Markscheme

May 2015

Global Politics

Higher level and standard level

Paper 2

13 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	• 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 fundamental political concepts and approaches. • There is limited justification of main points. • Counterclaims 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 fundamental political concepts and approaches. • Many of the main points are justified and arguments are largely coherent. • Some counterclaims 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 fundamental political concepts and approaches. • All or nearly all of the main points are justified and arguments are coherent. • Counterclaims 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 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. 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 increased interactions and interconnectedness in global politics have fundamentally changed the nature of state sovereignty.**

   Responses should include an understanding of the concept of sovereignty; for example, they may make reference to features such as territorial control and the principle of non-interference in another state's affairs. The definition may differentiate between internal and external sovereignty. Responses may make reference to ideas such as the equality of states in international law, or may include a brief discussion of Westphalian sovereignty. Responses may discuss interactions and interconnectedness in global politics by drawing on key concepts not mentioned in the question, such as interdependence, globalization, development or sustainability.

   Arguments for the claim may include:
   - globalization, the rise of non-state actors and the increasing interconnectedness of the world are challenges to state power and sovereignty, as individual states have less control;
   - states are losing influence through the pooling of some aspects of their sovereignty, such as in the case of the EU;
   - global issues which are cross-border in nature such as pollution, disease, war or terrorism increasingly require cooperation and action across state boundaries, which may then place limitations on state activity and sovereignty;
   - increased specialization in the economic organization of the world means that states are no longer self-sufficient in many areas but are dependent on each other for vital supplies and services;
   - responses to human rights abuses have given rise to the concept of "conditional" sovereignty and to humanitarian intervention.

Arguments against the claim may include:

- the centrality of state sovereignty in the international system has endured despite globalization, as illustrated by the number of states in the international community;
- statehood is still highly desired and most secessionist groups seek to be states and seek full membership of the UN;
- no other actors are as powerful as states, as evidenced by the difficulties experienced by non-state actors such as the United Nations in exerting power to influence global issues;
- states still rely on and deploy enormous amounts of military power and control and the world is still organized around state-centric security concerns;
- states are not necessarily threatened by globalization and may respond to interconnectedness by adapting and competing in other ways for influence (*eg* through trade, "cultural imperialism", or the power of agenda setting);
- increased cross- border interactions and interconnectedness have not necessarily changed the nature of state sovereignty: there are other important, often domestically rooted, factors, such as the growth in influence of civil society.

Responses should make reference to specific examples. For instance, candidates could discuss the role of media in war reporting ("the CNN effect") or the phenomenon of the spread of communications technology and the attempted control of social media by states, as in the case of China. They could refer to specific problems that do not respect state boundaries, such as greenhouse gases or refugees, *eg* from Syria entering neighbouring countries. Conversely, they could refer to states such as China and Brazil, whose influence has increased in recent years or to the persistence of inter-state conflicts where violation of sovereignty is still the most significant aspect at play, such as in the case of Russia's recent disputed behaviour in Crimea.

Responses should include the candidate's examination of the claim that increased interaction and interconnectedness in global politics have fundamentally changed the nature of state sovereignty.

2. **Power is often assumed to be linked to the possession of, or access to, resources. Discuss the validity of this view.**

Responses should include an understanding of the concept of power.
A spectrum of power may be indicated – from influence and capacity through to coercion and force. Candidates may discuss power in the sense of international relations, and/or in the sense of internal control. Responses may make reference to different types of resources (*eg* military, economic, or natural resources), or may, equally validly, focus on one particular type of resource such as economic resources.

