



MARKSCHEME

May 2014

GLOBAL POLITICS

Higher Level and Standard Level

Paper 1

6 pages

*This markscheme is **confidential** and for the exclusive use of examiners in this examination session.*

*It is the property of the International Baccalaureate and must **not** be reproduced or distributed to any other person without the authorization of the IB Assessment Centre.*

Unit 2 Human Rights

Bulleted lists in this markscheme indicate likely points that candidates may include in their answer: they are not exhaustive, and examiners should credit other valid points not listed. Students should organize the material into a clear, logical and coherent response.

Humanitarian Intervention

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

- the unique opportunity facing the world (“unique ability to stop violence on a horrific scale”);
- emphasis on non-military intervention (“pursue his removal only through non-military means”; limitations of the use of force);
- scope – the issue of whether intervention should aim at regime change (“broadening the military mission to include regime change would be a mistake”);
- emphasis on the importance of cooperation as key to solving conflict (coalition including Arab countries; the role of the international community and the role of the United States in assisting in a coalition).

Award [1 mark] for each relevant point up to a maximum of [3 marks].

Other relevant points not listed can also be rewarded.

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

Answers may include, but are not limited to:

- the national flag in the image – suggesting that nationalistic sentiment may make people averse to external intervention;
- a quest for autonomy, both as separation from the West and others (the flag as a symbol for this desire);
- the complexities of the internal situation (alternative ideals and goals – who stands behind the flag and what does it symbolise?); there may be internal power struggles/divisions within civil society;
- concern that the country will be perceived as being weak and/or needing outside help, or as being unable to solve their own conflicts (“Libyan people can manage it alone”);
- there have been more visible protests against intervention in recent years, following increased access to communication technology *etc* making it easier to organise opposition to intervention (eg the production of a well-designed poster).

Candidates are not expected to make four separate points in order to achieve full marks. For each valid point a maximum of [2 marks] may be awarded, up to a total of [4 marks]. To be awarded [2 marks] a point must be well developed; for example, simply making the point that the national flag in the image suggests that there are strong nationalistic sentiments would be awarded [1 mark], whereas developing this point into a comment such as “the national flag in the image suggests nationalistic sentiment, which may make the people averse to external intervention by other countries” would be awarded [2 marks]. Please note this is an example only, and there are other valid ways in which this point could be developed.

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

Potential points of contrast:

- Source C emphasizes the difference between humanitarian intervention and war, stating that humanitarian intervention is “intended for humanitarian ends”. In contrast Source D focuses more specifically on the example of Libya, and on why success in Libya may have been due to factors which made it an atypical example;
- Source C notes that UN member states are tasked to “take all necessary measures to protect civilians” but questions whether military action is a necessary measure, and whether it actually protects civilians. Source C is critical of the military means used by states, arguing that this aspect of intervention may eventually undermine the security of people. In contrast, Source D focuses on why the military operation in Libya was successful, so seems more optimistic about the potential usefulness of military action;
- Source C portrays the resolution as a “huge achievement”. In contrast, Source D suggests that the UN Security Council’s resolution only came about because of more practical factors, such as China and Russia having no special relationship with Libya. Source D also suggests that the small size of Libya made intervention more likely, which again suggests that humanitarian motives were not a prime consideration;
- Source D notes the importance of regional actors, suggesting for example that the Libyan intervention partly occurred because of the impact of the Arab Spring. These regional actors are only mentioned in passing in Source C. Also, Source D discusses the “credible” and “cohesive” nature of the internal opposition movements in Libya, while Source C does not discuss the role of internal opposition movements;
- both sources talk about the importance of the UN Security Council but Source D is more sceptical, for example highlighting that the UN Security Council is also subject to state veto.

If the view of only one source is discussed award a maximum of [4 marks]. For a response which focuses significantly on one source with only minimal reference to the other source, award a maximum of [5 marks]. Award [2 marks] per effective point of contrast up to a maximum of [8 marks]. For an [8 mark] response expect a detailed contrast running throughout with an explicit focus on the legitimacy of humanitarian intervention, but do not expect all of the points above, and allow other valid points

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 marks]**

Source material may include, but is not limited to:

Source A

- illustrates the importance and “unique opportunity” of intervention in Libya – and shows the articulation by the USA of a new “responsibility to protect” norm;
- illustrates that there are choices to be made over how, or whether, military intervention needs to occur in response to human rights violations;
- emphasizes the need to intervene in a way that is favourable with the coalition. This suggests that such considerations might also limit the nature and scope of intervention in terms of its humanitarian impact;

Source B

- shows that people in the areas/countries where human rights violations are taking place might not want foreign intervention;

Source C

- suggests that the no-fly zone was legitimate but that this has been replaced by air strikes which are now harming civilians. One reason why humanitarian intervention might not take place even if human rights are being violated is that the intervention might itself lead to loss of civilian life;
- notes that the UN Security Council managed to vote in time to have a significant impact. This suggests that it is often slow to act, or that bureaucratic factors may prevent/delay humanitarian intervention;

Source D

- discusses the use of appropriate force in intervention and throws doubt on the idea that humanitarian motives are key in this case. This implies that decisions on whether to intervene are not always made based primarily on whether human rights are being violated;
- argues that for humanitarian intervention to be successful, local and international conditions need to be conducive to outside intervention – sets out many geopolitical factors which facilitated it in this case;
- cynically makes the point that states will not risk their own forces’ lives to save others unless other factors make this worthwhile, even if there are human rights violations occurring.

Own knowledge could include, but is not limited to:

- the argument that there is a moral obligation for humanitarian intervention when there are human rights violations;
- examples such as Rwanda, Cambodia or Zimbabwe where humanitarian intervention did not take place despite human rights violations;
- humanitarian intervention could be regarded as an unacceptable violation of state sovereignty, regardless of whether there are human rights violations occurring;
- sometimes intervention is proposed, but is vetoed by member states *eg* as in Syria.

Please use the markbands that follow, but note the following:

The bullet points indicate possible areas candidates might cover in their answers. They are not compulsory points. Examiners should not expect all of the above and should be responsive to any other valid points/arguments; for example, individual candidates may refer to their own experience of conflict or human rights abuses which is acceptable if used effectively and appropriately. Students should synthesize and evaluate evidence from the sources and from their study of the

prescribed content and key concepts of the course. If only source material or only own knowledge is used, the response can only be awarded a maximum of [6 marks].

Markbands for question 4

Marks	Level descriptor
0	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The work does not reach a standard described by the descriptors below.
1-2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> There is little relevant knowledge and a very limited awareness of the demands of the question. There is little or no attempt to synthesise own knowledge and source material. Responses at this level are often largely descriptive and contain unsupported generalizations.
3-4	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> There is limited awareness of the demands of the question or the question is only partially addressed. There is some knowledge demonstrated, but this is not always relevant or accurate, and may not be used appropriately or effectively. Responses at this level are often more descriptive than evaluative.
5-6	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Answers show some awareness of the demands of the question. Knowledge is mostly accurate and relevant, and there is some limited synthesis of own knowledge and source material. Counterclaims are implicitly identified but are not explored.
7-8	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Answers are focused and show good awareness of the demands of the question. Relevant and accurate knowledge is demonstrated, there is some synthesis of own knowledge and source material, and appropriate examples are used. The response contains claims and counter claims.
9-10	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Answers are clearly focused and show a high degree of awareness of the demands of the question. Relevant and accurate knowledge is demonstrated, there is effective synthesis of own knowledge and source material, and appropriate examples are used. The response contains clear evaluation, with well balanced claims and counter claims.