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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.
Section A: European Option

Liberalism and Nationalism in Italy and Germany, 1815–1871

King Victor Emmanuel and Cavour

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

Source A

I am indifferent to the loss of this statesman. Cavour’s death is very fortunate for Italy. He was rich, aristocratic, cunning, with no moral restraint, greedy and insatiable for power. He had wide-ranging ideas, was great at intrigue and plotting, prepared to go to any lengths to defeat his opponents. He used Secret Service funds, illegally, to corrupt the electorate and the press, deceived public opinion and was for ten years the complete master of the country. He treated Sardinia as badly as he possibly could and he waged a ruthless war against revolution which alone could bring independence, greatness and liberty to Italy. His death is a stroke of good luck.

G Asproni, a Sardinian Deputy, writing in his Diary, on hearing, incorrectly, that Cavour was dead, 1860.

Source B

It would be unfair to represent Victor Emmanuel as a sovereign of no merit. He has the acute shrewdness inherent in the Italian race and he is not wanting in wit. He has tremendous courage carried to the point of rashness. He is lazy and ill-informed and he hates attending Cabinet and coming to decisions. Cavour does his best to spare the King from these occupations. The King recognises the superiority of the Prime Minister, but he does not forgive him for it. He submits to Cavour while hating him with all his heart. Like all mediocre men the King is jealous and quick to hate. He loathed how Garibaldi gained so much prestige and he seemed pleased with the possibility that Garibaldi might be captured and hanged. His primary interests are hunting and womanising and he will disappear for weeks at critical times to chase both. After the Queen died and the King wished to marry his mistress secretly, it was Cavour, after a stormy argument which came close to having him dismissed, that prevented this action which would have severely damaged the monarchy and the cause of unity.

From the Diary of a French Diplomat in Turin, 1861.

Source C

There must be no more criticisms of our revelations about the merits of Cavour. We must praise that glorious man who should be respected as he raised us out of slavery. Cavour achieved this supreme end by preserving the authority of the King and prevented the direction of our national movement from falling into the hands of any radical party. If he had given way to the plots and demands of Garibaldi and Mazzini, the House of Savoy would have been dragged into revolution. The rule of law would have gone. We would have been abandoned by England and savagely attacked by France and Austria.

N Bianchi, an Italian historian, writing in 1863.
Source D

The Italian Revolution triumphed not through the actions of the people but through the clever tactics of a small minority, aided by foreign events and coincidences. The mass of the people remained passive. The rebellion of 1848 had shown the senselessness of all the revolutionary schemes. After that, the monarchy of Piedmont was accepted as having the intelligence and the money to bring about the independence and unity of the country. The Piedmontese monarchy made the republican heroism of Mazzini and Garibaldi unnecessary. Cavour was the genius of the period. It was he, with the erratic support of the King, that made unity possible. With the achievement of national unification, Cavour carried out the most amazing miracle of politics in the nineteenth century.

Alfredo Oriani, an Italian writer, 1889.

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

(a) Compare and contrast the attitudes towards the Piedmontese monarchy in Sources B and D.

(b) ‘Cavour played the decisive role in the struggle for Italian unity.’ How far do Sources A to D support this view?
Section B: American Option

The Origins of the Civil War, 1846–1861

The consequences of the Kansas–Nebraska Act

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

Source A

The crime is committed. The wall erected to guard the domain of Liberty is flung down by an American Congress, and Slavery crawls, like a slimy reptile over the ruins.

They tell us that the North will not submit. We hope it will not. But we have seen this same North crouch lower each year under the whip of the slave driver, until it is hard to tell what it will not submit to. Who, seven years ago, would have believed that Congress could enact the kidnapping of free citizens, without judge or jury? Who would have believed that it could enact that white people have a right to hold black people in slavery?

It was fitting that the Kansas Bill should be passed as it was. It was in accordance with its spirit that it should be conceived in treachery, sprung upon the House by a fraud, and forced through it by a Parliamentary lie. We cannot predict what will be the consequences of this most fatal blow to Liberty. But we can see what the duty of Freemen is, and we mean it shall be through no fault of ours if it is left undone.

From the 'Evening Journal', (New York), a Whig newspaper, May 1854.

Source B

A cartoon published in 'Harper’s Weekly', a Northern magazine, 1856.
Source C

The secret Missouri societies were known by different names, such as ‘Blue Lodge’, and ‘The Sons of the South’. Their members were bound together by secret oaths, and they had passwords. The different lodges were connected together by an effective organisation. They included great numbers of the citizens of Missouri, and extended into Kansas. Their purpose was not only to extend slavery into Kansas, but also into other territory of the United States, and to form a union of all the friends of slavery. They organised and sent men to vote at the elections in the territory and encouraged pro-slavery men to emigrate into the territory. These dangerous societies were controlled by men whose purpose was to extend slavery into the territory at all costs, and were altogether the most effective instrument in organising the subsequent armed invasions.

