GradeMax

Cambridge Assessment International Education

Cambridge International AS & A Level

HISTORY **9489/42**

Paper 4 Depth Study **March 2021**

MARK SCHEME

Maximum Mark: 60

Published

This mark scheme is published as an aid to teachers and candidates, to indicate the requirements of the examination. It shows the basis on which Examiners were instructed to award marks. It does not indicate the details of the discussions that took place at an Examiners' meeting before marking began, which would have considered the acceptability of alternative answers.

Mark schemes should be read in conjunction with the question paper and the Principal Examiner Report for Teachers.

Cambridge International will not enter into discussions about these mark schemes.

Cambridge International is publishing the mark schemes for the March 2021 series for most Cambridge IGCSE™, Cambridge International A and AS Level components and some Cambridge O Level components.

© UCLES 2021

[Turn over

GradeMax

Generic Marking Principles

These general marking principles must be applied by all examiners when marking candidate answers. They should be applied alongside the specific content of the mark scheme or generic level descriptors for a question. Each question paper and mark scheme will also comply with these marking principles.

GENERIC MARKING PRINCIPLE 1:

Marks must be awarded in line with:

- the specific content of the mark scheme or the generic level descriptors for the question
- the specific skills defined in the mark scheme or in the generic level descriptors for the question
- the standard of response required by a candidate as exemplified by the standardisation scripts.

GENERIC MARKING PRINCIPLE 2:

Marks awarded are always **whole marks** (not half marks, or other fractions).

GENERIC MARKING PRINCIPLE 3:

Marks must be awarded **positively**:

- marks are awarded for correct/valid answers, as defined in the mark scheme. However, credit is given for valid answers which go beyond the scope of the syllabus and mark scheme, referring to your Team Leader as appropriate
- marks are awarded when candidates clearly demonstrate what they know and can do
- marks are not deducted for errors
- marks are not deducted for omissions
- answers should only be judged on the quality of spelling, punctuation and grammar when these features are specifically assessed by the question as indicated by the mark scheme. The meaning, however, should be unambiguous.

GENERIC MARKING PRINCIPLE 4:

Rules must be applied consistently, e.g. in situations where candidates have not followed instructions or in the application of generic level descriptors.

GENERIC MARKING PRINCIPLE 5:

Marks should be awarded using the full range of marks defined in the mark scheme for the question (however; the use of the full mark range may be limited according to the quality of the candidate responses seen).

GENERIC MARKING PRINCIPLE 6:

Marks awarded are based solely on the requirements as defined in the mark scheme. Marks should not be awarded with grade thresholds or grade descriptors in mind.

© UCLES 2021

GradeMax

AO2 – Demonstrate an understanding of the past through explanation, analysis and a substantiated judgement of key concepts: causation, consequence, continuity, change and significance within an historical context, the relationships between key features and characteristics of the periods studied.		
This mark scheme assesses the quality of analysis demonstrated in addressing the question.		
Level 5	**Answers demonstrate a full understanding of the question, are balanced and analytical.** Answers: • establish valid and wide-ranging criteria for assessing the question • are consistently analytical of the key features and characteristics of the period • provide a focused, balanced argument with a sustained line of reasoning throughout • reach a clear and sustained judgement.	**13–15**
Level 4	**Answers demonstrate a good understanding of the question, and are mostly analytical.** Answers: • establish valid criteria for assessing the question • are analytical of the key features and characteristics of the period, but treatment of points may be uneven • attempt to provide a balanced argument, but may lack coherence and precision in some places • reach a supported judgement, although some of the evaluations may be only partly substantiated.	**10–12**
Level 3	**Answers demonstrate an understanding of the question and contain some analysis. Argument lacks balance.** Answers: • show attempts at establishing criteria for assessing the question • show some analysis of the key features and characteristics of the period, but may also contain descriptive passages • provide an argument but lacks balance, coherence and precision • begin to form a judgement although with weak substantiation.	**7–9**
Level 2	**Answers demonstrate some understanding of the question and are descriptive.** Answers: • attempt to establish criteria for assessing the question but these may be implicit • show limited analysis of the key features and characteristics of the period, and contain descriptive passages that are not always clearly related to the focus of the question • make an attempt at proving an argument, but this is done inconsistently and/or may be unrelated to the focus of the question • make an assertion rather than a judgement.	**4–6**

