

Markscheme

November 2020

Global politics

Higher level and standard level

Paper 2

19 pages

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 written permission from the IB.

Additionally, the license tied with this product prohibits commercial 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, is not permitted and is subject to the IB's prior written consent via a license. More information on how to request a license can be obtained from <https://ibo.org/become-an-ib-school/ib-publishing/licensing/applying-for-a-license/>.

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 de l'IB.

De plus, la licence associée à ce produit interdit toute utilisation commerciale 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, n'est pas autorisée et est soumise au consentement écrit préalable de l'IB par l'intermédiaire d'une licence. Pour plus d'informations sur la procédure à suivre pour demander une licence, rendez-vous à l'adresse suivante : <https://ibo.org/become-an-ib-school/ib-publishing/licensing/applying-for-a-license/>.

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 que medie la autorización escrita del IB.

Además, la licencia vinculada a este producto prohíbe el uso con fines comerciales 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— no está permitido y estará sujeto al otorgamiento previo de una licencia escrita por parte del IB. En este enlace encontrará más información sobre cómo solicitar una 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. Evaluate the claim that power in global politics is about possession of resources.

Responses are likely to include a definition of power and the discourse on the term. Candidates may then move on to identify the different types of power they have studied such as economic (possession of resources), military, political, soft, hard and smart power. They may elaborate on possession of resources and what it would possibly encompass (such as land, natural resources, economic capital, human resource capital, military capabilities, technological advancement, good infrastructure, open markets, and supportive trade and investment policies), how it is changing and the ways to measure it.

Arguments in favour of the claim that power in global politics is about possession of resources may include:

- Possession of resources enables a state to realize its objectives and garner all kinds of influence and power. It is therefore the basis of and prerequisite for a state's power in global politics. In other words, power flows from variables such as acquiring and possessing economic power and military strength.
- Economic and military resources and power can be used in two ways – to impact and influence other countries or to limit or punish them. For instance, economically powerful countries can use their influence to gain access to cheap resources and labor through offering aid for developing infrastructure.
- Economic or military resources can be used by a state to enact hard power. There are also other coercive economic tools such as sanctions, tariffs, embargo or trade wars which could be used by economically powerful states. Economically powerful states can use unequal or asymmetric trade and investment balance to gain access to resources and have political leverage over other states such as China's inroads into Africa through investments which gives it considerable political leverage as well as access to resources there. Trade blocs could also be used for this purpose.
- Military power of a state, which is often considered as ultimate power also needs resources. It is easier and more feasible for strong economies to become notable military powers. Prominent examples are the US, Russia and China.
- MNCs have begun to wield significant power over state policy making simply because they often have more economic resources than certain states and can use their power to influence government policy decisions in their favour. Therefore, economic power remains one of the most critical factors to the extent that it even shapes state behavior and policies.
- Non-traditional security matters, which do not necessarily lend themselves to solutions through other types of power such as military power, also require availability of resources. Climate change, the spread of infectious diseases, and food and water security need economic resources to be controlled and managed.
- Soft power could also be developed based on availability and possession of resources. For instance, providing aid, holding cultural events, ability to attract foreign students for education would require or at least could be made more effective if the state possesses resources such as economic capital or human resource capital.

Arguments against the claim that power in global politics is about possession of resources may include:

- Power depends on much more than resources. In order to exercise and accumulate power states need many other variables such as good leadership, soft power to persuade through use of diplomacy, cultural influence, quality of governance, quality of human resource capital, character and morale of the state.
- Soft power, or the ability to get what you want through attraction rather than through coercion, through the use of variables such as culture and political values is more effective in certain situations and does not necessarily require possession of economic and military resources. For instance, spread of cultural power through movies, fast-food.
- The use of resources to enhance economic and military power may not always work effectively all of the time or in all circumstances, especially if the targeted state and its government feels that steps such as sanctions or punitive measures may harm their interests and they decide not to cooperate or even rebel.
- Different forms of power are nested within one another and possession of one enables the other, in which case economic power may not necessarily be the most significant one. For instance, the soft power of China is often termed as a charm offensive and has been based on communicating the idea that Beijing is not a “threat”. For example, China has taken steps such as signing the Treaty of Amity and Cooperation with countries in Southeast Asia. This did not require possession of resources. But rather, soft power or cooption has led to further economic cooperation between the two sides.
- Possession of resources is not enough in a state’s capacity to manage many transnational issues such as handling climate change, pandemics or natural disasters. They require transnational cooperation, appropriate policies and timely action and effective implementation of policies. In short, it is about governance too.
- Mere possession of economic/military power and resources does not necessarily translate into political power or influence. For example, Japan with its economic resources doesn’t yield much influence politically and strategically.
- Political power does not always require resources and is also a very important type of power in terms of its ability to influence decision making and agenda setting. For instance, the power of the US in managing North Korea’s nuclearization (through 6 party talks) or the use of this power by the permanent members of the UN Security Council through the use of veto power.

