Cambridge Assessment International Education

Cambridge IGCSE™

HISTORY **0470/23**

Paper 2 **October/November 2021**

2 hours

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.

DC (MS/CT) 201390/2
© UCLES 2021

Option A: Nineteenth century topic

WAS BISMARCK OR NAPOLEON III MORE TO BLAME FOR THE WAR IN 1870?

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

Background Information

On 19 July 1870 France declared war on Prussia. Both Bismarck and Napoleon III had reasons to go to war. A war with France could persuade the southern German states to support the North German Confederation in defending German honour. This could be the final step towards a unified Germany. Meanwhile, Napoleon was unpopular in France and was under pressure to revive France's glorious past. According to Bismarck's memoirs, written in the 1890s during his retirement, he had long planned German unification and he brought about the war with France to help this process.

Was France or Prussia more to blame for the war?

SOURCE A

Bismarck had no clear aim after the victories of 1866. He was content to leave the south German states in their independent existence. There was no danger of a threat from Austria and so the German problem had been settled. France and Prussia had no reason for conflict. Bismarck wrote in 1866, 'I have always regarded an alliance with France as the natural expression of the shared interests of our two countries.' Napoleon III thought exactly the same. Bismarck rightly thought that Napoleon was a man of peace but he failed to understand that Napoleon did not control the French and that he was constantly urged by the French to go to war and restore France's prestige.

There is not a scrap of evidence that Bismarck worked deliberately for a war with France. On the contrary, he made repeated gestures of friendship towards Napoleon. He certainly did not foresee the crisis that blew up in July 1870 over the Spanish throne. The edited 'Ems telegram' was not the cause of war. France was already preparing for war. Once the war became inevitable Bismarck wanted to present himself as the creator of Germany, not as a man mastered by events. Therefore, against all his previous statements, the war with France had to appear long-planned by the master statesman. In truth, the French had blundered into a war which was not unwelcome to them; and Bismarck, though taken by surprise, turned their blunder to his advantage.

From a book published in 1955.

© UCLES 2021

SOURCE B

After 1866 Bismarck intended to unify Germany and rearrange Europe on a new system, the main feature of which would be a powerful Germany controlled by Prussia. It is certain that he regarded union between south and north as the culmination of his efforts. However, Bismarck never took risks and he knew there was much anti-Prussian feeling in the South. Everything therefore pointed to delay. Bismarck's strategy over the next three years was masterly. His handling of the affair over Luxembourg was an insult to Napoleon and the French were angered by such a humiliation. There were many in France who wanted a glorious war with the Germans. France was being steadily enclosed by Prussia in a way that only war could break – but Bismarck was not yet ready. By 1870 the armed forces of the Confederation were reorganised and mobilisation could be completed within three weeks. France swarmed with German spies. The war with France was being remorselessly prepared. The edited version of the Ems telegram in July 1870 was brutal and provocative. A French misjudgement had enabled Bismarck to represent France as insulted. France had to either accept the insult or force a war to defend French honour. On 15 July King William ordered a general mobilisation of the army. On 19 July France declared war. Bismarck had won.

From a book published in 1918.

SOURCE C

A cartoon published in an American magazine, August 1870.
Death is saying, 'Who goes there?' and Napoleon III replies, 'A friend'. Around Napoleon are the words 'War', 'Fire', 'Ruin', 'Famine', 'Desolation', 'Death', 'Blood'.

SOURCE D

I shall never consent to a war that is avoidable, much less seek it. But this war with France will surely come. It will be forced upon us by the French Emperor. His security depends on his personal prestige. He has lost much of this because he has permitted Prussia to become so great without obtaining some 'compensation'. It was well known that he wanted compensation but was manoeuvred out of it by me. Such a loss of prestige is dangerous to his position as emperor. He will, as soon as his army is in good fighting condition, make an effort to recover that prestige by using some excuse to pick a quarrel with us.

Bismarck speaking to an American politician in 1867. This conversation was remembered by the politician in his memoirs, published in 1908.

SOURCE E

The first cause of the War of 1870 is to be found in the year 1866 when Napoleon allowed Prussia to become a great power and a threat to us. Napoleon became the tool of Prussia in the hope of a reward. He should have supported others, like Russia, who were trying to stop the conquests of Prussia. He certainly should not have encouraged Prussia but that is what he did and he demanded a reward for that encouragement. Prussia showed no gratitude to Napoleon and broke the promise it had made in the Treaty of Prague to slow its expansion. It also made treaties of alliance, thus contributing to the military unity of Germany which was the only form of unity dangerous to us.

I devoted my efforts in international matters to friendly cooperation between France and Germany and would have achieved it if I had had more influence. But there was one man who wanted war – Bismarck, who made truth an instrument of falsehood and who thought that anything that contributed to his success was legitimate.

From Emile Ollivier's book 'The Franco-Prussian War and Its Hidden Causes', 1912. Ollivier was Prime Minister of Napoleon's government, 1869–70. He was forced to resign because of the defeat by Prussia.

SOURCE F

A cartoon published in France in 1867. The French soldier is saying to the German soldier, 'Now you are big enough. You must not get any bigger. I'm telling you this for your own health.'

SOURCE G

I was convinced that a United Germany was only a question of time, that the North German Confederation was only the first step in its formation. I did not doubt that a Franco-German War must take place before the construction of a United Germany could be achieved. I was preoccupied with the idea of delaying the outbreak of this war until our fighting strength should be increased. I at no time regarded a war with France as a simple matter and my efforts to postpone the outbreak of war until our military training could be fully developed in all parts of the Confederation were therefore quite reasonable. I took it for granted that we could count on Russian support against any coalition France might form. From England we could not rely on any active support and the events of 1870 have shown I was correct.

