



# Cambridge International AS & A Level

**HISTORY**

**9389/12**

Paper 1 Document Question

**May/June 2020**

**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. Blank pages are indicated.

**Section A: European Option****Liberalism and Nationalism in Italy and Germany, 1815–1871****Bismarck and the War with Denmark**

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

**Source A**

- 1 The Great German association recognises a considerable violation of the rights of Germany and the Germans living in Schleswig-Holstein in the recent measure taken in Denmark which will bring about not only a complete division of Schleswig from Holstein but also make Schleswig into a Danish province.
- 2 The Great German association demands that all German governments will energetically oppose this step by Denmark of imposing its will on the inhabitants of Schleswig-Holstein.
- 3 The Great German association finds the attempt by Denmark to withdraw from its duties towards Germany gives grounds for pointing out the necessity of creating a more unified and effective German military force.
- 4 Denmark has broken the terms of earlier Treaties by injuring the rights of Germans.
- 5 The Schleswig-Holstein affair is a struggle for law against aggression, for honesty against lies and for freedom against foreign domination.

*Resolutions of a group of conservative Deputies in the Prussian Landtag, May 1863.*

**Source B**

We consider the Danish conflict as a part of the fight of monarchies against the European revolution. From the outset, the present government of Prussia has been guided by this conviction in its handling of the Danish question. We have been successful and I am convinced that in Vienna, as well as here, the good influence which the two German powers have exercised, by their common and energetic action, will be felt. We record, with satisfaction, the substantial progress of conservative feeling within both monarchies. We are no longer in danger of being driven into the current of revolution. We have found a bond in this joint action. If people are not convinced of the solid combination of Austria and Prussia, anarchy could once again raise its head in Germany and we would lose trust and respect abroad. This unity with Austria is vital.

*Bismarck to the Prussian Ambassador in Vienna, June 1864.*

**Source C**

## Article 1

His Majesty the Emperor of Austria shall exercise rights over the Duchy of Holstein. The King of Prussia shall exercise rights over the Duchy of Schleswig.

## Article 2

Austria and Prussia will suggest to the German Diet the establishment of a German fleet, based in Kiel. Until this happens the warships of both powers shall use this harbour. The command of it and the police duties within it shall be exercised by Prussia.

## Article 4

The Royal Prussian Government shall retain two military roads through Holstein; the one from Lübeck to Kiel, the other from Hamburg to Lauenburg.

## Article 9

The Emperor of Austria cedes to his Majesty the King of Prussia the rights granted by the Treaty of Vienna over the Duchy of Lauenburg, for which the Royal Prussian Government will pay the Austrian 2 500 000 Danish rixdollars.

*Extracts from the Articles of the Convention of Gastein, August 1865.*

**Source D**

It is utterly impossible to explain how Bismarck succeeded in persuading Austria to enter this war with Denmark to further Prussia's interest. This was in direct contradiction to Bismarck's previous hostile policy towards Austria. It was his energetic initiative that pulled Austria in to support his invasion, but it is still not at all clear why he did so. Why Austria joined in against Denmark is also not clear, but some argue Austria was obliged to join in in order to watch over Prussia and contain it. Many in Vienna claimed it was done purely in the interests of Prussia and Germany. However, there was a desire in Austria to retrieve the army's prestige after the disasters in Italy in 1859. Bismarck cleverly played on the Austrian emperor's friendly feeling towards him. Also, all knew that Bismarck's traditionally conservative policy at the time was favourably viewed in Vienna. Bismarck knew perfectly well that, after the victory over Denmark, the quarrel with Austria would break out again, and it could well be a war to the death.

*From a biography of Bismarck by a German writer, published in 1869.*

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

- (a) Compare and contrast Sources B and D as evidence about Bismarck's attitude towards Austria. [15]
- (b) 'The Schleswig-Holstein question was solely a dispute between Prussia and Denmark.' How far do Sources A to D support this view? [25]

**Section B: American Option****The Origins of the Civil War, 1846–1861****The Passage of the Kansas–Nebraska Act, 1854**

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

**Source A**

According to existing law, this territory of Kansas–Nebraska is now guarded against slavery by the act of Congress, approved 6 March 1820, in preparation for the admission of Missouri into the Union, and in the following explicit words:

Section 8: In all the territory ceded by France to the United States under the name of Louisiana, which lies north of 36° 30', slavery and involuntary servitude shall be, and is hereafter, FOREVER PROHIBITED.

It is now proposed to set this aside. The term Abolitionist, which is so often used as a criticism, should instead be applied to those who would overthrow this well-established principle. They are not Abolitionists of Slavery. They are Abolitionists of Freedom.

