

Markscheme

November 2023

Global politics

Higher level and standard level

Paper 2

© 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 is the main factor limiting the effectiveness of intergovernmental organizations (IGOs).’ To what extent do you agree with this view?

Responses should demonstrate a clear understanding of the key terms - intergovernmental organizations (IGOs) and state sovereignty. State sovereignty could be described as the inherent supremacy of the state to control activities and actors within its borders (internal) and independence in international relations (external). Candidates may describe IGOs as organizations composed of states that come together under a formal agreement and encourage cooperation. Some examples could include the UN, World Trade Organization (WTO), European Union (EU) and the African Union. Candidates could discuss the different roles and functions of IGOs, such as sustainable development (eg EU), settlement of disputes (eg WTO) or acceleration of economic growth and ensuring peace and stability. Candidates should provide a standard by which the ‘effectiveness’ of the IGO could be conceptualised or established, such as its ability to perform its role, goals, and functions and achieve desired results. They could then move on to discuss to what extent they agree with the claim that state sovereignty limits the effectiveness of intergovernmental organizations.

Arguments in favour of the claim that state sovereignty is the main factor limiting the effectiveness of intergovernmental organizations may include:

- states are sovereign and join or leave intergovernmental organizations by their own will, eg the UK leaving the EU (Brexit). This is likely to impact implementation of crucial decisions by IGOs diluting their effectiveness. For example, the US threat of withdrawal from NAFTA under former President Trump, US withdrawal from the TPP, Paris Accord.
- there is no overarching global authority that can legitimately enforce IGOs decisions and compel states to adhere to them. States are the most powerful actors in global politics (Westphalian view).
- member states can erode the effectiveness of IGOs. For instance, the World Health Organization (WHO) came under severe criticism from member states for the way it handled the COVID -19 pandemic. The IGO was criticised for its apparent deference to China and the US even suspended financial contributions to the WHO.
- decision-making mechanisms and procedures of IGOs are influenced by the sovereign interests of the most powerful states, e.g. the UN Charter gave veto power to a few states, allowing them to take decisions based on their own interests or those of their allies. This has had a negative impact on the functioning of the IGO and affected its effectiveness in responding to conflicts, human rights violations, etc. (e.g. the Russian invasion of Ukraine). Similarly, the IMF and World Bank both have proportional voting systems.
- decisions and policies proposed by IGOs are not always binding, leaving it open for sovereign states to follow or ignore them. Thus, unless all member states agree to follow and implement decisions, they will not be effective. For instance, in 2021, India and Russia opposed a draft proposal that would bring climate change into the UN Security Council ambit, enabling it to enforce and hold countries accountable on matters related to climate change.

Arguments against the claim that state sovereignty is the main factor limiting the effectiveness of intergovernmental organizations may include:

- when states join intergovernmental organizations, they part with some amount of sovereignty in the area where the IGO operates. They also come under some obligation to follow the IGO and formulate and implement policies and processes in tandem with those of the IGO, e.g. the EU. Thus, state sovereignty does not limit IGOs or negatively impact their effectiveness.
- state sovereignty does not limit the effectiveness of IGOs. Rather, the effectiveness of IGOs depends on the agenda and subject of the IGO, the power dynamics between member states within the IGO, and implementation strategy followed by them. E.g. the effectiveness of the WTO is reduced by the Global North-Global South divide.
- the state-centric approach and outlook in global politics is no longer a reality in a globalized world. Domestic policies and internal matters of states are no longer insulated from outside influence in an interdependent world. Issues such as climate change are transboundary in nature and cannot be managed only at the national level. E.g. Paris Agreement was a legally binding international treaty on climate change.
- As such, many IGOs respect state sovereignty concerns. For instance, the Charter of the Organisation of American States proclaims, (...) that ‘international order consists essentially of respect for the (...) sovereignty, and independence of States’. Therefore, rather than state sovereignty limiting effectiveness of IGOs, the latter bolsters state sovereignty.
- IGOs such as the EU are symbols of how sovereign states cannot have much control over the effectiveness of IGOs. The EU members have given up sovereignty in areas such as tariffs and the IGO’s decisions are quite effective and binding most of the time. Similarly, membership of the European Monetary Union (EMU) constrains the ‘sovereign’ right of countries that have entered the third stage of the EMU to conduct their own monetary policy.
- not all states are sovereign in the same way, nor can all states impact the effectiveness of IGOs equally. The power and influence of some states within IGOs is bound to be more, while failed states, quasi-sovereign states are unable to have similar influence.
- factors other than state sovereignty affect effectiveness of IGOs – such as lack of funding, absence of their own military force (e.g. for UN peacekeeping operations).

