Diploma Programme
Programme du diplôme
Programa del Diploma

Global politics
Higher level and standard level
Paper 1

Thursday 19 May 2016 (afternoon)

1 hour 15 minutes

Instructions to candidates

• Do not open this examination paper until instructed to do so.
• Answer all the questions.
• The maximum mark for this examination paper is **[25 marks]**.

International Baccalaureate®
Baccalauréat International
Bachillerato Internacional

Unit 4   Peace and conflict

Causes of conflict

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

Source A   Adapted from a chart of information about causes of war in the Middle East, published in *L'Express*, a French weekly news magazine, in 2014

Principal Middle East conflicts and combatants (2000–2014)	Identity, minorities and borders	Power and prestige (status)	Ideology and religion	"Power plays"	Use of petrol/ oil as a weapon
Second Intifada (2000–2005) Palestinians, Hamas / Israel	■				
Second Lebanese war (2006) Israel / Hezbollah		■	■		
Iraq war (2003–2011) USA, UK + International coalition / Iraq		■		■	■
Israeli interventions in Gaza (2006, 2009, 2012, 2014) Israel / Hamas	■	■	■		
Syrian civil war (since 2011) Syria / Free Syrian Army / Kurds / IS	■	■	■	■	
Conflict against IS (since 2014) Jihadists / Syria / Iraq, Kurds + International coalition	■		■	■	

Source B   Adapted from *A First Draft of the History of America's Ongoing Wars on Terrorism* by Bruce Hoffman

Both Syria and Iraq have become magnets for foreign fighters – over 12 000 have arrived from 81 countries. Violence is theologically justified by *fatwas* (religious commands) provided by leading Muslim clerics, and driven by strong sectarian grievances. Rebels have benefitted from the support of wealthy Arabian Gulf patrons. The growth and communicative power of social networking platforms such as Facebook and Twitter have transformed terrorism and are fuelling and sustaining these struggles to an unprecedented extent.

It was thought the bloody split in the region between Al Qaeda and the breakaway group the Islamic State of Iraq and Syria (ISIS) might weaken them both, but this has proved little more than wishful thinking. History has often shown how splits within terrorist movements have led to increased levels of violence and greater bloodshed as factions compete with one another for status, support and viability. The violence and bloodshed already sparked by this split is thus far from over and in fact may only have begun.

Source C Adapted from an article by Dominique de Villepin: "Let France Resist the Spirit of War" in the national newspaper *Le Monde*, in France, written in direct response to the shootings at the offices of the *Charlie Hebdo* satirical newspaper in Paris in January 2015.

Western interventions in the Middle East have appeared to be driven by various ambitions, but they have succeeded in creating the same result – the emergence of an elusive jihadist enemy and the collapse of states and civil societies in the region. We now know some of the events that led to this. The joint foreign intervention in Libya in 2011 and its collapse since that date has transformed the country into a terrorist landmark in the Sahara. In the Sahel the terrorist group Boko Haram is extending its barbarous grip, particularly in Nigeria.

The wars feed new wars, each time larger, and increasingly difficult to resolve. They nourish terrorism among us with promises of eradicating it. We will only overcome jihadism and terrorism by bringing concrete solutions to the crises in the Muslim world. These crises are at the same time territorial, social, political and economic – conflicts that we simplify by seeing only the Islamist symptom. The spirit of war is a trap. It is a cycle that is driving us every day toward a war that is out of control. In the name of our democratic values, our duty is to resist the spirit of war.

Source D Adapted from: *Syria: The story of the conflict*, an article published on the BBC website, in March 2015

More than 200 000 Syrians have lost their lives in four years of armed conflict, which began with anti-government protests before escalating into a full-scale civil war.

Pro-democracy protests erupted in March 2011 in the southern city of Deraa after the arrest and torture of some teenagers who painted revolutionary slogans on a school wall. After security forces opened fire on demonstrators, killing several, more took to the streets. The unrest triggered nationwide protests demanding President Assad's resignation. Opposition supporters eventually began to take up arms, first to defend themselves and later to expel security forces from their local areas. Violence escalated and the country descended into civil war as rebel brigades were formed to battle government forces for control of cities, towns and the countryside.

The conflict is now more than just a battle between those for or against President Assad. It has acquired sectarian overtones, pitching the country's Sunni majority against the president's Shia Alawite sect, and it has drawn in neighbouring countries and world powers. The rise of the jihadist groups, including Islamic State, has added a further dimension. What began as another Arab Spring uprising against an autocratic (oppressive) ruler has mushroomed into a brutal war that has drawn in regional and world powers.