Responses should make some reference to specific examples of whether power in global politics is about possession of resources in terms of military and economic power or not. Candidates could use examples such as that of China’s aid (economic resources) to countries with authoritarian regimes such as Sudan which provides them with an advantage over such states. Also candidates could give examples of situations where hard power (military) has worked better for a state to achieve its goals such as international action against the ISIS and Syria. Examples of power without necessarily possessing economic and military resources (soft power) could be the number of students going to the US to pursue studies or the influence of Indian films on the South Asian region and beyond. Responses should include a conclusion on the degree to which possession of resources is the most significant variable defining power in global politics today.

2. Discuss the claim that intergovernmental organizations (IGOs) reduce conflicts.

Responses are likely to include a definition of intergovernmental organizations as a group comprising sovereign states or intergovernmental organizations which are formed based on a treaty or formal agreement. These have played an important role in mitigation, resolution and prevention of conflicts. Few examples of intergovernmental organizations include the UN and the World Bank (at the global level) and EU and ASEAN (at the regional level). Some of these play an active role in case of the outbreak of inter-state conflicts. Candidates might choose to discuss types of conflicts – resource, territorial, economic, ideological. They could then proceed to identify some such conflicts which have arisen in recent times as examples and use them to support their arguments and counter claims.

Arguments in favour of the claim that inter-governmental organizations reduce conflicts may include:

- IGOs at the global level such as the UN provide a platform for states to coordinate, cooperate and discuss matters (promote interconnectedness) thus enabling easing of tensions. They also ensure transparency and bring in an objectivity with their multiple members. The UN is a prime example of such a platform
- IGOs help states form a network wherein they influence states and member states help affect each other. In sum, the mere presence of such organizations waters down the possibility of conflicts turning violent
- IGOs (especially global) have the resources, institutional mechanisms and means to help prevent or manage conflict by both use of force (eg some UN peacekeeping missions such as United Nations Mission in East Timor (UNAMET and United Nations Iraq-Kuwait Observation Mission (UNIKOM)) and without the use of force such as mediation and negotiation.
- IGOs at the regional level have the dual advantages of being geographically close as also culturally more connected with the parties in conflict. They are also likely to share common interests and be more familiar with the significant actors in decision making on the conflict. Eg ASEAN which permitted conflict mediation after 1976.
- Regional IGOs can provide help to member states in a shorter time frame and with lower costs in case of the outbreak of a conflict.
- IGOs which may not necessarily exist with a politico-strategic agenda and focus on the economic aspects (such as World Bank and IMF) also have leverage over conflicts. This is true especially in cases where they have influence over conflicting parties where they can indirectly mould a state's behavior in a dispute.

Arguments against of the claim that inter-governmental organizations reduce conflicts may include:

- IGOs such as the UN may not always be able to take swift action such as peacekeeping operations due to limitations such as veto by the permanent members, lack of finances or even the reluctance of member states to provide troops. Troops may even be provided based on certain conditions which may limit the effectiveness of management of the conflict in question, eg Russian veto in conflict with Ukraine.
- Not all IGOs are able to give binding and implementable decisions, in which case the conflicting parties may not pay heed to the suggestions or decisions by the IGO, still not solving the conflict. Eg AU is not able to impose agreements because their charter does not provide for it.
- States remain the most significant sovereign players in global politics and can choose to either exit from intergovernmental organizations or not join them if it clashes with what they perceive to be against their power and national interest.
- IGOs may have limited ability to reduce conflict if parties to the conflict are not ready to accept their involvement.
- Regional IGOs may not have the mandate to interfere in conflicts within a state, eg ASEAN.

