



# **MARKSCHEME**

**May 2012**

## **WORLD POLITICS AND INTERNATIONAL RELATIONS**

**Standard Level**

**Paper 1**

16 pages

*This markscheme is **confidential** and for the exclusive use of examiners in this examination session.*

*It is the property of the International Baccalaureate and must **not** be reproduced or distributed to any other person without the authorization of IB Cardiff.*

Candidates should answer two questions, **each chosen from a different syllabus area**. If two essay questions are chosen from the same syllabus area, only the best essay will contribute to the final grade.

In addition to these markbands please follow the guidance for individual questions in the paper-specific markscheme that follows.

<b>Level</b>	<b>Marks</b>
<b>0:</b> Completely inappropriate answer.	<b>0</b>
<b>1:</b> Little understanding of the specific demands of the question Very little recognition of relevant international relations theory Relevant terms not defined Significant errors	<b>1-5</b>
<b>2:</b> Some understanding of the specific demands of the question Some recognition of relevant international relations theory Some relevant terms defined Some errors	<b>6-10</b>
<b>3:</b> Understanding of the specific demands of the question Relevant international relations theory explained and developed Relevant international relations terms defined Few errors Examples are included. An attempt at critical commentary (evaluation, discussion, examination)	<b>11-15</b>
<b>4:</b> Clear understanding of the specific demands of the question Relevant international relations theory clearly explained and developed Relevant international relations terms clearly defined No significant errors Examples are used effectively Evidence of appropriate critical commentary (evaluation, discussion, examination)	<b>16-20</b>

## SYLLABUS AREA I

### 1. Evaluate the importance of the modern nation-state to the continuing maintenance of international order.

The question demands that candidates first define what is understood by the term “nation state,” and then critically analyse if the development of such political units has contributed to stability in international relations (IR). The more sophisticated answer will show that on the one hand, respect for the sovereignty of the nation state and acceptance of its right to pursue its own self-interest has ensured stability in IR; while on the other hand, the acceptance of such a realist approach to IR can also be claimed to have contributed to conflict.

To show that respect for the sovereignty of the nation state, and acceptance of its right to pursue its own self-interest has ensured stability in IR, candidates could refer to the 1648 Treaty of Westphalia, through which the Great Powers agreed to abide by the principle of national territorial and sovereign integrity to maintain international order. This proved to be a successful means of preventing conflict through the eighteenth and nineteenth century when a balance of power between nation-states was achieved. The Congress of Vienna could be cited as an attempt to maintain international order by accepting the nation-state as the main actor in IR. In 1815, through the principle of Balance of Power, leaders attempted a system that would limit the action of the state, as a means of maintaining peace.

On the other hand, and following Wilson’s liberal approach to IR, inaugurated in 1919 after the First World War, it could be stated that acceptance of the nation state’s right to pursue its own self-interest disrupts order in IR. Wilson’s ideas were based on the belief that the good nature of humans, rather than their own self-interest, should dictate international order. Hence, according to the liberal perspective, only international cooperation can lead to world peace, hence eroding the relevance of the modern nation-state to the maintenance of international order. Following this line of reasoning, during the second half of the twentieth century, liberal IGOs were viewed as a replacement for the nation state as the primary decision-taking actor in the system of international relations.

Credit should be awarded to candidates who further challenge such ideas, in claiming that the nation state is still relevant to the maintenance of international order in the twenty-first century. Candidates could contend, for example, that within IGOs states are not equal (e.g. the UN Security Council), and that the acceptance of their power and right to pursue their self-interest allows for order in IR.

