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

**Source A**

There has been prolonged drought and the crops are ruined. There is absolutely no money in Schönhausen. Daily wages are down to 60 thaler a week and the meadows are far from finished. Riots have broken out in Coslin. Even after midnight the streets were so full that we could only get through with military protection. Food shops have been looted. There was a serious bread riot in Stettin, which had to be put down with artillery. There is despair throughout this land after the harsh winter.

*Bismarck to his wife, April 1847.*

**Source B**

Prussia must be resisted, even though my goal of creating a federal German state is not dissimilar to theirs. It wants to be the central point, the sun around which all the planets will revolve and it wants to take any opportunity to fashion Germany in this way and therefore dominate it. Prussia would use a Constitution for its own purposes and ignore the freedoms that it could bring. Unless we countered Prussian arrogance we would not get the great benefits laid out in the Constitution which Frankfurt tried to bring about.

*Franz Raveaux, a German radical and member of the Frankfurt Parliament, writing in 1849.*

**Source C**

What the German people, including the liberals and the democrats, desire is unity. All other reforms, such as the Constitution, depended on that, although many viewed its ideas on equality, liberty and freedom to be of critical importance. Most of the ideas in the Frankfurt Parliament were based on the idea of national unity, since it served to constitute a German nation state and to cement the principle of popular participation in Government. Unity must come from popular will and be grounded in a constitutional way as decided by the representatives of the nation. Unity will bring freedom and material well-being. This cannot be brought about by princes, but only by the people.

*Gabriel Riesser, a radical from Hamburg and member of the Frankfurt Parliament, 1849.*
Source D

Of course it was a radical revolution that raged from palace to palace in the month of March 1848 that stirred up the otherwise dumb and dull masses. But the magic words ‘German unity’ drowned out the wildest roar; where it rang out there was an immediate joyful confidence, a good conscience resulting from a just desire. In this spirit of German unity, the constitution-granting Reichstag convened and its first act was to put von Gagern, a statesman and known supporter of unity, at its head.

Johann Gustav Droysen, a German liberal, writing in 1850.

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

(a) Compare and contrast the views in Sources B and C on the German constitution. [15]

(b) How far do Sources A to D show that the desire for unity was the most important cause of unrest in Germany in 1848? [25]
2. Read the sources and then answer both parts of the question.

**Source A**

It will be seen that Seward is again cast aside. An equally extreme abolitionist is put up for President. He is the same man who had the contest with Douglas in Illinois last year, Douglas beating him and thereby securing a re-election to the Senate. Hamlin, an old Democrat, is an ordinary man, adding no particular strength to the ticket. Lincoln was a Whig. His patriotism may be measured by the fact that during the past winter his Black Republican friends in New York invited him to make a party speech; he did so and sent in a bill for two hundred dollars. Our impressions are that the nominees are weak and that Bell and Everett may beat them. The Convention by vote struck out the word ‘National’ where the party was called ‘the National Republican party’. This is honest at least. But it is sad to see a purely sectional party, not even pretending to be a national party, endeavouring to get possession of the government.

*From ‘The Fayetteville Observer (North Carolina), 21 May 1860.*

**Source B**

*The New York Sun*, the oldest and most widely circulated penny paper in the United States, which has never been a Republican paper, has the following on the Republican nomination:

‘The first impression produced among our city politicians that the rejection of Mr Seward and the nomination of Mr Lincoln by the Chicago convention was a blunder has been removed by subsequent reflection. It is now admitted that Mr Lincoln’s nomination is a strong one. He is emphatically a man of the people. That he would, if elected, make a good president we do not entertain a doubt. His chances of election are certainly good unless the Democrats show more wisdom than they did in splitting at Charleston. The people are tired of being ruled by professional politicians.’

*From the ‘Chicago Press and Tribune’, 28 May 1860.*

**Source C**

The effect of Lincoln’s nomination on the South is little less than miraculous. It seems to have tranquillised all the angry elements in that quarter, the Democratic Party excepted. The note of preparation for the marshalling of armed hosts to dissolve the Union in the event of a Republican victory in November is heard no more. The most desperate secessionist threatens no revolt and advises no treasonable action. Whether all this is to be ascribed to the admitted conservatism of Lincoln’s character and opinions is, perhaps, doubtful. We are of the opinion that the thinking men of the South are, in reality, more favourable to his election than that of Douglas.