1. Identify the **three** major causes of conflicts in the Middle East from 2000 to the present day, based on information given in Source A.   [3]

2. With explicit reference to Source B and, **briefly**, to **two** examples you have studied, outline ways in which violent non-state actors are able to strengthen their power.   [4]

3. Contrast the views expressed in Sources C and D on the sources of conflict in the countries mentioned.   [8]

4. Using all the sources **and** your own knowledge, evaluate the claim that conflicts today are more often caused by regional rather than international factors.   [10]

Markscheme

May 2016

Global politics

Higher level and standard level

Paper 1

Unit 4   Peace and Conflict

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.

Causes of conflict

1.   **Identify the *three* major causes of conflicts in the Middle East from 2000 to the present day,
     based on information given in Source A.**   **[3 marks]**

     The three major causes (4 incidences of each are recorded) of conflict according to the table are:
     *   identity, minorities and borders;
     *   power and prestige;
     *   ideology and religion.

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

2.   **With explicit reference to Source B and,** *briefly*, **to** *two* **examples you have studied, outline ways in which violent non-state actors are able to strengthen their power.   [4 marks]**

Answers may include, but are not limited to:
- non-state actors such as Al Qaeda exploit existing sectarian tensions between the Sunni and Shia populations over which states have limited control;
- the theological justification of violence through *fatwas* demonstrates the power of clerics, independent of state power;
- financial support from wealthy Arabian Gulf patrons supports influence from outside the state;
- the use of social media enhances communication beyond the state structure, fuelling and sustaining struggles;
- this increased communication in turn attracts volunteer foreign fighters from many countries.

Valid examples from own knowledge may include, but are not limited to:
- coercing of local populations (ISIS, Boko Haram);
- committing terrorist atrocities that gain global attention (9/11, suicide bombings, filmed decapitations);
- kidnapping people for financial gain (ransom) or political gain *eg* return of prisoners (*eg* FARC in Colombia);
- engaging in criminal activity *eg* the drugs trade (cocaine – FARC, and Shining Path in Peru), to raise money for political causes;
- infiltrating organizations such as trade unions and universities to recruit new members *eg* Shining Path;
- sabotaging and taking control of utilities, including oil producing and storage facilities, industry, airports *etc* to destabilize trade and daily life and hence governments, and also for financial gain to support their activities.

Other relevant points not listed can also be rewarded. Candidates are not expected to make four separate points in order to achieve full marks.

For responses that do not make reference to both the source and to two examples, award a maximum of **[3]**.

3. **Contrast the views expressed in Sources C and D on the sources of conflict in the countries mentioned.** **[8 marks]**

Scope of analysis: it is worth noting that source C refers to causes of conflict in the Middle East, whilst, in general, source D refers principally to the causes of the conflict within Syria, which has now drawn in neighbouring countries and world powers.

Potential points of contrast:
- **western intervention**: source C refers repeatedly to western intervention in negative terms as a significant source of more conflict; source D refers to world powers being "drawn in" but is neutral about the effects of this;
- **the role of ideology/religion**: source C states that "we simplify by seeing only the Islamist symptom". Source D does not suggest that ideology/religion was a primary source of conflict in Syria but notes that the conflict "has acquired sectarian overtones, pitching the country's Sunni majority against the president's Shia Alawite sect";
- **repressive government**: source D concentrates in its report on the role of President Assad and characterizes the original, primary cause of the conflict as opposition to his brutal repression of dissent ("…conflict, which began with anti-government protests"). Source C lists a range of crises in the Muslim world "territorial, social, political and economic", as well as the "Islamist symptom", as causes of the conflict;
- **the "Arab Spring"**: source D cites the influence of earlier pro-democracy uprisings in the region – the Syrian conflict began as "another Arab Spring uprising against an autocratic ruler", suggesting a knock-on effect in the region. Source C does not mention this pro-democracy tendency but refers more generally to wars in the Middle East as feeding more wars, "each time larger, and increasingly difficult to resolve" and nourishing terrorist movements there and overspilling into neighbouring regions, such as Boko Haram in the Sahel;
- **jihadi groups**: both sources refer to jihadist involvement as a cause of conflict; however, source C blames western intervention for the emergence of this "elusive enemy" (and also for the collapse of states and civil societies in the region). Source D cites the rise of jihadist groups, including Islamic State, as "adding a further dimension" but does not link this rise to a particular cause (although as it is mentioned immediately after a reference to the Sunni/Shia divide in Syria in the previous sentence, this suggests a possible link may be inferred to ideological struggles);
- **retaliation in response to violence**: "the spirit of war is a trap". Source C, written in response to an incident of related terrorist activity in a country outside the Middle East, implicitly pleads for no violent measures to be taken in response to this that may in turn be a cause of further violence. Source D does not mention this dimension outside of Syria, but describes an escalation of violence within Syria growing from retaliation – the original brutal crackdown on protestors – and counter-retaliation to this by opponents of Assad;
- **self-defence, and defence of territory**: Source D states that "opposition forces began to take up arms, first to defend themselves and later to expel security forces from their local areas…" Source C mentions territorial issues as one of the crises that is a cause of war in the Muslim world, but with no specific reference to one conflict.

