**eduresourceza.com**

Downloaded from eduresourceza.com

**Cambridge International Examinations**
Cambridge International General Certificate of Secondary Education

**HISTORY** **0470/23**

Paper 2 **October/November 2016**

**2 hours**

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 has two options.
Choose **one** option, and answer **all** of the questions on that topic.
**Option A: 19th Century topic** [p2–p5]
**Option B: 20th Century topic** [p6–p11]

The number of marks is given in brackets [ ] at the end of each question or part question.

The syllabus is approved for use in England, Wales and Northern Ireland as a Cambridge International Level 1/Level 2 Certificate.

This document consists of **11** printed pages, **1** blank page and **1** insert.

DC (NF/FD) 140510/3 **R**
© UCLES 2016

CAMBRIDGE
International Examinations

**[Turn over**

Downloaded from eduresourceza.com

Downloaded from eduresourceza.com


## Option A: 19th Century topic

## HOW FAR WAS CAVOUR IN CONTROL OF EVENTS IN 1859–60?

Study the Background Information and the sources carefully, and then answer **all** the questions.

### Background Information

The years 1859–60 are often seen as crucial for Italian unification. However, historians have disagreed over how far Cavour was in control of events in these years. There is also disagreement over whether he had a master plan for Italian unification, or whether he was more interested in adding to Piedmont's power. Who was in control when Cavour and Napoleon III met in 1858 and agreed to provoke Austria into war? How far did Garibaldi's successes in Sicily and Naples seize the initiative and force Cavour to embrace unification?

In the years 1859–60, how far was Cavour in control of events?

### SOURCE A

The year 1860 saw the birth of a united Italy. Within a few months Piedmont had more than doubled its size. Few people were more surprised at this achievement than Cavour, its chief architect, and few more disappointed than Mazzini and Garibaldi. In 1860 there had existed two conflicting centres of policy-making, one of them being at Turin where Cavour was Prime Minister, the other at Palermo and Naples where Garibaldi ruled as revolutionary dictator. Cavour was eventually able to impose his own solution, but he succeeded only because his radical opponents first broke free from his leadership and then forced him into actions that he had neither intended nor even foreseen.

In my opinion the contribution made by Garibaldi to the successes of 1860 has been underrated, but this does not diminish Cavour's greater achievements. The year 1860 was the most difficult of his life, when the initiative had fallen into the hands of his political enemies. What he succeeded in doing was to make the best of circumstances that were largely against him. Cavour's main contribution to Italian unification was as a diplomat, because he better than anyone understood how to exploit the rivalries between countries in Europe, thus the alliance with France. It is in no sense discreditable to suggest that he spent much of the time feeling his way, sometimes following contradictory policies until the time came when he could choose and make a decisive move.

Until 1860 Cavour had been unenthusiastic about the idea of a united Italy. His native language was French, not Italian, and he knew little about the rest of Italy. His own preference was for an enlarged Piedmont becoming the centre of a kingdom of northern Italy. Only in 1860 did he begin to understand that a united Italian state under Piedmontese and conservative direction would be practical politics. It was the urgent need to defeat Garibaldi that finally made this a necessary solution.

*From a book published in 1954.*

Downloaded from eduresourceza.com

Downloaded from eduresourceza.com


**SOURCE B**

Garibaldi alone was committed to a united Italy from start to finish. Napoleon III was not, Cavour was not. Garibaldi is fundamental to the unification process. It was he who forced Cavour to embrace unification. Cavour knew nothing of the south and aimed only at an enlarged Piedmont. He did not envisage full unification until a much later date, possibly by another generation. Garibaldi's success transformed the situation. Cavour was opposed to Garibaldi's expedition and he saw Garibaldi's success as a threat to everything he had achieved. Garibaldi had to be stopped and the only way this could be done was to take over the Papal States and southern Italy. Cavour unified Italy not because he believed in a united Italy but to stop Garibaldi. It was a desperate gamble to preserve an enlarged Piedmont.

Once he had achieved unification he became a firm supporter of it but he was not its architect. He was not a planner, he was an opportunist and his schemes succeeded more by luck than design. For example, the alliance with France was not of his making. Unification was forced on him by Garibaldi's achievements.

*From a book published in 2001.*

**SOURCE C**

THE GIANT AND THE DWARF.

*A cartoon published in Britain in June 1859. Napoleon III, on the left, is saying to King Victor Emmanuel, 'Bravo, my little fellow! You shall do all the fighting and we'll divide the glory.'*

Downloaded from eduresourceza.com

Downloaded from eduresourceza.com


**SOURCE D**

Garibaldi is planning the wildest schemes. As he remains devoted to King Victor Emmanuel, he will not help Mazzini or republicanism. But he feels it is his duty to liberate all Italy, stage by stage, before turning it over to the King. He is thus putting off the day when Sicily will demand annexation to Piedmont, for he wants to keep the dictatorial powers which will enable him to raise an army to conquer first Naples, then Rome. The government here has no influence on him. We must therefore prevent Garibaldi from conquering Naples, and we must try and annex Sicily as soon as possible. Were Garibaldi to become master of Naples we would not be able to stop him from compromising us with France and Europe. If the Bourbons have to fall, it should not be by Garibaldi's actions.

