Diploma Programme
Programme du diplôme
Programa del Diploma

Markscheme

November 2017

Global politics

Higher level and standard level

Paper 2

13 pages

International Baccalaureate
Baccalauréat International
Bachillerato Internacional

This markscheme is the property of the International Baccalaureate and must **not** be reproduced or distributed to any other person without the authorization of the IB Global Centre, Cardiff.

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.

Important points to note
- The content listed in the markscheme indicates possible areas candidates might cover in their answers. Candidates may take a different approach, which if appropriate, should be rewarded. Examiners should not expect all of the information listed and should allow other valid points.
- Students are expected to draw on political concepts that are relevant to the arguments they put forward. These will usually be, but are not always, taken from the concepts listed in the global politics guide – if they are valid and relevant to the answer, they can be rewarded.
- The paper expects conceptual understanding but extensive knowledge of political theory is **not** required unless the question specifies it.
- Explicit stand-alone definitions are not required: understanding of terms may sometimes be conveyed as effectively through the way they are woven into the response.
- Please do keep in mind the IB command term associated with each question and recognize what candidates are required to do in response.
- The candidates are heavily time-constrained so numerous examples are not expected.

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.

Power, sovereignty and international relations

1. **Examine the claim that state sovereignty is challenged by non-governmental organizations (NGOs) and non-state actors such as intergovernmental organizations (IGOs).**

   Responses are likely to include an explanation of the concept of sovereignty – implying that the state or government has supreme authority. Candidates may discuss how the state is the sole author of laws within its territory (internal sovereignty). External sovereignty refers to the capacity of each state to act independently and autonomously on the world stage. Candidates may then briefly dwell upon their understanding of NGOs (organizations with membership, support and activities across borders) and non-state actors (Amnesty International) with some examples of how these have an impact on state sovereignty.

   Arguments that state sovereignty is challenged by NGOs and non-state actors may include:
   - NGOs such as Amnesty International have emerged as powerful players and influencers of policy with their legitimacy and expertise. These NGOs have an important role to play and scrutinise states which fall short of delivering on their responsibilities. For instance, in 2013 efforts from Amnesty International saw some progress with regards to the detention facility at Guantanamo Bay when President Obama appointed staff to lead the effort to close the detention facility, Congress rolled back some restrictions on transferring detainees to other countries, and 11 detainees were transferred
   - NGOs work together to influence state sovereignty and policy making. For example, multinational corporation Johnson Controls joined other firms to work for energy efficiency in 2012. The Clinton Climate Initiative and Rocky Mountain Institute also collaborated on the project. The groups estimated the project will cut energy costs by 38%, saving US$4.4m annually and reducing carbon emissions by 105,000 metric tons over 15 years
   - NGOs have a significant role to play in shaping public opinion, reviewing compliance and policy changes which in turn has an impact on the direction of decisions taken by sovereign states
   - non-state actors such as international and regional organizations challenge the Westphalian notion of sovereignty. States cede a certain amount of sovereignty to IGOs such as the UN and choose to follow certain norms and rules laid out by these global governance institutions
   - non-state actors challenge state sovereignty. Terrorist groups directly attack infrastructure and people whose welfare is a responsibility of the state.

   Arguments that state sovereignty is not challenged by NGOs and non-state actors may include:
   - the capacity of NGOs to interfere in a state's internal affairs or functioning is very limited due to their limited powers, lack of military resources and at times lack of proper funding
   - NGOs need state support to make an impact and contribution
   - Non-state actors such as terrorist groups do not necessarily have the same kind of resources as a state
   - the sovereign state remains the primary unit in global politics. Non-state actors such as terrorist groups do not have the kind of power, legitimacy and resources states possess.

   Responses should contain references to specific examples. They could cite cases of states which have had to make changes to their policies due to pressure from non-state actors and non-governmental organizations. Candidates could then conclude by responding on how far they think the sovereignty of states is eroded by these NGOs and non-state actors. Candidates are expected to discuss the impact of both NGOs and non-state actors on state sovereignty and those who can do both should be awarded marks accordingly. Responses should include the candidate's evaluation of the validity of the claim put forward in the question.

