



Cambridge
International
AS & A Level

Cambridge International Examinations
Cambridge International Advanced Subsidiary and Advanced Level

HISTORY

9389/12

Paper 1 Document Question

May/June 2016

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****Bismarck and the Schleswig-Holstein Crisis**

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

Source A

Bismarck might be described as firstly Prussian, secondly through-and-through Prussian and thirdly German through Prussian. He has a great contempt of public opinion and of German liberalism and its leaders. The territorial rounding-off of Prussia, which is the object of his life, as well as his political aspirations, might lead to him becoming a danger to the peace of Europe. He may argue that he wishes to co-operate with Austria in resolving the 'German' question, but underneath it all he wants both political and military domination of central Europe.

A British diplomat in Germany writing to the British Foreign Secretary, 1862.

Source B

We consider the Danish conflict as essentially an episode in the fight of the monarchic principle against European revolution, which it is our mission to eliminate. We take this as our rule of conduct in handling the Duchies problem. If our actions can satisfy justifiable national needs as felt by the respectable part of the nation, the revolution will be deprived of the pretexts by which it draws its strength. Our principal aim must be the preservation of order. We need conclusive and lasting success in our struggle against revolutionary ideas or old quarrels will rise again in Germany and anarchy will raise its head as well.

Bismarck to the Prussian Ambassador in Vienna, June 1864.

Source C

I am no Bismarck enthusiast, but he has the ability to act and I look forward to the future with pleasure. There is something invigorating that, after 50 years of peace, there is a day like our victory at Duppel for our young Prussian troops. In the face of all the manoeuvring of the princes, the Austrian project for reform and the oratory of the 'true' Germans and the Nationalverein, it is a blessing that the full force of real power and real activism should make itself felt. It is time that the medium-sized and small states should be kept within limits and that states like Prussia take leadership in Germany. War can bring benefits and I am sure that people will see in due course that Bismarck took the only decision possible.

J G Droysen, Liberal deputy to the Frankfurt Parliament and a leader of the Kleindeutsch movement, 1864.

Source D

The victory of our arms over Denmark has restored our northern boundaries to us. Such a victory would have elevated the national spirit in every well-ordered state. However, this war will cause major problems for us. Prussia has shown disrespect for the rights of the reconquered provinces, where the wishes of the local inhabitants have been ignored and little respect has been paid to their traditions. There is no sign of any support for Liberal ideas here. The fact that the Prussian government annexed them by force and not through peaceful negotiation has harmed the reputation of Prussia. There is also the fear that the emerging fatal jealousy of Prussia and Austria will lead to a conflict that reaches far beyond the original object of the dispute.

Decision of a Congress of Liberal Deputies in Frankfurt, May 1866.

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

- (a) To what extent do Sources C and D have a similar attitude towards the consequences of the war with Denmark? [15]
- (b) How far do Sources A to D support the view that Bismarck's main aim was the expansion of Prussia? [25]

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

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

Source A

It is well known that there is no slavery in Mexico. Should the United States therefore acquire any territory from that government, could human beings, or negroes, be held as property by citizens emigrating with slaves to that territory from the Southern States? We think not. Unless we are mistaken, negroes can only be held as property by statute law. Then, until Congress would pass a law authorising slavery – and *that* they would *never* do – negroes could never be held as property in any such territory. The following is the form in which this proviso was passed by the House:

That there shall be neither slavery nor involuntary servitude in any territory on the continent of America which shall thereafter be acquired by or annexed to the United States by virtue of this appropriation of funds or in any other manner whatsoever, except for crimes whereof the party shall have been duly convicted.

The votes on this proviso stood: yeas 113; nays 106.

From 'The Spirit of Democracy', Ohio, 27 February 1847.

Source B

The Wilmot Proviso, it will be seen, has been killed in the Senate, by the decisive majority of 31 to 21. We have feared this from the first. We knew that some Whig Senators who are against the extension of Slave Territory would nonetheless vote against the Proviso. It was clearly doomed.

No matter: the PRINCIPLE is fixed. The House will not consent to incorporate another inch of Slave Territory. Many who voted in favour in the House were not enthusiastic for it but their constituents were and will continue to be. The battle is not yet fought out but the end is unmistakable. Fair notice has been given that Slavery shall not stealthily cross the Rio Grande and spread itself on the other side. The next Congress must complete the work in ratifying the Treaty with Mexico and in organising the territory acquired from her, if such there be. Advocates of Universal Freedom, let us calmly and steadily move on! Our victory, though postponed, is morally certain.

From the 'New York Daily Tribune', 3 March 1847.