© UCLES 2021

GradeMax

Level 1	**Answers address the topic, but not the question.** Answers: • focus on the topic rather than the question • lack analysis or an argument • lack a relevant judgement.	**1–3**
Level 0	**No creditable content.**	**0**

GradeMax

AO1 – Recall, select and deploy historical knowledge appropriately and effectively.		
This mark scheme assesses the quality and depth of knowledge deployed to support the argument made.		
Level 5	**Answers demonstrate a high level of relevant detail.** Supporting material: • is carefully selected • is fully focused on supporting the argument • is wide-ranging • is consistently precise and accurate.	**13–15**
Level 4	**Answers demonstrate a good level of relevant supporting detail.** Supporting material: • is selected appropriately • is mostly focused on supporting the argument • covers a range of points but the depth may be uneven • is mostly precise and accurate.	**10–12**
Level 3	**Answers demonstrate an adequate level of supporting detail.** Supporting material: • is mostly appropriately selected • may not fully support the points being made, may be descriptive in places • covers a narrow range of points • occasionally lacks precision and accuracy in places.	**7–9**
Level 2	**Answers demonstrate some relevant supporting detail.** Supporting material: • is presented as a narrative • is not directly linked to the argument • is limited in range and depth • frequently lacks precision and accuracy.	**4–6**
Level 1	**Answers demonstrate limited knowledge of the topic.** Supporting material: • has limited relevance to the argument • is inaccurate or vague.	**1–3**
Level 0	**No creditable content.**	**0**

© UCLES 2021

GradeMax

Question	Answer	Marks
1	**Assess the impact of Mussolini's foreign policy on Italy.** Responses may consider the significance of events such as the Corfu Incident, the Stresa Front, attempted Anschluss by Germany in 1934, the Abyssinian Crisis, The Rome Berlin Tokyo Axis, the Munich meetings, the Pact of Steel and the Cavallero Memorandum. When looking at the foreign policy actions of Mussolini it is important to look at his aims, actions, and the outcomes of his policies. His aim to create a strong man image and the boast of recreating the Roman Empire need assessing and his increasing isolation from Britain and France and the ever- closer relationship with Germany. His aim to be a power broker and particularly his courting by Britain and France in the policy of Appeasement as for example by the reluctance to impose sanctions over Abyssinia or his help in organising the Munich Conference. Responses ought to assess what benefits and what negative consequences came about from his policies and in particular being drawn into a disastrous World War Two, which Italy was not prepared to fight and which lead to his fall from power and allied occupation of Italy.	**30**

© UCLES 2021

GradeMax

Question	Answer	Marks
2	**Evaluate the causes of the Great Terror.** The murder of Kirov in 1934 is usually seen as a starting point of the Great Terror and the fact that Stalin felt threatened at the 17th party Congress and there was pen questioning of his economic policies. This lead on to the removal of former Bolsheviks and rivals in the show trials of the 16, 17 and 21. These were state managed with pre-determined outcomes and held in public to demonstrate Stalin's power. Rivals such as Zinoviev, Kamenev, Bukharin, Rykov and Tomsky were all removed. The Yezhovschina starting in 1936 was a mass and indiscriminate use of terror orchestrated by Yezhov, who had in turn replaced Yagoda, who was later executed. These purges involved wholesale murder and involved the general population and were designed to subdue the population. In 1938 Yezhov was replaced by Beria, who continued terror and made the Gulags part of the economic system of the Soviet Union. Yezhov was executed to show that no one was safe and indeed, he was publicly blamed for the excesses of the Yezhovschina. During the Great Terror there was also the purge of the military. Motives might include removing rivals, subduing the population, providing cheap labour for the Five-Year Plans, but also the character of Stalin and the nature of the Soviet State. This also leads on the degree of centralised control or local excess by the NKVD and local party bosses.	**30**

