Markscheme

May 2022

Global politics

Higher level and standard level

Paper 2

19 pages

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

Markbands for paper two

Marks	Level descriptor
0	• The work does not reach a standard described by the descriptors below.
1–5	• The response reveals limited understanding of the demands of the question. • The response is poorly structured, or where there is a recognizable essay structure there is minimal focus on the task. • There is little relevant knowledge, and examples are either lacking or not relevant. • The response is mostly descriptive.
6–10	• The response indicates some understanding of the demands of the question. • There is some evidence of an attempt to structure the response. • Some relevant knowledge is present, and some examples are mentioned but they are not developed or their relevance to arguments is not clear. • The response demonstrates limited understanding of the key concepts of the course. • There is limited justification of main points. • Counterclaims, or different views on the question are not considered.
11–15	• The demands of the question are understood and mostly addressed but the implications are not considered. • There is a clear attempt to structure the response. • The response is mostly based on relevant and accurate knowledge of global politics, and relevant examples are given and support arguments. • The response demonstrates some understanding of the key concepts of the course. • Many of the main points are justified and arguments are largely coherent. • Some counterclaims, or different views on the question are considered.
16–20	• The demands of the questions are understood and addressed, and most implications are considered. • The response is well-structured. • The response demonstrates relevant and accurate knowledge and understanding of global politics, and relevant examples are used in a way that strengthens arguments. • The response demonstrates a good grasp of the key concepts of the course. • All or nearly all of the main points are justified and arguments are coherent. • Counterclaims, or different views on the question are explored.
21–25	• A very well structured and balanced response that addresses the demands and implications of the question. • Comprehensive knowledge and in-depth understanding of global politics is applied in the response consistently and effectively, with examples integrated. • The response demonstrates a very good grasp of the key concepts of the course. • All of the main points are justified. Arguments are clear, coherent and compelling. • Counterclaims, or different views on the question are explored and evaluated.

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

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

Power, sovereignty and international relations

1. **Discuss the claim that state sovereignty is an outdated concept in a globalized world.**

   Responses are likely to include a definition and discourse on the concept of state sovereignty. Candidates may then move on to explain the concept of globalization, what it involves and its different facets. State sovereignty could be described as the inherent supremacy of the state within its borders (internal), independence in international relations and the recognition that all states possess this power equally. Candidates could also discuss the Westphalian notion of state sovereignty. They should also explain the concept of globalization – the growing interdependence between the world's societies, economies, cultures, politics due to the increase in information flow and exchange, cross-border trade and investment and people. They may then proceed to discuss whether state sovereignty is an outdated concept in a globalized world.

   Arguments in favour of the claim that state sovereignty is an outdated concept in a globalized world may include:
   - State sovereignty is challenged by increasing interconnectedness and interdependence and individual states have less control over traditionally domestic matters, e.g., macroeconomic management.
   - In a globalized world, cross-border and transnational issues such as pollution, pandemics, war on terror, require coordinated and cooperative action across borders, which may directly and indirectly place limitations on state sovereignty.
   - An increase in cross-border economic activities through trade and investments means states are not entirely self-sufficient in terms of important services and supplies, e.g., the negative impact of the lack of supply of semi-conductors in many industries during the Covid-19 pandemic.
   - Intergovernmental organizations (IGOs) associated with globalization, erode state sovereignty as states are expected to give away part of their sovereignty to become members, e.g., the EU and immigration.
   - International organizations such as the UN have passed resolutions such as the Responsibility to Protect (R2P) which does not view it as a right to intervene but more a responsibility to protect. States which are known to have abused human rights are now open to humanitarian intervention in a globalized world – making state sovereignty 'conditional' to their ability to govern effectively and ensure that their citizens are taken care of.
   - The spread of information through social media and internet blurs sovereign boundaries and states often must bear the fallout of developments in other states, e.g., the Arab Spring.

Arguments against the claim that state sovereignty is an outdated concept in a globalized world may include:

- State sovereignty is not an outdated concept because it is only the nature of sovereignty that has changed. In other words, it is a fluid and dynamic concept, which could even be disaggregated, i.e., some states have bargained one form of sovereignty for another (e.g., Special Economic Zones in many LEDCs.
- States are still key actors and decision makers in the domestic and international arena, and therefore the view that globalization has rendered the sovereign state powerless is not true.
- Sovereignty is fungible in nature and does not get eroded when states work together in a globalized world. This is also an exercise of state sovereignty – often termed as pooled sovereignty, e.g., the EU.
- There are some functions of the sovereign state on the domestic front, which cannot be undertaken by any other actor such as maintenance of peace and security within their boundaries, e.g., policy formulation and implementation.
- The state maintains its sovereign right to decide the extent to which it will integrate in terms of globalizing through multilateral arrangements or membership of intergovernmental organizations.
- There are no successful alternatives to sovereignty or statehood. Most groups aspire to be recognized as sovereign states, even terror groups such as the ISIS.
- The protection offered by sovereign states is needed more than ever in a world of increasing risk and terror - hence bolstering the institution (national security).