*For answers to be considered at **Level 2**, there should be evidence of understanding of the concept of nation state, and an attempt to analyse how respect for the sovereignty of the nation state and acceptance of its right to pursue its own self-interest has ensured stability in IR. Candidates only analyse one side of the argument.*

*For answers to be considered at **Level 3**, there should be clear evidence of understanding of the concepts of nation state and sovereignty, and an attempt to analyse how respect for the sovereignty of the nation state and acceptance of its right to pursue its own self-interest has ensured stability in IR. Both sides of the argument are addressed, though the evaluation might lack balance.*

*For answers to be considered at **Level 4**, there should be clear evidence of understanding of the concepts of nation state and sovereignty. Candidates thoroughly evaluate **both** sides of the argument and provide solid examples.*

*The depth with which this is achieved and the effective use of examples can be a good discriminator between **Level 3** and **Level 4**.*

*Examiners should not expect all of the above, and should be receptive to examples that are not contemplated in the markscheme.*

2. **Define the concept of democracy and analyse how the application of the term has varied over time. Use at least two examples to illustrate your answer.**

The question demands that candidates first define the concept of democracy, and then examine how such an idea has been implemented with variations through time and across cultures. More sophisticated answers will assert that a wide variety of democratic systems are in use across the globe, providing comparative elements to assess the degree to which each could be described as “democratic.”

The term Democracy comes from the Greek, and means “rule of the people.” Through time and across cultures, different regimes have been adopted to best allow for such rule.

In Athens’ City States during the sixth and fifth century B.C, “rule of the people” was pursued through direct participation of citizens in decision taking: men would gather in an Assembly, regarded as the supreme authority, to take decisions through majority voting. The experience was based on three principles: equality before the law, freedom of speech, and collective participation of government. This form of democracy is referred to as **Direct Democracy**, as all citizens (free men) were directly involved in government, hence directly exercising their sovereignty. Elements of direct democracy are still evident in modern democratic regimes: amongst them we can highlight referendum possibilities and possibilities of initiating laws in California.

As nation states with considerable size and larger populations were formed, the direct involvement of all men in government became untenable. Hence, **Representative Democracies** evolved, through which the sovereign masses would exercise their political power through elected representatives. To J Bentham, coercive institutions flourished as the only possible way of allowing individuals to exercise their freedoms. Hence, and in line with the nineteenth century **liberal tradition**, democracy is to be defined as the form of government that best protects individuals from the state through regular, free and fair elections, as the governing body becomes accountable to the sovereign mass. The liberal definition of democracy led to the **establishment of republics and constitutional monarchies**.

The **Madisonian theory of democracy** criticizes liberalism in that liberal republics and constitutional monarchies can fall into tyranny, as through majority rule they only protect the interest of a proportion of society (*i.e.* its majority), to whom authorities owe their loyalty. To Madison, *frequent elections will not provide an external check sufficient to prevent tyranny*. Hence, liberal democracies are not truly democratic since they allow for “rule of the majority” rather than “rule of the people”. Non-tyrannical republics, to Madison, should separate the powers of the different governmental institutions, construct a system of checks and balances so that different branches of power control each other, and place government beyond the control of the majority through indirect elections. This theory of democracy was applied to the US Constitution, giving rise to the **presidentialist system of government**.

Madison, Hamilton and Jay, in the Federalist Papers, also advocated a further division of power by splitting sovereignty between member units and a central government, as a means of further protecting the rights of individuals from a concentration of power, to truly allow for “rule of the people”. Such a theory of democracy gave rise to **federal systems of government**, which were applied with variations in time and across cultures. Canada, Australia, Europe, Russia, Iraq, Nepal, Argentina and Nigeria could serve as examples of the application of federal systems as a means of fostering “rule of the people.”

Democratic Theory has evolved over time and alternative definitions of democracy include “Polyarchal Democracy,” among others. Candidates could expand on any of these definitions, examine how they are applied in modern democratic regimes, and analyse the extent to which they allow for “rule of the people.”

*For answers to be considered at **Level 2**, there should be evidence of understanding of the concept of democracy, and an attempt to analyse variations in its application.*

*For answers to be considered at **Level 3**, there should be clear evidence of understanding of the concept of democracy, and an analysis of variations in its application. The adequate use of **two** examples can be a good discriminator between **Level 2** and **Level 3**.*

*For answers to be considered at **Level 4**, there should be clear evidence of understanding of the concept of democracy, and an in-depth analysis of variations in its application. Candidates provide at least **two** solid examples.*

*At the top end of this band, candidates may provide comparative elements to assess the degree to which each could be described as “democratic.”*

*The depth of analysis and the effective use of examples can be a good discriminator between **Level 3** and **Level 4**.*

*Examiners should not expect all of the above, and should be receptive to examples that are not contemplated in the markscheme.*

3. “Multi-polar systems ensure stability in international relations.” Examine the validity of this statement, using *at least two* examples to illustrate your answer.