© UCLES 2021

GradeMax

Question	Answer	Marks
3	**Assess the aims of Hitler's foreign policy in the period 1933–41.** Hitler had a variety of motives in the period. Revising the Treaty of Versailles, creating a Greater Germany, Lebensraum in Eastern Europe, and arguably racial imperialism. Domination of Europe, military strength, and then arguably global conquest. He also wanted to avoid a two- front war with the Soviet Union for as long as possible and until Western Europe was defeated. His foreign policy was also designed to increase his own popularity at home, at least in the early years and finally he wanted to make Germany economically self-sufficient using Autarky from 1936 to allow war to be followed as a policy. He intended to make himself the Master of Foreign Policy replacing traditional diplomats such as Von Neurath with Von Ribbentrop and military tactics, replacing Von Blomberg and Von Fritsch with Keitel. From 1933 he wanted German equality and revoked the Treaty of Versailles, left the World Disarmament Conference and then the League of Nations. 1935 saw the Saar Plebiscite and the Anglo-German Naval Treaty, 1936 the reoccupation of the Rhineland, a decisive step, which showed neither France nor Britain would stand up to him at this stage. The Spanish Civil War was simply a chance to test his air force. The Rome-Berlin-Tokyo Axis was an anti-Soviet alliance and the Hossbach Memorandum of 1937 set out his future plans. 1938 saw the Anschluss and then the Munich Agreement handing Germany the Sudetenland. Hitler in his foreign policy was playing on the Pro-Appeasement policies of Britain and France whilst regaining territory taken at the Treaty of Versailles. 1939 was a decisive year in his occupation of Rump Czechoslovakia and the Nazi-Soviet Pact of August 1939. The Pact of Steel with Italy might be mentioned here too. September 1st and the invasion brought war and then Hitler's aims were to quickly conquer Western Europe which he did apart from Britain. In 1941 Germany launched Operation Barbarossa which has racial and economic and political motives.	**30**

© UCLES 2021

GradeMax

Question	Answer	Marks
4	'**Britain followed a policy of appeasement because it was militarily unprepared for war.' Discuss this view.** Responses may consider how Britain was militarily unprepared to fight the Second World War, but better prepared by 1939 than it had been in the early 1930s. Other motives for the policy need examination and explanation. A strong anti-war feeling amongst politicians who had seen the Great War was a very strong motivating factor. Baldwin, Chamberlain, and Halifax are all prominent here. Public Opinion was also arguably pacifist as shown by the Oxford Union Debate, although many of these young men would later fight. The need to govern the Empire and increasing demands for independence in India from Gandhi and Jinnah occupied much government time and economic resource. The fact that the Dominions made it very clear that they would fight again but only if the Mother Country was in peril made Britain cautious of foreign policy entanglements. The on-going impact of the Great Depression and trying to solve the economic problems of Britain were high on the political agenda. There was also a belief that the Treaty of Versailles needed revising and that many of Hitler's demands were justified or certainly not worth fighting over. Chamberlain felt he had a rapport with Hitler and his Munich Agreement was welcomed by a cheering House of Commons. Also, the need to keep Mussolini as a negotiating partner allowed Britain to justify appeasement over Abyssinia. Fear of the Soviet Union also seemed more justified than that of Hitler. Britain also was prepared to unilaterally revise the Treaty of Versailles when needed, for example the Anglo-German Naval Treaty of 1935.	**30**

