Diploma Programme
Programme du diplôme
Programa del Diploma

Markscheme

November 2019

Global politics

Higher level and standard level

Paper 2

16 pages

International Baccalaureate
Baccalauréat International
Bachillerato Internacional

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. 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 information 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. 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.
- 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. **Discuss the effectiveness of two types of power and their impact on global politics.**

   Responses should demonstrate a clear understanding of the concept of power as well as its various forms – hard (military, economic such as sanctions) and soft (social, cultural, aid *etc*), individual and collective or unilateral and multilateral. Power could be described as the ability to influence others to get them to do what you want. Candidates could move on to identify some types of power before clearly outlining the two types they will discuss.

   Arguments why different types of power could be effective could include:
   - hard power is needed even in situations such as responses to disasters, *eg* those carried out by humanitarian UN agencies involving the use of soft power (disease, education, protection of health resources)
   - non-coercive means can produce a voluntary response from a given state and lead to a more effective and long-lasting result (soft power)
   - the states that exert the most influence globally, such as implementing/driving the UN agenda, possess hard power – have strong military capabilities and economic resources such as China, US (hard, collective, multilateral power)
   - multilateralism requires states to follow international norms and institutions and pool resources, making it more effective (collective, multilateral power)
   - soft power such as political ideals, cultural norms, diplomacy, economic assistance and social policies may be effective and some issues are resolved through the use of such methods. For example, Land Mine Treaties and Japan's pacifist strategic culture.
   - soft power or persuasion can be effectively used to achieve goals and preferred outcomes in contexts such as education and propaganda, *eg* through the use of social media (soft power)
   - many transnational issues such as climate change, pandemics, cybercrime, drug trafficking and terrorism could possibly be mitigated more successfully through non-coercive means. For example the Framework Convention on Climate Change 1992, Sustainable Development Goals and Millennium Development Goals. In an era of economic interdependence, incentives such as incorporation into free trade agreements could work more effectively in bringing about a desired outcome rather than coercion.
   - individuals with a powerful agenda are known to have effected change with considerable use of soft power, for example Trump and use of social media. Unilateral power is mostly used by powerful states to further their own interests (often disregarding others' interests) but could be effective because the state would most likely be hegemonic (unilateral power).

Arguments why different types of power could be ineffective could include:
- acquisition and maintenance of instruments of coercive power – military power, arms, nuclear weapons – is expensive and limited to specific circumstances (hard power).
- soft power is not very likely to bring about successful outcomes for states in a short time, especially in comparison with military action and economic sanctions. For instance, use of soft power may be ineffective or irrelevant compared to the use of force or protection of territorial integrity and autonomy. Also, soft power alone may not prove to be effective in dealing with intrastate/domestic and transnational wars involving non-state actors (insurgents, terrorists)
- mere possession of resources does not always result in a country having the power to achieve desired outcomes: sometimes non-material factors such as changes in strategy and/or leadership can affect outcomes (hard power)
- use of unilateral power may not be appreciated by other states and be perceived as selfish and might come with political costs, *eg* US withdrawal from the Trans-Pacific Partnership in December 2016.

Responses should contain references to specific examples. These may be taken, for instance from the varied use of different kinds of power by states in global politics. Responses should include the candidate's conclusion on whether the use of any two types of power they have chosen is effective or ineffective, as the case may be, in global politics. They could also argue that each of the types of power may work for some issues, while it may not work for others. This is also an acceptable argument.

Responses should include the candidate's position on the effectiveness of different types of power and their impact on global politics.

2.   Justify the statement that "the sovereign state is the most significant protector as well as the biggest threat to human rights".

Responses should demonstrate a clear understanding of the twin concepts of state sovereignty and human rights. State sovereignty could be described as the inherent supremacy of the state within its borders (internal), independence in international relations and the recognition that all states possess this power equally. Candidates could discuss the Westphalian notion of state sovereignty. They should also be able to briefly outline their understanding of the concept of human rights – their universality and inalienability. They could also bring in the concept of globalization and how it facilitates and necessitates interaction and interdependence with other states and also erodes traditional notions of state sovereignty. Candidates could then move on to discuss how the sovereign state is the most significant protector and/or violator of human rights.

