Section A: European Option

Liberalism and Nationalism in Italy and Germany, 1848–1871

Different approaches to Italian Unification

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

**Source A**

As soon as I entered the Emperor’s study he raised the question which was the purpose of my journey. He began by saying that he had decided to support Piedmont with all his power in a war against Austria, provided that the war was undertaken for a non-revolutionary end which could be justified in the eyes of French and European public opinion. Since the search for an excuse presented our main problem before we could agree, the Emperor came to my aid in seeking grounds for war. It was very hard to find any until we thought about Massa and Carrara. The Emperor agreed we had to drive the Austrians out of Italy. We would form a Kingdom of Upper Italy under the House of Savoy. Rome would be left to the Pope and there would be a Kingdom of Central Italy. The Neapolitan frontier would remain unchanged. These four Italian states would form a confederation on the pattern of the German Bund, the Presidency of which would be given to the Pope. Nice and Savoy would go to France.

*Cavour to Victor Emmanuel, July 1858.*

**Source B**

Republicans by conviction believe that peoples cannot make themselves nations through a lie such as this. Liberty cannot be obtained by concessions to others. No nation can be founded on foreign arms, but only by the battles of those who make up the new nation. The country of the Italians should embrace the whole extent of the territory between the frontier of the Alps to the farthest shores of Italy. National sovereignty shall consist of the free choice by the vote of the people. Any war for independence, unconnected with liberty, would just lead to the substitution of new masters for old. Any war allied to Louis Napoleon Bonaparte would be a folly and a crime.

*Mazzini’s Public Declaration after Plombières, February 1859.*

**Source C**

You know that when you departed for Sicily your expedition did not have my approval. To put an end to this war between Italians and Italians I counsel you to renounce the idea of crossing to the mainland with your brave army. This is provided that the King of Naples pledges himself to evacuate the island and leave the Sicilians free to decide their own future.

*King Victor Emmanuel to Garibaldi, July 1860.*
Source D

A British cartoon from 1860.

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

(a) Compare and contrast the attitudes expressed in Sources A and B about an alliance between Piedmont and France. [15]

(b) ‘Garibaldi should be seen as the main creator of a united Italy.’ How far do Sources A to D support this view? [25]
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Section B: American Option

The Origins of the Civil War, 1846–1861

The Dred Scott Judgment, 1857

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

Source A

The main proposition decided by the Supreme Court is that under the Constitution of the United States a negro, descended from slave parents imported from Africa, is not and cannot be a citizen of the United States. We are told by the leaders of the Republican or Abolition party that this proposition is cruel, inhuman and infamous and should not be obeyed by any good citizen. Wherein is the cruelty, the inhumanity, the infamy? They quote the Declaration of Independence, which says, ‘We hold these truths to be self-evident that all men are created equal’ and insist that this language was intended to include negroes as well as white men. Did any of the thirteen states abolish slavery – much less place the negro on an equality with the white man? History records the emphatic answer – No.


Source B

Judge Taney, in delivering the verdict of the majority of the Court, insists at great length that negroes were no part of the people who made, or for whom was made, the Declaration of Independence or the Constitution of the United States. Judge Curtis, in his dissenting opinion, shows that in five of the then thirteen states, free negroes were voters and, in proportion to their numbers, had the same part in making the Constitution that white people had. The ultimate destiny of the black race has never appeared so hopeless as in the last three or four years. Now, to aid in making the bondage of the negro universal and eternal, the Declaration of Independence is assailed, sneered at and torn till, if its framers could rise from the earth, they could not at all recognise it.

*From a speech by Abraham Lincoln in Springfield, Illinois, 26 June 1857.*

Source C

The importance of the Dred Scott decision is greatly enhanced by its immediate effect upon two of the great political parties of the country. At a single blow it shatters and destroys the platform of the Republican party. It annihilates the issue which was made paramount in the recent presidential election and takes away from the Democratic party all the advantages of its advocacy of popular sovereignty. It leaves both of these great parties adrift, without a single plank of their late platforms on which to rest. In the recent election, while the Republicans demanded the restoration of the Missouri Compromise, the Democratic party strongly advocated the popular sovereignty doctrine incorporated in the Kansas-Nebraska Act.