Candidates should make references to examples of inter-state conflicts where intergovernmental organizations have been successful in preventing or managing conflicts such as those in Sierra Leone, Timor Leste and Kosovo (UN), NATO in Kosovo. They could also cite examples of cases where intergovernmental organizations have not been able to make an effective impact or prevent conflict such as AU which was ineffective in the conflict in DRC. North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO) has enabled peace enforcement.

Responses should include a conclusion on the extent to which intergovernmental organizations have been able to reduce conflict.

Human rights

3. The central problem with international human rights laws and treaties is that they are open to different interpretations. 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. Candidates should refer to specific international human rights laws and/or treaties and the extent to which they are subject to different interpretations. The effectiveness of human rights laws and treaties also should be discussed with an emphasis on whether or not they are open to different interpretations and, if so, the degree to which this renders them ineffective vis-à-vis the codification, protection and enforcement of human rights around the world.

Arguments in favour of the claim that the central problem with international human rights laws and treaties is that they are open to different interpretations may include:

- In most countries, people have as many as 400 international human rights and the sheer quantity and variety of rights provides little guidance to governments in terms of which right(s) should be prioritized, especially given limited governmental budgets.
- Human rights laws and treaties provide no specific guidance to governments. In addition, variations in governance structures may interfere with the universal application of international laws/treaties. For example, the right to freedom of expression is hotly contested around the world: in Europe hate speech is not permitted while in many Islamic countries, any kind of defamation against Islam is not protected.
- The ambiguity of international human rights laws/treaties means that it is impossible to arrive at a set of clearly defined rules that can be interpreted and applied by trusted institutions at the international level.
- While many governments employ the idiom of human rights, they use it to make radically different arguments about how countries should behave, eg many countries cite the “right to security”, a catch-all idea that protection from crime or terrorism justifies harsh enforcement methods.
- The language of rights, untethered to specific legal interpretations, is too spongy to prevent governments from committing abuses and can easily be used to clothe illiberal agendas, eg Russia referenced the rights of ethnic minorities in Ukraine in order to justify its military intervention there in 2014, just as the USA cited Saddam Hussein’s suppression of human rights in order to establish support for the Iraq war in 2003.

Arguments against the claim that the central problem with international human rights laws and treaties is that they are open to different interpretations may include:

- Any ambiguity that may exist at the international level with human rights laws/treaties has been resolved at the national level - in many countries the task of clearly interpreting vaguely worded international human rights laws/treaties has been delegated to trusted domestic institutions such as courts.
- In a similar fashion, vaguely worded international human rights laws and treaties have been more clearly codified in the national constitutions of some countries, *eg* South Africa and Brazil.
- The existence of regional human rights institutions and/or instruments such as the African Charter on Human and Peoples' Rights and the American Convention on Human Rights provide a more specific and palatable sense of a state's human rights obligations and thus the chance that human rights laws/treaties will be embraced locally.
- Many human rights advocates assert that despite their openness to different interpretation, human rights laws/treaties provide important moral support for oppressed people, *eg* women's rights groups in patriarchal states have drawn inspiration from the ratification of the CEDAW, Amnesty International and Human Rights Watch can pressure governments to improve the human rights they care about, even if they cannot get states to comply with all their treaty obligations.
- The fact that human rights laws/treaties are open to different interpretations is actually beneficial as this broadens their application in global politics.
- While human rights laws/treaties are indeed open to different interpretations, this is not their central problem, *ie* the main issue is the lack of state compliance with their legal obligations of states due to the principle of sovereignty and/or the weakness of the international human rights institutions charged with their protection and enforcement, *eg* the UN Human Rights Council.

Responses should make some reference to specific examples of human rights laws and/or treaties in discussing their efficacy, such as the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights (ICCPR), the International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights (ICESCR), the United Nations Convention against Torture (UNCAT), the Convention Relating to the Status of Refugees, etc. It is likely that many students will also refer to the 1948 Universal Declaration of Human Rights (UDHR) and although this is not actually a treaty, *per se*, many scholars believe that it is now part of customary international law and so some leeway should be granted here.

Responses should include a conclusion on the degree to which the central problem with international human rights laws/treaties is that they are open to different interpretations.