Arguments why the sovereign state is the most significant protector and threat to human rights could include:
- it is ultimately the state which decides if it wishes to be part of human rights mechanisms. In that sense, the state remains the primary decision maker on all issues and matters related to human rights
- the sovereign state could take decisions and make policies which could have an impact on human rights, but could defend these on the plea that such decisions are within its jurisdiction and sovereign right. Interpretation and implementation of human rights guidelines within its boundaries is a function of the sovereign state
- several matters perceived as human rights violations have been rejected by states on the basis of cultural relativism, so ultimately the state decides
- unless there are major human rights violations, other states would not be able to interfere or crack down on such violations, which might be justified as an internal matter by the violating state
- the state has the power to defend citizens from human rights violations within its borders and protect them too considering that it can better manage warring groups within its borders.

Arguments why the sovereign state is not necessarily the major protector and threat to human rights could include:

- it could be argued that when states ratify or sign human rights agreements, they part with some amount of sovereignty on such matters
- sometimes, membership of some organizations/mechanisms, political and economic engagements with other countries in a globalized world require states to alter their domestic rules and legislation on human rights considering that many of these are tied with their support for human rights, *eg.* the EU.
- actions/policies perceived as gross violations of human rights by sovereign states are no longer accepted by the international community, which is able to respond through the concept of Responsibility to Protect (R2P).
- Non-state actors such as MNC's and terrorist organizations represent a more significant threat to human rights than states, *eg.* the egregious human rights violations perpetrated by ISIS, the violation of third-generation human rights by MNC's like BHP Billiton or Glencore.
- Non-governmental organisations (NGOs) do more to protect human rights than states by monitoring state compliance to human rights laws/treaties and raising awareness when violations occur, *eg.* the work of Amnesty International and Human Rights Watch.

Responses should contain references to specific examples where the sovereign state has emerged as the primary protector or violator of human rights. Success stories of human rights protection could include Sweden and Canada (which has been granting asylum to Chechens from Russia for instance) while violators of human rights could include Myanmar and Rohingya ethnic cleansing, political prisoners in Venezuela.

Candidates could then conclude by discussing whether they think the sovereign state is the primary protector or violator of human rights or not. They could also conclude that in some cases, the state is the protector while in other places and times it may not be.

Human rights

3. **"People who are forced to move from their homes due to circumstances beyond their control remain vulnerable, despite developments in human rights laws and treaties." Examine this view.**

Responses should apply the definition of human rights to demonstrate how it applies to groups such as internally displaced people (IDPs), refugees, and the stateless. The idea of vulnerability could be discussed using examples of different groups. Responses should demonstrate an understanding of how human rights laws and treaties are upheld and why those forced to move from their homes remain vulnerable.

*Arguments that the human rights of those forced to move **remain vulnerable** despite developments in human rights laws and treaties may include:*
*   most enforcement and protection takes place at a state level and is dependent on state interest (*eg* resources, political will)
*   those who are displaced may not have access to legal resources and support
*   many people are more vulnerable because they are victims of war and civil conflict, often at the hands of states
*   international coordination to protect the rights of people is generally weak, especially in emergency situations
*   international enforcement in lieu of state responsibility is rare.

*Arguments that those forced to move **can be adequately protected** using human rights laws and treaties may include:*
*   existing laws and treaties are already applicable to refugees and displaced people given their inalienable and universal rights
*   NGOs are increasing awareness of increased migration, refugee flows, and forced relocation, making it more difficult for the international system to ignore violations
*   while issues surrounding people forced to relocate are challenging the international system, there exists the political will to coordinate policy and address needs (as seen recently with the coordination of refugee policy among some EU members)
*   the UN's Responsibility to Protect (R2P) doctrine requires member states to prevent human rights abuses such as genocide and ethnic cleansing.

Responses should provide modern, specific examples such as the Rohingya from Myanmar and Syrian refugees, and include a candidate's conclusion on whether the human rights of those forced to move remain vulnerable despite human rights laws and treaties. Specific examples of human rights laws and treaties should be mentioned, *eg.* the 1951 Refugee Convention.

