

Markscheme

November 2021

Global politics

Higher level and standard level

Paper 2

19 pages

© International Baccalaureate Organization 2021

All rights reserved. No part of this product may be reproduced in any form or by any electronic or mechanical means, including information storage and retrieval systems, without the prior written permission from the IB. Additionally, the license tied with this product prohibits use of any selected files or extracts from this product. Use by third parties, including but not limited to publishers, private teachers, tutoring or study services, preparatory schools, vendors operating curriculum mapping services or teacher resource digital platforms and app developers, whether fee-covered or not, is prohibited and is a criminal offense.

More information on how to request written permission in the form of a license can be obtained from <https://ibo.org/become-an-ib-school/ib-publishing/licensing/applying-for-a-license/>.

© Organisation du Baccalauréat International 2021

Tous droits réservés. Aucune partie de ce produit ne peut être reproduite sous quelque forme ni par quelque moyen que ce soit, électronique ou mécanique, y compris des systèmes de stockage et de récupération d'informations, sans l'autorisation écrite préalable de l'IB. De plus, la licence associée à ce produit interdit toute utilisation de tout fichier ou extrait sélectionné dans ce produit. L'utilisation par des tiers, y compris, sans toutefois s'y limiter, des éditeurs, des professeurs particuliers, des services de tutorat ou d'aide aux études, des établissements de préparation à l'enseignement supérieur, des fournisseurs de services de planification des programmes d'études, des gestionnaires de plateformes pédagogiques en ligne, et des développeurs d'applications, moyennant paiement ou non, est interdite et constitue une infraction pénale.

Pour plus d'informations sur la procédure à suivre pour obtenir une autorisation écrite sous la forme d'une licence, rendez-vous à l'adresse <https://ibo.org/become-an-ib-school/ib-publishing/licensing/applying-for-a-license/>.

© Organización del Bachillerato Internacional, 2021

Todos los derechos reservados. No se podrá reproducir ninguna parte de este producto de ninguna forma ni por ningún medio electrónico o mecánico, incluidos los sistemas de almacenamiento y recuperación de información, sin la previa autorización por escrito del IB. Además, la licencia vinculada a este producto prohíbe el uso de todo archivo o fragmento seleccionado de este producto. El uso por parte de terceros —lo que incluye, a título enunciativo, editoriales, profesores particulares, servicios de apoyo académico o ayuda para el estudio, colegios preparatorios, desarrolladores de aplicaciones y entidades que presten servicios de planificación curricular u ofrezcan recursos para docentes mediante plataformas digitales—, ya sea incluido en tasas o no, está prohibido y constituye un delito.

En este enlace encontrará más información sobre cómo solicitar una autorización por escrito en forma de licencia: <https://ibo.org/become-an-ib-school/ib-publishing/licensing/applying-for-a-license/>.

The paper is marked using the generic markbands on the following page, and the paper specific markscheme that follows. The markscheme for this paper is the same for HL and SL.

Markbands for paper two

Marks	Level descriptor
0	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The work does not reach a standard described by the descriptors below.
1–5	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The response reveals limited understanding of the demands of the question. • The response is poorly structured, or where there is a recognizable essay structure there is minimal focus on the task. • There is little relevant knowledge, and examples are either lacking or not relevant. • The response is mostly descriptive.
6–10	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The response indicates some understanding of the demands of the question. • There is some evidence of an attempt to structure the response. • Some relevant knowledge is present, and some examples are mentioned but they are not developed or their relevance to arguments is not clear. • The response demonstrates limited understanding of the key concepts of the course. • There is limited justification of main points. • Counterclaims, or different views on the question are not considered.
11–15	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The demands of the question are understood and mostly addressed but the implications are not considered. • There is a clear attempt to structure the response. • The response is mostly based on relevant and accurate knowledge of global politics, and relevant examples are given and support arguments. • The response demonstrates some understanding of the key concepts of the course. • Many of the main points are justified and arguments are largely coherent. • Some counterclaims, or different views on the question are considered.
16–20	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The demands of the questions are understood and addressed, and most implications are considered. • The response is well-structured. • The response demonstrates relevant and accurate knowledge and understanding of global politics, and relevant examples are used in a way that strengthens arguments. • The response demonstrates a good grasp of the key concepts of the course. • All or nearly all of the main points are justified and arguments are coherent. • Counterclaims, or different views on the question are explored.
21–25	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A very well structured and balanced response that addresses the demands and implications of the question. • Comprehensive knowledge and in-depth understanding of global politics is applied in the response consistently and effectively, with examples integrated. • The response demonstrates a very good grasp of the key concepts of the course. • All of the main points are justified. Arguments are clear, coherent and compelling. • Counterclaims, or different views on the question are explored and evaluated.

