

**ANSWER BOOKLET
LIVRET DE RÉPONSES
CUADERNILLO DE RESPUESTAS**

4 PAGES / PÁGINAS



International Baccalaureate
Baccalauréat International
Bachillerato Internacional

Question 1: Discuss reasons why the legitimacy of a state may need to be questioned.

[Unit of study: Power, sovereignty and international relations]

1. Legitimacy, as a concept, has received a variety of definitions over the years from different scholars. Most famous of these, Max Weber, defines legitimacy simply as the belief in the rightful rule of the state (Politics as a vocation, 1919). However, he further picks this down to three main points, traditional, charismatic and legal/rational legitimacy. On the other end of the spectrum, David Beetham attempts to outline more concrete and objective universal criteria for legitimacy. He claims that legitimacy is derived under three conditions, consent, rule based governance, and the belief of the population in those rules. (The legitimization of power, 2nd edition). Both scholars approach the question of legitimacy from a different angle but as but together provide a framework under which the legitimacy of a state may be questioned.

One of the most prominent examples of questioning the legitimacy of a state comes from the not economically developed nation on earth, the United States. President Donald Trump was elected in to office in the early January 2017 with a minority of the overall vote, but under the electoral guidelines of the United States ~~due~~ he won the office. This has lead to many questioning his legitimacy as the head of the state and consequently the ~~of~~ decisions made by the state. ~~If one could argue that, due to Trump not achieving the consent of his people. However,~~ the international community still regards him as the legitimate leader of the United States. This is due to the fact that,



-2-

while he doesn't meet Beetham's first criteria for legitimacy, consent, all the other criterion both from Beetham's point of view and Weber's are met. The practice of the election and the electoral college are written into US law. Trump is exercising his power within the law, some would argue otherwise especially with his recent attempts at preventing certain nationals from entering the US, he is a charismatic leader and he is a charismatic leader. Hence, while some might question his legitimacy and consequently the legitimacy of the decisionmaking of the United States, under guidelines set out by Weber and Beetham the legitimacy of the state is not under question.

When looking at ~~controversial~~ contested territories such as Kosovo or the state of Palestine, the question takes a completely different dynamic from that outlined in the case of Trump. Now it is not the legitimacy of the leader hindering the legitimacy of the state to conduct its everyday life, but the existence of the state itself to exercise rightful authority over a given territory. If one is to use the declarative theory of statehood, which as the basis for the legal component of Weber's and Beetham's conditions for legitimacy both Kosovo and the Palestinian territories can, to some extent, be seen as rightful in exercising power over their territory. That is, they both have a permanent population, defined borders which while contested, are agreed out in international treaties, the ability to govern over their territory and the ability to enter into relations with other states. However, if one is to look at however, when moving away from the legal requirement for legitimacy, the right to exercise power over their territories for Kosovo and Palestine comes under question.

Firstly, Beetham's requirement for collective belief in the rules isn't satisfied. Since, in the case of especially Palestine, these come from the United Nations which is in itself in a crisis



04AX02

- 3 -

of exercising authority due to its repeated failures of solving the Israel-Palestine conflict. Moreover, in no part of the process is consent provided. While state may express consent towards both the Palestinian state and Kosovo, there is still a sizeable number of states that don't. Moreover, if one is to look for consent from further more, while a clearly defined territory exists for the states in question, they are highly contested especially in Palestine where Israel continues to settle onto Palestinian land. Hence, while a liberal might argue that the state of Palestine is legitimate or Kosovo is legitimate due to it meeting most international standards for statehood outlined here, a realist would argue otherwise due to the inability of the states in question to function without international protection.

One could also look at North Korea as an example where the legitimacy of the state is under question, especially in the international community. Both South Korea and North Korea claim the Korean peninsula in its entirety and, since a peace agreement between the two states has never been signed since the Korean War, they are still contesting for the same land. Under Weber's requirement for charismatic legitimacy, North Korea could be defined as legitimate due to it being an authoritarian state with a charismatic leader, Kim Jong-un. However, when it comes to Weber's requirement for legal/rational legitimacy or Beetham's definitions of legitimacy, the legitimacy of both North and South Korea can be questioned. Since neither have a clearly defined territory due to their overlapping territorial claims and due to their varying levels of consent from the international community the legitimacy of both states can be questioned. Especially since, if the United Nations Security Council is treated as the pinnacle of international relations, the UNSC is split in half with their support with both Russia and China approving of North Korean statehood while the United Kingdom, France and especially the United States oppose it, at least under the current regime. However, one could argue that since all



04AX03

- 4 -

of these nations engage in relations with both regimes, they acquire consent and are hence legitimate.

This essay has looked at both territorial ~~and~~ claims to the existence of the state and the legitimacy of the leaders of a state as reasons to question the legitimacy of a state. While, in the case of Kosovo, Palestine and North Korea, the question most often boils down to the application of the requirements for statehood or the legal components in Weber's and Beetham's definitions of legitimacy, when the question is different and more subtle, ~~in~~ when looking at the leaders of one state, in this case legitimacy has been gained and questioning the head of the state erodes the legitimacy of the state itself. Nevertheless, Beetham and Weber provide a strong framework to question the legitimacy of a state especially if their conditions aren't met.