Responses should include the candidate's position on whether people who are forced to move from their homes due to circumstances beyond their control remain vulnerable, despite developments in human rights laws and treaties.

4. To what extent is the effective enforcement of human rights tied to the level of development in a state?

Candidates should briefly outline their understanding of the concept of human rights – their universality and inalienability. Responses should discuss how human rights are enforced, and the role of the state itself in guaranteeing human rights. Responses should include a definition of development, possibly recognizing its multidimensionality and that it remains a contested concept. Candidates should discuss the relevant institutions of enforcement (*eg* police, courts, and legislature), and to what extent the level of development affects their efficacy in upholding human rights.

Arguments that the effective enforcement of human rights **is** *tied to the level of development may include:*
- more developed states have higher levels of institutionalization and state capacity and are therefore better able to enforce human rights
- states need to reach a certain level of economic development that fulfils basic needs before they can use resources to enforce human rights
- more developed states are less likely to violate human rights as a repressive strategy
- human rights as currently conceived are identified most often with western-industrialized states that have high levels of development and strong human rights records already.

Arguments that the effective enforcement of human rights **is not** *tied to the level of development may include:*
- the existence of human rights violations in developed states suggests it is not a development issue (*eg* the use of the death penalty in the US, Japan, and Singapore)
- as delineated in the Universal Declaration of Human Rights, human rights are universal and not dependent on the level of development in the location where a person lives
- there are international courts and tribunals to enforce human rights when a state may be incapable of doing so*, ie*. where state institutions are weak or unwilling
- transnational advocacy networks empower organizations such as Amnesty International and Human Rights Watch that transcend states and can promote awareness and effective enforcement regardless of the level of state development or compliant behaviour.
- the effective enforcement of human rights is inherently difficult even before any link to the level of development is considered.

Responses should provide modern, specific examples that highlight the relationship between the effective enforcement of human rights and level of development. Specific examples might include the existence of human rights violations in developed states, for example, the European Court of Human Rights' ruling against the UK government's blanket ban on prisoners voting. Also, specific examples might include the effective protection of human rights in states with lower levels of development, such as the decision by Guatemala's constitutional court to recognize the indigenous Q'eqchi's collective property rights.

Responses should include the candidate's position on whether or not the effective enforcement of human rights is tied to the level of development.

Development

5.   **Discuss the limitations of measuring development with reference to *one* method you have studied.**

Responses should include definitions of development and at least one measurement method.

Possible limitations in measuring development may include:
- single indicator measures (such as Gross National Product) ignore other aspects (such as wellbeing)
- composite indicators (such as the Human Development Index) depend on weightings which may be contestable
- errors and inconsistencies may occur in the compiling of measurements
- measurements often rely on averages or per capita calculations, which tell us nothing about inequality and distribution, for example a small elite might command most wealth or income with the majority in poverty
- measurements are backward-looking, so tell us little about sustainability or future trends
- comparisons between countries may be affected by fluctuations in exchange rates and different costs of living, inflation, etc.
- measures can be misleading: if a factory poisons the environment, the costs of cleaning up and healthcare costs are added to measures like Gross National Product even though it is a negative for society
- measures which rely on monetary exchanges place no value on for example environmental degradation, unpaid work, intellectual property (*eg* open source software), wealth, the shadow economy, tax evaded, or subsistence farming. All of these may contribute to development.

It is likely that many candidates will argue that any such limitations are minimal and/or that despite any limitations present in measuring development there is still value in doing so. For instance:
- methods of measurement are generally consistent within and between countries, allowing us to compare development over time and internationally
- reputable organizations exist to collect, monitor and ensure accuracy of development indicators, such as the United Nations Development Programme (UNDP) and the Organization for Economic Co-operation and Development (OECD)
- new measures of development have been adopted to provide greater breadth and accuracy, such as the HPI (Human Poverty Index), ISEW (Index of Sustainable Economic Welfare)
- definitions of development have broadened to include welfare and wellbeing
- data collection has improved with the advent of computerized accounting and taxation.

Responses should contain references to specific examples.

Responses may include references to shortcomings of individual measures, such as double-counting in national income.

