

Markscheme

May 2023

Global politics

Higher level and standard level

Paper 2

19 pages

© International Baccalaureate Organization 2023

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

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

© Organisation du Baccalauréat International 2023

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

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

© Organización del Bachillerato Internacional, 2023

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

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

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

Markbands for paper two

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

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

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

Power, sovereignty and international relations

1. “State sovereignty remains the key concept in understanding global politics.” Discuss this view.

Responses should demonstrate a clear understanding of the concept of sovereignty – implying that the state or government has supreme authority. Sovereignty characterizes a state’s independence, its control over territory and its ability to govern itself. How states use their sovereign power is at the heart of many important issues in global politics. Candidates could discuss how state sovereignty could have two dimensions – one, state as the sole author of laws within its territory (internal sovereignty) and two, the capacity of each state to act independently and autonomously on the world stage (external sovereignty). Candidates could discuss the Westphalian notion of state sovereignty with its emphasis on non-interference and the kind of changes it has been undergoing. Candidates should be able to discuss to what extent they believe that state sovereignty remains the key concept in understanding global politics. The underlying assumption is that state sovereignty has been and remains the key concept in understanding global politics.

Arguments in favour of the claim that state sovereignty remains the key concept in understanding global politics may include:

- The state remains the primary actor and unit of analysis in global politics and therefore state sovereignty as a concept is intrinsic to understanding state behavior which in turn will impact politics at the regional, international, and global level. All matters related to global politics converge around the sovereign state and its behavior. Ultimately state sovereignty is central to a state’s very survival or existence.
- Although variables such as globalization and the emergence of non-state actors are often said to erode the primacy of state sovereignty, sovereign states remain key decision makers: they make decisions keeping in mind their national interest and choose to insulate themselves from outside influence when required. For instance, supranationality and membership of international and regional groupings is optional, and states may choose to either not join these or withdraw, e.g., the UK leaving the EU (Brexit), Burundi and the Philippines withdrawing from the Rome Statute.
- The concept of state sovereignty is critical in understanding different facets of global politics. For instance, the state is the most important decision maker when it comes to the pursuit of development – in all its forms ranging from economic to social and human. The state makes policies based on its supreme authority within its borders as well as based on its ability to act independently on the world stage to fulfil this purpose.
- State sovereignty forms the basis of situations and decisions related to both peace and conflict. States use their sovereign control over their territory to make laws and use their institutions to ensure peace. At the same time, they make attempts to keep their citizens protected from conflict or may choose to get into a conflict if their interests are being harmed.
- State sovereignty gives the state a legal status. International norms and institutions are all a manifestation and product of state sovereignty. In fact, the very foundational principle of the post-World War Two international system, according to the United Nations, is the "sovereign equality of all its members." In fact, even non-state actors such as terror groups aim and aspire to get the legal status of a state and gain the resultant sovereignty that comes with it, e.g., ISIS in Syria and Iraq.

Arguments against the claim that state sovereignty remains the key concept in understanding global politics may include:

- Many more concepts or issues are more important than state sovereignty in developing an understanding of global politics. In fact, power is the key concept in the study of global politics. Politics is all about the ability of one actor to make the other do what it would not do otherwise. Global politics is based on this power play between states, making it the most essential concept in understanding global politics.
- Globalization is challenging the traditional notion of state sovereignty and transforming it, whereby states have new ways of governance in tandem with the changes brought about by the phenomenon. Therefore, in today's world, globalization holds more significance than state sovereignty. Aspects of globalization such as global communication and trade cannot always be completely controlled by states. For example, global financial flows often elude the control of states.
- The emergence of non-state actors such as non-governmental organizations, multinational organizations and even terror groups as significant variables on the global stage has diluted the significance of state sovereignty. All these actors pose a big challenge to state sovereignty, watering down the importance traditionally given to state sovereignty, e.g., Al Shabaab in Somalia and Boko Haram in Nigeria.
- Issues and concepts of identity, sustainability and human development are increasingly gaining prominence in the study of global politics. These are issues that transcend man-made boundaries and threaten the very existence of human beings making them more critical than state sovereignty.

Responses should contain references to specific examples of why state sovereignty has always been and remains the key concept in understanding global politics. Sovereign states focus on the pursuit of their national interest. States such as the U.S., China and India have chosen to exercise their sovereignty and refused to sign international treaties (Rome Statute 1998) when they felt their national interests were being compromised. Similarly, even to be a member of any regional or global intergovernmental organization, it is imperative that a unit is recognized as a sovereign state. Candidates could also discuss how the perception of erosion of parliamentary sovereignty of the UK is cited as a reason behind Brexit. On the contrary, candidates may provide examples of how other issues and concepts such as globalization are becoming more important than state sovereignty and may even be rendering sovereignty less significant. For instance, they could discuss how in an interdependent world, states join intergovernmental organizations at both the global and regional level (such as the UN, ASEAN, the International Monetary Fund and European Union) for both security and economic development. Besides, pressing transnational issues such as transborder terrorism cannot be managed without cooperation and coordination amongst states. Also, candidates may highlight how the quest for power, resources and hegemony is driving states such as U.S., China, and India to formulate policies and take decisions beyond protecting their sovereignty. The South China Sea dispute between China and some Southeast Asian countries is an example. Candidates may also argue that while state sovereignty is very important to the understanding of global politics, it is not the most significant concept. In fact, one key concept cannot define or form the basis of understanding global politics but a range of concepts such as hegemony, interdependence, balance of power, legitimacy, power, identity etc. Better responses may question or critique the underlying assumption that state sovereignty has always been the key concept in understanding global politics.