Responses should make some reference to specific examples of how state sovereignty is an outdated concept in a globalized world. Arguments in favour could use examples such how the spread of pandemics and diseases travel across national boundaries and has to be solved by cooperation between states. They could use the example of the spread of coronavirus and how it is impacting the economy not just in China but across the world. Also, candidates could give examples of situations where state sovereignty does not get eroded in a globalized world and states choose their perceived national interest over being part of globalization. For instance, they could cite the example of how countries such as the US, Somalia and South Sudan have not ratified the Convention on the Rights of the Child (which establishes standards for the protection and development of all children without any kind of discrimination), while 194 countries have chosen to do so. Furthermore, the decision taken by the UK to leave the European Union (Brexit) is reflective of a choice favoring state sovereignty over globalization and membership of an IGO, the EU.

Responses should include a conclusion on the degree to which they think state sovereignty is an outdated concept in a globalized world.

2.   **Examine the influence of terrorism on a state's ability to pursue development.**

Responses are likely to include an explanation of the concept of terrorism as the unlawful use of violence and intimidation, often by non-state actors and especially against civilians, in the pursuit of political aims. Candidates may then move on to explain the concept of development. Candidates should explain what they mean by the term development and its different facets – economic, social, political – acknowledging that it is a contested concept. They could also discuss human and sustainable development. Candidates could then go on to examine the impact of terrorism on a state's ability to pursue development. Influence could be conceptualised in more than one way, e.g., material, ideational, normative, etc.

Arguments in favour of the claim that terrorism negatively impacts a state's ability to pursue development may include:
- There is a close link between peace and development. Terrorism and the associated violence undermine many of the institutions which drive economic growth and/or development.
- States where terrorism is widespread are more likely to lose out on foreign direct investment due to reluctance of other countries to invest, which in turn impacts economic development. This is particularly true in cases where terror attacks are transnational and have led to widespread damage to life and property. Terrorism also raises the costs of trade with terror-affected countries, e.g., Syria and Libya.
- States facing terrorism may ultimately see an outflow of skilled labour and this will impact development. Also, there could be increases in market uncertainty and impact on sectors such as tourism and transport.
- Terror strikes could not just lead to loss of life and displacement of people but also cause lasting damage to property and infrastructure which is a strain on social and economic as well as human development, such as that seen in the case of Nigeria where terrorism negatively impacted the education of girls. Terrorism could also lead to social unrest and unemployment, impacting social development.
- The spread of terrorism could hamper sustainable development, for instance, in cases where terror groups take control over resources and exploit them for funding their activities. They could also resort to destruction of resources such as by burning oil fields, e.g., ISIS taking over oil fields in Egypt and Syria.
- Countries that are unable to handle terror groups face the risk of punitive action from other states including the loss of funding for projects, political isolation and alienation.
- States facing terrorism-related issues will have to divert resources from developmental projects and activities towards counter-terrorism efforts. For instance, the US diverted resources meant for other purposes towards funding the 'war on terror' following the 9/11 attacks.

Arguments against the claim that terrorism does not negatively impact a state's ability to pursue development may include:

- States with strong institutions and governments can effectively manage and/or eliminate terror groups. The power and capability of the state to govern well is a significant factor in ensuring that terrorism does not impact its ability to pursue economic development, e.g., Germany's management of neo-Nazi and far-right militia groups.
- Countries are fighting terrorism effectively at the national and international levels because their economies and development are interconnected in a globalized world. That makes it easier for them coordinate their response to terror groups.
- Some terror activities may not have any profound economic impact. They could be localized or geographically concentrated in a small area, thereby not impacting the bigger economic picture or development at large. Besides, some terrorist group activities might not be intense or persistent, making them ineffective from the perspective of national development
- The cost of managing terrorism is one of the variables factored in by states and does not necessarily impact their economic development, e.g., the US factored in funding for the Department of Homeland Security.
- The impact of terror groups in terms of sustainable development is perhaps a small part of the issue. Sustainable development has to be a part of the policy of every state in order to be effective. Besides, if states are capable of managing terror groups, they could prevent any damage to resources and the environment.
- If the citizens of a state are doing well in terms of different parameters of measuring human development such as good life expectancy, education and a decent standard of living, they are more likely to be less attracted to or affected by terrorism, which cannot make inroads into the society or state. i.e., there is a positive feedback loop between increased development and low levels of terror-related activities.
- Terrorism can act as an agent of change (in government/regime) and lay the grounds for greater development by bringing about a change in system(s) or policies.

