how do differ.

In conclusion both Source A and B mostly contrast each other, the only most significant similarity I could find was the opposition towards slavery in the south.

3

4

5

6

3 This implies a difference with Source A, but it is not made explicit.

4 A valid difference between Sources A and B is shown here.

5 A description of Source B in relation to the issue is given but the candidate does not show a contrast with Source A, so this is not a valid difference.

6 A similarity between the sources is identified but no support from these sources is provided. Mark for (a) = 8 out of 15



Example Candidate Response – middle, continued

Examiner comments

2 b Source A, From the 'New York Daily Tribune' published in March 1846 does very little to show any favour towards the statement that the annexation of Texas is

Both Source A and Source D are very much ~~against~~ <sup>against</sup> the statement that the annexation of Texas would benefit the United States while Source B does agree and Source C agrees to the fullest extent, in this essay I shall explain why:

Source A, From the 'New York Daily Tribune' published in March 1846 does not agree that the annexation of Texas would benefit the United States as Source A being a New York newspaper based in the North where Union opposes slavery believes it would rather more benefit the South as Texas is a slave state with cotton plantations. Therefore it would do more to benefit the South interests. The source also states that the Annexation of Texas into the Union would be a clear violation of the Federal principle and seem it unconstitutional. Therefore the source states the Texas will not be admitted into the Union without a struggle, a struggle which will begin peacefully but the end of which is not easy to foresee. From my own knowledge I know that a war then took place between Mexico and the Southern States in which Texas was acquired by the US.

Source A, From the 'New York Daily Tribune' published in March 1846 does not agree that the annexation of Texas would benefit the United States as Source A being a New York newspaper based in the North where Union opposes slavery believes it would rather more benefit the South as Texas is a slave state with cotton plantations. Therefore it would do more to benefit the South interests. The source also states that the Annexation of Texas into the Union would be a clear violation of the Federal principle and seem it unconstitutional. Therefore the source states the Texas will not be admitted into the Union without a struggle, a struggle which will begin peacefully but the end of which is not easy to foresee. From my own knowledge I know that a war then took place between Mexico and the Southern States in which Texas was acquired by the US.

Source A, From the 'New York Daily Tribune' published in March 1846 does not agree that the annexation of Texas would benefit the United States as Source A being a New York newspaper based in the North where Union opposes slavery believes it would rather more benefit the South as Texas is a slave state with cotton plantations. Therefore it would do more to benefit the South interests. The source also states that the Annexation of Texas into the Union would be a clear violation of the Federal principle and seem it unconstitutional. Therefore the source states the Texas will not be admitted into the Union without a struggle, a struggle which will begin peacefully but the end of which is not easy to foresee. From my own knowledge I know that a war then took place between Mexico and the Southern States in which Texas was acquired by the US.

7 This is a simple source overview, but the candidate does not make a clear link to the question.

8 This is a valid use of Source A to challenge the assertion given in the question, i.e., the annexation of Texas would benefit the United States.

9 Here, the candidate includes further discussion of Source A.

Example Candidate Response – middle, continued

Examiner comments

Source B, From The 'New York Courier and Enquirer' published in November of 1845. It agrees ~~that~~ that the annexation of Texas ~~will~~ would benefit the United States as ~~for~~ it states 'Texas is necessary to the Commerce of the United States' therefore if Texas can be annexed without a violation of national law it is the wisest way to do so. They believe it is their duty to better the nation and by Texas being annexed it will ~~benefit~~ be an importance to the interests of the cotton-growing states, and also by annexing Texas they can then, ~~as~~ as a friend of the 'Slave' better prevent the smuggling of slaves from the West Indies. ~~From my own this knowledge I~~ ~~is~~ is a very strong argument, though ~~from my own knowledge~~ Texas was annexed as a slave state, so the newspaper contradicted themselves.