Responses should include a conclusion on whether the candidate agrees that state sovereignty remains the key concept in understanding global politics.

2. “The contribution of states to sustainable development is greater than that of non-governmental organizations (NGOs).” Evaluate this view.

Responses are likely to include a brief description of states and non-governmental organizations (NGOs). They may define states as institutions of government with the purpose of ensuring the establishment of order and security, laws and their enforcement. The state is sovereign and operates within its geographic boundaries. A non-governmental organization could be described as a group of citizens that works independently of the government, is non-profit and works towards social and political issues. They may then discuss some of the primary areas of work of NGOs and provide a few examples, e.g., World Wildlife Fund and conservation. Candidates are also likely to explain their understanding of the term sustainable development as “development that meets the needs of the present without compromising the ability of future generations to meet their own needs” (UN). Any other appropriate definitions or explanations of states and sustainable development will be acceptable and rewarded accordingly. Students may provide a benchmark or their perspective on how they will assess or quantify ‘contribution’ through providing real world examples to support their arguments.

Arguments in favour of the claim that the contribution of states to sustainable development is greater than that of NGOs may include:

- States and state actors possess more power and resources than NGOs to implement sustainable development projects. Unless the state itself is powerful, capable of good governance, and committed to sustainable development, achieving it is not possible. NGOs often face funding issues that may become a major obstacle in their activities. Besides, sovereign states are powerful enough to make it difficult for NGOs to operate or even force them to curb their operations.
- Sustainable development largely depends on policies formulated and implemented by states, making them primary actors managing the trajectory of sustainable development. NGOs drawn from civil society, can, at best, help bridge gaps or supplement the state’s efforts.
- A state’s contribution to sustainable development at the national level is significant because they make policies, allocate funding, human capital and resources to further sustainable development. NGOs do not have the same level of infrastructure or power to make policies or resources to implement them.
- At the international level, states work with other countries through IGOs and regional organizations, sign sustainable development policies and treaties. These may help them procure expertise, funds, and other kinds of support from other countries who may have better technology or ideas in the field. In some states, NGOs can at best act as pressure groups and help spread awareness, but not do much in terms of concrete action on the ground.
- States can facilitate coordination and cooperation amongst key actors such as public sector, business community and society at the state and national levels to further sustainable development in different sectors. NGOs do not possess the resources or power to do the same.

Arguments against the claim that the contribution of states to sustainable development is greater than that of NGOs may include:

- NGOs can work closer to the ground and their aim is to pursue inclusive growth. They can fill gaps left by the failure of states in taking effective steps towards the goal of sustainable development. Often state machinery is unable to reach people at the grassroots level. For example, it is usually local NGOs that help implement the UN's SDGs on the ground.
- NGOs can be more effective than the state they are operating within because they are not subject to the same bureaucratic procedures as states and their relevant departments. As a result, action can be taken more quickly than it can be by a state.
- NGOs can act as pressure groups and raise awareness about the need to focus on sustainable development. They can effectively change public opinion and pressurize states into changing policies that clash with sustainable development. The participation of civil society is key to furthering sustainable development. For example, a diverse range of NGO's act as observers at COP meetings.
- NGOs have made notable contributions in developing sustainable development systems by raising international awareness, influencing global policy agendas. This makes them important contributors even at a regional or global level that could impact decisions affecting many states at a time. For example, many environmental NGOs have consultative status in ECOSOC.
- Some NGOs are more likely to be inclusive when it comes to marginalized communities and sustainable development. States could have their own political agendas which could be divisive. They may also choose to appease and cater to certain groups. It could mean destabilizing societies and neglecting certain groups, eg, sustainable fishing/farming amongst indigenous groups.
- States do not always prioritize sustainable development and may focus only on economic or traditional forms of development over sustainable development. Some states aim for short term economic gains over longer-term sustainable development goals, e.g., China until relatively recently. They often follow special interest groups such as corporations or energy companies, which influence their economic or development policies, e.g., the Biden administration's approval of the Willow project in Alaska.