*A letter from Cavour to Costantino Nigra, July 1860. Nigra was a Piedmontese diplomat working for Cavour in Paris.*

**SOURCE E**

As to Garibaldi's expedition to Sicily, Cavour said exactly these words: 'Well and good. Begin at the south in order to come north. When it is a question of actions of that kind, however bold they may be, you can rely on my support.' Those were his precise words. He promised to help the expedition, provided the part played by the government was completely concealed.

*Giuseppe Sirtori speaking in the Italian Parliament in 1863. Sirtori was Garibaldi's chief of staff and was with him during his conquest of Sicily and Naples. He represented Garibaldi in discussions with Cavour.*

**SOURCE F**

Several times Cavour mentioned the possibility of Italian unity, and what he said to me was this:

> I have always favoured a federal system. I have never recoiled from the extreme but inevitable result of a federation, namely the establishment of a republic. After the armistice of Villafranca, however, federalism was no longer possible. So I came to believe that the only possibility was a unitary and monarchical state.

Cavour possesses a gift for intrigue and in the last few days he has recovered his lost self-confidence. The day he throws off the mask to deal openly with the conqueror of the Two Sicilies, he will put himself at the head of an all-powerful liberal party.

*A letter from Baron Talleyrand, French ambassador at Turin, to the French Foreign Minister, August 1860.*

© UCLES 2016
Downloaded from eduresourceza.com

Downloaded from eduresourceza.com


**SOURCE G**

Our policy must be conservative. We do not want to uproot society and disturb civil order. How should we have reacted to recent events at Naples? Should we have allowed the germs of revolution which we had destroyed in northern Italy to multiply elsewhere? No, we could not.

By seizing the direction of political events in southern Italy, the King and his government prevented our wonderful Italian movement from degenerating, they prevented the factions which did us so much harm in 1848 from exploiting the emergency conditions in Naples after its conquest by Garibaldi. We intervened to allow the people of southern Italy to decide freely on their fate.

*Cavour speaking to the Piedmontese Parliament, October 1860.*

Now answer **all** the following questions. You may use any of the sources to help you answer the questions, in addition to those sources which you are told to use. In answering the questions you should use your knowledge of the topic to help you interpret and evaluate the sources.

**1** Study Sources A and B.

How far do these two sources agree? Explain your answer using details of the sources. [7]

**2** Study Source C.

What is the cartoonist's message? Explain your answer using details of the source and your knowledge. [8]

**3** Study Sources D and E.

Does Source D prove that Sirtori was lying in Source E? Explain your answer using details of the sources and your knowledge. [8]

**4** Study Source F.

Are you surprised by this source? Explain your answer using details of the source and your knowledge. [7]

**5** Study Source G.

Why did Cavour make this speech? Explain your answer using details of the source and your knowledge. [8]

**6** Study **all** the sources.

How far do these sources provide convincing evidence that in the years 1859–60 Cavour was in control of events? Use the sources to explain your answer. [12]

Downloaded from eduresourceza.com

Downloaded from eduresourceza.com


## Option B: 20th Century topic

## HOW FAR WAS THE LEAGUE OF NATIONS A FAILURE?

Study the Background Information and the sources carefully, and then answer **all** the questions.

### Background Information

The League of Nations faced many difficult problems after its establishment in 1919. Its critics claim that it achieved little and point to the fact that another world war broke out in 1939. Its defenders argue that although it did eventually fail to prevent another world war, it had several successes. Overall, how far was the League of Nations a failure?

### SOURCE A

It became clear very quickly that the League would be just an addition to existing international relations mechanisms and often one to be kept at arm's length; Britain and France had no intention of allowing the Treaty's enforcement to become a League responsibility. It is also not clear whether the 'new diplomacy' achieved different results than the 'old' diplomacy might have done in similar circumstances.

The League, however, did have its uses. Handing over the government of Danzig and the Saar to the League solved tricky problems. The League's beneficial role in inhibiting slavery, international prostitution and the trading of drugs, in promoting the protection of refugees, and preventing and controlling disease, was acknowledged. It enjoyed successes in the Swedish-Finnish quarrel over the Aaland Islands in 1920 and in the Greece-Bulgaria dispute of 1925, but significantly, both were in accessible parts of Europe, were between minor states, and did not involve the direct interests of a great power.

The League was much less effective where any of these criteria did not apply. It was in Abyssinia in 1935 that the demands of the old and new diplomacies came into sharpest conflict. The circumstances meant that the credibility of the League and the 'new' diplomacy became linked with the response to this problem. The lessons were painful. The League had ended in failure. It had been based on too many paradoxes: the attempt to create collective security in a world of sovereign national states and the hope of international democracy in a world dominated by great powers. After Abyssinia the League became an increasing irrelevance.

*From a history book published in 2010.*

© UCLES 2016
Downloaded from eduresourceza.com

Downloaded from eduresourceza.com


**SOURCE B**

The League appeared to many to offer the best alternative to the balance-of-power approach that had failed so badly in 1914. But it was not the League that Wilson had planned. It was not a substitute for great-power politics, as he had intended, but rather just additional to it. It always operated within prescribed limits and its success depended on the willingness of the powerful states to use it.

