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

**Source A**

The Austrian Ambassador in London argued very strongly that allowing Piedmont to attend the peace conference in Paris would make her into a first-rate power and unsettle the order of Europe and create a dangerous precedent. I maintained that Piedmont must be treated as an equal to all nations. I said they had joined the Crimean Alliance without hesitation and we would never abandon a friend or allow any offense be caused to her. Piedmont must be able to attend and participate fully. Quite how much influence she should have in the final decisions over Russia might be questioned however. All I would admit was that, if Cavour considered that any question raised at the conference was of no direct concern to Piedmont, he would be free to attend if he thought fit.

*Lord Clarendon, British Foreign Secretary, in a letter to Sir James Hudson, the British Ambassador in Turin, February 1856.*

**Source B**

19 April. At my office, I found despatches announcing that France, as well as Britain, is proposing disarmament and the admission of Piedmont to a general peace congress together with all the other Italian states. This is very grave news. All Cavour’s colleagues blame him for putting too much faith in Napoleon. When he heard the news, Cavour leapt out of bed and said, ‘The only thing left for me to do is blow out my brains.’ He felt badly betrayed by France. He spoke of resignation, he felt deeply upset and alone. When I met him later in the day he said, ‘British policy has won. All is lost. Napoleon has abandoned us.’

*From the diary of Giuseppe Massari, 1859. He was a keen supporter of Cavour and Italian unity.*

**Source C**

The people of the Duchies of Tuscany, Modena and Parma, and also of Romagna have elected representative assemblies which have declared their determination to unite with Piedmont. I think, overall, that it is in our interests to support this. The French and the Austrians have their own reasons for being opposed to it, but they have no right to determine the future destiny of these lands. Britain is one of the great powers of Europe and must take part in all European deliberations. We could support the restoration of Austrian power in Italy. However, this domination has been the cause of social, civil and political misery to the nations of Italy. On the contrary, support for a united Italy would free the people from foreign control and leave them to decide their future. We would have a real friend in the region, and there is wealth there.

*A letter from Lord Palmerston, the British Prime Minister, to Queen Victoria, August 1859.*
Source D

Cavour refused to accept a prolonged armistice unless the whole of Northern Italy was liberated from Austrian control, and he resigned. He dismissed Napoleon's view that we ought to be only too pleased to just get Lombardy. Cavour argued that the French promises ought to be kept. He threatened to encourage a revolution in Italy rather than leave the work half done. I could not blame him. For years, he had worked so hard to form an independent Kingdom of Italy and now he saw his efforts frustrated by the French. Cavour wished to carry on the war alone, but 1848 was too fresh in our memories, and as military men we declined the responsibility and would not continue the war.

A Piedmontese general, describing Cavour’s meeting with Victor Emmanuel on the day that the armistice at Villafranca was signed, 1859.

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

(a) Compare and contrast the views of Cavour given in Sources B and D. [15]

(b) ‘Foreign support helped the cause of Italian unification.’ How far do Sources A to D support this view? [25]
Section B: American Option

The Origins of the Civil War, 1846–1861

The Formation of the Republican Party, 1854–56

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

Source A

Hon. Amasa Walker said, ‘We did not come here to say hard things against slavery or slaveholders. We came here to prevent slave power from trampling out the liberties of this nation. The crisis is imminent. Men of all political parties at the North must forget past disagreements. If we do not consent to this, we cannot have a basis upon which to build the creed of the new organisation. We must have a party that will rescue Massachusetts from the dominion of slavery. It must be written in law that, from now on, no man shall be taken from Massachusetts without trial by jury. (Cheers from the audience.) We will never consent to concede to slave power anything more than this.’

From a report of the Anti-Nebraska Convention, held in Worcester, Massachusetts. July 1854. This Convention agreed to establish the Republican Party of Massachusetts.

Source B

As it is our high duty to maintain the existing Union of the States, what should we do in the approaching Presidential election? Let us survey the field of action. The old Whig Party no longer exists. In the North most of them have united with the abolitionists and free-soil Democrats and formed a sectional party which is held together mainly by its hostility to the South. In fact, its only leading principle is anti-slavery. It has adopted the designation the ‘Republican Party’, though it is more commonly called the Black Republican Party. The latter designation is the more appropriate, not only because, while it is devoted to the elevation of the black man, it ignores, disregards and condemns the rights of white men. If the Republican Party’s policy could be carried into practice, the experiment would merely end in the destruction of the white race.