04AX04

ANSWER BOOKLET
LIVRET DE RÉPONSES
CUADERNILLO DE RESPUESTAS

4 PAGES / PÁGINAS



International Baccalaureate
Baccalauréat International
Bachillerato Internacional

Question 4: Discuss the claim that development in industrializing countries often violates universal rights to a clean environment and to the humanitarian treatment of labour.

[Unit of study: Human rights]

4. The violation of human rights, especially those to a clean environment and the humanitarian treatment of labour, are hotly contested topics in modern day politics. Often it comes down to the question, which is more important, these rights or the socio-economic development of the nation. Dambisa Moyo, would argue that many nations are held back from achieving development to a higher standard than the freedom and liberty, which entail the right to a clean environment and the humanitarian treatment of labour, in her TED talks. Moreover, this can be seen in multiple nations globally not only and not only develop industrialising but also in industrialised nations. Countries such as Qatar, Indonesia, and Vietnam often choose to violate environmental standards and labour rights in response to development since the gains from it outweigh the costs. Hence, it isn't something one should worry about.

A liberal stance is often to argue that through the following of human rights a better society will follow. However, a realist, and an ever increasing number of states and individuals would disagree. Often in industrialising countries, due to high unemployment and poverty, a working with little to no labour protection is a better decision to that of trying to advocate for these rights. Moreover, if one is not willing to work under inadequate labour protection another person often will. Hence, one could argue, it is a vicious cycle of exploitation which should be stopped.



-2-

However, this often takes the stance of human rights being universal, inalienable and indivisible, but for many. Experience in these nations has shown that a cultural relative attitude is better since without the job under inadequate labour standards their human rights for safe sanitation, housing and welfare ~~for~~ welfare would not be met. Hence, while development often disregards the right to a clean environment and humanitarian treatment of labour it is this development, Dambisa Moyo would argue, which leads to the fulfilment of human rights.

Moreover, industrialising countries are often at a disadvantage in terms of power when it comes to multinational companies operating within their borders. Companies such as Glencore, who own the Mopani copper mines in Zambia, disregard environmental standards in to produce at maximum capacity. They can do this since, the host state would be even worse off without the investment and tax revenue from their mining activities. Of course, one could argue that this isn't the case since the environmental degradation will lead to long term issues with the mine providing a short-term solution. However, ~~once again~~, this is often not the case if industrialised countries are to look at for examples Britain during the industrial revolution disregarded both environmental protection and labour rights in the face of development and in the long run have managed to transform their country into a highly developed nation. Hence, one could argue, industrialising countries have to violate the rights to a clean environment and to the humanitarian treatment of labour to achieve development. One could further argue that not to do so would be bad for the state of these two rights in the long run since, without development, the state won't be able to provide these second positive, second generation, rights since it won't have the resources nor the capacity to.

Furthermore, as noted at the beginning of this essay, this is also not an issue solely of industrialising nations. Hence,



04AX02

- 3 -

One could argue that it would be hypocritical to make them follow these human rights outlined if industrialised nations such as Qatar who exploit a lot of migrant labour from India, Bangladesh and Nepal and Pakistan, are a not made to follow them. Hence, Moreover, a realist would argue, Hence, Thus, action by western nations to try and protect these rights in industrialising nations would not be warranted. Yet, this often happens due to industrialised nations yielding more power over industrialising countries. Hence international treaties on the protection of ~~climate~~ the right to a clean environment have historically failed since ~~industrial~~ ~~as stated earlier~~ industrialised nations often require all nations to abide by the regulations and ~~that~~ industrialising nations have found it impossible to do so.

An exception to the above is the COP21 Paris Climate accord which strongly recognised this issue that violating the right to a clean environment is a prerequisite for development. Hence, it included points in which industrialised states pledged to support nations namely to acquire better development to without violating this right. Due to the high capital intensity of clean energy without these clauses the violation of the right to a clean environment would have ensued. Since, ~~as a~~ Of course, one could argue, the pledges of these nations weren't big enough to prevent these violations in the name of development and, further more, they were made in the self interest of the industrialised economies. This is due to the fact that, especially clean energy, it requires highly skilled labour which will benefit the donor nations. However, a realist would argue once again, that this shouldn't be an issue since it is better than no action at all.

While the COP21 acc agreement provides a framework, as outlined above, for the reduction of violating the right to a clean environment in the name of development, a similar framework for labour rights is lacking. Solutions could be found



04AX03

- 4 -

in better regulatory enforcement ~~and the improvement of~~ from both the industrialising nation ~~but also from pledges~~ and the industrialised nations which are often the end market for the goods produced under poor labour standards. However, this is unlikely due to the benefits for both of these countries through development for the industrialising and cheaper goods for the industrialised. Of course,

Hence, as this essay has argued, development in industrialising countries often violates universal rights to a clean environment and to the humanitarian treatment of labour. However, as noted by this essay and furthered by Dambisa Moyo, this is necessarily not a bad thing since development is the prerequisite for human rights, not the other way round. I liberal might disagree but if one is to look at both the ~~Americas~~ the UK or ~~for~~ the United States this has been the historical case and ~~can~~ the trend can be expected to ~~reverse~~ reverse.