Do not expect all of the points above, and allow other valid points. Award **[2]** per effective point of contrast up to a maximum of **[8]**.

If the view of only one source is discussed award a maximum of **[4]**. For a response which focuses significantly on one source with only minimal reference to the other source, award a maximum of **[5]**. For responses that discuss the sources separately, rather than in a running contrast, award a maximum **[6]**.

4. **Using all the sources *and* your own knowledge, evaluate the claim that conflicts today are more often caused by regional rather than international factors.** **[10 marks]**

Question 4 is assessed according to the markbands that follow, in conjunction with these marking notes.

NB: it could be argued that some factors of conflict listed below could have elements that are of both regional and international significance, and some answers may validly reflect these nuances. Some candidates may argue that regional conflicts are in effect now international, due to the prevalence of international reporting and social media, and as a consequence the distinction between regional and international is now somewhat artificial.

Regional factors from source material may include, but are not limited to:
Source A
- identities, minorities and borders feature strongly in the chart as causes of conflict;
- frequent mention of the same countries *eg* Syria, Israel, Iraq suggest that there are specific regional causes of conflict that recur.

Source B
- Syria as an ancient arena of sectarian conflict between Shia and Sunni;
- *fatwas* issued by clerics – could be regionally targeted;
- financial support to rebels from Arabian Gulf states helps promote the conflict in Syria.

Source C
- crises in the Muslim world – territorial, social, political and economic are cited as needing to be resolved before conflict can end.

Source D
- autocratic government – brutal crackdown on anti-governmental protests within Syria escalating into full-scale civil war;
- the knock-on effect of the Arab spring uprisings previously in other Middle Eastern countries.

International factors from source material may include, but are not limited to:
Source A
- two of the wars listed since 2003 involve international coalitions;
- conflict over oil *eg* in Iraq, implicitly involves global interests;
- power struggles can be regional or global.

Source B
- both Syria and Iraq have become magnets for foreign fighters;
- the global increased ability to communicate ideas easily through social networking fuels and sustains the struggles;
- *fatwas* issued by clerics – can be of international significance.

Source C
- source C places emphasis on the role of western intervention as an aggravating factor of regional conflicts;
- the source mentions "an elusive jihadist enemy" – suggesting this could be based anywhere and operate internationally *eg* as in the Charlie Hebdo killings.

Source D
- the Syrian conflict has drawn in neighbouring countries and world powers;
- the rise of Islamic State has added a further dimension, which, though not stated in the source, has implicitly involved the wider world – (terrorist atrocities in western countries, kidnap of western hostages);
- brutal war that has drawn in regional and world powers.

Own knowledge could include, but is not limited to:

Regional factors (specific examples may come from any region)
- the role of other states in a regional conflict, *eg* in Syria;
- the roles of Saudi Arabia and Iran (Sunni/Shia factors); Turkey's role; Russia's role in Syria: support for Assad; the power vacuum in Syria leaving more of a role for outside actors;
- regional factors can "spill over" and affect other countries, eventually becoming more significant in international terms *eg* the Arab Spring movement;
- the dynamics of conflict can be influenced by the non-willingness of international actors to intervene, allowing regional conflicts to fester, *eg* conflicts in Africa such as in Mali and Nigeria.

International factors:
- the removal of western support for authoritarian regimes, leaving power vacuums, *eg* Saddam Hussein in Iraq; Ghaddafi in Libya;
- the dynamics of conflict are influenced by the willingness of the West to intervene selectively, militarily or with sanctions, *eg* in Iraq, sanctions imposed on Russia due to the situation in the Ukraine; British military intervention in Sierra Leone; NATO in Afghanistan;
- the effect of the sale of arms by external actors to countries involved in regional conflicts, *eg* in Darfur (arms supplied to Sudan by Russia and China);
- the development of technologies that influence how regional conflicts are fought, *eg* drone warfare, used by the US in Pakistan; the tension over Iran's development of nuclear weapons, which could affect the global balance of power.

Do not expect all of the above, and reward other relevant points and/or examples not listed.

If only source material or only own knowledge is used, the response can only be awarded a maximum of **[6]**.

To achieve the maximum **[10]**, responses must refer to all four sources.