The question demands that candidates first define the concept of polarity, and then examine its impact on the international system. On the one hand, candidates should stress that multi-polar systems can be claimed to ensure stability in IR. On the other hand, they should contend that multi-polarity can be also cited as a cause for conflict; and that bi-polar or uni-polar systems can be also claimed to ensure stability in IR. The more sophisticated answer will include detailed examples to illustrate views.

The concept of polarity refers to how power, in the form of economic, military, and cultural influence, is distributed in the international system. In multi-polar systems power is distributed among three or more states. According to **classical realists**, including H Morgenthau and E H Carr, multi-polar systems allow for stability in IR as Great Powers can increase their influence through minor conflict without challenging other Great Powers. In such a scenario only petty wars that do not challenge stability in IR occur. To illustrate such a view, candidates may refer to nineteenth century European politics, when the “Concert of Europe” met regularly to discuss international affairs. They could also contend that the international system in the twenty-first century is a multi-polar one, in which only petty conflict arises.

On the other hand, the First and Second World War could be examined in the context of multi-polar failure to prevent major conflict. In the light of **neorealism**, the origin of both World Wars could be explained as Great Powers having misjudged the intentions of other Great Powers, leading them to take action that eventually compromised their security.

Candidates could also suggest that stability in IR is allowed for by bi-polar or uni-polar systems. Cold War stability could be analysed in the context of bi-polarity in IR, while Post Cold War stability could be examined in the context of uni-polarity in IR.

*For answers to be considered at **Level 2**, there should be evidence of understanding of the concept of polarity, and an attempt to analyse its impact on the international system. Candidates only analyse one side of the argument, or only provide one example.*

*For answers to be considered at **Level 3**, there should be clear evidence of understanding of the concept of polarity and an analysis of its impact on the international system. Both sides of the argument are addressed, though the evaluation might lack balance. Two examples are given.*

*For answers to be considered at **Level 4**, there should be clear evidence of understanding of the concept of polarity and an in-depth analysis of its impact on the international system. Candidates thoroughly evaluate **both** sides of the argument, and two solid examples are given.*

*The depth with which this is achieved and the effective use of examples can be a good discriminator between **Level 3** and **Level 4**.*

*Examiners should not expect all of the above, and should be receptive to examples that are not contemplated in the markscheme.*



**4. Analyse the causes of two twentieth century conflicts using the realist theory of international relations.**

The question demands that candidates first define the concept of realism and describe its features; then apply such theory to examine the causes of two twentieth century conflicts. The more sophisticated answer will analyse the causes of conflict through more than one perspective within the realist theory.

Realist theory contends that national interest and security, rather than moral concerns, guide the action of nation states. Hence, in terms of international relations, realists suggest that governments will tend to cater for their own self-interest (often understood in terms of increases of relative power) rather than a greater good. This leads to the creation of an antagonistic international system. Students could examine any number of theories, including classical realism (which in line with what was stipulated by Morgenthau and Carr deems that the self-interested nature of man guides states into antagonism); structural realism (which through a system level analysis suggests that the international system determines state behaviour); neoclassical realism (which combines previous approaches in stating that the international system influences state behaviour only as state leaders perceive such a system); among others.

The causes of any number of twentieth century conflicts could be examined through the prism of realism including both world wars, the Cold War or any proxy war within such larger conflicts. Credit should be awarded to candidates for in-depth analysis and detail in describing such conflicts.

