

# **Markscheme**

**May 2024**

**Global politics**

**Higher level and standard level**

**Paper 2**

© International Baccalaureate Organization 2024

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 2024

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, 2024

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

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 arrangements, 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. Evaluate the view that non-state actors have a limited impact on global politics.

Responses should demonstrate a clear understanding of the concept of non-state actors (NSAs) – such as terrorist groups, political parties, multi-national corporations (MNCs), trade unions, social movements, and non-governmental organizations (NGOs). They may describe terrorists as groups that use violence to create fear towards achieving their agenda or ideologies, e.g., Abu Sayyaf and ISIS. NGOs are organizations established by a group of individuals who wish to pursue goals relating to a broad range of issues and areas such as eradication of poverty, gender equality, sustainable development, etc. Political parties may be defined as groups of people with similar ideas on politics, and similar ideologies that may come together to contest for power through elections. They may provide examples of political parties such as Democrats and Republicans (United States) and Peoples' Action Party (Singapore). Prominent NGOs could include Amnesty International and Oxfam. Some MNCs include Apple and Nike. Candidates should be able to discuss to what extent they believe that NSAs have a limited role to play in global politics.

*Arguments in favour of the claim that non-state actors have a limited impact on global politics may include:*

- Politics is all about the ability of one actor to make the other do what it would not do otherwise. Global politics is based on this power play between states, making a state the most important actor in global politics, rather than non-state actors. NSAs can thus never play a prominent role due to a lack of power, especially hard power. For example, typically only states have the power to invade another country (Russia and Ukraine), and only states can impose economic sanctions, e.g., the US and EU sanctions on Russia in the wake of the invasion of Ukraine.
- Political parties themselves are not sure of when and for how long they can be in power. If they lose elections or their government loses the confidence of the people, they will be unable to play an effective role.
- NGOs may not have the necessary financial backing or effective machinery to take any successful actions or implement policies, unlike states that are better equipped to undertake these tasks. Besides, NGOs can only function or operate in a state if permitted by state officials. In that sense, their very existence and ability to contribute to global politics depends on the permission of the state. For example, Oxfam India's foreign funding was blocked in 2021 by Indian authorities.
- Trade Unions have minimal presence and power in many countries due to a variety of factors such as political reforms, privatization, and globalization. For instance, according to the Social Market Foundation, a British think-tank, 13.2 million people in Britain were members of trade unions in 1979, but this number fell to just 6.01 million in 2018 – a decline of over 50%.
- Terrorist groups use threats and violence against civilians to achieve a political goal, but are still not as powerful as states, nor do they possess equal resources and institutions. Also, they do not possess any legal status as entities. Powerful states such as the US, UK as well as intergovernmental organizations (e.g., the UN) aim at curbing terrorism with all their might, making it difficult for terror groups to operate through measures such as intelligence sharing and blocking funds.

Arguments against the claim that non-state actors have a limited impact on global politics may include:

- Political parties are important actors, especially in a democratic setup. They afford the citizens options on policies, which in turn become legislation, which could be directly or indirectly linked to steps in dealing with global challenges. Besides, parties in power can implement social, political, and economic reforms which directly and indirectly help manage global challenges.
- NSAs such as NGOs can highlight and use pressure to influence states and governments to take appropriate action on many issues of critical nature in global politics such as human rights, poverty, and inequality. NGOs such as Human Rights Watch have monitored human rights violations and brought about changes, e.g., banning of landmines worldwide, for which they received the 1997 Nobel Peace Prize along with their partners.
- NGOs and political parties can be very powerful when it comes to links with people on the ground and their problems and issues. All of these are critical as they are all linked to bigger issues at the global level such as poverty, lack of education, unemployment, the climate crisis, etc. In that sense, these actors are a key link between civil society, the state, and IGOs. For instance, Save the Children reached nearly 48.8 million children in 2022 across 116 countries around the world.
- Trade Unions continue to exist in many countries as powerful entities, functioning across different types of industries (from heavy manufacturing to the government). They help workers secure higher wages and occupational safety, resolve conflicts, provide legal support, and ensure better working conditions. Powerful trade Unions include the Congress of South African Trade Unions, and the All-China Federation.
- Terror groups have also pushed states to focus on them through their strong networks, economic and military resources, and trained personnel. Terror groups like ISIS and al Qaeda have managed to alter the course and nature of developments in global politics. Powerful states such as the US and UK have been pushed to get involved in inter-state conflicts and faced domestic crises, both economic and security, due to terror attacks e.g., the 9/11 attacks in the US and the Moscow theatre attack in 2024.