Source D

The decision of the Supreme Court in the Dred Scott case will bring the enemies of the South face to face with the constitution of their country. They cannot escape the issue presented – the observance of the laws of the land or disunion. The leaders of the Black Republican party are denouncing the decision of the very tribunal to which they had appealed and are endeavouring to excite among the people of the North a bitter hostility to it. But as fanatical as the people of New England are, they will hesitate to enter the ranks of a political party organised for the express purpose of overturning a decision of the Supreme Court. Some of our Southern editors oppose the agitation to which this decision will give rise. But let it come. The fury of the storm has passed.

From the Milledgeville [Georgia] 'Federal Union', 31 March 1857.

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

(a) Compare and contrast the interpretations of the Declaration of Independence given in Sources A and B. [15]

(b) ‘The Dred Scott judgement greatly benefited the Democratic party’. How far do Sources A to D support this assertion? [25]
3 Read the sources and then answer both parts of the question.

Source A

Finland and Sweden have agreed to allow the League of Nations to settle their dispute over possession of the Aaland Islands. This places in the hands of the League an international dispute it was thought might lead to war. Council members see this as one of the strongest expressions of support and confidence the League has yet received. Both Sweden and Finland expressed their approval of the course of action taken by the League, and said they felt confident that an acceptable solution would be reached. The islands belonged to Sweden in 1809, when they were taken by Russia and attached to the province of Finland. Separated from Russia during World War I, Finland now asserts that it is entitled to ownership. Sweden claims its previous ownership together with the large proportion of Swedish population in the islands as reasons why they should now be returned to her.


Source B

The Aalanders demand a plebiscite which would leave no doubt as to their wish for reunion with Sweden. Finland refuses to authorise a plebiscite in view of its sovereign rights over the islands. Sweden supports the wish of the islanders.

The Aalanders have neither been persecuted nor oppressed by Finland. The Aalanders’ claim that their Swedish language is threatened and can only be saved by union with Sweden is unfounded.

A minority of the population of a state does not have the right to separate itself from that state in order to be incorporated into another state or to declare its independence. This would destroy order and stability within states.

The loss of the Aaland Islands might lead the Finns to take vengeance on the Swedish minority living elsewhere in Finland.

Aaland in the hands of Finland does not constitute a danger to Sweden.

Extracts from the Report of the Commission established by the League of Nations to investigate the dispute over the Aaland Islands, 1921.
Source C

Since Finland and Sweden have consented that the League of Nations should effect a settlement of their difficulties, and agreed to abide by its decision;

Having reviewed the Commission's report;

Desiring a solution which creates maximum security for the population of the Islands and the parties concerned;

Decides

1. The sovereignty of the Aaland Islands is recognised to belong to Finland.
2. In the interests of the world and future cordial relations between Finland and Sweden, the prosperity and happiness of the Islands cannot be ensured without further guarantees.
3. Such guarantees should be agreed by representatives of Finland and Sweden, if necessary with the assistance of the League of Nations.

Decision by the Council of the League of Nations, 1921.

Source D

It is with profound disappointment that Sweden learns of the League’s decision. In supporting the cause of the people of the Aaland Islands, Sweden was not influenced by the desire to increase her territory. It only wished to support the just aspirations of the island population to reunite itself to its mother-country. This population has declared its unanimous wish not to be bound to a country to which it had been joined by force. Sweden had hoped that the League, which was established to assure justice in international relationships, would have favoured a solution in line with the principle of self-determination. It had hoped that the League of Nations would have filled, at least on this occasion, the role of the champion and defender of right. The League’s decision will shake the confidence that countries which support international law have in the League of Nations. The decision is not likely to lead to peace in the area. Sweden loyally accepts the decision, but hopes that the day will come when the aspirations of the people of the Aaland Islands will be triumphantly vindicated.

Response of the Swedish Government to the League of Nations’ decision, 1921.

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

(a) Compare and contrast Sources A and D as evidence of the Swedish government's opinions about the League of Nations in the early 1920s. 

(b) How far do Sources A to D support the view that the League of Nations was right to allow Finland to retain possession of the Aaland Islands?