The content listed indicates possible areas candidates might cover in their answers. They are **not** compulsory points. They are only a framework to help examiners in their assessment. Candidates may take a different approach, which if appropriate, should be rewarded. Examiners should not expect all of the points listed and should allow other valid points.

An understanding of, and an ability to work with, the key concepts of the course are particularly important in this paper. Whether or not the key concepts are explicitly mentioned in a question, students are expected to draw on their conceptual understanding of global politics and are invited to draw on any political concepts that are relevant to the arguments they put forward.

Power, sovereignty and international relations

1. Justify the claim that the structure of the United Nations (UN) limits its ability to preserve peace and security.

Responses are likely to include a brief description of role and functions of an international governmental organization. They may define an international organization as an institution in which members are together by a formal agreement and which carry out activities in many states. They may then discuss the primary function and impact of the UN and its different organs such as the Security Council and General Assembly and highlight its function in the preservation of peace and security. Candidates could then proceed to argue to what extent they agree with the claim that the structure of the UN limits its ability to preserve international peace and security.

Arguments in favour of the claim that the structure of the UN limits its ability to preserve international peace and security may include:

- Many member states claim there is an unequal distribution of power within the UN Security Council and more historically powerful states especially with the veto power of the permanent members have an unfair advantage in agenda setting and impact effectiveness by delaying or not permitting actions or processes which negatively impact their interests or even those of their allies.
- There is an overall lack of ability of the UN to enforce decisions unless it is supported by the permanent members of the Security Council. Other problems such as lack of resources due to delayed payments by even the bigger states stalls the effectiveness of the UN. In short, the UN is effective when the big powers want it to be.
- Lack of unanimity in Security Council over action to be taken to curb violence through an armed action is not always possible on time to prevent outbreak of violence. Besides, the UN does not have its own troops and arms and depends on contributions from member states;
- There have been many instances of inaction and lack of interest in cases of human rights violations or conflict situations whereby the UN has not taken strong enough action. For instance, Sierra Leone and Rwanda have not garnered as much attention as conflicts in the Middle East. Similarly, the human rights violations in Myanmar was not acted upon effectively
- Decisions and action items on various issues such as the environment are not always effective, because either states do not agree to follow them if they find them against their national interest, or simply because there is no enforcement mechanism or power that the UN possesses.
- The UN General Assembly is a platform for deliberation amongst member states, has a deliberative function and makes recommendations. However, its role and effectiveness is not formidable. It is often perceived to be a 'talking shop.' Resolutions of the General Assembly are not legally binding and members states are not bound to follow them watering down their effectiveness.

Arguments against the claim that the structure of the UN limits its ability to preserve international peace and security may include:

- The UN has helped bring down the number of inter-state conflicts simply because it has become a forum and platform for dialogue, mediation and negotiation amongst states. The UN General Assembly is perhaps the most significant organ where members deliberate, express views and try to reach consensus on different issues.
- The UN has been effective in solving many conflict situations through peacekeeping operations and collective security. A number of peacekeeping missions sanctioned by the UN Security Council and carried out by peacekeeping forces are a testimony of this contribution towards peace and security.
- It has also acted as an effective forum in managing many transnational issues such as environmental protection, protection of human rights and has put forth goals such as the MDGs and SDGs to help states work towards them and provide a basic minimum standard of living to people across borders. The UN Human Rights Council and the United Nations Environment Programme (UNEP) are authorities within the United Nations system that work on such issues.
- The membership of the UN provides even the smaller states a platform to air their grievances and look for support to solve their issues. The General Assembly gives them a forum to interact with the other states on an equal footing
- Some specialized agencies of the UN such as the UNICEF and WHO have had significant success stories in terms of their contribution towards a range of issues such as healthcare and care of women and children with the cooperation and involvement of its member states.

