



MARKSCHEME

May 2014

GLOBAL POLITICS

Higher Level and Standard Level

Paper 2

11 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 the IB Assessment Centre.*

The paper is marked using the generic markbands below, 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 | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The work does not reach a standard described by the descriptors below. |
| 1–5 | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 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 | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 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 fundamental political concepts and approaches. • There is limited justification of main points. • Counterclaims are not considered. |
| 11–15 | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 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 fundamental political concepts and approaches. • Many of the main points are justified and arguments are largely coherent. • Some counterclaims are considered. |
| 16–20 | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 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 fundamental political concepts and approaches. • All or nearly all of the main points are justified and arguments are coherent. • Counterclaims are explored. |
| 21–25 | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 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 fundamental political concepts and approaches. • All of the main points are justified. Arguments are clear, coherent and compelling. • Counterclaims 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. Some questions use the key concepts of a particular unit; others may draw on key concepts from several units; yet others may not use key concepts at all. 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. Examine the claim that the significance of military power is diminishing in contemporary global politics.

Better answers will demonstrate an excellent grasp of the concept of military power, and are likely to contrast this with other types of power such as economic power. They could include discussion of the various components of power, for example, military, economic (tangible) and leadership (intangible), or of how power has been viewed differently by different schools of thought.

Arguments in favour of the claim that the significance of military power has diminished could include:

- the increasing weight of variables such as economic interdependence, transnational actors and international organizations;
- increased globalization leading to less emphasis on individual states and their individual military power; economic power being equally, if not more, important than military power, as economic power is required to bolster military power;
- the idea that some issues do not lend themselves to military solutions, for example, states may avoid using military action if it could negatively impact future trade agreements *etc.*

Arguments against the claim that the significance of military power has diminished may include:

- military force remains critical, as shown by the fact that the production of arms continues to increase;
- the sale of military weapons has become a major factor in the arming of various contestants for control of resources;
- military power is also still important as a deterrent, *etc.*

Answers should include reference to specific examples. These could include examples such as the anti-military culture in places such as Japan; anti-war movements, such as the protests against the war in Iraq; or the importance of military power in the conflict in Syria.

The responses are likely to end with a conclusion stating to what extent the candidate agrees or disagrees that the significance of military power is diminishing in contemporary global politics.

2. Discuss the impact of NGOs, MNCs, and international organizations on state sovereignty.

Better answers will demonstrate an excellent understanding of the concept of sovereignty, including reference to sovereignty as characterizing a state's independence, its control over territory and its ability to govern itself. Candidates may talk about the role and functions of the state, and then proceed to explore how and what kind of an impact each of the aforementioned – NGOs, MNCs and international organizations like the United Nations – has had on state sovereignty.

Arguments that these actors have no real impact may include:

- states may control the agenda of many of these organizations;
- the strengthening of national security and national interest due to the threat of terrorism and to economic interests;
- states sometimes have a choice over whether to align with recommendations/policies *etc* from these organizations, rather than these being compulsory, *etc*.

Arguments that these actors have a big impact may include:

- trade agreements;
- corporate demands on state laws, for example, environmental or labour laws;
- capital flight;
- threats to relocate;
- the ability of these actors to have significant impact, even bringing down governments or bringing about severe economic consequences for states, *etc*.

The responses should make reference to specific examples, such as (*have no real impact*): the EU, the World Bank, and the IMF control the interests of states; states can ban NGO protests such as in Singapore; the US refused to sign the Kyoto agreement; (*have a big impact*): can bring down governments, for example, Guatemala.

The responses may end with a conclusion/judgment on the impact of NGOs, MNCs and international organizations on state sovereignty.

Human rights

3. **Compare and contrast an institutional approach to the ratification and enforcement of human rights (for example, through the Hague Courts) with non-institutional approaches (for example, through human rights NGOs, such as Amnesty International).**

It is not necessary for the response to be equally balanced between similarities and differences to achieve the highest marks.

Better answers will demonstrate an excellent understanding of the concept of human rights; for example they may include references to human rights as often being regarded as universal, inalienable, equal, and indivisible rights which people are entitled to purely by being human.

Answers should explore the similarities and differences between an institutional and non-institutional approach to the ratification and enforcement of human rights.

Similarities may include:

- both try to actively enforce human rights ideals;
- both have controversial aspects;
- both have become increasingly media centred;
- both interact with government bodies and seats of power at various geographic levels.