*For answers to be considered at **Level 2**, there should be evidence of understanding of the concept of realism, and an attempt to apply such theory to examine the causes of any two twentieth century conflicts. Only one perspective within the realist theory is developed, or the causes of only one conflict are analysed.*

*For answers to be considered at **Level 3**, there should be clear evidence of understanding of the concept of realism, and application of such theory to examine the causes of any two twentieth century conflicts. More than one perspective within the realist theory is developed and the causes of two conflicts are analysed.*

*For answers to be considered at **Level 4**, there should be clear evidence of understanding of the concept of realism and an in-depth application of more than one perspective to analyse the causes of any two twentieth century conflicts.*

*The depth with which this is achieved and the effective use of examples can be a good discriminator between **Level 3** and **Level 4**.*

*Examiners should not expect all of the above, and should be receptive to examples that are not contemplated in the markscheme.*

## SYLLABUS AREA II

### 5. “The end of the Cold War has enhanced the peacekeeping performance of the United Nations.” To what extent do you agree with this statement?

The question demands that candidates define the term “peacekeeping” and critically examine the performance of the United Nations in resolving conflict between rival groups or nations, assessing the significance of factors that hinder its efficiency. On the one hand, it could be argued that once Cold War rivalries ceased, paralysis in the Security Council was overcome leading to enhanced performance in the resolution of conflict between rival groups or nations. On the other hand, a poor peacekeeping record in the post–Cold War era could also be acknowledged. The more sophisticated answer will not only list and describe peacekeeping operations, but will also explore factors that prevent the United Nations from acting as an effective peacekeeping organization.

The term “peacekeeping” refers to the deployment of peacekeeping forces to achieve disarmament, demobilization and enforcement of ceasefire agreements.

To propose that an enhanced performance in the resolution of conflict between rival groups or nations followed the end of the Cold War, candidates should examine the structure of the United Nations to explain how veto power for permanent members of the Security Council prevents the organization from acting swiftly to resolve conflict. In fact, peacekeeping operations are only authorized by a Security Council Resolution. Hence, they should examine how Cold War hostilities determined a blockade in the decision-making process as both the USA and USSR would veto each other’s proposals as permanent members of the Security Council (examples to illustrate such argument could be found in the United Nations actions in Korea and Indochina). Finally, candidates should suggest that once this hostility ceased in 1990, the United Nations peacekeeping record improved. Evidence to support such an argument could include UNAMET’s success in East Timor (1999) or UNMISS’s success in South Sudan (2010), although any other relevant examples could be provided including the United Nations’ actions in Cambodia, El Salvador, Guatemala, Mozambique, Namibia, and Tajikistan.

On the other hand, candidates could examine the view that obstacles to the United Nations’ peacekeeping operations persist after the fall of the Berlin Wall, preventing the organization from acting as an effective peacekeeping organization. Among such obstacles, candidates could analyse the need for bigger and better trained forces, reluctance from Security Council members to provide the means to implement mandates, the need for improving intelligence so as to stop a crisis before it arises, among others. Evidence to support such argument could include UNAMIR’s failure to implement the Arusha accords in Rwanda (1994); UNMIBH’s performance in former Yugoslavia (1994) and UNOSOMI (1991–1992), UNITAF (1992–1993), UNOSOMII’s (1993–1996) failures in Somalia.

Top answers could explore difficulties in measuring the United Nations performance in peacekeeping, as success is hard to achieve given the nature of its activities (United Nations’ peacekeeping operations almost by definition go to the most physically and politically difficult environments). Moreover, United Nations peacekeeping efforts rely on a variety of exogenous factors that could determine its level of success including a genuine commitment to a political process by the parties in working towards peace. Top candidates would also challenge the assumption proposed by the question that suggests that United Nations peacekeeping operations were ineffective during the Cold War by examining the performance of the United Nations’ peacekeeping force in the Suez (1957).

*For answers to be considered at **Level 2**, there should be evidence of understanding of the concept of peacekeeping, and an attempt to evaluate the UN's peacekeeping performance in the post-Cold War era. Candidates only analyse one side of the argument.*

*For answers to be considered at **Level 3**, there should be clear evidence of understanding of the concept of peacekeeping, and an evaluation of the UN's peacekeeping performance in the post-Cold War. Both sides of the argument are addressed, though the evaluation might lack balance. Peacekeeping operations are listed and described with some detail.*