Responses should make some reference to specific examples of how the structure of the UN limits its ability to maintain international peace and security. Candidates could also give examples of situations where the UN has been effective such as peacekeeping and humanitarian missions in Haiti, Kosovo and Timor-Leste. Other examples could include the universal instruments against international terrorism adopted by the member states under the UN Global Counter Terrorism Strategy. On the contrary, the UN has not been able to take appropriate remedial measures in countries such as Myanmar facing the Rohingya crisis due to what has been attributed to a systemic and structural limitations and lack of coordination and agreement amongst different UN organs.

Responses should include a conclusion on the degree to which the candidate agrees with the claim that the structure of the UN limits its ability to preserve international peace and security.

2. “Strikes and demonstrations undermine the legitimacy of a state.” Discuss this view.

Responses are likely to include an explanation of the concepts of strikes and demonstrations and legitimacy of a state. Candidates could highlight the fact that legitimacy provides the basis of governance of a state. It requires the state to have the popular consent of its citizens to its exercise of political power over them. Conditions under which a state could lose legitimacy could include its lack of ability or willingness to govern and their inability to ensure citizens’ well-being. Strikes involve stopping of work due to the mass refusal of employees to work. Demonstrations could be described as activism such as a march or rally of people. Some candidates might make a link between power, sovereignty and legitimacy, but the distinction between and conceptualization of each should be clear. Candidates could discuss how strikes and demonstrations undermine the legitimacy of a state.

Arguments in favour of the claim that strikes and demonstrations undermine the legitimacy of a state may include:

- Strikes and demonstrations could involve violence, cause loss of life and damage to property all of which reflect the inability of the state to perform its basic security function
- Strikes curb work and productivity through loss of working hours, loss of income for daily wage earners and these have a direct impact on the economy – economic instability and this in turn could undermine the legitimacy of a state eg Yemen
- Demonstrations which result from a lack of political stability undermine and reflect the erosion of a state’s legitimacy eg. the protests and demonstrations in Sudan in 2019 that led to the ouster of Omar al-Bashir and continued against the transnational military council that took over thereafter.
- Demonstrations could be held against a state’s leadership taking power through unethical ways, leading to a dent in its legitimacy eg Hirak movement in Algeria
- Protests and demonstrations against the use of force, repression and violence by a state machinery could undermine its legitimacy
- State’s inability to honor the social contract exposes it to a possible erosion of legitimacy due to the dissatisfaction of people, which manifests itself in strikes and demonstrations
- Social mobilization in the form of strikes and demonstrations happens hoping for political change, that is people are protesting for a reason eg Womens march in the US.

Arguments against the claim that strikes and demonstrations undermine the legitimacy of a state may include:

- States with strong institutions and governments can effectively manage strikes and demonstrations. The power and capability of the state to govern well is a significant factor
- Strikes and demonstrations might undermine the legitimacy of the government, but not necessarily of the state. State institutions may still be robust
- Strikes and demonstrations could be ways of improving working conditions and rights of workers and may actually be helpful in bolstering human development and well-being – an important factor in considering state legitimacy
- Strikes are now an uncommon phenomenon in many parts of the world and are thus not too big a disruption in development
- Some protests and demonstrations may not have any profound impact on a state’s legitimacy. They are either geographically concentrated in a small area, be decentralized or involve only certain sectors or businesses, thereby not impacting state legitimacy. Eg Iran protests
- How states handle protest demonstrations and strikes provides them with the opportunity to increase legitimacy through effective management of the situation.

Responses should make some reference to specific examples of how strikes and demonstrations have had an impact on the legitimacy of a state. Candidates could use examples such as the protests in Hong Kong (2019 onwards) and the impact on different sectors such as tourism, travel and finance. The Arab Spring protests (2010) and strikes such as that in , Africa (at least 88 strikes in 2004) and demonstrations under the Black

Lives Matter (BLM) movement or those held in Thailand (2020) demanding constitutional revision and reform of the monarchy. Candidates could also give examples of protests such as the gilet jaunes (yellow vest) demonstrations in France (2018-2019) over demands for economic justice which did not really impact the legitimacy of the state.

Responses should include a conclusion on the degree to which the candidate agrees with the claim that strikes and demonstrations undermine the legitimacy of a state.

Human rights

3. To what extent is the protection and enforcement of human rights in developing countries best pursued at the national level?

