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.
Section A: European Option

Liberalism and Nationalism in Italy and Germany, 1815–1871

The War between Prussia and Austria, 1866

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

Source A

It was the experience of our well-trained and well-oiled mechanism, in which each man and part knows their place, which had taught it how to win victories. It was not just the reorganisation of the army that has contributed to the outcome. It is a much more modern bureaucratic attitude to war. Our generals were not seen as very able and they could have been defeated as there was evidence of both competence and bravery on the part of the Austrians. However, we have made our mark on Europe with this victory and we will now be looked to, to provide leadership.

From a letter by Prince Frederick Charles, who was a Prussian commander during the War of 1866, writing in 1867.

Source B

On 3 July there took place the terrible battle at Sadowa in which eight Prussian Army Corps gained a great victory, after a hard battle, over five Austrian army corps. Also our Northern Army seems broken up and unable to resist the Prussian advance into Bohemia and Moravia. Austria has never before suffered such a terrible defeat. It was not just Prussia’s new weapons that did the harm, but also the blow to our pride in Italy lowered our spirits. Dreadful mistakes in leadership were once again committed. There prevails in our army inactivity and confusion. Austria’s place in Europe and the world has been damaged forever and we can no longer stand up to the Prussian monster on its onward march.

From the diary of Baroness Spitzenberg, an Austrian aristocrat, 1866.

Source C

The Emperor Napoleon warned me that the destruction of the Austrian state could cause a real threat to European peace. Russia would oppose her destruction as well. France would not be able to remain quiet if Prussia became too powerful and grew in size. While France understands that Prussia is now in a better position to advance, it ought to show moderation and also be aware that there could be a change to the balance of power in Europe which could undo Prussia’s achievements and bring a much wider conflict.

Goltz, the Prussian Ambassador to France, to King William I of Prussia, July 1866.
Source D

Article 1
With the exception of the Kingdoms of Lombardy and Venetia, the territory of the Austrian Monarchy remains intact.

Article 2
The Emperor of Austria recognises the dissolution of the Germanic confederation and consents to a new organisation of Germany without the participation of Austria. Austria, likewise, promises to recognise the closer union which will be founded by the King of Prussia, and he consents to the German states in the South entering into a union.

Article 3
Austria transfers to Prussia all the rights which belong to her over the Duchies of Schleswig and Holstein.

Article 4
Austria undertakes to pay Prussia the sum of 40,000,000 thalers to cover in part the expenses incurred in the war.

The Preliminary Treaty of Peace between Austria and Prussia, July 1866.

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

(a) To what extent do Sources A and B differ about the reasons for Prussia’s victory in the War of 1866? [15]

(b) ‘The War of 1866 was a complete disaster for Austria.’ How far do Sources A to D support this view? [25]
Section B: American Option

The Origins of the Civil War, 1846–1861

The Results of the Presidential Election of 1860

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

Source A

THE CONTEST IN NEW YORK

THE LAST HOURS OF THE STRUGGLE

The Real Condition of the Two Parties in the State

The Democrats, through this part of the state, are in high glee over the suddenly developed signs in favour of their electoral ticket. They exhibit tenfold more enthusiasm than their Republican opponents, who seem suddenly to have been immersed in a bath of cold water. The canvass of the state shows, so far as I have been able to ascertain, an immense falling off of the Republican vote compared with 1856. Today the opinion gives Lincoln only an even chance of winning New York. If he does not win, he will not be elected President of the United States. But in the midst of this excitement, the Republican managers keep cool, calm and collected, satisfied that they are just as sure of winning the state as if they had the returns in their pocket.

From the ‘New York Herald’, 4 November 1860.

Source B

We hail with profound gratification every indication that Lincoln will be defeated. The destinies of the country are in the hands of New York. It would be extraordinary and regrettable if New York, which has profited most from the slave labour of the South, and with which the most important and most varied commercial ties exist, was of all states the most to blame for the dissolution of the Union. The city of New York will, no doubt, give a big majority against Lincoln but the rural districts are, for the most part, Black Republicans. We do not yet despair of the Republic. We confess we cannot satisfy ourselves that the chances against Lincoln are very good but we are determined to look on the bright side and to hope for as long as we can.

From the ‘Weekly Standard Gazette’ (Raleigh, North Carolina), 7 November 1860.

Source C

RETURNS FROM 22 STATES

The Republicans have triumphed. The forces of slavery and disunion have met with a massive defeat. Henceforth, Freedom is National and Slavery Sectional. The information we have received indicates a Republican victory in New York state as large as the largest Republican estimates. Pennsylvania has been won with a Republican whirlwind. In fact, so far as heard from, every state claimed by Lincoln has done all that was asked of it. Read and rejoice.

