

Answer **one** question from **one** section only.

Section A: European Option

Liberalism and nationalism in Germany, 1815–71

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

Source A

The student is a child, and the *Burschenschaft** an impractical puppet show. I am not surprised that this student nonsense is on the decline or has turned to other things than politics. Indeed, there can hardly be a more ill-suited conspirator than a professor, either alone or as part of a group. The notion that revolution might be incited at the universities is something I have never feared, but I am certain that an entire generation of revolutionaries would develop there if no limits were placed on the universities. Perhaps the governments' disciplinary measures will contribute less fully toward this end than the fatigue of the students, the silliness of the professors, and the different direction that studies will take. The greatest, and therefore most urgent, problem today is the press. I am very pleased to tell you about the corresponding disciplinary measures that I am thinking of proposing at Carlsbad. These measures must begin without delay.

From a letter by Austrian Foreign Minister Metternich to his secretary in June 1819.

**The Burschenschaft was a Nationalist student club.*

Source B



A cartoon called 'The Thinkers' Club', published throughout the German Confederation in September 1819. The caption reads 'The most important question of today's meeting: how long will thinking be allowed to us?'

Source C

The country where our hope resides, this beautiful land, is being ravaged and plundered, gagged and disgraced. Rich in resources, it should be the home of joy and contentment for all its people. Yet its blood is being sucked by thirty-four kings! It is the home of hunger, misery and poverty for most of its residents. Germany should be the guardian of liberty and international order in Europe, but German energy is being used for the very opposite purpose by suppressing liberty and founding an eternal empire of darkness. The dukes of Austria and the electors of Brandenburg have seized the greater part of Germany for themselves. The Emperor of Austria and King of Prussia use their powers to suppress freedom and popular sovereignty. They also use their dominance over the smaller countries of Germany to make those countries serve the system of princely autocracy and despotic force.

From a speech by journalist Johann Wirth at the Hambach festival, May 1832.

Source D

I was sent for this morning by Prince Metternich whom I found in a state of much agitation. Metternich said the proceedings at Hambach had made the issue very clear. The question now was whether the sovereigns of Germany would give up their thrones without a struggle, or whether their authority would be reasserted by force. I had been warned that Austria and Prussia had agreed to employ their military forces for the suppression of revolt in Germany, a decision from which they have held back until now. It is obvious that this may be the start of more serious events to come. Metternich thinks that the mass of the people and the higher ranks of the bourgeoisie are still attached to monarchical government and are enemies to revolutionary ideas. However, he thinks the press, the professors, the students and the workers are actively promoting revolution.

A report of Metternich's response to the Hambach festival by a British diplomat, June 1832.

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

(a) Read Sources **A** and **D**.

How far do Sources A and D agree on Metternich's attitude towards supporters of revolution in Germany? [15]

(b) Read **all** of the sources.

'There was a real threat of revolution in Germany after 1815.' How far do the sources support this assertion? [25]

Section B: American Option**The origins of the Civil War, 1820–61**

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

Source A

The insurrection at Harpers Ferry was no insurrection at all. Not a single slave joined the reckless fanatics who sought to promote their hateful policy of emancipation by blood and treason. It was a silly invasion of Virginia by some eighteen men. Four or five men were killed and a few more were hanged and that will be the end of the enterprise in its mere physical aspects. However, events are often important, not on account of their immediate magnitude but on account of their significance. The great importance of the abolition riot in Virginia is that it shows to the people of the South the destiny that awaits them. Our connection with the North creates a permanent threat of insurrection in the South. The Union is a powerful organisation by which domestic unrest is created. The mightiest dangers threaten the South.

From the 'Charleston (South Carolina) Mercury', October 1859.

Source B

There are men, both North and South—principally fanatics and fools under the control of scheming agitators—whose intentions seem to be to turn one section of the country against the other in hostile strife. These men, in the North, seize upon Brown's crime as a text to preach war against the South and, in the South, as a warrant for the dissolution of the Union. But the great mass of the people, both North and South, condemn Brown's treason. Our own opinion is that too much importance has been attached to this matter. Nor can we see any reason, in what has transpired, to urge sectional war between North and South. We are not here to say that the South has not suffered grievous wrongs and oppression from the North, for it has. However, we do not think the Southern states could better their condition by a dissolution of the Union.

From the 'Arkansas Gazette', November 1859.

Source C

The Harpers Ferry affair ought to have been treated as the vulgar crime and outrage of a squad of reckless, desperate ruffians and they should have been accordingly tried and executed as vile criminals in the simplest and most summary manner. There should not have been the chance of elevating them to political offenders or making them representatives and champions of northern sentiment. In the South, every opportunity has been taken to portray these infamous fanatics as grand political criminals. The North, or at least the whole Republican Party, has been held responsible for their actions, which has spread the greatest excitement and indignation against that whole section. The Harpers Ferry outrage ought to have been met calmly and firmly, and made a means of added strength to us, both North and South.