Arguments in favour of the view that power is linked to the possession of resources may include:
- states that have the most resources do often have the most power on the world stage (*eg* the US, China);
- history shows us that those with power often come in and take away resources from resource-rich but less powerful states;
- within states, those who possess resources tend to be the powerful actors in the society (*eg* the US, Russia)

Arguments against the view that power is linked to the possession of resources may include:
- power can be difficult to measure (for instance, soft power, social power, cultural power) and perceptions of power may matter just as much as having tangible resources;
- resources alone are not power; intention and capability (*eg* effective leadership and administration) transform resources into power;
- there are states with abundant natural resources that have a relative lack of power on the world stage, as abundant natural resources may go hand in hand with commodity-led, lower value growth (*eg* DRC);
- even states which have copious resources still face numerous other challenges that undermine their ability to exercise power or control (*eg* the restrictions placed on them by international law, the structure of international institutions, such as the UN Security Council, or the influence of civil society).

Responses should make reference to specific examples. Which examples are included is likely to depend on the selected interpretation of the concept of power and the types of resources discussed.

Responses could distinguish between states that have hard power arising from the possession of military, economic, and/or natural resources (*eg* the US, China, Brazil), and states that have soft power that is not based to such a degree on tangible resources and that can be informational, diplomatic, or cultural, and involve agenda setting (*eg* UK, Norway).

Candidates could discuss the relationship between power and natural resources in specific countries, *eg*:

	High natural resources	Low natural resources
Much power	The US, China	Japan
Little power	DRC	Haiti

Responses should include the candidate's evaluation of whether power is linked to the possession of resources.

Human Rights

3.   **"Human rights covenants and treaties limit development in newly industrializing economies." To what extent do you agree with this claim?**

Responses should include an understanding of the concept of development and of the nature and intention of human rights covenants and treaties. Responses should also show an understanding of what is meant by newly industrializing economies.

*Arguments that human rights covenants and treaties **do** limit the development of newly industrialising economies may include:*
- greater monitoring of labour conditions for human rights reasons has reduced flexibility to organize labour in the process of industrialization;
- trade agreements, agreements between buyers and suppliers, and self-monitoring by multinational corporations often specify the ways in which commodities can be produced and distributed, and this places limits on how resources, including labour, can be implemented;
- it could be argued that many countries became modern states through a process of industrialization, and that emerging economies should be allowed to follow the same path. The process of industrialization by which many presently developed countries became prosperous was based on practices, such as child labour during the Industrial Revolution, which would nowadays be considered to be violations of human rights, and would be condemned and/or forbidden by environmental standards and international organizations, such as the World Trade Organization and the International Labour Organization.

*Arguments that human rights covenants and treaties **do not** limit the development of newly industrialising economies may include:*
- human rights covenants and treaties are often not enforced, or are not enforceable, and therefore they do not limit development;
- it is possible to have development without violating human rights or environmental standards or treaties; for example in recent years there have been efforts to promote rights-based approaches to development and sustainability;
- these sorts of covenants and treaties do not "limit" the process of development, but instead "improve" the process;
- although human rights covenants and treaties may place limits on some aspects of development, they also facilitate other aspects, such as education, technology transfer or international cooperation.

Responses should make some reference to specific examples. For instance, candidates could discuss the process of industrialization in a certain country, such as in China or India. They could refer to aspects of specific covenants and treaties, such as to the International Covenant of Economic, Social and Cultural Rights (1966), the Convention on the Protection of Rights of Migrant Workers (1990), the Rome Statute (2002) or the Kyoto Protocol (2005), and evaluate how these aspects have or have not limited development.

Responses should include the candidate's evaluation of whether human rights treaties and covenants limit development in newly industrializing economies.

4.   **Discuss the extent to which cultural relativism can be used to justify different concepts of human rights.**

Responses should include an understanding of cultural relativism and of individual and collective rights, and an indication of how these have been used in discussions on human rights. Responses may also refer to the creation of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights (UDHR) and the controversies that have surrounded it . Responses may also distinguish between cultural relativism and universal rights.

*Arguments that cultural relativism **can** be used as justification may include:*
- cultural relativism assumes that the practices of individual cultures represent autonomous rights that should not be compared to those of other cultures and the idea can thus be applied to defend many different practices and concepts of rights;
- a cultural relativist approach is more successful than universal approaches: for example, responses may note that individual rights – on which a great emphasis is placed in the UDHR – have been criticised as western conceptions that have been forced on non-western cultures through colonialism and other forms of coercion that have often been detrimental to the maintaining of more collective rights around the world;
- cultural relativism may be more successful than universal approaches in defending collective human rights, given its emphasis on people's shared experience within a culture.