*For answers to be considered at **Level 4**, there should be clear evidence of understanding of the concept of peacekeeping, and an in-depth evaluation of the UN's peacekeeping performance in the post-Cold War. Candidates thoroughly evaluate **both** sides of the argument, provide solid examples, and explore factors that prevent the UN from acting as an effective peacekeeping organization.*

*Examiners should not expect all of the above, and should be receptive to examples that are not contemplated in the markscheme.*

6. **“The growth of regional IGOs has improved the protection of human rights.” Choosing any one of the EU, ASEAN, NAFTA or Mercosur, assess the validity of this statement.**

With the growth of IGOs, specific regional systems to protect human rights have developed. This question demands that candidates examine if any one of such regional systems has been effective in protecting the human rights of its citizens. Both failures and successes should be addressed. The more sophisticated answer will explore factors that prevent the regional IGO from effectively protecting human rights.

**European Union:**

(+) To address human rights violations, the Charter of Fundamental Rights of the European Union gave the political, economic and social rights of its citizens the status of international law through the Treaty of Lisbon in December 2009. Hence, regional cooperation has led to greater protection of human rights, as any person who feels his or her rights under the Convention have been violated by a state party can take a case to the European Court of Justice. Still, and even before 2009, the ECJ had ruled in favour of protecting the rights of its citizens, claiming that fundamental rights “form an integral part of the general principles of [European Community] law;” and hence no member state could act in violation to them. Evidence to illustrate such a view can be found in *Kremzow v Austria*. Furthermore, candidates could suggest that through a variety of programs, the EU is active in protecting the rights of its citizens. Many programs could be described to illustrate the point including the Program for Employment and Social Solidarity (PROGRESS), which with a budget of €743 million aims at combating racism and xenophobia; or actions taken by the Fundamental Rights Agency to combat human trafficking.

(-) The 1958 Treaty of Rome, which founded the European Economic Community, made no reference to human rights issues, reinforcing the idea that regional cooperation had purely economic ends in its beginnings. Only in 1970 after the *Handelsgesellschaft* case, did the European Court of Justice establish that human rights “form an integral part of the general principles of [European Community] law,” creating a doctrine of unwritten rights. Nevertheless, these were only codified in the 2000 Charter of Fundamental Rights of the European Union, which gained legal force only in 2009. Hence, it could be stated that regional cooperation in this case has not led to an active protection of human rights through international law until recently. Moreover, it should be stressed that several states (including Britain, Poland and the Czech Republic) have tried to find ways to avoid the application of the Charter in their countries. Thirdly, and in terms of application of the Charter’s provisions, it could be argued that citizens of the EU are still facing racism and xenophobia among other types of discrimination; and that rights to asylum, refuge and migration are still often broken.

**Mercosur:**

(+) The constituent treaty of Mercosur, the Treaty of Asunción (1991), incorporated the issue of human rights, when establishing democracy as a pre-condition of membership. This clause proved an effective safeguard for human rights when implemented in April 1996 to ease the political crisis in Paraguay: the threat to exclude the country from Mercosur acted as deterrent to a *coup d’état*. Moreover, analysts suggest that regional cooperation has encouraged debate over the rule of law, human rights and democratic institutions. In fact, since 2004, Mercosur institutions have developed several activities that aim at the protection of human rights, among which we can highlight the development of Meetings of High Level Authorities on Human Rights of Mercosur and Associate States, who prepared the Protocol on Commitment to the Promotion and Protection of Human Rights in Mercosur (the meetings aimed at discussing, analysing, evaluating and monitoring human

rights policies across Mercosur); the 2005 Asunción Declaration on Commitment to the Promotion and Protection of Human Rights in Mercosur and Associate States, binding governments into the effective protection of human rights and fundamental freedoms (the declaration envisages enforcement mechanisms for those countries that don't abide by it, including a suspension on participating in different organs of the integration process); and the creation of the Mercosur Human Rights Public Policy Institute in 2007 to research and propose public policy on the issue of promoting and protecting human rights in member states.

