



Cambridge International Examinations
Cambridge Pre-U Certificate

GLOBAL PERSPECTIVES AND INDEPENDENT RESEARCH

9777/01

Paper 1 Written Paper

October/November 2016

MARK SCHEME

Maximum Mark: 30

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 will not enter into discussions about these mark schemes.

Cambridge is publishing the mark schemes for the October/November 2016 series for most Cambridge IGCSE[®], Cambridge International A and AS Level components and some Cambridge O Level components.

© IGCSE is a registered trademark.

This syllabus is approved for use in England, Wales and Northern Ireland as a Cambridge International Level 3 Pre-U Certificate.

This document consists of **5** printed pages.

Page 2	Mark Scheme	Syllabus	Paper
	Cambridge Pre-U – October/November 2016	9777	01

1 Study Document 1.

- (a) Identify two conditions which might justify humanitarian intervention given in Document 1. [2]

Examiners should be aware that candidates are asked only to identify conditions and not explain or evaluate them; therefore they should not expect lengthy responses. Candidates are not expected to put the conditions into their own words and may simply copy them from the Document; however examiners should ensure that all the conditions given in the response are taken from Document 1.

Candidates should be awarded one mark for each correct or valid condition taken from the Document up to a maximum of two marks. Candidates who develop one point and do not identify two conditions may not be awarded more than one mark for each as the question asks for two.

The conditions that candidates are most likely to write are:

- The threat or harm to the population must be clear and sufficiently serious
- No other purposes or ulterior motives must be available
- Intervention must be a last resort
- Non-military intervention must have been explored
- The means of the intervention must be proportional
- If force is used it must be minimal
- To preserve the principles of the dignity of man and protection of human life (could be offered as two conditions)
- Military action must echo international law
- The scale of force, duration and intensity of action should be the minimum necessary

- (b) Identify and explain any two reasons against humanitarian intervention given in Document 1. [4]

Candidates are asked to identify *and* explain two reasons, but examiners should be aware that this question carries only four marks and should not expect a lengthy answer. An explanation requires candidates to put the relevant text into their own words – they should not be rewarded for simply copying out or large sections of the Document. However, examiners should ensure that the reasons given are taken from the Document, rather than their own knowledge.

Candidates should be awarded one mark for identifying each reason and one for explaining what it means. One reasoned which is also explained should be rewarded two marks.

The reasons are (possible explanation is brackets):

- Every state has responsibility for its own affairs. Explanation = it is a state's decision whether or not to intervene with events/problems in its own territory/boundaries.
- One country does not have the right to impose its own values/opinions onto another country. Explanation = one country cannot invade another and seek to change its ways, culture.
- Intervention can fail and/or cause more problems. Explanation = it might make the situation worse, or be unsuccessful. (Example = loss of more lives in the Congo or Haiti earthquake.)

Page 3	Mark Scheme	Syllabus	Paper
	Cambridge Pre-U – October/November 2016	9777	01

2 Assess the strengths and weaknesses of the author’s argument about humanitarian intervention in Document 1. [10]

- Responses should focus on the strengths **and** weaknesses of the argument about humanitarian intervention put forward by the author in Document 1.
- At Level 3 candidates must consider both the strengths and weaknesses.
- At Level 2 there is likely to be imbalance, with most of the answer focusing on the weakness of the argument, although some answers may focus largely on the strengths. Candidates who focus on only the strengths or weaknesses can still achieve any mark within this level depending upon the quality of the evaluation.
- At Level 1 it is likely that candidates will consider only either the strengths or weaknesses. At this level candidates’ answers are likely to be descriptive in approach, particularly at the lower end, if there is evaluation it may be very generalised.

Level 3 8–10 marks	Sustained evaluation of strengths and weaknesses of reasoning and evidence; critical assessment with explicit reference to how flaws and counter argument support the overall argument. Highly effective, accurate and clearly expressed explanation and reasoning; clear evidence of structured argument/discussion, with conclusions reached/explicitly stated in a cogent and convincing manner.
Level 2 5–7 marks	Some evaluation of strengths and weaknesses of reasoning and evidence, but evaluation may focus on one aspect; assessment of flaws etc. may not link clearly to the overall argument. Effective and generally accurate explanation and reasoning; some evidence of structured argument/discussion; conclusions may not be explicitly stated or link directly to the analysis.
Level 1 1–4 marks	Little or no evaluation of strengths and weaknesses, although flaws etc. may be identified. Level of communication is limited, response may be cursory or descriptive; communication does not deal with complex subject matter.

No set answer is expected and examiners should be flexible in their approach. There is no requirement to use technical terms to access any level and candidates will NOT be rewarded for their use unless they link them directly to the demands of the question.

Indicative Content

Strengths

- Clear definition of humanitarian intervention offered at the outset
- Precise examples offered to support the argument e.g. Haiti and Congo
- Use of evidence within the examples e.g. death of 54 people in Haiti
- Acknowledges there is a counter argument, so the argument appears balanced
- Sets out specific criteria to assess justification for intervention. The author states distinct criteria and specifies them
- Offers a clear conclusion leading from the reasoning
- Use of language is precise, legalistic in tone
- Author is a researcher therefore close to the subject/data and writing for an audience with an interest in political issues – this strengthens the author’s claim to know

Page 4	Mark Scheme	Syllabus	Paper
	Cambridge Pre-U – October/November 2016	9777	01

Weaknesses

- The evidence used is not sourced
- It is not clear what status the criteria have to support the views about theoretical justification
- What does 'must' mean – 'to preserve those laws action must be taken' – why?
- Conflation between a failed military mission (Congo – and unforeseen consequences of the earthquake (Haiti)
- What is a properly 'executed' intervention? Hitler's invasion of Czechoslovakia may have been properly executed (in some terms) and considered a success in some quarters.
- The conclusion about theory and reality is clearly stated but what does it really mean?

