



UNIVERSITY OF CAMBRIDGE INTERNATIONAL EXAMINATIONS  
International General Certificate of Secondary Education

**HISTORY**

**0470/02**

Paper 2

**October/November 2007**

**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 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****WAS GARIBALDI MORE IMPORTANT TO THE ACHIEVEMENT  
OF ITALIAN UNIFICATION THAN CAVOUR?**

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

**Background Information**

The years 1859–1861 were crucial in the story of Italian Unification. By 1860 Piedmont had, with French help, acquired Lombardy and the states of Central Italy. In May 1860 Garibaldi led his 'Thousand' to support the revolution in Sicily. He conquered Sicily and in August he returned to the mainland and proceeded to conquer Naples. Rome was his next target. Garibaldi's exploits horrified Cavour who quickly sent a Piedmontese army south to intervene (conquering some of the Papal Territories on the way). Garibaldi was persuaded to hand over his conquests to Victor Emmanuel II in October and the Kingdom of Italy was proclaimed in March 1861.

Historians have argued over the importance of Garibaldi in the achievement of unification. Was he just an idealistic romantic revolutionary? Was he used by Cavour? Or did he make an essential contribution, one that made him more important than Cavour?

**SOURCE A**

*A drawing of Garibaldi at the Battle of Calatafimi in 1860 during the conquest of Sicily.*

**SOURCE B**

*A painting of Cavour.*

**SOURCE C**

The greater the danger the more clear and calm he became, and the more correct his judgement. He always had supreme confidence in himself and thus he was reluctant to ask advice from others.

He loved liberty, but he maintained that in the hour of danger it was necessary for all to obey the will of one individual. Some people said he had fallen in love with dictatorship when he saw how it operated successfully in South America.

What often harmed him was that he believed all men were honest and devoted to their country. He trusted people too easily. No man can say he ever saw Garibaldi use threats of force to make his soldiers obey him. No man ever heard his voice raised in anger. His reputation for justice, honesty, and goodness formed a halo around his head. The man had something so majestic about him that just to hear his voice you would rush joyfully to face death as if it were a fine thing to die observed and approved by such a man.

*A description of Garibaldi, published in 1903, by one of the 'Thousand' who sailed with him to Sicily.*

**SOURCE D**

Only outside Italy, and by persons who have not studied Risorgimento history in any detail, do we ever hear it denied that Garibaldi's great expedition of 1860 carried on the main work of Italian unity, at a time when no other means could have achieved it. The Sicilian and Neapolitan populations were incapable of bringing about a revolution in the face of an army of 90 000 men, without external help. Cavour was unable to give them the necessary help because of the attitude of France and Austria. Nothing could have liberated Sicily and Naples except a raid by the revolutionary party, and no such raid could have succeeded except one led by Garibaldi. It was only this that put Cavour into the position where he could unite the whole of Italy into one state.

*From a book about Garibaldi, published in 1909.*

**SOURCE E**


During the 1850s Cavour considered unification of Italy neither possible nor desirable; he therefore differed from Garibaldi who argued that a 'single Italy must be our first goal'. Cavour wanted only an enlarged Piedmont. Between 1859 and 1860, however, Cavour was pushed along by events. He was seriously concerned about the activities of Garibaldi and the 'Thousand' in Sicily and Naples and their threat to the Papal States. He realised that to oppose Garibaldi would incur the hatred of Italian patriots everywhere. To take no action would enable Garibaldi to establish a rival state in the south or give him credit for the unification of Italy. Cavour found this prospect dreadful and was determined that 'the King cannot accept the crown of Italy at the hand of Garibaldi'. The only solution was to take direct action and outmanoeuvre Garibaldi. The overall result would have to be a kingdom covering the whole of Italy.

*From a book published in 1982.*

**SOURCE F**

Cavour is known in history as the architect of the modern kingdom of Italy. It was Cavour who won the respect and confidence of Europe. It was Cavour who won the gratitude of the Western Powers by helping them in the Crimean War. It was Cavour who brought Napoleon III into Italy in 1859 and broke the power of Austria. It was Cavour who kept Italy from foreign interference while Garibaldi won the Kingdom of Naples for Italy and Victor Emmanuel. Italy found in Cavour a man who viewed Italy as a single problem and lifted it from a mere redistribution of Italian soil on to the higher level of the creation of a nation.

*From a biography of Cavour published in 1925.*

**SOURCE G**

*A cartoon entitled 'The man in possession', published in Britain in 1860.*

**SOURCE H**

RIGHT LEG IN THE BOOT AT LAST.

