



Cambridge International A Level

HISTORY

9389/11

Paper 1 Document Question

October/November 2021

1 hour

You must answer on the enclosed answer booklet.

You will need: Answer booklet (enclosed)

INSTRUCTIONS

- Answer **one** question from **one** section only. Answer **both** parts of the question.
Section A: European Option
Section B: American Option
Section C: International Option
- Follow the instructions on the front cover of the answer booklet. If you need additional answer paper, ask the invigilator for a continuation booklet.

INFORMATION

- The total mark for this paper is 40.
- The number of marks for each question or part question is shown in brackets [].

This document has **8** pages. Any blank pages are indicated.

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

The King wants no war, but for months now Bismarck has twisted things so that the King has become more and more irritable. Finally Bismarck will push him so far that he will not be able to do anything but commit to a war which will stir up all Europe. Bismarck's talent to manipulate the King is great and worthy of admiration. As an expression of his lack of principle and warlike policies, some sort of political reform idea for Germany will be dumped on us to achieve this. With such a man everything is possible!

The Crown Prince of Prussia writing to a Prussian General, March 1866.

Source B

Bismarck gave hints that the war with Austria must decisively achieve the rounding off of Prussian territory. That caused the Crown Prince to ask the question whether there was the intention to annex territory, as he had not understood that intention. The King answered angrily, that there is no question of any war yet and still less of deposing any German princes. The King wants peace, but Bismarck was by far the clearest and sharpest of the two. I became convinced that he has created the whole situation to encourage the King to become more warlike. The meeting went on for three hours, and as we came out the Crown Prince said, 'We know no more than we did before. The King will not, Bismarck will.'

An army General writing to his wife, commenting on the meeting of the War Council of Prussia, 26 May 1866.

Source C

Only a few years ago, and ignoring all previous insults, I gave the Emperor of Austria a friendly hand when there was an intention of giving up a German country to foreign domination. I hoped that an alliance based on mutual respect, and furthering the prosperity and power of Germany, would result from this Austrian and Prussian brotherhood in arms. I have been deceived. Austria will not forget that its princes formerly reigned over Germany and considers Prussia as a hostile rival. I have done everything to save Prussia. Up to the last moment I have tried, along with France, Great Britain and Russia, to come to a friendly arrangement. However, Austria has refused and other German states have openly sided with her. Let it then be so! It is not my fault if my people are forced to maintain a difficult struggle, and perhaps bear hard trials; but no other choice was left.

From the War Manifesto of King William IV, 18 June 1866.

Source D

The Vienna Peace and the Gastein Convention justified Bismarck in calling Austria to account for its treacherous toleration of revolutionary activities against Prussia. The tone of Bismarck's language towards Austria after January 1866 and the increasing tension between the two states was felt to be so threatening as to justify Austria in beginning its military preparations at the end of March. Prussia then felt it had to arm in self-defence. Each country in turn looked for support from the smaller German states. While there was a possibility of reconciliation and disarmament in April, it failed through the refusal of Austria to suspend its preparations for attacking Italy. Now the governments of Italy and Prussia joined in common hatred of Austria, each having plans for overthrowing Austrian power.

From a biography of Bismarck published in Germany in 1875.

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

- (a) Compare and contrast the views of the relationship between Bismarck and the King in Sources A and B. [15]
- (b) 'Austria must take responsibility for causing the War in 1866.' How far do Sources A to D support this view? [25]

Section B: American Option**The Origins of the Civil War, 1846–1861****Implementing the Kansas–Nebraska Act**

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

Source A

It is not expected that slavery will be extended into either of the territories which this Bill proposes to establish. With this view of the matter, we confess that we somewhat doubt the value of disturbing the Missouri Compromise, which was agreed by the South as the condition for admitting Missouri into the Union. The North may say that, by attempting to repeal the restrictive slave clause, the South has violated this agreement. It will be difficult to deny this. They will claim to be released from that agreement and the more recent Compromise of 1850 and attempt to introduce the Wilmot Proviso into existing and future territories south of 36°30'. This Bill will be the rallying cry for another anti-slavery agitation which will throw all that have preceded it in the shade.

From the 'Raleigh Register' (North Carolina), February 1854.

Source B

Those who have passed the Bill, flushed with success, already announce new schemes. They count upon the slave state of Kansas within the next Congress. They are planning an unprovoked and unjustifiable war for the sole purpose of forming slave states in Cuba. They will send agents to Texas and New Mexico with instructions to form slave states there. As a consequence of the recognition of slave property in all territories, they will demand the recognition of it in all states. They believe that popular discontent with the Bill will die out and that the whole future destiny of the country will be in the hands of slaveholders. We believe that the purposes of eternal justice are not to be blocked by men. We know that right will ultimately triumph. But whether that triumph be slow or speedy is for the decisions of the free men, North and South, of the Union.

From the 'Albany Evening Journal' (New York), May 1854.