Markbands for question 4

Marks	Level descriptor
0	• The work does not reach a standard described by the descriptors below.
1-2	• 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	• 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	• 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	• 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	• 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.

Diploma Programme
Programme du diplôme
Programa del Diploma

Global politics
Higher level
Paper 2

Friday 20 May 2016 (morning)

2 hours 45 minutes

Instructions to candidates

- Do not open this examination paper until instructed to do so.
- Answer three questions, each from a different unit of study. Each question is worth **[25 marks]**.
- The maximum mark for this examination paper is **[75 marks]**.

2216–5952

International Baccalaureate
Baccalauréat International
Bachillerato Internacional

Answer **three** questions, each from a different unit of study.

Each question is worth **[25 marks]**.

Power, sovereignty and international relations

1.   Discuss the claim that power in global politics is mostly exercised through the use of force and threats.

2.   Evaluate the claim that state sovereignty creates obstacles for the realization of justice for individuals and communities.

Human rights

3.   "The Universal Declaration of Human Rights (1948) is no longer relevant for dealing with human rights issues in the 21st century." To what extent do you agree with this claim?

4.   Examine the effectiveness of non-state actors in advancing the protection of human rights.

Development

5.   Discuss the view that social factors such as gender relations or migration can both help and hinder development.

6.   Examine the view that successful development cannot be achieved without addressing political inequality.

Peace and conflict

7.   Evaluate the success of third-party involvement in transforming **one** intra-state conflict away from violence and towards positive peace.

8.   "The use of violence can never be legitimate." Discuss the validity of this claim, with reference to **at least one** violent conflict you have studied.

Diploma Programme
Programme du diplôme
Programa del Diploma

Global politics
Standard level
Paper 2

Friday 20 May 2016 (morning)

1 hour 45 minutes

Instructions to candidates

* Do not open this examination paper until instructed to do so.
* Answer two questions, each from a different unit of study. Each question is worth **[25 marks]**.
* The maximum mark for this examination paper is **[50 marks]**.

International Baccalaureate®
Baccalauréat International
Bachillerato Internacional

Answer two questions, each from a different unit of study.

Each question is worth **[25 marks]**.

Power, sovereignty and international relations

1. Discuss the claim that power in global politics is mostly exercised through the use of force and threats.

2. Evaluate the claim that state sovereignty creates obstacles for the realization of justice for individuals and communities.

Human rights

3. "The Universal Declaration of Human Rights (1948) is no longer relevant for dealing with human rights issues in the 21st century." To what extent do you agree with this claim?

4. Examine the effectiveness of non-state actors in advancing the protection of human rights.

Development

5. Discuss the view that social factors such as gender relations or migration can both help and hinder development.

6. Examine the view that successful development cannot be achieved without addressing political inequality.

Peace and conflict

7. Evaluate the success of third-party involvement in transforming **one** intra-state conflict away from violence and towards positive peace.

8. "The use of violence can never be legitimate." Discuss the validity of this claim, with reference to **at least one** violent conflict you have studied.

Markscheme

May 2016

Global politics

Higher level and standard level

Paper 2

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.

The paper is marked using the generic markbands below, 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	• The work does not reach a standard described by the descriptors below.
1–5	• 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	• 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 fundamental political concepts and approaches. • There is limited justification of main points. • Counterclaims are not considered.
11–15	• 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 fundamental political concepts and approaches. • Many of the main points are justified and arguments are largely coherent. • Some counterclaims are considered.
16–20	• 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 fundamental political concepts and approaches. • All or nearly all of the main points are justified and arguments are coherent. • Counterclaims are explored.
21–25	• 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 fundamental political concepts and approaches. • All of the main points are justified. Arguments are clear, coherent and compelling. • Counterclaims 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. **Discuss the claim that power in global politics is mostly exercised through the use of force and threats.**

    Responses are likely to include a definition of the concept of power; such as the ability to make someone do something – often, but not always, by the use of force or threats – or face consequences; or the ability to achieve a desired outcome through the use of other means, which could involve the use of both coercive (force and threats) and co-optive mechanisms. Although the majority of candidates are likely to focus on state actors, it is also acceptable for responses to focus entirely on the exercise of power by non-state actors.

    Responses may make reference to ideas such as distinctions drawn between hard and soft power. Candidates may also refer to the concept of smart power which in effect combines elements of both hard (coercion and payment) and soft power (persuasion and attraction), sometimes making it difficult to distinguish where coercion starts and ends. Candidates could also highlight the fact that the concept of power is central, yet remains elusive in nature. Better answers may be able to weave relevant theories on power into the arguments.

