

4.1 Global political challenges

Name: _____ Class: _____ Date: _____

Total: 28 marks

KEY WORDS global political challenge • climate change

Global political challenges

Objective

Apply the challenge-and-case craft (challenge, levels, actors, governance, concepts) to stimulus material, and command the challenge-field kits – environment, poverty, migration, health, identity, peace (the HL extension: global political challenges).

1 Key knowledge and worked examples

Extension toolkit. A global political challenge: crosses borders, defies single-state solution, structures conflict over who decides and who pays. Craft: define the challenge; set levels (local, national, global and their interaction); name actors and interests; analyse governance (authority? enforcement?); tie concepts to the named actors. Kits: environment (UNFCCC 1992, Kyoto 1997, Paris 2015 with NDCs); poverty (between- and within-state; Gini; SDGs); migration (mixed flows; 1951 categories; the governance gap); health (WHO informational; COVAX); identity (civic vs ethnic nationalism); peace (new wars; remote war; the R2P record).

2 Practice

2.1 State the three defining features of a global political challenge. [3]

2.2 Name the four craft moves the Paper 3 scaffold applies to any stimulus. [4]

2.3 How did Paris 2015 invert Kyoto 1997's logic? [2]

2.4 Name the two scales of the poverty-and-inequality challenge. [2]

2.5 Why is the WHO's authority described as informational? [2]

3 Exam-style questions

3.1 (*Stimulus style.*) A stimulus documents a state raising its NDC while expanding fossil extraction. Using levels, actors and governance, analyse what this pattern shows about the climate challenge. [6]

3.2 (*Evaluate style.*) “The Paris design's realism is also its limit.” Evaluate the transparency mechanism against enforced targets for a challenge of free-rider incentives. [5]

3.3 (*Cross-challenge style.*) The pandemic closed borders while vaccine nationalism divided access. Explain how health reproduces the sovereignty-versus-rights tension from the migration field. [4]

Solutions

2.1 Crosses borders (no single state contains it); defies any single state's solution (unilateral action is insufficient); structures political conflict over who decides, who pays and who benefits (3).

2.2 Define the challenge; set its levels (local-national-global and their interaction); name the actors and their interests; analyse the governance (institutions, authority, enforcement) (4).

2.3 Kyoto set binding targets on the few (developed states); Paris inverted the logic – each state sets its own nationally determined contribution, with transparency and review rather than enforcement (2).

2.4 Between states (the convergence-or-divergence of national economies) and within states (domestic inequality) (2).

2.5 The WHO can recommend, name and coordinate, and its information shapes legitimacy (1); but it cannot compel states – no enforcement power of its own (1).

3.1 Levels: the state performs globally (the raised pledge) while acting nationally (the extraction licences) – the levels diverge, and the local-national interest (revenue, energy) beats the global pledge (2). Actors and interests: the state balancing international standing against domestic energy politics; fossil firms with extraction investments; the global majority whose climate the totals determine (2). Governance: the Paris regime asks transparency, not cessation – the pattern is compliant within the design, which is the finding: the challenge's governance rewards pledges over performance (2).

3.2 For the transparency mechanism: universality – states that would never accept enforcement signed, so the regime's legitimacy is global (2); name-and-shame and peer review have produced ratchets of ambition in several rounds (1). Against enforced targets: enforcement would confront the free-rider core directly, but Kyoto showed the compliance cost – key emitters staying outside (2). Judgement: the design bought legitimacy at the price of bindingness; the pledge-performance gap is its measured limit, so the claim holds (accept any reasoned weighing anchored in the Kyoto comparison).

3.3 Sovereignty's reflex in both fields: the border. In migration, states assert the sovereign right to admit and exclude; in the pandemic, states closed borders as the reflex response despite evidence of limited effect – the same logic of territorial control against a challenge that ignores borders (2). Rights' counter-logic: the person – the refugee's claim under the 1951 Convention, the patient's claim to health; vaccine nationalism divided access by citizenship, reproducing the exclusion the migration field knows (2). The tension is structural: both challenges cross borders while authority remains territorial.

Local review guidance: every paragraph names its craft move (levels, actors, governance) before its evidence; (R1 3.2) the evaluation anchors in the Kyoto comparison; (R1 3.3) a cross-field answer names the shared structure, not two stories. Authored guidance.