



ISHU IB DP Programme Entrance Test

Global Politics Time: 30 min

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

Source A

Adapted from President Vladimir Putin's New York Times Editorial. New York Times. September 12, 2013

From the outset, Russia has advocated peaceful dialogue enabling Syrians to develop a compromise plan for their own future. We are not protecting the Syrian government, but international law. We need to use the United Nations Security Council and believe that preserving law and order in today's complex and turbulent world is one of the few ways to keep international relations from sliding into chaos. The law is still the law, and we must follow it whether we like it or not. Under current international law, force is permitted only in self-defense or by the decision of the Security Council. Anything else is unacceptable under the United Nations Charter and would constitute an act of aggression.

No one doubts that poison gas was used in Syria. But there is every reason to believe it was used not by the Syrian Army, but by opposition forces, to provoke intervention by their powerful foreign patrons, who would be siding with the fundamentalists. Reports that militants are preparing another attack — this time against Israel — cannot be ignored...

We must stop using the language of force and return to the path of civilized diplomatic and political settlement.

A new opportunity to avoid military action has emerged in the past few days. The United States, Russia and all members of the international community must take advantage of the Syrian government's willingness to place its chemical arsenal under international control for subsequent destruction. Judging by the statements of President Obama, the United States sees this as an alternative to military action. ...

Source C

Adapted from USA President Barack Obama's
"Remarks to Nation". September 10, 2013.

My fellow Americans, tonight I want to talk to you about Syria -- why it matters, and where we go from here.

Over the past two years, what began as a series of peaceful protests against the repressive regime of Bashar al-Assad has turned into a brutal civil war. Over 100,000 people have been killed. Millions have fled the country. ...

The situation profoundly changed, though, on August 21st, when Assad's government gassed to death over a thousand people, including hundreds of children.... On that terrible night, the world saw in gruesome detail the terrible nature of chemical weapons, and why the overwhelming majority of humanity has declared them off-limits -- a crime against humanity, and a violation of the laws of war. ...

This is not a world we should accept. This is what's at stake. And that is why, after careful deliberation, I determined that it is in the national security interests of the United States to respond to the Assad regime's use of chemical weapons through a targeted military strike. The purpose of this strike would be to deter Assad from using chemical weapons, to degrade his regime's ability to use them, and to make clear to the world that we will not tolerate their use.

1. Identify two main points made by Russian President Vladimir Putin in **Source A** about the issue of US intervention in Syria and its potential impact on international law.
2. With explicit reference to **Source C**, explain why the United States considered military action necessary against Syria after its alleged use of chemical weapons.
3. Contrast the differing claims of Source A and Source C about international law and how it should be applied to the case of the use of chemical weapons in Syria in 2013.

2.

3.