Source C, From an article by John O'Sullivan in the 'United States Magazine and Democratic Review' published between July and August in 1845. Shows ~~at~~ ~~A~~ Agreement to the fullest extent to the statement that the annexation of Texas would benefit the United States. As believing in the 'manifest destiny' (the belief that the US is entitled to expand its land as it is ~~a~~ given the destiny for the great nation) it ~~claims~~ 'Now is the time for opposition to the annexation of Texas to cease' as 'Texas is now ours' The source from John O'Sullivan

10 A valid use of Source B is given to support the assertion given in the question.

11 Further discussion of Source B is included here.

12 A valid use of Source C is given to support the assertion given in the question.

Example Candidate Response – middle, continued

Examiner comments

	<p>states that many nations have tried to interfere in the reception of Texas into the Union though they are 'thwarting our policy, dignity or greatness'. John shifts our view that the annexation has been a military conquest and of territorial expansion. Saying there was no obligation of any towards Mexico to be in the least degree to restrain our right to bring about the desired recovery of the said province once we own'. This source serves more a strong point referring to their policy of manifest destiny.</p> <p>Source D, A speech to the US senate by Daniel Webster, a senator for Massachusetts, the speech was given in December 1845. Daniel clearly states that he is very much against the statement that the annexation of Texas will benefit the united States, this is clearly shown when he says 'I must repeat my objections I have against this annexation'. Daniel believed there must be a limit to the extent of territory annexed by the union as they are too make their institutions permanent as the government is likely to be endangered by a further enlargement of its already vast surface.</p> <p>Daniel then goes on</p>
--	---

13

13 A valid use of Source D is given with accompanying support, to challenge the assertion given in the question.  
Mark for (b) = 13 out of 25

Total mark awarded = 21 out of 40

How the candidate could have improved their answer

- (a)
- The candidate should have made comparing and contrasting the sources the main focus of their answer. The response had large sections of description which means that only a short amount of time was spent directly comparing the sources for similarities and differences. Hence, the response was awarded for a valid difference but only the identification of a similarity.
  - To improve, the response needed to ensure that any contextual knowledge in the answer was used to compare or contrast the sources rather than just as extra detail which did not answer the question.
- (b)
- This was a mid-level response which showed some awareness of how the sources support and challenge the statement, but it has clear areas for improvement. The candidate needed to continue developing their analysis of the sources by considering how relevant contextual knowledge and provenance impact on their usefulness. This could have been done by further explaining why particular sources support or challenge the assertion given in the question or by showing how the source fits into the wider context.
  - The candidate should have evaluated the nature, origin, or purpose of the sources to decide how useful they were when answering the question. This would allow the candidate to consider how much weight they could give to each source.

Example Candidate Response – low

Examiner comments

2	A	Source A is clearly against the annexation of Texas "We of the North are opposed to it" while Source B is pro-slavery as the statement says "As the friend of the slave," Source A feels slavery the annexation of Texas is not worth it "a country disgraced throughout in all parts" while Source B sees it from an as beneficial from an economic point of view "Texas is necessary to the Commerce of the United States". Source A feels the South discussed the matter without alerting the North and the fact while Source B says everyone and every part of the Country is interested in the annexation of Texas "The whole Country is deeply interested in re-obtaining what was once ours".
		The views regarding the annexation of Texas are similar in the sense that they are both talking the annexing of Texas from Mexico during the Mexican-American war. Source A and B are aware of the fact that the annexation of Texas is a violation of the Federal principle but Source A only talks about the fact that South are going against the principle while Source B says they have concluded that without it being a violation of national it is their duty to annex her.
		Source A is clearly from the North who are against slavery and the language used in Source A depicts emotions against slavery and fear of Slave power and the Slaver power conspiracy as Source B says the South wants to annex Texas for Southern

- 1 The candidate misreads Source B. It is not a pro-slavery source.
- 2 A valid difference between the sources is shown with clear support from each source.
- 3 This is a weaker attempt at contrast as the point is not made clear from Source A.
- 4 This is incorrect. These sources are from before the Mexican-American War.
- 5 An attempted comparison is not made clear and so this cannot be rewarded.

**Example Candidate Response – low, continued**

**Examiner comments**

2	A	<p>expansion. Source A which is from the North's newspaper The New York Daily Tribune in March 1844 which could mean the view is partisan as they are against Slave Power conspiracy and Southern expansion.</p>
		<p>Source B is from the New York Courier and Enquirer in November 1844. This is clearly from Pro-Southern Democrats. They are in favor of Southern expansion and solely looking at the benefits of annexation of Texas as it will boost production of cotton and they also made mention that it can prevent the "smuggling of slaves from West Indies".</p>
		<p>Both Sources A and B come from the same place New York and written in the same time period but the views are very different as Source A is against the annexation of Texas and Source B is against for the expansion and annexing of Texas. This suggests that the sources may be unreliable and partisan as they are speaking from a one sided view.</p>

6

7

6

7

A simple description of provenance of Source A is given here.