Responses should make some reference to specific examples of how the contribution of states to sustainable development is greater than that of NGOs. An example of a state successfully contributing to sustainable development is Costa Rica's promotion of ecotourism and net zero carbon policy. On the other hand, candidates may provide examples where NGOs have not been able to contribute much towards promoting sustainable development. For instance, NGOs in Jamaica were unable to curb the destruction of coral reefs. Besides, the asymmetry in terms of finances and hard power between NGOs and states is reflected in how their presence and functioning in a state is itself dependent on the discretion of the state. For example, the Indian government cancelled Greenpeace's license to operate, citing financial fraud and falsification of data leading to Greenpeace's withdrawal from India. The Indian government has accused other NGOs of trying to hamper projects on social and environmental grounds. On the other hand, Greenpeace has led successful campaigns in countries like Philippines, Thailand and Indonesia preventing the entry of radioactive shipments, stopping polluting technologies and promoting sustainable agriculture and renewable energy.

Responses should include the candidate's evaluation of the view that the contribution of states is greater than that of non-governmental organizations (NGOs) in sustainable development.

Human rights

3. “It is evident that international human rights laws and treaties have failed given the persistence of clear human rights violations.” Discuss this view.

Responses are likely to include a definition of human rights as basic claims and entitlements that, many argue, one should be able to exercise simply by virtue of being a human being, which are inalienable and essential for living a life of dignity. Candidates should refer to specific international human rights laws and/or treaties (eg, the 1948 Convention on the Prevention and Punishment of the Crime of Genocide, the 1979 Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Discrimination against Women, the 1984 Convention against Torture) as well as specific instances of human rights violations around the world and the extent to which their continuing presence undermines the effectiveness of international human rights laws and treaties.

Arguments in favour of the view that international human rights laws and treaties have failed given the persistence of clear human rights violations may include:

- The principle of sovereignty allows states to violate human rights laws and treaties with relative impunity within their borders, eg, according to Amnesty International despite the Convention against Torture governments in some 150 countries use torture, not much different from when the treaty came into force in 1987.
- Despite the widespread ratification of core human rights laws/treaties, there is little evidence that these have been responsible for any of the positive developments in global politics in recent decades, eg, 168 countries are party to the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights which has been in effect since 1976 yet, according to Freedom House, by 2020 only 83 countries were classified as ‘free’.
- Some of the rights included in international human rights laws and treaties are defined in relatively general terms and so it is unsurprising that these rights are often perceived to be violated, eg, both the African Charter on Human and People’s Rights as well as the ASEAN Human Rights Declaration proclaim a right to a clean environment but this is very difficult to define per se.
- The politicization of human rights sees different countries prioritizing different rights and the lack of consensus among states means that human rights violations continue, eg., European countries and the US have emphasized in recent years the rights of women and the environment while China and Russia have emphasized development and respect for cultural/religious traditions.
- In a similar sense, the universal nature of many international human rights laws and treaties may be undermined by reference to the principle of cultural relativism, i.e., some countries may defend apparent human rights violations by classifying them as cultural traditions. For example, the persistence of the practice of female genital mutilation by some cultural groups.
- Human rights laws and treaties are too ambitious and too ambiguous, they overwhelm states with obligations they cannot possibly keep and provide no clear method for evaluating whether governments act reasonably or not.
- Furthermore, many human rights laws and treaties are ineffectively enforced providing the space and opportunity for gross violations to occur, eg, the increased use of drone technology and collateral loss of life.

Arguments against the view that international human rights laws have failed given the persistence of clear human rights violations may include:

- Human rights laws and treaties codify a widely endorsed set of principles whose legitimacy is widely accepted even by those who violate them, *eg*, government officials rarely plead that they have actually violated such laws but instead seek to cast doubt on the veracity of any allegations.
- There is clear evidence that at least some human rights laws and treaties have made a discernible difference at the national level, *eg*, Chile and Argentina cited human rights treaties to strike down military self-amnesties for mass atrocities while Kenya cited CEDAW to grant women equal access to inheritances and the European Convention on Human Rights led Ireland to decriminalize homosexual acts.
- Human rights laws and treaties are effective even when domestic courts are too weak to enforce them because they codify a public's view about how its government should behave, *ie*, local rights groups are able to work with international partners like Human Rights Watch to generate pressure on their government to respect treaties signed and ratified.
- It is not that human rights laws and treaties have failed but that states have lacked the political will or capacity to enforce them and/or fulfill their aspirational goals, *eg*, the inconsistent application of humanitarian intervention in the face of egregious human rights violations.
- On a similar note, some states have decided not to prosecute those who have violated human rights laws and/or treaties in order to achieve transitional justice, *eg*, apartheid is a crime against humanity, defined as such in a 1973 UN convention, but South African decided not to pursue individual criminal prosecution in favour of a Truth and Reconciliation Commission.
- Regardless of the persistence of human rights violations, human rights laws and treaties are a tool for people worldwide to hold their own governments to account, *eg*, the cases of Cao Shunli and Liu Xiaobo in China.

