Diploma Programme
Programme du diplôme
Programa del Diploma

Markscheme

November 2024

Global politics

Higher level and standard level

Paper 2

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 students might cover in their answers. They are **not** compulsory points. They are only a framework to help examiners in their assessment. Students 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. Examine the claim that the power of a state increases with its membership of intergovernmental organizations (IGOs).

    Responses should demonstrate a clear understanding of the concept of power. Students could define power as the ability of one actor to influence the other or to achieve a desired outcome using different means through use of both coercive and co-optive mechanisms (hard, soft and smart power). Intergovernmental organizations (IGOs) could be defined as organizations composed of states that come together under a formal agreement and encourage cooperation, e.g., the UN, European Union (EU). Students could discuss how IGOs could have different functions and purposes, such as facilitating economic cooperation, settlement of disputes and ensuring peace and stability – all of which may help strengthen the power of a state. Students could conceptualize an increase in power of state in terms of increase in resources – economic (through concrete indicators such as GDP), military power or in terms of outcomes (greater voice in agenda setting, dispute settlement or influencing preferences of other countries). Students could then move on to discuss the extent to which they agree with the claim that the power of a state increases with its membership of intergovernmental organizations.

    Arguments in favour of the claim that the power of a state increases with its membership of intergovernmental organizations may include:

    - By joining IGOs, states enhance their security which adds to their power. In an interdependent and globalized world, neither can they gain power, nor exercise power without being part of these organizations. E.g., The North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO) as a grouping is more powerful than its independent member states.
    - States can gain economic power by being part of IGOs. E.g., ASEAN and EU have ensured that member states make economic gains as bigger markets, through facilitating, easing, and securing trade and investment - all of which adds to economic power of their member states.
    - Military and economic power especially of smaller states grows with their membership of IGOs as such countries lack resources and may suffer from conflict. For example, Qatar's membership in the Gulf Cooperation Council (GCC) has allowed it to thrive economically by sharing oil and natural gas pipelines while its alignment with the GCC has provided a security buffer, creating mutual protection against external threats.
    - States can exercise relational power/diplomacy with greater effectiveness through IGOs. This helps reduce friction, conflict and ensures that resources are diverted toward economic and social development and augments the power of member states. E.g., The Alliance of Small Island States (AOSIS) aims to address the global climate emergency that disproportionately threatens them. It advocates for ways and policies to address inequity of impact of the climate crisis and work as an ad hoc lobby through the UN.
    - Leaving an IGO may decrease the power of states, e.g., Brexit has arguably impacted the UK's economy negatively with less trade openness and possible effect on its attractiveness as an investment destination.

Arguments against the claim that that the power of a state increases with its membership of intergovernmental organizations may include:

- The power of states diminishes with membership of IGOs. Common interests and interconnectedness also mean more vulnerability for states. For instance, a financial crisis in one member state of an IGO can impact the economic power of all other member states negatively putting them through a spiralling crisis too. E.g., the Greece debt crisis that began in late 2009.
- The power of states decreases with membership of IGOs due to the legally binding provisions or rules that discipline relations amongst member states. They lose complete autonomy over policies. E.g., the principle of non-interference in the internal affairs of other member states results in the inability of individual ASEAN members to take action against alleged human rights violations in Myanmar.
- Member states are expected to align their domestic policies with the IGO, affecting decision making at the national level. E.g., European Monetary Union members must follow an independent monetary policy run by the European Central Bank. Also, World Trade Organization (WTO) members can lose autonomy because they agree to follow rules and regulations to settle disputes, which may override national laws.
- Pooling of sovereignty in IGOs also means that states have pooled, shared or delegated away some of their powers through treaties that they sign to become members of organizations. E.g., the impact of NATO membership on matters of defence and security.
- Ultimately, IGOs do not affect the power of states. States still have the sovereign ability to decide what is in their interest. Decisions and policies proposed by an IGO are not always necessarily binding, leaving them open for member states to follow or ignore. E.g., the Philippines refused to cooperate with the ICC and instead chose to withdraw from the Rome Statute in 2018.
- Already powerful states may gain more power from membership in an IGO and can drive the discourse/set agendas while the power of smaller and weaker states can be eroded. For instance, as a P5 member of the UN Security Council Russia blocked any UN action on Crimea in 2014.

Responses should contain references to specific contemporary real-world examples. Students could cite cases where the power of states has increased with its membership of IGOs. For instance, smaller member states of the ASEAN and African Union have benefitted economically and politically by being part of the organization. Besides, IGOs such as the UN provide aid on social issues such as education and promotion of gender equality – which help make states develop and become more powerful. On the other hand, students could provide examples of how the power of states does not increase with their membership of IGOs. For example, Poland and Hungary in the EU and Turkey in NATO have disproportionate power in the organization in decision making, affecting the ability of other smaller or weaker members to play a significant role and highlight their interests. On a similar note, students could mention that the answer to the question depends very much on the terms of membership and/or the structure of specific IGOs; not all IGOs are the same. Finally, power is a very broad concept and the ways in which students conceptualize an increase in state power may vary. This and any other valid approach or example should be evaluated positively.

Responses should include a conclusion on the degree to which the student agrees with the claim that the power of a state increases with their membership of IGOs.

2.   To what extent do you agree with the claim that the biggest challenge to state sovereignty comes from globalization?