*Arguments that cultural relativism **cannot** be used as justification may include*:
- the notion of cultural relativism has been used to justify controversial cultural practices that infringe particularly on individuals' rights, such as honour killing and female genital mutilation;
- cultural relativism does not allow for cultural comparisons and may therefore lead to a misinterpretation of practices within cultures;
- universal approaches, in their emphasis on the similarity of all human beings, may be more successful in defending individual human rights, due to their emphasis on the commonality of experience of **all** human beings.

Responses should make reference to specific examples. They could discuss Asian, African or indigenous conceptions of rights that tend to view human rights in more collective terms. Responses could also mention more recent developments in universal rights, such as covenants and treaties against gender discrimination, for the protection of migrant workers or in favour of hate crime laws, etc.

Responses should include the candidate's evaluation of the extent to which cultural relativism can been used as an argument to defend alternative concepts of individual and collective human rights.

Development

5. **Evaluate the view that globalization harms rather than benefits the poorest people in countries with the lowest incomes.**

Responses should include an understanding of the concept of globalization, for example, the idea that societies and cultures are becoming increasingly integrated and connected, and that goods, services and ideas are flowing more freely as barriers and borders are reduced. They may also consider the meaning of the phrases "countries with the lowest incomes", or "the poorest people", for example referring to definitions such as the World Bank definition (2013) of a low income country as being a country with a per capita income of less than $1035 per year and a poor person as being someone living on less than $1.25 per day. Responses may also include a discussion of what is meant by "harm"; for example, making reference to concepts such as structural violence, and by "benefit"; for example economic benefits, technological benefits, social benefits, etc.

Arguments that support the view may include:
- even though the process of globalization has accelerated in recent years there has been an increase in economic and social inequality within many countries;
- the richest countries have gained most from globalization through their multinational corporations, their ability to finance and build up large scale operations anywhere in the world and the predictability of their political environments and legal frameworks;
- globalization leads to many different forms of harm, including the exploitation of cheap labour, erosion of local cultures and large scale environmental damage.

Arguments against the view may include:
- globalization fosters employment possibilities that previously did not exist;
- globalization offers new opportunities to the poorest people: it is national structures and policies that may not allow people to benefit from these;
- globalization brings with it developments that benefit entire populations, including the poorest people, such as an improved knowledge of nutrition and health and the building up of communications infrastructure.

Responses should contain references to specific examples. Candidates could, for example, give examples of multinational corporations that exploit child labour, or that use suppliers who tolerate dangerous working conditions, or operate in poorly regulated countries to avoid health and safety legislation, for example the well-reported collapse of the Rana Plaza factory building in Bangladesh, killing or maiming many workers, where garments for several global clothing chains were manufactured.

Examples of globalization working in favour of the poorest people in the poorest countries could include the setting-up of microfinance organizations such as the Grameen bank that syndicate loans to entrepreneurs in developing countries, or the rising importance of mobile phone technology in facilitating economic activity in Sub-Saharan Africa.

Responses should include the candidate's evaluation of the validity of the view put forward in the question.

6. **Discuss the view that sustainable development will never be achieved until state and non-state actors can be persuaded or forced to act in the common interest.**

Responses should include an understanding of the concepts of sustainable development, and of state and non-state actors, and an attempt to explain the phrase "act in the common interest." This may be defined in different ways, *eg* as the common interest of people within a particular region or country, or as the common interest of humanity in general.   Integral to the question is the idea that "the common interest" may mean different things to state and non-state actors now and in the future. Non-state actors such as NGOs and multinational corporations may envisage sustainable development in very different ways.