04AX04

ANSWER BOOKLET
LIVRET DE RÉPONSES
CUADERNILLO DE RESPUESTAS

4 PAGES / PÁGINAS



International Baccalaureate
Baccalauréat International
Bachillerato Internacional

Question 5: Evaluate the claim that inequality encourages, rather than prevents, development.

[Unit of study: Development]

5.

Inequality is often seen as a negative side of both globalisation and as a hindering factor for development. However, if one is to look at all of the four development theories covered, Modernisation, Dependency, neo-liberalism and the Washington consensus, all entertain a level of inequality as a prerequisite for development. Furthermore, if historical and modern examples are to be trusted, ~~the point is~~ both in the face of communism and states such as North Korea, inequality encourages, rather than hinders development.

If one is to look at the ~~Modernisation~~ Modernisation theory which states that the path to development can be achieved through five steps, irrespective of the natural resources, political system or cultural factors of a nation, a requirement for inequality can be noted. More specifically, to create the "preconditions for take off" a country's industry must develop must hold both enough capital have the incentives to move towards ~~and~~ a western model of a developed nation. It can be seen in countries such as North Korea where the government rationed out goods equally to its citizens that these incentives can't be met within the nation, hence development is hindered. Of course, one could argue that this is due to ineffective leadership and mismanagement of resources, but, according to ~~modernisation~~ modernisation theory despite this development should ensue. However, the lack of incentives prohibits this which inhibits development within the nation.

The inefficiency of modernisation theory lead to this rise



04AX01

-2-

of dependency theory which argues that the conditions outlined in modernisation theory can't be met without the exploitation of other nations. Hence, they can't be met without inequality. The theory argues that developed nations are only able to reach the status that they are through the exploitation of inequality as it is between them. This can be seen to be true as in the modern world especially through the use of multinational corporations who often outsource their production to less developed nations. Through this they are able to achieve higher profits due to the lower costs abroad and in the cases such as that of Glencore operating in Zambia, through transfer pricing. This drives development in the host nation of the MNC. Of course one could argue that through cases such as the rise of the Asian tigers who didn't exploit less developed nations, inequality isn't an encouraging factor of development. However, these states also received a lot of development aid from developed western nations such as the US in United States which was possible through the unequal status the success of which was possible through the unequal development status of the states. That is, the aid created more results than in the Asian tigers than it would have if used on a state of similar development status.

Furthermore, if one is to look at neo-liberal development inequality plays a central role through the creation of incentives. Without these the market system which it advocates for would not function hence inequality encourages development instead of hindering it. The best example of this is the United States who champion the neo-liberal development theory through the highly deregulated and free market. Through this the US has become the most largest economy in the world which shows the championing of neo-liberal development and the role of inequality encouraging development. However, one could argue, development isn't purely a measure of economic growth about measuring economic growth. Through the neo-liberal development model.



04AX02

- 3 -

environmental degradation has ensued and unhappiness and jealousy have become common place, especially with growing globalisation. Hence, if development is measured in terms of the happiness of the population inequality has hindered, not encouraged, development. Moreover, one could argue that the ~~ex~~ high economic figures are only present due to the ultra-rich living in the US and hence, the development status indicated in the economic figures is skewed. Hence, one could argue. Moreover, one could argue that the extreme levels of inequality in the US inhibit social mobility which further reduces development prospects. However, without the initial inequality create the conditions for neo-liberal development to shine everyone would be worse off. Hence, inequality encourages, rather than prevents, development.

Furthermore, as a response to the critique above rose the theory of the Washington Consensus whereby government should have a role in the economy to guide it and enhance development. However, within this model inequality still persists as the driving force while the government fills in the shortfall of the economy. ~~If one is to look~~ Hence, inequality still plays a role in enhancing, rather than hindering, development.

Of course, one could argue that nations with a low gini index and hence low income inequality such as the Nordic nations have achieved government lead development and a strong social security network which ~~but~~ enhances the living standards of all, not just a few. Hence, they argue, that inequality isn't necessary for development and it hinders it. However, to run these social security systems a level of inequality is necessary so that they can be financed through taxation. Moreover, these nations have created the conditions necessary for high social mobility which leads to incentives to enter higher income groups to provide more for the government. Through this these nations are able to finance their development.



04AX03

- 4 -

hence inequality, once again, encourages rather than hinders development.

This essay has taken a highly capitalist view towards development and recognizes this throughout. However, as noted through the examples, every development theory has an element of inequality embedded within it and, while one could argue successfully that high levels of inequality hinder development low levels encourage it as this essay has argued. Moreover, as argued here, this can be seen on both national and international levels ~~and~~ where development has been perpetuated by globalisation bringing together players of different ability and development status. Hence inequality encourages, rather than hinders, development.



04AX04