Diploma Programme
Programme du diplôme
Programa del Diploma

Markscheme

May 2024

Global politics

Higher level and standard level

Paper 2

21 pages

International Baccalaureate
Baccalauréat International
Bachillerato Internacional

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	• The work does not reach a standard described by the descriptors below.
1–5	• The response reveals limited understanding of the demands of the question. • The response is poorly structured, or where there is a recognizable essay structure there is minimal focus on the task. • There is little relevant knowledge, and examples are either lacking or not relevant. • The response is mostly descriptive.
6–10	• The response indicates some understanding of the demands of the question. • There is some evidence of an attempt to structure the response. • Some relevant knowledge is present, and some examples are mentioned but they are not developed or their relevance to arguments is not clear. • The response demonstrates limited understanding of 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	• 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	• 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	• 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. To what extent do you agree with the claim that state power remains central to understanding global politics?

   Responses should demonstrate a clear understanding of the concept of power. Candidates could describe power as the ability of one actor to make the other do what it would not do otherwise. They could discuss types of power – hard, soft and smart and how each of these are used by state and non-state actors in global politics. They could discuss how each kind of power is used by states to further their national interest and ensure their sovereignty, survival, and development. Candidates are likely to discuss both power and sovereignty and could argue that both are equally significant to global politics. Candidates should be able to discuss to what extent they believe that state power remains the key concept and pursuit of power is at the heart of many important issues in global politics.

   Arguments in favour of the claim that state power remains central to understanding global politics may include:

   - Politics is all about power. Global politics is based on this power play between states, making it the most essential concept in understanding global politics. Even other significant concepts such as sovereignty are closely intertwined with power.
   - Pursuit of power is the main aim of both states and non-state actors. States work relentlessly towards gaining hard power (military and economic), use of soft power (diplomacy) and smart power to achieve their national interests and goals. The quest for power and hegemony is driving states such as US, China and India to formulate policies.
   - For states, with power comes the ability to fulfil many other aims, making it a central feature of its goals, eg possession and access to economic power can ensure human development, military power can bolster security and peace. Eg the US and China, both being economically powerful have the ability to develop robust military, purchase and develop weapons and also invest in other sectors such as health and education.
   - States will often attempt to boost their relational power by forming alliances, entering into minilateral arrangments, or joining IGOs. Unless we focus on state power we will be unable to fully understand and analyse many of the most important developments in contemporary global politics, e.g., AUKUS, the China-Russia alliance, the Lubin Triangle, etc.
   - Powerful states also have an upper hand in IGOs and can not only shape agendas, but also insulate themselves from any proposed decision that may harm their national interests such as the use of veto power at the UN Security Council. For instance, Russia's (on Syria) and China's (to block a resolution on Myanmar) use of veto have been cases in point.

Arguments against the claim that state power remains central to understanding global politics may include:

- There are other concepts or issues are more important than state power in developing an understanding of global politics. In fact, state sovereignty is the key concept because states are primary actors in global politics.
- Globalization is challenging the traditional notion of power and lowering the significance of the use and pursuit of power. States prefer to be part of the phenomenon of globalization through engagement, interdependence, and cooperation through membership of organizations (UN, European Union, IMF), trade blocs (ASEAN Free Trade Area) etc.
- The emergence of non-state actors such as non-governmental organizations (Amnesty International, Red Cross), multinational corporations (Apple, Microsoft) on the global stage have diluted the significance of states' power.
- 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 the pursuit of power by states.
- Non-state actors such as terror groups and multinational corporations are also looking to gain power and promote their own aims. For eg, the ISIS, Al Qaeda are all fighting for power, while MNC's such as Apple and Samsung aim to gain economic power, as well as develop the ability to influence state decisions and policies. These potentially challenge state sovereignty, thus reinforcing the point that state power and sovereignty are of prime importance.
- One key concept cannot suffice to 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. all put together can help us understand developments in global politics.

Responses should contain references to specific examples of why the pursuit of power by states has always been and remains the key concept in understanding global politics. States exercise a great deal of power when acting in their national interest and this is unlikely to change in the way countries such as China and Russia have chosen to build their power (military, economic, and soft) and how they have used it, for example, in the Russian invasions of Ukraine, and in the ways China has dealt with Hong Kong and Taiwan. On the contrary, candidates may provide examples of how other issues and concepts such as globalization are becoming more important than state power. For instance, in managing transnational issues such as global warming and the need for sustainable development, states have sacrificed a part of their sovereignty and power to face the reality of interdependence. They use IGOs and join hands with NGOs to manage these issues. Some responses may question or critique the underlying assumption that power has always been *the* central concept in understanding global politics. Finally, students could note that it is difficult, if not impossible, to neatly distinguish the centrality of any one concept in understanding global politics, i.e., power and sovereignty are intertwined, so we cannot say that only one is singularly important. These and any other valid approach should be rewarded positively.