"Acting in the common interest" implies a discussion of whether or not state and non-state actors will need to be persuaded, or forced, to act *together* in the common interest to achieve sustainable development, and this need for cooperation is the most fruitful line of inquiry. However, some candidates may interpret the phrase differently, and discuss whether each group will need to be persuaded, or forced, to act *individually* in the common interest. This interpretation should also be accepted and valid points rewarded.

Arguments may follow an environmental, socio-political or economic perspective, and responses may also consider the timeframe given ("never").

Arguments in favour of the view may include:
- development so far has not been sustainable, so persuasion or force is likely to be necessary to produce action for the common good– the failure of the climate change agenda to achieve significant change so far, despite growing evidence of increasing environmental damage, indicates this;
- state and non-state actors need to work together, otherwise sustainable development is unlikely to grow, but each group is likely to need persuasion or force to encourage it to do this, given their differing agendas. Non-state actors on their own cannot force action in the common interest: they may, for example, lack the political and/or other power needed to enforce change; conversely, states acting on their own may not be able to bring about changes as effectively as when acting in concert with non-state actors, who often have a greater potential for bringing about practical changes (*eg* MNCs), and for mobilizing popular support for policies (*eg* NGOs).

Arguments against the view may include:
- many state actors are proactive and take action themselves to promote sustainable development - no persuasion or coercion from outside is needed;
- outside attempts at " interference" are not always welcome - states need to be seen to make decisions for themselves, and undue external attempts at persuasion may in fact have the opposite effect to that anticipated;
- many NGOs and other non-state actors already promote sustainable development, and need no persuasion of its benefits. This willingness is not just limited to NGOs: businesses, who traditionally were seen as opposing sustainable development, but have been increasingly cooperating with efforts towards attaining sustainable development, where they have found easy ways to do this;
- finally, on a pessimistic note, it could be argued that force or persuasion are futile, because sustainable development is an impossible ideal. The whole area is so complex and highly contested that greed, self-interest and/or national priorities will always be given precedence over, or be interpreted as, the common interest, so getting state and non-state actors to cooperate with each other is an unachievable ideal.

Responses should contain references to specific examples. For example, activities such as logging in Sumatra, and felling in the Amazonian rainforest are seen by the global community as militating against the common interest, but the governments of Indonesia

and Brazil, and local and international business interests, often seem unwilling to respond to these concerns. The fishing industry provides further examples, *eg* the failure to address the problem of overfishing, and the failure of arguments for the necessity of doing this.

Examples of successful cooperation between state and non-state actors to work for sustainable development could include, for example, cases where governments are financing development initiatives that are managed by NGOs.

Responses should include the candidate's discussion of the validity of the view put forward in the question.

7. **Peacebuilding is arguably more important than peacemaking, yet it is given much less funding and attention. To what extent do you agree with this claim?**

    Responses should include the candidate's understanding of the concept of peace, and distinguish between the processes of peacebuilding and peacemaking. They may refer to negative peace, *ie* the absence of direct physical violence and the end of warfare, as the essential first step in any peacemaking process. Responses may then contrast this with positive peace, which has to do with tackling post-conflict structures of violence in order to build sustainable peace.

    Arguments that support the claim may include:
    - peacebuilding, in which civil society is rebuilt through re-establishing social institutions such as medical facilities and schools, is essential for the promotion of social justice and the rebuilding of civil society;
    - in many situations the world's attention, and international efforts, are directed towards funding and supporting the earlier stages of peacemaking *ie* the achieving, monitoring and maintaining of a state of negative peace;
    - once negative peace has been achieved and the most visible forms of suffering have subsided, world attention tends to be directed elsewhere, and international support is forthcoming only from nations that have vested political and economic interests in the country or area in question.

    Arguments against the claim may include:
    - the most expensive and most important efforts have to be directed towards ending armed conflicts, as it is in these that human suffering and human rights abuses are likely to be at their worst;
    - establishing and then maintaining a newly achieved peace demand the greatest commitment, as the situation is likely to be at its most sensitive in the immediate aftermath of the conflict;
    - peacebuilding is likely to be supported in cases where direct economic and political benefits are associated with post war reconstruction, *eg* where expensive infrastructure developments are undertaken for the benefit of domestic or third parties with vested interests. However, in these scenarios, the building of low-cost social and educational institutions may be a low priority.

