



# Cambridge International AS & A Level

---

**HISTORY****9489/03**

Paper 3 Interpretations question

**For examination from 2021**

SPECIMEN PAPER

**1 hour 15 minutes**

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 **6** pages. Blank pages are indicated.

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.

Princip did not intend to inspire Austria to invade Serbia. Quite the contrary, under questioning by his captors he attempted to keep them from learning of any connection between the Serbs and himself. Moreover, the Austro-Hungarian foreign office was at work planning the destruction of Serbia even before Princip struck. The troubled and confused adolescent terrorist did indeed open the door to the Austrian invasion by killing the Archduke who had been blocking the way to war, but Princip did not know that; what he did, in that respect, was unintentional.

Kaiser Wilhelm, Chancellor Bethmann, Foreign Minister ~~a~~ *g*ow, and an assortment of their German military and civilian colleagues, encouraged the Austrians to launch an attack on Serbia, and so were directly responsible for that war. However in the case of the Kaiser, when it looked as though there were a peaceful solution, he opted for it enthusiastically.

Austro-Hungarian Foreign Minister Berchtold was the man most responsible for bringing about the Serbian war. Sometime during or after the Balkan Wars he decided that his country could survive only if Serbia were crushed and altogether eliminated as a factor in politics. He seems to have believed that a merely diplomatic triumph would be insubstantial and might not last. Only victory in war would achieve his goal, and that could be accomplished only if Germany would keep Russia from interfering, while big Austria-Hungary crushed little Serbia.

As soon as Germany's blank cheque was received, Berchtold put himself to work starting his war. He was, like Princip, persistent and undiscouraged. He refused to be turned aside. He would not be drawn into conversations or negotiations that might trap him into keeping the peace, even (and this confused other leaders) on favourable terms. The other players in European politics found the ~~u~~ *l*y crisis uniquely puzzling because they sensed they were missing something. What they were missing was the knowledge that Vienna did not want peace. They assumed that Berchtold hoped to secure his terms, which might well have been ~~ek~~ *re*me. But he did not desire his terms or any terms; he preferred to fight a war. After the war he did not want a subservient Serbia (as the Kaiser wanted); he wanted there to be no Serbia at all.

Berchtold operated under severe handicaps: the machinery of the Austro-Hungarian state moved with maddening slowness. He could not move swiftly enough to achieve the outcome that the Germans wanted. Everything took time, time during which the powers might impose a peace. Since his armies could not move for weeks, he declared war anyway, doing nothing but using the 'at war' status to fend off potential peacemakers.

Berchtold had one great asset in pursuing his goal. The foreign minister of any other great power would have been reined in by his allies. If Russia wanted to invade a neighbour, France – which financed Russia's military ~~ep~~ *an*sion – would keep St Petersburg from doing so. When Germany meddled in Morocco in 1911, even Austria-Hungary refused support and thereby helped stop Berlin. Only one country had an ally that would not restrain it, that would support it blindly. That was Austria-Hungary, backed unconditionally by Germany, and it was the one country in Europe led by a man who was determined to start a war.

*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]

## Section B: Topic 2

### The Holocaust

2 Read the extract and then answer the question.

In every country that suffered Nazi and Fascist occupation Jews were found taking part in the struggle against the enemy. This aspect of the anti-Nazi Jewish campaign took many different forms and reached considerable proportions.

Throughout Europe the Jews were condemned to death. For every Jew in occupied Europe, passively obeying the orders of the authorities could have no other effect – except by a miracle – than death. The only way a Jew could hope to survive was by disobeying the orders of the German occupying forces. This disobedience could take many different forms; armed resistance was only one of them. It began with refusing to be registered as a Jew, refusing to wear the yellow star, refusing to go to the assembly points, refusing to live in the ghettos. Some Jews infringed German orders by procuring false identity papers and ration books. They tried to go into hiding, and above all to ensure that their wives and children were out of harm's way, and here they were often obliged to depend upon the non-Jewish population. In most cases, and particularly in Western Europe, national resistance movements considered it one of their main duties to come to the aid of Jews on the run. Hitler's war against the Jews was in a way a 'war within a war', and from the Jewish point of view, every time one of these 'small' actions succeeded, the Nazis suffered a setback. Since it was a question of killing all Jews, each Jew who escaped represented a defeat for the Third Reich. Every time a Jew provided himself with false papers and went into hiding, either to take part in resistance activities or simply to avoid being deported, he accomplished an anti-German act, an act of resistance.