*From the ‘St. Louis Globe-Democrat (Missouri), 1 June 1860.*
Source D

Abraham Lincoln, the Black Republican nominee for President of the United States, is the author of the treasonable, fanatical and revolutionary doctrine: ‘A house divided against itself cannot stand. I believe this government cannot endure permanently half slave and half free. It will become all one thing or the other.’

It was announced by Lincoln prior to Seward’s ‘Irrepressible Conflict’ speech [in June 1858], the leading idea of which was the basis of all Lincoln’s arguments against Stephen Douglas in 1858, by whom he was defeated for the US Senate. Let the conservative masses reflect upon Lincoln’s startling doctrine and let patriots shrink from it, as from a serpent whose sting is death!

From the ‘Bedford Gazette’ (Pennsylvania), 8 June 1860.

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

(a) To what extent do Sources A and B agree in their assessment of the Republican Party’s choice of Lincoln as candidate to contest the 1860 presidential election? [15]

(b) How far do Sources A to D support the assertion that Abraham Lincoln’s candidacy divided the nation? [25]
Section C: International Option

The Search for International Peace and Security, 1919–1945

Public opinion in the USA regarding the establishment of a League of Nations

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

**Source A**

On the eve of his return to the Paris Peace Conference, President Wilson addressed a huge audience in New York urging the establishment of a League of Nations. ‘The first thing I am going to tell the people of Europe,’ he said, ‘is that the overwhelming majority of the American people are in favour of the League of Nations. I know that is true.’

Addressing the Senate in Washington, Senator Frelinghuysen disputed President Wilson’s assumption that he represents public sentiment in proposing American participation in the League of Nations. Senator Sherman described the League of Nations as ‘a box full of evils which will empty upon America the aggregated calamities of the world’. He criticised the President for acting as a dictator. Senator Knox accused the League of Nations as striking down American constitutional principles. He declared that the proposed League would create divisions which would breed war.

*Article in an American newspaper, 7 March 1919.*

**Source B**

Before deciding for or against the League of Nations, I think each one of us should give the subject considerable thought. How many of us have done so before deciding one way or the other? The argument that the formation of a League of Nations would prevent war sounds fine, but would it hold good? In my opinion, the ultimate result of such a League would involve us in disputes which should (except for us being a member of the League) not concern us. Why should we make ourselves party to a pact which would compel us to help protect the interests of a nation, such as Britain, whose dominions are world-wide and, therefore, the more likely to foster trouble? Let us follow the advice of our great leaders and ‘keep out of entangling alliances’.

*Letter to an American newspaper, 28 March 1919.*
**Source C**

A League of Nations is both desirable and necessary for three reasons. First, it is a necessity for concluding this war. We must not forget that this war has created new nations. These small states will be vulnerable if we do not guarantee their independence. Secondly, we need a League in order to avoid a recurrence of competitive armaments, which simply leads to the economic ruin of states. The third and most important reason for a League is to prevent a recurrence of a world war. A League should eliminate war in 99 out of 100 cases because it affords another way than war to settle inevitable disputes. A collective police force takes the place of national military forces. The national pride which so often leads to war will be transferred to keeping treaties. Our boys went abroad to make the world ‘safe for democracy’. We owe it to them that their labours shall not have been in vain. Let us erect a monument which will not only commemorate but perpetuate their work – the monument of a League of Nations.

*Letter to an American newspaper, 31 July 1919.*

**Source D**

This newspaper has polled the opinions of 100 000 of its subscribers regarding the League of Nations. Three questions were asked, and the results are:

- Do you favour the League of Nations without reservations? – 25 725
- Do you favour the League of Nations with reservations? – 31 640
- Do you oppose US entry into any form of League of Nations? – 22 745

Out of a total of 80 110 votes, 57 365 are in favour of some kind of League, as opposed to 22 745 ‘irreconcilables’ who are against any kind of League. Perhaps the flame of idealism does not burn quite so brightly as it did, but the voters apparently have faith that the League of Nations will provide insurance against wars, even if it does not succeed in stopping all wars.

*Article in an American newspaper, 5 June 1920.*

**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 USA’s involvement in the proposed League of Nations. [15]

(b) How far do Sources A to D support President Wilson’s claim that a majority of the American people supported the idea of a League of Nations? [25]