Responses should conclude by discussing to what extent the candidate agrees with the claim that state power remains central to understanding global politics.

2. Examine the claim that sovereignty issues are the main cause of conflicts in global politics.

Responses should demonstrate a clear understanding of the key term - sovereignty. 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. Some attributes of sovereignty include fixed borders, a permanent population and government. Candidates may describe conflict as the dynamic process of actual or perceived opposition between individuals or groups. This could be based on differences over positions, interests, or values. They could distinguish between non-violent and violent conflict and inter- and intra-state conflicts.

Arguments in favour of the claim that sovereignty issues are the main cause of conflict may include:

- Sovereignty is central to a state's very survival or existence. States are sovereign and would go to any extent to protect their sovereignty and power. There are many areas where overlapping sovereignty claims over territories could result in conflict. E.g. Taiwanissue, Crimea issue (Ukraine and Russia).
- States may want to extend boundaries to have access to additional land, and resources or to support secessionist forces in another country and thus extend sovereignty beyond their existing borders. e.g. Russia in Ukraine.
- Movements seeking independence from a sovereign state frequently result in violent conflicts. These movements arise from groups within a state demanding the right to form their own independent government. The conflict in Catalonia, Spain, where there has been a significant push for independence, illustrates how sovereignty issues can lead to internal strife and tension, even if not always violent.
- External interference in a country's internal affairs can lead to conflicts where national sovereignty is perceived to be undermined. This kind of interference might come from foreign governments, international organizations, or external non-state actors. The intervention by NATO in Libya in 2011, under the guise of humanitarian assistance, led to prolonged instability, showcasing how external attempts to influence domestic matters can ignite or prolong conflict.
- Many conflicts in post-colonial states arise from boundaries drawn by colonial powers that did not reflect the ethnic, cultural, and linguistic realities on the ground. These artificially created states often struggle with internal sovereignty issues, leading to conflicts. The ongoing conflict in the Democratic Republic of the Congo partly stems from colonial legacies that have exacerbated ethnic divisions and challenged the coherence of state sovereignty.
- The tension between state sovereignty and the enforcement of global norms and laws (such as human rights or environmental regulations) can lead to conflicts. States may resist external pressures or interventions that are seen as infringing on their sovereignty. North Korea's nuclear program in defiance of international sanctions and diplomatic pressures is a case in point, where sovereignty issues lead to significant international tension and conflict.

Arguments against the claim that sovereignty issues are the main cause of conflict may include:

- Conflicts can also arise from ideological differences, including disputes over governance models (democracy vs. authoritarianism), economic systems (capitalism vs. socialism), or social policies (secularism vs. religious law). These ideological conflicts can lead to civil wars and international tensions irrespective of sovereignty issues. The rise of ISIS in Iraq and Syria was largely driven by ideological goals to

establish a caliphate based on a radical interpretation of Islamic law, rather than disputes over the sovereignty of the territories involved.

- Ethnic and sectarian divisions often lead to conflict as groups struggle for political power, autonomy, or recognition within existing state structures. These conflicts can occur even in situations where sovereignty is not in question. The Syrian Civil War, for instance, involves multiple groups with differing ethnic and religious identities, where the primary issues are more about governance, identity, and power rather than the sovereignty of Syria itself.
- The concept of sovereignty itself means that the state has defined and fixed borders, leaving little room to enter into conflict with other states over this issue. Not every state essentially has areas that have disputed sovereignty.
- Poor governance, corruption, and the inability of a state to perform basic functions can lead to conflicts as various groups vie to fill the power vacuum or as the population revolts against ineffective leaders. These types of conflicts are often internal and involve little to no explicit sovereignty disputes. The turmoil in Venezuela, marked by extreme economic crisis and political repression, has led to widespread unrest and migration without directly involving issues of state sovereignty.
- States have come together to form intergovernmental organizations and regional groupings. These have ensured that conflicts have reduced considerably at least between states. IGOs such as the UN and regional-level groupings such as the Association for Southeast Asian Nations (ASEAN) play a role in providing a platform for negotiation and discussion to pre-empt conflicts that are based on any kind of sovereignty issues. Eg East Timor conflict.
- The increasing interconnectedness of the world through globalization means that conflicts are often influenced by external economic pressures, foreign policies, and international markets, rather than traditional sovereignty disputes. For example, trade wars, economic sanctions, and financial crises can provoke conflicts within and between states as they respond to global economic shifts and pressures, which may have little to do with sovereignty in a traditional sense.

Responses should contain references to specific examples. Candidates could cite cases where matters or issues related to sovereignty have led to conflicts. States have chosen to get into conflicts either to claim control over areas over which they claim sovereignty or enter into violent conflicts to gain more territory and sovereign control over it. These conflicts could be both inter or intra-state ones. Examples of sovereignty-based conflicts include those in Scotland, Catalonia (intra-state), Palestine (inter-state), and Tibet. They could also cite other examples of conflicts that do not stem from sovereignty issues – the South China Sea dispute (over natural resources), and conflicts in Myanmar, Thailand, and the Philippines (identity-based). Furthermore, in a globalized and interconnected world, states may generally avoid conflicts of any kind as economic, social, political, and cultural interconnectedness and interdependence lead them to choose means other than conflicts to settle disputes. Finally, responses may argue that it is almost impossible to distil the cause of any conflict down to a single issue. These and any other valid approach should be rewarded positively.

