

CJC JC2 H2 Prelims Exams
Suggested Answers for Paper 1

1(a) Compare and contrast the evidence provided in Sources A and B on China's involvement in the Korean War.
[10]

Similarity	Sources A and B are similar in showing that China had involved itself in the Korean War through its military support for North Korea.
Reason for Similarity	The similarity between the sources can be explained by their common context, as Source A was written in 2004 and was looking back retrospectively on the events of the Korean War, while Source B was written in 1951, after China had involved itself in the conflict. They are therefore able to account for the military involvement of China, in support of the DPRK in the Korean War.
Difference	However upon deeper evaluation, both sources are more different than similar, as they present differing reasons for China's involvement in the war. Source A asserts that China had been instigated by Stalin to involve itself in the conflict for his strategic interests, while Source B asserts that China involved itself to fulfil its own aggressive goals.
Reason for Difference	The difference between the sources can be explained by their different provenance and intended outcomes. ▪ Source A – An assessment of the Korean War by a historian [author], published in 2004, more than 50 years after the Korean War [context]. ▪ Source B – MacArthur's [author] address to the Congress [audience] in 1951, after the rollback against Communism which had provoked the involvement of China [context].

*Note to Marker:

- Other differences are acceptable as long as it is a:
 - clear contrast
 - can be supported by content of sources
 - can be supported by provenance of sources
- Having both context and author/audience for IO will render students able to get L4. A 9 – 10 marks would be determined by quality of IO and explanation.

1(b) How far do Sources A – F support the view that the Korean War and Cuban Missile Crisis were driven by local players?

[30]

Source	Challenge			Support		
	A	B	E	C	F	D
Face Value	Rather than local players, the Korean War was driven by the involvement of the superpowers and China.		Rather than local players, the CMC was driven by the superpowers.	CMC was driven by Castro, whose revolutionary attempts triggered tensions with the US.		Korean War was driven by local players, as Rhee's regime had started the conflict.
Purpose		MacArthur's [author] address to the Congress [audience] in 1951, after the rollback against Communism which had provoked the involvement of China [context].	Extracted from J. F. Kennedy's [author] Cuban Missile Crisis Address to the Nation [audience], 22 October, 1962, after the discovery of Soviet missile sites in Cuba [context].	- C: Cartoon published in a US newspaper [author] in 1961. - F: Speech by Castro [author] at the May Day celebrations in Havana in 1961. - Both sources published 2 years after the Cuban Revolution. Cuba had distanced itself politically from the US while progressively forging ties with the USSR [context].		Statement of the Soviet government [author] to the US Ambassador [audience], 29 June 1950, 4 days after the DPRK commenced an offensive against the south, and the US was calling for retaliatory action under the UNSC [context].
CK / CR	Despite the possible purpose, the credibility is enhanced with CK. - Stalin's opportunistic support for Kim, based on the assumption that the US would not intervene in Korea (Dean Acheson's Defence Perimeter Speech). - MacArthur's unilateral decisions to commence a rollback on communism, provoking significant Chinese involvement in defence of its territorial security at the Yalu River.		Despite the possible purpose, credibility enhanced with CK. - Location of Cuba within the US' backyard – Soviet missiles thus posed security threat. - USSR's nuclear presence in Cuba was a violation of the US' Monroe Doctrine, where it claimed strategic interests over Central America.	Despite the possible purpose, Credibility is enhanced with CK. - Economic dominance of the US over Cuba e.g. US owned 80% of Cuba's utilities, 40% of its sugar, 90% of mining wealth. - Cuban Revolution: Implemented economic reforms which threatened US interests in Cuba e.g. trade agreements with USSR and re-distribution of US property among poorer farmers in Cuba. - The above actions triggered US economic retaliation against Cuba (e.g. reduction in Cuban sugar quota).		Credibility is further limited with CK and CR. - Rhee's regime was plagued by internal political factionalism and economic problems. It was also supported by the US only with light arms for defensive purposes and was thus not in a position to commence an offensive against the North. - CR to Source A/B: The Korean War was started by the "North Korean invaders" and subsequently aggravated by the involvement of the superpowers and China. <i>*There is a need to provide some CK to directly question the culpability of Rhee, before CR to A/B to show the responsibility of the other players.</i>

Modification of Assertion

Based on the above evaluation, the stronger sources were those which showed that while local players had some responsibility in triggering tensions with the superpowers, the Korean War and Cuban Missile Crisis were driven by the superpowers, as well as external players like China. However, the specific claim of Source D that the Korean War was started by Rhee could not stand up to the scrutiny of contextual knowledge, cross-reference, and critical analysis of its provenance and purpose, as developed above.

Thus the hypothesis should be modified: While the provocative actions of local players triggered tensions leading to the outbreak of the Korean War and Cuban Missile Crisis (Sources A & B, C & F), the subsequent development of these conflicts was driven by the superpowers, who had supported the local players and intervened in domestic rivalry for their own strategic interests (Sources A, B and E).

2. 'The Bretton Woods system determined the fate of the global economy.' Discuss.

**This essay has defined "determined the fate" – as having negative connotations*

Possible Stand:

It ***could be argued*** that the BWs determined the fate of the global economy since its collapse by 1973, would trigger off the beginnings of the Crisis Decades. However, the reason for the collapse of the BWs is ultimately linked to the role of US, which was fundamentally responsible for the collapse of the system and many other actions and decisions that laid the foundations for decline and sustained it through to 1990.

