



UNIVERSITY OF CAMBRIDGE INTERNATIONAL EXAMINATIONS  
International General Certificate of Secondary Education

www.PapaCambridge.com

**HISTORY**

**0470/22**

Paper 2

**May/June 2010**

**2 hours**

Additional Materials: Answer Booklet/Paper

**READ THESE INSTRUCTIONS FIRST**

If you have been given an Answer Booklet, follow the instructions on the front cover of the Booklet.  
Write your Centre number, candidate number and name on all the work you hand in.  
Write in dark blue or black pen.  
You may use a soft pencil for any diagrams, graphs or rough working.  
Do not use staples, paper clips, highlighters, glue or correction fluid.

This paper has two options.  
Choose **one** option, and then answer **all** of the questions on that topic.  
**Option A: 19th Century topic** [p2–p6]  
**Option B: 20th Century topic** [p7–p11]

At the end of the examination, fasten all your work securely together.  
The number of marks is given in brackets [ ] at the end of each question or part question.



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



**Option A: 19th Century topic****DID SLAVERY CAUSE THE AMERICAN CIVIL WAR?**

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

**Background Information**

The causes of the American Civil War have long been argued over. Some historians have argued that the South went to war to defend the independence and rights of states – rights that were being threatened by an ever-more powerful North. Others have argued that the war was about slavery, which was at the heart of the Southern economy and society. There has also been disagreement about how far the war was inevitable, with some historians seeing fundamental differences between the North and South in terms of attitudes, culture, society and economy. Others have argued that the war could have been avoided right up to the final moment and that it was the immediate events that sparked off the fighting.

**SOURCE A**

The secession of the seven states had presented the Federal government with all manner of administrative problems, from the delivery of mail to the enforcement of law and order, but these did not in themselves threaten an immediate collision between the North and the South. The presence of forts manned by Federal soldiers within some of the seceding states was a different matter. Lincoln was told by the commander at Fort Sumter that the garrison had supplies for only a further six weeks. Lincoln decided to send a relief expedition to Fort Sumter.

Fort Sumter had now taken on a symbolic value out of all proportion to its military importance: the Confederacy feared that its case for recognition as a sovereign nation would be compromised as long as another power maintained an armed presence within its main harbours, while the Federal authority felt that it could not afford the loss of face if the forts were surrendered to states in rebellion. Lincoln ordered that the troops he was sending to Sumter should only be used if the South Carolinians resisted the landing of provisions for the fort. He thus placed on Confederate shoulders the onus of firing a first shot. If Lincoln was indeed setting some kind of trap, the Confederate leadership, including Jefferson Davis, walked unhesitatingly into it. On 12 April their troops began firing on Fort Sumter. The firing lasted thirty-four hours before the commander in the fort decided that he and his men had had enough.

Once the Confederates had actually fired on the flag, Northerners rallied firmly to the Union's defence. In the South the Sumter success raised secessionist fervour to a new pitch and appeared to confirm the belief that one Southerner could whip ten Yankees. But it had killed the dream that independence could be won without a fight. Four more states came into the Confederate camp. Lines were being drawn and positions taken. The war was about to begin in earnest.

*From a history book published in 1987.*

**SOURCE B**

The Civil War was caused by Northern aggression against Southern rights. It was the issue of the expansion of slavery, rather than its mere existence, that divided the nation. In the mid-1850s a Northern political party, the Republican party, emerged, pledged to stop the further spread of slavery. The containment of slavery should ensure that ultimately it withered and died. That was just what Southerners feared. The Northern population, helped by immigration, was already growing at a much faster rate than the Southern. Worried by the population imbalance, Southerners increasingly accepted the view that sovereignty lay in the individual states and that in certain circumstances secession might well be a justified process.

Secession did not necessarily mean war. Lincoln's government could have allowed the states to depart in peace. But most Northerners were not willing to accept the break-up of the Union. In 1861 Lincoln was not pledged to end slavery; he was simply pledged to preserve the Union. The Confederate states were fighting for the right to self-determination. While few Northerners were willing to fight to the death to free the slaves, most were prepared to fight to save the Union. The slave issue meant they had to fight to save the Union.

*From a history book published in 2002.*

**SOURCE C**

Our new Constitution has put at rest forever all the agitating questions relating to African slavery as it exists among us and the proper status of the negro in our form of civilisation. This was the immediate cause of the recent split and the present revolution. The ideas held by most of the leading statesmen at the time of the formation of the old Constitution were that the enslavement of the African was in violation of the laws of nature and that it was wrong in principle, socially, morally and politically. Those ideas, however, were fundamentally wrong. They rested upon the assumption of the equality of races. This was an error. Our new Government is founded upon the opposite idea – that the negro is not equal to the white man; that slavery is his natural and moral condition.

*From a speech by Alexander Stephens, the Confederate Vice-President, March 1861.*

**SOURCE D**

Southerners fought for the defence of an inherent right to withdraw from a Union which they had, as sovereign communities, voluntarily entered. The existence of African slavery was in no case the cause of the conflict, but only an incident.