Responses should conclude by discussing the extent to which the candidate agrees with the claim that sovereignty issues are the main cause of conflict in global politics today.

Human rights

3. "The politicization of human rights leads to stronger protection of human rights."
Evaluate this view.

The response should consider possible impacts that the politicization of human rights may lead to stronger human rights protection. Candidates should define the politicization of human rights and human rights protection. Politicization of human rights can be defined as the process of international actors dealing with certain human rights in a selective manner and possibly with the end goal of realizing unrelated political goals. These actors could include, but are not limited to, states, intergovernmental organizations (IGOs), multinational corporations (MNCs), and non-governmental organizations (NGOs). Candidates can focus on the many unexpected and unwanted impacts that politicizing a certain human rights issue may cause. They are also likely to discuss the contested nature of the very definition of human rights leading to a problem of knowing which human rights should be protected. A definition of human rights protection could be that it is the process through which international and national actors work to ensure the viability of inalienable rights. A response should show a conceptualization as to what "stronger human rights protection" is. Responses should show an understanding of different aspects and mechanisms through which politicization of human rights impacts different actors in global politics then causes stronger human rights protection.

Arguments in favour of the claim that the politicization of human rights leads to stronger protection of human rights may include:

- The politicization of human rights will lead to greater awareness about a particular issue within a country. This will lead to more effective human rights protection or at least limit the ability of the actor violating human rights to continue doing so without consequences. For example, Zimbabwe's ability to attract aid flow from international organizations was limited due to alleged human rights violations in 2021, forcing them to reconsider their position.
- The politicization of human rights brings about pressure from the international community. This can include measures such as sanctions that may cause the country violating human rights to reconsider its actions. For example, non-democratic regimes such as Turkey or Saudi Arabia arguably make fewer human rights violations when under scrutiny from the international community.
- The politicization of human rights will have an impact beyond the country that is the target of politicization. For example, the violations against the Uighur minority in China were not effectively resolved but this politicization of the issue led to a greater understanding of the need to protect minorities worldwide.
- The politicization of human rights may have unintended consequences for the country choosing to politicize human rights as it will be held under a higher standard in the future. The US has often been accused of politicizing human rights and, as a result, was under strong scrutiny during the Black Lives Matter protests where the US was expected to show strong progress in terms of protecting human rights.
- The politicization of human rights might bring more resources to ensure stronger human rights protection. Usually, more powerful state and non-state actors engage in politicization of human rights, thus ensuring that more disposable resources such as political influence and financial capital are used for the protection of human rights.

Arguments against the claim that the politicization of human rights leads to stronger protection of human rights may include:

- Some countries crack down even harder on protesters who are driven by the raised awareness caused by the politicization of human rights. In Venezuela, many protesters against the regime faced increasingly repressive measures in 2019 as the government response became even more severe after calls for the leading officials to resign.
- The goal of politicization is to implement the political goal of the actor pursuing politicization. The goal of politicizing human rights is not actually to protect human rights. For example, the US claimed that human rights in Iraq were a major concern in 2003 and helped justify its invasion but human rights violations became even worse throughout the 2010s in the aftermath of the US intervention.
- The politicization of human rights may lead to human rights violations. If sanctions on vital resources are implemented, it may lead to a violation of second or third-generation human rights for those living in the country. For example, the EU introduced sanctions against Belarus in 2022 for human rights violations even though it was one of the least developed countries in Europe.
- The politicization of human rights may have no impact on effective human rights protection. Raising awareness about the situation during the war in Syria in 2016 in no way aided the hundreds of thousands who had to flee the country. The Syrian regime lacked sovereignty over most of its territory and thus the impact of politicization on actual human rights protection was very limited.
- The politicization of human rights encompasses a case-by-case approach to human rights that undermines the necessary approach of viewing all human rights as universal. Only if we view human rights as universal can we ensure stronger protection in the long term.

Responses should refer to specific examples. Candidates should consider the process of how the politicization of human rights may increase awareness about this issue but also may cause different forms of conflict. Specific examples could include the US politicization of human rights in the Middle East, NGOs such as Amnesty International raising awareness about human rights violations, attempts by the EU to ensure human rights protection in certain conflict-impacted areas of Southeast Europe, and attempts by some states such as the United Kingdom to call out human rights violators during some discussions in the UN. Candidates could identify that politicization will not just impact the actor who is being targeted through the politicization of human rights, but that other actors including NGOs and corporations may engage because of politicization. These and any other valid approach should be rewarded positively.