2. **Evaluate the function and impact of *one* of the following in dealing with global challenges:**
   - **Political parties**
   - **Intergovernmental organizations (IGOs)**
   - **Multinational corporations (MNCs)**
   - **Informal forums.**

Responses should demonstrate a clear understanding of what candidates define and identify as global challenges – climate change, non-state actors such as crime and terrorist groups, poverty, sustainable development, gender disparities, hunger and diseases, food and water security. In a globalized world these challenges cannot be tackled by states in isolation. Candidates could then move on to choose any one of the four options – political parties (Democratic and Republican in US, Communist Party of China, Peoples' Action Party in Singapore among others), IGOs (such as WTO, IMF, EU and ASEAN among others), MNCs (Unilever, Ikea, Tata, Nike among others) or informal forums (G20, G7, G8, WEF among others) and delve further into what their understanding of each of them involves and includes:

Political parties:
- Political parties are important actors in a democratic society. Citizens have options on policies, which in turn can become legislation which could be directly or indirectly linked to steps in dealing with global challenges. For example, candidates could cite cases of political parties such as the Democratic Party of the US which has clearly outlined certain issues of global concern such as managing terrorism, non-proliferation of weapons and climate leadership
- Political parties provide democratic societies with leaders who will pursue interests and collaborate with other leaders at international fora to manage global challenges
- Political parties help to address global challenges such as lack of gender empowerment and participation in decision making by involving more women in their organization
- Political parties can make use of their access to and contacts with international organizations, NGOs and groups abroad/across borders and use this linkage to address global challenges
- Parties in power can implement social, political and economic reforms which directly and indirectly help manage global challenges.

Intergovernmental organizations (IGOs):
- IGOs such as the EU and ASEAN can become powerful platforms to formulate, coordinate and implement policies to address global challenges such as migration and poverty. Candidates could give examples of IGOs such as ASEAN and the EU policies to combat terrorism and organized crime through sharing best practices, intelligence, cutting off funding *etc*
- Member states of these groups can help and assist each other using their own expertise to face cross border challenges such as the role of ASEAN in dealing with the outbreak of SARS in 2003.

Multinational corporations (MNCs):
- MNCs can contribute towards tackling several global challenges through corporate social responsibility schemes
- MNCs employing local population in relatively poorer areas can help provide employment to people and help to alleviate poverty
- MNCs have economic resources, technology, an international presence, and the ability to use markets to try to solve global challenges
- Some candidates could argue that MNCs primarily aim at making profits and do not try to deal with global challenges.

Informal forums:

- Informal forums such as G20 have taken steps to manage global challenges by strengthening financial systems, promoting economic growth and employment, enhancing food security and promoting green growth
- Groups such as the G8 countries encompassing powerful states can implement policies and agendas in formal world institutions to manage global problems. For example, the World Economic Forum meeting of business leaders at Davos in 2014 had many global challenges such as overcoming famine and economic inequality on its agenda
- Some candidates could argue that many of these informal forums are not able to contribute much to solving global issues considering that they do not have a staff, headquarters or rules and powers.

Responses should contain references to specific examples. Any other valid and relevant examples should be evaluated positively.

Human rights

3.   **To what extent has the Universal Declaration of Human Rights (UDHR) provided the basis for contemporary political movements for social change?**

Responses should include examples of contemporary political movements and how they can be related to the UDHR. Components of the UDHR should be used to illustrate the examples in answering the question.

Arguments that the UDHR has provided the basis for contemporary political movements for social change may include:
- the leaders of contemporary social movements have referred to the UDHR in their justifications for action
- the UDHR has served as a basis for the recruiting of grass roots membership into movements for social change
- the development of the UDHR was commissioned by the UN as the basis for motivating change across a range of issues
- contemporary treaties and covenants are based on goals and objectives set by the UDHR (i.e., The Beijing Declaration, the Kyoto Agreement, *etc*)
- the UDHR has provided the basis for humanitarian intervention approved by the UN.

