Cambridge Assessment International Education

Cambridge International AS & A Level

HISTORY **9489/32**

Paper 3 Interpretations Question **May/June 2021**

1 hour 15 minutes

4978095471

You must answer on the enclosed answer booklet.

You will need: Answer booklet (enclosed)

INSTRUCTIONS

- Answer **one** question from **one** section only.
  - Section A: The origins of the First World War
  - Section B: The Holocaust
  - Section C: The origins and development of the Cold War
- 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 40.
- The number of marks for each question or part question is shown in brackets [ ].

This document has **4** pages.

© UCLES 2021

Answer **one** question from **one** section only.

Section A: Topic 1

The origins of the First World War

1 Read the extract and then answer the question.

The conflict of military and political interests, of resentment and ideas, which found expression in the July crisis, left no government of any of the European powers free of some measure of responsibility—greater or smaller—for the outbreak of the war. It is, however, not the purpose of this work to enter into the familiar controversy over the question of war guilt, to discuss exhaustively the responsibility of the individual statesmen and soldiers of all the European powers concerned, or to pass judgement on them. We are concerned solely with the German leaders' objectives and with the policy actually followed by them in the July crisis, and only in relation to how their policy throws light on the assumptions and origins of Germany's war aims.

Given the tenseness of the world situation in 1914, any limited or local war in Europe directly involving one great power would inevitably carry with it the imminent danger of a general war. Germany's world policy, which had already led to three dangerous crises (those of 1905, 1908 and 1911), was largely responsible for this tension. As Germany willed and sought the Austrian–Serbian war and, in its confidence in its military superiority, deliberately faced the risk of conflict with Russia and France, its leaders must bear a substantial share of the historical responsibility for the outbreak of general war in 1914. This responsibility is not lessened by the fact that at the last moment Germany tried to stop the inevitable war, for its efforts to influence Vienna were due exclusively to the threat of British intervention and, even so, they were half-hearted, belated and immediately withdrawn.

German politicians and writers, both during and after the war—particularly after Versailles—invariably maintained that the war was forced on Germany, or at least that Germany's share of the responsibility was no greater than that of the other participants. But confidential exchanges between Germany and Austria, and between the responsible figures in Germany itself, throw a revealing spotlight on the real responsibility. A few weeks after the outbreak of war, the Austrians asked urgently for German help against the superior Russian armies facing them. It was refused. Tisza (the Hungarian Prime Minister) then advised Berchtold to tell the Germans that 'We took our decision to go to war on the strength of the express statements both of the Kaiser and of the German Chancellor that they regarded the moment as suitable and would be glad if we showed our support'. Just three years later, in August 1917, at the climax of a heated debate whether the war should be continued in the interests of Germany's war aims, Austria's Foreign Minister, Czernin, told the Germans present that 'It was not Austria alone that began the war then'. Characteristically, the official German record of the meeting left Czernin's next sentence incomplete, but the records of the German High Command gave it in full: 'It was Germany which demanded that the ultimatum to Serbia should be drawn up in those sharp terms.'

The official documents prove that during the July crisis the Kaiser, the German military leaders and the Foreign Ministry were pressing Austria-Hungary to strike against Serbia without delay, or alternatively agreed to the despatch of an ultimatum to Serbia which made war between the two countries more than probable. In doing so they deliberately took the risk of a continental war against Russia and France.

What can you learn from this extract about the interpretation and approach of the historian who wrote it? Use the extract and your knowledge of the origins of the First World War to explain your answer. [40]

© UCLES 2021

Section B: Topic 2

The Holocaust

2 Read the extract and then answer the question.

By late 1941 the Germans and their allies were slaughtering Jews throughout the east. The Wehrmacht was fully involved. It had moved far beyond facilitating the Einsatzgruppen by participating in the murder of Jews as 'resistance fighters'. Now the army operated on its own initiative. On the order of General Braemer, army commander in Ostland, a police reserve battalion attached to his forces massacred the inhabitants of the local ghettos.

The perpetrators knew what to do on the ground. But they were not quite clear about policy. The 'Brown Portfolio', the official guidelines for the treatment of Jews, did not mention genocide. Nor were the perpetrators totally comfortable murdering German Jews. As the General Commander for Belorussia explained to his superior, Heinrich Lohse, the Reich Commissioner for Ostland: 'I am certainly tough and prepared to do my bit toward the solution of the Jewish Question, but people from our own cultural sphere are rather different from the uncivilised hordes living here.' Lohse, a civilian Nazi, sympathised. He had intervened in the execution of some Jews two months earlier. When the SS complained to Berlin, he protested that he had not been given clear instructions: 'I have forbidden the indiscriminate executions of Jews because they were not carried out in a justifiable manner. Is there a directive to liquidate all Jews in the east? Is this to take place without regard to age or sex and their usefulness to the economy? So far I have not been able to find such a directive either in the regulations regarding the Jewish Question in the 'Brown Portfolio' or in other decrees.' It took the political department of the Ministry of the Eastern Territories over a month to respond: 'The Jewish Question has probably been clarified by now through verbal discussions. Economic considerations are to be regarded as fundamentally irrelevant.'

