Diploma Programme
Programme du diplôme
Programa del Diploma

Markscheme

May 2021

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 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. **"Non-state actors have a significant impact on the power of states." Evaluate this claim using two of the following types of non-state actors:**
   - **non-governmental organizations (NGOs);**
   - **multinational corporations (MNCs);**
   - **trade unions.**

Responses are likely to include a brief explanation of the concept of power. Power could be explained as the ability to make an actor do something or face consequences, or to achieve a desired outcome using different means through use of both coercive and co-optive mechanisms. Candidates might choose to differentiate between the types of power: hard, soft and smart. In the context of power of the state, this could mean both within and between states. Candidates could then proceed to discuss main features of the chosen actors and their impact on the power of the state. In studying these actors, they could examine where power lies in global politics, the legitimacy of these non-state actors, and the role they perform. They could demonstrate that these non-state actors can create issues, set agendas, create dependency and establish rules that could erode or buttress the power of a state in myriad ways. Some candidates may also discuss this question within the context of internal and external sovereignty.

Arguments in favour of the claim that NGOs, MNCs and Trade Unions have a significant impact on the power of the state could include:

NGOs:
- NGOs act as pressure groups and are able to influence and monitor governments on policy formulation and implementation.
- NGOs help spread awareness (data and inputs) amongst civil society and stakeholders on crucial matters related to their area of expertise, equipping them with knowledge. This could strengthen state power by providing necessary inputs to improve. It could also be the basis on which the state could be questioned and pressurized.
- NGOs are better connected to people and their problems at the grassroots levels than bureaucracies and governments at times, making them more influential and powerful than the state machinery.
- Many NGOs operate based off a set of universal principles set out by the international community, which might not be in line with state policy.

MNCs:
- *MNCs* have the capacity to make political interventions in states decision making and influence political, social and economic agendas thus diluting the power of states to take decisions.
- MNCs operate across states and are then able to exploit scarce resources, determine employment and therefore the level of development of the state. States must often fall in line with the demands of these MNCs even at the cost of their own welfare at times. MNCs may even threaten to withdraw from states which do not agree to their terms; MNCs could potentially impact a state's political and economic situation adversely if its own interests are not taken care of.

Trade Unions:
- Trade Unions can bring work to a standstill in order to push for their demands through collective bargaining. This in turn has an impact on the economy (or economic power) of a state, also pushing it to take certain decisions.
- Trade Unions have influence on the electoral base and can influence policy making decisions. They can act as pressure groups and influence public opinion which influences state power within its territory.

Arguments against the claim that NGOs, MNCs and Trade Unions have a significant impact on the power of the state could include:

NGOs:
- NGOs may have ideas and spread awareness, but do not have the formal powers possessed by states to put their ideas into practice, nor do they have the material resources to do so.
- NGOs depend on funding from independent sources, and that funding might not be regular or enough for them to survive or function effectively.
- NGOs are often alleged to be working under governmental influence or interests of donors. Besides, they will only be able to operate in states where governments or those in power permit them to function. In other words, they do not have the authority to operate without consent of the state involved.

MNCs:
- Despite the fact that MNCs may erode state power and are independent of them, states continue to be supreme and legitimate actors in global politics. States have supreme power and can block MNCs decisions and actions within their territory.
- States provide access to both resources and markets to MNCs. They also provide the institutional and infrastructural structures these MNCs require to carry out operations and production.
- States with their resources, institutions and legislation can manage the influence and power of the MNCs.
- MNCs could even strengthen the power of the state by bringing in employment, technology and income thereby bolstering the economic power of the state.

Trade Unions:
- The state has powers to curtail trade unions through passage of legislation or through using its power and resources and quelling or disabling the existence or curbing the power of these unions.
- The number of trade unions around the world itself has declined, making them a lesser force to reckon with.
- States could also possibly curb the resources of trade unions and limit their ability to exert pressure, ban strikes *etc.*

Responses should cite relevant examples to elaborate on their examples. For instance, responses should contain references to specific examples of how NGOs, MNCs and Trade Unions have enjoyed a significant impact on the power of a specific state. For instance, following Amnesty International's work on Syria, the US-led Coalition announced its re-evaluation of previously closed cases regarding accusations of civilian casualties in 2018. They initially denied and condemned our findings on the civilian casualties in Raqqa, before further new evidence from our investigations came to light. The Coalition admitted to 77 of the 79 cases documented by Amnesty and raised their civilian death figures in Raqqa by 300%. Similarly, in Cambodia, land and human rights activist, Tep Vanny and other human rights activists were released, receiving a royal pardon six months before the end of her sentence for peaceful protests after Amnesty's campaign. Responses could also mention examples of poor wages and resource exploitation by MNCs such as Reebok and Nike. Examples of how these non-state actors cannot impact the power of states could include the example of US states like Maine, Alabama and Ohio which are aiming to curb the powers of trade unions, particularly those representing government workers. Any other valid approach should be evaluated positively.