Responses should contain references to specific examples of why/how non-state actors may have a limited impact on global politics. They could cite examples of how, for instance, some NGOs were penalized in India and not allowed to carry out their work. Similarly, they could discuss how some NGOs are unable to function effectively due to lack of funding, such as the Association for Volunteer Administration in the USA. They could also cite examples of how political parties such as those in democracies such as the US, India, and the UK that are out of power after elections are unable to completely fulfil their agendas and promises. Also, according to the Global Terrorism Index 2020, deaths from terrorism are now 59 per cent lower than their peak in 2014. There is also reduction in the number of countries experiencing deaths from terrorism. On the other hand, some candidates may provide examples of how NGOs like Amnesty International have been able to successfully highlight human rights abuses and have pressurized countries to act. They may also highlight the power of MNCs such as Apple and Nike that operate across borders wielding tremendous power over governments, affecting economic growth, and impacting the development of states. For example, former US President Trump met Apple head Tim Cook to discuss trade and immigration amidst a trade war with China. 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 non-state actors have a limited impact on global politics.



## 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. To what extent do you agree with the claim that developments in human rights over time have led to greater equality?

Responses should provide a clear conceptualization as to how human rights have developed over time. Candidates can use examples of treaties or laws, but can also point out examples of achieving civil, political, and other milestones over time. While a historic approach to the question is not necessary, candidates may compare the current legislation protecting human rights with historical documents such as the UDHR. Candidates can also make the distinction of how the evolution of different generations of human rights may contribute to achieving greater equality. The question also invites a comparison between how the UDHR has ensured the development of human rights compared to more modern treaties aiming to influence human rights. Candidates should provide a definition of equality that focuses on an understanding of all individuals having the same intrinsic value and working towards a more equitable society in the long term. Equality may be understood as a multidimensional and contested concept and outcome. The responses should have a strong conceptualization as to what “greater equality” entails. There might be references to associated concepts such as fairness and justice. Candidates should provide a clear link between developments in human rights through social, cultural, and economic aspects that have led to greater equality.

*Arguments in favour of the claim that developments in human rights over time have led to greater equality may include:*

- Developments in human rights have led to greater protection for endangered groups such as minorities. This improvement in legal status has led to more equality in human rights protection and enforcement. For example, the 2007 Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples has led to significant advancements in the human rights of minorities and Indigenous peoples.
- Developments in human rights have enabled us to expand our view of human rights. There is now more focus on achieving newer generations of human rights. For example, even the SDGs have a strong focus on making sure everyone has equality, which is mainly achieved through access to education and well-paying jobs.
- There is more equality internationally because of the development of human rights. While human rights are still not truly universal, the differences are now being more widely monitored and noticed by intergovernmental and non-governmental organizations. As a result, there is greater equality globally.
- Even in countries that are less economically developed or have repressive regimes, the development of human rights has led to greater equality because of higher global human rights standards. This has allowed groups around the world such as the Bangladesh Rural Advancement Committee (BRAC) to work on achieving greater equality.
- There is a greater number of actors promoting equality. When the UDHR was signed, there was a limited number of actors focusing on equality while today many actors including non-governmental organizations are more focused on achieving equality, e.g., Gender at Work and the Association for Women’s Rights in Development.