“IF IT WON’T GO ON, SIRE, TRY A LITTLE MORE POWDER.”

*A cartoon published in Britain in November 1860.*

**SOURCE I**

Garibaldi has become intoxicated by success and by the praise showered on him all over Europe. He is planning the wildest schemes. He feels it 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, and in the end Venice. The Government here has no influence on him. We must prevent Garibaldi from conquering Naples, and we must try to annex Sicily as soon as possible. Were Garibaldi to become master of the Neapolitan provinces we would not be able to stop him from compromising us with France and Europe.

*A letter from Cavour to the Piedmontese Ambassador in Paris, 12 July 1860.*

**SOURCE J**

Your Majesty knows the high esteem and love I have for you. But the present state of things in Italy does not allow me to obey you as I should have wished. Called by the people, I delayed as long as I could. But if now in spite of all the calls that reach me, I were longer to delay, I should fail in my duty and endanger the sacred cause of Italy. Allow me then Sire, this time to disobey you. As soon as I shall have fulfilled what I have undertaken, by freeing the peoples from a hated tyranny, I will lay down my sword at your feet and obey you for the rest of my life.

*A letter from Garibaldi to Victor Emmanuel II, 22 July 1860.  
This letter was immediately published by Cavour.*

**SOURCE K**

Cavour could not risk an open war with Naples; on the other hand, if he did nothing, he might be faced with radical revolution in northern Italy. Radical energy had to be released somewhere: better against Sicily and Naples, than against Cavour. The fighting revolutionary Garibaldi agreed to be diverted to Sicily. Cavour did nothing to interfere with Garibaldi. By launching Garibaldi he had given the revolution a chance to organise itself; now he had to show that he could do for Italy as much as the radicals were promising. Cavour planned to annex Naples to preserve the monarchical character of the Italian movement. Garibaldi was too quick for Cavour: he crossed to the mainland before Cavour was ready to move. He now had to persuade Garibaldi to recognise the authority of Victor Emmanuel over southern Italy.

*From a book published in 1954.*

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.

Compare the impressions these sources give of Garibaldi and Cavour. Explain your answer using details of the sources. [7]

**2** Study Source C.

Do you think this description of Garibaldi can be trusted? Explain your answer using details of the source and your knowledge. [8]

**3** Study Sources D, E and F.

Which of these three sources agree the most? Explain your answer using details of the sources and your knowledge. [8]

**4** Study Sources G and H.

How far do these two cartoons share the same message? Explain your answer using details of the sources and your knowledge. [7]

**5** Study Sources I and J.

Do you think Cavour and Victor Emmanuel would have stopped worrying after they had read Garibaldi's letter? Explain your answer using details of the sources and your knowledge. [8]

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

Do these sources convince you that Garibaldi was more important than Cavour in the achievement of the unification of Italy? Use the sources to explain your answer. [12]

**Option B: 20th Century topic****WAS THE UNITED NATIONS' INVOLVEMENT IN KOREA MORE ABOUT THE AUTHORITY OF THE UN OR THE DESIRE OF THE USA TO FIGHT COMMUNISM?**

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

**Background Information**

When the UN was set up in 1945 one of its main aims was to encourage peace and prevent war. It was hoped that the UN would be successful because, unlike the League of Nations, it was led by the world's most powerful countries that had united to defeat Hitler. However, the growing hostility between the USA and the USSR soon began to disrupt the work of the UN.

When, in June 1950, forces from communist North Korea invaded South Korea with Russian approval, the UN sent an army to support the South. Most of the soldiers were American and an American, General MacArthur, was appointed as UN Commander-in-Chief. The UN regarded the invasion as a threat to its authority, but the US government seemed to see it more as an example of a world-wide threat from communism.

Was the UN effort in Korea about defending the authority and reputation of the UN, or was it really about the USA's desire to continue the Cold War and fight the spread of communism?

**SOURCE A**

In June 1950 the North Korean army invaded the South across the 38th parallel. It was a clear act of aggression and the United Nations acted swiftly and with some effect. A resolution was passed calling for the sending of United Nations' forces to assist the South Korean government.

The USSR, as a member of the UN Security Council, could have opposed the resolution. The Soviet veto would have been enough to prevent a single UN soldier setting foot in Korea. Unfortunately for the Soviets they were at that time boycotting the UN in protest at the refusal of the UN to admit Communist China. The resolution was passed without opposition. The vast majority of the troops came from the United States but 15 other countries, including Britain, contributed troops to the UN force as well.