Responses should make some reference to specific examples of how terrorism has had an impact on a state's ability to pursue development. Candidates could use examples of terrorist groups and their activities in different parts of the world and its impact on a state's ability to pursue economic development. For instance, they could cite the example of the terror attack on Saudi oil refineries by Yemen's Houthi rebels in 2019, which led to their closure and impact on production. Similarly, they could also talk about the long-term impact of terror activities on the social, political, and economic development of Afghanistan. Candidates could discuss how terrorism could possibly affect different sectors such as tourism, travel, and finance. Examples of terror groups which have not really made an impact on a state's ability to pursue development at the national level could be southern provinces of Pattani in Thailand and Mindanao in the Philippines. Finally, candidates may point to instances of state terrorism where a state conducts acts of terrorism against another state or against its own citizens, e.g., Sri Lanka's targeting of alleged LTTE sympathizers and Tamil civilians in the early 21st century or Myanmar's actions against anti-coup protesters in 2021.

Responses should include a conclusion on the degree to which they agree with the claim that terrorism impacts the ability of a state to pursue development.

Human rights

3.   **"The evolution of human rights since 1948 has undermined the effectiveness of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights." To what extent do you agree with this claim?**

Responses are likely to include a definition of human rights as basic claims and entitlements that, many argue, one should be able to exercise simply by virtue of being a human being. Candidates may also identify some of the specific fundamental human rights principles contained within the Universal Declaration of Human Rights (UDHR) of 1948 in order to provide some reference points for analysing how the effectiveness of the UDHR may have been undermined, e.g., the right to life, liberty and the security of the person (Art. 3), freedom from torture (Art. 5), equality before the law / freedom from discrimination (Art. 7), freedom of opinion and expression (Art. 19), etc. Candidates may then go on to discuss the evolution or changes in human rights, with the development of new statutes, the tailoring of rights declarations to regional sensibilities or the development of a third generation of rights.

Arguments in favour of the claim that the evolution of human rights since 1948 has undermined the effectiveness of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights may include:
- The sheer quantity and variety of rights has diluted the effectiveness of many fundamental human rights principles contained within the UDHR, e.g., calls to make everything from access to the internet to free employment counseling a human right have cheapened the meaning of many of the rights expressed in the UDHR.
- Human rights advocates have broadened the scope of issues covered by the UDHR while narrowing the room for differences in bringing those rights to life, aggravating suspicion of human rights in today's multipolar world, e.g., attempts by Western countries to promote gay rights in Africa triggered deep-rooted resentment about how the West treats Africa; the results are tougher laws in places like Uganda.
- The number of rights, and rights claims, has risen steeply as various well-meaning special interest groups have sought to harness the moral authority of the human rights idea to their causes, thereby diluting the significance of the UDHR. For example, in Europe advocates for abolishing circumcision have argued that a child's bodily integrity is a human right while attempting to reduce religious freedom to a mere right to worship, which devout Jews and Muslims see as a direct attack on a ritual integral to their faith (contrary to Art. 18 of the UDHR).
- The mindset and actions of many contemporary human rights actors makes it extremely difficult to realize the aim of the UDHR's framers to promote the implementation of fundamental human rights principles under a variety of circumstances and cultures, reducing both the effectiveness and universal appeal of the UHDR's principles. In Kenya, for example, international attempts to prosecute Uhuru Kenyatta for fueling ethnic violence after the 2007 election ignored how this would boost his popularity among his supporters—helping him to eventual victory in the 2013 elections.
- Whereas many emerging states once accepted many of the fundamental principles contained within the UDHR out of deference to Western accomplishment or power, today they push back when Western-funded organizations reference such human rights to promote ideas that are not widely shared.
- The concept of cultural relativism has led to the development of regional and/or national sets of human rights protocols/norms, which may be seen to diminish the importance of the UDHR. For example, unlike many wealthy Western states China openly advertises that its trade agreements and development lending are not conditional on rights observance and has opposed UN actions based on human rights.