(-) The Treaty of Asunción (1991) didn't explicitly include the aim of protecting human rights, revealing that the main objective behind regional cooperation lay in economic integration. In fact, many academics suggest that the issue of human rights is only vaguely included in regional texts such as paragraph 6 of the Preamble of the Treaty of Asunción, which only states that it is within the aim of Mercosur to enhance the living conditions of its citizens. Moreover, by citing factual evidence candidates can suggest that human rights are widely violated in member states, and may claim that individuals cannot resort to any regional authority to see that their rights are protected.

#### **ASEAN:**

(+) As from 1993, ASEAN members have articulated the need for an intergovernmental body that would help promote and protect human rights. The ASEAN Intergovernmental Commission on Human Rights (AICHR) was launched in 2009 as a consultative body, led by a body of representatives (one per member state), each of whom remain accountable to their own government. Meanwhile, the Working Group for an ASEAN Human Rights Mechanism is still working to set a declaration of principles and a court that would hold agreement on human rights binding.

(-) Commentators have described AICHR as "toothless:" lack of a common declaration of principles and a court to uphold recommendations inhibit its effectiveness, and initiatives to protect fundamental rights in member states (including fact-findings, annual reports and regional rights monitoring) have been dismissed. Hence, AICHR is best described as a commission that promotes human rights rather than protects them. In fact, candidates could argue that human rights violations in ASEAN are still in occurrence while AICHR takes no action against them: evidence that illustrates such argument could be found in the crimes against humanity committed by the Burmese junta leaders. Moreover, candidates could suggest that regional integration has not moved member states into consideration of human rights issues: only Thailand, Malaysia, Indonesia and the Philippines have established national human rights commissions to discuss human rights issues publicly.

#### **NAFTA:**

(+) NAFTA's Labor Side Agreement, "the North American Agreement on Labor Cooperation (NAALC)," which came into effect with NAFTA, on 1 January 1994, included major provisions on workers' rights. In fact, it was the first treaty on regional cooperation ever to include such provisions. Through it, NAFTA member states agreed to enforce their own labor laws along with 11 workers' rights principles. Evidence shows that through NAALC the public was able to submit complaints to the participating countries when rights related to minimum wage, child labor, and safety and health in the workplace were violated. Seven cases that involve worker health and safety have been opened, showing that NAALC remains an effective mechanism for voicing such violations.

(-) NAALC sanctions are only applicable for enforcing 3 out of the 11 workers' rights principles listed on the agreement (those related to minimum wage, child labor, and safety and health in the workplace). Hence, NAFTA's Labor Side Agreement remains a weak regional instrument for the protection of human rights, as compliance with it is mostly voluntary. Moreover, NAALC mechanisms for enforcing minimum wage, child labor, and safety and health in the workplace rights remain weak as well: its focus on governmental enforcement of rights rather than companies' prevents the organization from tackling the problem at root. Hence, it depends on the willingness of governments to cooperate (who in turn, have shown reluctance to form jointly a tri-national Evaluation Committee of Experts to further the cause). Furthermore, NAALC mechanisms don't include workers in the process. Candidates could assess working conditions in Mexican Maquiladoras to illustrate the argument.

*For answers to be considered at **Level 2**, there should be evidence of understanding of the aims and structure of the chosen regional IGO, and an attempt to evaluate its performance in protecting human rights. Candidates only analyse one side of the argument.*

*For answers to be considered at **Level 3**, there should be clear evidence of understanding of the aims and structure of the chosen regional IGO, and an evaluation of its performance in protecting human rights. Both sides of the argument are addressed, though the evaluation might lack balance.*

*For answers to be considered at **Level 4**, there should be clear evidence of understanding of the aims and structure of the chosen regional IGO, and an in-depth evaluation of its performance in protecting human rights. Candidates thoroughly evaluate both sides of the argument, provide solid examples, and explore factors that prevent the IGO from effectively protecting human rights.*

*Examiners should not expect all of the above, and should be receptive to examples that are not contemplated in the markscheme.*

## 7. To what extent has globalization benefited developing countries?

This question demands that candidates define the concepts of “globalization” and “developing countries”, and then examine if such processes have benefited the latter politically, economically and socially. Candidates are expected to explore both the benefits and problems that globalization has brought to developing countries. The more sophisticated answer will include detailed evidence to illustrate views, and could challenge the assumption that globalization has affected all developing countries equally, suggesting that regional integration has at times acted as a buffer to globalization’s effects.