    Responses should contain references to specific examples. These may be taken, for instance, from the break-up and reconstruction of the former Yugoslavia; the Iraq war and post-war reconstruction; the truth and reconciliation commission in South Africa; peace building efforts in Rwanda or in Cambodia following the UN-backed withdrawal of Vietnamese forces and the UN-supported elections, though any appropriate examples should be rewarded.

Responses should include the candidate's view of whether peace building is much more important than peacemaking, and whether it receives less funding and attention.

8.   **Discuss why non-violent protest is sometimes able to achieve success against even the most powerful of opponents.**

Responses should draw specifically on candidates' understanding of relevant key concepts, such as power, conflict, and non-violence, and may also touch on the theoretical foundation of pacifism given for this unit, or on the theoretical foundations of unit 1. Candidates may distinguish between hard and soft power. They may explore the nature of conflict, perhaps using a theoretical construct such as Galtung's conflict triangle to identify that in conflict there is always a contradiction or situational cause of conflict which is then manifested in different ways. Responses may explain that conflict can be symmetric or asymmetric (they do not have to use this exact term) and that it is in asymmetric conflicts that non-violent protest is most often used.

Arguments for why non-violent protest can achieve success against even the most powerful of opponents:
- the power of rulers derives from consent by the subjects; non-violent action is a process of withdrawing consent and thus is a way to challenge the key problems of dictatorship and other systems of oppression, genocide, and war;
- in asymmetric conflicts, where the weaker party's hard power capabilities are often limited, using the soft power of non-violent protest to challenge the stronger party may be a more effective mechanism to achieve an accommodation of the weaker party's vital interests;
- in certain cases, especially where open communications, publicity and the interest of the world media exist together, non-violent tactics can alter the conflict symmetry by redefining the conflict in terms of rights and by denying the use of unrestricted power to the more powerful party;
- communications and modern social media have changed the ability of non-violent protest to challenge even the most powerful opponents (*eg* see Erica Chenoweth and Maria Stephan's 2012 book *Why Civil Resistance Works: The Strategic Logic of Nonviolent Conflict*);
- the likelihood of success for a non-violent protest is enhanced by the fact that there is such a wide variety of methods which can be applied in different contexts (Gene Sharp's *Theory of Power* presents 198 such methods of non-violent action).

Arguments for why non-violent protest may not achieve success against powerful opponents:
- fragmentation: any divisions amongst the protesters will make non-violent protest ineffective against the most powerful opponents;
- in asymmetric conflicts, the available violent responses are often guerilla war or terrorism and such tactics allow the more powerful opponent to justify the use of their hard power and excessive violence to achieve their objectives; protesters turning to violence, and especially to the indiscriminate use of extreme physical violence, with no regard to international opinion or to controls (by bodies such as the International Criminal Court) will rule out the effectiveness of allied non-violent protests, by losing them the moral high-ground;
- closure or failure of communications and mass or social media will weaken the power of non-violent protest.
- harsh punitive measures may be taken by the powerful parties against the protestors that may effectively silence their opposition, at least in the short term: "might" may suppress "right".

Responses should contain references to specific examples. The standard examples of non-violent protests are those of Mahatma Gandhi and Martin Luther King. Unless these examples are well structured *ie* unless theory is present, backed up by the examples, they are often unpersuasive. Candidates could consider more recent examples, such as the popular movements in different countries that eventually led to the collapse of the Soviet Union; the 1990s protest against apartheid in South Africa; or the first Palestinian Intifada, which, it can be argued, led to the Oslo Peace Process. Non-violent revolutions of the Arab Spring could also be addressed.

Responses should include the candidate's views on why non-violent protest might or might not achieve success against powerful opponents.