The candidate confuses the origins of Source B.  
Mark for (a) = 5 out of 15

Example Candidate Response – low, continued

Examiner comments

(B) The annexation of Texas would benefit the United States; ~~A~~ ~~at~~ ~~a~~ greater extent. I agree at a higher extent that it would benefit the United States simply because source A address it clearly that it ~~is~~ of the southern interest the the North pretended as if it was out of their concern but at the same time it was burning within it that it was opposing this annexation since it also wanted it to its side therefore this shows how important and beneficial it was for the annexation of the Texas.

Please note that Questions 2(a) and 2(b) are from different candidates.

8 The analysis of the source is not clear here. This suggests misunderstanding by the candidate.

9 The it also disagree at a lesser extent by showing how it was just the interest of the south since the south always wanted it to annex and taking all the charges leaving behind the North as issued in source A.

9 A weak challenge to the assertion from Source A but this is not made explicit.

Source B Agree at a higher greater extent that the annexation of the Texas was beneficial to the United state where as it issued it as they have always endeavoured to show that Texas is necessary to the commerce of the United states And the passion

10 A valid use of Source B is used to support the assertion in the question, i.e., the annexation of Texas would benefit the United States.

10 of Texas is ~~an~~ important for the protection of the interests of the cotton - growing ~~that~~ of the United states at large.



Example Candidate Response – low, continued

Examiner comments

11 Source C disagree at a greater extent that the annexation of Texas to cease where by other nation had to interfere in the question of the reception of Texas into the Union for the association a vowed object of thwarting a policy that could limit their greatness and also was checking on the fulfilment of the view of annexation that was measured of military conquest and territorial expansion that was unjust and untrue.

11 An understanding of the source is not made clear here. Therefore the analysis is also unclear.

12 On the other side Source C agree at a minimum extent to the annexation of Texas to the United States since other states and countries had now planned to interfere in interest of the benefits that they had seen it had in the United States such as Mexico did, and back time back even the Britain that was also included:

12 This shows some weak support for the assertion from Source C, but this is not made clear or supported with evidence from the source. Mark for (b) = 11 out of 25

Source D disagree at a greater extent that the annexation of Texas would benefit the United States back to the question the only answer was why the objection <sup>to an annexation</sup> was given was due to the following there had to be some limit to the extent of their territory if they were to make the inhibition permanent. The Government could be no longer by further enlargement of its already vast surface.

Source D also since he view that they have always wished that this country should exhibit to other nations of the earth for example of the great, rich and powerful republic which is not possessed by the spirit of expansionism.

## Example Candidate Response – low, continued

## Examiner comments

<p>Source D also disagree by showing that they will never be <del>an</del> admission of slave holding state as the south were and the North opposed it by influence of Abraham Lincoln in the Civil war.</p>
<p>In conclusion to the above source A that uses on the way <del>of</del> the benefits to the south that the annexation was to bring and source B and C was to show that disagreed completely since other states in source C had started interfering in the annexation and the source D was had gave a chance to both sides to give their opinion where the North could not admit to cooperate with the south since they were at first slave holding states.</p>

## How the candidate could have improved their answer

(a)

- The response would have been improved by showing the similarities and differences between the sources with relevance to the question, i.e., the views of New York regarding annexation.
- The candidate should have shown how these similarities and differences appeared in the sources by using support directly from the sources. This could take the form of a short quotation or a paraphrase.

(b)

- The candidate needed to make a clearer analysis of each source by stating whether it supported or challenged the statement in the question and used support from the source. This support could have been in the form of a direct quotation or paraphrase.
- Once the candidate had established whether the sources supported or challenged the assertion, they could begin to use contextual knowledge to explain the sources.

## Common mistakes candidates made in this question

- **(a)** Candidates did not look for the similarities and differences related directly to the question, i.e., New York views of the annexation of Texas. Instead, they offered vague or unsupported comparisons which could not be credited. Candidates should not presume that a source will have a particular opinion just because it comes from a particular state or organisation. It is important to read the content of the source.
- **(b)** Candidates often wrote long sections attempting to evaluate the sources, but this was not related to how useful the source was for answering the question. Provenance should have been used to place the sources in context and discuss how this affected their evidential weight in the question.
- In both parts of the question, candidates sometimes included long sections of contextual knowledge which, although relevant to the topic, did not help to answer the question. Contextual knowledge should have been used directly to explain the similarities and differences in **(a)** and to analyse the sources in **(b)**.