Arguments against the claim that the evolution of human rights since 1948 has undermined the effectiveness of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights may include:

- The UDHR sees a handful of fundamental rights drafted in such a way as to leave little room for flexibility in their implementation, e.g., protections for religion and conscience, as well as prohibitions against genocide; slavery; torture; and discrimination. Today, many human rights treaties make these rights non-derogable - i.e., there are no circumstances under which they can be lifted or suspended.
- Where other rights are concerned, the framers of the Universal Declaration were clear that universality would not mean homogeneity in implementation. For example, individuals everywhere have the right to be free of torture, but different countries may legitimately come to different conclusions about when private property may be taken for public use; such relatively minor differences do not undermine the effectiveness of the UDHR
- Contemporary human rights declarations continue to include all the fundamental human rights first highlighted in the UDHR, e.g., the 2012 Human Rights Declaration by the Association of Southeast Asian Nations (ASEAN) included all the civil and political rights that similar documents elsewhere have.
- It is not the expansion of human rights but the lack of flexibility in their implementation that has reduced the effectiveness of the UDHR.
- Ultimately, establishing a culture of human rights such as the one envisaged by the UDHR can only be built from the bottom up. Focusing on the gravest violations of human dignity while understanding that other rights can be protected in a legitimate variety of ways is the best way to achieve this, e.g., many of the human rights contained within the UDHR feature prominently in national constitutions (South Africa, Argentina) along with the protection of other rights.

Responses should contain references to specific examples. Arguments in favour of the claim could reference how U.S. retrenchment in the Middle East and the rise of authoritarian states like China have reduced the effective reach of some of the fundamental human rights principles contained within the UDHR by stretching resources too thinly and/or highlighting how these principles are not credibly universal. Arguments against the claim might note how the introduction of regional flavor into contemporary human rights declarations provides the UDHR with greater legitimacy, improving the chance that many of its fundamental principles will be embraced locally. For example, ASEAN's 2012 declaration builds upon much that appears in the UHDR and includes innovative provisions related to human trafficking, vulnerable groups, etc. Finally, candidates may argue that it is some other factor(s), other than the evolution of human rights, that has reduced the effectiveness of the UDHR. This and any other valid approach should be evaluated positively.

Responses should include a conclusion on the degree to which the candidate agrees with the claim that the evolution of human rights since 1948 has undermined the effectiveness of the UDHR.

4.   Discuss whether environmental factors pose the greatest threat to human rights at both the national and international levels.

Responses are likely to include a definition of human rights as basic claims and entitlements that, many argue, one should be able to exercise simply by virtue of being a human being, which are inalienable and essential for living a life of dignity. Candidates are likely to identify environmental factors in terms of the consequences of climate change on people and communities or other man-made effects on the environment although they may also refer to geography and resource endowment as well

Arguments in favour of the claim that environmental factors pose the greatest threat to human rights at both the national and international levels may include:
- The fulfillment of all fundamental human rights depends on access to a healthy environment. For example, a 2014 United Nations report confirmed that human-driven climate change directly and indirectly threatens the full and effective enjoyment of a range of human rights by people at both the national and international levels, including the fundamental rights to life, water and sanitation, food, health, housing, self-determination, culture, and development.
- Environmental factors such as climate change have increased average temperatures affecting the rights to life and health as well as other human rights at both the national and international levels, e.g., according to the World Bank, at 2°C of warming, 100-400 million more people living in poverty could be at risk of hunger and 1-2 billion more may no longer have adequate water.
- Environmental factors may lead to greater uncertainty and insecurity and combined with large-scale movements of people both internally and across borders, these will pose immense and unprecedented challenges to governance and likely stimulate nationalist, xenophobic, racist, and other responses that threaten human rights, e.g., the rise of anti-immigrant movements in Europe since the migrant crisis of 2015.
- Many states enacting policies that will exacerbate the effects of environmental factors such as climate change do so in ways that threaten human rights at the national and international levels, e.g., in Brazil, president Bolsonaro promised to open the Amazon rainforest for mining and to end demarcation of indigenous lands.
- Environmental factors exacerbate inequality at both the national and international levels, i.e., the richest will be the best placed to cope with a worsening environment, while the poorest, who have contributed the least to environmental degradation and have the least capacity to react, will be the most harmed, e.g., many coastal states in the Global South.
- Climate change threatens the very existence of some small island states, e.g., Kiribati and the Maldives. If the residents of such states are forced to evacuate and find other homes, the effects on their human rights, including their rights to self-determination and to development, will be devastating.
- Environmental factors may be considered as or give rise to a national emergency, which in turn may justify limitations on human rights as governments respond by augmenting their powers, e.g., human encroachment on the environment has led to disease outbreaks such as Ebola or Coronavirus, which, in turn, has provided countries with an opportunity to broaden state surveillance, impose quarantines, and infringe upon freedoms of assembly and expression.