The League moved quickly after it was established. The first dispute successfully resolved was between Finland and Sweden. It also speedily resolved the conflict between Bulgaria and Greece. If most of the League's successes involved small states, the clash between Britain and Turkey over oil-rich Mosul in 1924 suggested that the Council's procedures could be used to keep the peace in matters involving a great power. The failure over the Italian invasion of Abyssinia was due to Britain and France, rather than the League.

Nor was the failure of various international conferences such as the World Economic Conference of London in 1933 the fault of the League of Nations. The framework for international cooperation was still fragile but the activities of the League appeared with the passage of time to be a contribution to the shaping of the contemporary world. The League was a forerunner of a new world order based on international cooperation. It embodied the new ideas that characterised the twentieth century. It is hoped the ideal of world peace – the ideal of the League – will become the dominant feature of the twenty-first century.

*From a history book published in 2011.*

**SOURCE C**




*A British cartoon published in 1920.*

Downloaded from eduresourceza.com

Downloaded from eduresourceza.com


**SOURCE D**

"JUST THEN CAME DOWN A MONSTROUS DOVE
WHOSE FORCE WAS PURELY MORAL,
WHICH TURNED THE HEROES' HEARTS TO LOVE
AND MADE THEM DROP THEIR QUARREL."

*A British cartoon published in November 1925.*

Downloaded from eduresourceza.com

Downloaded from eduresourceza.com


**SOURCE E**

*A British cartoon published in December 1931.*

**SOURCE F**

I would like to speak about the League and the policy of collective security which we have whole-heartedly supported with such disappointing results. The dispute between Italy and Abyssinia was a perfect opportunity for the exercise of that policy. It has been tried based on sanctions and it has failed to prevent war, failed to save the victim from the aggressor.

The other day the President of the League of Nations said that if we were to pursue the policy of sanctions it was still possible to preserve the independence of Abyssinia. That seems to me to be madness. We must admit we have tried to impose upon the League a task which was beyond its powers to fulfill. It is time to limit the functions of the League so that they match with its real powers. But if the League is to be limited in that way it must be admitted that it could no longer be relied upon to secure the peace of the world.

*From a speech by Neville Chamberlain, a leading member of the British government, June 1936.*

Downloaded from eduresourceza.com

Downloaded from eduresourceza.com


**SOURCE G**

There exist inside the League two ideas about how best to preserve peace. There is the idea that when a state announces a foreign policy based on aggression and invading other countries' frontiers, the League has the duty of declaring that it will fight such a policy with every means at its disposal.

There is, however, another idea that the aggressor should be treated with consideration and that negotiations should be carried out with the assurance that no collective action will be carried out. Unfortunately, this is the policy that has so far been followed and it has as its consequences three wars and threatens to bring us a fourth.

*Maxim Litvinov speaking at the League of Nations Assembly, September 1938.*
*Litvinov was in charge of Soviet foreign policy.*

**SOURCE H**

It is common to speak of the failure of the League. Is it true that all our efforts for those twenty years have been thrown away? The work of the League is unmistakably printed on the social, economic and humanitarian life of the world. But above all that, a great advance was made in the international organisation of peace. For the first time an organisation was constructed to abolish war. An Assembly representing some fifty peace-loving nations.

For ten years the League advanced. Our balance-sheet is not altogether unfavourable. In the essential task of maintaining peace it succeeded during a number of years. It succeeded as long as the governments of the Great Powers supported it and as long as, in the background, there was the possibility that their force would be put at the service of its decisions. During a number of years the League of Nations settled various grave disputes such as the Aaland Islands, all of them involving areas which might have become battlefields if the League had not settled them.

*From a speech by Seán Lester, Secretary-General of the League of Nations. He was speaking to the Assembly during the last session of the League in 1946, when it dissolved itself.*

© UCLES 2016
Downloaded from eduresourceza.com

Downloaded from eduresourceza.com


Now answer **all** the following questions. You may use any of the sources to help you answer the questions, in addition to those sources which you are told to use. In answering the questions you should use your knowledge of the topic to help you interpret and evaluate the sources.

**1** Study Sources A and B.

How far do these two sources agree? Explain your answer using details of the sources. [7]

**2** Study Sources C and D.

How similar are these two cartoons? Explain your answer using details of the sources and your knowledge. [8]

**3** Study Source E.

What is the cartoonist's message? Explain your answer using details of the source and your knowledge. [8]

**4** Study Source F.

Are you surprised by this source? Explain your answer using details of the source and your knowledge. [8]

**5** Study Sources G and H.

How far does Source G prove that Source H is wrong? Explain your answer using details of the sources and your knowledge. [7]

**6** Study **all** the sources.

How far do these sources provide convincing evidence that the League of Nations was a failure? Use the sources to explain your answer. [12]

© UCLES 2016
Downloaded from eduresourceza.com

Downloaded from eduresourceza.com


**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.

© UCLES 2016
Downloaded from eduresourceza.com