
HISTORY

9389/33

Paper 3 Interpretations Question

May/June 2016

1 hour

No Additional Materials are required.

READ THESE INSTRUCTIONS FIRST

An answer booklet is provided inside this question paper. You should follow the instructions on the front cover of the answer booklet. If you need additional answer paper ask the invigilator for a continuation booklet.

This paper contains **three** sections:

Section A: Topic 1 The Causes and Impact of British Imperialism, c. 1850–1939

Section B: Topic 2 The Holocaust

Section C: Topic 3 The Origins and Development of the Cold War, 1941–1950

Answer the question on the topic you have studied.

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

This document consists of **4** printed pages and **1** Insert.

Section A: Topic 1**The Causes and Impact of British Imperialism, c.1850–1939**

- 1 Read the extract and then answer the question.

In 1880 the British could still regard the world as their oyster, but with marginally less confidence than twenty or thirty years earlier. Britain was still the world's only global power and much, perhaps the greater part, of its international strength lay in its ability to influence weaker, less developed states rather than the possession of a territorial empire. In some areas the need for the old-style informal empire was disappearing. In 1886 the commander of the Cape Squadron told the Admiralty that it was no longer necessary for warships to police the waters off the River Plate. The days of violent revolutions and civil wars had passed and the slave trade had been ended. Now governments kept order and British lives and property were respected.

A greater change was now occurring throughout the world. Contemporaries called it the 'new imperialism', a phrase that was subsequently taken up by historians to describe the sudden surge of annexations by the great powers, chiefly in Africa, the Far East and the Pacific. In fact, there was little that was novel about this phenomenon except its frenzied pace and the participation of states which had previously avoided overseas expansion. The reasons for this outbreak of conquests and occupation of underdeveloped and militarily weak countries by the industrial nations were complex. Everywhere there was plenty of heady talk about the progress of mankind and the spread of civilisation. But behind the bombast of late nineteenth-century imperialism lay economic uncertainties and self-doubts which troubled both old and new imperial powers. From 1872 the patterns of world trade were changing in ways which hurt all countries, particularly Britain. From then until 1896 there was a world-wide recession to which many governments reacted by dropping free trade in favour of protection. As the tariff barriers went up, British exports tumbled. While adhering to the dogma of free trade, Britain had to keep abreast of her rivals. Businessmen, often acting through their local chambers of commerce, began urging a policy of annexation on the government to prevent existing or potential markets from being lost. Colonial lobbying became a growth industry during the last years of the nineteenth century. In Britain the imperialists made alliances with the owners of the new, cheap, mass-circulation press which had the power to sway popular opinion. The press invited the public to participate in the international bargaining for territory and occasional head-on collisions which marked the period of the new imperialism. It was soon found that the masses could be whipped into a belligerent frenzy whenever it appeared that their country was being flouted.

How could Britain adjust to and survive in a world which was rapidly changing and where the dice were no longer in its favour? The old formula of free trade and unofficial empire was no longer practical in an age where other countries were establishing their own, jealously guarded spheres of influence. The practical response was to discard the old beliefs and join in the rush to acquire territory, if only to prevent rivals from doing so. Thus when unofficial empire collapsed in Egypt in 1882, Gladstone's government substituted direct control, occupying the country by force. There was no imperial masterplan beyond a determination to ensure the absolute security of India. In broad terms, Britain was simply committed to hanging on to its old influence, even if this meant replacing informal with direct control.

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 British Empire 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 33 000 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, 1941–1950

3 Read the extract and then answer the question.

The inevitable consequence of the Second World War was an active and aggressive American 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 American 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 United States.

Washington’s concern for Russian policies and actions must not obscure the great measure to which American 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-American relations except as one of a number of vital aspects of the larger advancement and application of heightened American 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 United States with Russia than American 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 American war-time 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 American 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 policy-makers 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]

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 International Examinations Copyright Acknowledgements Booklet. This is produced for each series of examinations and is freely available to download at www.cie.org.uk after the live examination series.

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.