Responses should include a conclusion on the extent to which non-state actors have a significant impact on the power of the state.

2. **Using two examples evaluate how environmental factors influence state sovereignty.**

Responses are likely to include a brief definition of the concept of sovereignty by referring to features such as territorial control and the principle of non-interference in another state's affairs (internal sovereignty) as well as the ability to enter into relations with other states (external sovereignty). Responses may include a discussion of the concept of Westphalian sovereignty. Candidates may then go on to identify environmental issues and factors which transcend state sovereignty in their perception. They could bring together a variety of variables such as climate change, spread of diseases, or the actions of international organizations as they address these factors. Each of these are oblivious to political boundaries. Candidates could also discuss the transnational nature of environment and some problems related to it.

Arguments in favour of the claim that environmental factors influence state sovereignty may include:
- The environment is an issue which cannot be contained within the confines of national boundaries. Different environmental issues can neither be controlled, contained or managed effectively without cooperation and coordination with other countries. The impact of environment in one country is bound to have repercussions beyond sovereign borders.
- Cross border issues increasingly require cooperation and action across state boundaries, which may then place limitations on state sovereignty. This becomes evident in the form of national/domestic laws which they might need to pass to be part of solutions or even qualify to be part of international action/organizations addressing them or as a precondition to receive aid, for instance.
- Environment and climate change have an impact on the economy – a state's resources are then diverted to tackle the effects such as healthcare *etc* impacting their internal sovereignty and inability to spend resources in areas where they would like to focus on.
- Environmental issues such as water impacts domestic sovereignty (India making changes to Pakistan's river water supply during recent standoffs), industrial pollution impacting people across borders, displacement of people from natural habitat for development work within and across borders are possible examples.
- Most national environmental issues cannot be tackled without help and coordination with other countries. Treaties and agreements on environmental issues such as the Kyoto Protocol and Paris Agreement are significant in coordinating with other countries on such matters also impact sovereignty of states since they are expected to abide by them and their clauses.

Arguments against the claim that environmental factors influence state sovereignty may include:

- State sovereignty is not challenged by environmental factors but may just need to adapt itself to them. The presence of international environmental agreements has turned into a network of sovereignty or pooling of sovereignty where states have actually increased their external sovereignty.
- States can choose to enter into international agreements (external sovereignty). They also have the authority to take all decisions even about the extent they wish to participate on environmental issues.
- States ultimately control what occurs within their borders on environment related matters (internal sovereignty).

Responses should refer to specific examples. For instance, candidates could refer to specific environmental factors and problems not respecting state boundaries, such as greenhouse effect and climate change which both have a global impact. It is estimated that there would be a possible rise in the average global temperature of 1 degree Celsius by 2025 and 3 degrees Celsius before the end of the 21st century. This would have an impact on human health, harm aquatic animals and crops and may even see some small island states disappear entirely. As a result, states

cannot handle such issues independently but must dilute their sovereignty and take joint action with other states. On the other side of the argument, responses could refer to states exercising their sovereign rights in opposition to such efforts, such as the US which under the Trump administration backed out of the Paris agreement. Finally, some students may approach this question by instead evaluating the ways in which different environmental factors influence state sovereignty. This and any other valid approach should be evaluated positively.

Responses should include a conclusion about the extent to which environmental factors influence state sovereignty.

Human rights

3. **Justify the claim that the debate between universal rights and cultural relativism is useful for codifying and protecting 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. Candidates should also offer some understanding of the two opposing conceptual foundations underpinning this question - universalism and (cultural) relativism – and the degree to which human rights can be said to be culturally or individually determined.