Responses should demonstrate a clear understanding of the concepts of sovereignty and globalization. Students could define sovereignty as a state's independence, its control over territory and its ability to govern itself. They could also define internal (total authority within one's own territory) and external (ability of state to act independently to face external actors) sovereignty. They could mention some other factors that challenge sovereignty such as supranationalism, transnational challenges, subnational challenges such as violent conflicts, etc. Students may describe globalization as the increasing interconnectedness, interaction, integration and interdependence. Students could then move on to discuss to what extent they agree with the claim that the biggest challenge to state sovereignty comes from globalization.

Arguments in favour of the claim that the biggest challenge to state sovereignty comes from globalization may include:

- In a globalized world, sovereign states cannot function in isolation and depend on others and global financial flows for development and resources. Thus, they prefer to adjust to the demands of globalization to avoid isolation, e.g. the EU's dependence on Russia for oil and fears of a negative impact on the economy led to the reluctance of some states such as Germany to impose an embargo during the Russia-Ukraine conflict.
- Globalization has multiple facets that could impact national identities and how these are constructed. E.g., 59% of the world's population uses social media, potentially leading to spreading of cultural values that transcend national boundaries, impacting sovereignty.
- State borders are now permeable (some more than others) due to globalization, and states are increasingly prone to external influences through greater migration, tourism, etc. For example, the free movement of people and goods within the Schengen zone and has caused issues such as increased crime and pollution while the outsourcing of US jobs has undermined the internal sovereignty of the state.
- Sovereign states are being hollowed out by globalization and becoming less powerful and internally sovereign due to global economic and financial flows. They need to align their policies and outlook with the rest of the countries in the world, thus weakening their sovereignty. This alters the Westphalian view of sovereignty of states. For instance, IMF interventions in Greece (2010) and Pakistan and Sri Lanka (2024).
- Other perceived challenges to sovereignty such as supranationalism, humanitarian intervention, the spread of technology, and economic or financial flows are also offshoots of political globalization. For example, some MNCs are wealthier than states while globalization has also engendered a greater role for NGOs in global politics.

Arguments against the claim that the biggest challenge to state sovereignty comes from globalization may include:

- State sovereignty is not challenged by globalization. States engage in sovereignty bargains, that is, they voluntarily accept some limitations to their sovereign ability in exchange for some advantages. This means that states can continue to choose their options on various issues based on their national interests. E.g., Brexit, the US exit from the TPP/CPTPP, and India's exit from the RCEP.
- IGOs as an offshoot of political globalization also respect state sovereignty. For instance, the UN and the Organization of American States Charters proclaim that the organisation respects the sovereignty of member states. Besides, all IGOs are established by treaty among the governments of sovereign states.
- Some domestic challenges to sovereignty such as separatism, political violence, inter- and intra-state wars, civil wars, and revolutions are challenges not linked to the phenomenon of globalization, but are instead due to domestic discontent. Therefore, globalization is not the biggest challenge to the sovereignty of some states. E.g., the ChinaIndia border issue and skirmishes (2020-2021), the Myanmar civil war (2021-).
- The biggest challenge to sovereignty comes from the anarchic nature of global politics and not from globalization. States are always looking to gain access to more resources, extend boundaries and gain power. In this quest, they challenge sovereignty of other states. E.g., Russian invasion of Ukraine in 2022.
- MNCs and other international non-state actors often do not have the degree of legitimacy required to challenge state sovereignty.. In sum, MNCs and NSAs can only function in a state if it allows them to do so. For example, the Swiss mining giant Glencore was fined by the Democratic Republic of Congo while the Indian government cancelled the permits of NGOs like Oxfam to operate within its borders.
- There are some pressing existential issues such as pandemics, terrorism, cyber-security matters that challenge state sovereignty because they transcend national borders and cannot be managed alone by states even with adequate resources. So, these are a bigger threat to state sovereignty than globalization.

Responses should contain references to specific contemporary real-world examples. Students could cite cases where the biggest challenge for state sovereignty comes from globalization. They could also discuss how the concept of sovereignty has evolved over the years. For instance, with globalization and the resultant flow of people, goods and resources, states cannot take unilateral decisions, e.g.,. Pakistan's tussle with the IMF over loan conditions. They could also argue that sub-national movements are themselves subject to globalization, e.g., the transnational nature of Islamic fundamentalism or far-right extremist movements often transcend borders. On the other hand, students could provide examples of how state sovereignty has either not been challenged by globalization or has other bigger challenges. They could highlight the issue of the climate emergency for instance as a bigger challenge to state sovereignty than globalization, e.g. the very existence of smaller island states such as Maldives depends on climate change and rising sea levels. This is not an issue related to globalization. Finally, students may argue that the sovereignty of some states may be more affected by globalization than others; not all states are equally challenged by globalization, especially as it is not a unidimensional concept. This and any other valid approach or example should be evaluated positively.

Responses should include a conclusion on the degree to which the student agrees with the claim that globalization is the biggest challenge to state sovereignty.

Human Rights

3.   To what extent has the practice of human rights become increasingly difficult due to greater interdependence in global politics?