Suggested Response:

TS1: The Bretton Woods system could be argued to have determined the fate of the GE since its collapse would trigger off the Crisis Decades.

TS2: However while the BWs was significant, it was not the greatest determinant of fate of the global economy since the impact of the BWs was fundamentally influenced by the US, which would be argued to be the greatest determinant of the fate of the GE.

TS3 - 4: US as the greatest determinant of the fate of the global economy is further reiterated when considering how their actions & policies beyond the Bretton Woods system, largely and more consistently contributed to the decline from 1945 to 2000.

- Possible focus areas – US role in the increasing oil prices, protectionism & the Debt Crisis

Judgmental Conclusion: Though BWs was important to the decline of the GE, it paled in comparison to the role of US which is a more direct and sustained factor in determining the fate of the GE

3. Why did the Asian Tigers experience an economic 'miracle' from the 1970s?

Possible Stand:

The economic miracle experienced by South Korea and Taiwan can be attributed to the role of international developments [alternative factor], through which the Asian Tigers received economic aid and support, facilitating their sudden and significant growth from the 1970s. However, it was fundamentally their domestic governments [main factor] who had capitalized on the opportunities afforded by international developments, and put in place pragmatic economic policies that ensured the sustained growth of their economies. It was also the astute economic policies of the domestic governments that capitalized and supported private businesses, and which responded effectively to global economic challenges to maintain their trajectory of growth.

**Alternative approaches (e.g. weighing between the role of private businesses vs the state) may also be accepted.*

Suggested Response:

TS1: International political and economic developments undeniably contributed to the economic miracle of the Asian Tigers through the provision of substantial economic aid and support, laying steady foundations for growth.

TS2: That said, the economic miracle experienced by the Asian Tigers could be explained more by the interventionist role of the state, which put in place policies capitalizing on opportunities afforded by international developments, fundamentally driving economic growth.

TS3: Furthermore, the states of South Korea and Taiwan had imposed pragmatic policies to continually restructure their economies to remain competitive for sustained growth, proving their significance as the driving force behind the economic miracle of the 1970s.

TS4: The role of the state in South Korea and Taiwan was also directly responsible for the economic miracle of the 1970s, as they had capitalized and supported domestic private businesses and employed them as engines for growth.

Judgmental Conclusion: While international developments contributed to the economic miracle in South Korea and Taiwan in the 1970s, the fundamental reason was the interventionist role of the state.

4. 'The Security Council proved to be the greatest hurdle to the success of the United Nations.' Assess the validity of this statement from 1945 - 1991.

Possible Stand: It is indeed true that the Security Council proved to be the greatest hurdle to the success of the United Nations from 1945 – 1991, when compared to the other UN organs of GA, SG and ICJ. While they had significant successes, which may suggest that they facilitated, rather than obstructed success, these successes were ultimately dependent on alignment to the national interests of its most powerful members. Hence, a misalignment will essentially lead to the SC becoming a significant hurdle to UN success. In fact, it is the greatest hurdle since it also resulted in significant ineffectiveness of the other organs such as the GA, SG and ICJ.

Suggested Response:

TS1: The perception that the SC proved to be the greatest hurdle would seem incredibly flawed when considered its most dominant and direct role in maintaining international peace and security amidst Cold War politics.

TS2: The idea that Security Council was a hurdle to UN success seems even more ludicrous when considering the significant successes in the post-Cold War period.

TS3: *[weaker argument + downplay]* However, in reality successes of the SC were not only fragile and unsustained, it was dependent on alignment of major power interest to UN actions. Hence, where it did not align, the Security Council members would severely affect effectiveness through the use of veto, proving to be the greatest hurdle.

TS4: Further, SC being the greatest hurdle is most convincingly proven when it is the organ that significantly impeded the ability and effectiveness of other UN organs in fulfilling their roles and responsibilities.

Judgmental Conclusion: UNSC was indeed the greatest hurdle to UN success.

5. How far do you agree that the United Nations has lived up to expectations in fulfilling its peacekeeping responsibilities?

Possible Stand:

Suggested Response: It *could be argued* that UN has indeed lived up to expectations in fulfilling its peacekeeping responsibilities from 1945 to 2000. All three organs of the UN, the SC, GA and SG seemed to have played their part in contributing to overall success. However, the successes were largely limited in scope and unsustained since they were significantly restricted by great power politics and structural limitations. Even efforts at reforming peacekeeping proved limited in effectiveness.

TS1: It could be perceived that UN has lived up to expectations in fulfilling its peacekeeping responsibilities when considering the successes in the Cold War period.

TS2: This perception could be further reinforced when looking at the post-Cold War period, where UN even expanded its peacekeeping responsibilities to include peacebuilding and showed effectiveness in Cambodia.

TS3: However, in reality, these successes were largely limited in scope and unsustained as they were often restricted by great power politics.

TS4: Peacekeeping was also significantly affected by structural limitations throughout 1945 to 2000, thus showing UN has failed to live up to expectations.

Judgmental Conclusion: Hence on overall, UN has not lived up to expectations with regards to peacekeeping