

---

**HISTORY**

**9389/13**

Paper 1 Document Question

**May/June 2017**

**1 hour**

No Additional Materials are required.

---

**READ THESE INSTRUCTIONS FIRST**

An answer booklet is provided inside this question paper. You should follow the instructions on the front cover of the answer booklet. If you need additional answer paper ask the invigilator for a continuation booklet.

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.

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



---

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

**Section A: European Option****Liberalism and Nationalism in Italy and Germany, 1815–1871****Mazzini and Garibaldi**

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

**Source A**

The radical movements in Italy organised after 1830 were usually easily suppressed even before they had broken out. Inevitably so, such movements, relying solely on republicanism, violence and popular agitation, were hopeless. A democratic revolution of the sort advanced by Mazzini would stand no chance of success. Active power in Italy lies in the hands of the middle class and part of the upper class, both of which are extremely conservative. The dangerous doctrines of Young Italy will not take hold and only a few will follow the principles of this bitter and unfortunate group.

*Cavour, commenting on an essay written by Mazzini, May 1846.*

**Source B**

Mazzini should never have negotiated with the French and he should have restrained the more radical republicans in Rome. He had great intelligence but little political common sense. He threw away a great opportunity in Rome by his poor administration and the way he wasted public money. His failure to work with Garibaldi was also damaging.

*From the memoirs of Felice Orsini, who had fought in Rome with Mazzini,  
July 1852.*

**Source C**

Mazzini, alone, unarmed and often a fugitive, succeeded in making all the tyrants of Europe tremble on their thrones. In times of despair he gave us hope. He kept alive in us the confidence that the cause of unity would win. It was unfortunate that he and Garibaldi were always quarrelling. Whenever Italy needed them to be in agreement, they looked at each other with distrust and resentment, almost as rivals. Neither wished to appear as number two. While Garibaldi would consider coming second to Victor Emmanuel, Mazzini would not come second to anyone. Neither could organise anything, but both, in their own ways, were brave and inspiring leaders. Garibaldi, of course, did provide the great generalship that was so important to victory in both Sicily and Naples.

*From the memoirs of Giuseppe Bandi, a strong Garibaldi supporter, written in 1868.*

**Source D**

In spite of the huge popular acclaim, the contribution of both Mazzini and Garibaldi to victory in the South has been much exaggerated. Mazzini's fine ideas had not really spread there and few had heard of him. Garibaldi was successful in Sicily simply because of the peasant revolt there, and he was soon to change sides and support landowners against them! In Naples he also had an easy task; all had lost confidence in the Bourbons and the Austrians had deserted them. The British Navy was also very helpful to Garibaldi. His much-praised military skills were perhaps useful in minor struggles in South America, but were in fact of little use in Italy.

*A S Bicknell, a British writer and journalist who had followed Garibaldi's invasion of Sicily and southern Italy, 1861.*

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

- (a) Compare and contrast the views on Garibaldi in Sources C and D. [15]
- (b) 'Mazzini played a vital role in bringing about Italian unification.' How far do Sources A to D support this view? [25]

## Section B: American Option

### The Origins of the Civil War, 1846–1861

#### The Fugitive Slave Act: The Case of Joshua Glover

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

##### Source A

The negro man Joshua Glover belongs to Mr Garland as a slave for life, under the laws of Missouri where Mr Garland resides. He ran away and escaped in the spring of 1852. Having learned that his slave resided near Racine, Wisconsin, Mr Garland, in pursuance of law, in February 1854 in St. Louis made proof of his property in said slave. He came to this city and obtained a warrant from the District Judge of Wisconsin to arrest his slave and bring him before said Judge.

The alleged slave was arrested and lodged in jail yesterday morning for safe keeping before the matter could be heard by the Judge. About the same time, Mr Garland was arrested by the Sheriff of Racine County for an alleged assault upon his slave. Mr Garland states that he had used no force upon the slave except on the occasion of the slave's arrest, and then only at the request of the Deputy Marshal to help him, and only so much as was necessary to effect the arrest of said slave.

*From a letter from the Agents/Solicitors for Bennami Garland, March 1854.*

##### Source B

In a short time, the facts concerning the seizure of Glover became known and these were of such a brutal character as to produce much excitement. It appears that the kidnapping party consisted of two US Deputy Marshals, B S Garland of Missouri, the so-called owner, and a slave-catcher by trade from St. Louis named Melvin. Glover's cabin door was forced open and a loaded pistol pointed at Glover by Garland. Glover took hold of the pistol to prevent Garland from shooting him when one of the Deputy Marshals struck Glover over the head, knocking Glover senseless to the floor. Glover was then handcuffed and taken into a wagon. After twelve hours' driving, he was brought to the Milwaukee jail.

*From 'The Green Mountain Freeman', a Vermont newspaper, 15 February 1855.*

##### Source C

There are indeed few events upon record in the history of the United States between the revolution and the rebellion that brought into question a more important principle or raised the populace to a more dangerous frenzy than the never-to-be forgotten Glover Rescue. Joshua Glover, the fugitive slave, was captured by his master in Racine and thrown into jail without warrant or authority of any kind. Even the United States Marshal for the state of Wisconsin lent himself to the dishonourable act of going to Racine and capturing Glover. Yes, and further, the United States Marshal had the sanction of a United States Judge, Miller, who was Virginian by birth and a strong advocate of slavery. Of course Glover resisted and force had to be used and he was brought to Milwaukee jail covered with dirt and blood.

