
HISTORY

9389/12

Paper 1 Document Question

May/June 2014

1 hour

Additional Materials: Answer Booklet/Paper

READ THESE INSTRUCTIONS FIRST

If you have been given an Answer Booklet, follow the instructions on the front cover of the Booklet.

Write your Centre number, candidate number and name on all the work you hand in.

Write in dark blue or black pen.

Do not use staples, paper clips, glue or correction fluid.

DO NOT WRITE IN ANY BARCODES.

This paper contains **three** sections:

Section A: European Option

Section B: American Option

Section C: International Option

Answer **both** parts of the question from **one** section only.

At the end of the examination, fasten all your work securely together.

The marks are given in brackets [] at the end of each part question.



This document consists of **7** printed pages and **1** blank page.

Section A: European Option**Liberalism and Nationalism in Italy and Germany, 1848–1871****Bismarck's attitude to Austria**

1 Read the sources and then answer **both** parts of the question.

Source A

Since Napoleon was defeated in 1815, Germany has clearly been too small for both Prussia and Austria. As long as an honourable arrangement about the influence of each country cannot be agreed and carried out, we will be rivals in the same disputed land. Austria will remain the only state to whom we can permanently lose or from whom we can permanently gain. For a thousand years, the balance between them has been adjusted by war. It is the only way in which they can evolve. In the not too distant future we shall have to fight for our existence against Austria. It is not within our power to avoid that because the course of events has no other solution.

In 1856 Bismarck gives two other Prussian politicians his assessment of relations between Prussia and Austria.

Source B

No state has the desire and opportunity to assert its German point of view independently to the same extent as Prussia. Prussian interests coincide exactly with most of the German states except Austria. There is nothing more German than the development of Prussia's particular interests, properly understood.

Bismarck explains his view of the importance of Prussia in Germany to Prince William, the heir to the King of Prussia, 1858.

Source C

After our victory in battle against Austria in 1866, a council of war was held under the presidency of the king, in which the question to be decided was whether we should make peace under the conditions offered by Austria or continue the war. A painful illness from which I was suffering made it necessary that the council should be held in my room. On this occasion I was the only civilian there not in uniform. I declared it to be my conviction that peace must be concluded on the Austrian terms, but I remained alone in my opinion. The king supported the military majority.

I believed that we had to avoid wounding Austria too severely. We had to avoid leaving behind in her any unnecessary bitterness of feeling or desire for revenge. We ought instead to reserve the possibility of becoming friends again with our enemy of the moment. We should in any case regard Austria as a piece on the European chessboard and the renewal of friendly relations as a move open to us. If Austria were severely injured, she would become the ally of France and of every other opponent of ours. She would even sacrifice her anti-Russian interests for the sake of revenge on Prussia.

Bismarck writing in his memoirs about his policy towards Austria, published in 1899 after his death.

Source D

In 1866 in Germany the forces of the past were engaged in a struggle with the forces of growth regarding the future form of national life. The German people required a new political order to secure unity at home and a position of political power in the world in keeping with its greatness. The structure of the German Confederation under the leadership of Austria could no longer satisfy this requirement. As long as the dual authority of two great powers divided Germany, a sound solution to the German problem in the long term was unimaginable.

An Austrian historian explains why Prussia and Austria were in conflict, published 1935.

Answer **both** parts of the question with reference to the sources.

- (a) Compare and contrast Sources A and C as evidence of Bismarck's attitude to Austria. [15]
- (b) How far do these sources show that, during the period to 1866, Bismarck was more concerned with Prussian than with German interests? [25]

Section B: American Option**The Origins of the Civil War, 1846–1861****Daniel Webster's Seventh of March Speech, 1850**

2 Read the sources and then answer **both** parts of the question.

Source A

In the excited times in which we live, there is found to exist a state of bitterness between the North and the South. There are lists of grievances produced by each; and those grievances, real or supposed, alienate the minds of one portion of the country from the other. I shall bestow a little attention on these various grievances. I begin with the complaints of the South. I will refer to one which has in my opinion just foundation: and that is there has been found in the North, among individuals and among legislators, a disinclination to perform their constitutional duties in regard to the return of persons bound to service who have escaped into the free states. In that respect, the South, in my judgement is right and the North is wrong.

I put it to all the sober and sound minds of the North as a question of morals and a question of conscience. What right have they, in their legislative capacity, or any other capacity, to endeavour to get round this Constitution, or to embarrass the free exercise of the rights secured in the Constitution to the persons whose slaves escape them? None at *all*, none at *all*.

From the Seventh of March speech to the US Senate given by Daniel Webster, Senator for Massachusetts, 1850.

Source B

Mr Webster's speech seems to us to have for its object not at all the great question of right and wrong now open before our people but the mere quieting of the country. He treats the North and South as a father might treat two quarrelsome boys by dividing the dispute between them.

The doctrine of equilibrium – plainly stated by Mr Calhoun, obviously meant by Mr Webster – is simply shocking and utterly inadmissible. The great Northern statesman, after defending the Constitution with his unrivalled powers, has at length sacrificed himself to it. He seems not to know how deep a hold the anti-slavery movement has on the conscience of the great mass of the New England and the Western people. No genius, no eloquence, no public position, no past services can make his views tolerable to the calm reflection of the Free States.

From 'The Liberator', 29 March 1850.