*Arguments against the claim that developments in human rights over time have led to greater equality may include:*

- Despite numerous new treaties aimed at achieving human rights development, there is still widespread inequality. Several powerful countries also refuse to accept modern human rights legislation, and this prevents human rights from fully developing or from achieving equality. For example, the US and Israel refuse to accept the jurisdiction of the ICC so political equality and accountability are lacking.
- Developments in human rights are being jeopardized by cultural relativism. For example, some groups are still not treated in an equitable manner such as women in Middle Eastern countries like Saudi Arabia.
- Human rights have not developed to an acceptable degree and there are still numerous human rights concerns. Damage to the environment and numerous conflicts show that the status of human rights development is contestable. Thus, greater equality has not resulted.
- The large number of new treaties and proposals related to human rights suggests that many of them are not followed. If the UDHR and subsequent human rights instruments were applicable and fully enforced, further legislation would not have been necessary. As a result, all these advances are not achieving equality, e.g., the unequal rights of women in many parts of the Middle East and Africa.
- Global inequality is at historic rates. This can be seen through economic inequality as well as access to resources and technology. For example, Western countries enjoyed access to life-saving COVID-19 vaccines and medication first even though every individual should have had equal access to healthcare.

Responses should have a clear focus on how developments of human rights over time have led to greater equality. Candidates could do so by making a link between how relevant treaties, legislation, or achievement of civil or political milestones has contributed to raised awareness about the need for greater equality. Examples include the Equality Act passed in the USA in 2021, which expanded federal civil rights laws to protect LGBTQ people from discrimination in employment, housing, credit, jury service, and federally funded programs. Responses should refer to specific examples. Candidates can discuss different aspects of inequality and show how developments in human rights may not have consistently impacted each of these aspects in the same manner. Specific examples could include: the Rome Treaty, an effective discussion about how the government response to COVID-19 impacted human rights, the SDGs, different forms of inequality ranging from social, cultural, or economic, and protests movements such as the “Occupy Wall Street” movement. 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 developments in human rights over time have led to greater equality.

## 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. Discuss the view that development is most effectively promoted by intergovernmental organizations (IGOs).

Responses are likely to include a definition of intergovernmental organizations (IGOs), which are composed primarily of sovereign states or other organizations for serving common interests established by a treaty and governed by international laws. Development may be defined as a sustained increase in the standard of living and well-being. The counterclaim should suggest alternative actors in the promotion of development. Responses might also expect to contain distinctions between the Bretton Woods IGOs (World Bank, IMF, WTO), the UN and its agencies including UNDP, regional IGOs such as ASEAN, the Africa Development Bank, and the EU, and their respective approaches to development. Students may provide some criteria or benchmarks for determining how the effectiveness of any actor's actions can be gauged.

*Arguments in favour of the view that development is most effectively promoted by intergovernmental organizations (IGOs) may include:*

- IGOs can play a valuable role as information collectors and providers. Their transparency and air of impartiality can make them useful promoters of development. For example, the OECD developed the polluter pays principle as well as PISA, a program for international student assessment.
- IGOs have become increasingly important in resolving conflict between and within nations. This helps to remove a major obstacle to development. The African Union's involvement in the conflict in Sudan (AMIS) leading to the deployment of the UN-AU Mission in Darfur (UBNAMID) in 2007 is a clear example of how IGOs can facilitate the resolution of conflicts, thereby removing significant obstacles to development.
- IGOs offer developing countries the chance to develop by lending them money to promote infrastructure projects such as roads, hydroelectric power, telecoms, and water supply schemes. World Bank loans, for example, have funded India's addition of 30 gigawatts of renewable energy, enough to power 150 million homes.
- Global IGOs such as the World Bank, IMF, and WTO were strong advocates of development through neo-liberal policies of free trade, deregulation, privatization, and reduced state intervention known as the Washington Consensus. Countries which adopted or had neoliberal policies imposed on them grew and developed more quickly than non-adopters after 2000.
- In recent times IGOs have played a leadership role in sustainable development through the UNDP's Sustainable Development Goals and their focus on environment, health, education and human rights. They constitute an urgent call for 17 sets of targets to be reached between 2015 and 2030 and have set the agenda for development.