4. Evaluate the view that human rights limit state power in global politics.

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. Students are also likely to provide a definition of power - the ability to effect change and/or the ability to make someone do something – and refer to different types of power: hard, soft, and smart. Candidates may also briefly discuss their understanding of the role played by the state in global politics.

Arguments in favour of the view that human rights limit state power in global politics may include:

- Declarations of the UN General Assembly may enjoy the status of customary international law and, thus, act to limit the more “conventional” applications of state power, eg the Universal Declaration of Human Rights (1948) or the Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples (2007).
- Other institutional changes in the international framework of human rights also play a role in limiting state power, eg the greater prominence of the UN Human Rights Commission and the appointment of a UN High Commissioner for Human Rights in 1993.
- The key role played by international non-governmental organizations committed to deepening state compliance with human rights law, eg Amnesty International, Human Rights Watch, etc.
- Reference to the fact that within the European Union (EU) respect for human rights had always been a condition for membership, which then limits what member states can and cannot do.
- The inclusion of human rights into the diplomacy of Western states. Many states or entities, such as the EU, now include explicit reference to human rights in their foreign policy, which may limit state power.
- Many of the world's most important trading nations, from Canada and the EU to Brazil and Chile include human rights language in their Preferential Trade Agreements (PTAs), which may act as a restraint on state power.
- The role of Responsibility to Protect (R2P) may serve as a check on state power. The role played by the International Criminal Court (ICC) in limiting egregious violations of human rights by a state (or state actors) may also be mentioned in this regard.

Arguments against the view that human rights limit state power in global politics may include:

- States remain tremendously powerful actors, and over the past decade, the international order has seen a structural shift away from those states that traditionally support human rights promotion, and towards those that have openly challenged and/or violated human rights norms, eg China, Russia and Turkey.
- The post-September 11 era has seen many previous human rights gains reversed as governments have altered the priorities accorded to national security over individual liberties, eg the US's “War on Terror”, the EU's apparent unwillingness to confront Budapest's treatment of immigrants and its roll-back of press freedoms, etc.
- The diplomacy of human rights in global politics may just pay lip service to human rights. States retain the ability to ignore such sensibilities when it suits them or when other factors such as national security and trade take priority, eg continued Western arms exports to Saudi Arabia despite its poor human rights record in the Yemeni civil war.
- While mention of human rights may be embedded in some PTA's, such references may be rhetorical in nature rather than legally binding.
- The application of R2P has been inconsistent due to the political and economic interests of more powerful countries, eg 10 of the 11 situations under investigation at the ICC are African countries, while governments such as Syria's commit atrocities with little fear of intervention or prosecution because Russia, a P5 state, undermines any attempt to hold the country's leaders accountable.
- Human rights' laws/treaties are only effective if states choose to comply with them. For instance, in October 2017, South Africa, Burundi, and Gambia announced they would withdraw from the ICC due to its alleged anti-African bias, showcasing the fact that states retain ultimate power in global politics.

- Human rights generally affect a state's soft power and may leave the exercise of hard power relatively unaffected.

Candidates should include reference to specific examples to support their evaluation of the claim in the question such as the Ukraine bringing a series of cases against Russia to the European Court of Human Rights over the latter's actions in the occupied Donbass region and Crimea. At the same time, the world shows an inability to hold states such as Yemen, China and Syria accountable for gross human rights violations. Any other valid and relevant approaches and examples should be evaluated positively, so long as the response remains squarely focused on the topic of human rights in global politics. Candidates may also refer to the related concept of (state) sovereignty by highlighting how the practice and implementation of human rights may undermine both its internal and external dimensions thereby limiting a state's independence or ability to govern.

Responses should include a conclusion on the degree to which human rights are (in)effective in limiting state power in global politics.

Development

5. Evaluate the claim that the challenges of sustainability mean that development may no longer be possible.

Responses should include a definition or description or demonstrate understanding of sustainability along the lines of the Brundtland Report (1987): “development that meets the needs of the present **without** compromising the ability of future generations to meet their own needs,” and make reference to the multidimensional and contested nature of development and the different means of measuring it.