Arguments against the claim that environmental factors pose the greatest threat to human rights at both the national and international levels may include:

- Other factors, such as political, economic, social and/or institutional factors may pose a greater threat to human rights at the national and international levels, e.g., ideological conflict, competition for scarce resources or conflict based on a clash of cultures/values may pose a greater threat to human rights than environmental factors, if only in the short-term.
- It is difficult to qualify and/or quantify the effects of climate change as human rights violations at either level in a strict legal sense, e.g., in 2009 the Office of the High Commissioner for Human Rights stated that it would be virtually impossible to disentangle the complex causal relationships linking emissions from a particular country to a specific effect.
- There has been a concerted effort at the international level to meet the challenges posed by climate change and mitigate at least some of its more egregious effects on fundamental human rights, e.g., the adoption of the Paris Agreement in December 2015.
- The required changes to societies and economies because of changing environmental conditions could be an opportunity to improve poor people's lives, e.g., A 2019 UN special rapporteur's report notes that environmental crises could be a catalyst for states to fulfil long ignored fundamental human rights, including rights to social security and access to food, healthcare, shelter, and decent work.
- Litigation at the national level, including legal cases against states and fossil fuel companies in the Netherlands, the Philippines, and the USA, as well as increased activism at both the national and international levels – e.g., worldwide school strikes and Extinction Rebellion – have compelled governments to pay more attention to fulfilling their human rights' obligations by taking steps to provide present and future generations access to a healthy environment.

Candidates should include reference to specific examples to support their evaluation of the claim in the question. For example, the UN estimates that by 2050 climate change could displace 140 million people in Sub-Saharan Africa, South Asia, and Latin America alone. Projections of future impacts of climate change, mostly expecting 2°C scenarios, forecast slower economic growth and poverty reduction as well as further erosions in food security, all of which will trigger new poverty traps as well as increased conflict such as we see in the Lake Chad region. Some candidates may argue that environmental factors pose the greatest threat at the national *or* international level but *not* at both levels to the same degree; this and any other valid and relevant approaches and examples should be evaluated positively.

Responses should include a conclusion on the degree to which the candidate agrees with the claim that environmental factors pose the greatest threat to human rights at both the national and international levels.

Development

5. **Discuss the view that development always results in inequalities.**

Responses should include definitions of development and inequality. Inequality can be seen in an economic, political or social sense. Economic inequalities might be conceptualised in terms of either income and/or wealth. Political inequalities might include political access and power. Social inequalities might include issues of class, race, and gender. The question suggests an inevitability about the relationship between development and inequality, which a candidate may note. Development is a long-term process that is multidimensional and which may affect inequalities differently at different stages. Candidates may discuss the contested meanings of development, and how the type of development impacts inequality negatively or positively.

Arguments that support the view that development always results in inequalities may include:
- Economic inequality can be shown to have increased in the most populous countries in terms of a worsening Gini index since 1990 as the pace of development has increased, e.g., China, India.
- Development may cause the emergence or solidification of political elites who use their position to accumulate disproportionate amounts of power engendering or exacerbating inequalities.
- Social disparities may be increased through the process of development e.g. indigenous peoples with weak title to land (the Dakota Access Pipeline in the US).
- The dominance of free market principles has increased inequality in late-stage development, e.g. China, Chile.
- Development can reinforce traditional ruling elites who are in the best position to take advantage of the new opportunities which come with development, i.e., such elites may be in better position to reap the majority of benefits that accrue from industrialisation and/or trade liberalisation.
- The share of income earned by the top few percent has tended to increase with development this century in most countries allowing its beneficiaries to store income in the form of wealth, which further increases inequality, e.g., a handful of traditionally powerful families in the Philippines has used their wealth to shore up political power and control of key industries.
- Development has tended to lead to environmental degradation, worsening social and environmental equality for the poor and vulnerable. For example, higher income groups can escape air pollution. Climate change also disproportionally affects the poor and vulnerable who are left behind.