Responses should contain references to specific examples. Arguments in favour of the view could reference any number of contemporary human rights violations such as the genocide of the Rohingyas by the Myanmar government despite the Convention on the Prevention and Punishment of the Crime of Genocide being the oldest post-World War Two treaty. Arguments against the view may reference the widespread ratification of the core human rights laws/treaties as evidence of the legitimacy of the international human rights system and, broadly, the norms on which it is based being accepted; there can be no doubt that human rights around the world have improved over time. For example, in recent decades, China has curbed its use of the death penalty, has abolished re-education through labour, liberalized the one-child policy and started efforts to limit the use of torture for confessions ostensibly all as a result of its international human rights treaty commitments whereas Saudi Arabia has taken a few minor steps towards greater freedom for women. These and any other valid approach should be evaluated positively.

Responses should include a conclusion on the degree to which the candidate agrees with the view that it is evident that international human rights laws and treaties have failed given the persistence of clear human rights violations.

4. To what extent does the protection and enforcement of universal human rights depend on the achievement of a positive peace?

Responses are likely to include a definition of human rights as basic claims and entitlements that, many argue, one should be able to exercise simply by virtue of being a human being, which are inalienable and essential for living a life of dignity. Candidates may refer to one of the core human rights treaties as a benchmark for universal human rights (eg, the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights (1966) or the International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights (1966)). Candidates are likely to discuss the various ways in which the protection and enforcement of human rights can be achieved. Candidates should also provide a definition of positive peace as not only the absence of conflict and violence but also as the presence of a state of harmonious relations. Students may conceptualise conflict more abstractly as the presence of structural and/or cultural violence. Students may also briefly establish some benchmark(s) by which one can determine the degree of dependence between the protection and enforcement of human rights and the achievement of a positive peace.

Arguments in favour of the claim that the protection and enforcement of universal human rights depends on the achievement of a positive peace may include:

- In the absence of a positive peace, structural and/or cultural violence exists both of which threaten the protection and enforcement of human rights, eg, the Black Lives Matter movement in the US.
- In the absence of a positive peace there is always the threat of (violent) conflict and preparing for/defending against this potential diverts funds and attention away from the protection and enforcement of universal human rights.
- Positive peace is centered on improving human conditions and so is intimately linked to the protection and enforcement of universal human rights, *i.e.*, peaceful countries often have formal laws that guarantee basic human rights and freedoms, and the informal social and cultural norms that relate to behaviours of citizens. Positive peace represents the capacity of a society to meet the needs of its citizens thus protecting and enforcing some core human rights.
- A positive peace involves a robust civil society and inclusive, permanent, and independent institutions, which guarantee that human rights will be protected and enforced, eg, Senegal's relative stability and peacefulness in a region marred by political violence has seen it establish strong and independent institutions that protect the human rights of its ethnic and religious sub-national groups.
- Empirically, there is a strong correlation between peacefulness and human rights, *ie*, the IEP's 2020 Global Peace Index reveals that those countries with the most solid human rights records are the most peaceful.
- The UN General Assembly has affirmed peace as a human right in the 1978 Declaration on the Preparation of Societies for Life in Peace, which was further affirmed in both the African Charter on Human and Peoples' Rights (1981) as well as the ASEAN Charter (2007).

Arguments against the claim that the protection and enforcement of universal human rights depends on the achievement of a positive peace may include:

- The protection and enforcement of universal human rights depends more on the presence of negative peace than positive peace as the most egregious violations of human rights often occur as a consequence of direct violence, *eg*, the genocide of the Rohingya by the Myanmar state or the incarceration of over one million Uighurs in ‘re-education camps’.
- There is the concern that human rights violations have, in some cases, been used to justify politically motivated foreign interventions and regime change undermining peace, *eg*, the 2011 NATO-led intervention in Libya.
- Some human rights may need to be violated or certain human rights violations may need to be overlooked for a positive peace to be attained, *eg*, responsibility to protect (R2P) or instances where security concerns may override the protection and enforcement of certain human rights.
- There may be tension between achieving justice in the form of prosecuting human rights violations and the reconciliation that is generally thought of as a key component of positive peace. For example, while human rights advocates often push for accountability for crimes committed and punishment to deter further abuses, conflict resolution advocates worry that punishing the perpetrators might further splinter the society, making the healing process and the achievement of a positive peace more difficult.
- The international community plays a key role in determining whether human rights and conflict resolution practices compete or collaborate, *eg*, the RUF and the Sierra Leonean government - the latter saw the international community undermining local efforts to achieve a lasting, sustainable peace with the UN withholding support for the granting of amnesty for human rights violations.
- It is conceivable that structural violence may be so extreme that a limited war must be deemed a lesser evil, if there is no other way to end or mitigate the structural violence – hence the achievement of a positive peace may require human rights violations, *eg*, the wars of liberation from colonial rule or the overthrow of a repressive regime

Candidates should include reference to specific examples to support their evaluation of the claim in the question. Arguments against the claim may reference any number of alternative factors upon which the protection and enforcement of universal human rights depends, for example, the presence of strong international institutions and/or engagement on the part of powerful states, *eg*, the distinction that is often made between lack of international reaction to the genocide in Rwanda (1994) versus NATO’s 1999 intervention on behalf of the Kosovars. Further, some candidates could argue that both ‘positive peace’ and ‘human rights’ may be defined differently by different groups, particularly with respect to the different generations (civil-political vs. social-economic-cultural) in order to serve ideological purposes. Candidates may also argue that a positive peace is aspirational rather than pragmatic and consequently that it can never be fully achieved; as such, the prompt is flawed. Some responses may invert the prompt and argue that a positive peace, in fact, depends on the protection and enforcement of human rights as evidenced by the creation of both the Universal Declaration of Human Rights and the Convention on the Prevention and Punishment of the Crime of Genocide being among the first international documents adopted by the UN following the end of World War II. These and any other valid and relevant approaches and examples should be evaluated positively.