Arguments that support the claim that the challenges of sustainability mean that development may no longer be possible may include:

- ambitious economic development (especially if synonymous with growth) and sustainability are seen as in conflict with each other. Recent and growing evidence of climate change has started to alter priorities towards the latter
- the global consensus to preserve natural resources and ecosystems has recently been moved up the political agenda as evidenced by the reaction of world leaders to the destruction of the Amazon rainforest (for domestic economic reasons)
- it has been argued that all non-renewable resources are finite and that therefore they should not be used. Given current dependence on fossil fuels, minerals and other raw materials, sustainable development is not possible at current rates of consumption
- environmental evidence of degradation and the deteriorating quality of the natural environment, such as air and water and prevalence of plastics, has led to arguments that current modes of development have to stop and be reversed
- because the ability of the natural environment to absorb high levels of pollutants is increasingly limited, a tipping point may be reached so it is better to halt development now
- even if all development, sustainable and otherwise, were to stop now, some indicators such as rising sea level change would continue, so development needs not only stopping but reversing.

Arguments against the claim that the challenges of sustainability mean that development may no longer be possible may include:

- the adoption in 2015 of the UN's 17 Sustainable Development Goals for 2030 shows that there is international consensus that development remains possible but by a different path from previously
- a series of environmental disasters related to climate change has brought the feasibility of sustainable development towards the top of the academic agenda, eg wildfires, extreme hurricanes. For example, Jeffrey Sachs, has argued that the technology and political will exist and has linked further development to good governance
- the UN Decade of Education for Sustainable Development (2005-2014) implies that education can change behaviours, values and priorities to make sustainability possible. Outcomes included summits and agreements such as Rio (2012) and Paris (2015)
- climate change agreements such as Kyoto and Paris (2015, signed by 196 states) show that such issues are being taken seriously at the highest levels and that the decision to limit global temperature increase to 1.5% shows consensus to reach risk-reducing targets
- the emergence, adoption and government promotion of new technologies based on renewable energy supplies shows that business and consumers can respond to altered priorities, eg solar panels, wind turbines.
- actions taken by developed countries show that further development is possible, eg Netherlands railways running on renewables, Singapore's rooftop SolarNova programme.

Responses should contain references to specific examples. Candidates could, for example, consider the arguments over the recent Amazon fires which appeared to have tacit approval from political leaders. Responses could also consider that this is an area of data conflict, where reliability, omission and interpretation of data is highly contestable. Also, responses may refer to recent writing on this debate, eg Deep Adaptation or lack of political will to confront it especially among populist leaders.

Responses should include a valid conclusion to the question based on an evaluation of the arguments presented.

6. Discuss the view that social factors inhibit development.

Responses should include an attempt to define social factors. In the syllabus content this comprises examples such as values, cultures, traditions, gender relations and migration but this is not an inclusive list. Responses might also consider rapid population growth, discrimination and culture defined more narrowly in terms of attitudes to minorities. Also, responses should demonstrate understanding of the multidimensional and contested nature of development and the ways it might be measured.

Arguments in favour of the view that social factors inhibit development may include:

- cultural or religious norms may block the role of women, for example limiting access to education and thus undermining their contribution to development, for example persistent low levels of female literacy in Afghanistan
- rapid population growth from natural increase implies large families, and poor households are less able to invest in the health and education of each child, which may limit the next generation's ability to participate in development. For example, falling fertility in East Asia is associated with impressive growth and development in the 20th century, compared with slower growth and development in Latin America where family size remained larger
- discrimination against certain groups, deliberately or otherwise, on the basis of caste, language, gender or race, may limit the country's overall rate of development. For example, the economist Paul Donovan has argued that racism and homophobia are prevalent in the least competitive economies because discrimination denies workers equal opportunity and career options, thus wasting human capital
- access to education may be limited for certain groups by social issues, for example traditional expectations of the roles of women and girls, early marriage
- where traditions inhibit change or acceptance of change locally, regionally or nationally, development might not begin, for example traditions which prevent property ownership or inheritance for women may stifle entrepreneurship
- migration can impede development through, for example, loss of a skilled workforce, unregulated arrival of large numbers of dependent people in need of support, though effects on the country of origin are contestable.