## Question 3

## Example Candidate Response – high

## Examiner comments

3	(a)	<p>Sources A and C provide <del>slightly</del> differing accounts of evidence of foreign intervention in Spain, <del>and</del> agree to <sup>some extent</sup> a small extent on the matter.</p> <p>Firstly, Source A suggests that allegations of Italian intervention in the Spanish Civil War were based entirely on conjectures, whereas Source C provides specific, factual evidence against Italy. This allowed Signor Grandi of Italy to rebut the statements in Source A, but the evidence provided in Source C is implied to be irrefutable. Plus, Source A mentions no specific transgressions done by either <del>the</del> Italy or Germany, whilst Source C puts forth specific military transgressions. In particular, it is stated that Italian troops were present in Spain for the purposes of fighting in the Civil War, which directly opposes Article 10 of the League of Nations' Covenant. Moreover, the lack of such evidence in Source A allows for the reaching of a conclusion within the Non-Intervention Committee, wherein no unanimous decision is reached and no probe is served by it. Source C offers no direct repercussions for Italy, but the heightened volume of evidence against the nation suggests that the League's Committee ought to take more direct action against such transgressions. Also, Source C only implicates those nations against which there is evidence of foreign intervention (Italy and Germany), whilst Source A also implicates the USSR in foreign intervention within Spain. This suggests that the evidence in Source A is insufficient for an "objective" unanimous delegation of justice against particular nations, whereas that in Source C has been expanded upon to provide a more well-rounded</p>
---	-----	--

1 A valid use of both sources to show a difference in relation to the question, i.e., evidence about foreign intervention in Spain.

2 Further exploration of this difference between the sources is analysed for the rest of the page.

## Example Candidate Response – high, continued

## Examiner comments

overview of foreign intervention in Spain. Nonetheless, the sources do agree on the fact that there was at least some evidence of intervention by Germany and Italy to provide a foundation for allegations of misconduct. A historian could also make use of both sources as evidence of Italy and Germany both being involved in the Spanish Civil War together. This is made evident as source A mentions the Italian and German representatives being ~~involved~~ accused of involvement in Spain at the same time, and source C provides evidence for the fact that Italian and German troops attacked in Guadalupe together.

3 A valid use of both sources to show a similarity which is relevant to the question asked.

Nonetheless, it is important to consider the reliability of the two sources. Source A is part of a recorded account of the Non-Intervention Committee's meeting, made by a non-interventionist British group, whilst source C is a telegram sent by the Spanish government to the League of Nations. The account is a written source from an official meeting by the Committee, but is only a recorded version of it, allowing for the possibility of biased emissions or changes to the true content of the meeting. Also, the fact that it was recorded by a group outwardly known to be in support of non-intervention means that it could have been providing a one-sided account in favour of non-intervention, but the welcomes in the committee's actions are also discussed, making for a more objective opinion. Source C on the other hand is a primary source of the Spanish government's immediate views on foreign intervention, and was almost meant for a public audience. Hence not

4 Some discussion of provenance is given but not directly used to explain the comparison between the sources.

directly seeking to influence public opinion. Still, it did seek to convince the League of Nations of the reliability of foreign (Italian and German) interference in the Spanish Civil War, but it does provide specific, factual evidence to support its claims. Also, source C was made later than A, allowing for more supporting evidence to arise, ~~making~~ ~~more~~ supporting its account. Overall, source C is slightly more reliable than A.

5 Some further discussion of provenance is given here. Mark for (a) = 11 out of 15

In conclusion, sources A and C agree to quite a small extent.

## Example Candidate Response – high, continued

## Examiner comments

3	(b)	<p>Non-intervention <sup>was</sup> one of the core ideals of the League of Nations Covenant, and it was greatly tested by the Spanish Civil War of the 1930s. Sources A, B, C and D discuss the statement of these being a genuine commitment to non-intervention in the Spanish Civil War, and they support this view to a small extent.</p> <p>First of all, some of the sources do provide evidence of a commitment to non-intervention in Spain. Source A states that a lengthy meeting was held to discuss the possibility of Italian and German involvement in the Civil War, suggesting that the Committee of Non-Intervention sought to eradicate the problem even when just the possibility of it arose. Source B states the emergence of new attempts within the official Non-Intervention Committee to improve its effectiveness at realising its goal of non-intervention. Nations are implored by the League of Nations itself to maximise its efforts at upkeeping non-intervention, suggesting that the League was committed to ensuring non-intervention within all of its member nations, by all member nations. Source D offers a <del>less</del> <sup>less</sup> <del>unanimous</del> <sup>unanimous</sup> commitment to non-intervention, as two powerful League members (Italy and Germany) are shown to be defiant of such attempts, "walking out" on the non-intervention meeting. However, Britain and France remain dedicated to the cause of non-intervention enough to keep going despite German and Italian lack of cooperation. Whilst showing a divided front of the Committee, with Germany and Italy even being known to send military troops in aid of</p>
---	-----	---