Responses should include a conclusion on the degree to which the protection and enforcement of universal human rights depends on the achievement of a positive peace.

Development

5. “The lack of a universally accepted model of development has hindered development.” Discuss this view.

Responses should include definitions of development and an explanation of at least one of the models or theories which have been suggested, such as Rostow, Sen, modernisation theory, dependency theory, Washington Consensus, Beijing Consensus, etc. These models may be used to support or contradict the view. It might also be argued that there has been a “best” or at least a prevalent model in the form of Neo-Classical market friendly liberalisation, even though some of the most successful developed countries departed from it to succeed, eg, state subsidization of exports and credit and controls on foreign ownership and investment in Japan and Korea.

Arguments that support the claim that the lack of a universally accepted model of development has hindered development may include:

- Models have tended to emerge from within particular political contexts, rendering them suspicious, outdated, or inappropriate to those following other political ideologies in subsequent years. For example, Rostow’s Stages of Growth was a product of the Cold War and subtitled “A Non-Communist Manifesto” yet is still discussed as a viable model.
- Models have tended to favour free market approaches or state intervention approaches. The bipolar nature of the world after 1945 has meant that developing countries have been made to favour one to the exclusion of the other. For example, structural adjustment programmes fostered and made conditional by the IMF have forced developing countries into privatizations and dependency. The lack of a model which combines the positive aspects of free markets and state intervention has hindered development.
- Development has proved to be unpredictable in its outcome in different countries, rendering a universal model or theory unlikely. Some have developed slowly to an advanced level (UK, USA, 200 years or more), others have experienced rapid development (South Korea, China, less than 100 years) and some not at all, where obstacles to development have prevented it happening (approximately 20 failed states). The lack of a model which can explain all development may have contributed to the latter’s failure to achieve the level of development aspired to.
- Development itself is a contestable concept. To an economist successful development is measured in indicators of growth and living standards, while geographers might measure the responsible use of resources and other social scientists in terms of wellbeing and freedoms, though all these priorities overlap. Academic rivalries add to the contestable nature of development and the lack of consensus makes a universal pathway or theory less likely, hindering a clear path to development.
- Countries vary so much in their natural endowment of resources, geography and human capital that no one pathway or theory is appropriate for all. For example, a city-state like Singapore has focused on state investment in urban infrastructure to promote its development, while oil and mineral-rich countries have relied on multinational corporations to promote development for them. These very different pathways suggest that a universal model would have little meaning for countries with different factor endowments.

Arguments against the claim that the lack of a universally accepted model of development has hindered development may include:

- Development has not been hindered in modern times: over the last 70 years the average human being has increased in income 4.4 times while global population has tripled. In the last 20 years development has accelerated with global poverty rates falling by a half, and undernourishment by a fifth.
- Each country is unique in its natural and human endowment and nearly every country has found its own unique formula for development, so an agreed development model or theory would be inappropriate if it existed. For example, Myanmar's development has depended heavily on illicit crops (opium) tolerated by a military leadership; Japan and South Korea developed using heavy industrialisation but no natural resources; Hong Kong and Singapore have developed through international trade and favourable tax status. These unique pathways to development have been very successful due to local decision making rather than the adoption of set models.
- It can be argued that there is an ideologically accepted common pathway through market friendly liberalisation and outward orientation, as demonstrated for example by India's sudden switch to it outward orientation in 1991 and the resulting acceleration in economic development.
- Development in the form of industrialisation and urbanisation started a hundred years before any model of development emerged and was poorly recorded, so models have been retrofitted to the experience of development rather than suggested as blueprints for the future, leaving plenty of room for data conflict arguments and whether past experience provides helpful signposts for future development. In this light, models have been rather irrelevant to economic development. Models are derived from lived experience and so do not in themselves bring about development, only explain what has occurred.
- Once development occurs it sets visible standards for emulation for less developed countries regardless of models due to globalization. Multinational corporations offer consumer goods that create desire and induce markets.

Responses should make reference to specific examples. Arguments in favour of the argument might refer to the fact that Rostow's model, despite being over 60 years old continues to be a popular example of modernisation theory, even though it is an historical retrofit linked to the early industrial revolution and most apt for Britain, the USA Germany and Japan. Arguments against the argument might mention Dependency Theory, a reaction to modernisation theory, which seems to accurately capture the experiences and situation of many countries in the Global South with its notions of centre and periphery and the idea that the rich get richer at the expense of the poor.

