**Social Studies 30-2**



**Unit 6.7: Balancing Individual and Collective Rights**

[Here is a link to the instruction video also found on the assignment download page](https://adlc.wistia.com/medias/e3nin2xj0r)

**Big Ideas**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
|  | * *Examine why government practices may not reflect values of liberalism.* * *Explore an issue and defend a position regarding this question.* |
|  | * *This is a three-part assignment.* |
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# **Instructions**

1. Read through the background.
2. Read the textbook pages and unit readings that go with this assignment.
3. Research the events in the first chart and fill out your evidence and your answers.
4. Write a response to the question based off the chart information.

# **Background**

In this assignment, you will develop an understanding of individual and collective rights and the challenges liberal democracies face in attempting to balance the promotion of these rights.

This is a three-part assignment. In Part 1, you will research various charters and acts adopted by two liberal democracies that deal with rights. In Part 2, you will examine some case studies that impact these charters and acts. Finally, in Part 3, you will address the question of balancing individual and collective rights.

# **Part One Research**

In the following chart, assess the extent to which each charter or act provides a reasonable balance between protecting the rights of groups and individuals. Highlight yes or no in the corresponding column and then provide an example from your research to support your assessment.

**Total /10** (1 mark for each evidence box)

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Documents**  (A starting point on the Internet is provided for each document.) | **Are the fundamental rights of individuals, such as the Freedom of Speech, Religion, and Security of person, being protected? Respond using your own words.** | | **Are the fundamental rights of individuals and/or groups being denied by protecting the rights of others? Respond using your own words.** | |
| **Yes/No** | **Evidence** | **Yes/No** | **Evidence** |
| **Bill of Rights (United States)**  <http://www.loc.gov/rr/program/bib/ourdocs/billofrights.html> | Yes/No |  | Yes/No |  |
| **Canadian Charter of Rights and Freedoms**  <https://laws-lois.justice.gc.ca/eng/const/page-15.html> | Yes/No |  | Yes/No |  |
| **War Measures Act (Canada)**  <http://www.thecanadianencyclopedia.ca/en/article/october-crisis/> | Yes/No |  | Yes/No |  |
| **Patriot Act (United States)**  <http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Usa_patriot_act> | Yes/No |  | Yes/No |  |
| **Anti-terrorism Act (Canada)**  <http://www.justice.gc.ca/eng/cj-jp/ns-sn/act-loi.html> | Yes/No |  | Yes/No |  |
| **Cite Sources:** | | | | |

# **Part Two Research**

Examine each of the following case studies on issues related to both individual and collective rights. Indicate whether each event promoted or weakened individual and/or collective rights. In each case, provide evidence for your promote/weaken assessment.

**Total /6** (2 marks for each evidence box)

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Case Studies**  (A starting point on the Internet is provided for each event.) |  | **Did this event’s action promote or weaken individual and/or collective rights?**  **Provide evidence.**  **In your own words.** | |
| **War Measures Act and the October Crisis, 1970 (Canada)**  <http://www.thecanadianencyclopedia.ca/en/article/october-crisis/> |  | Promote/Weaken |  |
| **PATRIOT Act and the Rendition of Mahar Arar (United States/Canada)**  <http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Mahar_Arar> |  | Promote/Weaken |  |
| **Anti-terrorism Act and Charter of Rights and Freedoms (Canada)**  <http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Canadian_Anti-Terrorism_Act> |  | Promote/Weaken |  |
| **Cite Sources:** |  | | |

# **Part Three Paragraph Response**

**Discuss why government practices may not always reflect liberal values**.

Use the information you researched in the above charts as examples to help support your position (position paragraph).

**Your written response should** specifically refer to the countries in the above charts.

**Total /10**  \*Based on the Position Paragraph rubric found at the end of the assignment

## **Suggested Format**

Position paragraph

* Address the question in general.
* Are there times when the government may not always reflect liberal values?
* Answer the following yes or no question as your thesis: Do governments always reflect liberal values?
* Use details from the chart to support your thesis.
* You should have 2–3 examples from the charts with supporting statements.
* Please use terminology from the course.
* Introduce current events or course examples to support yourself.

## 

## **Suggestions for Success**

* Avoid only summarizing the events.
* Make this a paragraph of 7-10 sentences long.
* Avoid arguing both sides of the argument.
* Write a thesis statement.
* Refer to the information and case studies you researched in the above charts.