Arguments against the view that development always results in inequalities may include:
- Development has been accompanied by significant (though incomplete) movement towards equality in economic terms, e.g., minimum wages, state provision of merit goods such as education and healthcare, welfare payments. This has at least reduced absolute poverty if not relative poverty.
- Inequalities exist in all societies, including those which have not experienced development, so it is wrong to see development as always resulting in inequality.
- Development has been accompanied by significant (though incomplete) movement towards equality in political terms, e.g., expanded franchise, democratisation.
- Development has tended to promote social equality, e.g., gender equality, human rights, empowerment of minorities. In a similar sense, Fareed Zakaria has argued that it is only once a state has reached a certain level of income that democracy 'sticks' and there is the likelihood of greater social equality.
- It all depends on the level of analysis. At the national level economic inequality may have increased within countries in terms of wealth and income, but at the global level inequality has reduced as developed countries have grown more slowly than developing countries in the last 20 years.

- It all depends on the stage of development: Simon Kuznets argued that inequality increases in the early stages of development through industrialisation but decreases in the later stages as the welfare state takes over.
- The links between reduced inequalities and sustainable development are highlighted in Goal 10 of the SDGs. In addition, some IGO's such as the European Union have formulated proposals to reduce inequality in terms of age, gender, disability, race, ethnicity, origin, religion, etc.

Responses should contain references to specific examples to support their evaluation of the claim in the question. Candidates could, for example, refer to means of measuring economic inequality such as the Gini coefficient, where a low score close to zero means greater equality and a high score close to 1 means greater inequality. A possible conclusion is that inequality is not an inevitable result of development, but much depends on individual countries' politics and policies as well as the model of development adopted. Examples could be given of developed countries which have high levels of equality such as Norway and Finland and developed countries with relatively low levels of equality such as Hong Kong and South Africa.

Responses should include a conclusion on the degree to which the candidate agrees with the claim that development always results in inequalities.

6.   **Evaluate the view that development does more to damage than to enhance human rights.**

Responses should include definitions or discussion of development and human rights. 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. The concept of development is multifaceted and contested, and some aspects of development may harm human rights while other actively promote them. Those most likely to see their human rights be adversely affected by the consequences of development include migrant workers, minorities, indigenous peoples, women and children, hence the long list of international human rights instruments to protect them.

Arguments that support the view that development does more to damage than to enhance human rights may include:
- Because development disrupts existing traditional relationships and methods of production, opportunities arise for one section of society to exploit another and for there to be a loss of rights in social, economic and political terms, e.g., trade liberalization often disproportionately benefits the better educated and/or residents of national trading hubs.
- The disruption (e.g., migration from countryside to towns) caused by development may bring about changes beyond the view and awareness of national and international organisations, making the persistence of human rights abuses possible, and the protection of exploited or vulnerable groups difficult.
- Development causes environmental disasters which damage the rights of those affected who bear the costs, e.g., the Mariana Dam in Brazil and the Narmada Dam in India.
- Development leads indirectly to climate change which undermines the fundamental rights to life, water and sanitation, food, health, housing, self-determination, culture, and development, e.g., on-going drought conditions in Sudan.
- Development theories sometimes incorporate ideas of a leading or modern sector which accumulates power and resources leading to relative impoverishment of the traditional sector and the undermining of human rights, e.g., Rio de Janeiro's favelas.
- Early-stage development often focuses on labour-intensive manufacturing. Labour exploitation which infringes upon core human rights can be revealed by tragedies such as the Rana Plaza garment factory collapse near Dhaka in 2013 which killed over 1100 and injured around 2,500 mainly women workers.

Arguments against the view that development does more to damage than to enhance human rights may include:
- Human rights and development have the same aim: to promote well-being and freedom, based on the inherent dignity and equality of all people.
- At a certain point of development, human rights become a social imperative, e.g. the UN adopted the group Right to Development for peoples in 1986, reaffirmed by the 1993 Vienna Declaration and Programme of action. As such, it is a responsibility of all countries to ensure that human rights are enhanced as development proceeds.
- Development brings improved national legal and judicial systems which can protect, enhance, and enforce all human rights.
- Developed countries can support human rights internationally, e.g., through the UN's Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples (2007) and many other UN rights declarations linked to Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs).
- For the future, more than 90% of the SDGs are linked to international human rights and labour standards so that development will therefore incorporate human rights.
- Development has enhanced connectedness, though the Internet and social media, so that violations of liberty, freedom and human rights become apparent quickly and international organisations and NGOs can monitor and publicise them.