*From a history book published in Britain.*

**SOURCE B**

There was bitter hostility between the North's Communist leader, Kim Il Sung, and Syngman Rhee, the President of South Korea. In 1950 this hostility spilled over into open warfare. North Korean troops overwhelmed the South's forces. By September 1950 all except a small corner of south-east Korea was under Communist control.

President Truman immediately sent advisers, supplies and warships to Korea. At the same time, he put enormous pressure on the UN Security Council to condemn the actions of the North Koreans and to call on them to withdraw their troops. When the resolution was passed the USSR was not even at the meeting to use its veto. The USA was the single biggest contributor to the UN budget and was therefore in a powerful position to influence the UN decision. The UN was now committed to using armed forces to drive the North Korean troops out of South Korea.

*From a history book published in Britain.*

**SOURCE C**

We cannot stand idly by when the American imperialist, a notorious enemy, is now expanding its war of aggression against our Korean neighbour and is attempting to spread the aggressive flames to the borders of our country.

*From a Chinese newspaper, October 1950.*

**SOURCE D**

*A South Korean poster from 1950 showing what the South Koreans feared would happen to their country.*

**SOURCE E**

My God, that's war against the United Nations.

*Trygve Lie, Secretary-General of the UN, on hearing about the invasion of South Korea by North Korea.*



**SOURCE F**

Acheson had called again to inform Truman that the attack was a full-scale invasion. Truman had said at once, 'Dean, we've got to stop the damn Commies no matter what!' The decision had taken about ten seconds, and that was all there was to it.

*A television producer's account of what Truman had told him about events on 25 June 1950. Dean Acheson was in charge of American foreign policy at the time.*

**SOURCE G**

If the UN is ever going to do anything, this is the time, and if the UN cannot bring the crisis in Korea to an end then we might as well just give up on the United Nations and forget it.

*Tom Connally, an extreme anti-communist member of the American Senate, speaking in 1950.*

**SOURCE H**

*A cartoon from a British newspaper, November 1950. It shows General MacArthur ordering a South Korean tank to stop.*

**SOURCE I**

Our principal difficulty is General MacArthur. His policy is different from the policy of the UN. He seems to want war with China. We do not. It is no exaggeration to say that by his public utterances he has weakened public confidence in this country and in Western Europe in the quality of American political judgement and leadership. Here we seem to have a case of a commander publicly suggesting that his policy is not the stated policy of his government, nor subject to the control of his own government.

*From a telegram from the British Foreign Secretary to the British Ambassador in the USA, early April 1951.*

**SOURCE J**

I have received your announcement of your appointment of me as United Nations Commander. I can only repeat the pledge of my complete personal loyalty to you as well as an absolute devotion to your struggle for peace and good will throughout the world. I hope I will not fail you.

*General MacArthur writing to Truman in 1950.*

**SOURCE K**

A constant stream of propaganda flowed from MacArthur's headquarters directed as much against the American Government as against the communists. MacArthur was disgusted by the attitude of America's feeble allies. He spread word of a conspiracy by the British to persuade the United States to give Red China Taiwan's seat at the UN. The constant message from MacArthur was that any compromise in Korea which left the Chinese militarily undefeated, would be a national disaster for the United States.

*From a British history book published in 1987*

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 similar are these two accounts of events leading to the Korean War? Explain your answer using details of the sources. [6]

**2** Study Sources C and D.

Why do you think these two sources disagree? Explain your answer using details of the sources and your knowledge. [7]

**3** Study Sources E, F and G.

How far would Trygve Lie and Truman have agreed with Connally? Explain your answer using details of the sources and your knowledge. [8]

**4** Study Sources H and I.

Do these sources prove that the United States was fully supporting the UN in Korea? Explain your answer using the details of the sources and your knowledge. [9]

**5** Study Sources J and K.

Are you surprised by Source J? Explain your answer using details of the sources and your knowledge. [8]

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

Do these sources provide convincing evidence that the Korean War was more about the USA's fight against communism than defending the authority of the UN? Use the sources to explain your answer. [12]

## BLANK PAGE

---

*Copyright Acknowledgements:*

Option A Source A	© Peter Newark Military Pictures.
Option A Source K	© A.J.P. Taylor; <i>The Struggle for Mastery in Europe, 1848–1918</i> ; Oxford University Press.
Option B Source A	© Neil DeMarco; <i>The World This Century: Working with Evidence</i> ; Collins Educational; 1987.
Option B Source B	© Ben Walsh; <i>GCSE Modern World History</i> ; John Murray; 1996.
Option B Source H	© Solo Syndication/Associated Newspapers.
Option B Source K	© Max Hastings; <i>The Korean War</i> ; Pan; 1988.

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.

University of 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.