<Write your response here.>

# **Rubric for Position Paragraph(s)**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Scoring Criteria:**  **Position Paragraph** | **Explanations and Support**  **7 marks**  When marking ***Explanations and Support***, markers should consider the   * quality of explanations * selection and quality of support | **Communication**  **3 marks**  When marking ***Communication***, markers should consider   * organization and coherence * vocabulary (specificity and accuracy) * sentence construction (clarity and completeness) * grammar and mechanics (consistency of   tense, punctuation, spelling, and capitalization) |
| **Excellent**  **E** | Explanations are thorough and comprehensive, revealing a perceptive understanding. Support is specific and accurate. Errors, if present, do not detract from the response. 7 | The writing is fluent and effectively organized. Vocabulary is precise and effective. The writing demonstrates confident control of sentence construction, grammar, and mechanics. The occurrence of errors is rare.  3 |
| **Proficient**  **Pf** | Explanations are appropriate and purposeful, revealing a clear understanding. Support is relevant and appropriate but may contain some minor errors. 5.6 | The writing is clearly organized. Vocabulary is accurate and appropriate. The writing frequently demonstrates effective control of sentence construction, grammar, and mechanics. The occurrence of errors is infrequent. 2.4 |
| **Satisfactory**  **S** | Explanations are general and straightforward, revealing an acceptable understanding. Support is relevant but general, may be incompletely developed, and/or contains errors. 4.2 | The writing is generally clear and functionally organized. Vocabulary is generally accurate but not specific. The writing demonstrates basic control of sentence construction, grammar, and mechanics. Errors do not seriously interfere with communication. 1.8 |
| **Limited**  **L** | Explanations are over generalized and/or redundant, revealing a confused, though discernable, understanding. Support is superficial, may not always be relevant, and contains significant errors. 2.8 | The writing is uneven and incomplete but is discernibly organized. Vocabulary is imprecise and/or inappropriate. The writing demonstrates faltering control of sentence construction, grammar, and mechanics. Errors hinder communication.  1.2 |
| **Poor**  **P** | Explanations are tangential or minimal, revealing a negligible understanding. Support, if present, is incomplete, may be marginally relevant, and contains significant and/or frequent errors. 1.4 | The writing is unclear and disorganized. Vocabulary is ineffective and frequently incorrect. The writing demonstrates lack of control of sentence construction, grammar, and mechanics. Errors impede communication.  .06 |
| **Total:  /10** | | |
| **Areas of Strength** |  | |
| **Areas to Improve** |  | |
| **Totals** | **Chart: /16 Response: /10 Total: /26**  Once your assignment is graded, always review the comments and the feedback file. You will be expected to use those comments and feedback in your next assignment. | |

# 

# **Student Exemplars**

**90-100%**

Some cases it is impossible for a country to satisfy both the desires of freedom and security or rights and safety. What the PATRIOT Act, War Measures Act, and Anti-Terrorism Act all have in common is that all are meant to provide better protection and security for the country and its people, however at the cost some freedoms and rights. One reason government practices may not always reflect liberal values is because it must think of the security of a nation as a whole. For example before the October Crisis began, the FLQ was responsible for over 95 bombings including the bombing of the Montreal Stock Exchange on February 13th 1969 which caused extensive damage and injured 27 people. In order to fund their efforts the FLQ resorted to bank robbery and later kidnapped the provincial cabinet minister, Pierre Laporte (who was later murdered by FLQ members) and the British diplomat James Cross. The Canadian government needed to respond to the FLQ and they chose to respond in a way that was aimed to bring a swift end to the FLQ’s activity at the expense of some individual freedoms. A curfew was put in place in some regions and people were detained without the laying of charges. These actions go against the liberal value of freedom for the individual. The freedom to leave one’s home was suspended for a short time and those who were detained without charges experienced their legal rights being violated. The attacks of 911 killed nearly 3000 people, injured thousands of others, and caused at least $10 billion in property and infrastructure damage. This terrorist attack demanded an increase of security and efforts to protect the country from future acts of terror. As a result of this event Canada created the Anti-terrorism act and the U.S created the PATRIOT Act. Although these acts have their differences, they both contributed to extending the power of the government and security and law enforcement agencies in the form of providing them greater ability for surveillance and monitoring people. As shown in the case of Mahar Arar, the U.S also had the power to detain people without charges. Privacy became an issue due to these acts and many criticized these acts as violating the constitutional rights of citizens in the U.S and the rights listed in the Charter of Freedom and Rights for the Canadian citizens. One can easily criticize these acts for the rights and freedoms they sometimes violate, but the difficulty is no one knows what might have happened if the governments of Canada and the U.S did not implement these acts. No one can say with absolute certainty that these acts did not prevent the FLQ from causing greater damage, or perhaps prevent another terrorist attack from occurring such as the one on September 11th.  I think in certain situations, some government practices are too great of a rejection of liberal values and violation of people’s rights. What happened to Mahar Arar is a good example of this. After detaining him without charges and questioned without having any meaningful access to a lawyer, he was sent to Syria where the United States knew he could be tortured. I think this is a clear example of the government’s practices going too far. At the same time, I don’t believe it is reasonable to resist every government action that would challenge our freedoms and rights. The reality is that terrorism exists and with today’s technology, the damage that one can do is only becoming greater. This is why I think the government practices cannot always reflect liberal values. Sometimes the importance of security and safety of the country outweighs the importance of individual and collective freedoms and rights. ADLC

Marker’s Response: Opening, closing, details, rights mentioned and examples provided great job!

**50-60%**

Every country must have an economic system to answer these three things, form of government, objectives and ideologies. To me I think the government should provide economic equality to protect against the worst elements of capitalism but also to not limit too much of their freedoms. The government should take a role in the economy while allowing private enterprises because such involvement would eliminate the negative aspects of capitalism while adopting the positive aspects of Socialism. I think this would benefit the economy in variety of ways, it allows businesses to remain in the private hands while removing some of the worst abuses of pure capitalism also it protects the consumers, producers, and the community as a whole. (This is good but needs some examples for support from the charts above.)