    Arguments in favour of the claim that the debate between universal rights and cultural relativism is useful for codifying and protecting human rights may include:
    *   Unless human rights are seen as universal any attempt to critique widespread abuses which stem from long-held cultural practices will be subject to accusations of cultural imperialism, *eg*, Western and African/Islamic debates over female genital mutilation.
    *   Some contemporary institutions that are explicitly grounded in an universalist conceptualization of human rights have played a key role in combating egregious infringements of human rights at both the national and international levels, *eg* Truth and Reconciliation Commissions, the International Criminal Court.
    *   Human rights may be universal in their application but cannot be universal in their acceptance. Some of the differences that exist between different cultures are significant and must be considered in the codification and protection of human rights.
    *   The concept of "universal" human rights is fundamentally Western and so there is a need for cultural relativism in the codification and protection of human rights.
    *   Many critics of universalism believe that there must be a greater balance in codification between rights and responsibilities as well as between social/economic rights and civil/political rights, *eg* The Bangkok Declaration (1997).
    *   Some human rights agreements have not been ratified or have been ratified, but with certain reservations, by some states on the basis of cultural relativism, *eg* Saudi Arabia has not ratified the UDHR and India chose not to be bound by sections of the Convention on the Elimination of Discrimination Against Women.

Arguments against the claim that the debate between universal rights and cultural relativism is useful for codifying and protecting human rights may include:

- The claim for privileging cultural relativism is often employed as a guise for political or economic gain, not as a commitment to the higher values and ideals of the protection of human rights.
- Many of the most strident proponents of cultural relativism are among the worst human rights violators themselves, *eg* Saudi Arabia, China.
- Many human rights are not contentious and do not present difficulties in terms of their codification and protection.
- The debate is circular. It is difficult to think of any one culture that has remained intact and without outside influence throughout history.
- Social reality is much more complex than such a simple "either-or" situation and so the opposition between universal rights on the one hand and cultural relativism on the other is a false dichotomy that is not useful in the codification or protection of human rights.
- It is difficult to clearly define "culture" and so references to cultural relativism are not theoretically useful in the codification of human rights.
- The concept of universalism has failed. In the post-9/11 era, states that have traditionally promoted a universal vision vis-a-vis the codification and protection of human rights (US, UK) have altered their practices, *eg* racial profiling, torture/"enhanced interrogation", *etc* has now been deemed acceptable.

Responses should contain references to specific examples. Arguments in favour of the claim could reference the existence of critiques such as "Asian values" or "Islamic values", which all emphasize codifying and protecting collective over individual rights. Alternatively, a candidate may highlight the fact that no government currently questions the commitments contained in the UDHR. To date, all United Nations member states have ratified at least one of the nine core international human rights treaties, and 80 percent have ratified four or more, giving concrete expression to the universality of the UDHR and international human rights. Arguments against the claim may be more conceptual but should still provide specific examples of human rights that transcend national, ethnic and religious identities and therefore undermine the binary distinction between universal and relativistic conceptualisations of human rights, *eg*, freedom from torture and freedom from slavery (Articles 3 and 4 of the UDHR, respectively). Any other valid approach should be evaluated positively.

Responses should include a conclusion on the extent to which the candidate agrees with the claim that the debate between universal rights and cultural relativism is useful for codifying and protecting human rights.

4. "**Human rights must be prioritized for successful development to occur in developing countries." 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. Candidates may identify the emergence of different generations of human rights in order to outline the evolution of human rights over time. Students are also likely to provide a definition of development and acknowledge that this is a contested and multidimensional concept, which has also evolved over time. Candidates may also briefly establish some of the ways in which development might be classified as "successful" or evaluate indicators for measuring successful development.

Arguments in favour of the claim that human rights must be prioritized for successful development to occur in developing countries may include:
- Development is a multidimensional process and its successful realization requires prioritizing human rights so that all individuals can freely participate in development and in the fair distribution of benefits resulting therefrom, *ie.* development processes – traditionally technical and economically orientated - are becoming increasingly focused on enjoyment of rights and promotion of values, *eg,* Amartya Sen's concept of "Development as Freedom".
- The evolution of human rights over time to include second- and third-generation rights means that human rights and development are increasingly viewed as being intertwined, *ie* there is now a right to economic and social development, a right to a healthy environment, a right to intergenerational equity and sustainability, *etc* all of which are commonly seen as hallmarks of "successful" development.
- Under international human rights law, states have existing legal obligations to realize human rights such that development goals, targets, and indicators need to be aligned with them.
- Many of the Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs) explicitly refer to claims on human rights, *eg* gender inequality, sustainability, peace and justice, etc. Furthermore, many SDG targets are closely aligned with human rights standards.
- The UN's 2030 *Agenda for Sustainable Development* is unequivocally anchored in human rights, *eg* its preamble states that the SDGs aim to "realize the human rights of all".
- Some IGOs stress the need for prioritizing human rights, specifically requiring that development must be carried out in a manner in which all human rights and fundamental freedoms can be fully realized, *eg* both the African Union and the UN see the "right to development" as a universal and inalienable right and an integral part of fundamental human rights.
- Rule of law is essential to peaceful and sustainable economic development, but only if law itself is deduced from the principles of human dignity and the common good.