Responses should include a conclusion on the degree to which the candidate agrees with the view that that the lack of a universally accepted model of development has hindered development.

6. Examine the view that development is the strongest motivation for cooperation between states.

Responses should include a definition of development, recognising that this is a multidimensional and contested concept. There could also be some context for cooperation between states, such as treaties, collective security, strategic alliances, intergovernmental organisations, economic cooperation, and informal cooperation. Arguments for and against the view may depend on how development is viewed and defined, i.e., in its economic, human, social, or sustainable dimensions. Aspects of cooperation, peacemaking, and peacebuilding such as positive peace, reconciliation, negotiations, and treaties may also be relevant.

Arguments that support the view that development is the strongest motivation for cooperation between states may include:

- Development leads to higher living standards but depends on international trade and supply chains which cross borders. Development through cooperation is thus an imperative to achieve everything from food security to higher living standards. For example, countries which import around half or more of their food include Japan, South Korea, and Mexico, all of whom have extensive trade cooperation agreements.
- In a globalised world, advanced levels of development are visible to all and set standards for emulation for LEDCs, whose populations may press for political reforms and international cooperation to promote development and the availability of consumer goods. Multinational corporations link markets in developed and developing countries, whose governments may be forced to accommodate them or even try to attract them through free trade zones such as those in Pakistan, Mexico, and Brazil.
- Development enhances the power and influence of countries, whose leadership may seek cooperation to raise opportunities for regional dominance, leading to subsequent cooperation in other fields such as education, soft power, science, technology, and finance.
- Development leads naturally to cooperation in trade at regional level in trade blocs such as USMCA, a free trade area between Canada, the United States, and Mexico. Once established, this cooperation may progress towards deeper arrangements such as a customs union like Caricom and a single market such as the EU.
- Development leads to ever closer forms of cooperation in the form of interdependence. For example, cars and aircraft are assembled with components from different countries in Europe and North America. The extent of interdependence arising from development can be seen in the disruption to trade, travel, leisure, *etc* caused by the Coronavirus pandemic in 2020–2021.
- The desire for sustainable development has led to international cooperation between states at the Paris Agreement in 2015 and ongoing discussions on climate change.

Arguments against the view that development is the strongest motivation for cooperation between states may include:

- Collective security may be an even stronger motivation for international cooperation than development. For example, NATO's Article 5 was invoked following the September 11 attacks in the United States, leading to seven NATO members joining the US in the War on Terror in Afghanistan.
- International cooperation for humanitarian disaster relief may be temporarily prioritised over development by sudden external shocks such as natural disasters, pandemics and climate change, eg the NATO Response Force humanitarian operation launched to assist the Pakistani government after a major earthquake in 2005.
- Regional conflicts which occur irrespective of national boundaries require international cooperation yet eliminate development from the cooperation agenda. There has been an average of 24 million people displaced each year between 2008 and 2018. An example is the Lake Chad Basin crisis, affecting Nigeria, Cameroon, Chad, and Niger. Crisis level acute food shortages affected 113 million people in 2018 alone, leading to international cooperation through food aid programmes, both official and through NGOs.
- In parts of the world which are subject to geopolitical superpower rivalry, such as the Indo-Pacific, cooperation is more likely to be based on military preoccupations than development. The relations between the US and Taiwan and the Philippines are at odds with China's ambitions in the region so the emphasis is likely to be greater on human capital through education, training, soft power and aid than development explicitly.
- International crime may be the basis for state cooperation rather than development. Countering drugs, arms trafficking, human trafficking, and money laundering of illegal funds requires states to co-operate to disrupt such illicit activities. The UN and US have focused much effort on eliminating the drugs trade in Colombia, Peru, and Bolivia. The EU links money laundering to terrorist finance and lists states' degree of compliance to encourage cooperation, e.g., Albania. States may cooperate for reasons other than development, for example to exchange information and improve inter-regional dialogue on governance agendas, to advance mutual understanding and collaboration at the inter-regional level on democracy through intellectual and people-to-people exchanges or on specific issue like gender equality. Examples of such organisations are the Council of Europe, the African Union, the Organisation of American states.

Responses should make reference to specific examples. For instance, candidates could discuss states which made development their priority and pursued it via international cooperation and integrating into the global economy such as Taiwan and Singapore in the recent past. Candidates may argue that the strongest reason for cooperation is environmental protection and conservation of natural resources. Destruction of our ecosystem will end development if not addressed, and climate change is making this more urgent. An example of a state which has tried to prioritise environmental responsibility through cooperation is Costa Rica. It aimed to be greenhouse gas-neutral by 2021 in collaboration with the International Climate Initiative, COP24 and Germany.

Responses should include a conclusion on the degree to which the candidate agrees with the view that development is the strongest motivation for cooperation between states.