Arguments that the UDHR has not provided the basis for contemporary political movements for social change may include:
- some might argue that contemporary social movements have developed independently of the UDHR, and that most grass-root members of contemporary social movements have never heard of the UDHR
- the UDHR is dated and does not fully relate to the demands of contemporary movements, (*ie* climate change)
- the problem of cultural relativism is still an issue in many non-western countries whose social movements may not recognize or agree with the UDHR
- many contemporary social movements (*eg* Arab Spring, Occupy) have emerged as spontaneous mass movements for social change that have not referred to the UDHR in their development.

Responses should contain references to specific examples. Candidates could choose one argument or another, and these choices should be rewarded if they are clearly argued. But both can be justified by referring to various movements for social change around the globe.

Responses should include the candidate's evaluative conclusion on the extent to which the UDHR has provided the basis for contemporary political movements for social change.

4.   **"Universal rights should take precedence over cultural relativism in the formation of human rights treaties and covenants."   Discuss this view.**

Reponses should define cultural relativism, universal rights and human rights treaties and covenants. Examples of treaties and covenants should be provided in the answer, along with the reasons for why the assertion provided by the question does or does not hold.

Arguments that support the view that universal rights should take precedence over cultural relativism in the formation of human rights treaties and covenants may include:
- recent treaties and covenants have urged the acceptance of, for example, women's rights, pollution standards, recognition of climate change and a condemnation of genital mutilation despite arguments for the recognition of cultural relativism
- cultural relativism is no longer recognized as a mechanism that can guarantee freedom from harm to life and limb. This is recognized in treaties and covenants (*eg* the Beijing Declaration for the Rights of Women)
- globalization has made universal rights the standard approach for meetings of human rights activists and UN Organizations (such as UNESCO, the United Nations Entity for Gender Equality and the Empowerment of Women, and the UN Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Discrimination Against Women, which specifically targets genital mutilation) and major agreements such as the Beijing Declaration and the Kyoto Protocol on greenhouse gas emission reductions
- cultural relativism has often been used an excuse for the discrimination against women and ethnic groups.

Arguments that oppose the view that universal rights should take precedence over cultural relativism in the formation of human rights treaties and covenants may include:
- many countries and groups still argue that the UNDR is a western document that discriminates against the culture and practices of Asian and African societies, citing the need to recognize cultural relativism
- the treaties and conventions that argue for universal rights are not enforceable and are therefore not followed or agreed to by many parts of the world, who insist on their own cultural knowledge and practices
- in many Middle Eastern countries women want and demand circumcision to be eligible for employment opportunities and marriage
- human rights treaties and covenants are often not signed by the major industrialized countries and members of the UN Security Council, including the United States, Russia, India, China and Israel, citing the need to recognize differences in human rights standards among nations.

Globalization has created greater diversity as local cultures incorporate beliefs from the outside, creating more needs for the recognition of cultural diversity and relativism. Responses should contain references to specific examples. Responses should include the candidate's evaluation of the validity of the view put forward in the question.

Development

5. **"Definitions of development that stress meeting basic needs should be replaced with definitions that focus on well-being." Discuss this statement.**

Responses should demonstrate some understanding of the two approaches. Candidates should define the basic needs approach which is linked to the measurement of absolute poverty in developing countries, or the absolute minimum resources necessary for long-term physical well-being and the amount of income needed to satisfy these needs. The approach originated at the International Labor Organisation's World Employment Conference in 1976, and candidates should be aware that basic needs include food, water, shelter and clothing and more recently sanitation, education and healthcare. Candidates should be able to mention indicators of basic needs such as the Human Development Index (HDI), and to note that it is consumption-orientated. The shortcomings of this approach lie in the use of averages and aggregates which say little about individual experiences.