Differences may include:

- non-institutional organizations such as Human Rights Watch or Amnesty International are often seen to have sufficient influence to have an effect on human rights policies, whereas institutions tend to have more prestige, resources or power;
- institutional approaches tend to be more state centred, whereas non-institutional approaches tend to be more informal or more local;
- institutional approaches have to work within systemic frameworks;
- there are possible differences in how they are financed.

Candidates may name institutional forums and organizations that consider human rights beyond those mentioned in the question itself. Examples may include the Zapatista rebellion, the International Court of Justice, groups such as Occupy, *etc.* They may also discuss specific examples of failures of the particular approaches, for example the fact that none of the major powers have been brought to the Hague Courts.

The response may sum up with a conclusion on the similarities and differences between institutional and non-institutional approaches to human rights ratification and enforcement.

4. To what extent do the complex realities and relationships of power in global politics make the concept of human rights an unachievable ideal?

Better answers will demonstrate an excellent understanding of the concept of human rights and the concept of power. They may then discuss whether the realities of power make the goals utopian rather than realistic.

Arguments that they are unachievable may include:

- inherent differences in resources and opportunities
- they are too idealistic;
- they are unrealistic or impractical;
- reference to the complex links between political and economic power;
- the difficulties posed by entrenched belief systems; *etc.*

Arguments that human rights are achievable may include:

- there has been progress in gaining recognition of human rights, even in difficult circumstances;
- power can be seen to be moving away from the state to grassroots, which links to the importance of the individual rather than the state in human rights.

Answers should make reference to specific examples, such as, for instance, to the fact that 147 countries ratified the Convention against Torture and Other Cruel, Inhuman or Degrading Treatment or Punishment; or they could refer to the success of polio vaccination programmes, or to MNC demands, for example, for free trade zones, *etc.*

Answers may include a conclusion reflecting on how power and human rights are interlinked, and on the extent to which the complex realities and relationships of power in global politics make the concept of human rights an unachievable ideal. They may, for example, conclude that human rights are aspirational goals, so it does not matter whether they are achievable or not.

Development

5. Evaluate the claim that development through aid relies heavily on a stable government and a lack of corruption.

Better answers will demonstrate an excellent understanding of the concept of development and the concept of aid. They may also distinguish between different types of development, such as human and sustainable development, and different types of aid. Answers may also contain an explanation of the meaning of the terms “stable government” and “lack of corruption”, and may contrast development through aid to development through other methods. The focus of the question is on the factors that enable development, rather than on the removal of obstacles to development (emphasized at the time of the MDGs).

Arguments supporting the claim may include:

- that development depends on the removal of barriers such as corruption;
- that corruption can lead to a misallocation of resources, and to resources not being used for their intended purpose;
- that development relies on stable governance and infrastructure; *etc.*

Arguments against the claim may include:

- that often the countries that need aid are exactly those that have unstable governments and issues with corruption;
- that the success of development relies far more on factors other than the two mentioned, such as financial stability;
- that bureaucracy can actually stifle economic activity whereas corruption and bribes can stimulate/facilitate economic activity; *etc.*

Answers should make reference to specific examples such as Transparency International, worldaudit.org, the Corruption Perception Index, UNDP, the UN Convention against Corruption, *etc.* They may also make reference to specific examples of countries where instability and corruption have postponed development, such as in Sudan, and to countries where a relative stability and lack of corruption have promoted it, such as in Chile. Responses may end with a conclusion/judgment on whether development through aid depends on stable government and lack of corruption.

6. The fundamental weakness of development goals (such as the Millennium Development Goals) is their lack of focus on how targets are actually to be achieved. To what extent do you agree with this claim?

Better answers will demonstrate an excellent understanding of the concept of development and may also contain explanations of concepts underlying particular goals such as environmental sustainability, poverty or hunger. Answers may focus on the example provided of the Millennium Development Goals and the setting of development targets for realization in 2015, or they may focus on other examples of development goals.

Arguments that this is a fundamental weakness of development goals may include:

- the lack of focus on methods;
- the lack of defined responsibilities for rich countries; *etc.*

Answers may also identify other weaknesses of development goals, such as to the need to further develop some targets, for example, equality and gender issues, or to the need to respond to the changes in the political climate since 9/11; *etc.*

Arguments that this is not a fundamental weakness of development goals may include:

- it was justifiable to set the MDGs without guidance on how to achieve them because they were intended to raise consciousness about development issues;
- development goals help with the classification of issues into defined categories;
- they provide a focus for political consensus at international level, *etc.*

Answers should make reference to specific examples, which could for instance be drawn from the UN Secretary General’s annual progress report, or from the experience of individual countries.

