



INNOVA JUNIOR COLLEGE
JC 2 PRELIMINARY EXAMINATION
in preparation for the General Certificate of Education Advanced Level
Higher 2

HISTORY

9731/01

Paper 1 International History, 1945-2000

18 Aug 2016

3 hours

Additional Materials: Writing Paper

READ THESE INSTRUCTIONS FIRST

If you have been given an Answer Booklet, follow the instructions on the front cover of the Booklet.

Write your name and class on all the work you hand in.

Write in dark blue or black ink on both sides of the paper.

You may use a soft pencil for any diagrams, graphs or rough working.

Do not use staples, paper clips, highlighters, glue or correction fluid.

Section A

Answer **Question 1**.

Section B

Answer any **three** questions.

At the end of the examination, answers for Section A and Section B should be fastened **separately**. Section B should be fastened with a cover page.

All questions in this paper carry equal marks.

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

This document consists of **4** printed pages.



Innova Junior College

9731/01/IJC/AUG16

[Turn over

Section A

You **must** answer Question 1.

THE UNITED NATIONS AND LAWS AGAINST INTERNATIONAL TERRORISM

- 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

Those who call us terrorists wish to prevent world public opinion from discovering the truth about us and from seeing the justice on our faces. They seek to hide the terrorism and tyranny of their acts, and our own posture of self-defense. The difference between the revolutionary and the terrorist lies in the reason for which each fights. For whoever stands by a just cause and fights for the freedom and liberation of his land from the invaders, the settlers and the colonialists, cannot possibly be called terrorist, otherwise the American people in their struggle for liberation from the British colonialists would have been terrorists; the European resistance against the Nazis would be terrorism, the struggle of the Asian, African and Latin American peoples would also be terrorism, and many of you who are in this Assembly hall were considered terrorists. This is actually a just and proper struggle consecrated by the United Nations Charter and by the Universal Declaration of Human Rights. As to those who fight against the just causes, those who wage war to occupy, colonise and oppress other people, those are the terrorists. Those are the people whose actions should be condemned, who should be called war criminals: for the justice of the cause determines the right to struggle.

From a speech by Yasser Arafat, Chairman of the Palestinian Liberation Organisation, to the UN General Assembly, 1974.

Source B

In October 1999, the US asked the Security Council to impose economic sanctions on the Taliban, demanding that the Taliban turn over bin Laden. In the operative part of Resolution 1276, adopted on 15 October 1999, the Security Council [among other things]: "Demands that the Taliban turn over Osama bin Laden without further delay to... appropriate authorities in a country where he will be arrested and effectively brought to justice."

At a time when the UN Security Council often has trouble reaching agreement on whether one crisis or another constitutes a threat to international peace, the 15-member Council was nevertheless able to reach solid agreement on the growing dangers of international terrorism. The Security Council voted unanimously to wage a common fight against terrorists everywhere. Such an agreement is remarkable, and all the more so as two Islamic countries voted in favour.

From an article by a Polish university professor, published in the European Journal of International Law, 2001.

Source C

The months after 9/11 saw new energy at the UN and in regional organizations to fill gaps in the normative, legal and institutional infrastructure of effective counter-terrorism...At present, international mechanisms to promote state and collective action against terrorism are comprehensive but not authoritative. State responsibilities are increasingly well articulated,

through UN Security Council resolutions, the General Assembly's unanimously adopted counter-terrorism strategy, and regional declarations. However, of these, only the Security Council's elements are authoritative. Some 70 formal and informal bodies now pursue counter-terrorism, leading to an ad hoc and largely improvisational response. Little has been done to develop effective mechanisms for building local capacity to combat terrorism.

We support the creation of a new organization that could help to expand the scale and improve the quality of national counter-terrorism strategies. Such an organization, grounded in existing treaties and agreed international frameworks, could also set standards for state action and monitor state performance. To be efficient, it should build on existing capacities, such as the UN Office on Drugs and Crime, and operate in a manner that reinforces the central role of the UN Security Council on threats to international peace and security.

From an academic article on managing Global Terrorism, 2008.

Source D

Some nations want to play their part in the fight against terror, but tell us they lack the means to enforce their laws and control their borders. We stand ready to help. Some governments still turn a blind eye to the terrorists, hoping the threat will pass them by. They are mistaken. And some governments, while pledging to uphold the principles of the UN, have cast their lot with the terrorists. They support them and harbour them, and they will find that their welcome guests are parasites that will weaken them, and eventually consume them.

This struggle is a defining moment for the United Nations itself. And the world needs its principled leadership. It undermines the credibility of this great institution, for example, when the Commission on Human Rights offers seats to the world's most persistent violators of human rights. The United Nations depends, above all, on its moral authority—and that authority must be preserved. The steps I described will not be easy. For all nations, they will require effort. For some nations, they will require great courage. Yet, the cost of inaction is far greater. The only alternative to victory is a nightmare world where every city is a potential killing field.

From a statement by US President George W. Bush before the 56th regular session of the UN General Assembly, 10 November 2001.

Source E

One of the more powerful achievements of the United Nations system has been the establishment of a regime of international treaties and conventions. It is these international treaties that provide the legal framework for the suppression of terrorist acts and the pursuit of perpetrators of terrorism, and set out ways to limit illicit access to the tools terrorists need. UN anti-terrorism treaties that predate 11 September 2001 range from the UN International Civil Aviation Organisation, 1963 Convention on Offence and Certain Other Acts Committed on Board Aircraft, to the International Convention for the Suppression of the Financing of Terrorism, drafted in 1999.

From the official United Nations' website on its activities to address terrorism, 2002.

Now answer the following question.

How far do sources A to E support the view that the United Nations was successful in addressing international terrorism?

Section B

[Turn over

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

- 2 Was there a turning point in the development of the Cold War in Europe from 1945-1955?
- 3 "Reagan was the architect of the end of the Cold War." How far do you agree with this view?
- 4 "The primary reason for US dominance of the global economy from 1945 to 2000 was its role in the Bretton-Woods system." To what extent do you agree with this verdict?
- 5 How far do you agree that religious fundamentalism arose from 1970-2000 as a result of a backlash against the West?
- 6 To what extent was the continuation of the Indo-Pakistani conflict over Kashmir since 1947 due to the opposing visions of nationhood between the two sides?