3 To what extent is Document 2 more convincing in its view about interventions than Document 1?

In your answer, you should consider the evidence and reasoning used in the documents.

[14]

Responses should focus on key reasons in both documents in order to compare the perspectives and synthesise them in order to reach a reasoned judgement. In order to assess whether Document 2 is more convincing than Document 1 candidates should consider not only the content of the Documents, but critically assess the arguments put forward through a consideration of issues such as the nature of the passages, purpose and language.

- At Level 3 candidates will reach a judgement regarding which Document is the most convincing in its view about interventions. In order to do this they will have covered a significant range of issues, and evaluated them clearly. They will have made clear points about impact on the quality of argument and on the reader, explaining how they make the argument more or less convincing. Response offering some high quality evaluative points may be placed lower in this level. To reach the top of this level the full descriptor must be met.
- At Level 2 there will be some evaluation and comparison, but it will be either poorly developed or limited in the areas covered. There is unlikely to be any explanation or evaluation of impact on the reader.
- At Level 1 there will be very little comparison of the passages or evaluation and candidates may simply describe the documents or identify areas of similarity and difference.

Level 3 11–14 marks	Answers at this level will demonstrate a sustained judgement about which Document is most convincing. There will be sustained evaluation of alternative perspectives; critical assessment with explicit reference to key issues raised in the passages leading to a reasoned and sustained judgement. Highly effective, accurate and clearly expressed explanation and reasoning; clear evidence of structured argument/ discussion, with conclusions reached/explicitly stated in a cogent and convincing manner.
Level 2 6–10 marks	Answers at this level will be more than just a comparison of the two documents; there will be some evaluation, but this will not be sustained and may focus on one perspective; assessment may not link key reasons and evidence clearly to the perspective or to the reasoned judgement. Effective and generally accurate explanation and reasoning; some evidence of structured argument/discussion; conclusions may not be explicitly stated or link directly to analysis.

Page 5	Mark Scheme	Syllabus	Paper
	Cambridge Pre-U – October/November 2016	9777	01

Level 1 1–5 marks	Answers at this level will describe a few points and there will be little or no evaluation of perspectives, although some relevant evidence or reasons may be identified. If there is any judgement it will be unsupported or superficial. Level of communication is limited; response may be cursory or descriptive; communication does not deal with complex subject matter.
----------------------	--

No set answer is expected and examiners should be flexible in their approach. Answers should go beyond a simple comparison of the content of the two passages and look to evaluate a range of issues if they want to access the higher levels. Candidates may cover a range of issues, such as the reliability of the Documents, by looking at their origin. There might be consideration of the evidence that is used by the two authors and the quality of their arguments and reasoning.

Document 2 argues that we need greater consistency in how interventions are dealt with so that the UN members cannot ignore their responsibilities. Its central premise differs from Doc 1 which focuses on whether intervention can be considered humanitarian in nature and what this actually means in reality.

Doc 2 more convincing:

- Authors are in specialist research field potentially with a more distinct aim than the organisation for which the author of Document 1 works.
- It could be argued that the authors of Doc 2 make a strong point about the major powers not having the doctrine applied to them because they are responsible for carrying it out. The point that the major powers are largely responsible is exemplified in Document 2 para 2.
- Doc 2 raises a valid point about who is to decide 'right' and 'wrong behaviour'. The assumption in Document 1 is that to protect the dignity of man action must be taken and Document 2 challenges this by considering who is to make the decision. In a sense this almost moves the debate on and can strengthen the argument.
- It offers a clear alternative to intervention (R2P) which is not given attention in Doc 1 and which again strengthens the argument by progressing it.
- It puts intervention in a wider historical context of colonialism than Document 1, although both documents use an appeal to history, Doc 2's is wider.

Doc 2 less convincing:

- The claims are too wide for the evidence presented. Document 1 offers more examples and considers different sorts of humanitarian intervention. Whereas in Doc 2 there is no support for whether the major powers have ignored issues or had an interest in maintaining conflicts.
- It could be argued that in Doc 2 there is insufficient consideration of the theoretical justifications such as are stated in Document 1
- It is not made clear why military intervention is such a 'dubious' tool
- The case for Intervention is stated to have a slippery slope (Doc 2, para 2) flaw, but no examples are provided to support that. It could be argued that Document 1 is more supported by examples/evidence which makes it more convincing
- The precise examples of suffering and death in Doc 1 are actually supporting a view that there are practical issues which ought to be addressed – again strengthening.
- The inverted commas round 'international community' in Doc 2 are intended to challenge the underlying concept but without explanation.
- Doc 2 does not make clear how the prevention of the failure of the international system is to be achieved or what justification in international law that would have or how any agreements would be enforced. It is lacking in explanation.

A reminder – candidates at the **higher level must make a supported judgement as to which is the more convincing argument**. Some candidates might offer an alternative or modified view, and if this has been supported that should be credited.