© UCLES 2021

GradeMax

Question	Answer	Marks
5	**Assess the reasons for the opposition to the Civil Rights movement in the Southern states of the US in the 1950s.** Factors might include resentment at changes emanating from North and from protests in the South; concerns about social and economic status. Historic traditions should be considered. White supremacy had a long history since the failure of Reconstruction in the 1870s and the gradual establishment of Jim Crow laws and restrictions on voting and political activity. The discrimination and racial control had had the backing of the Supreme Court and there had been little support for comprehensive civil rights legislation from either Congress or the Executive. White juries in the South were unwilling to convict for acts of violence against African Americans and while organisations ranging from the clandestine to the more overt acted against change in the years after the Second World War. Governors like Wallace and Faubus won popularity by opposing desegregation. Civil Rights activists found the South a dangerous place and Southern Senators and Congressmen were a powerful lobby against change. Reasons for this sustained opposition might be seen in terms of a reaction against developments which threatened change – the more active Civil Rights in the 1950s and the successes of the NAACP in mounting legal challenges against segregation; the pressure on governments to demonstrate during the Cold War that international criticisms of its own policy towards civil rights was flawed and the support of white liberals for moderate change. At root a minority of Southerners adopted a militant resistance to any change on the grounds that it threatened racial control. The deep-rooted view that without this control African Americans would be an economic, social and sexual threat went back to the 1860s or beyond. Years of unpunished violence, lynching and political discrimination in the form of 'grandfather clauses' which prevented black voting and the cooperation of courts, police and local government in abuse meant that there were high expectations that all change could be resisted successfully. The pace of change in post-war America left many feeling insecure about traditional ways of life especially in rural areas and small towns in the South so that opposition to civil rights was a form of opposition to modernisation. The feeling that Northern influence was impinging on the South was an important motive for opposition. Fears that without social control African Americans might be competitors remained strong and were exploited by racist leaders. However, opposition could take other forms than militant action, violence and political opposition to change. A generalised concern that social norms were being eroded and a lack of willingness to oppose white opposition in the form of Citizens organisations or the Klan activities might be explained by social conservatism – dislike of old certainties such as segregation, the subservience of African Americans and the patronising use of first names or nicknames for local blacks. There was a distinction too between those who were opposed to all change and those who opposed civil rights movements being imported from the North and trying to drive the pace of reform too quickly.	**30**

© UCLES 2021

GradeMax

Question	Answer	Marks
6	'**During the1960s and 1970s it was clear that post-war economic doctrines were failing.' Discuss this view** Challenge to post war assumptions as growth slowed and impact of external events. Post-war economic thinking was heavily influenced by the apparent failures of unregulated capitalism in the Great Crash and the rise of federal responsibility and control which grew during the Second World War. After 1945 the US could not return to isolationism and had to accept its global position. Through to the 1960s and 1970s, it was taken for granted that the Federal government would play a large part in the domestic economy and would manage business cycles, aim to maintain full employment, regulate private firms and the financial sector and produce various public goods such as the expansion of the interstate highways. To do this required relatively high levels of taxation and there was limited progress towards tax cuts through the period. This adapted Keynesianism was accompanied by high levels of defence spending putting the state as a major driver of economic activity. Federal and state spending and subsidies cushioned free enterprise against market forces. The US allied this macroeconomic management with moves for free trade, but international capital movements were restricted. There were critics of this mixed economy who looked back to neo liberal economic theory and when the US economy faltered from steady if unimpressive growth rates in the 1970s there were calls for deregulation and reduction of subsidies and welfare and tax cuts to stimulate enterprise together with an extension of free trade. *Laissez faire* ideas were reintroduced on the grounds that government efforts to manage the business cycle were futile and excessive levels of taxation and regulation were destroying the vitality of market economies. Trade negotiations were now expanded to dismantle 'nontariff barriers' that included domestic legislation that had the unintended consequence of discriminating against foreign products. Developing nations were told to scrap their planning processes, to privatise state-owned enterprises, and to end subsidies that made food, transportation, and housing more available for the poor. The assault on post-war economic doctrines that still determined much thinking in the 1960s and 70s was considerable, but the debate is whether it was justified. Defenders have argued that the balance between the public and private sectors was beneficially maintained and that the oil crisis was beyond the control of governments and the recession was not a result of ill-judged doctrine but of changes in the world context. It is also pointed out that the critics could not prevent continuing high levels of government spending which were part of US commitment to world power status, not Keynesianism. Also, the consumer-based prosperity that continued into the 1960s did ensure a degree of social stability that was lost by neo-liberal economic policy which resulted in greater social inequality. Critics pointed to the sluggish growth rates and the over dependence on the state and the benefits of greater enterprise with the expansion of technology and the freer financial markets.	**30**