Responses should contain references to specific examples. Candidates could cite cases where state sovereignty has overshadowed and impacted the effectiveness of IGOs. An example could be the restrictive trade policies implemented by the US during the Trump era against China. Both countries are part of the WTO and ratified to adhere to the trade-enhancing policies of the organization. However, the US implemented various trade restricting policies (tariffs, quotas), resulting in a lack of cohesion with WTO policies. On the other hand, candidates could provide examples of how state sovereignty has not affected the effectiveness of IGOs. If a member state violates EU rules, the European Commission can take action against that country. For instance, the European Commission started an infringement procedure against Poland for undermining EU law and the independence of its judiciary. Some candidates could argue that it is difficult or not possible to measure effectiveness because IGOs have different goals. They may also argue that operationalizing effectiveness in the real world is not possible. The same IGO may be effective in one case, but not in another. Candidates may also seek to problematize state sovereignty and see IGOs and the concept and practice of state sovereignty being in a mutually constitutive dynamic in which each shapes the other over time. Any other valid arguments and examples should be positively evaluated.

Responses should conclude by discussing to what extent they think state sovereignty is the main factor limiting the effectiveness of intergovernmental organizations .

2. Discuss the view that economic cooperation is essential for development.

Responses should demonstrate a clear understanding of the concepts of economic cooperation (and what it encompasses, such as trade agreements, investments, regional economic integration amongst states, and regulation of international production) and development. Candidates could give examples of some prominent bilateral, regional, and multilateral trade agreements such as US-Singapore FTA and China-ASEAN FTA and multilateral trade agreements (US Mexico Canada Agreement, ASEAN Free Trade Area, and the European Free Trade Association) as well as investment agreements. They could also bring in the concept of globalization and how it facilitates and necessitates interaction and interdependence with other states. Development could be explained as a sustained increase in the standard of living and well-being of a level of social organization. It is likely that students will explain the contested and multidimensional nature of the concept. Candidates could then move on to discuss whether economic cooperation is essential for development to occur.

Arguments in favour of the claim that economic cooperation is essential for development to occur could include:

- in a globalized world, development (depending on how it is conceptualised and/or measured) is practically impossible without engaging with other states in a formal framework. The network of bilateral and multilateral trade agreements and integration initiatives help bolster development of all states involved.
- economic cooperation through Preferential Trade Agreements (PTAs) ensures that exporters and investors can gain benefits like freer trade, reduced tariffs, preferential access to certain sectors, faster entry into markets and Intellectual Property protection. All these help in boosting the economy and ensuring economic development. E.g. EU.
- cooperation among states through trade and investments can help fight poverty and raise the standard of living for many people. It helps provide advantages such as employment opportunities and more affordable goods and services for people. They can then have access to better healthcare facilities, education, etc. that in turn will foster human development. E.g. the EU-Mexico Trade agreement opens up each other's markets for goods, services and investment for both.
- technology transfer can be facilitated through economic cooperation from developed to developing and underdeveloped states. Such transfers are important to their integration into the global economy and boosting development of all types. An example is the Comprehensive and Progressive Trans-Pacific Partnership (CPTPP) that calls for the promotion of a free and open digital economy. These kinds of partnerships can also exist between two or more developing or underdeveloped states.
- lack of access to platforms for economic cooperation has a clear impact on development. For example, North Korea has been under sanctions for a long time, preventing it from joining networks for economic cooperation, and remains one of the most under-developed countries in the world.
- development depends heavily on finance and financial cooperation, banking, and investment and these depend on international cooperation. For instance, Washington imposed curbs on Bank Rossiya in 2014 for its close ties to Kremlin officials. In 2022, with concerns over possible Russian invasion of Ukraine, possible sanctions being considered were against state banks, additional financial institutions and private banks.

Arguments against the claim that economic cooperation is essential for development to occur could include:

- economic cooperation between developed and developing or underdeveloped states may not always result in development for the latter. The benefits from greater economic integration at the global level have been very uneven. Developing or underdeveloped states may just become suppliers of raw material and cheap labour, while the benefits of economic cooperation are reaped by more developed and powerful states. For example, the WTO has not helped developing countries as much as they have helped developed countries. Underdeveloped countries have an understanding of this as was seen in the failure of the Uruguay and Doha round of WTO negotiations.
- development depends more on internal/domestic factors. Political and social factors such as stability of government, robust infrastructure, accountability, transparency, gender equality, and political culture are also equally or more important contributors to development. Other important variables include quality of human resources, geography, resource endowment, and impact on climate change. E.g. Singapore's development has been attributed to its stable and accountable government, efficient bureaucracy as also its political culture, despite having limited resource endowment.
- economic cooperation with other states could have a possible negative impact on domestic industries, smaller companies, and an adverse effect on human development and livelihoods of smaller artisans or small-scale industries. E.g. small and domestic industries in India are facing losses due to cheaper imports from China. Similarly, the multinational corporations that base production facilities in developing countries such as Bangladesh do not have basic facilities for the labour force, which is often not even paid enough.
- economic cooperation could also lead to a depletion of finite natural resources in developing countries due to exploitation by developed countries. This can severely impact development—E.g. China's exploitation of resources in Africa. Also, dependence on a single resource may not be good for development—E.g. Venezuela's hyperinflation because of loans for public programs (resource curse argument).
- development can occur due to other aspects of cooperation such as cooperation through non-governmental organizations, political cooperation or collective security. NGOs such as Amnesty International focusing on human rights help in human development transcending basic understanding of development seen in economic terms. Development is possible without extensive economic cooperation or with limited economic cooperation. E.g. Cuba.