Source C

The passage of the Nebraska Bill has enabled the slave states to fling off their masks and reveal their true intentions. So far as the acquisition of foreign territory is concerned, their next great step is the seizure of Cuba. This will add to the number and wealth of the slave states and provide an additional market for slave-raising Virginia. Their home plan is equally ambitious. New slave states are to be made from Texas, Kansas and Nebraska. Their first demand, however, will be that individuals from the slave states shall have the declared right of travelling through the free states with their 'property'. The North has submitted so far, for the sake of peace and the Union, that the South supposes that there will always be enough Northerners to be flattered or frightened into compliance with its wishes.

From the 'Hartford Courant' (Connecticut), June 1854.

Source D

The Nebraska Bill is urged as a great Union-saving measure. Well I too go for saving the Union. Much as I hate slavery, I would consent to an extension of it rather than see the Union dissolved. In the whole range of possibilities, the only way slavery agitation could have been revived was the project of repealing the Missouri Compromise. For the sake of the Union, the Missouri Compromise ought to be restored. If we omit to do this, what follows? Slavery may or may not be established in Nebraska. But whether it be or not, we shall have lost the spirit of compromise. For who after this will ever trust a national compromise?

From a speech by Abraham Lincoln given in Peoria, Illinois, October 1854.

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

- (a) Compare and contrast Sources A and D on the reasons for opposing the repeal of the Missouri Compromise. [15]
- (b) 'The passing of the Kansas–Nebraska Act was a triumph for the slave-holding states.' How far do Sources A to D support this view? [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

Beginning from ten o'clock on 18 September, Japanese soldiers, without provocation of any kind, opened rifle fire and artillery fire on Chinese soldiers at or near the city of Mukden, bombarded the barracks of the Chinese soldiers, and later took military occupation of Mukden and other places. To these acts of violence the Chinese soldiers have made no resistance and have refrained from conduct which might in any way aggravate the situation. I am instructed by my Government to request the Council to take immediate steps to prevent the further development of a situation endangering the peace of nations, and to re-establish the situation as it was before.

*An appeal from the Chinese Government presented to the Council of the League,
21 September 1931.*

Source B

Chinese troops destroyed the tracks of the South Manchurian Railway at midnight on 18 September. A clash between Japanese and Chinese troops then took place. In order to prevent imminent disaster the Chinese soldiers in neighbouring localities were disarmed. Our soldiers were mostly withdrawn within the railway zone, although some still remain in Mukden and a few other places. Nowhere does a state of military occupation exist.

The Japanese Government has no territorial designs in Manchuria. What we desire is that Japanese subjects shall be able to engage in various peaceful activities, and be given the opportunity of participating in the development of that land by means of capital and labour.

From a statement by the Japanese Government to the League of Nations, 24 September 1931.

Source C

On 21 September China appealed to the League. On 24 October the Council called upon Japan to evacuate occupied territory within three weeks. Japanese military operations have continued. The Japanese representative has been persuaded that a League Commission should visit Manchuria, but it is doubtful whether agreement can be reached on its terms of reference. There is widespread feeling, which I believe to be justified, that although Japan has acted contrary to the Covenant, it has a real grievance against China. This is not simply a case where the armed forces of one country have crossed the frontiers of another. Japan owns the South Manchurian Railway and is entitled to have troops guarding the land through which the railway runs. China might appeal to the Council under Article 15 of the Covenant. Under this the Council must send out an independent Commission of Enquiry, but it wants to avoid this because it introduces a more menacing atmosphere.

*From a memorandum by Sir John Simon, minister responsible for foreign affairs for the
British Government, 23 November 1931.*

Source D

The Commission interviewed as many as possible of the people who had been in Mukden at the time. The Japanese had a plan in case of possible hostilities. This plan was put into operation with swiftness and precision. An explosion undoubtedly occurred on the railroad but was not, by itself, sufficient to justify military action. The military operations of the Japanese troops cannot be regarded as legitimate self-defence. However, officers on the spot may have thought they were acting in self-defence.

Criticisms alone will not settle this dispute. There must be practical efforts at conciliation. A restoration of the situation as it was before would be no solution. To restore these conditions would invite a repetition of the trouble. Recognition of the present regime in Manchuria would be equally unsatisfactory. Any solution must re-state the rights and responsibilities of both countries in Manchuria and should include a Chinese–Japanese Treaty of Conciliation and Non-Aggression.

From the Lytton Commission Report, September 1932.

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

- (a) Compare and contrast Sources C and D as evidence about the League's reaction to the Japanese invasion of Manchuria. [15]
- (b) 'Japan's actions in Manchuria were justified.' How far do Sources A to D support this view? [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 Assessment International Education Copyright Acknowledgements Booklet. This is produced for each series of examinations and is freely available to download at www.cambridgeinternational.org after the live examination series.

Cambridge Assessment International Education is part of the Cambridge Assessment Group. Cambridge Assessment is the brand name of the University of Cambridge Local Examinations Syndicate (UCLES), which itself is a department of the University of Cambridge.