Arguments against the view that social factors inhibit development may include:

- social factors inhibiting development may be overwhelmed by other factors encouraging development such as political and economic factors. For example, urbanisation is a dominant feature of development and as cities are built they offer new ways of living and working at high density in which previous social structures become less important
- traditional social values may survive among older generations and in the countryside without inhibiting development which takes place in a dominant city or sector populated by a younger age group. For example, in Europe traditional and modern social values can coexist comfortably without any sense of one inhibiting the other
- life in a developed economy sets new standards for emulation which gradually replace traditional cultural or religious norms, removing their ability to inhibit development
- globalization fosters common social attitudes which permeate societies and alter traditional social values in favour of, for example, gender equality and education
- migration can encourage development through for example, remittances of money from workers living abroad, arrival of a displaced but skilled workforce
- social factors comprise only one among many sets of factors which can inhibit development. Others such as political and economic factors may be more potent.

Responses should contain references to specific examples of social factors that may impede or promote development. For example, candidates may discuss countries which have retained traditional social structures and values while undertaking development, such as China, Saudi Arabia, or countries where central government has tried to foster the values of urban mega-cities in their surrounding rural regions such as Shanghai and Suzhou. Much depends on how “social factors” are perceived and exemplified.

Responses should include a valid conclusion, having considered the arguments which support and do not support the view that social factors inhibit development.

Peace and conflict

7. Evaluate the claim that positive peace can never be fully achieved.

Responses should include a definition or demonstrate an understanding of peace and of positive peace. Peace can be defined very narrowly, as “negative peace”, the absence of direct violence, or more broadly defined as “positive peace”, the absence of indirect violence. Positive peace is defined as “the presence of attitudes, institutions and structures that create and sustain peaceful societies” (IEP). Candidates might explore concepts including violence, conflict, negative peace, direct violence, war, positive peace, structural violence, cultural violence, social justice, harmony, and development. Negative peace is understood as a precursor to positive peace in which issues fundamental to conflict are embedded: inequality, repression, human rights, discrimination, judicial equity, etc., and candidates might explore these in their evaluation.

Candidates are likely to align an understanding of positive peace with the eradication of indirect violence, and discuss the difficulty of identifying and addressing the issues surrounding indirect violence. Given the dynamic nature of societies and states, however, the argument is made that indirect violence can never be fully eradicated, making the achievement of positive peace impossible. Responses are likely to include discussions of the importance of overtly addressing indirect violence in promoting reconciliation and post-conflict justice to achieve a positive peace. An awareness that indirect violence is widespread, often endemic, and difficult to fully identify and address might be discussed.

Arguments for the claim that positive peace can never be fully achieved may include:

- that conflict can be so intractable that negative peace/conflict management has been the best achievable outcome (eg the Israeli–Palestinian conflict; the Kashmir conflict)
- that some forms of violence emerge from norms and values that make them more difficult to address and eradicate (eg extant homophobia in Russia despite decriminalizing homosexuality in 1993 as illustrated by the 2013 legislation banning gay “propaganda” among minors; the fact that 200 million girls/women alive today have undergone some form of FGM despite strong opposition)
- that violence is very dynamic and as culture, societies, and governments change, violence can be reactive, complicating its eradication (eg the passage of gay marriage legislation in countries including South Africa, the US, and New Zealand, and the subsequent escalation of discrimination, repression, isolation, and direct violence directed at LGBT+ communities)
- positive peace is so sweeping and contested a concept that its achievement is complicated by different understandings and is often characterized as a utopian ideal (eg feminist peace; inner-outer peace; realistic utopia).

Arguments against the claim that positive peace can never be fully achieved may include:

- the emphasis on development in the international community since WWII has provided finance, support and resources to address myriad sources of inequality and injustice that were not available in the past (eg development aid; The World Bank’s MDG and SDG)
- the greater inclusion of a variety of political actors in peace negotiations and the use of third party mediation facilitates the identification of indirect violence and factors impeding positive peace makes its realization increasingly possible (eg the Colombian peace negotiation’s General Agreement emphasized the participation of all, enabling greater participation by women’s groups, LGBT+ groups, etc)
- the expansion of human rights laws, treaties, declarations, and norms to address 2nd- (ie, socio-economic) and 3rd-generation (ie collective-developmental) human rights supports the realization of positive peace through awareness, development, and the pursuit of social justice (eg the International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights [ICESCR]; the Rio Declaration on Environment and Development)
- the expansion of mediation and other alternative dispute resolutions (ADR) as tools to pursue transitional and restorative justice suggest innovative (if not yet successful) approaches to

realizing positive peace (eg the pursuit of reparations for victims and their families from Indonesia to Guatemala).