    Arguments for the claim may include:
    *   the centrality of military and economic power is still accepted by realist thinkers who argue that the possession of superior capabilities is more likely to result in successful outcomes for states;
    *   states aspiring to be more powerful still seek to expand their military capabilities; wealth and economic prosperity – seen as key pre-requisites for building status and power;
    *   the states that exert the most influence globally (*eg* agenda setting in UN) also have strong military capabilities and economic resources;
    *   the continued existence of intrastate and transnational wars involving non-state actors, requires states to resort to use of force, suggesting that coercion is both effective and essential;
    *   propaganda, censorship and disinformation continue to be used as a means of coercion by state and non-state actors, *eg* ISIS usage of social media to attract fighters.

    Arguments against the claim may include:
    *   aspects of soft power such as political ideals, cultural norms and social policies may be equally if not more influential than force;
    *   the mere possession of resources doesn't always result in a country having the power to achieve desired outcomes: sometimes non-material factors such as changes in strategy and/or leadership can affect outcomes
    *   diplomacy and economic assistance are useful in furthering goals and interests;
    *   persuasion can be effectively used to achieve goals and preferred outcomes through the use of means such as education and propaganda, *eg* through the use of social media;
    *   the acquisition and maintenance of instruments of coercive power – military power, arms procurement, nuclear weapons is increasingly expensive;
    *   incentives such as incorporation into free trade agreements in an era of economic interdependence work more effectively than coercion;

- non-coercive means can produce a voluntary response from a given state and lead to a more effective and long-lasting result;
- many transnational issues such as climate change, pandemics, cybercrime, drug trafficking and terrorism cannot be mitigated through forceful means.

Responses should contain references to specific examples. These may be taken, for instance from the continued emphasis on weapons and arms acquisitions by states like China, where rapid military modernization is closely linked to its ambition to become a formidable political and economic power, like the US or Russia. Examples of the increasing use of soft power could be drawn from Japan's pacifist strategic culture and China's so-called charm offensive. Any other valid and relevant examples should be evaluated positively.

Responses should include the candidate's conclusion on whether or not power in global politics is mostly exercised through force and threats.

2. **Evaluate the claim that state sovereignty creates obstacles for the realization of justice for individuals and communities.**

Responses are likely to include an explanation of the concept of sovereignty – which implies that the state or government has supreme, unqualified authority. This is reflected in the claim by states to be the sole author of laws within their own territory (internal sovereignty). Internal sovereignty is the location of supreme power within the state. External sovereignty refers to the capacity of the state to act independently and autonomously on the world stage. Candidates should also briefly discuss their understanding of the concept of justice.

Arguments in favour of the claim may include:
- in matters relating to human rights violations, and atrocities, states and leaders continue to invoke the concept of sovereignty. They agree to monitoring and judgments by human rights courts and commissions only to the extent that they choose to. Sovereignty has, in that sense resisted human rights agreements;
- many human rights agreements have been ratified by states, but with reservations, *eg* the UN Convention on Women. For instance, India, Germany and Hungary choose not to be bound by certain sections of the CEDAW;
- sovereign states resent the monitoring of perceived injustices to both individuals and communities by NGOs and the media;
- sovereignty continues to curb issues related to justice for communities and groups such as women, minorities and gay rights: states set their own limits on the rights given to such communities, and argue that this is within their domestic jurisdiction and is also closely related to cultural and societal practices specific to their jurisdiction;
- sovereignty becomes an issue in cases where an individual or group seeks political asylum on the plea that their human rights are being violated in another country. In such situations, the sovereignty of the country in question clashes with issues of justice.

Arguments against the claim may include:
- the emergence of significant international organizations such as the UN, the EU, the WTO and international NGOs has entailed the setting-up of agreed rules, laws and practices, including some enforcement mechanisms;
- membership of most of the states in the UN and its institutions involves participating states accepting and allowing other members to intervene in its domestic affairs if it fails in its fundamental duty to protect citizens and communities within its sovereign territory;
- the international community has been able to intervene successfully in cases where injustice has been meted out to individuals and groups. Such humanitarian intervention is now increasingly accepted, and is achieved through coalition efforts as well as through international organizations such as the UN.

Reponses should include reference to specific examples to support their evaluation of the claim in the question. Examples that might be used to support the claim that state sovereignty hinders realization of justice to individuals and communities could include the continuation of human rights abuses in North Korea (including enslavement, murder and mass starvation), Somalia, and Sudan, and the fallout of these on the lives of people. They could also cite examples of human rights agreements that have been ratified, but with certain reservations by some states – *eg* India, Germany and Hungary chose not to be bound by sections of the CEDAW.