Source C

About eight hundred men, most of them citizens of Boston, have addressed to Daniel Webster a letter expressing their approval of his late, notorious speech in the Senate. The leading signers belong to the class expressively termed the 'Cottonocracy', of whom it is said that if they were ever to reach heaven, they would no doubt seek to dam up the waters of the river of life to drive their spinning machines. Webster has been for years not the Representative of Massachusetts but the tool of these 'cotton lords', the Trinity of whose worship is the golden eagle, the silver dollar and the copper cent, these three being, according to their faith, 'one Money, and entitled to the supreme adoration of their stunted souls'.

From 'The Anti-Slavery Bugle', New Lisbon, Ohio, 20 April 1850.

Source D

Four years ago tonight, on one of those high critical moments in history when great issues are determined, when the powers of right and wrong are mustered for conflict, Mr Webster most unexpectedly threw his whole weight on the side of slavery and caused by his personal and official authority the passage of the Fugitive Slave Bill. People were expecting a totally different course from Mr Webster. The old fugitive law was fast becoming a dead letter. The new Bill made it operative, required me to hunt slaves. The way in which the country was dragged to consent to this, and the disastrous defection of the men of letters, of some preachers of religion, was the darkest passage in our history.

From a lecture on the Fugitive Slave Law read by a prominent abolitionist at the Tabernacle, New York City, 7 March 1854.

Answer **both** parts of the question with reference to the sources.

- (a) To what extent do Sources B and C agree on the reaction of the North to Daniel Webster's Seventh of March speech? [15]
- (b) 'A disaster for the abolitionists.' How far do these sources support this assertion about the passage of the Fugitive Slave Act in 1850? [25]

Section C: International Option

The Search for International Peace and Security, 1919–1945

The League of Nations and the Abyssinian Crisis

3 Read the sources and then answer **both** parts of the question.

Source A



Cartoon from a British newspaper, August 1935. It shows Mussolini pulling the League along with Laval (French Foreign Minister) and Baldwin (British Prime Minister).

Source B

I do not suppose that in the history of this Assembly there was ever a more difficult moment for delivering a speech. When the world is stirred to excitement over the Abyssinian controversy, I will begin by re-affirming the support for the League by the government that I represent and the interest of the British people in collective security. On behalf of the British government, I can say that they will be second to none in their intention to fulfil, within the measure of their capacity, the obligations which the Covenant lays upon them. The League stands, and my country stands with it, for the collective maintenance of the Covenant, especially with regard to all acts of unprovoked aggression.

Sir Samuel Hoare, British Foreign Secretary, addressing the League of Nations, September 1935.

Source C

In October 1935, the League unanimously concluded that Italy had violated the Covenant and was in a state of aggression. I was assured that the resources of the Covenant would be employed so that the aggressor would not triumph. My confidence in the League was absolute. The Great Powers have promised the guarantee of collective security to small states. I thought it to be impossible that fifty-two nations, including the most powerful in the world, should be successfully opposed by a single aggressor. What has become of these promises? The Great Powers considered their undertakings under the Covenant as absolutely of no value. Their connections with Italy forced them to refuse to take any measures whatsoever to stop Italian aggression. Their governments, whilst ever protesting scrupulous attachment to the Covenant, have tirelessly used all their efforts to prevent its observance. As soon as any measure which was likely to be effective was proposed, various pretexts were devised in order to postpone even consideration of the measure.

Haile Selassie, Emperor of Abyssinia, addressing the League of Nations, June 1936.

Source D

I would like to make a few observations upon events of the last twelve months and their effect upon the League of Nations and the policy of collective security to which we have given such whole-hearted support with such disappointing results. The policy of collective security seemed to be an attractive alternative to the old system of alliances and balance of power which was unsuccessful in preventing the greatest war in history. The circumstances in which the dispute between Italy and Abyssinia began appeared to offer a favourable opportunity for the exercise of collective security. Italy's aggression was blatant and there was hardly any country to which it appeared that a policy of sanctions could be exercised with a greater chance of success than upon Italy. It is no use for us to shut our eyes to realities – collective security has been tried out and it has failed to prevent war, failed to stop war, failed to save the victim of aggression. Surely we must admit that we have tried to impose upon the League a task which it was beyond its powers to fulfil.

From a speech by Neville Chamberlain, a senior member of the British government, June 1936.

Answer **both** parts of the question with reference to the sources.

- (a) Compare and contrast the views expressed in Sources A and B about Britain's commitment to the Covenant of the League of Nations. [15]
- (b) How far do Sources A–D support the view that the League of Nations was never fully committed to taking effective measures in response to Italy's invasion of Abyssinia? [25]

Copyright Acknowledgements:

Section C Source A © David Low; *Discussions are proceeding*; Evening Standard; 29 August 1935; Ref: DL0999; www.cartoons.ac.uk.

Permission to reproduce items where third-party owned material protected by copyright is included has been sought and cleared where possible. Every reasonable effort has been made by the publisher (UCLES) to trace copyright holders, but if any items requiring clearance have unwittingly been included, the publisher will be pleased to make amends at the earliest possible opportunity.

Cambridge International Examinations is part of the Cambridge Assessment Group. Cambridge Assessment is the brand name of University of Cambridge Local Examinations Syndicate (UCLES), which is itself a department of the University of Cambridge.