Responses are likely to include a definition of human rights as basic claims and entitlements that, many argue, one should be able to exercise simply by virtue of being a human being. The practice of human rights in global politics may be articulated in terms of both claims on human rights as well as in terms of violations of human rights. Students should also offer some understanding of the key concept of interdependence, which in global politics most often refers to the mutual reliance between and among groups, organizations, geographic areas and/or states for access to resources that sustain living arrangements. Students may further reference the related key concept of globalization, which has increased interdependence, while often changing the relationships of power among the various actors engaged in global politics.

Arguments in favour of the claim that the practice of human rights has become increasingly difficult due to greater interdependence in global politics may include:

- Critics point out that the practice of human rights has been adversely affected by interdependence in the form of economic/financial globalization as inequality within and between states has risen, in particular in developing countries, e.g., between 1998-2008 the global top 1% and the middle classes of the emerging economies of China, India, Indonesia, Brazil and Egypt were the main 'winners' of globalization, which, in turn, has led to greater inequalities in human development and limiting the full realization of all human rights.
- Increased interdependence in the form of open trade causes production to relocate to areas where environmental standards and labour rights are lax, which adversely affects human rights, e.g., up to 20% of cobalt produced in the Democratic Republic of the Congo is generated by artisanal miners working in squalid and dangerous conditions.
- Greater interdependence in the form of globally accepted norms and practices, particularly those centred on approaches to or models of development are not compatible with human rights standards, i.e., neoliberal models based on the centrality of the market and its logic produce injustice, oppression, exploitation in societies around the world. For example, the neoliberal preference for privatisation, when applied to healthcare often damages the right to universal healthcare, as it did in Kenya.
- Greater interdependence, by creating the possibility for greater interconnectedness via the establishing of common identities, agendas, goals, methods, etc., has made it easier for extremist ideologies and organisations to spread, threatening the practice of human rights, e.g., extremist Islamist organizations like al Qaeda and ISIS as well as far-right extremist organizations like the Identitarian movement and QAnon have learned from one another and also frequently reference one another, demonstrating a high degree of interdependence.
- Greater interdependence may constrain states from speaking out against human rights violations that occur in or at the hands of states with which they are closely interconnected or allied, e.g., the USA and Saudi Arabia after Jamal Khashoggi's murder or the USA and Israel's treatment of the Palestinians in the West Bank and Gaza Strip.

Arguments against the claim that the practice of human rights has become increasingly difficult due to greater interdependence in global politics may include:

- Improvements in human rights are sometimes attributed to the spread of liberal democratic ideas, which is one of the key dimensions of greater interdependence and political globalization, e.g., some states and/or international governmental organizations like the European Court of Justice (ECJ) seek to promote international human rights by co-opting domestic political institutions shifting the domestic balance of power in favour of human rights protection.
- Many large trading countries reference human rights standards in their international economic agreements, e.g., the US, the EU, Brazil, and Canada all include provisions for human rights governance in many of their Preferential Trading Agreements.
- Greater interdependence means that sanctions and/or development assistance can be employed to promote human rights by linking respect for them to preferential economic relations, e.g., South Korea's 2021 reconsideration of new Official Development Assistance (ODA) projects in Myanmar can be seen as a response to growing human rights violations in the country.
- Greater interdependence in global politics has enhanced the ability of civil society to function across borders and promote human rights, e.g., international non-governmental organizations such as Human Rights Watch and Amnesty International are able to play a much greater role in highlighting human rights abuses around the world by naming and shaming states guilty of such violations.
- Greater interdependence in the form of universal jurisdiction has enhanced the practice of human rights in contemporary global politics, i.e., states or international organizations can claim criminal jurisdiction over a person accused of gross human rights violations (considered crimes against all) regardless of where the alleged crime was committed, and regardless of the accused's nationality, country of residence, or any other relation to the prosecuting entity.
- Greater interdependence in the context of dealing with existential issues such as climate change drives the creation of environmental treaties that can improve sustainability and protect the environment, which has been recognised as a human right by both the UN Human Rights Council in 2021 and the UN General Assembly in 2022, e.g., the Paris Agreement (2015).

Responses should contain references to specific contemporary real-world examples. Arguments in favour of the claim could note that greater interdependence in the form of increased migration flows has led to increases in human trafficking and widespread human rights violations. Furthermore, students might consider how the impact of the adverse consequences of greater interdependence, particularly in the form of globalization, on the enjoyment of human rights is multidimensional; all aspects of human existence be they political, economic, social or cultural, are affected. The negative impact on one dimension of human rights, e.g. economic rights, necessarily has a domino effect on other rights. Moreover, some students may point to the fact that the 'Chinese model' of development, which combines social control and economic liberalism, presents a form of interdependence that restricts the practice of human rights in many parts of the Global South. Arguments against the claim may reference how the answer to the question depends on which generation of human rights is under consideration. Finally, students may conclude that interdependence itself is largely asymmetrical and would be better characterized as dependence. This means that the question itself may be flawed as it is greater dependence, rather than interdependence, that poses the greater threat to the practice of human rights in contemporary global politics. This and any other valid approach or example should be evaluated positively.

Responses should include a conclusion on the degree to which the candidate agrees with the claim that the practice of human rights has become increasingly difficult due to greater interdependence in global politics.

4. "Without the protection and enforcement of human rights at different levels of analysis peace is impossible." Discuss this view.