Examples that could be used to illustrate the counterclaim that state sovereignty can no longer obstruct the realization of justice for individuals and groups could cite examples of successful humanitarian interventions such as those in Liberia, East Timor and Sierra Leone. They could also note cases where organizations such as the EC ensure the application of EU treaties and legislation through formal infringement proceedings, or even by referring member state to the European Court of Justice. These rules dilute state sovereignty.

Responses should include a conclusion on whether or not state sovereignty obstructs the realization of justice for individuals and communities.

Human rights

3. **"The Universal Declaration of Human Rights (1948) is no longer relevant for dealing with human rights issues in the 21st century." To what extent do you agree with this claim?**

    Arguments that the 1948 UNDHR is still relevant may include:
    - human rights abuses still persist, so it is needed as much as ever: additional covenants and treaties have updated the basic tenets expressed in the UNDHR;
    - it is formulated in non-prescriptive terms so can be adapted to deal with different sorts of rights;
    - it is the basis for further "generations" of rights including ones that address current concerns such as education and gender equality;
    - the majority of states are signatories so it is a morally aspirational goal for a great many nations.

    Arguments that the 1948 UNDHR is no longer relevant may include:
    - the UNDHR is a historic document limited to the vision of the western states that created it;
    - human rights abuses still persist, so has it proved to be ineffectual?
    - it does not include contemporary issues like same-sex marriage and gender rights;
    - it does not cater to the differing concepts of rights held in different cultures;
    - its tenets are not legally enforceable and this has been shown to limit their effectiveness.

Responses should include a conclusion on the extent to which the candidate agrees with the claim.

4. Examine the effectiveness of non-state actors in advancing the protection of human rights.

Arguments that non-state actors are effective may include:
- NGOs like Amnesty International are powerful advocates of human rights in that they can raise awareness of particular cases of abuse through investigations, the organization of social movements, and through the use of social media internationally;
- NGOs, because of their independent nature, can address the effects of neglect and other HR abuses in states;
- the structures of NGOs have more flexibility than state structures, which enables them to be quicker in responding to HR issues;
- some IGOs like the United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees (UNHCR) and the International Criminal Court (ICC) can bypass state sovereignty in order to uphold and promote human rights.

Arguments that non-state actors are not effective may include:
- the majority of NGOs are not well supported financially, so this limits their effectiveness;
- financial/personal gain motivations of some members of NGOs can be an issue;
- large NGOs working with government agencies may be limited in their ability to act independently and to represent local populations;
- some international campaigns by non-state actors cannot be effective in all countries because of differing cultural concepts of human rights;
- issues of state sovereignty and power prevent IGOs from bringing perpetrators of human rights abuses to international institutions of justice (*eg* the United States and China);
- some non-state actors have no interest in promoting human rights, or they may even directly challenge the tenets of the UDHR, and have an agenda that either neglects or doesn't recognize particular rights (*eg* the Taliban's renunciation of education for women) – some politically conservative NGOs actively campaign against others' perceptions of human rights (*eg* rights to same-sex marriage, or to the use of contraception to protect against unwanted pregnancy and sexually-transmitted diseases);
- MNCs – *eg* Apple, GE, and organizations like FIFA – make use of lax labour rights in countries as a way of obtaining cheap labour, often perpetuating and/or creating dangerous working environments;
- some MNCs are also complicit in the denial of rights such as the land rights of indigenous groups;
- well-intentioned campaigns, *eg* on social media, may be inaccurate or misleading, *eg* #Kony2012, and may sometimes be based on faulty or limited information.

Responses should include a conclusion on the effectiveness of non-state actors in advancing the protection of human rights.

Development

5. **Discuss the view that social factors such as gender relations or migration can both help and hinder development.**

Responses are likely to vary in focus depending on how development is conceived of, for instance, if it is conceived of in material terms then social factors will be viewed from a material perspective only. Better responses will define development as incorporating all aspects of a whole population's well-being, and so discuss a wider range of social factors, and whether or not these help and/or hinder development. Gender relations or migration are suggested as examples in the question, but candidates are free to discuss one of these, both of these, or any other social factor/ factors of their choice.

Arguments in favour of the view that social factors can help development may include:
*   inward migration: migrant populations are likely to be primarily young and male so add to the existing labour force – unskilled and skilled – in the receiving countries; migrants abroad may remit funds to families back home to support education and healthcare;
*   gender relations: women's empowerment, *eg* through education, political participation or take up of economic opportunities (*eg* the receipt of microloans), increases the likelihood of development for families and communities;
*   values: honesty, commitment to human rights, upholding of the rule of law are all helpful in promoting development;
*   cultural aspects: immigrants may bring cultural diversity, energy and innovation;
*   traditions may stimulate tourism, and traditional values often inspire craft/artisanal industries.

