

Cambridge
International
AS & A Level

Cambridge Assessment International Education
Cambridge International Advanced Subsidiary and Advanced Level

HISTORY

9389/11

Paper 1 Document Question

October/November 2019

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****The causes of the Franco–Prussian War**

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

Source A

When I have been asked whether I am pro-Russian or pro-Western powers such as France, I have always answered: 'I am Prussian' and my ideal in foreign politics is total freedom from prejudice, and independence of decision reached without pressure or dislike or attraction to other states or rulers. As far as I am concerned, as soon as it was proved to me that it was in the interests of a healthy and well considered Prussian policy, I would see our troops fire on English, French or Austrians with equal satisfaction. For me, France, whoever stands at its head, is only one piece, though an essential one, in the chess game of politics. I have neither sympathy nor dislike towards her. It would be disloyal of me to do so. The drive towards conquest is present as much in England, America or Russia, as it is in Napoleonic France. Napoleon does not seem to be the warlord type. I do not anticipate, at present, conflict there.

Bismarck in a letter to Leopold von Gerlach, a Prussian army general, May 1857.

Source B

When the Hohenzollerns changed their minds about accepting the throne of Spain, Bismarck refused to believe that there was any approaching danger and stayed away from the crisis taking the waters in Varzin in July for his health. The Hohenzollerns, father and son, had become very enthusiastic about the Spanish throne, having been talked into it by Bismarck. He was well aware how it would upset France and its Emperor and he was anxious to have an ally to the rear of France on the throne in Madrid. Bismarck seems to have taken the whole affair very casually, but he was not at all surprised to hear that the news had led to elaborate preparations for war in France and that they were prepared to attack before their army was fully mobilised. He knew the French Emperor was likely to act foolishly.

Diary of Count Alfred von Waldersee, Prussian military attaché in Paris, July 1870.

Source C

It was unfortunate that the Duc de Gramont, the French Foreign Secretary, did not take the advice given and was not satisfied by the public and amazing victory of French diplomacy over Prussia in the Spanish affair. War could have been avoided, but he insisted on taking a further step. Gramont ordered Benedetti, the French Ambassador with the Prussian King in Bad Ems, to get a promise from the King that Prussia would take no similar action in future. The King was highly offended and refused to discuss the matter with Benedetti further. The telegram which Bismarck sent in response to France was altered in such a way to make it not only provocative to France but to show French ambitions in their full strength in order to influence German and European opinion against France.

Diary of Count Alfred von Waldersee, Prussian military attaché in Paris, August 1870.

Source D

I took it as assumed that war with France would necessarily have to be waged on the road to our further national development, for our development at home as well as our extension beyond the river Main. We had to keep this eventuality in mind in all our domestic as well as our foreign relations. In an expanding Prussia, Napoleon of France saw not only a danger to France but also an opportunity to prevent the unification and national development of Germany. He believed that the non-Prussian portions of Germany would need real French support to fight us off, and he wished to hinder the direction of a united Germany. I assumed then that a united Germany was just a matter of time and that a Franco–Prussian War must take place before a united Germany could be realised.

*Bismarck's 'Reflections and Reminiscences',
written in the 1890s and describing the events of the year 1867.*

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

- (a) Compare and contrast Bismarck's views of foreign relations in Sources A and D. [15]
- (b) 'Bismarck always wanted to go to war with France.' How far do Sources A to D support this view? [25]

Section B: American Option**The Origins of the Civil War, 1846–1861****Impact of the Mexican–American War**

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

Source A

THE WILMOT PROVISIO IS ABOLITION, AGGRESSIVE, REVOLUTIONARY, AND SUBVERSIVE OF THE CONSTITUTION AND ITS GUARANTEES TO THE SLAVEHOLDING STATES.

The people of the non-Slaveholding States should let us alone. The Wilmot Abolition Proviso is splitting the Union into sectional parties; it is virtually the first step to dissolution. The North must see the truth and know the consequences of this action and the South must understand the danger it is in. Abolition has been advanced into a new position which is the most dangerous it has ever occupied. If it is not now met, resisted and defeated by the peaceful extension of the Missouri Compromise to solve the question of the territories, it will inevitably lead to the destruction of the rights of the Slaveholding States and their citizens, or to the necessity of maintaining them by the sword.

From the 'Charleston Mercury' (South Carolina), 1847.

Source B

Dear Sir,

The Wilmot Proviso has been before the country for some time. It has been repeatedly discussed in Congress, and by the public press. We may well regret the existence of slavery in the southern states, and wish they had been saved from its introduction. But it is there and we must deal with it as a great practical question about how our government works. Local institutions, whether they have power over slavery, or to any other question, are under the power of local authorities. Congress has no right to say that there shall be slavery in New York or that there shall be no slavery in Georgia; nor is there any other human power but the people of those states, respectively, which can change the relations existing therein. Similarly, in the territories the lives of our citizens, with the vast variety of property connected with them, cannot be controlled by the government.

A letter from Lewis Cass, Senator for Michigan and 1848 Democratic Party presidential candidate to Mr Nicholson of Tennessee, December 1847.