Responses are likely to include a definition of human rights as basic claims and entitlements that, many argue, one should be able to exercise simply by virtue of being a human being, which are inalienable and essential for living a life of dignity. Students may refer to the 1948 Universal Declaration of Human Rights (UDHR) and/or other significant human rights laws and treaties to identify specific human rights. Further, students may identify different institutions responsible for the protection and enforcement of human rights at different levels of global politics, such as but not limited to: community courts (e.g., Gacaca courts in Rwanda), national courts and police; regional organizations such as the Inter-American Commission on Human Rights and; global bodies such as the International Court of Justice (ICJ) and the International Criminal Court (ICC). Students should also demonstrate a clear understanding of the key concept of peace, which can be defined in terms of the absence of conflict and direct violence (negative peace) as well as a state of harmonious relations (positive peace). Students may approach this question by demonstrating how the protection and enforcement of human rights at various/multiple levels of analysis is necessary if peace is to be attained.

Arguments in favour of the claim that without the protection and enforcement of human rights at different levels peace is impossible may include:

- Unless local and national police forces protect and enforce human rights, human rights violations in the form of direct violence are more likely to occur meaning that negative peace is impossible, e.g., while the prohibition of extrajudicial killings is central to human rights law, police forces in countries like Brazil, South Africa, India, and Iran have been accused of such actions.
- National courts in many states have become a major institutional force in the protection of international human rights law, particularly in the application of universal jurisdiction where those accused of gross human rights violations may be prosecuted in a national court regardless of where the alleged crime was committed, and regardless of the accused's nationality, country of residence, or any other relation to the prosecuting entity. Without such recourse to justice it is unlikely that positive peace would be possible.
- National, regional and international human rights institutions offer the possibility of restorative or retributive justice, which may be a key element in achieving positive peace, e.g., South Africa's post-apartheid Truth and Reconciliation Commission, the ICC's indictment of state leaders for gross human rights violations.
- Without the protection and enforcement of human rights at the local and national levels, human rights violations are likely to occur providing clear evidence of direct/cultural/structural violence and, therefore, the absence of negative and/or positive peace, e.g., the arrest and killing of Mahsa Amini at the hand of local Iranian authorities in 2022 for allegedly not wearing her hijab correctly and the national government's subsequent brutal crackdown of peaceful protestors and human rights defenders are clear evidence of both direct violence and the structural violence experienced by women as a result of systemic discrimination.
- Positive peace requires the absence of all forms of violence - direct, cultural, and structural - which can only occur if all generations of human rights are protected and enforced at every level of analysis. That is, unless first generation (civil and political rights), second generation (social, economic and cultural rights), and third generation (collective/solidarity rights) are not protected and enforced then it is highly likely that violence, in one or more forms, will exist and peace will not be possible.

Arguments against the claim that without the protection and enforcement of human rights at different levels peace is impossible may include:

- Attaining negative peace does not necessarily require that all, or even most, human rights need to be protected and/or enforced, e.g., Article 24 of the UDHR, the right to rest and leisure.
- The lack of judicial independence in many countries renders remote the prospect of impartiality and due process in the application of universal jurisdiction for gross human rights violations which may then threaten the achievement of positive peace within a country, e.g., the case of Hissene Habre who was indicted by a Senegalese court for several counts of alleged torture while he was ruler of Chad only for all charges to be dismissed following the election of a new Senegalese president.
- The application of universal jurisdiction may exacerbate interstate conflict if states use it as a means of gaining advantage over states with whom they are in conflict by prosecuting nationals of those opponent states for alleged human rights violations unrelated to the conflict between the two states, e.g., in 2000 the Arab League issued a statement indicating that Arab states would pursue those responsible for alleged crimes, under the Geneva Conventions, against Palestinians.
- The protection and enforcement of human rights is inherently politicized, especially at the international level, and accusations of bias may prevent the realisation of positive peace, e.g., Burundi and the Philippines have both withdrawn from the ICC after the court moved to launch investigations against their sitting leaders.
- In the absence of a global government there is no entity or actor that can effectively protect and enforce human rights at the global level and so peace in any form can never be guaranteed.

Students should include reference to specific examples to support their evaluation of the claim in the question. Arguments in favour of the claim might reference the UN's vision of positive peace being anchored in human rights - meaning the full spectrum of civil, cultural, economic, political and social rights. It may also be the case that students could argue that peace, especially positive peace, and the protection and enforcement of human rights are mutually constitutive, a point recognised by the UN Charter. Arguments against the claim could note that sovereignty, the organizing principle of global politics, means that efforts to protect and enforce human rights, especially at the international and global levels, may ultimately be futile in the face of state resistance. For example, the military junta in Myanmar simply ignored the 2019 ICJ case brought by Gambia for the former's alleged genocide of the Rohingya. In addition, students may assert that sometimes attempts to protect and enforce human rights require the use of direct violence (e.g., humanitarian interventions under the auspices of R2P), which, in turn, bring more violence and conflict. Furthermore, it may be argued that unless human rights are protected and enforced at *every* level of analysis, which is highly unlikely, peace can never fully be attained. It may even be argued that the attainment of positive peace is largely aspirational and so, even if all human rights were protected and enforced, that some conflict is inherent in human society; positive peace is, therefore, impossible regardless. Any other valid and relevant approaches and examples should be evaluated positively.

Responses should include a conclusion on the degree to which the candidate agrees with the claim that without the protection and enforcement of human rights at different levels of analysis peace is impossible.