Arguments against the claim that human rights must be prioritized for successful development to occur in developing countries may include:
- Development is a contested concept; most developing states must prioritize their development goals and a focus on human rights may be seen as inhibiting the economic growth required to achieve these goals.
- Scarcity means that governments, particularly those in developing states, may lack the resources necessary to fulfill the duties implied by second- and third-generation rights. underdevelopment stemming from the negative impacts of aspects of international trade, unequal access to technology and a crushing debt burden is unlikely to be significantly affected by a human rights-based approach.
- The active promotion of human rights may be interpreted as interference in the internal affairs of a state; the principle of sovereignty means that states ultimately decide upon the shape of development and human rights may be prioritized only to the extent that they do not conflict with national laws.

- Cultural relativism sees human rights as varying across time and according to regional cultural variations, which means that there is no general agreement as to which human rights need to be prioritized for successful development to occur in developing countries, *eg* the Cultural Charter for Africa states that true development must be premised on development of all dynamic values in the African cultural heritage.
- Both human rights and what constitutes "successful" development are largely western-defined concepts; there is no reason that either of these visions is appropriate for poor, non-Western countries, with different traditions, and facing a range of challenges that belong, in the view of western countries, to the distant past.

Candidates should include reference to specific examples to support their evaluation of the claim in the question. China lifting 800 million people out of poverty is a historic achievement and can be interpreted as a measure of successful economic development. However, critics question the cost of such development in terms of fundamental human rights and, by extension, its "success". Further, a variety of programmes, initiatives and legal instruments explicitly link human rights and development, *eg* the UN's *Zero Hunger Challenge* and *Global Partnership for Education;* the fact that both Costa Rica and Colombia have undertaken land reforms in ways that boosted women's ownership of land, increasing labour productivity even further and, finally, the Alien Tort Statute holds MNC's liable for conduct that violates human rights. Any other valid and relevant approaches and examples should be evaluated positively, so long as the response remains squarely focused on the topic of human rights and the link between human rights and development, particularly in developing countries.

Responses should include a conclusion on the extent to which human rights must be prioritized for successful development to occur in developing countries.

Development

5.   **Evaluate the view that development depends mostly on economic factors.**

Responses should show a clear understanding of development. This understanding of development may be demonstrated from an economic perspective, perhaps mentioning neoliberal means of development and conventional ways of measuring development, such as through GDP. Candidates may also choose to highlight other ways that a country or a community might develop, such as through political, social, human or environmental means. Different definitions of development might be utilized, such as sustainable development or wellbeing, as well as different means of measuring other types of development, such as HPI or HDI. Responses might show that, since there are many different indicators for measuring development that are not just based on economic growth, development should not be considered as purely dependent on economic factors.

Arguments in favour of the claim that development depends mostly on economic factors may include:
- Economic factors comprise a suite of different aspects that can claim to be prerequisites for development and that development will not occur without them. These comprise:
- Financial features such as a stable currency and access to capital markets.
- A stable home market comprising many consumers with effective purchasing power and absence of extremes of inequality.
- Infrastructure to reduce the costs of economic activity domestically and internationally, *eg* transport and communications.
- A functioning labour market located close to centres of economic activity.
- ability to participate in international trade *eg* a marketable surplus from agriculture or primary products.
- Ability to attract foreign direct investment.
- An entrepreneurial and organisational group able to co-ordinate and control the other factors of production.
- The most widely used measurements of development include GDP and GNP, which are economic indicators, showing that economic factors are critical to development.