*From a private letter by James Seddon,
a Virginian lawyer and later Confederate Secretary of War, December 1859.*

Source D

John Brown was violent, lawless and fanatical. His ruling passion was to become the instrument of abolishing slavery, by force, throughout the slaveholding states. With him, this amounted almost to insanity. The news of the attack on Harpers Ferry spread rapidly across the country. All were at first ignorant of the weakness of his force while public rumour greatly exaggerated the strength of it. In the already excited condition of public feeling throughout the South, this raid of John Brown made a deeper impression on the southern mind than all previous events. Considered merely as the isolated act of a desperate fanatic, it would have had no lasting impact. It was the enthusiastic and permanent approval of the object of his expedition by the abolitionists of the North which spread alarm and apprehension throughout the South. The Republican party has honoured him ever since as a saint or a martyr in a cause they considered so holy.

*From 'Mr Buchanan's Administration on the Eve of the Rebellion', published in 1866.
The author of this book is usually accepted to be President Buchanan himself.*

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

(a) Read Sources **B** and **D**.

To what extent do these two sources agree about the North's response to the Harpers Ferry raid? [15]

(b) Read **all** of the sources.

'The South overreacted to the Harpers Ferry raid.' How far do the sources support this view? [25]

Section C: International Option**The League of Nations and international relations in the 1930s**

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

Source A

The Führer believed that almost certainly Britain, and probably France as well, had already tacitly written off the Czechs and were reconciled to the fact that this question would be cleared up in due course by Germany. Difficulties connected with the Empire, and the prospect of involvement in a long European war, were decisive considerations for Britain against participation in a war against Germany. Britain's attitude would certainly not be without influence on that of France. An attack by France without British support, and with the prospect of the offensive being brought to a standstill on our western fortifications, was hardly probable.

The annexation of Czechoslovakia offers us a substantial advantage because it would mean shorter and better frontiers, the freeing of forces for other purposes, and the possibility of creating new armed units.

From the Hossbach Memorandum, reporting Hitler's speech at a secret meeting in November 1937. Hossbach attended the meeting and wrote this report from memory five days later.

Source B

If we were to accept without protest such an explicit violation of the Munich Agreement, it might lead to a doubt as to the good faith of Britain and France. Its whole justification was, by liberating the Sudetenland, to safeguard the independence and integrity of the rest of Czechoslovakia. The enforced submission of the Prague government, brutally imposed by German pressure, cannot be used to excuse Great Britain and France from their moral obligation in the eyes of their own people and of those of other states, as well as of the Czechoslovak nation.

Please make sure that the British government agrees that the British and French representatives should immediately take concerted action in Berlin.

*From a letter from the French Minister for Foreign Affairs to the French Ambassador in London,
16 March 1939.*

Source C

Last autumn, I felt, by mutual goodwill, it should be possible to resolve all differences by discussion and without armed conflict. Herr Hitler himself said: 'I have assured Mr. Chamberlain I shall not be interested in the Czech state anymore, and I can guarantee it. We don't want any Czechs anymore.' In the Munich Agreement, which bears Herr Hitler's signature, there is this clause: 'The final determination of the frontiers will be carried out by the international commission.'

We are told that this seizure of territory has been necessitated by disturbances in Czechoslovakia. Germany, under its present regime, has sprung a series of unpleasant surprises upon the world. The Rhineland, the Anschluss, the severance of Sudetenland – all these shocked and affronted public opinion throughout the world. Yet, however much we might take exception to the methods in each of those cases, there was something to be said, whether on account of race or of fair claims too long resisted, for the necessity of a change in the existing situation.

But the events which have taken place this week in complete disregard of the principles laid down by the German government itself seem to fall into a different category. Is this, in fact, a step in the direction of an attempt to dominate the world by force?

From a public speech by Chamberlain, the British Prime Minister, 17 March 1939.

Source D

The events of 14–15 March confirmed the correctness of the policies Chamberlain and Daladier had followed in the Czech question, which explains the total lack of reaction in the western democracies to the collapse of the former Czechoslovakia. Naturally the professional warmongers in the hostile German-hating lying press are stuttering out a few emotional insults against Germany, but none of them is of any political significance. Nothing can change the facts, and it is evidence of the growing realisation of this in the western democracies that no significant figure is raising any objection. The justice of Germany's position is too clear to be disputed.

From 'Great Days', an article in the official Nazi newspaper by Goebbels, 18 March 1939.

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

(a) Read Sources A and C.

Compare and contrast Sources A and C as evidence about Hitler's attitude to Czechoslovakia. [15]

(b) Read all of the sources.

How far do the sources support the view that Britain and France opposed the German takeover of Czechoslovakia? [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.