Development

5. Discuss the view that institutional factors are essential to successful development.

Responses might seek to define institutional factors and what successful means in the context of development. Institutional factors are generally related to the UN, IMF, World Bank, World Trade Organization, partnerships between developing countries, efficacy of national and local institutions. Successful development is that which raises the level of well-being, standard of living and quality of life. While recognising that institutional factors are interconnected, responses might distinguish the importance of institutions at the international and the national level. International institutions which might be seen to promote development include the UN and the Bretton Woods institutions and trade blocs, while those at the national level might include those related to the legal and financial systems, and the legal basis of private property rights, governance, regulation and infrastructure. Students may approach this question by addressing how institutional factors are necessary if successful development is to be achieved.

Arguments in favour of the view that institutional factors are essential to successful development may include:

- International organisations foster a worldwide paradigm of development that evolves over time, and this makes it easy for new entrants to know what they have to do. For example, the Sustainable Development Goals fostered by the UNDP set the agenda for developing countries through targets. They also bring the weight of influence, status and support of the international community to newly developing countries.
- Before development occurs, trade may rely on kinship, ethnic ties, common language, religion, collective punishments and reputation to ensure that contracts and agreements are honoured. Once economic activity spreads more widely, institutions are essential to support development. These institutions can establish codes of conduct for contacts between people who do not know each other, standardise weights and measures, and enforcement through courts and policing. This form of protecting property rights implies an expanded role for the state, which is not sufficient but is essential to spur development. Vietnam is an example of a country where balanced and functional institutions have led to successful development.
- Institutions which foster an effective, clear regulatory environment can provide the stability in which growth and development can occur. This can promote competition and protect consumers, giving certainty to producers who can plan for the future. Within countries or trade blocs, examples may include accurate labelling of food products or enforced limits on environmental pollution within cities. Internationally, countries may collaboratively regulate airline safety, agree maritime codes such as lights and buoyage, embargo imports of endangered species, etc.
- Infrastructure, including transport, energy and communications, supports efficiency, productivity and reduces costs, which promotes development. Perhaps this is the most important stimulant of development and the institutions which run and regulate infrastructure are of vital significance and scale. For example. Indian Railways is state owned and the seventh biggest employer in the world. The government of India can subsidise it to influence labour mobility and thus development.
- Financial institutions are essential for development: the efficient allocation of resources depends on reliable banking institutions and financial markets to support investment and entrepreneurship. For example, a stable currency managed by a central bank and markets where investment can be raised will allow businesses to flourish. China is a good example: the three largest banks in the world by asset holdings are the Industrial and Commercial Bank of China, the China Construction Bank and the Agricultural Bank of China.
- Education and healthcare institutions are also vital for development. The institutions which support them include universities and colleges, hospitals and training institutions. Their purpose is to raise the level of skills and learning to match the progress of development. For example, India is rated as the fourth best country in the world in which to study medicine and this contributes strongly to its successful development.

Arguments against the view that institutional factors are essential to successful development may include:

- While institutional factors are important to development, there are many other equally important factors which are political, economic, social, and environmental in nature. Development can fail if any of them are deficient, regardless of the presence of institutional factors. Examples are climate vulnerability, debt, poverty, high population growth rates, ethnic and religious conflict and corruption.
- Institutions, far from being essential to successful development, can harm and prevent it. States which have the power to enforce property rights may overuse it to expropriate property or create monopolies which exclude efficient economic activity. Zimbabwe and Afghanistan are examples of counties where state or institutional interference with property rights has arguably hindered successful development.
- The establishment of reliable domestic institutions may be impossible and too expensive for developing countries, forcing them to rely on others and become indebted. For example, Sri Lanka's Hambantota Port Authority, a vital infrastructure institution, became so heavily indebted to China that it has taken the port over on a 99-year lease. Similar arrangements may occur in Zambia and Ghana, which are also heavily indebted to China as well as private lenders in the Global North.
- Lack of reliability of financial institutions can undermine confidence in business, capital markets and even personal finance at national and international level, inhibiting development even in developed countries. For example, in 2023 the Swiss government and market regulators forced the takeover of Credit Suisse by the investment bank UBS to prevent its collapse. Iceland's three main banks collapsed in the 2008 financial crisis. In developing countries, the 2008 crisis caused a collapse of foreign direct investment and remittances, rendering banking institutions very fragile and in need of support.
- Regulatory environments can be unenforceable or go wrong, eroding the success of development: self-interest can cause depletion of shared resources leading to the tragedy of the commons if regulation is ineffective. For example, illegal logging is widespread in Brazil, Indonesia, DRC, Ghana and Peru. In developed countries, water companies in the UK have evaded pollution regulations, finding it profitable to pay the fines and pollute rivers and the sea. Regulation can also be excessively bureaucratic, stifling activity. For example, opening a restaurant in Los Angeles means complying with the rules of a dozen government agencies

Responses should contain references to specific contemporary real-world examples. Arguments in favour of the claim might cite the example of a particular country and the extent to which its institutions have been essential to development. Poland and Chile are examples of countries with effective state institutions which have been essential for their successful development. Arguments against the claim might cite the example of an institution such as the IMF which claims to be the most helpful institution for helping developing countries yet has often been criticised for loan conditionality, for reflecting the interests and ideology of the West's financial community (Stiglitz) and for promoting free market reforms such as privatisation. They may identify countries such as Somalia and Haiti as examples of countries where institutions have proved too weak to be helpful in the quest for successful development. This and any other valid approach or example should be evaluated positively.