Responses should include the candidate's position on the limitations of the chosen development measure.

6. **Discuss the view that successful development depends on full participation at the international level.**

Responses should include a definition of development and some consideration of what 'successful' development might mean. Candidates should also offer some understanding of what participation at the international level involves (economic, political, social, cultural, etc.) as well as what it means to 'fully' participate.

Arguments that support the view that successful development depends on full participation at the international level may include:

- development is limited to the home market unless there is participation at the international level through trade. Historically, few countries have developed successfully based on the home market alone
- China and India were inward-orientated and had limited interactions with the global community until recently yet have developed rapidly in recent times. A recent example is the One Road One Belt initiative
- since 2000 the Millennium Development Goals and, subsequently, the Sustainable Development Goals have given every state a set of obligations to meet, or to help others to meet. Thus, development has moved closer to internationally defined standards
- countries which refuse to participate at the international level (such as North Korea or Libya under Gaddafi) fall behind in development
- globalization has made countries more interdependent and this has promoted development and through trade blocs reduced the likelihood of conflict
- financial markets have become more international and exclusion from them is likely to inhibit development
- countries which are willing to violate international expectations in foreign policy and human rights may suffer sanctions or embargoes from the international community which inhibit development, *eg* Myanmar, Cuba
- full participation opens the possibility of aid which can be helpful to development through capacity building
- countries which are open to foreign direct investment or aid are presumed to be more successful than those which are inward-oriented and try to develop in isolation. The pressures of globalization make it increasingly unlikely that successful development can take place in isolation.

Arguments against the view that successful development depends on full participation at the international level may include:

- the early stages of development have been achieved based on the home market, historic examples being the USA and Britain
- some countries with natural factor endowment such as oil and gas have developed without much co-operation with the international community
- the degree and intensity of participation can vary over time and in different fields (economic, political, defence, international standards) and few countries are committed to full participation in all fields due to their different priorities
- full exposure to international markets can stimulate or stifle development. For example, access to international capital markets could be stimulating or open the possibility of corruption and/or upheaval (e.g., 1 MDB Malaysia crisis, the 1997-98 Asian Financial Crisis, the 2008 GFC)
- full exposure to international markets may lead to dependency and relationships which are unequal in nature
- recent evidence of increased inequality raises doubts over how successful and full development is, even in the most developed countries.

Responses may contain references to recent specific examples of countries rejecting participation, such as Brexit and the failure of the Transatlantic Trade and Investment Partnership. Responses are likely to refer to classic historic examples of inward shifting to outward orientation such as India (early 1990s) and China (1990s). These can be credited because development theory often refers to the continuing effects of these historic examples.

Responses should include the candidate's position on the view that successful development depends on full participation at the international level.

Peace and conflict

7. **Compare and contrast the causes of *two* conflicts you have studied.**

    The command term "compare and contrast" requires candidates to give an account of similarities **and** differences between two situations, referring to both of them throughout their response. Responses should include a clear definition of conflict. Candidates should also show knowledge and understanding of different **causes** of conflict. It may be the case that some candidates focus more on different types of conflict instead and while there is often a link between the causes and types of a conflict, responses should be focused squarely on the former rather than the latter. In many cases, causes will be interlinked, and it is expected that candidates will highlight the complexity involved in determining the underlying causes of a conflict. Finally, it should be noted that both violent and non-violent conflicts are equally valid as examples.

    Possible bases for comparison/contrast may include:
    - greed versus grievance – *eg* Colombia, Sierra Leone, Bougainville
    - territorial control – *eg* disputes in the South China Sea, Russian claims in the Ukraine
    - material interest – *eg* weapon sales, access to foreign domestic markets
    - resource scarcity – *eg* Syria and water scarcity, conflict over vital resources such as oil and rare earth minerals (Democratic Republic of the Congo)
    - ideology – *eg* Brexit conflict between leavers and remainers, the Venezuelan civil conflict
    - threatened identity – *eg* Kurds in Turkey and Syria, ISIS/al-Qaeda attacks on non-Sunnis in Iraq and Syria
    - perception – *eg* immigration and the evolution of more heterogeneous populations in previously homogeneous states – eg, Germany, Sweden.
    - any other valid causes of conflict should be rewarded.