*From the memoirs of the Confederate President, Jefferson Davis, written in the 1880s.*

**SOURCE E**

*A cartoon published in America in November 1859, just after John Brown's raid at Harper's Ferry in Virginia. The caption reads 'A Southern planter arming his slaves to resist invasion.'*

**SOURCE F**

There is just now some small danger that a misunderstanding may cause trouble between the North and the South. Each section of the country misunderstands the other. The South imagines that the Northern people sympathize with John Brown, and regard him as a martyr. The bulk of the Northern people have no sympathy whatever with John Brown. They regard him as a man who broke his country's laws, who caused the death of innocent men, and who has been justly punished for his crimes.

On the other hand, the North is apt to be misled by the Southern newspapers and politicians clamouring for disunion. These newspapers and politicians misrepresent the true views of the South. In the event of disunion the South would be as great a sufferer as the North. Seven-eighths of the money the South receives from taxes are collected in the North. In the border states it would be morally impossible to maintain slavery, because no restraint, legal or moral, would prevent organized slave stampedes. These considerations are quite familiar to the intelligent statesmen of the South.

*From an American magazine, published in December 1859.*

**SOURCE G**

One in eight of the whole population was coloured slaves, not distributed equally over the Union, but localised in the southern part of it. All knew that these slaves were somehow the cause of war. To strengthen, perpetuate, and extend slavery was the aim for which insurgents would split the Union even by war, while the government claimed no right to do more than to restrict the territorial enlargement of it.

*President Lincoln speaking in March 1865.*

## SOURCE H



*A British cartoon published in September 1861.*

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.

Does Source D prove that Stephens (Source C) was wrong? Explain your answer using details of the sources and your knowledge. [8]

**3** Study Source E.

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

**4** Study Sources F and G.

How would Lincoln have reacted to Source F? Explain your answer using details of the sources and your knowledge. [8]

**5** Study Source H.

What is the message of this cartoon? Explain your answer using details of the source and your knowledge. [7]

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

Do these sources provide convincing evidence that the Civil War was caused by the issue of slavery? Use the sources to explain your answer. [12]

**Option B: 20th Century topic****HOW FAR WAS GORBACHEV RESPONSIBLE FOR THE COLLAPSE OF COMMUNIST CONTROL IN EASTERN EUROPE?**

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

**Background Information**

1989 was a momentous year in Eastern Europe. Soviet control of the countries of Eastern Europe and their Communist governments both crumbled. In Poland Solidarity won the elections and became the major partner in the new government. In East Germany the Berlin Wall was pulled down. In Romania the Communist dictator, Ceausescu, was overthrown and executed. In other countries like Czechoslovakia, Communist governments resigned and free elections were planned.

Such events would have been unthinkable 20 years earlier. Did Soviet and Communist control collapse in Eastern Europe because of Gorbachev, who came to power in the Soviet Union in 1985 and started to introduce important reforms? Or was it more because of other factors?

**SOURCE A**

So why was it different in 1989? Several reasons may be suggested. Firstly Gorbachev. He not only made it clear to East Germany that Soviet troops were not available for the purposes of domestic repression, but went out of his way to let it be known to the West and also to the people. Deprived of Soviet support, the East European governments did not have a leg to stand on. Nonetheless the Gorbachev factor alone does not explain why these ruling elites did not vigorously deploy their own formidable police and security forces. Perhaps the constant demands of the West for international norms of domestic conduct, the East European leaders' yearning for international respectability, and the hard currency credits they so badly needed, played some part.

Yet none of this would have stopped them if they had still been convinced of their right to rule. The decisive factor was the ruling elites' loss of belief in their own right to rule. The ruling elites were not ready to stand up for the things they had so long claimed to believe. They embraced, in indecent haste, the things they had denounced as 'capitalism'.

*From a historian who was in Eastern Europe in 1989.*


**SOURCE B**

Between 1989 and 1991 the world witnessed a unique event: the peacetime dissolution of a national great power and its empire. As soon as Gorbachev had become General Secretary in March 1985 he had filled his government with new people. They were to tell him that Eastern Europe was no longer a strategic necessity, that it was a costly economic burden, and thus it was a source of political embarrassment because it tied a modernising Soviet Union to the socialist dinosaurs who ruled the Eastern European states. On 5 July 1989 Gorbachev announced, 'Democracy affects all countries nowadays. What the Poles and Hungarians decide is their own affair, but we will respect their own decision, whatever it is.'

The East European leaders had been abandoned. The Soviet experience in Afghanistan had convinced Gorbachev that investment in an unpopular communist regime created more problems than it solved. If the Red Army was not to be used against anti-communist dissidents there remained the national armies of the individual states, but experience had already shown that these were not entirely reliable. Moscow could not rely on local forces. The East European regimes were defenceless.

The change in Soviet military thinking came not merely because of Afghanistan. Thinking in Moscow moved from an offensive strategy to a defensive one. This made it possible for Gorbachev to negotiate on troop withdrawals from Eastern Europe. The development of long-range missiles meant there was no longer a need for a buffer zone which Eastern Europe had formed. Moreover, the rising cost of the arms race was wrecking attempts to modernise and improve the Soviet economy. Gorbachev realised that the Soviet Union could not make itself the economic equal of the Western states without the de-Sovietization of Eastern Europe.