Responses should include a conclusion on the degree to which the candidate agrees with the view that institutional factors are essential to successful development.

6. Discuss the view that sustainable development depends mainly on the operation of state power.

Responses should include definitions of sustainable development and the operation of state power. Sustainable development could be defined as a specific form of development that incorporates environmental protection, social equity, inclusive and equitable progress, and no compromise in the needs of future generations to meet their own needs. The operation of state power might be defined as the capability of the state, through its legitimacy, institutions and access to resources, to achieve its goals such as development, security and human rights through law-making, taxation and enforcement. It might be expected that state power will be seen as important to sustainable development because only the state has the capacity and authority to shape the political, economic, social and environmental space in which sustainable development can occur.

Arguments in favour of the view that sustainable development depends mainly on the operation of state power may include:

- Sustainable development may require state power in order to adjust the legal framework, resources and institutions to make them more favourable to change. For example, World Bank research in Somalia and Chad has shown that building paved roads facilitates electricity supply and internet access, causing big shifts in employment from agriculture to manufacturing and services.
- If development is to be sustainable, the operation of state power may be the only way to provide regulations and enforcement to protect the environment from damage, for example through laws to protect natural resources and prevent harms such as pollution. For example, many states such as Portugal, Spain, Austria and Vietnam have banned the potentially carcinogenic herbicide glyphosate, while other states such as Denmark and UK are restricting the use of log burners to improve air quality especially in cities.
- Sustainable development may require costly infrastructure, and state power may be used to implement this by direct intervention or by international cooperation. For example, China's One Belt One Road scheme has fostered a thriving trade in food between itself and Kazakhstan improving diet and livelihoods for rural dwellers. In developed countries, state investment in public transport and urban design could reduce dependence on private cars and reduce air pollution. For example, in 2022 the EU announced €5.4 billion investment in sustainable transport infrastructure. Another example is state subsidy for renewables, for example the US has spent $45bn on renewable energy subsidies between 2021 and 2023
- Healthcare and education, which contribute directly to quality of life but may be unaffordable to many, may need to be provided directly by the state to turn the growth that comes from development into sustained higher living standards, e.g., universal public healthcare in Cuba.
- State power can be used to offer and regulate education in order to assist development and improve the productivity and earnings of the workforce. Education can also be used to convert development into sustainable development by promoting awareness of sustainable approaches to energy and food supply. For example, the Sustainable Development Goals have been incorporated into school syllabuses in many countries. Italy has included 33 hours a year of climate change and sustainability education from 2021 in all state schools.
- Several states have used their sovereign wealth funds to contribute to sustainable development. In 2021 alone $7.1bn was spent on water, renewables, etc. by such states as Norway and New Zealand, which have integrated climate-risk assessment into their investment processes.

Arguments against the view that sustainable development depends mainly on the operation of state power may include:

- Sustainable development does not just depend on state power but the support of a range of other stakeholders such as communities, consumers, firms, NGOs, and IGOs. For example, the World Wildlife Fund, an international NGO, is the world's largest conservation organisation with over 5 million supporters, active in over 100 countries. The UN and its affiliates are leaders in sustainable development among IGOs.
- The operation of state power through regulation may stifle free markets and entrepreneurship and thus be unsuccessful. Over-regulation and bureaucratic inefficiency may discourage business and slow down sustainable development. Regulation can add abatement costs to sustainable projects while bureaucratic inefficiency can slow down approval and implementation of such schemes. For example, multinational corporations may move their dirtiest processes to the least regulated states, for example paper production is increasingly focused in China, or away from states where bureaucracy slows decision making, such as the United States.
- Private sector engagement is also vital to sustainable development. Private companies may be lobbied by consumers or foster their own sense of corporate social responsibility to adopt environmental and clean technologies without state intervention. A recent example is Lego's adoption of plant-based rather than oil-based plastics.
- Sustainability often depends on the willingness of individuals to change their perceptions rather than the exercise of state power. Cultural and societal values also need to be supportive and these may depend on factors other than the operation of state power. Small changes in behaviour by individuals through, for example, recycling of plastic, glass and cardboard can make a large difference. For example, glass recycling in the EU has risen from 60% to 76% between 2005 and 2020 and has reached 94% in Sweden.
- Civil society participation through organisations such as NGOs and community groups can play a strong role in advocating for sustainable development and bringing about a more inclusive and democratic approach. By raising awareness and promoting environmental justice they can hold governments to account. Friends of the Earth is an example of such a group, operating in 73 countries.
- State power which is poorly operated may also lead to weakened property rights, political instability or corruption which will discourage foreign investment and inhibit business. An example is Afghanistan before 2017 which was attempting to follow the SDGs but its efforts were hampered by corruption.

