

Section A: European Option

Liberalism and Nationalism in Italy and Germany, 1815–1871

Different ideas of nationalism in Germany

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

Source A

The sovereign princes of Germany, convinced of the advantages which would arise for the security and independence of Germany, have agreed to unite themselves in a permanent confederation.

Article 2: The aim shall be the maintenance of the external and internal security of Germany as well as the independence of the individual German states.

Article 4: The affairs shall be managed by a Diet of the Confederation, in which all members of the Confederation shall vote through their representatives.

Article 5: Austria shall preside over the Diet of the Confederation. Each member of the Confederation shall have the right to initiate and support proposals.

Article 11: All members of the Confederation pledge themselves to protect Germany as a whole, and also every single confederated state, against attack. If war is declared by the Confederation, no individual member may negotiate with the enemy or make peace.

Articles of the German Confederation, 1815.

Source B

The creation of the Zollverein has led to my thinking more about German nationality. I felt that current popular nationalist theory took no account of *nations* but simply of the entire human race on the one hand and individuals on the other. The Zollverein will lead to free competition between nations and will benefit all. It will help Germany expand her industry. It will abolish her internal tariffs, and by the adoption of a common uniform policy towards foreigners, it will bring a much higher degree of commercial and industrial development. It must then extend itself over the whole coast from the mouth of the Rhine to the frontier of Poland, including Holland and Denmark. These two countries must be admitted into the German Bund and consequently into German nationality. America became a great and powerful nation by developing its own manufacturing power. Germany must do the same if she is to become a great nation.

From 'The National System of Political Economy' by Friedrich List, a German economist and political commentator, 1841.

Source C

No doubt this great Union, which is known in Germany by the name Zollverein, derived its first and strongest influence from a desire to get rid of the barriers to communication and trade in Germany. It was designed to help purely local interests and was not seen as a stepping stone to anything greater. Few realised that people's natural and national feelings, as well as common interests, would be brought much more strongly and permanently together. The Zollverein is gradually becoming representative of a sentiment held widely in Germany, but certainly not universally, that of national unity. In fact, the Zollverein has brought the idea of German nationality from hope and fancy into something much more substantial. There is now hope of greater common action by the States towards one single national unit.

*'Report on the Prussian Commercial Union', by John Bowring,
a British political economist and expert on British and German commerce.
The report was presented to the British Parliament in 1840.*

Source D

It has become increasingly obvious that national culture and political structure should coincide. Conditions and demands based on nationality now dominate thinking in Germany. The formation of a state is now dependent solely on the basis of the descent of their populations. All German people should form one nation. Most feel that this should now happen even at the expense of separation from, and the destruction of, a great state like Austria. It could also occur through the merger of lots of small fragments into one powerful single unit, such as is the case in Germany today.

From an essay written by Robert von Mohl, a German academic and diplomat from Baden, 1860.

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

- (a) Compare and contrast the views in Sources B and C about the impact of the Zollverein on Germany. [15]
- (b) 'After 1815, German nationalists wanted to create a single nation state.' How far do Sources A to D support this view? [25]

Section B: American Option

The Origins of the Civil War, 1846–1861

The contest between Lincoln and Douglas to become US Senator for Illinois, 1858

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

Source A

The rebellion of Mr Douglas in the US Senate against the federal administration ensured him the enmity of the administration; but, in spite of this, his position gave him immense strength both in and outside of Illinois. Prominent Republicans in other states were prepared to see him returned to the Senate as a rebuke to the administration, vainly hoping that Mr Douglas would abandon the Democratic Party. In consequence of this outside pressure, there can be no doubt that Mr Douglas was stronger by ten thousand votes *as a rebel* than he would have been as an administration favourite. All who know anything at all of Mr Douglas are aware that as a political debater, either on the stump or on the Senate floor, he has no superior in the country.

From 'The Life and Public Services of Hon. Abraham Lincoln', by D W Bartlett, a journalist, 1860.

Source B

Senator Douglas has agreed to invite Lincoln to meet him in one place in each Congressional district. Douglas's canvass will extend to every village in Illinois and few will not have heard his able defence of party and principles before the election in November. Douglas's canvass of Illinois has been one triumphal march. The people flock to hear him. As he exposes the designs of Black Republicans in his masterly manner, the audience sits in rapt attention. While Douglas is creating such enthusiasm wherever he goes, it is an uphill struggle for Lincoln. It is only when he meets Douglas that he can get a large crowd to hear him. His infamous principles have made him hated by the conservative state of Illinois. Lincoln and his managers already feel that the Black Republican Party is doomed to a disastrous defeat at the election.

From the 'Dallas Herald' (Texas), October 1858.