Responses are likely to include a definition of human rights as basic claims and entitlements that, many argue, one should be able to exercise simply by virtue of being a human being. Candidates may also identify national human rights institutions (NHRI's) with reference to national bodies entrusted with the task of protecting and enforcing human rights within a state, i.e., national courts and police, ombudsmen, National Human Rights Commissions, etc. Candidates will likely identify developing countries with reference to an appropriate measure (e.g., *per capita* Gross National Product, Human Development Index, etc.).

Arguments in favour of the claim that the protection and enforcement of human rights in developing countries is best pursued at the national level may include:

- Developing country governments are often the most powerful and/or legitimate actor at the national level and so may be the most capable of and responsible for protecting and enforcing human rights.
- Many post-colonial developing states are among the most zealous defenders of sovereignty (non-interference) which means that the protection and enforcement of human rights may be largely limited to the national level.
- It is more likely that human rights will be effectively protected and enforced when a developing state is allowed to choose the institutional framework which is best suited to its particular needs at the national level, e.g., The UN Universal Periodic Review, The Inter-American Commission on Human Rights, etc.
- The focus on human rights can be more specific at the national level thereby increasing the effectiveness of protection, e.g., in India there exist 162 separate institutions each responsible for protecting the human rights of a specific vulnerable group.
- National institutions in developing countries play an important and constructive role in protecting human rights in their advisory capacity to the competent authorities, e.g., the Peruvian Office of the Ombudsperson, the Indian Human Rights Commission, etc. In addition, the UN has acknowledged NHRI's to be one of the most important ways by which developing states bridge the implementation gap between their international human rights obligations and the actual enjoyment and protection of human rights on the ground.

Arguments against the claim that the protection and enforcement of human rights in developing countries is best pursued at the national level may include:

- Many developing states lack the material capability or willingness to effectively protect and enforce human rights, which means that these are better pursued at the regional and/or international levels, e.g., cases before the EU Court of Human Rights, ICJ or ICC.
- Due to the weak institutional structure of many developing states, many national level human rights institutions lack independence and credibility, e.g., in India the government of the day appoints leading members of the country's Human Rights Commission, there is little judicial autonomy in many countries (Pakistan, Bulgaria, China), etc.
- Many developing country governments simply overlook any recommendations or initiatives stemming from NHRI's, e.g, Morocco's government views its Human Rights Commission as a component of the opposition and so ignores it.
- Developing state governments have either wilfully ignored national level human rights organisations (e.g., Morocco, South Africa) or have been complicit in the human rights violations such that international level action was required (e.g., The Gambia's genocide case against Myanmar at the ICJ in 2019).
- In many cases, human rights are not legally defined by national level organisations but are instead determined by some of the main international human rights instruments, e.g., the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights (ICCPR), the International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights (ICESCR) or the Convention against Torture and Other Cruel, Inhuman or Degrading Treatment or Punishment (CAT).
- Different national bodies in developing countries charged with the protection and enforcement of human rights may be engaged in 'turf battles' reducing the overall effectiveness of national level actions, e.g., the Indian Ministry of External Affairs rejected some of the human rights oversight functions of the Indian Human Rights Commission despite these being clearly articulated in the latter's operational statutes.

Responses should contain references to specific examples. Arguments in favour of the claim could reference the Abuja Guidelines (2004), which are guidelines for developing effective relationships between different organisations at the national level for the promotion and protection of human rights. Arguments against the claim could note that the question poses a false dichotomy as the most effective means of protecting and enforcing human rights in developing countries involves national, regional and international actors/actions, e.g., the 1993 Paris Principles asserted that national *and* international cooperation was assumed to be an essential part of effective human rights implementation. Any other valid approach should be evaluated positively.

Responses should include a conclusion on the degree to which the candidate agrees with the claim the protection and enforcement of human rights in developing countries is best pursued at the national level.

4. “The most significant cause of human rights violations in global politics is structural violence.” Discuss this view.

Responses are likely to include a definition of human rights as basic claims and entitlements that, many argue, one should be able to exercise simply by virtue of being a human being, which are inalienable and essential for living a life of dignity. Candidates should also provide a definition of structural violence as a form of violence wherein some social structure or social institution may harm people by preventing them from meeting their basic needs and/or from allowing them to realise their full potential. Structural violence may also be defined in terms of inequalities in the share of power to decide the distribution of resources.