*From a history book published in 1994.*

**SOURCE C**

*A cartoon published in Britain in 1988.*



**SOURCE D**

*A photograph of events at the Berlin Wall in November 1989.*

**SOURCE E**

Although I was their superior the people I was working with that night were experiencing what I was. They kept demanding that I do something but I was not sure what to do. So I kept asking them, 'What shall I do? Order you to shoot?' The situation was now so serious that we'd reached a point where we could go no further. All I was thinking about now was to avoid bloodshed. There were so many people and they didn't have the space to move. If panic developed, people would have been crushed. I just did not want anybody to die. We had pistols, there were instructions not to use them but what if any of the men had lost his nerve? Even if he had shot into the air I cannot imagine what reaction that might have provoked. I called headquarters and said, 'We will have to let them all out.' The boss replied, 'You know your instructions and you must do only what they say.'

I said to my men, 'It cannot be held any longer. We have to open the checkpoint. I will let the people out.' My knees began to tremble and I had a very bad feeling in my stomach. I went to the telephone and rang headquarters. I said, 'Comrade, I opened the border. I couldn't hold it any longer. I let them all out.' He said, 'It's O.K.'

*An account by an East German official at a checkpoint on the Berlin Wall. He is describing events in November 1989 when thousands of people gathered on both sides of the Wall and demanded to be let through. He was interviewed by a historian ten years after the events described.*

**SOURCE F**

Dear Mr Gorbachev

I have been deeply moved by the events that have taken place in this country. Dear Mr Gorbachev, would like to express my deeply felt thanks for this, for it was you with your policies of glasnost and perestroika who set the heavy stone of politics in motion. On that day when the people of East Berlin and of East Germany were able to come to us freely, thousands of people shouted out your name, 'Gorbi, Gorbi'. The people fell into each other's arms and wept for joy, because at last they were free after forty-five years of suppression and authoritarian rule under a communist Stalinist system. This dreadful wall and border, which was now being opened up and carried away stone by stone, cost many people their lives and was a source of bitter suffering for many families.

*A letter from a member of the public in Berlin, West Germany, 14 February 1990.*

**SOURCE G**

*A cartoon published in Britain in August 1989. The figures on the right represent Britain, America and Japan.*

**SOURCE H**

Ceausescu ran away a few hours ago. You should have seen the joy, laughter and tears that came then. I'm transfixed, staring out of the window watching tracer-bullets whistling past. The army fights for us. God bless them. They refused to open fire against the people.

I was at the Presidential Palace with my brother when Ceausescu left by helicopter. The crowd was like a wild monster with a hundred mouths against Ceausescu. The crowd would have torn him to pieces and devoured him.

*An eyewitness account of events in Bucharest, Romania, on 22 December 1989.*

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 own 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 this cartoon? Explain your answer using details of the source and your knowledge. [8]

**3** Study Sources D and E.

Is one of these sources more useful than the other? Explain your answer using details of the sources and your knowledge. [8]

**4** Study Source F.

How reliable is this source as evidence about the fall of the Berlin Wall? Explain your answer using details of the source and your knowledge. [7]

**5** Study Source G.

Why was this cartoon published in 1989? Explain your answer using details of the source and your knowledge. [8]

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

Do these sources provide convincing evidence that Gorbachev was responsible for the collapse of Communist control of Eastern Europe? Use the sources to explain your answer. [12]

---

Copyright Acknowledgements:

Option A Source A	© P Batty & P Parish, <i>The Divided Union, The Story of the American Civil War 1861–65</i> ; Penguin, 1988.
Option A Source B	© Alan Farmer, <i>The American Civil War 1861–65</i> ; Hodder & Stoughton, 2002.
Option A Source C	© Alan Farmer, <i>The American Civil War 1861–65</i> ; Hodder & Stoughton, 2002.
Option A Source D	© Alan Farmer, <i>The American Civil War 1861–65</i> ; Hodder & Stoughton, 2002.
Option A Source E	© Harpweek. BlackHistory.
Option A Source F	© Harpweek. Editorial Black History.
Option A Source G	© Alan Farmer, <i>The American Civil War 1861–65</i> ; Hodder & Stoughton, 2002.
Option A Source H	© arthisto.umn.Tennielweb/punch, Punch.
Option B Source A	© Timothy Garton Ash, <i>We the People, The Revolution of 89</i> ; Penguin, 1990.
Option B Source B	© R J Crampton, <i>Eastern Europe in the Twentieth Century</i> ; Routledge, 1994.
Option B Source C	© The British Cartoon Archive.
Option B Source D	© Tony Lancaster & Derek Peaple, <i>The Modern World</i> ; Causeway Press, 1996.
Option B Source E	© Christopher Hilton, <i>The Wall, The People's Story</i> ; Sutton Publishing, 2002.
Option B Source F	© Ben Walsh, <i>GCSE Modern World</i> ; p.322, John Murray, 1996.
Option B Source G	© The British Cartoon Archive.
Option B Source H	© John Traynor, <i>Europe 1890–1990</i> ; Nelson, 1991.

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.