*Arguments against the view that development is most effectively promoted by intergovernmental organizations (IGOs) may include:*

- The Washington Consensus, fostered by the World Bank, IMF, and WTO, has been strongly criticized for benefiting big business/MNC profits rather than ordinary people, creating greater inequality and environmental damage, thus hampering development. The expected trickle-down proved illusory except in countries where pro-poor policies were adopted alongside Washington Consensus policies. For example, the massive economic crisis in Argentina (2001-2002) can be linked to neoliberal structural reforms while worsening wealth inequality leading to ethnic and regional tensions in Nigeria was a result of IMF and World Bank-guided reforms.
- Many IGOs' focus on industrialization, trade, and jobs has concentrated on urban areas, leaving rural areas to miss out on development, increasing inequality further. Rural development has been more effectively promoted by microfinance organizations and other NGOs which are often the very opposite of IGOs in scale and values. For example, Grameen Banking in Bangladesh.
- IGOs often implement development programs based on global standards or models that may not be relevant or sensitive to local cultural contexts and needs. This can lead to inefficiencies and the ineffectiveness of such programs. For instance, IMF structural adjustment programs (SAPs) have sometimes been criticized for imposing one-size-fits-all solutions that are inappropriate given the unique socio-economic conditions that exist in different countries.
- Relying heavily on IGOs for development assistance can lead to a dependency syndrome, where local governments become reliant on external aid and expertise instead of developing their own capacities. This can undermine local initiative and sustainability. Zimbabwe's reliance on foreign aid during the 2000s, which did not effectively build local administrative or economic capacity, is one such example.
- IGOs often operate at such a macro level that ensuring accountability and transparency can be challenging. This can lead to corruption and misuse of funds. For instance, the European Union has faced criticism for the lack of transparency and alleged mismanagement in the use of development funds in Eastern European countries.
- Development agendas of IGOs can be disproportionately influenced by their most powerful members, which may result in policies that favor the interests of these countries rather than those of the poorer nations they aim to help. For example, the World Bank and IMF have been critiqued for promoting Western-centric economic policies that align with the interests of major donor countries at the expense of recipient countries' autonomy.

Responses should contain references to specific examples. For example, IGOs that might be seen as helpful in promoting development include the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change. In addition, IGOs may encourage globalization that, in turn, may lead to development depending on which IGO is being considered and the local circumstances of the developing country. IGOs that might be seen as unhelpful to development include the Bretton Woods Institutions because they advanced the values of the developed world through a neoliberal outlook with poorer countries less involved in discussions, especially the WTO. Indeed, smaller countries may struggle to find a voice in the more traditional IGOs, e.g., the OECD contains only 38 countries. Finally, students may note that for some countries development has been possible without any meaningful assistance from IGOs, e.g., China, demonstrating that other pathways to development are 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 view that development is most effectively promoted by intergovernmental organizations.



## 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. With reference to **two** conflicts you have studied, evaluate the claim that competition for resources is the main cause of violent conflict.

Responses should demonstrate an understanding of the key concept of conflict as the dynamic process of actual or perceived opposition between individuals or groups; this could be opposition over positions, interests, or values. Responses should demonstrate knowledge and understanding of different causes of conflict. While references to different manifestations of violent 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 real-world examples (e.g., greed vs. grievance, territorial control, material interest, resource scarcity, ideology, threatened identity, perception, etc.). Candidates might highlight the complexity involved in determining the underlying causes of a conflict and identifying any single cause as 'the main cause'.

