

Exercise walk-through

2.1

Rights, development and durable arrangements: supported rehearsal

International Baccalaureate · IB Diploma · Global Politics · SL

1

The method

Method — Worked example

Connect concepts through mechanisms. Access rules can affect rights and fair treatment; resource distribution affects development and future sustainability. A durable agreement needs acceptable terms, implementation and credible review.

Task: two fictional organizations share a water supply. One proposes fixed priority; the other proposes need-based allocation reviewed jointly. Evaluate both without assuming consultation alone ensures fairness.

Fixed priority may be predictable but can entrench disadvantage. Joint review can incorporate changing needs but requires information, authority and dispute resolution. Compare enforceability, available water, unequal capacities and those absent from negotiation.

Method — Worked example

Compare enforceability, available water, unequal capacities and those absent from negotiation

Original source / task evidence

Task: two fictional organizations share a water supply. One proposes fixed priority; the other proposes need-based allocation reviewed jointly.

Separate what is stated from the interpretation.
Rights, development and durable arrangements

Original classroom evidence panel for Rights, development and durable arrangements

Exercises 2.1·3.1

2.1 For the worked case, identify the evidence and a conclusion it can support. Explain one material limit. [3]

3.1 A dry period makes the previous water allocation infeasible. How should the agreement be evaluated? Give a reasoned answer, evidence or method, and a relevant qualification. [3]

Exercises 2.1-3.1

2.1 For the worked case, identify the evidence and a conclusion it can support. Explain one material limit. [3]

2.1 Fixed priority may be predictable but can entrench disadvantage. Joint review can incorporate changing needs but requires information, authority and dispute resolution. Compare enforceability, available water, unequal capacities and those absent from negotiation. Authored points for identifying relevant evidence, explaining a supported inference and a material limit.

3.1 A dry period makes the previous water allocation infeasible. How should the agreement be evaluated? Give a reasoned answer, evidence or method, and a relevant qualification. [3]

3.1 Compare changed availability, essential needs, unequal vulnerability and implementation capacity. Review allocations through agreed dispute and monitoring procedures. Predictability matters, but keeping an infeasible or unfair rule can undermine durability and acceptance. Authored points for a relevant judgement, reason tied to the case and justified qualification or method. Accept a supported alternative.