Cambridge Assessment International Education

Cambridge IGCSE™

HISTORY **0470/21**

Paper 2 **October/November 2021**

2 hours

9423136020

You must answer on the enclosed answer booklet.

You will need: Answer booklet (enclosed)

INSTRUCTIONS

- Answer **all** the questions on **one** option only.
  - Option A: Nineteenth century topic
  - Option B: Twentieth century topic
- 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 50.
- The number of marks for each question or part question is shown in brackets [ ].

This document has **12** pages. Any blank pages are indicated.

© UCLES 2021

Option A: Nineteenth century topic

HOW IMPORTANT WAS KING WILLIAM I OF PRUSSIA?

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

Background Information

In 1849 the future William I had written, 'It is clear from our whole history that Prussia is destined to be at the head of Germany, but the question is – when and how?' William became King of Prussia in 1861, and in 1871 he fulfilled his prophecy by becoming Emperor of a united Germany. How far was this due to Bismarck, his Minister-President, and how far did William have any importance in this period? The usual story told by historians is that Bismarck decided policy and William simply agreed. His contemporaries describe him as polite, gentlemanly and considerate but having little influence over policy. Was it as simple as that?

Did William have much significance?

SOURCE A

Bismarck gained and held power by the brilliance of his personality, but he always depended on the goodwill of his King. If William I had decided to dismiss Bismarck after the 'blood and iron' speech, which most educated people in Germany condemned, Bismarck would have disappeared from history. During his years in power Bismarck forced the King again and again by temper tantrums and threats to do things William disliked.

Bismarck's career rested on his personal relations with the King. The desperate struggle to control an emotional old man who actually held power wore Bismarck's nerves to shreds and his rages arose from this powerlessness. The King would not always give in to Bismarck's demands. He felt, as a decent man, real loyalty to his ministers and could not allow them to be brutally discarded by Bismarck. The King's kindness for others enraged Bismarck. If the King wrote or spoke sharply to him, Bismarck collapsed into bed and was sometimes ill for weeks. William could not have shown Bismarck more love and attention, yet Bismarck had the nerve to complain of the horrible conduct of his King.

From a history book published in 2011.

SOURCE B

It was not an easy task to persuade the King to stay away from Frankfurt. I thought I had persuaded my master, but he did not find it easy to resist. He thought over and over again, 'Thirty reigning princes!' Besides, he loved and honoured the King of Saxony who had invited him. Not until midnight did I succeed in obtaining the King's refusal to the invitation. When I left my master, both he and I were ill and exhausted by the nervous tension of the situation. On the return journey to Berlin, the King passed so near to Frankfurt that his decision not to take part became known to everyone. The majority of the princes felt uncomfortable when they thought of Austria's scheme of reform, which, if Prussia stayed away, left them standing alone with Austria in a position where they got no protection from the rivalry of the two Great Powers.

From Bismarck's memoirs written in his retirement in the 1890s. In 1863 Austria had called a conference of German Princes in Frankfurt, with the aim of reforming the German Confederation in a way that would increase Austria's power in Germany.

© UCLES 2021

SOURCE C

I declared it to be my belief that peace must be concluded on the Austrian terms but remained alone in my opinion; the King supported the military majority. My nerves could not stand the strain and I got up, walked into my bedchamber and was overcome with tears. I set out the next day to explain to the King and said we had to avoid wounding Austria too severely to avoid leaving any desire for revenge. To this the King raised no objection but said the actual peace terms were inadequate and that Austria could not be allowed to escape unpunished. Under the impression that my opinion was rejected, I left the room. I then met the Crown Prince who said to me, 'If you are persuaded that peace must now be concluded, I am ready to defend your opinion with my father.' He returned after half an hour with the words, 'My father has consented.' The main memory I have is of the violent agitation into which I had been obliged to put my master in order to obtain what I considered essential to the interests of the country.

Bismarck's account of meetings with King William, his chief ministers and senior generals in July 1866 about whether to make peace with Austria. William wanted to march on Vienna.