From the ‘Burlington (Vermont) Free Press’, 9 November 1860.
Source D

The precise majorities in the different states are not known. As soon as the grand result was proclaimed, nobody cared to look after the minor details.

Lincoln’s majority:

In Ohio over 40 000
In Pennsylvania it is 80 000
In New York over 50 000
In Indiana over 25 000
In Illinois over 20 000
In Wisconsin over 18 000
In Massachusetts over 50 000
In Connecticut 12 000

Lincoln gets all the Free states east of the Rocky Mountains except New Jersey.

Breckinridge will probably get Alabama, Arkansas, Delaware, Florida, Georgia, Louisiana, Maryland, Mississippi, N. Carolina, S. Carolina and Texas, in all 87 Electoral College votes.

Bell gets Kentucky and Tennessee, 24 Electoral College votes.

Douglas gets Missouri and three votes in New Jersey, in all nine Electoral College votes.

Oregon is thought to cast her vote for Lincoln and California for Douglas.

From the ‘Holmes County (Ohio) Republican’, 15 November 1860.

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

(a) To what extent do Sources A and B agree about the election contest in New York state? [15]

(b) How far do Sources A to D support the assertion that Abraham Lincoln’s victory in the 1860 presidential election revealed the North to be more divided than united? [25]
Section C: International Option
The Search for International Peace and Security, 1919–1945
Mussolini and the League of Nations

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

Source A

If the right of rearmament is withheld, then there is no reason why Germany should stay in the League of Nations. And, in that case, the League will end with a bang. The League has so far only been an Anglo–French creation to retain their domination in the world. We cannot ignore the League at present. However, if our economic situation changes for the better, and if this enables us to withstand Anglo–French economic reprisals, it is possible that Italy will leave the League. Today we cannot make this gesture for we are not yet in a position to resist the reprisals of this Anglo–French clique. The day this danger no longer exists, the moment will have come for Italy to say to the League, ‘We have had enough of your pacifist democracy and your imperialism hiding behind your plans for peace.’

Mussolini, addressing Italy’s Fascist Grand Council, 7 April 1932.

Source B

If it votes against Italy’s cause in Abyssinia, we will leave the League of Nations. This is likely to mean war, but that would be the choice of the League. It would not be my choice. No nation can accuse Italy of desiring war, but whoever applies sanctions against Italy will meet the armed hostility of my people. Our cause in Abyssinia is a just one. In a few days it will be laid before the League. It will be laid before the whole world – proof that the Abyssinians are a barbaric people, sunk in the practice of slavery. Before any other nation talks of penalties against Italy, let it think well upon the consequences of such stupidity.

Mussolini, in an interview with a British newspaper reporter, 26 August 1935.

Source C

Italy has left the League of Nations. The decision to take this step was announced in theatrical fashion to 100 000 people in the Piazza di Venezia in Rome last night. Mussolini explained the withdrawal and, in doing so, attacked the League. Referring to the League’s imposition of sanctions against Italy during the Abyssinian war in 1935, Mussolini declared that Italy would never forget this ‘shameful attempt at the strangulation of the Italian people’. Mussolini’s speech was punctuated by cheers. He said, ‘We leave, without regret, this tottering temple in which men do not work for peace, but prepare for war. The great democracies can do nothing against the Italian people – we have the heroic spirit of our revolution, which no human force in the world will ever be able to bend.’ Britain is not unduly concerned as Italy’s intention to leave the League was anticipated. It is believed that the decision was in order to distract attention from internal difficulties in Italy.

From an Australian newspaper, 13 December 1937.
Source D

It is easy to see why Mussolini wanted negotiations with Britain regarding Abyssinia, but it is less easy to understand why we should have hurried so eagerly to his rescue. The British government from its usual vague, well-intentioned desire for peace, agreed to negotiate. There was every sign that Mussolini was in a very difficult position. The industrious, amiable Italian people were long overstrained. Everything in the country was eaten up in order to augment the magnificence of the state. Enormous taxes, broken finances, too many officials, indispensable raw materials practically unpurchasable, Abyssinia a curse, 400 000 soldiers overseas to be maintained by a continuous drain on the ground-down people of Italy. I think Mussolini would soon have been compelled to bring many of his troops home from Spain, where they have given little satisfaction either to himself or to General Franco. We know that large numbers of Italians who have gone to Abyssinia will soon be coming back to Italy, disillusioned.

Winston Churchill, Member of Parliament, addressing the British House of Commons, 22 February 1938.

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

(a) Compare and contrast Sources A and B as evidence of Mussolini’s attitude towards the League of Nations. [15]

(b) ‘Mussolini withdrew from the League of Nations because of its reaction to Italian involvement in Abyssinia.’ How far do Sources A to D support this view? [25]