Responses should conclude by discussing the extent to which the candidate agrees with the view that politicization of human rights leads to stronger protection of human rights.

4. "Effective enforcement of human rights undermines state sovereignty." Discuss this view.

The response could contain a definition of human rights and sovereignty. Human rights can be defined as the inalienable rights that each individual has by virtue of their humanity. Candidates can also discuss the contested definition of human rights as well as the lack of enforcement mechanisms. State sovereignty can be defined as the ability of the state to exercise power within its own borders and non-interference in its domestic affairs. The responses could consider the enforcement of human rights as a holistic and intertwined process that has multiple relevant stakeholders involved. Additionally, there may be multiple possible conceptualizations of both human rights and state sovereignty. While candidates are not specifically directed to consider any specific actor or method of enforcing human rights, any approach discussing how the enforcement of human rights undermines state sovereignty is acceptable. These approaches may include discussing treaties, legislation, or domestic/international courts that enforce human rights. It is also possible to discuss different possible approaches to ensuring the effective enforcement of human rights. Candidates should include a clear conceptualization as to what the "effective enforcement of human rights" is.

Arguments in favour of the view that the effective enforcement of human rights undermines state sovereignty may include:

- If a state is violating human rights, the effective enforcement of human rights may require measures such as sanctions, tariffs and quotas that undermine the its sovereignty. Myanmar was not allowed to have full diplomatic and political privileges in some intergovernmental organizations such as ASEAN for alleged human rights abuses and the military violently taking power.
- Human rights enforcement sometimes requires foreign intervention or other types of intervention based on the Responsibility to Protect (R2P) doctrine. As a result, states may require international oversight and support for a prolonged period of time. For example, Bosnia still has international oversight limiting its sovereignty decades after the war is over.
- Human rights is a contested concept and different interpretations of human rights can cause conflict. Conflict, even if it only manifests through sanctions or less trade activity, can cause economic decline and other pitfalls that undermine the sovereignty of all states, e.g., the reaction of the US and EU concerning China's actions in Xinjiang and Hong Kong
- One of the main responsibilities of the state is protecting the human rights of its population. The very discussion of enforcing human rights means that states are failing in their duty to effectively enforce human rights, thus undermining state sovereignty as a concept. Documents like the Rome Treaty only exist because some states have been ineffective at protecting the human rights of their own populations.
- Many organizations today prevent countries from entering the organization if they do not effectively enforce human rights. This may limit the external sovereignty and opportunities of certain countries, and they may not be able to enter intergovernmental organizations such as the EU.
- Focusing on the enforcement of human rights may have increased the pooled sovereignty of states participating in organizations dedicated to enforcing human rights. For example, all the states of the EU may have stronger pooled sovereignty as a result of participating in it and building the organization based on a shared understanding of the need to uphold and protect human rights.

Arguments against the view that the effective enforcement of human rights undermines state sovereignty may include:

- States are the main actor responsible for effective human rights enforcement within their own territory. As a result, when they are in charge of doing so and doing so effectively, there is no negative impact on sovereignty.
- Even when there are attempts to penalize a country for violating human rights, these measures are not always effective. China's sovereignty was not meaningfully impacted by the reported human rights violations against the Uighur minority in 2021 even though several countries including the US, UK and the EU implemented sanctions.
- Human rights enforcement is not effective on a global level because of a lack of commonly accepted human rights standards and a limited capacity to enforce existing treaties and conventions. As a result, there is no impact on state sovereignty when there is no enforcement mechanism.
- Although third-party interventions due to human rights violations undermine state sovereignty in the short term, they can enable the preconditions for strengthening sovereignty in the long term. These interventions may remove unstable regimes, allowing a country to develop the institutions and infrastructure needed for a country to strengthen its sovereignty in the long term, e.g., Kosovo following NATO's 1999 intervention
- While implementing sanctions against a country may inhibit its external sovereignty, it may strengthen it internally if the government is able to encourage unity through propaganda or by using other measures. For example, while Russia's external sovereignty is weakened because of its violations of human rights in Ukraine in 2022, its internal sovereignty may have strengthened.

Responses should refer to specific examples. Candidates could discuss how different actors can enforce human rights and how these different actors impact state sovereignty. Candidates can also point out the contested nature of human rights as well as a lack of meaningful enforcement as reasons why there may be no impact on state sovereignty. Candidates could also discuss different methods and measures actors can take to effectively enforce human rights such as third-party interventions. Specific examples may include third-party interventions caused by human rights violations such as the 2011 NATO-led intervention in Libya, the lack of a global response to violations against the Uighur minority in China in 2021, Turkey's inability to join the EU due to alleged human rights violations, and the sanctions enacted against countries such as Russia in 2022 and sanctions imposed against human rights violations such as those against some Saudi Arabian officials. Finally, responses may note how the answer to the prompt depends on the actors involved as the effective enforcement of human rights may be more or less viable depending, first, on the relative power and/or status of the states involved and, secondly, on the nature and magnitude of any human rights violations. These and any other valid approach should be rewarded positively.