SOURCE D

Bismarck gave hints that the war must decisively achieve the rounding off of Prussian territory. That caused the Crown Prince to ask the question whether there was an intention to annex territory. The King answered angrily that there is no question of war yet and still less of deposing German princes. He wants peace. Bismarck was by far the clearest and sharpest. I became convinced that he had brought about the whole situation in order to encourage the King to be more warlike. As we came out the Crown Prince said, 'The King will not; Bismarck will.'

An account by a senior army officer, who served under the Crown Prince, of the Grand War Council in May 1866. The King, Bismarck, senior politicians and army officers were present.

© UCLES 2021

[Turn over

SOURCE E



A French cartoon published in early 1867. It is entitled 'The Giant German Ogre'. It shows William and some small figures which represent the princes of North Germany.

© UCLES 2021

SOURCE F



A cartoon published in an American magazine, 7 January 1871. Bismarck is in the background. William's Prussian crown lies in the waste bin.

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 Source A.

What impressions does Source A give of the relationship between William and Bismarck? Explain your answer using details of the source. [7]

2 Study Sources B and C.

Does Source B make Source C surprising? Explain your answer using details of the sources and your knowledge. [8]

3 Study Source D.

How useful is this source as evidence about the Prussian decision to go to war with Austria? Explain your answer using details of the source and your knowledge. [7]

4 Study Source E.

Why was this cartoon published in France at that time? Explain your answer using details of the source and your knowledge. [8]

5 Study Source F.

What is the message of the cartoonist? 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 Bismarck dominated William? Use the sources to explain your answer. [12]

© UCLES 2021

BLANK PAGE

Option B: Twentieth century topic

HOW IMPORTANT WAS THE USA'S DECISION NOT TO JOIN THE LEAGUE OF NATIONS?

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

Background Information

In November 1919 the US Senate voted to reject the Treaty of Versailles and this was confirmed by another vote in March 1920. An important part of the Treaty was the creation of the League of Nations. The USA's rejection of the Treaty meant that it would not be joining the League of Nations.

When the League of Nations was established in 1919 many people had high hopes of it but by the late 1930s it was clear that it was a failure. Many reasons have been suggested to explain this including the lack of an army, the self-interest of powers such as Britain and France, and slow decision-making. However, some historians have argued that the failure of the USA to join the League was a fatal blow.

How far was the refusal of the USA to join the League responsible for its failure?

SOURCE A

On 19 November 1919, the US Senate rejected the Treaty of Versailles, thus destroying any chance of American membership of the League. Britain faced the alarming prospect of League membership without the economic power and naval strength of the United States. These events cast a long shadow over the future of the League, especially with the increasingly bitter arguments between Britain and France.

As early as the 1920s the Corfu Crisis had clearly demonstrated that while the threat of sanctions might be effective against small powers, it was unlikely to work effectively against Great Powers. Furthermore, unless the Great Powers, and especially Britain and France, were willing to work closely together to resolve disputes and to take joint economic and, if necessary, military action, the League could not exercise its authority in an effective way.

However, in the late 1920s, public opinion across Europe thought that the League was becoming strong enough to prevent future conflicts. Both Britain and France publicly accepted the importance of their League obligations. But in private, ministers and their officials were uncomfortably aware of the limitations of the League, and of how little it could actually achieve in terms of economic or military action against a major power, particularly in the absence of clear French-British agreement about how it should operate. The onset of the Depression only served to further weaken the League's capacity for effective action.

From a history book published in 1984.

© UCLES 2021

SOURCE B

The League was very popular with war-wearied public opinion – surely quarrels between states could be settled by reasonable men sitting around a table in Geneva. But the League had important weaknesses: Russia and Germany were not members, the League had no way of imposing its decisions and it was heavily dependent on Britain and France acting together. Most crucially of all, in November 1919, the United States, the most powerful country in the world, refused to join. This final weakness mattered most when major powers such as Japan and Italy needed to be dealt with in the 1930s.