6 Source A and Source B are used, with evidence, to show support for the assertion in the question, i.e., there was a genuine commitment to enforcing non-intervention in the Spanish Civil War.

7 A valid use of Source D to show support for the assertion in the question.

## Example Candidate Response – high, continued

## Examiner comments

Franco's Nationalists, the perseverance of the remaining nations implies a great dedication to non-intervention, despite the difficulties faced. However, the sources also disagree with this view of a true commitment to non-intervention in Spain. First of all, source A states that two of the most prominent nations in the League were officially implicated in intervening in the Spanish Civil War. Although these claims were denied, another nation (the USSR) ended up being implicated in the process. No decision on how to deal with a potential breach of the agreement to not intervene was reached, meaning that there was little incentive to avoid intervention and making the commitment to enforcing it weaker. Furthermore, source C provides specific evidence of military intervention in Spain on both Italy's and Germany's part. A direct breach of the League's Article 10 on non-intervention has occurred, and by two of the most influential nations within the League. ~~Therefore~~ This is a direct lack of commitment to non-intervention in Spain, in fact these actions being in direct opposition to the goal and greatly weakening the League's image of being dedicated to non-intervention, as even its own members didn't partake in enforcing it. As well as that, source D corroborated the idea that Italy and Germany's actions, done by Mussolini and Hitler respectively, directly opposed the aim of non-intervention in Spain. By showing the two ~~that~~ nations haughtily leaving a meeting about non-intervention, a ~~the~~ rift is implied ~~the~~

8 A valid use of Source A to challenge the assertion in the question with evidential support.

9 A valid use of Source C to challenge the assertion given in the question. This is explained through analysis.



## Example Candidate Response – high, continued

## Examiner comments

within the League that was supposed to be at the forefront of enforcing non-intervention. The fact that even the League was unable to unite in the aim of non-intervention in the Spanish Civil War proves the inherent weakness of its commitment to it, and thus its ineffectiveness.

Nonetheless, it is important to also consider the reliability of the sources. Source B is a written document, namely a draft resolution to the issue of foreign intervention, made by the League of Nations in late 1936. Although this document wasn't meant for public eyes, and remains an official document, its aim of was still to influence the actions of the nations within the League. Optimistic, hopeful language is used to not only support the idea of the League being committed to its cause, but also to implore other nations to voluntarily take action against non-intervention themselves. Moreover, this is only a draft resolution, and therefore doesn't fully reflect the final views of the League towards non-intervention. Still, the official nature of the source lends it credibility in expressing the League's true view, but only partially. Source D is a ~~newspaper~~ magazine cartoon made in Britain in September of 1937. The ~~newspaper~~ cartoon was meant for a British public audience, seeking to impart a certain view of the dedication to non-intervention. This is made evident by the fact that Britain and France (its ally) remain sitting, committed to pursuing non-intervention, whereas Italy and Germany are shown to be standing out,

10 A general discussion of provenance is given in this section, but it is not used to directly analyse the utility of the sources for answering the question.

Example Candidate Response – high, continued	Examiner comments
<p>11 playing on the inherent rift between British and Italian-German ideology. Also, the cartoon is meant to be satirical, exaggerating the reality of the situation for humorous effect. However, there is also factual evidence that supports the satire of the cartoon, such as the proof of German and Italian military involvement in the Spanish Civil War, <del>for</del> brought into the public eye before the cartoon <del>is</del> was published. For an overview of the reliability of sources A and C, please refer to question 3(a). Overall, the most reliable source can be considered C, for the reasons discussed above. In conclusion, the sources support this view to</p>	<p>11 Some useful contextual knowledge is given here. Mark for (b) = 15 out of 25</p> <p>Total mark awarded = 26 out of 40</p>

### How the candidate could have improved their answer

(a)

- The candidate could have made a more developed comparison of the sources by looking at other similarities and differences between the sources.
- The comparison could also have been developed by using the provenance of each source (the nature, origin, or purpose) to directly explain why the sources might be similar or different. One way of doing this would have been to explain how and why the different purposes of the sources lead to differences in the content.
- Provenance was discussed in this response, but it was not used to directly explain comparisons.