Arguments suggesting that social factors can hinder development may include:
*   outward migration – emigration can lead to brain drain, gender imbalance, greater pressure on gender relations, loss of working age population, loss of educated people who are most mobile; immigration can lead to lower wages;
*   where discouraged, inward migration may go underground, leading to people-smuggling, slavery, and the diverting of state resources to police these. Inward migration may lead to greater income inequality, visible in areas of deprivation and impoverishment, and estranging of local people;
*   values: corruption hinders development, rights of migrants are not protected leading to exploitation, lack of belief in the rule of law;
*   cultural aspects: language difficulties, poor race relations leading to social tensions, pressure on housing and community services, diversity not always leading to social cohesion, causing integration difficulties;
*   traditions and traditional decision making may inhibit changes needed for development.

Responses should contain references to specific examples to support the "help" and "hinder" aspects of the question. Examples could include: countries which have suffered "brain drains" and the loss of skilled workers through migration, leading to lower than expected rates of development might include the Philippines and Bulgaria; countries in which female participation in the workforce is low or limited by cultural factors, leading to lower rates of development might include Saudi Arabia, Iran, Pakistan; countries in which perceptions of corruption might inhibit business initiative and international trade, leading to lower rates of development might include Zimbabwe, Myanmar or Venezuela; or corruption and political instability (Afghanistan). Candidates may also cite countries that have not been able to develop due to international isolation (*eg* North Korea), and argue that this isolation is due to social factors.

Responses should include the candidate's evaluation of the validity of the view put forward in the question.

6. **Examine the view that successful development cannot be achieved without addressing political inequality.**

Responses are likely to include an explanation of political inequality. This might be phrased as the extent to which groups are unequal in their influence over the decisions made in governance structures, noting in a development context that political inequality is often associated with economic inequality and rigid social hierarchies.

Arguments that support the view that successful development cannot be achieved without addressing political inequality may include:
- if development is broadly conceived to incorporate all aspects of the whole population's well-being, not just economic growth, this by definition requires a commitment to equality, including political equality;
- a more democratic government is more likely to engage with development efforts because it is held accountable by the whole population including by the most needy;
- people and communities with low levels of development may be unable to make their voices heard due to a lack of access to education and health care, and so do not have the power to influence decisions about their own concerns;
- the granting of political rights to groups such as subsistence farmers, refugee communities, women, or indigenous groups not participating in the formal economy is a pre-requisite for development;
- there is evidence that in unequal societies resources are often diverted away from development.

Arguments against the view may include:
- if development is narrowly conceived to mean measurable, aggregate, economic growth, it could be argued that a country is developing even though political inequalities persist;
- it can be argued that tolerating inequality through supporting political elites will benefit everyone in the long run through the trickle-down effect and because these elites are best-placed to make decisions for the rest of the population;
- the advancement of development for groups such as subsistence farmers, refugee communities or indigenous groups not participating in the formal economy is a pre-requisite for the granting of greater political equality;
- international organizations such as the World Bank liaise and delegate the power to political elites to address development needs;
- MNCs and NGOs are more powerful in affecting development outcomes than political actors.

Responses should contain references to specific examples. Candidates could, for example, give examples of countries where political inequality has been high and development low due to the rule of long-running autocrats or cliques such as in North Korea, Congo, or Sudan.

Responses should include the candidate's evaluation of the validity of the view put forward in the question.

Peace and conflict

7. **Evaluate the success of third-party involvement in transforming *one* intra-state conflict away from violence and towards positive peace.**

Different arguments may be considered depending on which intra-state conflict is used in the answer, and it is expected that the answer will evaluate the validity of those arguments in the context of the chosen conflict. Responses are likely to include an explanation of the key terms from the question, such as third-party involvement (identifying different options for intervention *eg* armed military, diplomatic, economic), conflict transformation, intra-state conflict, violence, and positive peace. They may also highlight the importance of negative peace as an interim stage.

Reasons why third-party involvement may succeed:
- there is a supportive external environment with a strong regional and international dimension;
- the parties in conflict will benefit from the transformation to peace (negative and positive) more than they can benefit from an extension of fighting;
- the parties in the conflict agree to the third-party involvement;
- the third party has the trust of all parties, is genuinely neutral, detached from the reasons for conflict, and is not seeking to take control in the conflict;
- the third party has the necessary political, financial, and/or administrative status;
- the third party has the resources and expertise (knowledge and skills) to act as a mediator between warring groups and to help lead them to a peaceful resolution;
- neutral observers, *eg* election observers, can change the behavior of protagonists;
- third parties have the power to transform a conflict through the use of weapon embargoes, financial freezes, and/or trade limitations or by enhancing the status of the weaker party in an asymmetric conflict, thereby bringing the stronger party to accept value in negotiation.