To evaluate globalization’s **social effects**, examiners should remain receptive to a number of approaches, which include the impact of cross-cultural contacts; the commoditization of health-care; environmental degradation; the possibilities offered by migration; the effects of international law on the enforcement of human rights (including women, children and worker’s rights); among others.

To evaluate globalization’s **economic effects**, candidates could examine the effects of the emergence of world financial markets and institutions on third world economies; explore economic theories of comparative advantage or dependency theories; analyse the effects of trade liberalization on developing economies; examine globalization’s impact on manufacturing and consumer goods; among others.

To evaluate globalization’s **political effects** candidates could examine how the increase of information flows has empowered individuals and social groups against governments, forcing democratic change. The role of developed countries and IGOs in promoting and/or imposing democratization and human rights could also be examined.

*For answers to be considered at **Level 2**, there should be evidence of understanding of the concepts of globalization and developing countries, and an attempt to evaluate globalization’s impact on developing states. Candidates only analyse one side of the argument.*

*For answers to be considered at **Level 3**, there should be clear evidence of understanding of the concepts of globalization and developing countries, and an evaluation of globalization’s impact on developing states. Both sides of the argument are addressed, though the evaluation might lack balance.*

*For answers to be considered at **Level 4**, there should be clear evidence of understanding of the concepts of globalization and developing countries, and an in-depth evaluation of globalization’s impact on developing states. Candidates thoroughly evaluate both sides of the argument and provide solid examples.*

*The depth with which this is achieved and the effective use of examples can be a good discriminator between **Level 3** and **Level 4**.*

*Examiners should not expect all of the above, and should be receptive to examples that are not contemplated in the markscheme.*

**8. In international relations theory, analysis is often made at system, state or individual level. Using all three levels of analysis, evaluate the successes and failures of any one humanitarian intervention.**

This question demands that candidates define and describe Systems, State and Individual Levels of Analysis, and apply each of these levels to determine the reasons why any one humanitarian intervention succeeded or failed. To do so, candidates must also define what is meant by the term “humanitarian campaign.” The more sophisticated answer will provide detailed knowledge on the case study to allow for in-depth analysis.

At a **Systems Level**, IR is analysed by examining the world order that prevails at any given time in terms of the theory of the polar balance of power. It is argued that the state of polarity (uni-polar, bipolar or multi-polar) affects what states can effectively do in IR. Furthermore, at System Level, analysts also examine how global or regional arrangements can affect state action.

A **State Level Analysis** examines the nature, structure and functioning of particular states and the domestic pressures, which affect the formulation and execution of foreign policy.

At an **Individual Level**, the analysis concentrates on the individuals who are in powerful positions and the personal, psychological, political and alternative pressures that they face, which may affect their policy-making decisions.

As stated, candidates are required to apply each of these levels to evaluate the causes for the success or failure of any **one** humanitarian intervention, defined as military intervention to prevent human rights violations. Cases for analysis may include Operation Provide Comfort (Iraq, 1991), Unified Task Force (Somalia, 1992), Operation Uphold Democracy (Haiti, 1994), UNAMIR (Rwanda, 1994), UNTAET (East Timor, 1999), NATO bombing of Yugoslavia (1999), Coalition military intervention in Libya (2011), among others.

*For answers to be considered at **Level 2**, there should be evidence of understanding of the concept of humanitarian intervention, though all three levels are not adequately applied to evaluate reasons for its successes and failures. Alternatively, all three levels are covered but candidates only address one side of the argument.*

*For answers to be considered at **Level 3**, there should be clear evidence of understanding of the concept of humanitarian intervention, and application of all three levels to evaluate reasons for its successes and failures. Alternatively, an in-depth evaluation of successes and failures is provided, applying only two levels of analysis.*

*For answers to be considered at **Level 4**, all three levels are discussed in greater depth to evaluate reasons for successes and failures, and detailed knowledge on the humanitarian intervention is demonstrated.*

*Examiners should be receptive to examples not contemplated in the markscheme.*