



Suggested answers to 2016 COMBINED HUMANITIES (History) Paper 3 2204

1a)

The source is useful as an evidence about Nazi Germany as Source A tells me that lives of the Germans under the rule of Hitler had improved. This can be seen from the source which states that, "there can be no doubt that he has achieved a marvellous transformation in the spirit of the people and their economic and social outlook." This means that Hitler's rule had made Germany prosperous and the standard of living for people in Germany had improved significantly.

Source A is reliable and useful as an evidence about Nazi Germany as Source A is supported by Source D. Source D tells me that under Hitler's rule, lives were made better. This can be seen from Source D which states that, "We were poor, my mother made clothes, so I always felt a bit shabby and suddenly I had a fine uniform." This means that because of Hitler, Germans were happier and more satisfied with their lives, signifying that Germany was indeed more prosperous and the lives of people under Hitler had improved. Since Source D supports Source A, Source A is hence useful as an evidence about Nazi Germany.

Source A is unreliable and limited in its usefulness as an evidence about Nazi Germany as Source A is contradicted by Source E which tells me that the lives of German citizens had deteriorated. This can be seen in Source E which states that, "Instead we have military exercises, down in the mud, until we were exhausted." This means Germans were over exhausted and made to work excessively hence showing that there wasn't an improvement in their standard of living. Since Source E contradicts Source A, Source A is hence unreliable and limited in its usefulness.

Source A is useful as it is by David Lloyd George, who was the British Prime Minister during WWI. As the Prime Minister of Britain, he is experienced in the field of politics and has in depth knowledge about Germany. In addition, since the source was a primary account on the comparison of Germany before and after the war, and how it has achieved success, the source is hence credible, reliable and useful.

1b)

The source was published in 1935, as the Nuremburg Laws were introduced. From my contextual knowledge, I know that the Nuremburg Laws which defined German citizenship and the prohibition of relationships between Jews and the Aryan were institutionalized. As such, the cartoon was published to criticize the rule of Hitler. From the cartoon, Hitler is shown to be taking a photo with Goering and an ex-servicemen with Goebbels being the photographer. There is also a huge Nazi symbol covering up how protestors, Jews and Catholics were punished. This means that the cartoon seeks to mock how Hitler, Goering and Goebbels were trying to portray the Nazis in a good light but in actual fact was hiding that minority groups were being oppressed in Germany. He therefore aims to highlight and raise awareness to the British people how Nazis have been trying to cover up their hideous crimes and use propaganda to influence people to think only good of the Nazis.



1c)

I am surprised by Source C as Source C tells me that Goebbels had intentions to work with the Germans to uphold justice and report truths. This can be seen in Source C which states that, "I promise you that I will stand up for the rights of the press everywhere and at all times, but only on one condition, the press must stand up for the rights, not just of the government, but also of the German people." This means that Goebbels was impartial and willing to report facts about the Nazi government and the lives of the people in Germany. I am surprised as Source C is contradicted by Source B. Source B tells me that the media had suppressed all opposition and published only propaganda about the rule of Nazi. This can be seen in Source B which depicts how opposition has been oppressed behind a large Nazi symbol. This means that the Nazi party only circulated information that could present the government positively and kept the realities of oppression under wraps. Since Source C is contradicted by Source B, I am therefore surprised by Source C.

I am not entirely surprised by Source C as Source C is an extract from a speech made by Goebbels in March 1933. Goebbels was the Minister of Propaganda. I would hence expect him to portray how the press would be willing to work with the government and people to uphold righteousness and publish facts about Germany. Source C did what is expected and promoted the quality of being just to the German people to convince them that the press had indeed considered the interests of both the government and the people. Since the source did what was expected, I am therefore not entirely surprised by Source C.

1d)

Source E proves that what Metelmann (Source D) said was wrong about the Hitler Youth as Source E tells me that there Germans in the Hitler Youth were completely mistreated by the Nazis. This can be seen from the Source which states that, "We would like to have athletics, but there isn't any. Instead we have military exercises down in the mud, until we are exhausted." This mean that the welfare of soldiers was not considered and they were made to perform strenuous activities that had worn them out. Source E proves that Source D is wrong as Source E contradicts Source D, which tells me that the German youths had enjoyed themselves during their time in camp. This can be seen from Source D which states that, "I'd never been on a holiday; now they were taking us to camp by lakes and mountains.". This means that the Nazis considered the interests of the German youths and had brought through new and wonderful experiences. Since Source E contradicts Source D about how the German youths have been treated in camps, hence Source E can prove that Source D is wrong.