Responses should conclude by discussing the extent to which the candidate agrees with the view that the effective enforcement of human rights undermines state sovereignty.

Development

5. "Developing society is more important than developing the economy." Examine this view.

Responses should include attempts to define what developing society and developing the economy mean in this context. Development may be defined as a sustained increase in the standard of living and well-being. Candidates who offer different but viable conceptions of development such as sustainability, human, cultural, and political development should be rewarded. Responses should show some understanding of the different pathways to development included in the prompt. For instance, approaches for developing society may include concern for citizenship skills, improving education and healthcare, changing roles of women, more ecological living, and indigenous revitalization movements. Approaches for developing the economy might reference trade liberalization, export orientation, commodity-led growth, tourism, entrepreneurship, and the circular economy. Students may provide some criteria or benchmarks for determining how or why one pathway to development might be considered 'more important' than another.

Arguments in favour of the view that developing society is more important than developing the economy may include:

- Traditional aspects of culture and society need to adapt and accept more modern changes associated with development, for example, a greater role for women, a service sector, and a movement away from subsistence agriculture. Without this, development will be inhibited.
- Development requires an increasingly literate or skilled workforce so investment in human capital through education and training is vital for the process to be continued. This is exemplified in Thailand 4.0: this comprehensive scheme aims to lift the country's development through research and development, reducing social disparities, raising the country's HDI score through education including new universities, and protecting the environment with liveable cities.
- Economic development alone can lead to injustice and inequality, only social development can promote values of justice and equality. Society is made up of individuals and values such as justice, morality, and equality can only come from developing them first.
- The new conditions of work associated with development require the provision of well-developed healthcare and well-being systems. For example, governments in lower- to middle-income countries spend $60 per head on health, while governments in upper-middle income countries spend nearly $270 per person.
- The government needs to provide for basic needs through, for example, supporting basic human rights, ensuring law and order, and the provision of a stable currency. This also requires the establishment of strong institutions to support such social development. For example, Botswana is considered a country where strong institutions are fundamental to its success in development.

Arguments against the view that developing society is more important than developing the economy may include:

- Economic infrastructure is necessary to allow societies to progress and improve their living standards. Examples are roads, ports, transport, power, and telecommunications networks. These are essentially economic rather than social factors in development and need constant building, upgrading, and maintenance. A lack of updated infrastructure imposes social (and economic) costs on people, for example, traffic jams in Manila cost £57m a day in lost potential income.
- Willingness to adopt a relationship with the global economy is vital for development to begin and continue, for example through trade liberalization, admission of MNCs, and tourism. This is also part of economic development but may conflict with traditional social values. Resistance to development is strong in Indigenous societies based on pastoral, hunting/fishing livelihoods such as in northern Canada.
- Capital markets and investment need to be attracted to a developing country and the preconditions for this might include financial institutions and a convertible currency. The World Bank claims that financial sector development plays a huge role in economic development.
- Models of the stages of growth have emphasized the importance of industrialization and a leading sector, with social factors seen as potential brakes on progress or beneficial outcomes of growth. e.g. Rostow
- Poverty reduction, perhaps the most important outcome of development, cannot take place without economic transformation coming first, and therefore developing the economy is more important. The ILO for example has argued that economic growth is a necessary but not sufficient condition for poverty reduction.

Responses should contain references to specific examples. Some economically successful countries measured through multiplied GDP per head over the last 70 years are Taiwan (x32), Romania (x20), China (x16), and Brazil (x9). Some developing countries which have most successfully converted growth into well-being as measured by the World Economic Forum (including, health, education, equality, employment etc) between 2006 and 2016 are Ethiopia, China, Rwanda, Mongolia, and Sierra Leone. From this list it can be inferred that clear policies and governance can make a difference in translating economic into social development. Slovakia and Poland have made considerable progress since joining the EU. Returning to the relative importance of society and economy as outlined by the claim, it might be argued that society comprises everyone in a country or culture, while the economy may be owned by relatively few and its benefits may not be shared by all, so developing society is of paramount importance. Finally, students might take a more 'chronological' or 'sequential' view of development, in which it can be argued that economic transformation must take place to initiate development, and that social transformation will follow. This does not mean that the former is more important than the latter. Alternatively, it could be argued that advances in social and economic well-being are intertwined and occur together, which means that the prompt might be presenting a false dichotomy. These and any other valid approach should be rewarded positively.

Responses should include a conclusion on the degree to which the candidate agrees with the view that developing society is more important than developing the economy.