Arguments in favour of the claim that the most significant cause of human rights violations in global politics is structural violence may include:

- Structural violence constrains human agency to the extent that human needs (food, water, shelter, etc.) cannot be attained and is therefore the most significant cause of human rights violations, both within a state and between states, e.g., racial inequality in the US and the distribution of the global poor.
- Structural violence is responsible for a greater number of human rights violations worldwide given the numbers of starving and diseased people as well as the hundreds of millions still living in absolute poverty.
- Structural violence violates the right to development, which fully integrates civil and political rights as well as social, economic and cultural rights. Therefore, by perpetuating underdevelopment structural violence is the most significant cause of human rights violations.
- In a related sense, structural violence is the most significant cause of human rights violations via its impact on poverty and liberty, i.e., Amartya Sen has asserted that severe poverty causes massive under-fulfilment of fundamental social and economic as well as civil and political rights.
- Structural violence in the form of unequal access to education and health care, disproportionate rates of incarceration, restricted voting rights, structural economic inequalities and issues surrounding policing are present in both developing and developed states, e.g., African Americans and Native Americans experience disproportionately higher rights of arrest and police violence in the US.
- Structural violence is the most significant cause of human rights violations as it is entirely avoidable, i.e., inequalities associated with class, race, ethnicity, religion, etc. are not natural and betray the fact that an unrealized fundamental human right/need is avoidable.

Arguments against the claim that the most significant cause of human rights violations in global politics is structural violence may include:

- Direct violence is a more significant cause of human rights violations in global politics than structural violence as it is more immediately devastating. Furthermore, it is more visible and thus potentially compels global and national actors to address its effects, e.g., the displacement of millions due to the Syrian civil war.
- While structures and institutions may be significant causes of human rights violations, Realists would argue that it is agency – the actual choices actors make to protect/violate human rights – that is more significant.
- By legitimizing structural violence, cultural violence is a more significant cause of human rights violations. That is, cultural violence allows structural violence to become more intransigent by providing cover for it to the extent that we are even unaware of the latter’s existence.
- It may be easier to make legislative changes to institutions to correct structural violence (i.e., policing reforms) than to address direct violence such as an inextricable civil conflict, e.g., the war in Yemen or Syria.
- What qualifies as a human rights violation may vary. For example, cultural practices throughout the world systematically discriminate against women where they are denied

the vote, suffer from domestic abuse, and are excluded from employment opportunities. An even more extreme view argues that the existence of cultural differences precludes even the notion of human rights violations as there is no such thing as *universal* human rights.

Candidates should include reference to specific examples to support their evaluation of the claim in the question. Arguments in favour of the claim could reference data highlighting growing inequality, both within and between states as well as any examples demonstrating how certain populations, especially the poor, experience more constraints and limits on their agency when it comes to fulfilling their human rights. For example, The World Food Programme has noted that poverty and hunger are mutually constitutive with hunger being the number one cause of death in the world, killing more than HIV/AIDS, malaria, and tuberculosis combined. Candidates may also mention other forms of structural violence, i.e., those that feature in economic, political, medical or legal systems. Arguments against the claim might reference any relevant example of more visible and immediate human rights violations, e.g., the incarceration of Uighurs in Xinjiang or the on-going operation of Camp Delta (Guantanamo Bay). Finally, candidates may argue that it is neither easy nor accurate to distinguish between different forms of violence and so it may not be the case that any *single* form of violence is the *most* significant cause of human rights violations. Any other valid and relevant approaches and examples should be evaluated positively.

Responses should include a conclusion on the degree to which the candidate believes that structural violence is the most significant cause of human rights violations in global politics.

Development

5. With reference to political and institutional factors, discuss the view that development is more likely to be promoted at the global, rather than local, level.

Responses should include a clear understanding of development as a sustained increase in the standard of living and well-being of a level of social organisation. It is likely that students may note the contested and multidimensional nature of the concept. Responses should also include definitions or discussions of the levels of analysis and consideration of the question's invitation to consider the suggested alternatives: global versus local.