    As noted above, it is likely many candidates will recognize that most conflicts do not possess neatly discrete causes. For instance:
    - the causes of the current conflict in Syria are both political/ideological (a challenge to authoritarian rule) and resource-based (lack of access to water)
    - the territorial disputes in the South China Sea are the result of material interest (access to resources such as natural gas and fish as well as control of shipping routes) and political/ideological (reaction to China's historical claim to the region)
    - the violent conflict perpetrated by ISIS is grounded in questions surrounding both the nature of power in the Middle East and a perception of what the "correct" form of Islam is
    - the conflict in Myanmar is the result of a lack of economic development and the fact that the Buddhist Burmese do not consider the Muslim Rohingya as co-citizens, which leads to the latter's statelessness
    - the on-going structural violence in North America, South America and Australia between "settler societies" and indigenous populations is caused by conflict over resources (land, oil, water, minerals), a long-term perception of indigenous populations as the "other" and both violent and non-violent conflict over the rights and claims of indigenous peoples.

    Responses should include the candidate's conclusion on the complexity of conflict(s) and the difficulty of isolating separate and distinct causes of any conflict.

8. **To what extent do you agree with the claim that positive peace requires sustainable development?**

Candidates are expected to show a clear understanding of both key terms: positive peace and sustainable development. Candidates might argue that there are distinct similarities between those two terms – as they are both multidimensional and future-focused concepts – while recognizing that any such potential overlap is not complete.

Arguments that a positive peace requires sustainable development may include:
- both positive peace and sustainable development require the creation of social systems that serve the needs of the whole population
- positive peace is a long-term ideal. As a multidimensional concept, sustainable development focuses on specific aspects of positive peace such as intergenerational economic and social development
- both approaches are inherently inclusive with a strong commitment to justice and aim to improve well-being for all
- both are holistic ideas, which overlap in certain areas, *eg* social well-being
- to achieve positive peace, the more active, triple-bottom line (environmental, socio-political and economic) approach of sustainable development is required
- to achieve positive peace and ensure the well-being of everyone, a long-term sustainable view of development in which the ecological constraints of the environment are recognized is necessary
- the well-being of an entire population can only be assured if in the long term everyone's basic needs are met. Poverty and inequality due to unsustainable development breeds cultural and/or structural violence and, therefore, undermines the achievement of positive peace
- conflicts due to climate change brought on by unsustainable development are real threats to peace worldwide.

Arguments that a positive peace does not require sustainable development may include:
- in terms of national and global policy, sustainable development largely focuses on the environment and less so on economic and socio-political factors. The environment is not an area positive peace necessarily takes into account
- positive peace is inherently concerned with political equality and social justice. It does not need sustainable development to achieve this
- proponents of a positive peace generally seek to address pressing contemporary iterations of structural, cultural or direct violence. With an overwhelming focus on inter-generational equity, the long-run aspirations and goals of sustainable development may not be so relevant in the present
- positive peace involves the "integration of human society" via the correction of unjust social structures and norms, which does not require sustainable development
- some candidates may argue that it is sustainable development which, in fact, requires positive peace, *ie* that the specific economic, political and social factors which generate a positive peace – for example, diversity, economic equality and social justice – are qualities that are linked to sustainable development. This is a valid counterclaim and should be rewarded as such.

Possible examples may include:
- many of the UN Sustainable Development Goals (and, previously, the Millennium Development Goals) aim to achieve positive peace
- conflicts such as the one in the Democratic Republic of Congo demonstrate there is a need for both positive peace and sustainable development
- Costa Rica is an example where a focus on positive peace (no army, investments in education) go together with sustainable development (CO_2 reductions)
- South Africa is an example where a lack of sustainable development has made it harder to achieve positive peace
- the international movement to combat the cultural/structural violence engendered by institutionalized sexual harassment (*eg* the MeToo movement) is **not** directly related to sustainable development aims
- any other valid examples should be positively rewarded.

Responses should include the candidate's conclusion on whether they agree with the statement that positive peace requires sustainable development.

_____