*From 'Reminiscences of the Busy Life of Chauncey Olin', owner of a local abolitionist newspaper in 1854, published in 1893.*

**Source D**

I am a native of Cornwall [England] and, arriving in June 1850, took the anti-slavery side immediately. The Glover matter came up in March 1854. The news came that Glover had been captured by a deputy United States Marshal and a southerner, and that they had rushed him through to Milwaukee jail for fear the Racine abolitionists would rescue him. They didn't capture him fairly for Glover was a big strong man. They waited until he was asleep before they arrested him. There was a huge crowd at the jail. The leaders demanded the keys to the jail, but the jailer refused. Taller men than I had a piece of timber and made a battering ram of it, breaking in the door. They had Glover out.

*From the reminiscences of James Angove on the fiftieth anniversary of his arrival in the USA, 1900.*

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

- (a) To what extent do Sources A and C agree about the arrest of Joshua Glover? [15]
- (b) How far do Sources A to D support the assertion that implementing the Fugitive Slave Act worked well? [25]

**Section C: International Option****The Search for International Peace and Security, 1919–1945****The Origins of the United Nations and Veto Rights**

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

**Source A**

Plans for a world security organisation, drawn up here at the Dumbarton Oaks Conference, were simultaneously announced today in Moscow, London, Chungking and Washington. Several questions in setting up such an organisation were left unanswered in the meetings here. The most essential was whether the Big Powers should have the right to veto a decision of the proposed world Security Council. This raised differences of opinion between Russia, backing the veto on one hand, and Britain and the USA on the other. The whole problem of voting relationships among the Big Powers was left unsolved. As a result, the Dumbarton Oaks plan makes no provision as to how the Powers should finally decide when to use force against an aggressor.

*From an article in an American newspaper, 9 October 1944.*

**Source B**

At the San Francisco Conference, the small countries are denouncing the provision allowing the Big Five Powers to veto measures for settling international disputes. The Australian delegate argued, 'It would be preposterous if one great nation could, by exercising its veto, insist that a dispute between two other nations shall drag on indefinitely.' Gromyko, the Russian delegate, was strongly opposed to any softening of the veto. He said, 'The most essential factor in maintaining future world peace is unity among the most powerful peace-loving nations. Removing the power of veto might lead to friction and war.' Gromyko implied that if anyone lays hands on the veto power, which Stalin invented and which Roosevelt and Churchill accepted, Stalin would refuse to join the world peace league. Some of the American delegates denounced the veto as indefensible. However, the American delegation agreed to the veto, believing that, if Russia refused to join, the whole peace league, on which the hopes of humanity are pinned, would collapse. There could not be a peace league without all the big three – America, Britain and Russia.

*From an article in an American newspaper, 29 May 1945.*

**Source C**

At the time of the Dumbarton Oaks Conference last summer, it was believed that the veto originated with Russia and was opposed by the USA and Britain. Whether or not this version was inspired by the Roosevelt administration, it allowed it to go uncorrected because it was politically expedient. The country was just entering upon the Presidential election campaign in which the issue of collective security loomed large. The fact is that the veto originated not with Russia but with the USA. It was conceived as a provision that would get the peace organisation passed by the Senate. Roosevelt's government feared that the isolationists would be able to muster enough votes to prevent the organisation passing through the Senate. The veto was an escape clause safeguarding American sovereignty. When America proposed the veto, Stalin could scarcely believe it. It meant that if one of the Big Five were accused of aggression, it could prevent the international police force being called out against itself. With such a veto, Stalin could prevent the league from interfering with his aggressions on Poland and elsewhere.

*From an article in an American newspaper, 11 June 1945.*

**Source D**

The most serious disagreement at the San Francisco Conference is Russia's insistence on the veto right to prevent the Security Council from investigating international disputes. The trouble is that, although all the nations desire peace, none of them is willing to sacrifice any important national interest to that desire. Next to Russia, the country most insistent on retaining the veto is the USA. When it comes to security, the two countries best able to defend themselves are the least anxious to trust any alternative. In other words, the fundamental weakness of the Dumbarton Oaks plan – its failure to provide real collective security – is still there.

*From an article in an American magazine, 11 June 1945.*

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

- (a) Compare and contrast Sources B and C as evidence of the US government's attitude towards the granting of veto rights to the Big Five Powers. [15]
- (b) How far do Sources A to D support the view that the Soviet Union was responsible for the divisions which appeared at the San Francisco Conference over the issue of veto rights for the Big Five Powers? [25]

**BLANK PAGE**

---

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.

To avoid the issue of disclosure of answer-related information to candidates, all copyright acknowledgements are reproduced online in the Cambridge International Examinations Copyright Acknowledgements Booklet. This is produced for each series of examinations and is freely available to download at [www.cie.org.uk](http://www.cie.org.uk) after the live examination series.

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.