6. Evaluate the view that successful development can be inhibited by multinational corporations (MNCs).

Responses should include definitions of multinational corporations and development. A MNC has operations and generates revenue in countries other than its home country. The larger ones having a global presence, for example, Nestle, Nike, Apple, Huawei. Their operations transcend national borders and use global supply chains. Globalisation and the international division of labour have encouraged their growth, and their main purpose is profits for shareholders rather than development. Development may be defined as a sustained increase in the standard of living and well-being. Responses should consider the positive and negative impacts of MNCs on host countries. This can be done from a variety of perspectives, such as human welfare, political power, finance, capital flows, and environment, and many of the perspectives can be used for and against the view. Students should provide some benchmarks or ways in which development can be thought of as 'successful'.

Arguments in favour of the view that successful development can be inhibited by multinational corporations (MNCs) may include:

- MNCs can exploit labour in ways that affect individual well-being by paying unfair or inadequate wages and violating labour rights. Sweatshops are the most extreme example, with an estimated 250 million children working worldwide up to 16 hours a day. Chocolate production relies on cocoa beans from West Africa where much child labour is used, especially in the Ivory Coast and Ghana.
- MNCs can exploit and deplete the natural resources, with little incentive to conserve them as they can move elsewhere once they have run out. This can damage the future development potential of the host country. For example, oil extraction in Chad by ExxonMobil, Petronas and Chevron/Texaco, or uranium mining in Niger.
- The profits made by MNCs are often repatriated to their home countries and taxed elsewhere. Lack of access to surpluses generated from economic activity in developing countries may inhibit their successful development.
- When MNCs enter the economy of a country local entrepreneurs and small businesses may find it hard to compete on efficiency and price. They might be forced out of business or forced to reduce prices, reducing their incomes, and living standards and causing unemployment.
- MNCs are sometimes more economically and politically powerful than the host country so the relationship becomes unequal and one of dependence. MNCs may try to influence host governments in their favour through for example tax cuts and deregulation. The developing country fears unemployment and disruption if the MNC leaves. Thus, the future course of development is not in the control of the country where it takes place.
- MNCs are not there to promote development but to maximise shareholder value in their home countries. Thus, low wages and poor working conditions are part of the corporate strategy and need to be kept that way, for example, Apple's suppliers in China.

Arguments against the view that successful development can be inhibited by multinational corporations (MNCs) may include:

- MNCs can bring new jobs, forms of employment and skills training to the workforce in developing countries, often paying more than local companies. This can stimulate development through advances in literacy and numeracy as well as income and gender equality. An example is Shell's support for Indigenous peoples' communities in the Philippines.
- Sweatshops supplying MNCs are better than nothing because they provide job opportunities that would not otherwise be there, in which case successful development likely would not take place at all. The imposition of better wages and conditions would cause MNCs to shift to other less regulated countries.
- MNCs can bring capital flows and investment into developing countries, which may stimulate construction and infrastructure, creating a climate for local businesses to prosper. For example, Chinese-built roads and railways in Africa offer a long-term stimulus to development even after MNCs have left.
- MNCs often bring much-needed foreign direct investment (FDI) to developing countries. This investment is crucial because it not only provides immediate capital to the host country but also creates jobs, boosts productivity through technology transfer, and increases overall economic output. The presence of MNCs can be especially beneficial in countries where local financial markets are underdeveloped and cannot provide sufficient capital for growth, e.g., VW in Rwanda.
- MNCs can introduce a leading sector in an economy, which serves as a catalyst for widespread modernization and economic development. By establishing a new industry or enhancing a nascent one, MNCs can spur innovation, improve efficiencies, and foster competitive practices among local businesses. This often leads to a multiplier effect, where growth in the sector leads to benefits in other parts of the economy, such as through the creation of supply chains and service demands, e.g. Samsung's operations in Vietnam.
- MNCs may develop forms of corporate social responsibility as well as maximising profit. Some MNCs have tried to reverse social injustices by redirecting their profits to social improvement such as Ben and Jerry's and Patagonia. Shell, for example, has supported safety measures for Colombian fishermen and women in coastal communities.

Responses should contain references to specific examples. For example, MNCs in the consumer electronics industry employed Foxconn as a manufacturer in China. Its treatment of workers was exposed after 2012 when news of large-scale suicides emerged. On the other hand, Unilever led other MNCs in corporate social responsibility with a manifesto of public and transparent targets to be reached by 2020 including bringing safe drinking water to 500 million people, halving its greenhouse gas and waste emissions, and linking 500,000 smallholder farmers and distributors to its supply chain. This forced other MNCs such as Proctor and Gamble, Intel, and IBM to follow suit. Finally, responses may note that 'successful development' is a contingent and contextual process that varies from country to country. These and any other valid approach should be rewarded positively.

Responses should include a conclusion on the degree to which the candidate agrees with the view that successful development can be inhibited by multinational corporations (MNCs).