Reasons why third-part involvement may not succeed:
- the third-party involvement is imposed and not desired by at least one of the parties in conflict;
- if the involvement includes a mediation process that is in the public domain, actors are likely to play to their constituents for domestic political gain;
- extremists commit acts of violence to destroy trust in the negotiation process;
- the wrong individuals from the parties in conflict are involved and they do not have the support of the rank and file engaged in the conflict – no mandate;
- some conflicts are long-running and seemingly intractable, or the violence has been extreme and wounds are extensive – mediation or negotiation are not possible;
- there is a failure to identify and implement the criteria that would determine success;
- the third party may withdraw its involvement and leave the conflict unresolved, and possibly even less tractable.

Responses should refer to one specific intra-state conflict. While there are many definitions of intra-state conflict, examples chosen would typically have a high level of violence, within the internal boundaries of a state and with the established authority or government as one of the parties in conflict. Students may give examples of ethnic or civil conflicts which are less obviously/ explicitly intra-state conflicts, however, a broad definition should be accepted.

The end of the Cold War marked a fourfold increase in the use of United Nations peacekeeping forces in intra-state conflicts around the globe. Some appropriate examples could be Kashmir, the former Yugoslavia, Cambodia, Nicaragua, Sri Lanka, Darfur, Afghanistan, Iraq or, more recently, countries affected by the Arab Spring.

Responses should include the candidate's evaluation of whether or not third-party involvement can transform a conflict towards peace, and under what circumstances.

8. **"The use of violence can never be legitimate." Discuss the validity of this claim, with reference to at least one violent conflict you have studied.**

The focus of this question is on the moral and ethical dilemma that warfare and violence cause given that, in most societies killing is regarded as wrong, and therefore if violence is to be presented as legitimate there will be religious, legal and ethical formulations needed to outline the legitimacy of war and violence. Depending on the conflict(s) used as an example, responses could look at religious perspectives, or at legal aspects, for example the Geneva Convention, the Nuremberg Principles, or the UN Charter, or at moral perspectives.

Arguments used to legitimize violence may include:
- religious legitimacy: violence can be justified in theological terms, *eg* in pursuance of a "holy war" or "physical jihad" by Judaism, Islam, Hinduism, Buddhism, Christianity, *etc*;
- legal legitimacy: violence as a response to a perceived international threat, following the passing of a UN resolution (*eg* the UN Charter Chapter VII regarding the Iraqi invasion of Kuwait (UNIKOM), or the NATO-led intervention in Libya;
- moral legitimacy: the use of violence by states could be regarded as a lesser evil to achieve a greater good, such as to avoid an undue loss of human life, or to defend its citizens, and defend justice, or in opposition to structural violence, such as unfair laws, discrimination, threat(s) to livelihood, or in response to forced migration, or lack of resources. Max Weber's ideas on the state's monopoly on violence could be relevant;
- the need for self-defence by individuals or communities, *eg* by indigenous groups, needing to protect themselves against outside (or local) aggression; or in revolt against an occupier, *eg* the violence by Shiite groups against the US-led invasion of Iraq;
- "Just War Doctrine" provides an ideal platform for analysing the legitimacy of war and violence: *Jus ad Bellum* provides the legitimacy for going to war. Last Resort, Legitimate Authority (State), Right Intention and Just Cause, Chance of Success, Ultimate Goal of Peace and *Jus in Bello*, provide the legitimacy for how the war is fought; violence must be proportional and discriminatory (not target non-combatants).

Arguments against the legitimization of violence may include:
- violence doesn't solve anything but leads potentially to more violence – conflicts may escalate and spill over into other areas, harming innocent civilians;
- theological/ethical arguments against taking human life under any circumstances, or causing undue suffering;
- violence often involves material destruction *eg* of infrastructure, livelihoods, and resources that may take years to normalize and be very costly to replace;
- non-violent protests can be equally or more effective, and peaceful solutions through diplomatic means are likely to be more sustainable.

Responses should contain reference to at least one example of a violent conflict. This may, for example, be through the concept of a state monopoly on violence (Weber) with the formal decision of a state to go to war, or counter-examples of non-state actors who claim legitimacy, for example, that they are acting in self-defence. Non-state examples could include Northern Ireland, Israel-Palestine, South Sudan, Ukraine, the Arab Spring, Syria/Iraq, Kashmir.

Responses should include the candidate's conclusion on whether or not violence can ever be legitimate.