Responses should contain references to specific examples. Candidates could cite cases of how economic cooperation through trade agreements, investments and economic integration among states has been central to development. Examples could be countries such as Vietnam which opened up its economy and became part of trade agreements and other forms of economic cooperation, leading to an increase in their overall development. Similarly, the African Union (AU), launched the Pan African Rinderpest Campaign (PARC) to eradicate the disease (Rinderpest). Vaccine production and quality control technologies, skills upgrade and management training was undertaken among participant countries. The EU invested \$200 million and helped countries such as Nigeria that faced economic losses due to it. On the other hand, candidates could highlight that economic cooperation could lead to depletion of natural resources of developing countries such as those in Africa. Besides, low-wage workers from countries such as Bangladesh face inhumane conditions while working for big companies. Some candidates may argue that too much economic cooperation may not be beneficial. It may in fact negatively impact the development of countries that are outside the PTA.

Any other valid arguments and examples should be positively evaluated.

Responses should include a conclusion on the degree to which the candidate agrees that economic cooperation is essential for development to occur.

Human rights

3. Evaluate the claim that the Universal Declaration of Human Rights (1948) is still the most effective tool for dealing with human rights issues in the 21st century.

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 demonstrate a clear understanding of the UN's Universal Declaration of Human Rights (1948) (UDHR) and its importance in detailing fundamental human rights. It is likely that responses will include specific mention of some of the key articles within the Universal Declaration, particularly within the context of their relevance to contemporary human rights issues and/or concerns, e.g. Article 2 (freedom from discrimination). Candidates may conceptualise the effectiveness of the UDHR in terms of how well it promotes or ensures liberty, justice, and equality.

Arguments in favour of the claim that the Universal Declaration of Human Rights (1948) is still the most effective tool for dealing with human rights issues in the 21st century may include:

- the UDHR has become a touchstone for actions by governments, individuals, and nongovernmental groups. It has been ratified by every country in the world. In short, the UDHR has acquired a sustained moral and political significance matched by few documents; it serves as the foundation for the International Bill of Rights and several other crucial human rights agreements, e.g. The International Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Racial Discrimination (1965).
- the UDHR provides both a guide to present action and an evolving set of ideas for future implementation at the national level. Increasingly, the UDHR's principles have been embodied in what states do. Many of the rights enshrined in the UDHR have been incorporated into domestic state constitutions, e.g. in South Africa and Argentina.
- the UDHR has proven a remarkably flexible foundation for a continued broadening and deepening of the very concept of human rights, e.g. the UDHR continues to provide guidance for organizations such as the International Federation of Library Associations and Institutions as they seek to adapt existing rights, such as freedom of expression, to the digital age.
- several major treaties, ratified by more than 100 countries, trace their origins to the UDHR (e.g. The ICCPR and ICESCR (1966), CEDAW (1979), the Convention on the Rights of the Child (1989)) and there is little reason to suspect that future human rights treaties and laws could not also continue to use the UDHR as their foundation.
- the influence of the UDHR on national or regional governance is also apparent. For instance, efforts to reduce or eliminate the death penalty in Europe and elsewhere is often grounded in the UDHR and the document has also acted as a catalyst for greater attention being given to how transnational corporations affect human rights where they operate, e.g. the EU's General Data Protection Regulation (GDPR).

Arguments against the claim that the Universal Declaration of Human Rights (1948) is still the most effective tool for dealing with human rights issues in the 21st century may include:

- debates around the actual ‘universality’ of the rights contained within the UDHR persist, undermining its effectiveness; culturally relative perspectives assert that cultures or regions differ so much that no real global standards can exist, e.g. many Islamic states have maintained Sharia-based reservations to the UDHR.
- the UDHR is not enforceable. The U.N. has no armed forces of its own but must obtain parts of other states’ militaries for help. Furthermore, the U.N. agencies directly concerned with human rights often receive little funding, e.g. the Geneva-based Office of the High Commissioner for Human Rights.
- traditionally, human rights have very much been enjoyed (or repressed) at the local level, where individuals are active and where sovereign states can exercise authority, which may undermine the universality at the heart of the UDHR, e.g. China’s treatment of its Uighur population in Xinjiang (2017-).
- contemporary debates also center on the rights of persons belonging to ethnic groups and national minorities, and internally displaced people (IDPs) in particular. As individuals, they cannot be discriminated against because of their backgrounds. However, long-term economic or political disadvantages (structural violence), deeply ingrained social attitudes (cultural violence), and the like against the groups to which they belong may be beyond the scope of the UDHR.
- in a similar sense, serious economic issues undercut how much — and indeed whether — individuals can enjoy full human rights. Individuals must have reasonable chances for employment and schooling. They must be able to break out of the trap of poverty and avoid the debilitating impact of malnutrition and endemic disease. The UDHR speaks about these concerns only in very general terms and serious problems remain in light of economic inequalities within and between nations, e.g. wasteful or corrupt practices by government officials reduce what is available for other needs.
- the world has changed since 1948 in ways that the designers of the UDHR could not have imagined. As such, it is too much to expect this document to be able to capture all facets in the evolution of human rights since then, e.g. sexual rights including the rights of intersex people and sexual orientation.

Responses should contain references to specific contemporary real-world examples of human rights issues in the 21st century and the (ir)relevance of the UDHR in this context. Arguments in favour of the claim could note that the UDHR continues to guide much of the work of the UN insomuch as it relates to all three pillars of the United Nations: peace and security, development, and human rights. The UN Secretary-General, Antonio Guterres, has said on multiple occasions that the best prevention tool we have in helping countries avert the outbreak of crises that take a high toll on humanity, undermining institutions, and capacities to achieve peace and development is the UDHR and the treaties that derive from it, not least because almost every internal conflict in the world has human rights violations among its root causes. Arguments against the claim could mention the pushback in many parts of the world on gender and reproductive rights as well as LGBTQIA+ rights. Candidates may argue that the inclusion of many of the rights contained within the UDHR in domestic state legislation highlights its redundancy, but this could also be seen as an argument in favour of its continued relevance as not *all* countries have done so. Finally, candidates may question the validity of any discussion about the effectiveness of the UDHR as it could be considered primarily as an aspirational document. Any other valid approach should be evaluated positively.

Responses should include a conclusion on the degree to which the candidate agrees with the claim that the Universal Declaration of Human Rights (1948) is still the most effective tool for dealing with human rights issues in the 21st century.

4. “The most significant cause of human rights violations is conflict within states.” To what extent do you agree with this view?

Responses are likely to include a definition of universal human rights as basic claims and entitlements that, many argue, one should be able to exercise simply by virtue of being a human being. Candidates may provide an understanding of conflict within states (intrastate conflict) perhaps defined as violence between one or more advantaged or disadvantaged minority or majority groups, and one or more of these groups and political/juridical state, to gain either a greater share of limited resources or control and/or authority over the territorial state. Candidates may also demonstrate their understanding by contrasting intrastate and interstate conflict. Finally, candidates may identify real-world examples of human rights violations within the context of intrastate conflict, such as arbitrary detention, extrajudicial execution, discrimination (ethnic/religious/sexual/gender), rape, forced evictions, the recruitment of children into armed groups, etc.

Arguments in favour of the view that the most significant cause of human rights violations is conflict within states may include:

- intrastate conflicts frequently feature non-state actors - private armies, warlords, criminal gangs, etc. - using terror and/or guerrilla actions including the deliberate targeting of civilians and thus are not bound by the same international obligations as state actors, e.g. Sierra Leone (1991-2002), Boko Haram’s activity in Nigeria and the broader Sahel region (2009-).
- some of the most severe violations of human rights in contemporary global politics, including torture, sexual violence and disappearances but also frequently war crimes, crimes against humanity and even genocide, have occurred within the context of an intrastate conflict as these ‘new wars’ often feature no front lines, no battlefields, no clear conflict zones, and no distinction between combatants and civilians, e.g. Sri Lanka (1983-2009), Syria (2011-), Libya (2011-).
- the principle of state sovereignty and/or the protection of more powerful states limits actions by third parties (other states and/or IGOs) to intervene in intrastate conflicts in order to protect/enforce human rights, e.g. Kosovo (1998-1999), Syria (2011-) and China’s threat to veto any external action in Myanmar (2021).
- intrastate conflict adversely affects such things as the environment and the ability of people to work, thereby affecting related human rights, and these painful after-effects may linger long after the cessation of direct violence. Cease-fires and peace agreements that ignore human rights often perpetuate inequities and denial of human rights, leading to greater suffering and violence, e.g. Sierra Leone (1991-2002), Israel-Palestine, etc.
- intrastate conflicts often afflict weak, fragile, corrupt or collapsing states, which means that the state is often unable to fulfil its international obligations to protect and enforce human rights, e.g. South Sudan, Somalia, and the Central African Republic.