(b)

- This was a good response which clearly demonstrated how the sources supported and challenged the statement given in the question and began to describe the provenance of the sources. To improve, this response needed to use the nature, origin, or purpose of the sources to test them against the statement. So, as well as showing how the sources support and/or challenge the statement by using direct quotations (which this response does) it also needed to place the sources in context and evaluate them against the statement.
- This would also have allowed the candidate to consider which of the sources was the most useful for answering the question and how much weight the evidence holds.



**Example Candidate Response – middle**

**Examiner comments**

3 a. Both Source A and Source C compare on the fact that there was foreign intervention in Spain. For example, Source A says, 'Eventually Signor Grandi suggested a brief official statement to the effect that the committee had not accepted the allegations of breaches of the agreement and had, therefore, decided to take no action' While Source C says, 'The statements of the Italian officers and men taken prisoner during the last few days in the Guadelaajara sector confirm beyond of denial the presence of regular military units of the Italian army sent to fight on Spanish soil.'

Both Source A and Source C contrast on the fact at Source A claims that Italy did not take part in <sup>the</sup> Spanish civil war, while at Source C it claims that Italy took part in the Spanish civil. Source A says, 'Both Signor Grandi and Prince Bismarck objected to any consideration of the Spanish governments accusations.' And Source C says, 'This is being conducted by four regular divisions of the Italian army. The attacking forces are completed by two special brigades, one of German and Italian regular troops and other of German regular troops.'

1

2

1 Both sources are used to show a valid difference between the sources with supporting evidence.

2 A further difference between the two sources relating to foreign intervention is briefly explained. Mark for (a) = 6 out of 15

Example Candidate Response – middle, continued

Examiner comments

3	<p>b. Source A agrees on the fact that there was a genuine commitment to enforcing non-intervention in the Spanish Civil War. For example, 'The Non-Intervention Committee held a meeting for six and three-quarter hours. Lord Plymouth (Britain) presented documents from the Spanish government alleging breaches of the agreement. Both Signor Grandi (Italy) and Prince Bismarck (Germany) objected to any consideration of the Spanish government's accusations. Signor Grandi said that the Spanish charges were false and 'entirely fantastic'. He denied the allegations against Italy, and opened a bitter counter attack, charging the Soviet government with having violated the agreement.'</p>
4	<p>Source B agrees that there was a genuine commitment to enforcing non-intervention in the Spanish civil war. For example, 'New attempts are being made in the Non-Intervention Committee to make its action more effective, and we recommend that the members of the League represented on the committee make the non-intervention undertakings as strong as possible, and take appropriate measures to ensure that these are effectively supervised. This is with a view to avoiding the dangers which the present state of affairs in Spain is causing to peace and to good understanding between nations'</p>
	<p>On the other hand, Source A disagrees on the fact that there was a genuine commitment to enforcing non-intervention in the Spanish Civil War. For example, 'Eventually Signor Grandi suggested a brief official statement to the effect that the committee</p>

3 A valid use of Source A to agree with the assertion given in the question. Supporting evidence from the source is used.

4 A valid use of Source B to agree with the assertion given in the question.

Example Candidate Response – middle, continued

Examiner comments

5 had not accepted the allegations of breaches of the agreement and had, therefore, decided to take no action.

5 A valid use of Source A to challenge the assertion given in the question with a direct quotation used to support.

6 Source D disagrees on the issue that there was a genuine commitment to enforcing non-intervention in the Spanish Civil war. For example, 'The statements of the Italian officers and men taken prisoner during the last few days in the Guadalaajara Sector confirm beyond possibility of denial the presence of regular military units of the Italian army sent to fight on Spanish soil. This is clearly against the provisions of Article 10 of the covenant whereby the members of the league undertake to respect and preserve against external aggression the territorial integrity and existing political independence of all members of the league. They were subsequently by troops landed at Cadiz from the Italian steamer Sicilia and other ships. They were subsequently transported to the Guadalaajara front to take part in the present offensive. This is being conducted by four regular divisions of the Italian army. The attacking forces are completed by two special brigades one of German and Italian regular troops and other of German regular troops.'