Peace and conflict

7. Evaluate the view that contemporary conflicts are more about power than achieving justice.

Responses are likely to include a definition of conflict as the dynamic process of actual or perceived opposition between individuals or groups, which may be violent or non-violent in nature. Candidates are also likely to offer a definition of power and/or identify different dimensions of power (hard, soft, smart) or types of power (military, economic, politics, etc.) Likewise, candidates are also likely to offer an interpretation of justice as being closely associated with the idea of fairness and/or of individuals getting what they deserve. Candidates should also offer some understanding of the possible causes of modern conflicts including but not limited to: greed vs. grievance; territorial control; material interest; resource scarcity; ideology; threatened identity; and (mis)perception.

Arguments in favour of the view that contemporary conflicts are more about power than achieving justice may include:

- Even when rival parties in a conflict claim to be upholding order or fighting ‘terrorism’ in reality they seek to extend national influence and/or economic advantage, eg, the Yemeni civil war that began in 2014 can be viewed a battle for regional hegemony between Saudi Arabia and Iran.
- The relative collapse of western-led consensus favouring multilateral, collaborative approaches to international problems, which has been matched by the parallel rise of populist regimes has seen narrow national interests prioritized over perceptions of the common good, eg, rival third party involvement in the Libyan and Syrian civil wars.
- Declining American engagement has rendered global politics more anarchical thus allowing ambitious states to project their power and seek to dominate neighbours, e.g., China’s territorial claims in the South China Sea and the rise of other revisionist regional powers like Russia and Turkey.
- Inter- or intra-state violence is increasingly rooted in the climate crisis and demographic changes with the resulting resource scarcity, poverty and dislocation frequently driving modern conflicts, eg, the Democratic Republic of Congo since 2016 or the potential for interstate conflict in the newly accessible Arctic.
- On a related note, many contemporary conflicts arise over material interests and/or access to resources, eg, conflicts over intellectual property or access to rare earth minerals as a means to bolstering power.

Arguments against the view that contemporary conflicts are more about power than achieving justice may include:

- Many contemporary violent conflicts are rooted in a desire on the part of ordinary people to change dictatorial regimes and associated institutions which infringe upon their rights, *eg*, the Syrian civil war was initially a peaceful uprising against the autocratic al-Assad presidency and institutional or structural inequalities in Syria.
- Non-violent conflict, particularly that which occurs within a state, is often mostly moral in nature and focused on improving equality in terms of capabilities or well-being outcomes, *eg*, the civil rights/Black Lives Matter movement in the US or the global #metoo movements.
- Some of the most long-running contemporary conflicts are grounded in moral retribution, *eg*, the conflict in Afghanistan initially aimed to kill or capture the al-Qaida terrorists responsible for the September 11, 2001 attacks.
- In a similar vein, some of the most long-running contemporary conflicts possess a clear ideological basis and different conceptualisations of justice, *e.g.*, the Yemeni civil war is a proxy battle between Shia (Iran and the Houthi rebels) and Sunni (Saudi Arabia and the UAE) traditions within Islam.
- Given the increasing complexity of modern conflicts it may be impossible to determine which single cause is most prevalent in any conflict, *eg*, the recent conflict in the Ukraine is seen by many Western countries as nothing more than an attempt by Russia to project its power whereas President Putin has categorized the annexation of the Crimea as a humanitarian intervention to protect the rights of Russian citizens and Russian speakers in the region.

Responses should contain references to specific examples. Arguments in favour of the view could reference any number of contemporary conflicts in which increased power or material interests dominate such as the Chinese government establishing a military presence in the resource-rich Spratly Islands or the involvement of external actors in both the Syrian and Libyan conflicts as they seek to increase their relative power and influence. Arguments against the view may reference non-violent conflict within countries which find their basis in moral/ethical concerns such as the worldwide Youth Strikes for Climate or Extinction Rebellion actions to raise awareness of climate change/global heating. Candidates may argue that it is not so much about power vs. justice but, rather, about power and justice, *ie*, achieving justice may act as the basis for the acquisition of soft power or that expressions of hard power may be necessary to achieve justice. It may be the case that a candidate structures their response around an interrogation of the degree to which any single cause can be said to carry more weight than another when it comes analysing modern conflicts. These and any other valid approach should be evaluated positively.

Responses should include a conclusion on the degree to which the candidate agrees with the view that contemporary conflicts are more about power than achieving justice.

8. “The most important cause of conflict in the 21st century is globalization.” To what extent do you agree with this claim?

Responses are likely to include a definition of conflict as the dynamic process of actual or perceived opposition between individuals or groups, which may be violent or non-violent in nature. Candidates may also offer some understanding of the possible causes of conflict in global politics including but not limited to: greed vs. grievance; territorial control; material interest; resource scarcity; ideology; threatened identity; and (mis)perception. Candidates are also likely to provide a definition of globalization as the process by which the world’s local, national, and regional economies, societies and cultures are becoming increasingly integrated and connected and/or as the shrinking of time and space. Students may further acknowledge that the processes surrounding globalization possess both drawbacks and benefits, the latter of which are not evenly distributed.

