

Front  
95% I know the numbers don't add up but Mike Kennedy  
Woo!

Soviet Demands for reform were not genuinely attempting to improve the UN's structure and effectiveness as shown by documents C, E, A, and D ranked in decreasing reliability in that order. However Document B suggests that the Soviet demands were indeed a genuine attempt to help the UN.

Document E, coming from a more modern source, giving it a better view of both the Soviet and Western viewpoints, shows how far the the UN had come and how dysfunctional it now was. It shows how Hammarskjold had in a sense corrupted the position of Secretary-General and that it was not a bad thing that the Soviets "attacked" him. These concerns about Hammarskjold and his position are also addressed by documents B and C. It goes on however to point out that they didn't go about it the right way and that in-fact they proposed an even worse "troika" system which is backed by Kennedy in Document D and Hussein in Document C. This shows the Soviets not caring about improving the UN but rather trying to disrupt its working. This source is quite trustworthy and ranks fairly high as it is a collection of factual information and lacks any sort of opinion despite being from an American University during the Cold War.

Document A, coming from a political commentator towards the end of the Cold War, giving it a good view from all sides on the troika movement, also believes that the soviets call for change wasn't genuine. This can be seen by the use of "demanded". Khrushchev "demanded" a world unity and peace organization be divided into three sections which is the exact opposite of what the organization is intended for. Additionally that it says Khrushchev demanded is odd as in Document B he seems to be quite level headed, practical, and more urging rather than harshly demanding. While it agrees with Mr. Nehru in Document C, with the West holding much of the power in the UN, this document believes the Soviets were aiming for the same influence and aren't genuinely concerned when it says "broader strategic position". This implies that the USSR wants the position of the US in that it wants to hold a large influence over the UN and not equality and equal representation which Khrushchev speaks of in Document B. The source seems quite reliable. It is a source from the Soviet Union, albeit on its last leg, and is actually somewhat critical of the mother land. Being from the USSR it should have quite the understanding of Soviet politics and its intentions.

Document C, coming straight from the General Assembly and the mouth of the representatives of two neutral(?) country with his "genuine concerns" and that the Soviets want to have the influence they see the US and the West have. Nehru is more sympathetic with the Soviets idea of reform. He recognizes the need for it much like Documents E, A, B, and to some extent D but never directly supports what the Soviets want to do. What Khrushchev and the Soviets want is radical, swift change, to change a major part of the UN. Nehru doesn't want anything immediate and controversial making him somewhat against the Soviets. Perhaps he is worried with what the Soviets may do with these radical changes. He recognizes that the Western powers control much of the UN, but maybe that's not so bad compared to the plans the Soviets have in mind. This document is quite reliable as it offers viewpoints from neutral/non-aligned(?) countries that give two radically different responses. Hussein uses quite anti-communist language such as saying they have "rowdy tactics" and are "bad-tempered".

SE-1  
CE-2  
cedal  
CR ✓  
P ✓

yes

SE-2  
who are they  
CE-2  
outside

CR

However he is offset by Nehru who is much more rational and seemingly more calm. While still not entirely supportive of either side he does show sympathy towards the Soviets ideas but appears cautious towards their plans.

The final supporting document is Document D. Kennedy addresses the recent growth of the UN, backed by Documents B and C, and shows the US as supportive of any reform resulting in more equality, which calls into question whether or not the UN was truly controlled by the US as shown in Documents A and B. Kennedy suggests that the Soviets intentions as stated in Document B are not as they seem but are rather to further destabilize, like Hussein in Document C, the UN and "accept the Cold War in the headquarters of peace." This documents is only somewhat reliable if at all. Kennedy, being the President of the US, is going to support the West and oppose the Soviets. He is also indefinitely going to oppose the troika heavily as Hammarskjold had just died, emotions are high, and it would be easier for Soviets to play on this and instate said troika. With all this being said Kennedy didn't use any sensationalist language to rile up any emotions but called upon members for reason and level-headedness.

With all of this being said, Document B supports the idea that the Soviets had nothing but good intentions. Khrushchev proposes a plan that on paper seems to give all members, veteran and new, equal representation. This agrees with Documents C, A, and E with all the new members and a call for equality. He too believed that the UN was effectively controlled by the Western nations (Documents C and A) All of this seems genuine, especially when analyzing this document and this one alone. Its tone aids it. Much like Kennedy and Document D the argument is quite calm and level-headed. It is proposing equality thus supporting the idea of genuine reform concerns, and on paper sounds great (much like the idea of communism and we saw how that turned out) This documents validity, again much like Kennedy's, is only somewhat valid if at all. It is Khrushchev so he is going to put the USSR in the best position and isn't going to undermine or even point out any negative points of this Soviet troika plan.

When ranking the reliability of the Documents it turns out in this order (from most reliable to least): C, E, A, B, D, C being the most reliable because it comes from neutral(?) countries with differing viewpoints. E and A are essentially interchangeable in raking as they both look back on the events and seem to come from fairly reliable sources, A a political commentator and E from a University. D and C are also the same way. Both come from the leaders of the major countries in the Cold War conflict and both only support their country and give no sympathy to the others viewpoint, which is to be expected.

Ultimately with all the information given from various viewpoints it is clear the the USSR had other intentions with their "genuine concerns" Sources A, C, D, and E all point out that either the soviets had other intentions or that the change, be it from good intentions or not, would weaken the UN. While Document B is quite compelling, the source ultimately detracts from its credit and even if it didn't the evidence presented against it is too strong to accept that the Soviets really wanted to improve the UN.

yes!

add 2

2

i

yes

Michael  
Excellent