*From ‘Report of the Congressional Special Committee Appointed to Investigate the Troubles in Kansas’, 1856. The committee was chaired by W A Howard who was a Republican member of the House of Representatives.*

Source D

When the Kansas Bill passed the people of the South expected to take possession of the territory. They urged those on the border to move right over and take their slaves with them. They said that two thousand slaves settled in Kansas would make it a slave state. But the Southern people did not have the courage of their convictions. There were never more than a handful of slaves in Kansas. But Southern people were determined to take possession of Kansas and as soon as the Bill was passed the men in the border counties of Missouri began to rush over, and stake claims. They marked off the land, drove a stake down, wrote their name upon it and went back home. This was not legal but they agreed among themselves to shoot any man who interfered with them. When the real settlers came they found if they attempted to claim a piece of unoccupied land, it had already been claimed by somebody in Missouri who had a gun and a knife.

*From Richard Cordley’s ‘A History of Lawrence, Kansas’, published in 1895. Richard Cordley moved to Kansas in 1857 and was a minister in the Congregational Church and a strong abolitionist.*

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

(a) To what extent do Sources C and D agree about the issue that was causing conflict in Kansas? [15]

(b) How far do Sources A to D support the view that it was politicians in Washington DC who were responsible for the trouble in Kansas following the Kansas–Nebraska Act? [25]
Section C: International Option

The Search for International Peace and Security, 1919–1945

The League and the Japanese invasion of Manchuria

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

Source A

The situation in Manchuria is becoming more serious every day. On the day when the Council of the League met, Japan advanced its troops further into Manchuria. The League not only failed to take any measures against this further consolidation of the Japanese occupation but, on the contrary, met Japan halfway. The League intends to send a commission to investigate the situation in Manchuria. Japan wishes to make this commission a research institute to study the reasons for civil war in China and the weakness of the central government. There is no talk of the withdrawal of Japanese troops. The League is unable to accept the fact that military actions are taking place in Manchuria, because if it did it would have to ask who is the culprit and would have to draw conclusions on the basis of the Covenant.

From ‘Izvestia’, a newspaper which expressed the official views of the Soviet government, November 1931.

Source B

The Lytton Report is an admirable survey of the whole situation, and there is nothing of any substance which I feel able to criticise. From the point of view of reaching a settlement, it is a valuable document. To the impartial reader the Report goes far to support Japan, although it must expect some blame. There is material in the report for apportioning blame to China. It is not certain that everyone will read the Report in this sense but I think there are good reasons for hoping that no one will oppose a settlement which gives Japan satisfaction.

There are indications that the Japanese, who are not anxious to leave the League, will accept some criticism. There are grounds for hope that Japan will not be unreasonable in relation to the League. Discussions between China and Japan will be more difficult as the Japanese government recently declared that no solution would be tolerable which upheld any form of Chinese authority in Manchuria.

A report written by an official in the British Foreign Office, October 1932.
Source C

It was no surprise when the newspapers of Japan burst into a chorus of dissatisfaction when the Lytton Report became known. For any unbiased person it was a foregone conclusion that the Report would deny that the Manchukuo state was the spontaneous wish of the people of Manchuria. More justifiable criticism of the Report is that too favourable a view is taken of the present conditions and the future prospects of China. No one here is in favour of recognising the sovereignty of China over those provinces and everyone is determined to uphold the independence of Manchukuo. Those, outside the army, who direct Japanese policy look with apprehension at the possible results of a breach with the League. They fear the stigma which the disapproval of the League would inflict on Japan and the material results of Japanese isolation.

From a report written by the British Ambassador in Japan to the British government, October 1932.

Source D

The Report by the League contains gross errors both of fact and in the conclusions drawn. In asserting that the action of the Japanese army did not fall within the limits of self-defence, the Report came to an arbitrary conclusion. By refusing to acknowledge the actual circumstances that led to the foundation of Manchukuo, and by challenging the position taken by Japan in recognising the new state, the League cuts away the ground for the stabilisation of the situation in the Far East. Because of the profound differences in opinion existing between Japan and the League in their interpretation of the Covenant, the Japanese government gives notice of the intention of Japan to withdraw from the League of Nations.

From a telegram from the Japanese government to the Secretary General of the League of Nations, March 1933.

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

(a) To what extent do Sources B and C agree about the Lytton Report? [15]

(b) How far do Sources A to D support the view that Japan was concerned about the League? [25]