Source C

The series of debates that had been agreed upon by Messrs. Lincoln and Douglas was concluded at Alton on Friday. There were some five thousand people present, about two-thirds of whom were Lincoln men. These debates are now closed and the people of Illinois, having heard the two opposing champions, have been able to judge between the merits of their respective positions and their abilities as statesmen. We, as the friend of Mr Lincoln, feel perfectly satisfied with the noble fight he has made and we rest in the confidence that the November election will show that the verdict of the people will be strongly in his favour. While Douglas's speeches have been full of hate, nonsense and falsification, those of Lincoln have been characterised by fairness, logical argument and a manliness of spirit. While Douglas, by his bitterness and contemptible behaviour, has repelled friends, Lincoln by his good nature and honour, has gained friends.

From the 'Chicago Daily Journal' (Illinois), October 1858.

Source D

According to telegraphic reports, Senator Douglas has achieved a great victory in Illinois. The federal administration seems to have been completely wiped out. Mr Douglas had rebelled against the President—the official head of the Democratic Party. He had to fight the whole Republican Party with only the small portion of the Democratic Party that he could rescue from the influence of the administration. A more unequal contest could not be imagined. He has stumped the state thoroughly, meeting the two Republican leaders, Trumbull and Lincoln, both men of rare ability, at every point, maintaining his position with the greatest firmness and self-reliance. The effect of this victory upon the Democratic Party cannot fail to be decisive. As matters now stand, Mr Douglas cannot fail to secure the nomination for the Presidency.

From 'The New York Times', November 1858.

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

- (a) To what extent do Sources B and C agree about the way Senator Douglas conducted his campaign? [15]
- (b) How far do Sources A to D support the view that the result of the contest between Lincoln and Douglas was an unexpected triumph for Douglas? [25]

Section C: International Option

The Search for International Peace and Security, 1919–1945

American senators and the League of Nations

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

Source A

I have always been a sincere advocate of an agreement between the leading nations to set up the necessary international machinery that would bring about a practical abolition of war. But it is inadvisable to join a League of Nations that would make it necessary for the USA to maintain a standing army. This would be needed to support new and independent governments that it is intended to establish among semi-civilized people. This could involve the USA in wars in Europe, Asia and elsewhere. Rather, we should disarm the defeated nations and then follow the example by disarming ourselves. If the world is disarmed there will be no more world wars. If the leading nations would also agree to set up an international court of arbitration, the danger of war would be completely avoided. Nations should be left entirely independent to decide their own affairs.

From a letter to an American newspaper by Senator George Norris (Republican), 1918.

Source B

The Republicans are trying to defeat the plan for a League of Nations, which, if organised, will reduce military armament among all the great powers, and make war almost, if not, impossible. If the Senate destroys the League of Nations, then the USA must begin at once to arm on a greater scale than any other nation in the world, because we must be strong enough to beat all comers. This means a navy in the Atlantic big enough to overcome the combined navies of at least three European powers. It means a navy in the Pacific bigger than Japan. It means the greatest standing army we have ever had. If we want to promote human slaughter and increase taxation, we should defeat the League of Nations. If we must abandon the glorious ideas of peace for which this nation has always stood, we must do so with full knowledge that the alternative is wholesale preparation for war.

From a public speech by Senator William G. McAdoo (Democrat), 1919.

Source C

Can any American be willing to merge our nationality into internationality? We do not mean to live within and for ourselves alone, but we do mean to hold our ideals safe from foreign interference. Americans will not fail civilization in the advancement of peace. We are willing to give, but we resent demand. We desire a world relationship which will maintain peace through justice rather than force, yet still hold us free from menacing involvement. It is better to be the free agents of international justice than to be shackled by a written compact which surrenders our freedom of action and gives the League the right to proclaim America's duty to the world. No surrender of rights to a world council should ever summon Americans to war. There is sanctity in that right which we will not surrender.

From a public speech by Senator Warren G. Harding (Republican), 1919.

Source D

The finest impulses of humanity, rising above national lines, seek to make another war impossible. Under the old order of international anarchy, war came overnight and the world was on fire before we knew it. It sickens our senses to think of another. The League of Nations plans to make this impossible. Shall we act in concert with the free nations of the world in setting up a tribunal which would avoid war in the future? Shall we participate in the advancement of peace, or shall we follow the old paths trod by the nations of Europe, paths which always led to fields of blood? Shall we unite with our former allies to make the League effective, or shall we play a lone hand in the world, guarding our isolation with a huge army and an ever-increasing navy with all the consequent burdens of taxation? I am in favour of going into the League of Nations.

From a public speech by Senator James M. Cox (Democrat), 1920.

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

- (a) Compare and contrast the views of Senators Norris (Source A) and Harding (Source C) on the role the USA should adopt in international relations. [15]
- (b) How far do Sources A to D support the view that joining the League of Nations would lead to the USA's involvement in war? [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 International Examinations Copyright Acknowledgements Booklet. This is produced for each series of examinations and is freely available to download at www.cie.org.uk after the live examination series.

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