



TEMASEK JUNIOR COLLEGE
JC2 Preliminary Examinations 2016
HIGHER 2



HISTORY

Paper 1 International History, 1945 – 2000

8814/01

9731/01

13 September 2016

3 hours

Additional Materials: Writing Paper

READ THESE INSTRUCTIONS FIRST

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

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

Start each answer on a fresh piece of writing paper.

You may use an HB pencil for any diagrams, graphs or rough working.

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

Section A

Answer **Question 1**.

Section B

Answer any **three** questions.

At the end of the examination, fasten all your work securely together.

All questions in this paper carry equal marks [25].

You are reminded of the need for good English and clear handwriting in your answer.

This question paper consists of **4** printed pages.

Section A

You **must** answer Question 1.

THE UN, NATO AND PEACEKEEPING IN BOSNIA

- 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

Article 52

1. Nothing in the Charter precludes the existence of regional arrangements or agencies for dealing with such matters relating to the maintenance of international peace and security ...
2. The Members of the United Nations entering into such arrangements or constituting such agencies shall make every effort to achieve pacific* settlement of local disputes through such regional arrangements or agencies before referring them to the Security Council.
3. The Security Council shall encourage the development of pacific* settlement of local disputes through such regional arrangements or agencies either on the initiative of the states concerned or by reference from the Security Council.

Article 53

1. The Security Council shall, where appropriate, utilize such regional arrangements or agencies for enforcement action under its authority. But no enforcement action shall be taken without the authorization of the Security Council, ... or until such time as the Organization may, on request of the Governments concerned, be charged with the responsibility for preventing further aggression...

Article 54

The Security Council shall at all times be kept fully informed of activities undertaken or in contemplation under regional arrangements or by regional agencies...

Extracts from Chapter VIII of the UN Charter, 1945

* *pacific means peaceful*

Source B

In theory, NATO airpower was intended to provide some enforcement for PROFOR. But in practice, disagreements were common between UNPROFOR and NATO over the nature and extent of the use of air power. Until August 1995, only 10 small-scale strikes had been made. Although according to Security Council resolutions NATO was acting in support of UNPROFOR, in practice NATO made its own decisions when called on by UNPROFOR to carry out air strikes. In sum, the problem of competing credibilities is a particularly serious one between an organization designed to fight war and another dedicated to keep peace.

*Adapted from comments by Shashi Tharoor,
Special Assistant in UN Peacekeeping Operations, June 1995.*

Source C

So what is the UNSC's strategy for formulating realizable and sustainable military objectives? What are its 33,000 peacekeepers doing beyond the humanitarian mission? The simple answer, which utterly discredits the Security Council but not the peacekeepers themselves, is everything and nothing. In more than 60 resolutions passed since the conflict began, the Security Council has enlarged or expanded the mandate of UNPROFOR over a dozen times. Their resolutions have become increasingly disconnected from the situation on the ground and the military resources of UNPROFOR. The UN commanders in the field have reportedly quipped that they do not even bother reading the strategic directives from New York anymore.

Extract from a research institute's findings on the UN Mission in Bosnia, June 1995.

Source D

Peacekeeping doctrine assumes the willing consent and cooperation of the belligerents to work out a settlement which peacekeepers can help sustain. Peace enforcement, on the other hand, creates the settlement by compelling the warring parties to accept the conditions. Not until the NATO air onslaught in August 1995 did the UN-NATO effort move to peace enforcement. For three and a half years, the Security Council did not provide the means to enforce its resolutions. UNPROFOR has been required to find some sort of middle way between peacekeeping and peace enforcement. As Boutros-Ghali acknowledged in January: "The UN operation in Bosnia-Herzegovina was given additional mandates which required the use of force. These were incompatible with existing mandates requiring consent of the parties, impartiality, and the non-use of force. The resultant combination was inherently contradictory. It jeopardized the mission."

Extract from a research paper titled 'The Failure of the Middle Way', Nov 1995.

Source E

On 1 May 1993, Clinton sent representatives to consult with NATO allies to gain support for a strategy to order air strikes against the Serbs. This failed, exposing issues that would hamstring NATO's actions in the conflict. NATO members in UNPROFOR were concerned that their troops, lightly armed and widely dispersed, were likely to be taken as hostages and did not share Washington's enthusiasm for an air campaign. Divergence between NATO's perspectives on the conflict and little European domestic support for armed intervention added to Clinton's problems. NATO's inability to reach consensus ... called into question the future of the alliance.

In June 1993, Serb attacks on the Srebrenica "safe area" led the U.N. Security Council to authorize the use of air power "to support UNPROFOR in the performance of its mandate." The resolution established an arrangement where the U.N. and NATO both had to agree before air strikes could be carried out. This arrangement proved difficult for Washington, as the U.N. was extremely reluctant to authorize any effective combat action on the part of NATO.

Adapted from a US Government website, 2016.

Now answer the following question.