Arguments against the claim that development depends mostly on economic factors may include:
- Political factors such as a stable administration and legal framework can be considered to be of equal importance to the promotion of development, and absence of such factors may inhibit or prevent development.
- Institutional factors such as well-established education and healthcare institutions can be considered as prerequisites for development.
- Social factors including human resources, values and culture need to be appropriate for development to occur and can thus also be considered prerequisites for development.
- Environmental factors such as geography, climate, urban migration and natural endowment can also claim to be necessary conditions for development.
- Attracting foreign direct investment depends not just on economic factors but a broad range of factors, as well as transparency and absence of corruption.
- The conceptualization of development has shifted as global actors see the importance of sustainable development and wellbeing to the advancement of development. This is also shown through the fact that there is a recognition of different means of measuring development that focus on non-economic indicators such as happiness or lack of corruption.

Responses should contain references to specific examples and may organise economic factors into necessary and sufficient or try to rank order them. For example, even oil-rich countries have fared very differently in the last 20 years, with Nigeria's GDP per head growing little compared with Indonesia's. Some countries with few natural resources have achieved rapid development, such as Korea and Taiwan, but others with great natural resources have not, such as Congo and Venezuela. Poorly defined property rights do not seem to have inhibited the development of China. Any other valid approach should be evaluated positively.

Responses should include a conclusion on the extent to which development depends on economic factors.

6. **Examine the view that development weakens state sovereignty.**

Responses should include an understanding of both development and state sovereignty at the national and, perhaps, transnational levels. Candidates may define development as a sustained increase in the standard of living over time, though they may also provide a more comprehensive understanding that includes economic, political, social, human and environmental aspects. Sovereignty can include both internal (control over a state's borders and population) as well as external (ability to enter into relations with other states) aspects. Candidates may also view sovereignty as the ability of the state to act without interference from outside actors (states, IGOs, NGOs, MNCs). Responses should examine the interplay between these two concepts and show an understanding of how types of development might affect, negatively or positively, state sovereignty.

Arguments in favour of the view that development weakens state sovereignty may include:

- The freedom and autonomy which sovereignty is expected to deliver is actually compromised or eroded as a result of development by economic interdependence, sometimes formalised in trade blocs.
- Technological change which forces acceptance of international standards.
- National development projects which are sometimes so grand as to require international donors leading to fragmented policymaking.
- Integration into the global economy which renders states less immune to global economic events which can reduce control, such as the 2008 financial crisis.
- The endowment of natural resources which may become a matter of interest to other sovereign states such as the USA and China leading to encroachment on sovereignty.
- The increased number of international organizations and their functions which may be restrictive to state sovereignty *eg* the IBRD, IMF and WTO have all been involved in domestic affairs of their members.
- MNCs may encroach on economic sovereignty.
- Development has given rise to challenges so complex that the sovereign state is too small. to resolve them: environmental degradation may only be addressed by new international organizations acting globally.

Arguments against the view that development weakens state sovereignty may include:
- Sovereign states exercise a great deal of power when acting in their national interest and that this is unlikely to change with development.
- The meaning of sovereignty has itself evolved alongside development, so it has not weakened but adapted to remain a potent source of authority and community.
- Sovereignty is no longer monopolized by the state at national level but shared through devolution to cities and regions and non-state actors such as international organizations, without it being weakened.
- Countries have surrendered some state sovereignty to larger trade blocs, but this has assisted development and not reduced overall sovereignty.
- Since 1945, the emergence of human rights has embedded a sense of development as a human right such that state sovereignty depends on achieving a certain level of development.
- Development has led to communications advances which alert sovereign states and the global community to political and environmental challenges immediately, facilitating assistance, co-operation and if necessary, censure.

Responses should contain references to specific examples. Candidates could, for example, refer to the sacrifice of sovereignty for economic ambition by nations joining economic unions such as the EU and consequent conflicts, *eg* imposition of policies on Greece. Purely internal human rights violations have brought about UN interventions disregarding national sovereignty, such as economic sanctions against Libya and Syria. Any other valid approach should be evaluated positively.

Responses should include a conclusion on the extent to which development weakens state sovereignty.

Peace and conflict

7. **"Reconciliation is a necessary element of a successful post-conflict transformation."**
Discuss this view.

Responses should include a definition or understanding of reconciliation, its role in post-conflict states, and a discussion of whether it is necessary for success in post-conflict settings. Reconciliation remains a widely disputed term, with many disputing its desirability and/or effectiveness. At its most basic, reconciliation is the process and/or outcome of answering questions and seeking justice surrounding repression and violence, typically of a previous regime and/or non-state actors after regime change or war. These can be investigative, to uncover information, record violations, and/or to air the past with an eye toward healing, reconciliation and transformation.