Despite these problems and incidents such as Mussolini's flouting of the League's authority over Corfu, the League could have worked. By the late 1920s, the actions of the League, the revival of prosperity and the settling of French-German differences seemed to suggest that peace had come to stay. But it was not long before the absence of the USA really mattered. In the 1930s devastating financial and industrial collapse led to nationalist regimes winning power and harmony being destroyed. It was not surprising that the League, without the support of the USA, could not cope with the dangerous and complex situation that developed.

From a recent history book.

SOURCE C



THE GAP IN THE BRIDGE.

A cartoon published in a British magazine, December 1919. The keystone is the stone that locks the structure together.

SOURCE D

It was almost impossible to follow the proceedings of the League at Geneva without becoming cynical about it. The delegates acted in what they believed to be the interests of their own countries without the smallest regard for the general interests of the world. The journalists in Geneva were nearly all opposed to the weak behaviour of the League and the British and French governments. This was particularly true of the Americans. The British government was one of the most shortsighted. What foolishness its persistent opposition to any form of collective security is now seen to have been. From 1930 French policy was dictated from London, and after 1936 the subservience of France to England was complete. This meant France allowed itself to be dragged into policies opposed to the general interest of Europe with disastrous consequences. The Soviet delegation was one of the most faithful to the principles of the League.


From a book entitled 'The Geneva Racket, 1920–1939', published in 1941 by a British socialist and anti-fascist journalist. He lived in Geneva and reported on the League in the 1920s and 1930s.

SOURCE E

The development of the League of Nations is a central principle of our foreign policy. With America out of the League, sanctions are a mistake. The very people who have made us disarm, and quite right too, are now urging us forward to take action. But where will action lead us to? If you enforce an economic boycott you'll have war declared by Japan and Japan will seize Singapore and Hong Kong, and we cannot stop this. You'll get nothing out of America but big words. We cannot be going along one road, outside the League, with America, and also claim loyalty to the League.


Stanley Baldwin, speaking to a friend in February 1932, as recorded in the friend's diary. Baldwin was a member of the British government at this time.

SOURCE F



A cartoon published in Britain, January 1933. It is entitled 'The doormat'. The text on the left reads 'Honour of Nations'. The text on the box on the right reads 'Face-saving outfit'. The figure on the right is a member of the British government.

SOURCE G



A cartoon published in 1932. The two figures fighting represent Japan and China.

SOURCE H

America's commitment to the preservation of world peace was not just a matter of ethical attitudes; it reflected concern about the negative effects of war on America's world trade. Despite its refusal to join the League of Nations, there were strong economic reasons why the USA could not turn its back on the wider world.

When Italy attacked Abyssinia in 1935, Roosevelt, in advance of the League of Nations, promptly declared a state of war to exist between Italy and Abyssinia and imposed an arms embargo which he knew would affect Italy more than Abyssinia. Although he dared not align the USA openly with the League of Nations in applying sanctions, he urged businessmen not to trade with either side. When Italian purchases of raw materials from the USA rose sharply he threatened to publish the names of US exporters. This moral embargo was effective and trade fell back. It was Britain and France who let the League down by their surrender to Mussolini's demands.

From a history book published in 1985.

© UCLES 2021

[Turn over

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.

Why was this cartoon published in December 1919? Explain your answer using details of the source and your knowledge. [8]

3 Study Sources D and E.

How far does Source D make Source E surprising? Explain your answer using details of the sources and your knowledge. [8]

4 Study Sources F and G.

How far do these two cartoons agree? Explain your answer using details of the sources and your knowledge. [8]

5 Study Source H.

What impressions does this source give of the USA's attitude towards international affairs? Explain your answer using details of the source. [7]

6 Study **all** the sources.

How far do these sources provide convincing evidence that the League failed because the USA was not a member? Use the sources to explain your answer. [12]

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.

© UCLES 2021