



# JC 2 PRELIMINARY EXAMINATION 2016

HISTORY 9731/1

HISTORY 8814/1

**Paper 1: International History 1945-2000**

**Wednesday**

**24<sup>th</sup> August 2016**

**3 hours**

## **READ THESE INSTRUCTIONS FIRST**

1. Answer **four** questions.
2. You must answer Question 1 (Section A), and any three questions from Section B.
3. Begin each question on a new sheet of paper.
4. Fasten all your work securely together.

## **INFORMATION FOR CANDIDATES**

All questions in this paper carry equal marks.

You are reminded of the need for good English and clear presentation in your answers.

<b>NAME:</b>	<b>CLASS:</b>
--------------	---------------

You must answer Question 1.

## THE FAILURE OF UN PEACE EFFORTS

- 1 Read the Sources and then answer the question which follows.

When answering **Question 1** candidates are advised to pay particular attention to the interpretation and evaluation of the sources both individually and as a group.

### Source A

It does not help that the UN Security Council is structurally burdened with the veto, which seriously impedes its ability to bring about peace. Nonetheless, the USA gladly uses vetoes, obstructs or ignores UN resolutions and decisions, both in the Security Council, as well as the in the judicial arm of the UN regarding issues relating to itself and its allies. Defenders of these policies contend that such actions by the USA are often just a reaction to the fact that other nations similarly use the veto to dominate the UN. But is this accurate? From 1981 to 1986, the US vetoed 36 draft resolutions of the Security Council. The Soviet Union vetoed two.

On some occasions, the US refused to cooperate with the UN, or tried to pick fights with it, if American leaders were unsatisfied with how the UN handled peacekeeping affairs. The USA constantly tried to prevent the UN from having the right to determine what constitutes international aggression, and when it has occurred. If the UN was given this right, the USA would not be able to undertake its own invasions or give itself the right to judge international behaviour solely on the basis of American selfish interests. In short, the USA wanted to continue to enjoy the luxury of using the UN to meet its own foreign policy objectives and had little intention to be subservient to the UN.

*From a book by Michael Albert, published in 1994.*

### Source B

From the start, Republican politician Bob Dole would repeat the name Boutros Boutros-Ghali with such venom that you might think he was upset most of all by the sound of the name. The US had misgivings about the political leanings of the Secretary-General. The UN was used as the scapegoat for the debacle in Somalia. US officials unfairly laid the blame on the UN and its Secretary-General for the failures in Somalia. The troops in the peacekeeping mission were under the direct command of the US Central Command in Florida, not the UN, but the White House did not deem it politically wise to point this out. In Bosnia, US officials continually criticized Boutros-Ghali and his man in the former Yugoslavia, Yasushi Akashi, for standing in the way of bombing the Serbs. The Serbs were not bombed seriously for most of the war because the United States could not get its allies to agree. When they finally did agree, the Serbs were bombed. It was too late by then, however, to save the U.N. from humiliation over Bosnia.

*Stanley Meisler writing in an academic journal, published in 1996.*

### Source C

Hammaraskjold is playing a strange role in recent events in the Congo. What function is Mr Hammaraskjold fulfilling? Whose interests is he defending in the Congo at a time when he is supposedly trying to secure implementation of the Security Council resolution for the removal of the Belgian troops and take measures to provide for the integrity of the Congo republic? We suspect that he is actually a pro-American agent. His actions have so far only proven to us that he takes up a position that supports the US-backed leader in Congo, and only wishes to

disadvantage the USSR. The Secretary-General of the UN is supposed to be neutral, but he has forsaken it. In the process, the authority of the UN is now being trampled in the dirt.

*Extracted from an article from Pravda, a Soviet newspaper, 3 August 1960.*

#### **Source D**

All US citizens wishing to leave the country have now been evacuated. We are now looking closely at whether UNAMIR can achieve its mandate. No decisions made but a growing feeling that withdrawal of the peacekeeping force may be necessary. The State Department understands that the UN Secretariat briefed the Council this afternoon – the understanding is that the UN mandate of the attempted protection of Tutsi civilians is looking less likely with each passing day. This has apparently led to debate within the US over the future of the mandate. There is some feeling growing that the safety of individuals cannot be guaranteed, and as such, the US should support the removal of the peacekeeping mission.

*Extracted from a confidential document circulating within the US government, 11 April 1994.*

#### **Source E**

It should have come as no surprise to anyone that some of the missions of the past decade would be particularly hard to accomplish: they tended to deploy where conflict had not resulted in victory for any side, where a military stalemate or international pressure or both had brought fighting to a halt but at least some of the parties to the conflict were not seriously committed to ending the confrontation. United Nations operations thus did not deploy into post-conflict situations but tried to create them. Peacekeepers should not be deployed to achieve unrealistic mandates.

In the past, the UN peacekeeping missions have often found themselves unable to respond effectively to the challenge of carrying out mandates successfully. The UN needs to be clearer in stating the rules of engagement and under what circumstances should use of force be permitted. This will allow the missions to be more robust and not cede the initiative to the attackers. UN peacekeepers who witness violence against civilians should be authorized to stop it. The organization should also avoid appearing to support one faction in the conflict, a fault it had been guilty of in the past, in order to maintain the trust of the international community.

*Extracted from a United Nations report published in 2000.*

Now answer the following question:

*How far do Sources A to E prove that it was the USA, rather than the UN, who was responsible for the inability to foster peace from 1945 – 2000?*

## Section B

You must answer **three** questions from this section.

2. "The decline of superpower relations by the late 1940s was unexpected". With reference to the period 1945 – 1949, how far is this statement true?
3. "What really destroyed Communism was Communism itself". To what extent does this statement accurately describe the collapse of the USSR in 1991?
4. Was the USA more of a blessing or a curse to the global economy from 1945 – 2000?
5. How far do you agree that there was insufficient attention and effort directed towards achieving Palestinian statehood from 1948 – 2000?
6. How important was the role of religious fundamentalist groups in causing the protraction of the Indo-Pakistan conflict till 2000?