Source E can prove that Source D is wrong when I cross refer to my contextual knowledge. From my contextual knowledge, I know that Hitler Youth catered to 10 to 18 year olds and the task of the boys section was to prepare the boys for military service. Life inside the boys' camp was harsh, featuring a dreary routine of roll calls, paramilitary field exercises, hikes, marches, recitation of Nazi slogans and propaganda, along with endless singing of Hitler Youth songs and Nazi anthems. Since what I have learnt supports Source E, Source E can therefore prove that Source D is wrong.

Source E cannot entirely prove that Source D is wrong as Source E is an extract from a private letter, written by a member of the Hitler Youth. As this is a letter from one member,



the writer is relying on his personal experience in camps, about how the life in camp was demanding and strenuous. Since the account is simply by one person who is voicing out his opinions, the source is therefore not credible, unreliable and unable to prove that Source D is wrong.

1e)

Sources A and C support this view that the Nazis maintained control in Germany because they gave people what they wanted but sources B, D, F does not support this view.

Sources A supports this view as Source A tells me that the Nazis maintained control in Germany because they gave people peace and made improvements to their standard of living. This can be seen from Source A which states that, "He is also securing the German people against the constant dread of starvation." This means that the Nazi party had brought about an improvement in the daily lives of people as people are now have their daily needs met and do not have to worry about having insufficient food.

Source C also supports this view as Source C tells me that the Nazis maintained control in Germany because they gave people what they wanted which was to consider the interests and the voices of the German people. This can be seen in Source C which states that "I promise you that I will stand up for the rights of the press everywhere and at all times, but only on one condition, the press must stand up for the rights, not just of the government, but also of the German people." This means people supported the government because their welfare was considered and that the press had upheld justice.

However, Source B does not support this view. Source B tells me that people only showed support for the government because all forms of opposition was suppressed by the Nazi Party. This can be seen from Source B showing a Nazi soldier putting down protestors and minority groups. This means that Nazis had only gained control of Germany because people had feared them and disagreements with the government would be put down harshly.

Source D does not support this view. Source D tells me that people were made to believe that the Nazi rule had benefitted them in order to get their support. This can be seen from Source D which states, "He said it was just as well we had been brainwashed because we would go mad if we knew what we would really be fighting for. I wish now I could tell him; "You were right, I was an idiot." This means that the people had not supported the Nazis because it gave them what they wanted but rather they were made to believe that the government had been truthful and providing the best for the people.

Source F does not support this view. Source F is an extract from a book on German history published in 2001. The book was objective and credible and reports that although the issue of unemployment was resolved, the people were stretched to work more than previously. Hence, since Source C shows that people were forced to work more than usual, the people therefore would not support the Nazi because of they gave the people what they wanted.



2a)

The Munich Conference was held in 1938 to discuss the handing over control of Czechoslovakia to Germany. Hitler's next target was Sudetenland in Czechoslovakia which was made up of mainly Germans. Most Germans in Sudetenland had wanted a unification with Germany. Thus, Hitler threatened to go to war with Sudetenland if the authorities were not for a German unification. However, many Czechs were willing to fight to protect their freedom and refused to agree for Nazi control over Czechoslovakia. Despite the fact that Britain and France had agreed to defend Czechoslovakia if it faced threat from Germany, they retracted from their promise. The public in Britain and France had begun to believe that war was impending and started preparations, Yet the Munich Agreement was signed as a last minute attempt to prevent a full scale war and the fact that Hitler's demands of Sudetenland were seen as justified in view of the humiliation Germany had suffered due to the Treaty of Versailles.

2b)

I agree that Germany was defeated in World War II because Hitler's army was fighting on too many fronts. It was a major reason for Germany's defeat in the world war however it other factors like the entry of USA into the war and the Allied resistance also played significant role in hastening Germany's defeat.