Arguments in favour of the claim that the most important cause of conflict in the 21st century is globalization may include:

- Globalization, as a system of economic and information interdependence, breeds insecurity thereby increasing the potential for conflict between and within nation-states, *eg* the 2020 Covid-19 pandemic highlighted some of the pitfalls of global supply chains in terms of medical supplies and food security while online platforms propagate hate, terror and populist propaganda.
- The incorporation into the global economy of billions of low-paid workers from the developing world has led to a protracted squeeze on working- and middle-class incomes in developed countries which has deepened divides and increased conflict within the latter, *eg*, the rise of populist, often nativist parties, such as the AfD in Germany or PIS in Poland.
- Globalization disrupts the cultural and socio-economic divisions that define conventional patterns of politics giving rise to more exclusive modes of identification, which are usually manifest in racial and/or xenophobic tendencies and which amplify the potential for conflict, *eg*, Hindu nationalism under Narendra Modi, global Islam or anti-immigrationism in Europe.
- Globalization is uneven both in its processes and in its effects, giving rise to winners and losers both within and between states with increased inequalities and poverty acting as the engine for social and political conflict, *eg*, the *gilet jaunes* protests in France.
- The forces associated with globalization have weakened the power and legitimacy of nation-states facilitating social breakdown and increasing the incidence of intrastate conflict in the 21st century, *eg*, austerity measures following the 2008 Global Financial Crisis saw violent anti-austerity protests erupt in Greece between 2010-2012.
- While it may be true that globalization has reduced the incidence of interstate conflict it has increased the incidence of ‘new wars’ – characterized by genocide, ethnic cleansing, terrorism, and other low intensity conflicts, *eg*, the struggle for resources continues to create ethnic tensions that lead to violent conflict – the Liberian civil war and blood diamonds or the ongoing conflicts in the DRC.
- Conversely, globalization has created new spheres of conflict, *eg*, cyberwarfare and a new arms race in space.

Argument against the claim that the most important cause of conflict in the 21st century is globalization may include:

- By breaking down the barriers that would otherwise separate states and creating incentives that discourage hostility, globalization has significantly reduced conflict in the 21st century, *eg*, the incidence of conflict in sub-Saharan Africa has declined rapidly as globalization there has increased significantly.
- Globalization via transporting and communicative technologies encourages a global ‘collective consciousness’ that breaks down localized ethnic identities and replaces them with loyalties to larger communities, *e.g.*, the Fridays for Future school strikes.
- Globalization has increased the opportunity cost of interstate conflict as countries now have more to lose in terms of political allies, social gains and trade benefits, *i.e.*, globalization has made global trade more frictionless by harmonising international regulatory frameworks.
- Globalization generates a negative effect on militarised interstate conflict by encouraging a common peaceful disposition among national leaders, who are then less likely to resort to arms in times of crisis.
- Globalization in the form of international institutions acts as a brake on conflict, *eg*, the mediation of Liberia’s long-running civil war in 2003, the successful conclusion of the conflict in Aceh in 2005 and the EU’s steps to prevent a full-scale civil war in Macedonia in 2001.
- Globalization can be associated with a significant reduction in absolute poverty over the past two decades and this has reduced conflict over resources. Other causes of conflict such as resource scarcity or territorial disputes may be more significant causes of contemporary conflict, *eg*, the potential for conflict between Egypt, Sudan, and Ethiopia over the latter’s construction of a massive dam on the Blue Nile.
- A developing country’s integration into the global markets will bring both economic and political gains and reduce government interventions in the economy which can, in turn, mitigate conflict. For example, regional and global integration was often initiated to satisfy political and security needs, *i.e.*, the EU.

Candidates should include reference to specific examples from the 21st century to support their evaluation of the claim in the question. Arguments in favour of the claim might centre on the fragmenting effects of globalization and how conflicts arise in the form of resistance to the actual or perceived loss of particular forms of identity and patterns of life threatened by the juggernaut of globalized economic, political and cultural flows, *eg*, the Occupy movement. Arguments against the claim might emphasize the cosmopolitan and homogenizing effects of globalization to argue that a world more interconnected by technology (*eg*, the Internet and transportation), culture (*eg*, Netflix, Starbucks, tourism) and education (*eg*, international students and online learning) are less likely to foster conflict. Similarly, responses might note that while globalization may act as a ‘trigger’ for conflict its effects are mitigated by other factors, such as the role of state institutions and the degree of representation afforded to important minorities within a state, and so it is not the single most important cause of conflict. Some candidates may argue that globalization is both creative and destructive and involves both homogenization and localization; as such, it may be impossible to distinguish between its positive and negative effects so far as conflict/peace is concerned. This and any other valid and relevant approaches and examples should be evaluated positively.

Responses should include a conclusion on the degree to which the candidate believes that the most important cause of conflict in the 21st century is globalization.