Source C

It appears to be accepted by all hands that whenever peace may take place, one of its conditions will be the cession of territory by Mexico to the United States. Such territory, whatever its extent may be, is now free from the pollution of slavery. The question that will arise by its annexation will be whether the mere act of cession to the United States of America, 'by the Grace of God, Free and Independent', changes it from a land of freedom to a land of slaves. If not, a further question is whether such change should be made by any subsequent act of the federal government. We believe the principle of the Ordinance of 1787, by which the Institution of Slavery was excluded from all the unsettled territories then owned by the United States, should be applied to Oregon and Mexico.

*From an address of the Democrat members of the legislature of the State of New York,
April 1848.*

Source D

Which shall we have? Shall freedom be preserved in the territories, or shall it be struck down and slavery planted in its place? This is the one, clear, distinct and momentous question to be decided at the polls in November. The powerful and exciting debates which echoed through the Halls of the Capitol during nearly the whole of the last session of Congress show that the Wilmot Proviso has ceased to be derided as a 'humbug', and has risen up to overshadow all other subjects, to occupy the thoughts of all men. The electors of the whole country are therefore left free to choose between the preservation of freedom and the extension and consequent perpetuation of slavery. If they desire to see slavery extended they can give a direct vote for it by voting for either Cass or Taylor. If they are in favour of preserving freedom, they will of course vote for Mr Van Buren.

*From an election pamphlet published in Cincinnati, Ohio, 1848.
It was titled 'Free soil, free labor, free men, & free speech, against the extension and domination of the slaveholding interest'.*

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

- (a) Compare and contrast the views on the Wilmot Proviso given in Sources B and D. [15]
- (b) 'The main issue raised by the Mexican–American War was the power of the federal government.' How far do Sources A to D support this view? [25]

Section C: International Option

The Search for International Peace and Security, 1919–1945

Britain's leadership of the League of Nations

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

Source A

The British government has served the cause of the world and the League well, and one cannot help feeling proud of the stand it has made on behalf of collective security and of legality in international affairs. The application of sanctions against Italy in actual fact is an enormous step in advance, and I trust will have a marked effect not only in the Abyssinian case, but also in other future cases, and will serve as a warning against international adventures of this kind in the future.

From a letter by the South African diplomat, Jan Smuts, to the British League of Nations Union, October 1935.

Source B

The only reason Britain has urged sanctions lies in Italy's disregard for the Covenant regarding Abyssinia. It has been asked why Britain didn't take similar action in regard to Manchuria. This was entirely different to the case we are now considering. In the Manchurian dispute, China and Japan were never technically at war and the League did not pronounce Japan guilty of resorting to war in disregard of the Covenant. Article 16 therefore did not and could not come into operation. In the present case, Abyssinia appealed to the League, which had no alternative but to name Italy as an aggressor. As a member of the League we have had to play our part against Italy. Naturally it has had to be a prominent part because of the position which this country occupies in the world. But it is not true that Britain has invariably taken the lead; other countries have played their full part and it is the strength of the League that it is not confined to the actions of Britain alone.

Lord Stanhope (British Under-Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs), addressing the British parliament, 23 October 1935.

Source C

Imposing sanctions against Italy will lead to war. For the last thirty years, the three main powers in the League, France, Britain and Italy, have been involved in activities for the economic partition of Abyssinia. In encouraging sanctions, is Britain as impartial as some supporters of the League would like us to believe? Every nation has to look after its own economic interests and Britain controls territory on three sides of Abyssinia. The League was not particularly active in response to Japan's aggression in Manchuria, probably because its most powerful members had no interest in Manchuria. Had Britain been as interested in Manchuria as it is in Abyssinia, one wonders whether the League would have adopted a similar attitude over Japan's aggression as it has over Italy's invasion of Abyssinia. Britain is not concerned so much with peace as with its own economic interests.

An Australian politician addressing the Australian Senate, 8 November 1935. At this time, Australia was a self-governing member of the British Empire.

Source D

Britain took the lead at Geneva, encouraging enforcement of the Covenant and whipping up support for sanctions. This gained the admiration of the whole world and galvanised the League into action. Fifty states imposed sanctions against Italy. The Abyssinians were encouraged into a desperate resistance by the feeling that almost the whole world and, above all, Britain, was behind them. The sanctions caused great resentment in Italy. As the possibility of war between Britain and Italy increased, the British government negotiated proposals which would have rewarded Italian aggression with a great part of Abyssinia. Confronted by public outrage, the government then rejected these proposals and resumed the policy of limited sanctions. To continue with sanctions is certainly dangerous and probably futile. To end sanctions exposes Britain to worldwide humiliation. Meanwhile, Italy has continued progress in Abyssinia. Unless Britain is prepared to take action which will actually help the Abyssinian people, its government should not presume to offer guidance to other nations.

Winston Churchill, member of the British Parliament, writing on 17 April 1936.

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

- (a) Compare and contrast the views expressed in Sources B and C regarding the League of Nations' response to Japanese aggression in Manchuria. [15]
- (b) 'Britain's actions during the Abyssinian crisis demonstrated its commitment to the principles of the League of Nations.' How far do Sources A to D support this view? [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 Assessment International Education Copyright Acknowledgements Booklet. This is produced for each series of examinations and is freely available to download at www.cambridgeinternational.org after the live examination series.

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