Arguments against the claim that the most significant cause of human rights violations is conflict within states may include:

- interstate conflicts or the threat of interstate conflict pose the greater threat to human rights as such conflicts can result in much larger scale and more widespread human rights violations, e.g. Armenia-Azerbaijan (2020); Russia-Ukraine (2021-).
- the principle of Responsibility to Protect (R2P) and institutions such as the International Criminal Court (ICC) have perhaps seen a reduction in the most egregious forms of human rights violations generally associated with intrastate conflict.
- other factors other than intrastate conflict may pose a greater threat to the protection and enforcement of universal human rights, i.e. national poverty, structural violence, food insecurity, culturally relativist critiques of the allegedly Western bias contained within the many UN human rights laws and treaties, etc.
- it is the threat of global issues beyond the scope of individual nation-states that pose the greatest threat to human rights, e.g. climate change and nuclear proliferation.
- the causal chain may work in the other direction - that discrimination, particularly along ethnic or religious lines, and violations of political, social, and economic rights function as underlying causes of conflict, creating the deep grievances and group identities that may, under certain circumstances, (e.g. greater democratization), motivate and perpetuate collective violence, e.g. the US invasions and occupations of Iraq (2003-2011) and Afghanistan (2001-2021).

Responses should contain references to specific contemporary real-world examples of human rights violations within the context of intrastate conflict. Arguments in favour of the claim might point to the practices of both non-state and state actors in overriding the principle of distinguishing between combatants and civilians in many intrastate conflicts, thereby disabling the protection of civilians under international human rights law, e.g. the gross violations of human rights including torture and the recruitment of child soldiers perpetrated by the March 23 Movement (M23) in the DRC. Arguments against the claim might state that interstate conflicts are more significant in that both the scale and reach of such conflicts means that there is a far greater likelihood for serious human rights violations, i.e. interstate conflicts generally involve massive military force, and might be conducted by countries who choose to ignore international norms surrounding the use of force and human rights conventions on the treatment of civilians and combatants, e.g. Russia's invasion of Ukraine (2022). Finally, candidates may further argue that the relationship between human rights violations and intrastate conflict is characterised as complex, dynamic, and multidimensional; human rights violations are usually both causes and consequences of violent intrastate conflict, intertwined among other factors. Any other valid approach should be evaluated positively.

Responses should include a conclusion on the degree to which the candidate agrees with the claim that the most significant cause of human rights violations is conflict within states.

Development

5. Examine the view that improvements in well-being mostly depend on sustainable development.

Responses should include definitions of well-being and sustainable development. Development may be defined as a sustained increase in the standard of living and well-being while sustainable development meets the needs of the present without compromising the ability of future generations to meet their own needs. Well-being may be defined as how people feel and how they function on both a personal and social level and how they evaluate their lives. Developed countries have improved well-being, through access to stable or increased income, access to education, healthcare/public health, well-functioning institutions, decreased inequality, reduced poverty and unemployment. However, the question asks whether improvements in well-being depend on the success of sustainable development. This could be interpreted as whether further gains in well-being will arise from sustainable development in developed countries, or whether developing countries can achieve development if the whole process is sustainable from the start. Responses are likely to include reference to the Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs) as a blueprint for well-being in developed and developing countries from 2015.

Arguments that support the view that improvements in well-being mostly depend on sustainable development may include:

- advocacy for sustainable development has been getting stronger. The SDGs of 2015 and the UN Climate change conferences (COPs) have brought it to the forefront of international politics and pressure to commit to climate change targets by individual countries has been strong. For example, countries have set dates for phasing out fossil-fuelled transport and for reaching net zero carbon. Potential improvements in well-being are enhanced by this.
- sustainable development applies to both people and planet, so the side effects of non-sustainable development on the planet, (global warming, resource depletion, air and water pollution, environmental damage) are already reducing human well-being in developed and developing countries. An example is rising sea levels - 230 million people live less than a metre above current high tide levels.
- non-sustainable development also impacts the well-being of entire countries. Small island developing states (SIDS) in the Indian Ocean and Caribbean are particularly vulnerable. They have been recognised as a group by the UN since 1992. For example, many of the Marshall Islands (population 59,000) will be underwater in less than 15 years. So, the only way for well-being to be preserved, let alone enhanced, in the future is through sustainable development.
- countries that have high levels of well-being have also been at the forefront of sustainable development. Indices that measure well-being, such as the Human Happiness Index, show the highest levels have been attained in Nordic countries, which also score highest income, social support, generosity, freedom, trust in government, and health. Norway, for example, has set targets for each SDG with government departments responsible for strategy and annual progress reports.
- gains in well-being in the developed world have in the past correlated with sustainable economic growth. Realisation has grown that growth is not the only source of well-being, and that for the future, education, healthcare/public health, well-functioning institutions, decreased inequality, reduced poverty and unemployment should also have targets as these add to well-being. For example, there is rapid growth in ethical banks such as Triodos, while companies are rated for ESG (environmental, social, and corporate governance).