Responses should contain references to specific contemporary real-world examples. Arguments in favor of the claim could provide an example of the positive influence of the operation of state power on sustainable development is Costa Rica, which now produces nearly all its electricity from renewables and which famously abolished defence expenditure in favour of spending on education and healthcare following World War 2. It also strives to protect its environment and wildlife. Additionally, Ethiopia has set an ambitious goal of becoming carbon neutral by 2025 particularly through investment in hydro electric energy while Mexico is promoting sustainable agriculture, conserving its biodiversity and adopting solar and wind generation. Arguments against the claim may state that non-state actors such as the private sector, international charities and civil society also promote sustainable development. For example, Lend with Care, Grameen and Kiva offer microfinance to support women in small businesses in South-East Asia and Bangladesh. Some responses may argue that sustainable development is more complex than a direct outcome of state power. State power can create a supportive legal and regulatory environment but sustainable development also requires civil society to support it through lifestyle choices while business and entrepreneurship can invest and innovate to uphold it. This and any other valid approach or example should be evaluated positively.

Responses should include a conclusion on the degree to which the candidate agrees with the view that sustainable development depends mainly on the operation of state power.

Peace and Conflict

7. "Structural violence is at the root of all conflict." Discuss this claim with reference to at least two conflicts you have studied.

Students should demonstrate an understanding of the key terms violence and conflict. Violence is often defined as physical or psychological force afflicted upon another being. In particular, students should focus on structural violence, understood as a form of violence in which a social structure perpetuates inequity, thus causing a disproportionately negative impact on particular groups and communities. Some examples of structural violence include institutionalized racism, sexism, and classism, among others. Conflict could be broadly defined as the dynamic process of actual or perceived opposition between individuals or groups. This could be opposition over positions, interests or values. Students might explicitly distinguish between non-violent and violent conflicts. Both violent and non-violent conflicts are equally valid as examples. While references to different manifestations of conflict could be mentioned (e.g., intrastate war; interstate war; terrorism; violent protest; strikes and demonstrations), responses should be focused on the causes of conflict connected with the chosen examples. Students might highlight the complexity involved in determining the underlying causes of a conflict.

Arguments in favour of the claim that structural violence is at the root of all conflict may include:

- Protest movements such as Black Life Matters are often motivated by economic inequalities perpetrated by the economic-financial system, which excludes the great majority of the population from accessing resources essential for improved living standards or well-being (e.g. Occupy movement; Gilets Jaunes).
- Demonstrations and protests by women often originate from discriminatory practices in states. For example, in countries such as Saudi Arabia, Afghanistan and Iran; but also in the US with the #MeToo movement and the Women's March of 2017.
- Many civil conflicts and intra-state wars revolve around the discrimination of entire groups of people and their exclusion from accessing certain resources and meeting their basic needs. An example of this is the forcible displacement of Palestinians in the context of the longstanding Israeli-Palestinian conflict.
- The injustice perpetrated by structural violence at the global level, thus the unequal distribution of power and resources between Global South and Global North, is a main cause of many conflicts in Global South countries (e.g. "economic colonialism" in DRC continues to fuel violent conflict).
- Many identity conflicts are caused by structural violence in the form of institutionalized racism (e.g. Australian indigenous people reclaiming sovereignty).

Arguments against the claim that structural violence is at the root of all conflict may include:

- Most inter-state conflicts are interest-based and, therefore, are independent of structural violence dynamics (e.g. US-China trade war). This includes territorial conflicts such as the South China Sea dispute, which are predominantly motivated by geopolitical considerations.
- Many intra-state conflicts are ideological conflicts that counterpose different values and ideas of society. Identarian movements or other extremist right-wing ideologies that drive conflict are fueled by those who historically have benefitted (and still benefit) from structural inequalities (e.g. Capitol Hill assault 2021).
- One of the most enduring causes of conflict is religion, which has produced opposition between groups that predate contemporary social structures and the structural violence they perpetrate (e.g. different manifestations of religious fundamentalism and Islamic terrorism such as Al-Qaeda and ISIS).
- The most potentially destructive conflicts are caused by states' decisions to increase military spending, which is rooted in military-strategic considerations regarding the balance of power and (nuclear) deterrence (e.g. Russia vs US nuclear deterrence; China and India arms race).
- One root of conflict might be the inability of a state to maintain internal sovereignty and its legitimacy. Failed states which have lost the monopoly on the use of legitimate violence provide the space for competing groups to engage in conflict (e.g. Pakistan).

Responses should contain references to specific contemporary real-world examples. As examples in favour of the view that structural violence is at the root of all conflict, students could cite cases of violent and non-violent conflicts that originate from poverty, racism, classism and other forms of discrimination that cause a disproportionately negative impact on particular groups and communities. For instance, the treatment of Indigenous groups in countries such as Australia and Brazil, or violent conflicts such as the Israeli-Palestinian conflict and the ongoing conflict in the DRC. As examples against the view, students could refer to cases where protests, civil conflicts and wars are caused by factors such as material or geopolitical interests, ideology or religion. For instance, the conflict in Ukraine and the New People's Army insurgency in the Philippines. Students might acknowledge that structural violence and direct violence are strongly interdependent. Further, they could highlight the difficulty of isolating separate and distinct causes of any conflict. This and any other valid approach or example should be evaluated positively.

Responses should include a conclusion on the degree to which the candidate agrees with the claim that structural violence is at the root of all conflict.