© UCLES 2021

GradeMax

Question	Answer	Marks
7	**Evaluate the effectiveness of Affirmative Action policies in the 1980s.** Affirmative action produced some key legal changes that offered greater opportunity for minorities and seemed to go some way to meeting criticisms that civil rights progress had been limited to political change and had done little to meet economic and social inequality. In 1980 the Supreme Court accept that reasonable quotas were legal and that a federal law reserving 15% of public works to be reserved for qualified minority contractors. The opportunities for minorities were helped by Connecticut v Teal (1982) a Supreme Court decision making employers liable for race discrimination if selection procedures affected the opportunities of minorities disproportionally. Additionally, with deferral laws and the backing of the Supreme Court it could be argued that there was progress. There was an increase in the percentage of white-collar jobs held by African American men and women by the 1990s and a rise in physicians from 2.2 to 4.5% African American higher education professors doubled in the 1990s, attorneys rose 6 times and engineers 4 times. Therefore, Affirmative Action seemed to have had an effect on employment opportunities and its legality had been established. However, though there had been increases, the considerable inequality of representation of minorities in top positions and the professions remained. However, its success in being generally politically and socially accepted was less marked as Reagan actively opposed quotas and the Justice Department backed legal cases which challenged the principle of positive discrimination. By 1984 the Equal Employment Opportunity Commission was filing 60% fewer cases than it had in 1980 because of cuts in funding and political opposition. There was too a turn in the legal tide with the Wygant v Jackson Board of Education 1986 overturning the legality of a policy of a school board in laying off white teachers before non-white teachers to defend the employment of minorities.	**30**

© UCLES 2021

GradeMax

Question	Answer	Marks
8	**Assess the importance of the Bretton Woods agreement of 1944 for the United States.** The Bretton Woods agreement arose from a conference in 1944 organised by the US Treasury. The agreement came to be signed by 44 countries and was aimed at avoiding the inter-war problems of protectionism, competitive devaluations, outflows of currency and unstable exchange rates. The idea was that financial stability would promote international trade and this in turn would promote peace. To avoid inflexible gold standard rates, there was a basic fixed rate by which the US dollar was tied to gold to give stability and to establish a sound reserve currency. But there was the ability of countries to use a new International Monetary Fund to go beyond their quota to provide stimulus to prevent mass unemployment and depression. It took fifteen years for the new system to establish itself and did lead to some problems. There was a tendency of governments to pursue 'stop –go' policies, alternating between using the opportunity for expansionism not available in a more rigid gold standard system and then having to pursue austerity policies to protect the value of their currency. As the US was the reserve currency it was not subject to this and there was a gap between the US position and the rest of the world. The holding of dollars was also a problem for the US and by 1964 US gold stock was less than its dollar liabilities through the world. The US had to put pressure on other nations not to convert their dollars into gold and had to make great efforts to keep the price of gold down to the 1944 level of $35 an ounce, the system had depended on the value of the $ being reasonably stable but a big rise in inflation in the US after 1965 undermined this and in 1971 Nixon took the US off the gold standard and the Bretton Woods system came to an end. The agreement created two major international financial institutions the IMF and the World Bank. It was remarkable for the fact that 44 nations agreed to maintain stability and that the system lasted so long. It put the US at the centre of the western world in terms of economic stability and the key element was the US gold standard. However, the hopes were not entirely realized. It took a long time to become operative and far from being a period of international cooperation and global order, the years of the agreement showed the difficulties of creating an international order that encouraged free trade while also allowing nations to pursue policy goals involving domestic spending. Economies at varying levels of competitiveness and with trade surpluses that involved heavy dollar holdings led to imbalance. There was also resentment at the central position of the US and fears that US devaluation would erode the value of dollar holdings – but conversion into gold would go against US interests, so there was increasing tension. Thus while the agreement increased US influence and put it at the centre of plans for a more stable world economy from which it could benefit it also increased its responsibilities in promoting trade and prosperity and led it to problems in tis economic relations with other countries.	**30**