6 The candidate is actually using Source C, and not Source D.

7 Source C disagrees on the fact that there was a genuine commitment to enforcing non-intervention in the Spanish Civil war. For example, 'At source C it shows a cartoon in the British magazine of two men thinking about intervening the Spanish Civil war. And at the bottom of the picture it is written 'The Strolling players'. This means that there was an intervention in <sup>the</sup> Spanish civil war, but secretly.

7 Use of Source C to challenge the assertion given in the question.

In my conclusion, I personally think that there was an intervention in the Spanish civil war. Britain and France were secretly helping the nationalists, while Germany and Italy were helping the socialists. Eventually the socialists won the Spanish civil war. Britain, France, Italy and Germany were mainly doing business and testing their weapons but indirectly.

8 A general summary conclusion. Mark for (b) = 13 out of 25

Total mark awarded = 19 out of 40

## How the candidate could have improved their answer

**(a)**

- The response focused on explaining the differences between the two sources but did not attempt analysis of the similarities. The candidate should have ensured that they compared and contrasted the sources to fully answer the question.

**(b)**

- This is a mid-level response which showed some awareness of how the sources support and challenge the statement, but it has clear areas for improvement. The candidate needed to continue developing their analysis of the sources by considering how relevant contextual knowledge and provenance impact on their usefulness. This could have been done by further explaining why particular sources supported or challenged the assertion given in the question or by showing how the source fitted into the wider context.
- The candidate should have attempted to evaluate the nature, origin, or purpose of the sources to decide how useful they are when answering the question. This would allow the candidate to consider how much weight they could give to each source.

**Example Candidate Response – low**

**Examiner comments**

3 (a) Compare and contrast these sources as evidence about foreign intervention in Spain.

The sources explore the Spanish Civil War and particularly show how the non-intervention policy was tested during the war. The Spanish Civil War was the official war that tested the Committee of Non-Intervention. The sources support the view that Italy and Germany went against the Covenant thus making the non-intervention policy or failure. This essay will compare and contrast the sources as evidence about foreign intervention in Spain, particularly Italian and German intervention in Spain.

Source A shows Italian response to the allegations made by the Spanish government. It had been alleged that the Italians had sent down troops to Madrid during Spain in order to take part in the civil dispute. However, Signor Ciano as well as Bismarck defended themselves by denying this and claiming that Russia / the Soviet had been the offender and had indeed violated the Covenant. This source presented does, however contradict Source C which especially contradicts everything in Source A. Source C shows a telegram document sent in by the Spanish government to the Secretary General of the League of Nations. The Spanish government claims that the Italians and Germans had

1 A general discussion of the question without clear comparison between the sources.

2 Both sources are used to show a valid difference in relation to the question of foreign intervention.

## Example Candidate Response – low, continued

## Examiner comments

broken the terms of the covenant, particularly Article 10 which states that member states of the League should not interfere in external problems and must not participate in external aggression. This means that the world not send in armies or troops as this would be a threat to international peace. Source C shows that indeed Italy had violated the terms of the covenant as they sent in, on 6 February, a number of regular Italian troops had landed in Spain thus violating the treaty. Source A and Source C contradict as Source A shows that / claims that the Italians and Germans were innocent, while Source C gives evidence that puts Italy and Germany at fault.

In addition, Source C and D both support the view that Italy and Germany had, in fact, turned away from the covenant and violated the terms. The most biased could be Italy because Germany had left the League. Source D shows Germany and Italy looking up with the non-intervention on the grounds this showing that they had in fact ignored the Non-intervention Act passed. The Italians had turned against the League's terms and France admits that "those two seem to be always walking away from us." This shows

3 Further exploration of the differences between the sources.

4 Analysis of Source D is not relevant to this question as it is about comparisons between Sources A and C.



## Example Candidate Response – low, continued

## Examiner comments

that two have violated the relevant terms. While Source D does not explicitly show how the two - Germany and Italy were against the League, it does show the attitude of the Italy and Germany towards the League of Nations. It shows that both were working together against the League. It should be noted that this was a rise in Nazism and Fascism and both dictators did whatever they wanted against the League. It should thus be said that Source C and D agree that Italy and Germany had violated the relevant.

Source B actually urges its members states to adopt non-intervention. It further outlines important terms of the non-intervention act.