*From a speech by Charles Sumner to the US Senate, February 1854.*

**Source B**

During the discussion of the Kansas–Nebraska Bill, it was stated that Section 8 of the Act of 6 March 1820, commonly called the Missouri Compromise, deprived the people of the Territory, while it remained a Territory, of the right to decide the slavery question. In order to overcome this objection, Section 8 was declared void and an amendment which was included in the Bill on the motion of Senator Douglas, with these words of explanation:

*'It being the true intent of this Act, not to impose slavery into any Territory or State, nor to exclude it, but to leave the people there perfectly free to form and regulate their domestic institutions in their own way, subject only to the Constitution of the United States.'*

In this form the Kansas–Nebraska Act became law by the approval of the President, on 30 May 1854.

*From private conversations between Stephen Douglas and a US Army officer, written down in 1859 and published in 1866.*

**Source C**

Yesterday the Kansas–Nebraska Bill was passed by the House of Representatives by 113 votes to 100, a small majority. A measure which reopens a vast region, closed against it for a third of a century, to the barbarous institution of slavery, brings dishonour on our country. The greater part of this dishonour is concentrated on the Democratic Party. The Whigs of the Free States have taken care that they do not share in this guilt. Their representatives in Congress, to a man, voted against the Kansas–Nebraska Bill. The result is inevitable. The Democratic Party has lost its moral strength in the Free States. The deed of yesterday puts us in a minority for years to come.

*From the 'New York Evening Post' (Democrat), May 1854.*

**Source D**

We have the inexpressible pleasure of announcing to our readers this morning that, amid the general defection of Democratic states, Illinois remains faithful to her Democratic beliefs. Although gallant Douglas, that distinguished Senator, had the most bitter opposition to contend with, he has gloriously sustained himself by a triumphant majority. The surges of fanaticism of every kind have beat against Illinois in vain. A majority of its people have declared in favour of the Kansas–Nebraska Bill and of civil and religious liberty for all. The Democratic Party of the whole Union will extend their congratulations to Mr Douglas for his extraordinary and unexpected triumph. The Abolitionists have resorted to the most incredible efforts to beat him but have failed dismally.

*From the 'Cincinnati Enquirer' (Ohio), November 1854.*

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

- (a) Compare and contrast the views of the Missouri Compromise shown in Sources A and B. [15]
- (b) How far do Sources A to D support the view that, in passing the Kansas–Nebraska Act in 1854, the Democratic Party had become a sectional, Southern Party? [25]

## Section C: International Option

### The Search for International Peace and Security, 1919–1945

#### Disagreements about Disarmament

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

#### Source A

It is true we are pledged several times over to disarm: it is not so clear that we are pledged to sign a general disarmament convention. Certainly, we are nowhere pledged to reduction to the German level. What we told the Germans in 1919 was that the first step towards general disarmament must be a disarmament of Germany. Germany accepted the military, naval and air clauses of the Treaty of Versailles (and may have carried them out). Once that was done, other nations were free to reduce their armaments to the 'lowest point consistent with national safety'. We have done so. Other nations have done something similar – how much is a matter between them and their consciences.

The League has chosen to act as if it were committed to produce a general disarmament convention. The Germans have seized on this to connect general disarmament with their own so that they can claim to be free of their part of the bargain if the Allied governments do not perform theirs.

*A memorandum from the British Foreign Office to the British government, January 1928.*

#### Source B

The reason given for Germany's disarmament in the Treaty of Versailles was that it would make possible a general limitation of armaments in all countries. Germany has done her part. We have disarmed to a degree unexampled in history. But the other powers undertook to follow us along the way of disarmament. Authoritative statesmen in those countries have admitted that this was a legally binding obligation. Our disarmament should be matched by a corresponding action on the part of the other powers in accordance with their obligations under the Treaty. We have the right to demand the same degree of security as other countries. We put forward our demand for general disarmament in the interests of peace and the reconstruction of Europe, the most urgent tasks of our time. Germany is ready, and always was ready, to cooperate actively in any form of disarmament which is based on equality.

*From a speech by General Groener, German Defence Minister, in the Reichstag, March 1931.*

#### Source C

I can say without fear of contradiction that this country has continuously reduced its naval, military and air forces. We have carried out to the letter Germany's statement that its agreement to the disarmament proposals should be merely the first step, and that other nations should follow the disarmament which had been forced upon Germany. Unfortunately, our example has not been followed by other countries in the world. That is entirely because there is a great fear among nations. We have not got to the point of every nation trusting every other nation, or of nations having sufficient confidence in the League to bring about a settlement of their disputes. Therefore, because of the possibilities of war which may arise in the future, each country is determined to maintain the forces at its disposal to give it a measure of national security.

*From a speech by a Senior Naval Officer to the British Parliament, May 1932.*

## Source D



*A cartoon published in a British newspaper, October 1933.  
The three men standing represent Britain, France and Italy.  
Hitler (sitting on the League) says, 'Well, what are you going to do about it now?'*

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

- (a) Compare and contrast Sources A and B as evidence about German disarmament. [15]
- (b) How far do Sources A to D support the assertion that the Allied Powers were willing to match German disarmament? [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](http://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.