Post-conflict transformation typically refers to addressing the underlying issues and conditions that lead to conflict, though conflict-management and conflict-resolution may be included here. As such, successful post-conflict transformations can be judged in numerous ways, including by regime change, a resolution of violent conflict and subsequent information-sharing, peace accords, the redistribution of power through power-sharing political systems, or more integrative approaches such as truth-seeking initiatives and the creation of truth-commissions or truth-and-reconciliations commissions. Successful transformation is also a contested concept and is dependent on the case and the goals set forth. It is meant to resolve conflict; however, it doesn't necessarily necessitate forgiveness of the aggrieved, nor acceptance of claims or outcomes by the accused. Candidates may define successful transformation in very different ways. As these topics are disputed and used differently in different post-conflict settings, candidates can explore these topics and define their terms accordingly. Better responses will detail "success" with examples; success itself is a subjective concept and candidates should be rewarded accordingly.

Arguments in favour of the claim that reconciliation is a necessary element of a successful post-conflict transformation may include:
- The need to address impunity of predecessor regimes and hold perpetrators responsible.
- Theories of restorative justice that emphasize the need for justice for victims through inclusion, responsibility of the accused, and transformation.
- The need to foster healing and forgiveness to promote greater societal cohesion and/or transformation post-conflict.
- Its importance in addressing pre-existing structural violence & potential for future conflict.

Arguments against the claim that reconciliation is a necessary element of a successful post-conflict transformation may include:
- The belief that it is better to forget and move on.
- The risk of enflaming existing animosities.
- The fact that reconciliation itself is dependent on the situation, and can be sought at the individual- and national-level, and is dependent on the country and conflict itself
- That attempts at reconciliation in the past have failed to fulfil their goals and have been seen as simply providing further impunity to criminals under the guise of healing.

While historic examples such as Uganda and South Africa may be discussed, more recent examples should be included, such as Tunisia, Peru, East Timor, and Darfur. Examples could be used to demonstrate the importance of reconciliation, such as in South Sudan where underlying issues were left unaddressed over multiple peace deals, fuelling further conflict, or the difficulties of pursuing reconciliation, such as in Colombia where opposition is threatening the peace accord with the FARC-EP that ended fifty years of war. Any other valid approach should be evaluated positively.

Responses should include a conclusion on the extent to which reconciliation is a necessary element of a successful post-conflict transformation.

8. **"Conflict always violates human rights." Evaluate this statement.**

    Responses should discuss how conflict may violate human rights, such as through repression, collateral damage, forced relocations, and in creating refugees. It should evaluate the likelihood that conflict *always* violates human rights, and whether it is possible to have conflict without human rights violations.

    Responses may distinguish between types of conflict (*eg* interstate conflict; ideological conflict) as well as types of violence (*eg* direct violence; structural violence) and reflect on how they differ in their effect on human rights. A disaggregation of human rights may also be given to provide insight into how first generation human rights, such as right to life, differ from second or third generation rights, such as the right to a healthy environment, and may go on to link this to types of conflict.

    Arguments in favour of the claim that conflict always violates human rights may include:
    - Conflict involving direct violence violates bodily integrity and therefore it is impossible to have conflict without violating human rights.
    - conflict often has spill over effects (*eg* health issues; refugees) which are impossible to eliminate completely and result in human rights violations.
    - Unintended consequences of conflict often result in the violation of human rights.
    - in violent conflict, it is impossible to remove the potential of mistakes, from friendly fire to incorrect targeting, resulting in violations.

    Arguments against the claim that conflict always violates human rights may include:
    - Lower-level conflicts, such as interpersonal conflicts, don't necessarily entail the violation of human rights.
    - Traditional military conflict is fought between states and their militaries and therefore there is no expectation that human rights would be violated in such conflicts.
    - There are international laws protecting human rights during time of military conflict, from rights of combatants to those of civilians.
    - The self-defence doctrine provides the right of protection under imminent threat and it does not constitute a violation of international human rights law for a state to protect its security.

    Modern examples should be provided and linked to the relationship between conflict and human rights, such as: violent conflict and physical integrity in Syria, South Sudan and Yemen; political conflict in various forms such as economic sanctions' effect on human rights in Iran and Venezuela; and religious and/or ideological conflict and the right to self-determination (*eg* the Rohingya in Myanmar) or the right to freedom of movement (*eg* the Islamic religious police in Saudi Arabia). Any other valid approach should be evaluated positively.

    Responses should include a conclusion on the extent to which conflict always violates human rights.