When the Jews obeyed Nazi laws and regulations, or those of the Nazis' local accomplices, they suffered enormous losses. The more closely they conformed to the law, the less were their chances of surviving. Where they disobeyed the law by changing identity, leaving their homes or their ghettos and going into hiding, the percentage of losses visibly diminished, sometimes showing a spectacular drop. In Kiev, capital of the Ukraine, only one Jew survived out of the 33000 or so resident in the city when the Germans entered, while in the Jewish resistance in the swamps of White Russia, where whole families had sought refuge under the armed protection, such as it was, of the Jewish Resistance fighters, at least half of the fugitives survived.

However, the Jewish Resistance came up against enormous problems. The ceaseless surveillance of the Gestapo and the local police was by no means the only problem. Sheer terror of the Nazis drove most of the ghetto population to oppose any action likely to provoke reprisals. In an extreme case in Vilna, the leader of the ghetto resistance organisation was literally forced by the other inhabitants to give himself up to the Gestapo; and even when the Jewish population were less timorous, the Resistance fighters remained isolated. This sort of reaction was in no way confined to Jews, and in all the occupied countries only a minority took part in the resistance.

*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 inevitable consequence of the Second World War was an active and aggressive US intervention in ever-widening reaches of the globe, for, left alone, the transformation of European and Asian societies in unknown and undesirable ways, from Washington's viewpoint, was certain. This meant US interference in internal social conflicts to prevent the imminent victories of leftist forces and the provision of economic and military aid to rightist and capitalist elements wherever they might still be found to fill the breach. Only in Eastern Europe was such a strategy impossible, if only because there the security interests of the Soviet Union clashed with the policies of the US.

Washington's concern for Russian policies and actions must not obscure the great measure to which US policy merely fitted the Soviet problem into a much larger context, a framework which would have existed apart from anything Russia might have done. Indeed, no one can understand Soviet-US relations except as one of a number of vital aspects of the larger advancement and application of heightened US power in the post-war world, a greater undertaking that time and again was never caused by Russian policy and very often in no way involved Moscow. The so-called Cold War, in brief, was far less the confrontation of the US with Russia than US expansion into the entire world; a world the Soviet Union neither controlled nor created.

It was both easy and rational for Washington in the months immediately after the war to focus on the intentions of the Soviet Union and the seeming threat it posed to the restoration and reformation of the pre-war world which was the starting point for US wartime planning for the peace. Events in Iran, Eastern Europe, and elsewhere reinforced the increasingly bitter wartime diplomatic relations with Russia. Washington could not distinguish between left-wingers in the Greek mountains or in northern French coalfields and the policies of the Kremlin. It did not necessitate the total collapse of the London foreign ministers' conference during September 1945 to create a deeply pessimistic vision in Washington of the future course of relations with Russia, for that had existed for well over a year. It certainly did not require the hypersensitive dispatches of Kennan from the Moscow embassy, with their ingenious discoveries of grand strategies and meanings in this or that *Pravda* article; these were filed away and largely ignored. The ambassador to Moscow, Harriman, had his own cheerless opinion and the more important Soviet experts in the State Department fully shared it. By his wartime record and his first six months in office Secretary of State Byrnes had shown his stern firmness towards Russia and by the beginning of 1946 was learning to adopt the tone as well as the substance of US policy towards the USSR. 'I am tired of babying the Soviets,' Truman scolded him in January 1946. 'Unless Russia is faced with an iron fist and strong language another war is in the making.' Such blunt, tough style was what made the President most comfortable, and the Russians had already been familiar with it since April 1945. No later than the beginning of 1946, the critical American policymakers were assuming that Russia had embarked on a course that would certainly lead to sharp conflict and probably, someday, to war.

*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]



**BLANK PAGE**

---

**Copyright Acknowledgements:**

- Section A: © Excerpt(s) from EUROPE'S LAST SUMMER: WHO STARTED THE GREAT WAR IN 1914? by David Fromkin, copyright © 2014 by David Fromkin. Used by permission of Alfred A. Knopf, an imprint of the Knopf Doubleday Publishing Group, a division of Penguin Random House LLC. All rights reserved. From *Europe's Last Summer* by David Fromkin, published by William Heinemann, reprinted by permission of The Random House Group Limited. © 2004.
- Section B: © Lucien Steinberg; *Jews Against Hitler*; Gordon and Cremonesi; 1978.
- Section C: © J & G Kolko; *The Limits of Power*; Harper and Row; 1972.

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.

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.