



22145951



**GLOBAL POLITICS
HIGHER LEVEL AND STANDARD LEVEL
PAPER 1**

Wednesday 21 May 2014 (afternoon)

1 hour 15 minutes

INSTRUCTIONS TO CANDIDATES

- Do not open this examination paper until instructed to do so.
- Answer all the questions.
- The maximum mark for this examination paper is *[25 marks]*.

Unit 2 Human Rights

Humanitarian Intervention

Read all the sources carefully and answer all the questions that follow.

SOURCE A *A televised address reported in a blog. Adapted from CNN <http://news.blogs.cnn.com/2011/03/28/mideast-live-blog-libyan-rebels-advance-on-gadhafis-hometown/?iref=allsearch>*

In his televised address on Libya the U.S. President Barack Obama said that the world had a unique ability to stop violence “on a horrific scale” in Libya by acting in a broad coalition with the support of Arab countries.

The transition to a legitimate government in Libya is a task for the international community, and more importantly, a task for the Libyan people themselves, Obama said, adding: “If we tried to overthrow Gadhafi* by force, our coalition would break apart.”

Broadening the military mission to include regime change, would be a mistake, said Obama. “While there is no question that Libya would be better off without Moammar Gadhafi as leader, the United States will actively pursue his removal only through non-military means.”

* Gadhafi: also spelt as Qaddafi, Gaddafi, or Kaddafi, and other variations

SOURCE B *A photograph of protests against foreign intervention in Libya. Adapted from **Global Politics** by Andrew Heywood, Palgrave MacMillan, 2011.*



SOURCE C

*An article by Mary Kaldor, **Libya: war or humanitarian intervention**, March 29th 2011, from “Open Democracy,” a website that encourages debate in international politics. Mary Kaldor is Professor of Global Governance and Director of the Civil Society and Human Security Research Unit at the London School of Economics. Adapted from <http://www.opendemocracy.net/mary-kaldor/libya-war-or-humanitarian-intervention>.*

The problem with the military approach is that it reinforces division. Our preoccupation with classic military means is undermining our capacity to address growing insecurity. There is a difference between war and humanitarian intervention. The current attacks on Libya, like the NATO air strikes over Yugoslavia in 1999, are intended for humanitarian ends – the protection of civilians – but the means are those of war.

Certainly the United Nations Security Council Resolution number 1973 was a huge achievement just in time to prevent Gaddafi forces from overrunning Benghazi. The resolution called on member states and regional organizations to “take all necessary measures to protect civilians and civilian populated areas under threat of attack, while excluding a foreign occupation force of any form on any part of Libyan territory”.

But are military attacks from the air an appropriate means? As Amr Moussa, Secretary General of the Arab League, put it (even though he later retracted): “What is happening in Libya differs from the aim of a no-fly zone*. What we want is the protection of civilians, not the bombardment of more civilians.” The risks of war are several. People get killed, mostly soldiers, but also those civilians who are supposed to be protected, however hard Western forces try to be precise in their choice of targets.

* no-fly zone: airspace in which certain aircraft, especially military aircraft, are forbidden to fly

SOURCE D

*An article by Stewart Patrick, **Libya and the Future of Humanitarian Intervention: How Qaddafi’s Fall Vindicated Obama and RtoP**, August 26th 2011, published on “Foreign Affairs” a website that encourages independent debate on politics. Adapted from <http://www.foreignaffairs.com/articles/68233/stewart-patrick/libya-and-the-future-of-humanitarian-intervention>.*

One must be careful not to overdraw lessons from the Libyan experience. It was a unique case and is unlikely to be repeated. For one, Libya had Qaddafi, a villain figure who had managed to alienate nearly all UN member states, including his former Arab and African allies. The timing was also perfect. As the UN, NATO, and United States debated intervention, leaders in the Middle East were still feeling the effects of the Arab Spring. Acutely aware of the vulnerability of their own regimes, the members of the Arab League, Organization of the Islamic Conference, and Gulf Cooperation Council all endorsed the UN’s declaration of a no-fly zone over Libya, including the use of “all necessary means” to prevent mass atrocities.

In addition, China and Russia, the two permanent members of the Security Council (UNSC) most opposed to authorizing military intervention under Chapter VII of the UN Charter, had no special relationship with, or interests in, Libya. So, they had no reason to veto a collective action. Moreover, Libya is a small country. Therefore, the logistics of military intervention promised to be less intimidating there than it would have been in Sudan, for example, which is fifty percent larger, almost seven times as populous, and has hundreds of thousands of soldiers under arms. Libya also possessed a credible, fairly cohesive, and increasingly capable opposition movement, which provided the ground force that Western governments wanting to avoid casualties would not.

1. Identify **three** main points made by U.S. President Barack Obama in Source A about the issue of international intervention in Libya. [3]

 2. With explicit reference to Source B, explain why humanitarian intervention can often be the cause of protests and controversy. [4]

 3. Contrast the views of Source C and Source D regarding the legitimacy of humanitarian intervention. [8]

 4. Using the sources and your own knowledge, evaluate the claim that violations of human rights are no guarantee that humanitarian intervention will take place. [10]
-