8. To what extent is the prospect of a lasting peace negatively affected by the evolving nature of state sovereignty?

Students should demonstrate an understanding of the key concepts of peace and sovereignty. They are likely to include a definition of the main concept of peace, both in its positive and negative conceptions. While positive peace is defined as the presence of attitudes, institutions and structures that create and sustain peaceful societies, negative peace is defined as simply the absence of war or of direct physical violence. Lasting peace tends to emphasise the importance of addressing the underlying causes of conflict and violence to eliminate recurring conflicts and build a foundation for a stable peace. State sovereignty could be described as the inherent supremacy of the state to control activities and actors within its borders (internal) and independence in international relations. Sovereignty characterizes a state's independence, its control over territory and its ability to govern itself. How states use their sovereign power is at the heart of many important issues in global politics. Responses should acknowledge that there is an ongoing debate regarding the evolving nature of state sovereignty, where traditional conceptions of absolute and Westphalian sovereignty are counterposed to more recent understanding of sovereignty as responsibility and pooled sovereignty.

Arguments in favour of the view that the prospect of a lasting peace is negatively affected by the evolving nature of state sovereignty may include:

- The progressive erosion of state sovereignty caused by the process of globalization jeopardises the ability of states to create and sustain peaceful societies. Indeed, globalization erodes states sovereignty by pushing states to reduce the barriers to entry of local economies through the adoption of international standards and norms. States have also given up sovereignty in efforts to garner foreign investment through 'race to the bottom' reductions in regulations and taxation. This is particularly true for fragile or "weak" states (e.g. Honduras; Guatemala), but it also applied to more consolidated or "stronger" states (e.g. US).
- States weakened in their sovereign powers are likely to adopt a conflictual posture towards international organizations and neglect multilateralism and cooperation, thus negatively affecting the likelihood of a lasting peace (e.g. US withdrawal from the Paris Agreement in 2017).
- In an increasingly interdependent world where states have lost part of their sovereignty and where important decisions that directly affect them are taken "elsewhere", the rise of nationalist and nativist parties in many countries leads to increased levels of domestic conflict, undermining the prospect of a lasting peace (e.g. Brazil during the presidency of Bolsonaro, which culminated with the assault to Brasilia in January 2023).
- The evolution from absolute and exclusive sovereignty to the conception of "sovereignty as responsibility" has brought new life to military interventions under the guise of humanitarian interventions and the Responsibility to Protect (e.g. Libya 2011).
- As a reaction to the apparent erosion of state sovereignty caused by globalization, in the past decade we have witnessed to the reassertion of traditional, or Westphalian, state sovereignty. This has jeopardized the prospect of a lasting peace, causing international tensions and crisis (e.g. tensions over migrants and border control among EU member states).

Arguments against the view that the prospect of a lasting peace is negatively affected by the evolving nature of state sovereignty may include:

- The evolving nature of state sovereignty towards the sharing of decision-making powers between states (i.e. pooled sovereignty and supranationalism) promotes international cooperation and prevents the emergence of violent conflicts (e.g. European Union).
- The evolution from a Westphalian model of state sovereignty to an understanding of "sovereignty as responsibility" contributes to strengthening the prospect of a lasting peace because it sets a limit to sovereign prerogatives (i.e. gross violations of human rights), introducing some degree of accountability for rulers and assigning to the international community a responsibility to protect the victims (e.g. the deterrent effects of the ICC jurisdiction in countries such as Uganda, Kenya, and Côte d'Ivoire).
- There has not been significant evolution in the nature of state sovereignty. The Westphalian conception of state sovereignty is still dominant, which ensures states' exclusive sovereignty over their territory and their ability to maintain internal peace and security (e.g. Switzerland; Norway).
- State sovereignty is increasingly based on external recognition by other states and the international community. This creates an incentive for states to exercise their sovereign power in accordance with international standards and norms, thus contributing to the prospect of a lasting peace (e.g. the role of INGOs such as Amnesty International and Human Rights Watch).
- Many European Union member states, which have undergone the most significant evolution in the nature of their sovereignty by pooling their sovereignty in governing their currencies, trade policies, and many social welfare policies, are heavily committed to promote lasting peace. Indeed, the EU is the world's biggest donor of development assistance. It has financed more than 1,000 crisis response and conflict prevention projects carried out worldwide over the past 10 years.

Responses should contain references to specific contemporary real-world examples. As examples in favour of the view that the prospect of a lasting peace is negatively affected by the evolving nature of state sovereignty, students could discuss examples of governments trying to reassert sovereign powers with a conflictual posture (e.g. US with Trump; Brazil with Bolosnaro) or cite cases of military interventions justified on humanitarian grounds that ended up producing more violence and conflict (e.g. Libya 2011; Kosovo). As examples against the view, students could refer to cases where the limits imposed over states' absolute sovereignty create the conditions for increased cooperation and lasting peace (e.g. the process of European integration; ICC jurisdiction in countries such as Uganda, Kenya, and Côte d'Ivoire). Students should acknowledge that the concept of sovereignty has never been a fixed or uncontested concept in global politics, and the nature of its evolution is contested. They might suggest that the evolution in the nature of state sovereignty has not been an even process in terms of its effects on the likelihood of a lasting peace. Finally, students might also suggest that the nature of state sovereignty has not changed much over time. This and any other valid approach or example should be evaluated positively.

Responses should include a conclusion on the degree to which the candidate agrees with the view that the prospect of a lasting peace is negatively affected by the evolving nature of state sovereignty.