© UCLES 2021

GradeMax

Question	Answer	Marks
9	**Assess the impact of the Prague Spring on US–Soviet relations.** Pursuing détente with the Soviet Union was very important to President Lyndon B Johnson; it was an opportunity to end his presidency on a positive note. However, the Soviet invasion to crack down on political reform in Czechoslovakia put the negotiations on hold and it destroyed Johnson's last chance to leave a legacy he could be proud of. He did not want to upset the Soviets and in the process pursued a policy of no resistance and demonstrated that the United States was not prepared to defend democracy if it was not in its interests. Nevertheless, it soured the relationship between the two superpowers. Johnson was under so much pressure at home with his attempts to create the 'great society' and resistance to American involvement in Vietnam. The assassinations of civil rights leader, Martin Luther King, and presidential candidate, Robert Kennedy, also reduced people's faith in the political system. Success with détente would help to raise his standing and give the Americans a chance to establish an exit strategy for Vietnam. On 20 August 1968 Johnson was making his final preparations for a nuclear arms limitation summit meeting with the Soviet leaders on the following day. The Soviet invasion coincided with the planned meeting This forced him to postpone his plans and his hopes of being recognised as a great peacemaker; it was left to Richard Nixon to receive that honour. Johnson made every effort to protect his personal and political goals by his minimal reaction to the invasion. However, the United States did protest about the invasion in the UN Security Council. It also gave a diplomatic warning to the Soviet Union that it would be more forceful if there were similar action in Romania. Romania had been pursuing a more independent foreign policy and the United States hoped that Romania might become a neutral state in the Cold War. It also resulted in fresh commitments across the NATO alliance, with the United States confirming that it would continue to station its troops in West Germany. Czechoslovakia returned to full Soviet control and the successful invasion saved the shattering of communism in Eastern Europe. Johnson's fixation on détente enabled the Soviets to escape any direct intervention from the United States. Events clearly demonstrated that both Brezhnev and Johnson were prepared to put their own interests first. Brezhnev prioritised maintaining Soviet control of the satellites against pursuing détente. For him détente was just delayed by a few years; for Johnson it had a permanent effect on his legacy. It also led to the Brezhnev Doctrine whereby the Soviet Union maintained its right to intervene in any country where communism had been threatened. While the Prague Spring played a pivotal role in delaying détente, it also increased Soviet confidence that it could deal with its satellite unimpeded by the United States. On the other hand, it was also a wake-up call to the United States that Johnson had given the impression that in his determination to attain the co-operation of the Soviets he would allow the Warsaw Pact to do as it pleased.	**30**