Responses should contain references to specific examples to support their evaluation of the claim in the question. Candidates could, for example refer to the development-induced internal displacement of peoples such as the Three Gorges Dams in China which is thought to have uprooted 1.4 million people. Alternatively, candidates could consider economic migrants who, being mainly young and of working age, leave their home countries' workforces impoverished, e.g., South and Central Americans migrating to the USA. Candidates might also mention environmental damage caused by mining and/or agribusinesses who destroy traditional land-based livelihoods, especially for women. However, candidates may note that development can engender better social networks, which publicise needed campaigns related to human rights such as the 'Me Too' movement, LBGTQI+ advocacy, etc. Development allows resources and support for national and international NGOs to support human rights campaigns and measurable outcomes such as gender participation rates for minorities in the workforce, education, etc. Finally, candidates might note that the answer to the question depends on the type of development as well as the specific human rights under consideration.

Responses should include a conclusion on the degree to which the candidate agrees with the claim that development does more to damage than to enhance human rights.

Peace and conflict

7. **Evaluate the claim that third-party involvement lengthens the duration of conflict within states.**

Responses should include a definition or demonstrate an understanding of third-party involvement and conflict. Third-party involvement could involve intervention that is, the use of an actor's resources to affect the course of a civil conflict (Regan 2000). The assumption exists that third-party involvement and intervention as a form of conflict management shortens the duration of conflict, particularly civil or intra-state conflict; however, empirical research demonstrates that overall, third-party involvement lengthens the duration of conflict in most settings. Candidates may discuss third-party involvement using various types of interventions, such as military intervention (such as UN peacekeepers or NATO involvement), or non-military involvement (including humanitarian aid or economic sanctions and through negotiations).

Arguments that support the claim that third-party involvement lengthens the duration of conflict within states may include:
*   Third-party involvement often produces opposing interventions, complicating resolution, and lengthening conflict. Besides, third party interventions add another actor that must agree with the settlement terms to end conflict, thereby delaying resolution.
*   Interventions (especially military) can be complicated by unforeseen domestic, regional, and international events that can weaken the intervention effort thereby lengthening the conflict. For instance, on the domestic front, changes in domestic politics of third-party states may interfere with commitments made by them, thereby altering the effect and/or effectiveness of the intervention, e.g., Saudi and UAE support for the Yemeni regime as well as Iranian support for the Houthis in the Yemeni civil war
*   Economic interventions can be politicized, providing political support for the targeted party, and strengthening their resolve.
*   Third parties may lack the commitment and incentives necessary to positively affect the duration of conflict when challenged by events such as terrorist attacks.
*   Third party involvement through ways such as peacekeeping could prove to be ineffective due to issues ranging from insufficient or multidimensional mandates to deal with the crisis or lack of resources and constrained budgets. This may even exacerbate the conflict.
*   Third party interventions through negotiations could give legitimacy to non-state actors by trying to involve them in discussions or offer them political responsibility and may prolong conflict.
*   Peace treaties negotiated by third parties may not take into account local conditions or address issues related to structural violence that may in turn reignite the conflict.

Arguments against the claim that third- party involvement lengthens the duration of conflict within states may include:
*   Intervention biased in favour of one party to conflict may strengthen that party effectively to speed resolution.
*   Third party involvement can increase the visibility of a conflict internationally and help apply pressure on opposing parties to reach a negotiated settlement.
*   The decline in conflict overall can be attributed to coordinated international efforts that mobilize peacekeepers, negotiators, and mediators in the face of conflict.
*   Third party intervention may strengthen the credible commitment of negotiating parties, facilitating an agreement.
*   Third parties may provide the forums necessary to bring conflicting parties to the negotiating table in environments where such forums are not readily available or legitimate.
*   Third party intervention and their ability to enforce peace treaties through peacemaking tribunals or monitoring elections can be very useful and effective in reducing the length of the conflict.

Responses should contain references to specific examples where third-party involvement has prolonged conflict such as in Syria where the presence of the UN Observer force since 1974 has not helped solve the Israeli-Syrian conflict, deescalate military activity and maintain a ceasefire. Similarly, US interventions in both Afghanistan and Iraq are stated to have prolonged conflict in these countries due to variables such as differences in perception over the strategy to manage conflict and their view of post-conflict Iraq, for instance. The Rwandan and Ugandan intervention in the Congo conflict (1996-2002) lengthened its duration until their concerns were taken care of. The case of intervention in South Sudan by the Intergovernmental Authority on Development (IGAD) faced issues emanating from internal politics of member countries, which has lengthened the duration of conflict. Besides, the international community was also not able to monitor the implementation of a peace agreement there. Finally, candidates may argue that the absence of a third-party involvement prolonged a conflict, e.g., the Rwandan genocide. On the other hand, there have also been success stories of how third-party interventions have been successful in ending conflict such as that of British intervention and help to the government of Sierra Leone as the UN peacekeeping mission that helped manage conflict there.