Arguments in favour of the claim that development (with reference to political and institutional factors) is more likely to be promoted at the global, rather than local, level may include:

- Development depends heavily on capital flows and foreign direct investment which are largely under the regulatory control of multilateral development institutions, e.g. World Bank, European Investment Bank, Islamic Development Bank
- Membership is a requirement for international institutions which support development, and this implies a degree of political alignment. Release of development resources may require deep ties to national governments
- Alignment with the established international political order is necessary to foster development and trade: lack of alignment can lead to isolation or sanctions which disrupt trade and capital flows, e.g. North Korea
- Increasingly, international financial and political institutions are promoters of international development objectives, such as the MDGs and SDGs.
- International trade blocs, which require close economic and political co-operation and harmonisation, have proved an effective means to promoting development and become significant institutions in themselves, e.g. European Union, ASEAN
- As globalisation exposes people to “successful” countries elsewhere, local constraints on development diminish in favour of new technologies and developed country values which are favourable to development, e.g. human rights, gender equality, market forces etc. These become standards for emulation in institutions and politics
- Many international NGOs promote development in all its forms, such as Oxfam, Habitat for Humanity, Wateraid etc.

Arguments against the claim that development (with reference to political and institutional factors) is more likely to be promoted at the global, rather than local, level may include:

- Development can depend more on local physical factors than international ones: e.g. resource endowment such as raw materials, availability of a workforce, natural topography such as harbours.
- Political movements are often local in origin. Examples of locally inspired movements that grown to influence national and global political policies are Black Lives Matter, Me Too and the Arab Spring
- Development is above all a social and cultural progression from an agricultural to an industrialised/urbanised society. If beliefs, values, traditions and habits are favourable to development, it will likely take place without external stimulus, e.g. S. Korea's values of thrift, investment, hard work, education, organization, and discipline noted by Sam Huntington
- Historically, development has started with a leading sector on a small scale in a particular locality, where social and cultural factors have facilitated its inception and subsequent growth in the absence of institutional and political constraints, e.g. dissenters in the English industrial revolution
- Local social and cultural diversity may act as a promoter of development. It has been argued that this is the case in Mauritius and Singapore
- Social and cultural values influence how much a people will interact with the world and thus how easy it is for development to take place. Some favourable and possibly essential

social and cultural values include interest in innovation and change, and collectivism, meaning interest in the best outcomes for the whole community

- Positive attitudes to change and progress can lead to faster development especially combined with a strong work ethic
- Sustainable development and environmental awareness are now institutionally fostered by, for example, WHO, UNSDGs, Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change at a global level, but their origins lie in local and individual initiatives such as Rachel Carson's Silent Spring (1962), the Club of Rome's Limits to Growth (1972), Earth Day (1970), leading towards the Earth Summit (1992) and Kyoto (1997)

Responses should contain references to specific examples of development. Candidates could, for example, analyse the approach of particular countries. Rwanda for example has seen its nominal GDP more than quadruple since 2000 as a result of improvements to its governance and institutions proving attractive to international investors. Bangladesh has benefited from locally favourable demographics: the dependency ratio (of workers to dependants) has plummeted as the birth rate has come down. Ethiopia's development has benefited from state-led emphasis on manufacturing and infrastructure, heavily supported by China. India's development has relied heavily on its outward-facing orientation since the 1990s. Hardly any countries have self-started their development other than Britain's industrial revolution in the 18th century.

Responses should include a conclusion which supports or contradicts the view that development is more likely to be promoted at the global, rather than local, level.

6. Evaluate the view that development will reduce the likelihood of violent conflict.

Responses should include definitions or discussions of development and violent conflict. Violence is often defined as physical or psychological force afflicted upon another being whereas conflict can be defined as the dynamic process of actual or perceived opposition between individuals or groups. Development is a sustained increase in the standard of living and well-being of a level of social organisation. Responses may focus on interstate or intrastate conflict. Responses may refer to some broadly-held (yet contestable) perceptions: that violent conflict declines with economic growth and development, and that violent conflict can arise from economic differences rather than similarities.