© UCLES 2021

GradeMax

Question	Answer	Marks
10	**'It was the failure of the US post-war policy in China which enabled the Chinese Communist Party to gain power in 1949.' Assess this view.** After the surrender of Japan on 10 August 1945, Chiang Kai-shek's Nationalist China was admitted to the UN as a permanent member of the Security Council. The United States still hoped to maintain Nationalist China as an ally to stop the advance of communism. Truman wished to avoid a renewal of the Chinese civil war. However, US forces were over-stretched in Europe and Asia and heavy military commitment in China was unrealistic. General George Marshall was sent to persuade Mao and Chiang to form a government of national unity. Marshall arrived in China on 20 December 1945. His goal was to unify the Nationalists and Communists hoping that a strong, non-Communist China, would prevent the intervention of the Soviet Union. Even though Marshall conducted negotiations with both sides, no significant agreements were reached and in January 1947 Marshall left China. Although the United States were aware of the corruption of Chiang's administration, they wished to contain communism They therefore increased their aid to the Nationalists, supplying aircraft and sending teams to Taiwan to train their troops. American public opinion was firmly against fighting a war in China. The United States supported the losing side and they limited their commitment in the area. Responses may also consider other factors that influenced the communist victory, such as how it was the Nationalists themselves that helped the Communists secure victory. Chiang's troops often turned and fled rather than face the enemy. His army also had a reputation for arrogance and cowardice and was accused of looting and stealing. He lost support in the cities because of heavy taxes, inflation, unemployment and food shortages. Economic discontent led to strikes and there were protests demanding an end to the civil war and the creation of a government that included the Communists. The Nationalists responded with repression including censorship, mass arrests and assassinations. The Nationalists supported business and the landlords; they ignored the suffering of the peasants. Giving more US funds to the corrupt Nationalists would have been a huge waste of money. The Nationalists played a large part in their own defeat. However, the Communists themselves played a huge part in their victory. The People's Liberation Army was unified under a tightly controlled central command. In 1945 the CCP's liberated zone contained 19 base areas which included about a quarter of the country's territory. The Soviet Union turned over all of its captured Japanese weapons to the CCP who also received Manchuria from the Soviets. Mao appointed loyal generals including Lin Biao and Zhu De whose tactics contributed greatly to the Communist success. The ordinary soldiers in the army were treated with respect and, in contrast, thousands of Nationalists deserted. Large numbers of well-trained KMT deserted and joined the communists and they were able to take full advantage of their skills. In June 1947 the Communists successfully defeated the KMT New First Army; they now had tanks and heavy artillery at their disposal. In 1948 they launched an attack south of the Great Wall that cut off Nationalist troops from their supply bases in Xi'an. They then secured the South East Central section of China and by the end of January 1949 most of China was in the hands of the Communists.	**30**

© UCLES 2021

GradeMax

Question	Answer	Marks
11	**Analyse the reasons why the United Nations failed in Somalia.** President Siyad Barre fell from power in January 1991; he had ruled through his own support network and played off clans against each other causing factional power struggles. The economy of the country began to decline and by 1988 violent opposition to his rule had turned into a civil war. In November 1991, there was intense fighting in Mogadishu between the factions, one supporting Interim President, Ali Mahdi Mohamed and the other supporting the Chairman of the United Somali Congress, Mohamed Farah Aidid. In March 1992 a ceasefire had been agreed but it was ignored by the fighters on both sides. The first United Nations Operation in Somalia (UNOSOM I) was authorised by Security Council Resolution 751 of 24 April 1992. UNOSOM 1 was dispatched to monitor the cease-fire and to protect the personnel involved in the humanitarian work. The collapse of the Somali central government meant that the UN was unable to obtain consent to deploy troops and as a result their mandate was limited; local warlords prevented them from moving much beyond the airport in Mogadishu. Lawlessness and lack of security prevented aid from being distributed. There was looting of supplies by armed gangs and attacks on ships and on airports. However, blame for the failure of UNISOM 1 can also be attributed to the UN itself. Troops often refused to accept orders from UN commanders before checking with their own governments causing delays; the international response to Somalia's problems was also inadequate. Although three separate Security Council resolutions were passed in the first half of 1992, UN humanitarian agencies failed to implement the relief programme. It was also reported in 'The New York Times' in December 1991 that the United States held back UN efforts with the State Department because of safety concerns over the peacekeeping force. It was not until January 1992 when Boutros Boutros-Ghali became UN Secretary General that the UN became more heavily involved with humanitarian aid. Public pressure was put on governments internationally as the media drew attention to the catastrophe and the effects of widespread famine. There were also arguments between the UN and other humanitarian workers in Somalia and the UN reported that the failure of relief operations was due to the bureaucracy involved. Resolution 751 called for the establishment of a peacekeeping force to provide security for humanitarian activities in Mogadishu which included the deployment of 50 unarmed military observers to monitor the ceasefire agreement in the city and agreed in principle to the idea of a UN force to escort the delivery of humanitarian aid. By late October 1992, it was clear that the new plan was not working as intended; the small UN peacekeeping contingent could not ensure that humanitarian aid was delivered throughout the country. Following the ineffective UNOSOM I mission, Boutros-Ghali launched the United Nations Task Force (UNITAF) in December 1992. This was an American-led force of 30,000 troops from 23 countries authorised by Security Council Resolution to provide security for relief operations. The widespread famine and continued civil war in Somalia were seen as a threat to international peace and provided the reason for allowing the forces. The UNITAF forces were largely successful in supplying humanitarian aid but in March 1993 they handed over to UNOSOM II This put military and security objectives before political, economic and social ones and turned into a peace enforcement mission.	**30**