Candidates should also define the more recent well-being approach, which owes much to Amartya Sen who emphasizes the need to listen to what people themselves are saying they need, even though it might not yet be possible to realize it. Candidates should be able to mention well-being indicators such as The Happy Planet Index, or the OECD well-being indices. Examples of projects aiming to understand poverty from the perspective of the poor themselves should be rewarded.

Arguments that support the view that basic needs definitions should be replaced with well-being definitions may include:
- basic needs indicators make use of averages, medians and aggregates which say little about individual experiences
- well-being indicators are based on listening to what people say rather than measurement of needs determined by academic and international organizations
- understanding poverty from the perspective of the poor is surely better as a means of identifying future pathways to development than measuring levels of consumption.

Arguments against the view that basic needs definitions should be replaced with well-being definitions may include:
- well-being indicators are subjective, based on what people say rather than empirically observed data
- composite indicators such as HDI are quite sophisticated and allow for comparisons between countries and over time
- basic needs such as food, shelter, fresh water and clothing are surely universal needs whereas wellbeing is a state of mind
- basic needs indicators reflect what has been achieved whereas wellbeing indicators reflect aspirations which may not be achieved.

The command term "Discuss" is defined as "Offer a considered and balanced review that includes a range of arguments, factors or hypotheses. Opinions or conclusions should be presented clearly and supported by appropriate evidence." It allows candidates to draw a number of different conclusions, all of which can be valid if argued convincingly and with examples. The two approaches may be seen as complementary, or, alternatively, the candidate may agree or disagree with the quotation in varying degrees. A chronological argumentation can be taken and candidates may argue that one approach has grown out of the other. They may also argue that the basic needs approach is a precondition for the well-being approach.

6. **Discuss the view that harmful environmental factors represent the greatest threat to successful development.**

Responses may begin with a definition of successful development which points towards enhanced living standards and well-being as a corollary of economic growth, perhaps including measures of health, education, and longevity. Harmful environmental factors may be approached in different ways including for example population, natural resources, presence or lack of stability or conflict, and, perhaps most likely, sustainability and climate change.

Arguments that support the view that harmful environmental factors represent the greatest threat to successful development may include:
- climate change as a result of harmful environmental activities may prove the ultimate barrier to development. A current example is the disappearance of island communities due to rising sea levels *eg* Maldives/Tuvalu and threat to low lying cities and river deltas *eg* Nigeria
- climatic hazards such as hurricanes and drought render some countries fragile, *eg* drought led to famine in the Horn of Africa in 2011–12 leading to a refugee crisis and the diversion of resources away from development
- large scale, energy intensive industrialisation leads to environmental degradation which threatens further development *eg* parts of India
- sustainability can be compromised if poor countries exploit non-renewable resources at a rate which does not allow them to refresh, *eg* forests, fish.

Arguments against the view that harmful environmental factors represent the greatest threat to successful development may include:
- rapid population growth may prove a greater threat to successful development than harmful environmental factors through uncontrolled migration, and vicious circles of poverty
- a range of economic factors can be considered as prerequisites for successful development, *eg* factors of production such as natural resources and capital, and without them development is impossible, meaning that harmful environmental factors are of lesser significance
- a range of non-economic factors can also be considered as essential to successful development, such as property rights, absence of corruption and an educated workforce
- wars, conflict and political instability may prove a greater threat to successful development that harmful environmental factors, such as in Syria and Iraq.

The command term "Discuss" is defined as *"Offer a considered and balanced review that includes a range of arguments, factors or hypotheses. Opinions or conclusions should be presented clearly and supported by appropriate evidence."* Candidates can support the view and/or oppose it, in which case an alternative threat or threats to successful development should be identified. In either case, arguments should be supported with examples.

Peace and conflict

7.   **Examine the claim that contrasting material interests are the main cause of conflicts.**

Responses should include clear descriptions of the causes of conflict in the examples used.