Arguments for the claim that development will reduce the likelihood of violent conflict may include:

- Long-term peace within and between societies is really only possible when development offers people fair opportunities for sustainable livelihoods and greater income equality
- Development can promote regional trade blocs which lead to economic interdependence and reduce the likelihood of violent conflict
- Development can lead to gender equality: fairness and equality of opportunity for men and women can be associated with the relative peacefulness of states
- When development offers people an opportunity to improve their incomes and accumulate assets or the state to introduce welfare safety nets, they have a stake in stability and may reject those who foment conflict.
- Development can enhance inclusivity by improving accessibility to all regions, ethnic groups, minorities and across gender and age groups, thus exercising a unifying influence and reducing potential for intrastate conflict
- Development can promote statebuilding through revenue flows to fund good governance, infrastructure, stronger institutions and a legal framework, all of which encourage general consent and the wish for stability among stakeholders
- Through statebuilding it is possible to incorporate peacebuilding, which reduces the risk of lapsing back into conflict and lays the foundations for further development
- Sustainable development may be enhanced to reduce the likelihood of conflict as reliance on exploitation of limited primary resources is reduced.

Arguments against the claim that development will reduce the likelihood of violent conflict may include:

- Competition over access to resources or economic gain is at the heart of many conflicts, both within and between countries, and development can increase the urge for material gain, i.e. greed as a cause of conflict
- Violent conflict may resurface or be threatened with a resurgence of identity politics even in developed countries e.g. AfD in Germany, FN in France, Golden Dawn in Greece
- Development is often uneven rather than broad-fronted, and therefore increases inequality and extremes of economic difference, making conflict more likely, e.g. Mindanao, Pattani Thais, i.e. grievance as a cause of conflict
- Development is not usually conflict-sensitive and may stimulate long-lasting resentment among minorities e.g. Tamils, or aggregation of wealth in a small minority may stimulate resentment in a majority, e.g. Chinese diaspora in south east Asia
- Violent conflict can be caused by environmental disasters such as climate change and drought in agriculture-dependent areas, halting development and leading to uncontrolled migration and conflict, e.g. Sudan, Somalia
- Corruption and mismanagement resulting from particular forms of development in extractive industries can finance and sustain conflict, e.g. blood diamonds from Angola, Sierra Leone. Immobile resources can be captured by rent-seeking actors.
- The presence of violent conflict may even preclude the likelihood of development e.g. Rwanda.

Responses should contain references to specific examples. Candidates could, for example, refer to Sri Lanka and Nigeria where ethnic upheavals have occurred during periods of economic development, or the relationship between climate change and increased conflict in the horn of Africa. Another example could be the Bolivian Gas Wars over the ownership and exploitation of natural resources.

Responses should include a conclusion which supports or contradicts the view that development will reduce the likelihood of violent conflict.

Peace and conflict

7. Discuss whether just war theory is a valid justification for military intervention using *one* conflict you have studied.

Responses are likely to include an explanation of the just war theory. The question provides the students with an opportunity to discuss the theory and apply it to any one conflict they have studied to argue if it is a valid justification for military intervention (which could include deployment of military equipment and troops and involves use of force) or not. The just war theory postulates that the use of armed force (*jus ad bellum*) could be justified under certain conditions (including having a just cause such as humanitarian requirements, self-defence, having backing of a proper authority and right intent), along with the belief that the use of this force (*jus in bello*) should be limited in certain ways. In short it deals with the reasons behind wars and how they should be fought. Candidates could proceed to choose one violent conflict they have studied to discuss whether the just war theory justifies the use of military intervention in that conflict.

Arguments in favour of the claim that just war theory is a valid justification for military intervention in a conflict may include:

- Military intervention in a conflict could have a just cause, making it the correct path to follow. For instance, the conflict could have led to a humanitarian crisis (such as genocide), which needs intervention to prevent the loss of life and property, resolve conflict and curb violence.
- Such intervention could be the last resort or option to control or manage a humanitarian crisis or conflict after all other possible methods fail
- Military intervention could have the backing of a proper authority such as UN or international community sanction, making it even more legitimate in a way. This could also lead to better chances of development and post-conflict recovery
- Military intervention could be with a right and altruistic intent (though the perspectives here may vary), eg British intervention in Sierra Leone
- This kind of intervention could have a good chance of success because the use of hard power in managing crisis and conflict is more effective
- A successful military intervention could form the foundation for reconstruction and development.