5 When looking at Source B it gives context to what the act looks like and shows how Italy and Germany could have broken it - it thus leans towards supporting Source C and D but does not actually put any country at fault. It thus, becomes a source of information for the other news items by other members of the League. The source adds no contrast but might actually support the views of Source C and D.

In conclusion, through Source C and D and a lot of Source B, the sources show that Italy and Germany had ignored the policy of intervention and had intervened in Spanish relations while Source A shows Italy and Germany denying allegations.

5 Analysis of Source B is not relevant to this question as it is about comparisons between Sources A and C.  
Mark for (a) = 5 out of 15

## Example Candidate Response – low, continued

## Examiner comments

3 (b) There was a genuine commitment to enforcing non-intervention in the Spanish Civil War.

The 1930s brought about failures of the League of Nations to bring peace and stability to Europe, it was a period where tensions between European powers began to deteriorate and thus causing a foundation to the outbreak of the first to second world war and end of the League of Nations. Most certainly it was also the rise of dictatorship in Italy and Germany that brought Italy and Germany together thus testing the peace and security of the League. The Spanish Civil War was indeed important in testing the treaties signed by the League of Nations. It tested the Kellogg-Briand Pact as well as the Locarno treaties and the non-intervention act. At this point however, the League was at its weakest and France and Britain were keen on gaining Italian support against Germany. To

6

The League was ~~not~~ quite far from enforcing non-intervention in the Spanish Civil War. Thus the League of Nations was committed to a lesser extent.

Firstly, the League met with the Committee of Non-Intervention in Spain in order to negotiate and investigate on the allegations posed against Italy and

6 A general contextual introduction is given in this section, but it is not directly related to the sources, or the question asked.

Example Candidate Response – low, continued

Examiner comments

Germany. As Source A shows, the committee was proving that they were ready to find out what had happened and negotiate peace between the 3 countries and possibly remove Italian troops from Spain. This effort shows that the League was committed to enforcing the non-intervention policy in the Spanish Civil War.

However, to a larger extent, the League was not committed.

At this time member states for example France and Britain were very focused on their own problems in building their own armies and tensions proved that a war was possible. The League thus failed to send in troops to remove Italian forces and they were unable to impose sanctions on the offenders. Proving that the League was not committed.

Secondly, the League only talked thus seeming like a toothless bulldog. Source B poses this as the Resolution drafted makes promises with no actions. This then proves that the League was not committed.

7

8

9

7 A valid use of Source A to support the assertion in the question on the issue of non-intervention.

8 Another section of contextual knowledge which is not linked clearly to the sources.

9 An assertion is made about what Source B says but this is not made clear by quoting or paraphrasing the source. Mark for (b) = 7 out of 25

**Total mark awarded = 12 out of 40**

## How the candidate could have improved their answer

### (a)

- The candidate needed to show the similarities and differences between the sources with relevance to the question, i.e., evidence of foreign intervention in Spain. This should have been the focus of the response. Also, the candidate only needed to use the two sources named in the question.
- To improve the response, the candidate needed to show how these similarities and differences appeared in the sources by using support directly from the sources. This could take the form of a short quotation or a paraphrase.

### (b)

- The candidate needed to show that they understood that the sources showed support and challenge for the assertion in the question about the commitment to non-intervention. The response was one-sided.
- When using contextual knowledge, the candidate should have linked it directly to discussing particular sources rather than providing 'chunks' of knowledge that were not clearly linked to the question.

## Common mistakes candidates made in this question

- **(a)** Candidates did not look for the similarities and differences related directly to the question, i.e., evidence of foreign intervention. Instead, they offered vague or unsupported comparisons which could not be credited. Candidates should look carefully at the content of the sources as well as who they are written by.
- **(b)** Some candidates often wrote long sections attempting to evaluate the sources, but this was not related to how useful the source was for answering the question. Provenance should have been used to place the sources in context and discuss how this affected their evidential weight in the question.
- In both parts of the question, candidates sometimes included long sections of contextual knowledge which, although relevant to the topic, did not help to answer the question. Contextual knowledge should have been used directly to explain the similarities and differences in **(a)**, and to analyse the sources in **(b)**.

Cambridge Assessment International Education  
The Triangle Building, Shaftesbury Road, Cambridge, CB2 8EA, United Kingdom t: +44  
1223 553554  
e: [info@cambridgeinternational.org](mailto:info@cambridgeinternational.org) [www.cambridgeinternational.org](http://www.cambridgeinternational.org)

© Cambridge University Press & Assessment 2021 v2 (updated December 2021)