Responses should make reference to specific examples of conflict and demonstrate a clear understanding of peace and positive peace. Candidates should incorporate examples of peace achieved, permitting an evaluation of peace as a process and positive peace as a continuum. Candidates could use examples of contemporary conflict to discuss issues of positive peace incorporated, or not, into peace talks and negotiations; eg Middle East peace talks, Colombian peace plan, peace negotiations with the Taliban in Afghanistan, Aceh Peace Agreement. In contrast, an argument could be made that an increasing emphasis on the post-conflict environment and the process of conflict resolution, not merely management, suggests an opportunity to promote positive peace.

Responses should include the candidate's position on the claim that positive peace can never be fully achieved.

8. Examine the claim that humanitarian intervention is a violation of state sovereignty.

Responses should include a definition or demonstrate an understanding of both humanitarian intervention and state sovereignty. Humanitarian intervention refers to the use of military force in a state to stop or avert grave human suffering without the approval of its authorities. Sovereignty is characterized as a state's independence, its ability to make decisions concerning its own domestic affairs, and control over its territory, and is the foundation of our current international system.

The claim that humanitarian intervention violates state sovereignty is based on the understanding that sovereignty entails independent authority of the state and its monopoly on the legitimate use of force within its territory. Therefore, the claim is that intervention by third parties is without the state's approval, ergo, it is a clear violation of such authority. However, an emerging international norm challenges this understanding and supports the concerted international effort to protect civilians from mass atrocity crimes of genocide, war crimes, and crimes against humanity. Candidates might incorporate discussions of the principle of non-intervention, the legitimacy of the state, and the use of state violence against its own citizens, leading to outside intervention. Human rights, international norms and law, and the responsibility to protect (R2P) doctrine might be explored, as may state-citizen relations.

Arguments for the claim that humanitarian intervention is a violation of state sovereignty may include:

- that state sovereignty is enshrined in international law, dating back to the Treaty of Westphalia in 1648, which recognizes a state's right not to be subjected to other forces/states/powers; this dissuades humanitarian intervention as illustrated by its limited use
- that state sovereignty is inviolable and therefore third parties should not intervene without a state's approval under any circumstances
- the existence of a social contract between the state and its people, and while all states experience challenges, third parties should not interject themselves in that social contract (Hobbes, Locke, Rousseau)
- the view that third parties often undertake intervention with ulterior motives, and in these cases, humanitarian intervention is pursued to violate state sovereignty, often with political goals such as regime change (eg Iraq 2003; Libya 2011).

Arguments against the claim that humanitarian intervention is a violation of state sovereignty may include:

- there are times when the state cannot fulfil its responsibility relative to its citizens and humanitarian intervention is needed to address urgent security and other needs (eg Sierra Leone 2000)
- that states themselves are often the perpetrators of violence against their own people, promoting the intervention of outside actors to try to safeguard the lives and rights of individuals (eg Libya 2011; failure to act in cases including Zimbabwe and Syria)
- that illegitimate and fragile or failed states may not have the capacity or will to protect individuals, requiring humanitarian intervention or its threat (eg interventions in Iraq, Nigeria, and Libya against ISIL and related groups 2014)
- while humanitarian intervention prior to R2P was ad hoc, R2P now requires states to protect against mass atrocities, and the failure to do so compels the international community to intervene to protect individuals (ie powers vested in the UN Security Council under Chapter VII).

Responses should include relevant examples of humanitarian intervention or proposed intervention and apply them to the concept of state sovereignty. Candidates may explore the complexities of state violence including the four key concerns of R2P: war crimes, genocide, ethnic cleansing and crimes against humanity. They may discuss the responsibility of the state to its citizens and the responsibility of the international community to intervene where the state does not fulfil its duty, as well as unintended consequences and politicization of such interventions. Examples may include Libya and Iraq, offering the opportunity to address cases in which humanitarian intervention was used and whether it was a violation of sovereignty. Candidates may include cases in which humanitarian intervention has been considered but not undertaken, such as Syria, South Sudan, Ukraine, and Yemen, and how this inaction speaks to sovereignty.

Responses should include the candidate's position on the claim that humanitarian intervention violates state sovereignty.