Arguments against the view that improvements in well-being mostly depend on sustainable development may include:

- historically, well-being was not dependent on the relatively new concept of sustainable development. Previously, improvements in well-being in the now-developed countries were at the expense of the environment through industrialisation. The extra costs added by sustainable production and consumption may mean that socially equitable growth is no longer possible without reducing human well-being.
- policies to promote sustainable development may undermine well-being if current behaviours are challenged. For example, fuel tax increases in France meant to promote more sustainable behaviour threatened the lifestyle and disposable incomes of rural communities dependent on cars. This resulted in the *gilets jaunes* demonstrations in November 2018. Protests in Kazakhstan and Peru were triggered by fuel price rises, resulting in political instability and disruption which undermined well-being for many in the short term.
- the very concept of well-being can be contested. Attempts to measure it rely heavily on Subjective Well-being (SWB) of which the Happiness Index is a good example. It uses sampled Gallup surveys of self-evaluations concerning current life experience. Objective measurement of well-being remains problematic, and subjective measurement is a weak and unsatisfactory approach.
- sustainable development itself cannot be taken for granted as a source of improvements in well-being. Targets are non-binding and constantly changing as a result of changes in circumstance, for example the Paris Climate Agreement of 2015 is non-binding, and the global energy price increases of 2022 have encouraged countries to think of prolonging unsustainable forms of local energy production such as coal-fired power stations. Actual progress towards sustainable development is uneven and so its outcomes and effects on well-being are as yet indeterminate.
- some parts of the world may rely on unsustainable development for some time yet depending on resource endowment. For example, at the end of 2020, 350 coal-fired power stations were being built in Asia, and peak oil has not yet been reached. So sustainable development will remain a contested concept as we cannot know whether or when well-being will benefit.

Responses should contain references to specific examples of well-being and its measurement, and its relationship with sustainable development. An example of an alternative measure is the Happy Planet Index, which has rated Costa Rica highly since 2006. Responses may also include references to specific SDGs, and their significance to well-being. Examples of cities threatened by sea level rise in the developed and developing world equally are Tokyo, New York, Shanghai, Kolkata, and Dhaka which will all be underwater in 50 years if present trends continue. Examples of continuing non-sustainable development might be given, such as Australian coal exports which are expected to rise to 2023, with new sources being opened up such as the Galilee basin, as exports to India have surged. 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 improvements in well-being mostly depend on sustainable development.

6. Discuss the view that globalization increases inequality.

Responses should include definitions of globalization and inequality, which might be qualified in different ways such as within and between states. There are many possible definitions of globalization, but most convey the idea that it is the growing interdependence of economies, cultures, and populations exemplified by trade, technology, and flows of technology, people, and information. Also, responses might address the matter of how to measure inequality, which could be in terms of income or opportunity. Measures of income inequality might include the Gini Coefficient and Lorenz Curve, while other approaches to measuring inequality might relate to poverty or gender participation. Distinctions could also be made between the experiences of developed and developing countries.

Arguments that support the view that globalization increases inequality may include:

- globalization has tended to increase income inequality within developed countries, measured by the share of national income claimed by the top 10% of earners. For example, in the US, income inequality increased from 1980 to 2016 by about 20%. The effects of globalization on increasing wealth inequality are even stronger from 1995.
- globalization is concerned with specialisation and freer trade. If a country finds it can import goods more cheaply from abroad it can lead to deindustrialisation, unemployment and deprivation, all of which increase inequality. For example, in the US, manufacturing jobs shrank from 19 million in 1980 to 11.5 million in 2019, leaving the cities occupied by particular industries in severe deprivation, such as Detroit and its car industry.
- dissatisfaction with globalization has been used by populist politicians to get elected and engage in trade wars which have the effect of increasing inequality because of the increased costs of imports to consumers. The recent trade wars between the US and China and Brexit are examples of this.
- multinational corporations (MNCs), which generate 50% of world trade by value, are adept at paying their executives highly but not paying taxes in countries where they operate, depriving governments of revenue which could be used to promote equality through healthcare and education. Even the proposed 15% Corporate Tax Agreement proposed in 2021 will benefit developed countries far more than developing countries.
- historically, globalization resulted in financial interdependence and this has allowed the more rapid spread of financial crises such as the global financial crisis of 2008, and Russia in 2014. Globalization also accentuates inequalities in cases of global crisis in health or finance, for example the Covid-19 pandemic.