Responses should include the candidate's conclusion concerning the strength of the claim that third-party intervention lengthens the duration of conflict within a state.

8.   "**Lasting peace requires strong global governance." Discuss this view.**

Responses should demonstrate an understanding of lasting peace and global governance. Lasting peace emphasizes addressing the underlying causes of conflict and violence to eliminate recurring conflicts and build a foundation for a stable, global peace. Global governance refers to structures, institutions, and processes of administering and coordinating the global system through a process of consensus building. Institutions such as the UN and WTO, collective security institutions such as NATO, regional cooperating institutions such as the OAS and ASEAN, agendas and accords such as the Paris Agreement within the environmental and climate change agenda, and the Non-Proliferation Treaty of the nuclear nonproliferation regime all play an integral role in the process of global governance. Candidates may discuss negative and positive peace, structural violence, and what constitutes lasting peace. A firm connection should be made between the necessity for strong global governance and lasting peace.

Arguments that support the claim that lasting peace requires strong global governance may include:
- The global system is characterized by anarchy and conflict is a natural by-product of such a system in the absence of coordinated governance.
- Multilateralism promotes cooperation and creates channels for consensus building that helps limit the potential for conflict.
- Interdependence provides economic incentives to avoid conflict to facilitate gains realized (e.g., trade agreements).
- Repeated interactions facilitated by global governance structures aids airing differences and norm-building surrounding global issues thereby minimizing conflict and/or the potential for conflict.
- Environmental issues have the potential to lead to conflict due to variables such as competition for scarce resources. Cooperation over the environment which is a transnational issue can help build confidence. Besides, the expanded notion of security in today's world encompasses sustainable development of which environmental protection is an important factor. Global governance institutions and structures can play an important role in all these situations in a globalized world.
- There can be no lasting peace without development. All facets of development ranging from economic, social to human are intrinsically tied to lasting peace. A strong global governance structure can help facilitate and coordinate states to join hands and pursue all rounded development as well as help sort out differences that maybe acting as obstacles to cooperation.
- The deepening and expansion of economic enmeshment through greater cross-border trade and investment in a globalized world has created interdependence and trust between states and fostered lasting peace. Strong global governance is a significant prerequisite of this link as platforms of cooperation, navigating through problems and challenges.

Arguments against the claim that lasting peace requires strong global governance may include:
- Global governance tends to be created and orchestrated by Western states and therefore is inherently biased toward the interests of Western states. These institutions and structures may thus not be able to address issues that other states might face or understand their concerns possibly leading to friction and conflict. Culture is important for lasting peace because it forms the basis of respect and co-existence.
- Global governance entails a loss of sovereignty that may fuel nationalism and conflict thereby adversely affecting lasting peace.
- Given the weakness of international coordination on many issues, the marginalization of certain actors may fuel conflict given individual motivations (e.g., feeling disrespected).
- Global governance requires some cohesion of ideas and norms, fueling ideational motivations for conflict and limiting the potential for lasting peace.
- If states are strong and have a stable institutional and administrative structure as well as a robust economy, there will be lasting peace, considering that they are the primary stakeholders and actors in global politics. Sovereign states possess the power to choose to stay away from global governance institutions and processes, making them inconsequential in their scheme of things.
- Global governance institutions tend to be controlled by powerful global hegemons and states, that are also largely able to manipulate them and their processes to their advantage, often harming the interests of smaller and weaker states, which cannot ensure lasting peace.
- Lasting peace without any kind of structural violence is a utopian ideal, has never existed and is difficult to achieve. Thus, the existence of strong global governance is unlikely to contribute to such an ideal in any way.

Responses should contain references to specific examples. They could for instance refer to global governance institutions such as the United Nations and its successes in areas relating to human security including provision of food and clean water, conducting peacekeeping missions, addressing climate change, monitoring elections, and supporting governments and intervening in failed states where human rights have been violated. On the contrary, they could cite examples of how powerful states manipulate global governance to their advantage, which can never bring lasting peace in the world. The use of the veto by China and Russia on UN resolutions relating to Syria is such an example. Similarly, they could discuss how the US has withdrawn from global governance institutions such as the World Health organization and Trans Pacific Partnership at will citing their national interest as the reason. This US withdrawal has weakened leadership, global governance itself and also the ability of these structures and institutions to contribute to lasting peace. Besides, even Iceland - the most 'peaceful' country in the world in 2020 - faces challenges such as those in their healthcare system, environmental issues, making lasting peace a utopian ideal ultimately.

Responses should include the candidate's conclusion regarding whether lasting peace requires strong global governance.