*Arguments in favour of the claim that competition for resources is the main cause of violent conflict may include:*

- Control over resources has historically been the main cause of conflict among individuals and groups (e.g. Russia and Crimea; North-South Darfur). This is particularly true today, with states giving great strategic significance to resource security (e.g. the Ukraine war and the Russia-EU relations as well as conflicts in the Middle East, particularly in Syria and Iraq, which have been exacerbated by water scarcity, leading to tensions both within and between countries.)
- Resource wealth can provide financial means for rebel groups to sustain their operations. The sale or taxation of valuable resources like diamonds, gold, and timber has funded conflicts in several regions. For instance, the conflict in the Democratic Republic of the Congo has been fueled in part by the battle over mineral resources, with various armed groups competing for control over mines.
- Given the limited availability of resources, state and non-state actors fight over control of resources. Water wars are increasingly common (263 between 2010 and 2018 according to the UN) as well as land grabbing (e.g. conflict between the Brazilian government and the indigenous population over control of land in the Amazon Forest).
- In regions where economies are heavily dependent on natural resources, such as oil and minerals, competition for control of these resources can lead to conflict. The Niger Delta in Nigeria has experienced violent conflicts involving various militant groups fighting for a share of the oil wealth, which they feel has been unjustly exploited by national and multinational corporations without adequate local benefit.
- Environmental degradation and the depletion of resources can exacerbate existing tensions and lead to violence. As resources become scarcer due to overuse, pollution, or climate change, competition intensifies, increasing the likelihood of conflict. The Darfur conflict in Sudan, for instance, has roots in disputes over diminishing fertile land and water, exacerbated by environmental changes.
- The "resource curse" theory suggests that countries rich in natural resources often experience more conflict, corruption, and authoritarianism compared to those with fewer natural resources. This paradox arises because the wealth generated from resources creates incentives for various groups to attempt to control the state or the resources themselves, leading to internal conflicts. The ongoing unrest in Venezuela over oil wealth distribution is a contemporary example.

*Arguments against the claim that competition for resources is the main cause of violent conflict may include:*

- Defending the territorial integrity of a state is the main cause of violent conflict (e.g. Ukraine-Russia war).
- Economic disparities and structural inequality can lead to conflict as groups struggle for improved social, economic, and political rights. Such conflicts are often about access to opportunities and social justice rather than direct competition over natural resources. The Arab Spring movements, which began in 2010, were largely driven by demands for economic equity, anti-corruption measures, and democratic governance, rather than by disputes over natural resources.
- Power struggles within governments or between political factions are significant drivers of conflict, often unrelated to resource competition. These conflicts can arise from desires to gain or maintain control over state institutions, suppress opposition, or pursue ideological goals. The conflict in Yemen, for instance, primarily involves political power dynamics and regional influence, particularly between the Houthi movement and the internationally recognized government, rather than direct competition over resources.
- The absence of strong institutions, corruption, and poor governance can lead to conflicts as these create a vacuum of power that various groups may attempt to fill by force. In these scenarios, the root causes of conflict are more closely linked to governance issues rather than resource competition. Somalia's longstanding conflict, characterized by clan divisions and power struggles, exemplifies how weak governance and institutional failures can fuel violence.
- Psychological factors rather than rational ones are the main cause of violent conflict. Parties involved in a violent conflict are motivated more by long-standing grievances rather than greed (e.g. Darfur).
- International intervention can ignite or exacerbate conflicts, independent of resource competition. Foreign powers often intervene for strategic or political reasons, and their involvement can lead to violent conflicts. The invasion of Iraq in 2003, driven by the US and its allies under claims of disarming weapons of mass destruction and spreading democracy, led to a prolonged conflict without a direct link to competition for Iraqi resources at the outset.
- Many conflicts are rooted not in resource competition but in ethnic, religious, or ideological differences. These conflicts often persist even in regions where resource abundance is high or in the absence of significant competition for resources. For example, the ongoing conflict in Syria initially stemmed more from political repression and sectarian divisions than direct competition over natural resources.

Responses could contain references to other examples of conflict, but the focus should be on the two chosen examples of violent conflict. The candidate's evaluation of the claim that competition for resources is the main cause of conflict should emerge clearly from the discussion of these two examples. They could choose examples of both violent and non-violent conflict. Candidates could also note that violent conflicts are rarely understood in terms of a single cause. Their treatment of the chosen examples can include references to a multiplicity of causes, in so far as their position towards the claim is clearly presented and supported with appropriate evidence and sound argument. 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 competition for resources is the main cause of violent conflict.

---