Peace and conflict

7. Examine the claim that third-party involvement in conflict leads to more violence.

Candidates should demonstrate an understanding of third-party involvement conceptualized as an actor's use of resources to affect the course of a conflict in which they were not initially involved. Candidates may discuss different ways in which third parties get involved in a conflict (e.g. economic sanctions, weapon embargoes, financial freezes, trade limitations, NATO involvement, UN peace enforcement operations, election observers, humanitarian aid, negotiations). Candidates should also demonstrate an understanding of the key concepts of conflict and violence. Conflict is often defined as the dynamic process of actual or perceived opposition between individuals or groups; this could be opposition over positions, interests, or values. Violence is often defined as physical or psychological force afflicted upon another being. In the context of this question, "more violence" may be understood as the intensification and/or the prolongation of violence. Responses may include specific mention of some of the different forms of violence (e.g. direct, structural, cultural). Responses should consider the merits or otherwise of the argument that third-party involvement in conflict leads to more violence, uncovering the assumptions and interrelationships of the issue.

Arguments in favour of the claim that third-party involvement in conflict leads to more violence may include:

- Some third parties have an interest in prolonging a conflict by providing economic and military support to a warring party. This can lead to more violence (e.g. EU and US assistance to Ukraine; and Russian support to Bashar Al-Assad's regime).
- Third parties might have an interest in halting the hostilities in the short run through a cease-fire (or similar) rather than promoting a solution that addresses the root causes of the violence. This may lead to the prolongation and/or intensification of violence in the long run (e.g. South Sudan; Yemen).
- Levels of violence in a conflict are likely to increase when actions taken by a third party are considered by one or more of the parties involved to be unjust. In a relativist view, this is very likely to happen since the very notion of justice is based on socially and culturally determined values, and third parties cannot adopt a value-neutral stance on a conflict. Impartiality and neutrality are hardly possible (e.g. the US's failed intervention in Afghanistan).
- Third-party involvement could lead to the emergence or intensification of violent conflicts beyond the original perimeter. Violence could spread to other areas or regions. This is particularly true for ethnic conflicts such as that involving the Kurds in Syria, Turkey, Iran, and Iraq. Another example would be the War on Terror carried out by the US and its allies which led to a series of violent terrorist attacks in the UK and in Europe.
- Third parties are not in a good position to fully grasp the causes nor the complexities of the positions, interests or values animating a specific conflict. A partial or faulty understanding of the nature of a conflict can lead third parties to take actions that prolong or exacerbate violence (e.g., NATO's intervention in Libya 2011).

Arguments against the claim that third-party involvement in conflict leads to more violence may include:

- Belligerent parties can feel compelled to stop fighting and start a dialogue when third parties with an overwhelming military power get involved (e.g. the UK's intervention in Sierra Leone between 2000-2002).
- Third parties often have the legitimacy and the concrete means to negotiate peace agreements that lead to ceasefires and reduced levels of violence (e.g. The United Nations Interim Security Force for Abyei peacekeeping operation in Sudan).
- The causes of a conflict can be so entrenched that only a third party can ensure the neutrality and impartiality needed to create the conditions for dialogue and stop the violence.
- Prolonged third-party involvement in conflict contains violence and prevents escalation (e.g. the EU in Kosovo).
- Third parties often get involved by providing resources to the parties involved in conflict. Their non-involvement reduces the capacity of the warring parties to use violence.

Responses should contain references to specific examples. As examples of how third-party involvement in conflict leads to more violence, candidates could cite cases such as US interventions in both Afghanistan and Iraq, which have resulted in the intensification and prolongation of violent conflict in these countries. As examples against this claim, candidates could refer to cases such as the UK's support of Sierra Leone and the subsequent UN peacekeeping mission that helped manage conflict there. Candidates may also argue that in many cases third-party involvement could halt violence, but also that the absence of third-party involvement could lead to more violence (e.g., the ethnic cleansing that took place in Nagorno-Karabakh in 2023). Candidates could also note that third-party involvement in conflict entails the exercise of both coercive and non-coercive forms of power. Hence, references to the concept of power understood as the ability to effect change are also possible. These and any other valid approach should be rewarded positively.

Responses should include a conclusion on the degree to which the candidate agrees with the claim that third-party involvement in conflict leads to more violence.

8. "States should use violence only to protect themselves." Discuss this view with reference to just war theory.

Responses are likely to include a definition of the key concept of violence. Violence is often defined as physical or psychological force afflicted upon another being. In the context of this question, violence can be conceptualised as the use of physical force or military force on the part of a state. References to the concepts of structural and cultural violence are also possible. Candidates should demonstrate an understanding of the Just War Theory as a tradition of thought that sets the conditions under which a state can justifiably resort to the use of force (*jus ad bellum)* and the rules for the use of force (*jus in bello*). Responses could refer to principles such as competent authority, just cause, right intention, war used as a last resort/necessity, war proportional to the act that triggered it, and reasonable hope of success. Candidates might also refer to treaties and documents such as the UN Charter and the Geneva Conventions.