Arguments against the view that globalization increases inequality may include:

- globalization has tended to decrease income inequality within developing countries if they are able to participate in international trade and markets, for example countries which welcome tourism such as Barbados and Sri Lanka.
- regardless of globalization, political inequality is built into the global system. For example, the permanent membership of the UN Security Council does not include India and all of Africa and South America.
- globalization has led to economic integration which has caused poverty and inequality to fall over the last two decades. People in extreme poverty (under \$1.90 a day) have fallen from 1.7 billion in 2000 to under 700 million in 2020.
- India and China, which include a third of the world's population, have benefited enormously from globalization and reduced inequality within their borders. This has also helped to reduce inequality beyond their borders through the growth of trade. Reduced inequality in China owes much to migration from country to towns where employment opportunities related to the global economy are available.
- globalization favours the freer movement of labour, skills, ideas and technologies, which has reduced inequalities of opportunity around the world to a limited extent. This is enshrined in Sustainable Development Goal 10 which includes the promotion of inclusion and responsible and well-managed migration policies.
- globalization means that companies face competition in international rather than national markets, making them more efficient, reducing living costs and thus inequality. This is particularly true of consumer goods such as televisions and solar panels.

Responses should contain references to specific examples. It might be argued that globalization has created a rich elite able to set agendas through social media and politics. The CEOs of press and social media companies for example represent a new form of inequality through their extreme wealth and influence. Examples include Rupert Murdoch, Jeff Bezos and Mark Zuckerberg. It might be argued that while the trend has been for developing countries to become less unequal, they suffer most from shocks and setbacks, for example during the Covid-19 pandemic. Despite the demographic advantage of younger populations, Covid-19 mortality has been higher in low-income countries than the developed countries. It might also be argued that globalization tries to integrate developed and developing countries in a relationship of inequality yet the relevant currencies, investment capital and institutions are all in cities of the developed world. For example, Geneva hosts the headquarters of over 60 international organizations, secretariats and NGOs, and The Netherlands hosts over 40 IGOs. Also, it might be argued that the decrease in poverty over the last 20 years correlates with globalization, but that this does not necessarily imply causation. 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 globalization increases inequality.

Peace and conflict

7. Compare the causes of two different conflicts you have studied.

Responses should give an account of the similarities between the causes of two different conflicts. Candidates should demonstrate an understanding of the key term conflict, which could be defined as the dynamic process of actual or perceived opposition between individuals or groups. This could be opposition over positions, interests or values. Candidates might explicitly distinguish between non-violent and violent conflicts. Both violent and non-violent conflicts are equally valid as examples. Responses should also show knowledge and understanding of different causes of conflict. While references to different manifestations of conflict could be mentioned (e.g. intrastate war; interstate war; violent protest; demonstrations), responses should be focused squarely on the causes of conflict connected with the two chosen examples. Candidates might highlight the complexity involved in determining the underlying causes of a conflict.

Possible bases for comparison may include:

- the anarchical nature of the international system creates competition among states and results in geopolitical dynamics which are a main cause of conflict. As some states rise in power and other decline, international peace and regional stability is challenged (e.g. the growing global influence of China; a new “Cold War” between Russia and the U.S; Russia and the EU).
- ideology is a main cause of conflict. Opposing ideological positions are often at the basis of violent and non-violent conflicts between different states and non-state actors. A large number of violent conflicts are ideological, including those to protect vulnerable people and promote human rights (e.g. Sierra Leone 2000; South Sudan 2011; Libya 2011). Conflicts within societies today are predominantly caused by ideological polarization, which is exacerbated by the use of digital media and reinforced by the echo-chamber effect (Capitol Hill 2021; Covid-19 pandemic; Brexit).
- religious fundamentalism has become a major cause of conflict, particularly since the 9/11 attacks, both within and among political societies (India 2020; Taliban 2021; Christchurch Mosque shootings 2019; Berlin truck attack 2016; War on Terror).
- resource scarcity is a main cause of conflict. States and non-state actors fight to take control over portions of land that are rich in natural resources or that are located on strategic trading routes (e.g. Mali 2019 over water; DRC over minerals; South China Sea over gas and trade routes; land-grabbing in the Global South; dispossession of indigenous peoples). Resource scarcity also forces people to migrate and live in societies where they often enter in conflict with local populations (e.g. refugee crisis in Europe; Pacific Islanders migrating to Australia).
- environmental crises such as droughts and desertification are a main cause of mass migration and conflict (e.g. Northwest Nigeria crisis; rising sea levels affecting small island states in the Indian Ocean and Caribbean; Lake Chad crisis; deforestation of the Amazon Forest in Brazil).
- economic interest is what drives conflict, whether the party involved is a state or a non-state actor. What constitutes an economic interest will depend on the nature of the party involved and the specific circumstances (e.g. China-US trade war; weapon sales to the Saudi regime and the Yemen war).
- territorial control is a main cause of conflict (e.g. territorial claims in Antarctica; South China Sea dispute; Crimea; Brazil's federal government against indigenous people living in the Amazon Forest; Russian claims in the Ukraine). Control over the ‘outer space’ and the cyberspace are also increasingly a source of conflict.
- real or perceived threats to identity are one of the main triggers of aggressive behaviour (e.g. Russia's historical revisionism; Kurds in Turkey and Syria; ISIS/al-Qaeda attacks on non-Sunnis in Iraq and Syria; the immigration crisis in the EU).
- any other valid causes of conflict should be rewarded accordingly.