Important to notice here is the absence of the term 'violent', which means the question concerns virtually every conflict, between individuals, between groups or between states. It also concerns conflicts that have not yet become violent, but where relations are clearly problematic as between China and several East-Asian states with regards to the South China Sea. The way in which the relationships between the USA and the rest of the world develop could become central to this question. Answers can draw on any example of conflict, if it is used to effectively answer the question.

Arguments that support the claim may include:
- conflicts around identity or territory are often ultimately concerned with contrasting material interests
- conflicts usually do not start unless there is material interest involved
- examples of international conflicts could be: China in the East-China Sea, USA involvement in Iraq, which arguably is still about oil. An example of an interstate conflict is Boko-Haram in Nigeria where it has been said that its success is for a large part due to the deplorable economic circumstances in Northern Nigeria
- government's material interests come into conflict with the interests of non-state actors, such as the demonstrations against the oil pipeline in Dakota (2017), USA, and the rejection of a liquefied gas plant at the mouth of the Skeena river by a group of First Nation People in Canada (2016)
- environmental well-being could be a material interest, as in both cases above, the rivers involved are likely to be polluted which will create material difficulties for the inhabitants of the region. Continuing conflicts in the Nigerian delta between international oil companies and local inhabitants are another example.

Arguments against the claim may include:
- there are always multiple causes to a conflict
- other factors, such as values, ideology, identity or security can play a more significant role
- many inter-state conflicts are started because of grievances, not greed, against the state
- some candidates may explain the question with reference to the PIN model (Position, Interests, Needs), which claims it is necessary to understand **all** of the interests behind actors' positions before a conflict can be solved. This will often show that material interests do not always come first, but rather the aforementioned values, security, identity or ideology
- examples of (inter)national conflicts could be: Russia–Ukraine, India–Pakistan, Israel–Palestine, Turkey and the Kurds (identity/security more than material interests)
- many of the examples could be turned both ways, and this should be rewarded as long as the arguments are well substantiated.

Responses should contain references to specific examples and should include the candidate's conclusion on whether or not contrasting material interests are the main cause of conflicts.

8. **Discuss the view that non-violent protest is the only way to achieve lasting change in conflicts between the state and non-state actors.**

Responses should include a definition or examples of non-violent methods, to highlight the differences between non-violent and violent conflicts.

Candidates are given the opportunity to explore their understanding of the use of non-violent methods when people engage in conflicts.

Arguments in favour of the view may include:
- the state has easy access to military resources and will therefore almost always be stronger. (Gandhi in British India, Egypt)
- responding to non-violence with violence often strengthens the cause of the non-state actors, because the state is viewed as over-reacting (Martin Luther King in the USA; Egypt and the Arab Spring)
- non-violent action allows a focus on the issue itself rather than on the violence occurring
- it may be easier for people to get involved in non-violent protest such as a peaceful demonstration than in violent action such as the use of explosives (Examples from the Arab Spring can be used, but also Gandhi)
- violent methods used to protest may alienate the population from the protestors unlike non-violent methods used.

Arguments against the view may include:
- if non-violent methods used to protest are too weak, it can easily be crushed by the state (Turkey, later protests in Egypt)
- sometimes, violence sends a much stronger message to the state that the issue is serious (self-immolation in Tunisia which started off the Arab Spring)
- states may ignore non-violent methods used to protest, but are more likely to have to respond to violence
- violence may bring the population to side with the non-state actors, out of fear
- violence may make the world aware of the conflict (Rohingya in Myanmar)
- movements may begin as non-violent but often end up being violent (Syria).

Responses are likely to refer to classic historical examples concerning Gandhi/British India, Martin Luther King Jr/USA, Mandela/South Africa, but contemporary examples should be rewarded. Candidates can refer to examples of a more local nature where non-violent protest may or may not have been effective in producing lasting change.
Responses should include the candidate's conclusion to what extent they support the view that non-violent protest is the only way to achieve lasting change in conflicts between the state and non-state actors. It is possible and highly likely that candidates will only agree to some extent.