How far do Sources A-E show that it was confusion over the roles of the UN and NATO that led to the UN's failure in Bosnia?

Section B

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

- 2 Assess the significance of the Sovietisation of Eastern Europe in the origins of the Cold War.
- 3 “The Cold War ended only in 1991.” To what extent is this assessment valid?
- 4 Which was the most significant of the problems faced by the global economy after 1973?
- 5 How far were Deng Xiaoping's policies for China's economic development merely a continuation of those of his predecessors?
- 6 How important was the role of religion in the development of the Indo-Pakistani conflict from 1948 to 2000?

Credits:

- Source A <http://www.un.org/en/sections/un-charter/chapter-viii/index.html>
- Source B S Tharoor, “United Nations peacekeeping in Europe”. *Survival*, Summer 1995.
- Source C John F. Hillen, “Killing with kindness: The UN peacekeeping mission in Bosnia.” *Foreign Policy Briefing* No. 34. Cato Institute. 30 June 1995.
- Source D Australian Parliamentary Research Service, “The UN's Role in the Former Yugoslavia: the Failure of the Middle Way”. Research Paper No. 15. 1995-1996.
- Source E <https://history.state.gov/milestones/1993-2000/bosnia>

Assessment Rubrics

Source-based Study

Level 1	Writes about assertion, no use of sources	(1-5m)
Level 2	Uses information taken from sources to support <i>OR</i> challenge the assertion	(6-8m)
Level 3	Uses information taken from sources to support <i>AND</i> challenge the assertion	(9-13m)
Level 4	By interpreting/evaluating sources in context, finds evidence to support <i>OR</i> challenge the assertion	(14-16m)
Level 5	By interpreting/evaluating sources in context, finds evidence to support <i>AND</i> challenge the assertion	(17-21m)
Level 6	<p>Must reach Level 5 first, then</p> <p>Either a) explains why evidence to support or challenge is better or preferred (i.e. comparative judgement on why some sources are better than others);</p> <p>Or b) reconciles/explains problems in the sources to show that neither support nor challenge is to be preferred; explains why evidence points to an alternative assertion and modifies the assertion to fit the sources</p>	(22-25m)

Essay

Band	Marks	Descriptors
1	21-25	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ✓ The approach will be consistently analytical or explanatory rather than descriptive or narrative. ✓ Essays will be fully relevant. ✓ The argument will be structured coherently and supported by appropriate factual material. ✓ The writing will be accurate. ✓ At the lower end of the band, there may be some weaker sections to the answer, but the overall quality will show that the candidate is in control of the argument.
2	18-20	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ✓ Essays will be focused clearly on the demands of the question but there will be some unevenness. ✓ The approach will be mostly analytical or explanatory rather than descriptive or narrative. ✓ The answer will be mostly relevant. ✓ Most of the argument will be structured coherently and supported by largely accurate factual material. ✓ The impression will be that a good solid answer has been provided. ✓ The writing will be mostly accurate.

Band	Marks	Descriptors
3	16-17	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ✓ Essays will reflect a clear understanding of the question, and constitute a fair attempt to provide an argument and factual knowledge to answer it. ✓ The approach will contain analysis or explanation, but there may be some heavily narrative or descriptive passages. ✓ The answer will be largely relevant. ✓ Essays will achieve a genuine argument but may lack balance or depth of factual knowledge. ✓ Most of the answer will be structured satisfactorily but some parts may lack coherence. ✓ The writing will be generally accurate.
4	14-15	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ✓ Essays will indicate attempts to argue relevantly, though often only implicitly. ✓ The approach will depend more on some heavily descriptive or narrative passages than on analysis or explanation, which may be limited to introductions and conclusions. ✓ Factual material, sometimes very full, will be used to impart information or describe events rather than to address directly the requirements of the question. ✓ The structure of the argument could be organized more effectively. ✓ The writing will usually be accurate.
5	11-13	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ✗ Essays will offer some appropriate elements but there will be little attempt generally to link factual material to the demands of the question. ✗ The approach will lack analysis and the quality of the description or narrative, although sufficiently accurate and relevant to the topic if not the particular question, will not be linked effectively to the argument. ✗ The structure will show weaknesses and the treatment of topics within the answer will be unbalanced. ✗ The writing may show some accuracy but there will also be frequent errors.
6	8-10	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ✗ Essays will not be properly focused on the requirements of the question. ✗ There may be many unsupported assertions and commentaries which lack sufficient factual support. ✗ The argument may be of limited relevance to the topic and there may be confusion about the implications of the question. ✗ The writing will show significant weaknesses.
7	0-7	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ✗ Essays will be characterized by significant irrelevance or arguments which do not begin to make significant points. ✗ The answers may be largely fragmentary and incoherent. ✗ The writing will show very significant weakness. ✗ Marks at the bottom of this band will be given very rarely because even the most wayward and fragmentary answer usually makes at least a few valid points.