Responses may end with a conclusion/judgment on the extent to which it is helpful to set such targets without specifying the means of achieving them.

Peace and Conflict

7. “Transforming armed conflict towards peace relies on an interrelationship of peacemaking, peace keeping and peace building.” Discuss.

Better answers will demonstrate an excellent understanding of the concepts of peace and conflict, and will explain the terms peacemaking, peace keeping and peace building, and how these three interrelate. Although it is expected that candidates should explain what is meant by armed conflict, it should be noted that providing lengthy definitions of terms should not form the main part of the essay. The focus should be on discussing the interrelationship between the three concepts named in the question:

- peacemaking may be described as armed intervention with the possible use of force (violence) to separate parties in conflict. Answers may discuss whether it is always and only defined as this, for example, discussing whether efforts at diplomacy may not also count as peace-making.
- peace keeping may be described as maintaining the status quo with armed force and with the use of unarmed observers between parties in conflict with their agreement.
- peace building may be described as the building of positive peace and the infrastructure of civil society, for example, education, access to health care, local services and governance structures, and the removing of psychological scars of violence. Candidates may refer to the concept of peace as often being defined as a state both of non-conflict and of harmonious relations.

Candidates should discuss the relative importance of each process to the others and how each contributes to a successful peace process. The more sophisticated answers may identify that international interest and support for the process will usually have declined or disappeared before peace building has been embarked on.

Arguments for reliance on an interrelationship may include:

- if the infrastructure and stable governance is not in place then the peace will not last;
- if there is no reconciliation and reconstruction then conflict may reignite, and there may be lasting psychological resentment *etc.*

Arguments against reliance on an interrelationship may include:

- the view that as soon as armed conflict has stopped, peace has been achieved, so you don't need the other elements.

Candidates could also argue that lasting peace relies on other factors, such as the protection of human rights, and fair access to resources, in addition to these three elements. Answers may make reference to specific examples, such as to Afghanistan and Iraq, where the emphasis is on reconstruction, or to where the lack of all three activities for securing peace has meant that conflict has returned, or to where they have successfully been implemented together to establish peace.

Answers should include a conclusion on whether peace does rely on an interrelationship of these three. Candidates may bring in a practical reflection such as that although all three might be needed this is not always possible to implement – for example, if resources are limited, then it might be preferable to use these in more urgent peacemaking situations rather than tying them up in peacekeeping and peace building efforts.

8. **“If a person died from tuberculosis in the eighteenth century it would be hard to conceive of this as violence since it might have been quite unavoidable, but if he dies from it today, despite all the medical resources in the world, then violence is present” (Galtung). To what extent do you agree with the view that those in power have an obligation to identify and prevent structural violence?**

Better answers will demonstrate an excellent understanding of what is meant by structural violence. Candidates may discuss the importance of understanding different concepts of peace and violence: peace as the absence of war and direct violence, or peace as the absence of all violence, including structural violence as in this reference. Candidates may include specific discussion of Galtung and the context of the 1960s and 1970s and how this is relevant today (the quotation, from 1969, comes from the context of the Cold War and the clash between different ideologies): however it should be noted that this should **not** be the focus of the response.

Arguments that those in power have an obligation may include:

- economic and social policies should include equal access for everyone;
- those in power have a primary obligation to meet the basic needs of all people;
- health care provisions like vaccinations are a basic need;
- governments have more formal obligations and responsibilities than NGOs, MNCs, *etc.*

Arguments that they do not have an obligation may include:

- there is no such thing as structural violence;
- epidemics are natural and unfortunate events rather than the responsibility of governments;
- it is the responsibility of individuals to take care of themselves, and the managers of power have no obligation to do so.

Answers may make reference to specific examples, such as to places where deaths due to tuberculosis are still happening, such as in rural Haiti; or to where water is still the cause of a high percentage of communicable diseases, such as in India, or to where desertification and other negative environmental impacts, with resulting implications for health, occur due to the building of dams, for example, as in the Three Gorges Dam over the Yangtze river.

Candidates should include a conclusion on the extent to which they agree that those in power have an obligation to prevent structural violence.