Deeply anti-Semitic, Hitler believed the myth of the immensely powerful Jew. He had trusted the American Jews to keep their government out of the war in order to protect their fellow Jews in Germany. Now that Germany was at war with the United States, he no longer had any use for the German Jews. Still, Lohse's question remained unanswered. What was the government policy with regard to the Jews, and who was responsible for formulating and implementing it? If Himmler was sure of anything, it was that he wanted to be in charge and not some local Gauleiters, Reichskommissars, or—far worse for the political future of the SS—Wehrmacht generals. He saw himself as Hitler's most loyal servant, and he understood that his Führer was determined to annihilate the Jews. Himmler wished above all else to 'work towards the Führer'. In addition, his vision of a German East was close to his heart. He took seriously his mission of forging a *Volk* of physically perfect and genetically German people entitled to the *Lebensraum* of the east. But how to manage it? He knew that Hitler would not appoint him Reich Commissioner for the Final Solution of the Jewish Question. Indeed, he knew that the Führer now regretted the written authorisation he had given for the euthanasia programme. Himmler had to gain official authorisation another way. Göring's letter expanding Heydrich's authority to 'carry out all necessary preparations with regard to organisational and financial viewpoints for a total solution of the Jewish Question in the German sphere of influence in Europe' was the best Himmler could do. He would use it to establish his authority.

What can you learn from this extract about the interpretation and approach of the historian who wrote it? Use the extract and your knowledge of the Holocaust to explain your answer. [40]

Section C: Topic 3

The origins and development of the Cold War

3 Read the extract and then answer the question.

The type of risk-taking in which US officials wanted to engage, and the magnitude of the military capabilities they sought to deploy, would have been justified only if the Russians intended to seek world domination. For the most part, Truman administration officials did believe this of the Kremlin. And in this respect US policymakers made another significant error. Greatly fearing the appeal of Communist ideology to the war-devastated and disillusioned peoples of Europe, US officials confused the ideological aspects of Marxist-Leninist thought with the actions and behaviours of the Soviet leaders. Policymakers in Washington wrongly saw Communist aspirations and Russian intentions as the same thing. Seeing before them a potentially strong totalitarian opponent with an apparently attractive ideology, Truman administration officials refused to acknowledge that their enemy, however untrustworthy and cruel, had far-reaching security requirements of its own.

It is clear that Soviet behaviour was not consistently aggressive. At the end of the war, Soviet leaders must have been tempted to exploit a uniquely favourable situation. Their armies dominated eastern Europe. Germany and Japan were defeated. Communist resistance fighters were at the peak of their popularity in most of the countries formerly occupied by the Axis powers. Yet Stalin and his colleagues did not take all of the opportunities that lay before them. They did consolidate their hold over their immediate periphery in Poland, Romania and Bulgaria; they did manoeuvre for greater influence in Germany; they did put pressure on Iran and make demands upon Turkey. But the Soviets also demobilised their armies and withdrew from important areas. In 1945 and 1946 they pulled their troops out of northern Norway and Baltic islands, established acceptable governments in Austria and Finland, allowed free elections in Hungary and Czechoslovakia, and discouraged revolutionary action in France, Italy and Greece. Soviet actions were not entirely unselfish. To the extent that they maintained friendly ties with the Americans, they could hope to secure loans and reparations, and avoid the political and military costs of renewed rivalry with their wartime allies. Most of all, maintenance of the wartime coalition constituted the key to averting the possible revival of an aggressive Germany. Stalin saw Germany as the foremost security danger to long-term Soviet interests. Through collaborative action with its wartime allies, the Soviet Union might be able to control Germany's resurgence by extracting reparations, regulating its industrial production and overseeing its political reorientation.

Yet much as they might have had an incentive to cooperate with the West, the Russians could not do so at the expense of their most vital security priorities. Hence, they could not comply with US conditions that they accept popular elections, self-determination, and open trade with the countries neighbouring them. Nor could they satisfy US demands that they defer reparation payments and provide raw materials and foodstuffs to the Western zones of Germany. Free elections would lead to the emergence of hostile governments on Russian borders. Open trade would draw its East European neighbours into the Western orbit. Two German invasions within a generation dictated the essential need for a buffer zone. And if Stalin had accepted US policy in Germany, he would have found himself sacrificing Russia's economic and strategic priorities in order to reduce the financial burdens on the Americans and the British in order to advance West European recovery. Given the devastation Soviet Russia had endured at the hands of the Nazis, it was unreasonable to expect any Soviet leader to comply with such priorities.

What can you learn from this extract about the interpretation and approach of the historian who wrote it? Use the extract and your knowledge of the Cold War to explain your answer. [40]

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.