From a speech by Thomas Clingman, US Representative for North Carolina, published in the ‘Squatter Sovereign’ (Kansas Territory), April 1856.

Source C

Our undertaking is the abolition of American slavery, every part and parcel of it. Another presidential election is approaching. Can we rely on any of the great parties of our country to do our work? No. Only one of them is at all anti-slavery and even that is anti-slavery on one point only. The Republican Party opposes the introduction of slavery into the Territories but accepts its constitutionality in all the slave states. It even accepts the Fugitive Slave Bill for it fully admits that all the States, and all the Territories, are the constitutional hunting ground for slaves. Should the Republican Party get the reins of government, it will endeavour to restore the Missouri Compromise and agreeing to every other point in the present possessions and practices of slavery.

From a report of the Abolitionists’ Convention, the New York Herald, May 1856.
Source D

Since the formation of this system of government, no party has risen so quickly or with such majesty as the great Republican Party of today. It has known no infancy or youth but has towered at once in the fullness of its strength before the astonished gaze of the nation. Nor has the Republican Party appeared an hour too soon. The principles of personal liberty are rejected by the sham Democratic Party. The owners and overseers of slaves control the federal government. The people see these things and are resolved to amend them. When the government is brought back to the policy of its founders, and it is once more declared by the American people that freedom is national and slavery is sectional, the Republican Party can cease to exist as a distinct organisation.

From the ‘Fremont Journal’ (Ohio), September 1856.

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

(a) Compare and contrast Sources A and C as evidence of Northern attitudes towards slavery.

(b) ‘In its first three years, the Republican Party was only concerned with protecting the interests of the Northern section.’ How far do Sources A to D support this assertion?
3 Read the sources and then answer both parts of the question.

Source A

A cartoon from a British newspaper, June 1945.

Source B

The League failed for several reasons. Firstly, the original idea was that it should be universal. The League was never universal. It is impossible to exaggerate the significance of the fact that the USA is in the UN from the start. Secondly, the idea of democracy in international affairs led people to think that every nation must be regarded as equal and that there was no relation between power and responsibility. We have embodied these lessons in the Charter. Under the League, every nation, great or small, had a nominal right of veto. Under the Charter, only the Great Powers have it, and they only have it in the Security Council. Thirdly, the League was a part of the Paris peace treaty and was bound up with the fulfilment of that treaty. The Charter was developed before peace treaties have been made and does not concern itself with enforcing treaties.

Anthony Eden MP, (formerly British Foreign Secretary), addressing the British Parliament, August 1945.
Source C

The fact that the five Great Powers will become permanent members of the Security Council offers the greatest level of security against war that the world can provide at present. The Security Council has the power to act on its own initiative without having to call together all members of the UN. It is vital, in the event of the threat of war, to have prompt and decisive action. The Security Council will have military forces at its disposal and will have the power to take action with those forces if necessary. The League of Nations did not have that power. The League depended upon the disarmament of all nations, and faith in this was misplaced. The real lesson of the League was that world peace cannot be maintained unless the international organisation has power to employ armed force where necessary.

An Australian politician addressing the Australian Senate, September 1945.

Source D

The gap separating the League and the United Nations is not large. Many of the provisions of the UN system have been taken directly from the League Covenant, though usually with changes of names and rearrangements of words. Like the League, the UN is based on the principle of the sovereign equality of all its members. Since both the UN and the League are based on the principle of voluntary cooperation, the Charter does not give the UN greater authority than was vested in the League. It is claimed that the Charter is not connected with the treaties which are being made for settling the Second World War, whereas the League was always associated with the Paris peace settlement. Just as the League was never able to overcome the problem of being a League to enforce the peace treaties, the UN will inevitably become intimately and directly associated with the peace treaties once they are finalised.

From an article by a Professor of International Organisation, who had been a senior American delegate at the San Francisco Conference, February 1947.

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

(a) Compare and contrast the views expressed in Sources B and D regarding the League of Nations. [15]

(b) ‘At the time of its formation, it was believed that the United Nations would be a success.’ How far do Sources A to D support this view? [25]