Source C

In short, the Wilmot Proviso is Abolition – Abolition in the most dangerous form and, if it is not now resisted and defeated by peaceful compromise on the Missouri basis, it will end in the utter ruin of slaveholders, or compel them to resistance by the sword. The Mexican treaty may add territory enough to make ten or fifteen new states. All of these the despot Proviso will force to exclude slavery and of course add them to non-slave states. The Proviso will limit the slave states to their present number while new free states, without limit, may be admitted into the Union.

From the Charleston (South Carolina) 'Mercury', 11 August 1847.

Source D

The whole of the North has taken up arms against us on this matter and we have no alternative. In the South, whatever differences may exist on the old party questions, all are united upon one point – and that is that the presidential candidate whom it may support must declare uncompromising hostility to the spirit of the Proviso.

The Proviso aims at the annihilation of the black race and the depopulation of the Southern states by means of starvation. Anyone aware of the rapid increase in the black population of the South is also aware that the day will come when an outlet must be found for the multitudes who cannot obtain food from its overtasked soil. If we do not secure this outlet, starvation and insurrection will speedily obliterate all that the hand of man has done in the fair land of the South.

From the Jacksonville (Florida) News, 17 September 1847.

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

- (a) To what extent do Sources B and D agree about the aims of the Wilmot Proviso? [15]
- (b) How far do Sources A to D support the assertion that there was never any chance that the Wilmot Proviso would pass? [25]

Section C: International Option**The Search for International Peace and Security, 1919–1945****Different Interpretations of the League of Nations' Covenant**

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

Source A

The Republican Party stands for agreement among nations to preserve the peace of the world. We believe this can be done without compromising national independence, without depriving the American people of the right to determine for themselves what is just and fair when the occasion arises, and without involving them in a multitude of quarrels, the merits of which they are unable to judge. The Covenant signed by the President at Paris failed signally to accomplish this purpose. It contains stipulations, not only intolerable for an independent people, but certain to produce the injustice, hostility and controversy among nations which it proposed to prevent. We pledge the coming Republican administration to such agreements with the other nations of the world as shall meet the full duty of America to civilization and humanity, in accordance with American ideals, and without surrendering the right of the American people to exercise their judgement and power.

US Republican Party election campaign platform (manifesto), June 1920.

Source B

The League is the surest, if not the only, practicable means of maintaining the permanent peace of the world. Only by accepting the League may we hope to aid effectively in the restoration of order throughout the world and to take our rightful place in the front rank of spiritual, commercial and industrial advancement. We reject the Republican assumption that membership of the League would in any way impair the integrity or independence of our country. The fact that the Covenant has been entered into by twenty-nine nations, all as jealous of their independence as we of ours, refutes such a charge. The President has repeatedly declared that all our obligations as a member of the League must be fulfilled in strict conformity with the Constitution of the United States, embodied in which is the fundamental requirement of agreement by Congress before this nation may become a participant in any war.

US Democratic Party election campaign platform (manifesto), June 1920.

Source C

The USA rejected the League because, reading the Articles of the Covenant literally, they feared that it would involve them in commitments and responsibilities which they were not prepared to face. Britain accepted the League because we believed, and believed rightly, that the method of discussion among nations would promote peace by better mutual understanding. We ignored the fears which influenced Americans, because we attached no real importance to the form of the Articles which they regarded as full of hidden dangers. If our acceptance of the League compelled us to draw from those Articles the conclusions which America rejected, and the general obligation to work for peace involved intervention in every case of 'aggression', then I am certain that the people of this country will decide that we should do well to wash our hands of the League as speedily as possible.

Statement by the British Royal Navy's most senior officer, 1923.

Source D

The one serious defect in the Covenant is the element of compulsory obligation, the attempt to promote peace by binding members to take economic or other sanctions irrespective of the merits of the dispute in question. Compulsory sanctions are a hindrance and not a help to the League. They are certainly the principal reason why certain great nations stay out of the League. The League is fundamentally a conference system between independent sovereign states. Its effectiveness depends on consultation between nations and on the willingness of its members to take action which will deter nations from trying to solve their problems by force. The worst way of attaining this end is to tie the hands of members to specific obligations irrespective of the rights and wrongs of the case. The best way is to leave the full responsibility for decision about their action on the individual members.

Article in a British magazine, 1924.

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

- (a) Compare and contrast Sources A and B as evidence of American attitudes towards joining the League of Nations. [15]
- (b) How far do Sources A to D support the view that the League of Nations' Covenant threatened the independence of member states? [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 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.