It is true that the war on two fronts was a major reason for Germany's defeat in World War II as it is still considered Hitler's greatest mistake till today. After France fell in 1940, only Britain was left on the side of the Allied powers. If Hitler concentrated on taking them down, Germany could have had a chance to win the war. However, he chose to invade the Soviet Union while still at war with Britain instead. Invading Soviet Union meant that Germany's resources were divided between two fronts Although Germany was strong, it was too ambitious to hope to win war on both fronts. Especially since both sides had strong opponents defending with their full powers. This delayed Germany's possible victory until the USA entered the war. His declaration of war on the USA, in accordance to the Tripartite Pact, while at war on two fronts himself was a another misjudgement on his part. While it seemed like he had the upper hand because of the idea that the USA would concentrate on fighting Japan, that was not the case. The USA were primarily targetting Europe to end the war quickly. This led to the inevitable tip of the scales. Germany was defeated because her resources were divided and this prevented her from performing to her full capabilities. Thus Hitler's decision of having war at two fronts led Germany to be defeated in the War.

The entry of USA also contributed majorly in the defeat of Germany. Although the USA did not want war and were isolationist, they were aware of the possibility of war and thus began to prepare for such a possibility. The USA contributed a vast amount of resources, strategies and manpower to aid in the war. Up till 1941, the USA only gave military supplies and escorted Allied convoys as a form of support against Nazi Germany. However, after 1941, it was able to provide large numbers of American military personnel like soldiers and intelligence officers to the wars the largest producer of goods, the USA was able to convert



its factories to churn out war supplies at a fast pace. Also American participation was crucial in its contribution towards military planning and formation of key strategies such as “Operation Overlord” which helped the Allied forces finally break the Nazi defence over “Fortress Europe”. Their entry into WWII solved the Allied powers problems of military shortage and improved the overall capability of Allied powers. Because the USA stepped into the war officially, they were able to give a larger amount of aid to the Allied powers. Their entry into the war tipped the scales because they had the most amount of and best resources amongst the other nations, at that point of time. This ensured that Germany was unable to defeat the Allied powers and ended up defeated instead.

The internal problems the Nazis faced due to the strong Allied resistance also led to Germany’s defeat. There were resistance movements in Nazi-occupied European countries which were important in giving important information to the Allies. Their work was dangerous but they worked together to give information and support to the Allies in order to defeat the Germans. The Yugoslavian, Polish, Soviet resistance and the French Free Forces led the Allied strategies to be a great success. Initially people were too shocked to resist the German invasion. However after the invasion of Soviet Union, communists in the various European countries started working underground to resist the Germans. Other civilians joined the communist resistance because they saw it as a successful resistance movement and not because they supported communism. Communists in most countries were used to working underground and were able to effectively resist Nazis. The added support of the Allied powers boosted the confidence of these resistance movements. If the resistance movements had not constantly caused trouble and tried their best to cripple German forces and military production from the inside, the Allied powers might not have had enjoyed success against Germany. Germany was defeated due to resistance movements because it was causing a lot of resource and information drain. As such they could not focus on just fighting the Allies externally, but had to also ensure that there was internal peace in the areas they had already taken over.

In conclusion, the war on two fronts was a crucial factor in determining Germany’s defeat because the combined strength of the Allied powers was too strong for Germany to handle in a simultaneous war. Only the quick defeat of the British forces could have given Germany the upper hand to win the war, yet the war on two fronts diluted Germany’s strength instead making it impossible for her to win the war. The entry of the USA and the Allied resistance were added blows which hastened Germany’s utter defeat.



3a)

The Soviet Union formed the Warsaw Pact in 1955 as a form of retaliation against the formation of NATO (North Atlantic Treaty Organisation) by the USA and Western European leaders. The Soviet Union saw NATO as an immediate threat to its own security. The inclusion of West Germany in NATO further heightened this perceived threat. This led to the formation of the Warsaw Pact in 1955. Similar to the NATO, the Warsaw pact was a pledge to defend member countries which might be attacked by an external party. Member countries also promised to respect the national sovereignty and political independence of other member countries, and not interfere in each other's internal affairs. The real intention of the Warsaw Pact was to deter a possible invasion from Western Europe. It aimed to minimize the influence of Western European countries and American ideology both within and outside Europe. In this manner, it wanted to promote and adopt policies which focused on increasing Soviet Union's influence internationally.