Arguments in favour of the claim that states should use violence only to protect themselves may include:

- Just war theory emphasizes that violence should only be used for a just cause, with self-defence against an armed attack being universally recognized as such. Using violence solely for self-defence ensures that military action remains a last resort, thereby upholding the principle of justice. For example, the U.S. invasion of Afghanistan in 2001 can be seen as an act of self-defence, initiated in response to the September 11 attacks and aimed at dismantling Al-Qaeda and denying it a safe base of operations.
- The use of violence for self-protection helps to preserve state sovereignty and the integrity of national borders, core concepts in international law. This aligns with the just war criterion that war should have a reasonable prospect of success in protecting the nation without causing disproportionate damage. For example, Israel's use of defensive strikes against rocket attacks from Hezbollah in Lebanon is often justified by the state of Israel as necessary for protecting its civilian population and maintaining its territorial integrity.
- Restricting the use of state violence to self-defence helps prevent unjust aggression and the arbitrary use of power. It sets a clear limit on when states can legitimately use force, which can contribute to global stability and peace. For instance, international responses and condemnations of Russia's annexation of Crimea in 2014 emphasize the principle that state violence should be used only in legitimate self-defence, not for aggressive territorial expansion.
- Limiting the use of violence to self-defence is morally and ethically responsible, minimizing harm to civilians and reducing the likelihood of escalatory violence. Just war theory demands respect for the principles of discrimination and proportionality, which ensure that violence is directed only against legitimate military targets and that the force used is proportionate to the threat faced. An example of this was the NATO-led intervention in Libya in 2011, under a United Nations mandate, was initially justified on humanitarian grounds to protect civilians from imminent attack by government forces, highlighting how international action can align with just war principles to protect states under threat.
- A state using violence is very likely to produce loss of life and other forms of human rights violations. For this reason, it should be used only when necessary to protect the integrity of the state in line with the precepts of the Just War theory

Arguments against the claim that states should use violence only to protect themselves may include:

- Just war theory supports the use of violence for humanitarian reasons, where states may intervene to prevent genocide, war crimes, or crimes against humanity. The principle of Responsibility to Protect (R2P) is an extension of this idea, advocating for intervention when a state is unwilling or unable to prevent such atrocities against its own people, e.g., NATO's 2011 intervention in Libya.
- States may need to use violence to support international law and order, including enforcing international treaties and resolutions. This is particularly relevant in peacekeeping and peace enforcement operations sanctioned by international bodies like the United Nations under Chapter VII of the UN Charter. An example of this would be the AU-UN mission in South Sudan (UNMISS).
- The use of force to promote democracy is morally justified in that it brings freedom to an oppressed population (e.g., military coalition against ISIS since 2014).
- Under collective security arrangements, like those of NATO, states agree to defend one another, meaning that they may use violence not only in direct self-defence but also to protect other members. This mutual defence is intended to deter aggression and maintain regional stability. For example, Article 5 of NATO was invoked after the September 11, 2001 attacks on the United States, leading to collective defence actions in Afghanistan, which extended beyond the direct self-defence of individual NATO countries.
- Although controversial, some argue that preventive war can be justified under just war theory if there is a clear, imminent threat that cannot be neutralized through other means. This pre-emptive action is seen as a form of self-defence extended over time. For example, the U.S.-led invasion of Iraq in 2003 was initially argued (albeit contentiously) as preventive, aiming to stop the perceived imminent threat of weapons of mass destruction (which were ultimately not found).
- There are scenarios where violence might be used to protect the global commons—areas that no state owns but all rely upon, such as international waters or space. Ensuring the security of these areas may require actions that aren't directly tied to self-defence but are crucial for maintaining global stability and access. For example, piracy off the coast of Somalia prompted international naval forces, including those of the EU, NATO, and others, to engage in military actions far from their own territorial waters to secure international shipping lanes, which is vital for global trade.

Responses should contain references to specific examples. As examples of why states should use violence only to protect themselves in line with the Just War principle of *jus ad bellum*, candidates could cite cases in which other kinds of justifications for the use of force have led to negative outcomes in terms of less peaceful international relations, intensification of conflicts, more injustice and instability (e.g., Libya 2011). Furthermore, limiting the use of force to state protection prevents the politicization of human rights and their instrumental use to justify alleged humanitarian interventions (e.g. Iraq 2003). As examples against this claim, candidates could refer to cases where other kinds of justifications for the use of force, other than Just War theory, have led to positive outcomes in terms of more peaceful international relations, less conflict, more justice, and stability (e.g., NATO intervention in North Macedonia 2001-2003). Opinions should be presented clearly and supported with appropriate evidence and sound arguments. Finally, responses might note that the answer to the prompt might depend on the passage of time. That is, that applying Just War thinking as a justification for the use of force/violence can be problematic once time passes, i.e., what might have appeared to have been a justified use of force at one point in time may be proven later to have not been the case (e.g., the 2003 US invasion of Iraq). These and any other valid approach should be rewarded positively.

Responses should include a conclusion on the degree to which the candidate agrees with the view that states should use violence only to protect themselves.