© UCLES 2021

GradeMax

Question	Answer	Marks
12	**Evaluate the role of the United States in the creation of Israel.** David Ben-Gurion was the main founder of the State of Israel. From 1935, he was the head of the Jewish Agency and was, in effect, the leader of the Jewish community in Palestine. He led the struggle for an independent Jewish state to be created in Palestine and it was Ben-Gurion who formally proclaimed the establishment of the State of Israel on 14 May 1948 being the first to sign the Israeli Declaration of Independence. Britain's decision to withdraw from the Palestine Mandate and hand over the problems of the area to the UN paved the way for partition. Palestine had been under the control of the British since 1917 and formally became a British mandate of the League of Nations in 1923. The Balfour Declaration of 1917 stated that the British government favoured the establishment of a national home for the Jewish people but did not want to prejudice the rights of existing non-Jewish communities. In 1939 Britain issued a White Paper stating that it wanted an independent Palestine within 10 years; it would be a state in which Jews and Arabs shared responsibility for governing the country. It also stated that Jewish immigration would be restricted. In 1945, the British confirmed that there would be no increase in immigration and no separate Jewish state. The Zionists, however, were convinced that they had international public opinion on their side and decided on a policy of active opposition to British rule in Palestine. The British government, unable to reach agreement, referred the problem to the UN in 1947 and announced it would withdraw from Palestine on 18 May 1948. The UN devised the plan for partition and a Special Committee on Palestine (UNSCOP) was formed in April 1947 for this purpose. The majority of the committee members recommended that Palestine be partitioned into an Arab State and a Jewish State, with a special international status for the city of Jerusalem under the administrative authority of the UN. The Arab community rejected the plan arguing that it violated the principles of self-determination in the UN Charter. Knowing the extent of Arab opposition to Resolution 181, the UN proceeded to hold a vote in the assembly on the partition of Palestine and a two-thirds majority was obtained. It was also the determination of the United States for the resolution to be passed that led to pressure being put on UN members. Soon after President Truman took office in 1946, he approved a recommendation to admit 100 000 displaced persons into Palestine and in October publicly declared his support for the creation of a Jewish state. It is debatable why Truman decided to support the UN resolution; moral reasons have been put forward with Truman advocating a homeland for the Jewish community because of all their suffering at the hands of the Nazis. However strategic reasons have also been suggested. Partition effectively prevented US need to accept Jewish refugees which they believed would drain their economy. There were also Cold War considerations as it prevented Soviet involvement in the area. It also gained Truman support at home when elections were looming. In the autumn of 1947, against the advice of the State Department, Truman supported partition. A telegram signed by 26 US senators with influence on foreign aid bills was sent to wavering countries, seeking their support for the partition plan. The US Senate was considering a large aid package at the time and many nations reported pressure directed specifically at them. Therefore, while the United States did not initiate the move to create Israel, it was US pressure that secured support for the partition plan.	**30**

© UCLES 2021