From Bismarck's memoirs written in the 1890s during his retirement.

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.

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

4 Study Source F.

Why was this source published in France in 1867? Explain your answer using details of the source and your knowledge. [8]

5 Study Source G.

How useful is this source as evidence about the Franco-Prussian War of 1870? Explain your answer using details of the source and your knowledge. [7]

6 Study **all** the sources.

How far do these sources provide convincing evidence that France was to blame for the war with Prussia in 1870? Use the sources to explain your answer. [12]

© UCLES 2021

BLANK PAGE

Option B: Twentieth century topic

WAS THE LEAGUE JUSTIFIED IN DOING LITTLE ABOUT THE JAPANESE INVASION OF MANCHURIA?

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

Background Information

The issue of the Japanese invasion of Manchuria was not a straightforward one for the League. Eastern parts of Manchuria were already under the control of Japan and the Japanese army had the right to guard a zone around the South Manchurian Railway. It was in this zone that a bomb exploded on 18 September 1931. However, the explosion was probably staged by the Japanese army to provoke a crisis from which they could benefit. The Japanese army quickly ventured beyond the zone to 'guarantee order' and eventually conquered all of Manchuria. As a member of the League, the Chinese immediately appealed to the League.

In 1932 Japan set up a puppet state called Manchukuo. Japanese settlers, many of them farmers, flocked there. The Japanese transformed the economy and it even became a holiday destination for Japanese tourists. In Japanese eyes this further justified their taking over the area.

Did the League have good reasons for doing little about the Japanese invasion of Manchuria?

SOURCE A

The outbreak of hostilities in Manchuria caused much confusion at Geneva. Little reliable information was available given the slowness of communications. As there was a general reluctance to act, much emphasis was placed on China's lack of control in Manchuria, on Japan's treaty right to station troops there and on the argument that events in Manchuria did not constitute the invasion of one sovereign state by another.

Armed with hindsight, history has condemned Japan for the conquest. At the time, however, there was substantial sympathy for Japan as the representative of the civilised west in the barbarous east. The Chinese economy was indeed chaotic and the political situation turbulent, so much so that some doubted whether China constituted a sovereign state.

What could the League do? It could not condemn or expel Japan, as Japan would veto such attempts. Even the act of sending a commission of inquiry might inflame Japanese nationalism. World opinion was divided and, anyway, Japan was indifferent to it. Realists recognised that only military force could stop Japan, but who could supply it? For most countries the League's idea of collective security rested on the assumption that somebody else would supply the security. The only League members with the remotest prospect of action were Britain and France, but in reality neither could act. After years of shrinking armies and naval disarmament, neither had the military power to embark on such a course of action. In America the prevailing mood was overwhelmingly isolationist and hostile to the League. In the circumstances it is not surprising that nothing was done.

From a history book published in 1976.

© UCLES 2021

SOURCE B

Within days China brought the issue to the attention of the Council of the League. It was a complicated situation because Japanese troops had a right to be in Manchuria, although not as extensively as they were. Britain was not keen on sending troops, regarding Japan as a longstanding friend who was supporting capitalism in the Far East, and beyond the League, the USA did not support measures against Japan. However, a large area of Chinese territory had been put under Japanese occupation illegally, and small states were particularly angry. As a Finnish delegate told the Assembly, the League had to prove what it was made of. Was it just 'a debating body'?

The League had been approached for help by a member state that was the victim of aggression, but it did little. It should have done more. The scale of aggression was greater than in previous crises the League had faced and the consequences were more significant. This was the first major crisis of the League. The Covenant was under attack, and the League had failed. Japan's action was generally seen as a threat to the international community as a whole. Historians have called it a turning point in the history of the League. Determined leadership had been lacking and this was noted around the world. Small states had their confidence in the League shaken, and dictators were encouraged.

From a recent history book.

SOURCE C



An American cartoon published in 1931. The Nine-Power Treaty of 1922 recognised the territorial integrity of China.

SOURCE D

Japan has created a flourishing oasis in a desert of Chinese misrule. The Japanese army, after its initial well-prepared invasion, has become a well-equipped police force in a disordered part of China where the Chinese Government has little authority.

From The Times newspaper, published in Britain, 21 September 1931.

SOURCE E

The fundamental issue at stake is really of vital importance to future international relations. Are threats and force going to rule relations between sovereign states, or arbitration and judicial settlement? That is the fundamental question. The answer will be of immense importance to the future stability of the world. That consideration must be regarded as more important than the merits of the dispute itself.

From The Times newspaper, published in Britain, 16 October 1931.

© UCLES 2021

SOURCE F

A poster published by the Japanese government in 1936 to celebrate the fifth anniversary of the Mukden Incident. It shows Japanese settlers in Manchukuo.

SOURCE G

The Japanese aggression in Manchuria violated the Covenant of the League. The authority of the League in dealing with major Powers was tested. It failed utterly in dealing with this gross breach of the Covenant. The Council attempted to apply peaceful methods but when these failed it did not use force. The commercial and political interests of the major Powers in the Council, together with the likely military consequences, led them to withhold from the League the power necessary to force effective action. The smaller Powers in the Assembly wanted to apply economic sanctions through a world-wide boycott of Japan but they discovered that the major European Powers would not follow. This failure could not be blamed on lack of American cooperation because it consistently supported the League throughout.

From a book by US ex-President Hoover, published in 1942.

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

3 Study Sources D and E.

How far does Source D mean that Source E cannot be trusted? Explain your answer using details of the sources and your knowledge. [8]

4 Study Source F.

How useful is this source as evidence about the Japanese in Manchukuo? Explain your answer using details of the source and your knowledge. [7]

5 Study Source G.

Do you find this source surprising? 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 the League was justified in doing little about the Japanese invasion of Manchuria? 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