Arguments against the claim that just war theory is a valid justification for military intervention in a conflict may include:

- Military intervention in a conflict could be based on the greed for resources, self-interest of the interventionist, market expansion or enlarging their role and sphere of influence. Eg, Darfur conflict and Russian and Chinese interests in oil there
- There can be no justification for military interventions since they only lead to more loss of lives and cause environmental damage
- Attempts to solve violent conflicts could be done through alternative strategies that could bring success such as diplomatic options
- Military interventions are very rarely likely to be successful in establishing lasting peace and democracy and may turn out to be merely short-term solutions which could end once the intervention ends throwing the host country into conflict again
- External or outside military forces might be viewed by the local population as an invasion, thus making it more difficult for all parties involved to come to an effective peace settlement.

Examples of violent conflicts could include those in Syria¹, Libya (2011 where US, UK and France intervened with authorization from the UN), Iraq (US occupation 2003-12), East Timor (Australian intervention), , Darfur (2004 China and Russia's interest in oil there), Somalia (US-led multinational UN peacekeepers 1992-93), , UN peacekeeping force in the DRC, the NATO in Afghanistan, and US drone strikes in Pakistan under the Obama administration, Sierra Leone (UK altruistic military intervention worked, elections held). Any other relevant examples should be positively rewarded.

Responses should include a conclusion on the extent to which candidates agree that the just war theory is a valid justification for military intervention in a conflict.

8. Evaluate the claim that strategic alliances greatly reduce the likelihood of violent conflict between states.

Responses are likely to include an explanation of strategic alliances and a few examples of such strategic alliances. They could highlight the fact that such strategic alliances are written agreements between two or more countries and could include a range of cooperative security structures such as defence agreements (where countries are required to intervene militarily if any partner is attacked), non-aggression or neutrality partnerships (where partner countries are expected to be neutral if any partner is under attack) or ententes (where countries might agree to cooperate with each other in times of crisis). The question focuses on how they help reduce the likelihood of the outbreak of violent conflicts between states. Students may wish to acknowledge that strategic alliances have reduced the likelihood of violent conflicts between states. Violent conflicts between states could include interstate wars (examples of such conflicts in the past are Iraq, Afghanistan).

Arguments in favour of the claim that strategic alliances greatly reduce the likelihood of violent conflict between states may include:

- Strategic alliance can prove to be a deterrent to armed conflicts due to the high cost and risk involved, in keeping with the combined forces of alliance partners, discouraging violent conflict by potential adversaries.
- Strategic alliances are very likely to include information sharing on military capabilities and other variables which might be reasons behind sparking off conflicts. Lack of information and transparency, which could result in problems, are thus mitigated reducing the likelihood of violent conflict.
- Strategic alliances with countries critical and significant geographically and strategically can help nullify the chances of other alliances being formed against it, potentially reducing chances of violent conflict erupting.
- Effective geographical spread of strategic alliances can curb the ability of movement and control by adversaries discouraging war.
- Strategic alliances enable balancing – especially for smaller countries, which may be at risk of being overpowered by bigger powers. This empowers them and protects them from the likelihood of being pushed or dominated by bigger powerful countries which may intimidate and threaten them with war in the pursuit of their own interest. For instance, China's dominance in the South China Sea and competing claims with smaller countries in the region is balanced by US presence and prevents violent conflict.

Arguments against the claim that strategic alliances greatly reduce the likelihood of violent conflict between states may include:

- Strategic alliances enhance the possibility of conflict by increasing threat perception which in turn could lead to aggression
- Alliances could also mean that local conflicts could turn into wars with the involvement of more than one country through partnerships.
- Strategic alliances may embolden partners and actually push them towards violent conflict with the help and support of their partners
- National interests override strategic alliance commitments and if countries feel that alliance commitments are affecting the former, they may decide to disengage from the alliance and choose the path of violent conflict to protect their interests.
- Strategic alliances would make violent conflict cost effective. This might encourage alliance partners to go to war since they can share costs.
- Strategic alliances can turn a small-scale conflict into an entrenched one when small countries get help from larger military powers. (egs Yemen, Syria).

Candidates could provide examples of strategic alliance such as China's alliances in Latin America and Africa, US–Taiwan, US–Israel, US–South Korea and US–Japan alliances, ANZAC alliance (Australia and New Zealand), the GUUAM strategic alliance (Georgia, Ukraine, Uzbekistan, Azerbaijan and Moldova) and North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO).

Responses should include the candidate's evaluation of the validity of the view put forward in the question and clearly conclude whether they agree with the claim that strategic alliances greatly reduce the likelihood of violent conflict between states.