Responses should focus on similarities when comparing the causes of two different conflicts. Candidates might distinguish between different types of conflict and different manifestations of conflict. Those candidates who elaborate on the contested meaning of the concept of conflict should be rewarded. Insofar as the responses are focused on comparing the causes of two different conflicts, candidates might raise the point that most conflicts do not possess neatly discrete causes and that each conflict has its own specific causes. Responses could include counterclaims that highlight elements such as the complexity of conflict(s) and the difficulty of isolating separate and distinct causes of any conflict. Any other valid approach should be evaluated positively.

8. Examine the claim that peace is promoted by interdependence.

Responses should consider the merits or otherwise of the argument that peace is promoted by interdependence, uncovering the assumptions and interrelationships of the issue. Candidates should demonstrate an understanding of the key concepts: peace and interdependence. They are likely to include a definition of the main concept of peace, both in its positive and negative conceptions. While positive peace is defined as the presence of attitudes, institutions and structures that create and sustain peaceful societies, negative peace is defined as simply the absence of war or of direct physical violence. Interdependence is understood as the mutual reliance between and among groups, organizations, geographic areas and/or states for access to resources that sustain living arrangements. Often, this mutual reliance is economic (such as trade) but can also have a security dimension (such as defence arrangements) and, increasingly, a sustainability dimension (such as environmental treaties). References to the concept of globalization are also possible, in so far as it is understood as a process that has favoured interdependence in global politics.

Arguments in favour of the claim that peace is promoted by interdependence may include:

- economic interdependence favours the emergence of a shared interest in the maintenance of peaceful relations and the avoidance of war. When the economic successes of nations are tied to one another, avoiding war becomes a common interest. The cost of going to war is raised while the benefits of doing so are reduced (e.g. EU).
- commercial exchanges and trade relations lead to a deeper cultural understanding among different people and nations, thus reducing the likelihood of identity conflicts turning violent.
- the security dimension of interdependence leads to defence arrangements that deter states from waging war on each other. Whether based on the principle of collective security or the balance of power, these arrangements have the effect of turning war into an irrational choice (e.g. NATO; OAS; China's alliances in Latin America and Africa; USA and Taiwan).
- the sustainability dimension of interdependence leads to strengthening the sense of belonging to a global society and a common destiny. Even if with poor results, states are compelled to cooperate rather than resort to violence in order to settle conflicts and disagreements (e.g. COP 26).
- interdependence leads to institutionalised forms of cooperation and diplomacy. Regular dialogue and coordinated action favour the peaceful management of conflicts and prevent their escalation (e.g. China-US relations).

Arguments against the claim that peace is promoted by interdependence may include:

- peace can only be achieved by respecting and reinforcing states' sovereignty and independence. Interdependence means that states can more easily compromise and damage other states' interests. This augmented ability to influence and damage each other increases the risks of growing tensions and potentially violent conflicts.
- some states are excluded from the benefits of interdependence. Their isolation leads them to feel more vulnerable, increase their military spending, and adopt an aggressive posture towards other states (e.g. North Korea; Russia).
- economic interdependence does not necessarily lead to cooperation and dialogue; rather, it can lead to an intensification of conflicts and violence (e.g. Russia and the EU over gas; China's attempt to control the global trade routes of oil and natural gas in the South China Sea).
- collective security arrangements, defense and strategic alliances produce opposed geopolitical blocks and endanger peace (e.g. US-led NATO vs Russia-led CSTO).
- the sustainability dimension of interdependence implies intensified competition over limited natural resources. Groups and states are more likely to resort to direct physical violence or war to take control of these resources (e.g. conflict over water in Mali 2019; over two decades of conflict over coltan in DRC; oil and gas in the South China Sea).
- peace is not promoted by interdependence per se, but by the multipolar distribution of power in the current international system, which ensures a balance of power.

Responses should contain references to specific examples. As examples of how peace is promoted by interdependence, candidates could cite cases in which interdependence has led to collaborative behaviour and peaceful outcomes (e.g. EU; NATO; China-US relations). As examples against this claim, candidates could refer to cases where interdependence has led to violent conflict and war (e.g. Mali; DRC; South China Sea; Iraq War). Candidates could also note that interdependence has led to less interstate conflicts, while increasing the instances of intrastate conflicts. Opinions should be presented clearly and supported with appropriate evidence and sound argument. Candidates who elaborate on the theoretical foundations that undergird some of the arguments in favour or against the claim should be rewarded. They might suggest that while liberalism sees that peace is promoted by interdependence, realism and critical theories offer different perspectives on the issue. Any other valid approach should be evaluated positively.

Responses should include a conclusion on the degree to which the candidate agrees with the argument that peace is promoted by interdependence.