3b)

I largely disagree that Gorbachev was responsible for the end of the Cold War. While it may be true that Gorbachev's policies escalated the end of the Cold War, they were not the only contributing factors. Long term factors like the American economic and military superiority and the declining confidence in the communist ideology and failure of the Soviet economy also were to be blamed.

Gorbachev was responsible for the end of the Cold war because he recognized the need to reform the country's domestic and foreign policy. He wished to strengthen the Soviet economy and end the Cold War as the Soviet command economy was diagnosed as inefficient. He realized that there was a great amount of wastage of resources in the name of maintaining military competition with the USA. He then aimed to end this military competition by loosening the control of the Communist Party and the military over the economy and foreign policy of the Soviet Union. The old supporters military-industrial complex, of the Soviet Union, were replaced by his own supporters to reduce focus on military competition. For an instance, he replaced Minister of Foreign Affairs Andrei Gromyko, with Eduard Shevardnadze instead. He also implemented Glastnost (Openness) and Perestroika (Restructuring) which had profound effects on how the Soviets perceived the communist ideology henceforth. Both policies opened their minds to the better quality of life outside Eastern Europe and highlighted the deep-set economic problems that the country had. Thus, although his reforms aimed to improve the lives of Soviets, through reduced military competition, it is indeed true that some of his drastic reforms led to the fall of Soviet Union thus bringing an end to the Cold War.

However the American economic and military superiority also played a large part in ending the Cold War. Despite experiencing a severe downturn due to the a dual oil crisis in the 1970s, America began to see a significant improvement in its economy in the 1980s. This was largely attributed to President Ronald Reagan's policy of economic liberalization. Under this policy, individual enterprises were encouraged instead of over-reliance on the government for goods and services. This included cutting national budgets and selling of national assets as phone companies, oil companies and airlines. His policies were mirrored in other parts of Western Europe thus stimulating a massive economic growth and financial



boom in the West. This economic strength allowed the USA to participate actively in the arms race against the Soviet Union. This renewal of the arms race exerted a huge amount of pressure on the Soviet Union's ability to keep up with military expenditure and production. Some of the military expenditure includes investiture in the Strategic Defense Initiative (SDI) which aimed to develop new technologies to detect and destroy potential nuclear threats. USA's rich cache of resources enabled it to reach further in the arms race than the Soviet Union. Thus ultimately, it was near impossibility for the Soviet Union to continue the Cold War with USA due to the imbalance in economic and military strengths of the two nations.

The overall decline in confidence in the communist ideology and the failure of the Soviet economy also was responsible in ending the Cold War. The inherent flaws of the Soviet command economy led to its stagnation. Unlike the free market economy, resource allocation in the Soviet Union was poor because the state controlled all industries. The lack of the freedom of information, enterprise and individual creativity among producers meant that there was no opportunity for innovation and creativity or competition between companies to improve quality of goods. Too much focus was on quantitative indicators and a lack of focus on quality forced officials to falsify statistics and engage in corrupt practices, which crippled the command economy further. Moreover, a continued focus on industrial goods production meant that there was a lack of focus on consumer goods production. This led to massive shortages of food and other consumer goods, which were already in poor quality. The flawed system and the Soviet Union's inability to keep up with the needs of its economy was an internal problem that caused the downfall of Soviet Union. The weak economy crippled Soviet Union's chance at succeeding in the arms race and prevented it from truly being an equal rival to the USA, in the Cold War. Thus the overall decline in confidence in the communist ideology and the failure of the Soviet economy responsible in ending the Cold War.

In conclusion, I disagree that Gorbachev was responsible for the end of the Cold War because while his policies exacerbated the problems that Soviet Union faced and hastened the end of the Cold War, it was not the main reason for the end of it. The decline in confidence in the communist ideology and the failure of the Soviet economy played a larger part in causing the end of the Cold War because the Soviet command economy's flaws prevented the country from facing real, sustainable growth. This meant that it could not truly catch up to USA to be an equal in the arms race, without neglecting part of its responsibility to consumers. This would have eventually caused the end of the Cold War, even without Gorbachev's policies or the stark contrast posed by the American economic and military superiority.