

Markscheme

November 2018

Global politics

Higher level and standard level

Paper 2

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.
- Candidates 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	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The work does not reach a standard described by the descriptors below.
1–5	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The response reveals limited understanding of the demands of the question. • The response is poorly structured, or where there is a recognizable essay structure there is minimal focus on the task. • There is little relevant knowledge, and examples are either lacking or not relevant. • The response is mostly descriptive.
6–10	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The response indicates some understanding of the demands of the question. • There is some evidence of an attempt to structure the response. • Some relevant knowledge is present, and some examples are mentioned but they are not developed or their relevance to arguments is not clear. • The response demonstrates limited understanding of 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	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The demands of the question are understood and mostly addressed but the implications are not considered. • There is a clear attempt to structure the response. • The response is mostly based on relevant and accurate knowledge of global politics, and relevant examples are given and support arguments. • The response demonstrates some understanding of 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	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The demands of the questions are understood and addressed, and most implications are considered. • The response is well-structured. • The response demonstrates relevant and accurate knowledge and understanding of global politics, and relevant examples are used in a way that strengthens arguments. • The response demonstrates a good grasp of 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	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A very well structured and balanced response that addresses the demands and implications of the question. • Comprehensive knowledge and in-depth understanding of global politics is applied in the response consistently and effectively, with examples integrated. • The response demonstrates a very good grasp of 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. To what extent do you agree with the claim that economic cooperation hinders state sovereignty?

Responses should demonstrate a clear understanding of the twin concepts of economic cooperation (and what it encompasses, such as trade agreements, investments among states, components of the international financial architecture, such as the IMF, World Bank, WTO, etc., MNC's, etc.) and state sovereignty. 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. It could be argued that when states enter into economic cooperation mechanisms, they part with some amount of sovereignty. Candidates could provide examples of some prominent bilateral and multilateral trade agreements such as US–Singapore and China–ASEAN and multilateral trade agreements including the North American Free Trade Agreement, ASEAN Free Trade Area and the European Free Trade Association, as well as investment agreements. They could also bring in the concept of globalization and how it facilitates and necessitates interaction and interdependence with other states.

Arguments why economic cooperation hinders state sovereignty could include:

- Sometimes, membership of some organizations/mechanisms aimed at economic cooperation requires states to alter their domestic rules and legislation or even face action in case of non-compliance. For instance, the WTO has been criticized for creating a supranational court system that has the power to economically sanction countries to force them to comply with its rulings, which may even require such changes.
- Many trade and investment agreements tend to cover much more than just commerce, including instead reference to areas such as environment or labour policies – which means that they tend to impinge on state sovereignty and its domestic policies in such areas.
- Dispute solving mechanisms under economic cooperation may involve the use of international treaties.
- Sovereignty of states with smaller economies is more constrained than that of their larger partners as the financial penalties in cases of non-compliance with agreed policies would have a larger impact on their budgets.
- Possible negative impact of economic cooperation on domestic industries and/or smaller companies, could lead to unemployment. This, in turn could have an impact on political stability of those who govern the state and limit its capacity to manage unemployment – a part of a state's responsibility. Such an argument implies a link between a government's legitimacy and the (internal) sovereignty of the state.
- Depletion of finite natural resources in developing countries could have an impact on state sovereignty. Developing or underdeveloped states with natural resources may choose to permit other states to use these resources often along with providing additional perks such as access to markets.

Arguments why economic cooperation does not hinder state sovereignty could include:

- It is ultimately the state which decides if it wishes to be part of economic cooperation mechanisms or to open up their economy. In that sense, the state remains the primary decision maker on whether it accepts external authority structures.
- The Westphalian notion of sovereignty has altered its form to include economic cooperation mechanisms which increase network-interdependence, which leads states to pool sovereignty for better output.
- Economic cooperation mechanisms such as trade and investments bolster economic activity by reducing barriers, thus states may be seen as engaging in 'sovereignty bargains' in which one dimension or type of sovereignty is bargained away for gains in another. Any argument which advances a graduated or non-traditional conceptualisation of sovereignty should be rewarded as such.

Economic cooperation can strengthen economies and confer greater political influence and thus state sovereignty. For instance, Mexico has gained from inclusion into NAFTA, leading to an increase in jobs, production and overall economic growth, which in turn has afforded it greater political influence and stability. There seem to be less concerns over the possibility of economic problems and institutional failures there now, adding to the country's sovereignty too.

Responses should contain references to specific examples. Candidates could cite cases of trade agreements such as that of the EU, whereby when member states refuse to follow EU directives in the economic arena, infringement procedures could follow through the ECJ. If the ruling is in favour of the EC, member states must comply or pay a penalty. Candidates could then conclude by discussing how they think economic cooperation hinders state sovereignty or not.

**2. “Non-governmental organizations (NGOs) have a limited impact on global politics.”
Discuss this view.**

Responses should demonstrate a clear understanding of the concepts of non-governmental organizations (NGOs) (voluntary, non-profit local, national or international group working towards a specific goal or issue in support of public good) and provide examples of such organizations and their work, with specific focus on their contribution to global politics – ranging from eradication of poverty, elimination of WMDs, peace and protection of the environment to the provision of humanitarian assistance in times of crises. Candidates may highlight the work of some prominent NGOs such as The Red Cross, Action Africa Health International, Amnesty International and Save the Children. These organizations function through a range of activities, and their impact may be assessed by candidates. Candidates should outline some standard(s) by which the impact of NGO’s on global politics may be measured or assessed.

Arguments why NGOs have only a limited impact on global politics could include:

- NGOs may have ideas and spread awareness, but do not have powers possessed by states to put their ideas into practice, nor do they have the wherewithal to do so. Candidates are likely to distinguish between the hard and soft dimensions of power in this respect.
- NGOs depend on funding from independent sources, and that funding might not be regular or enough
- NGOs are often alleged to lack transparency and accountability, have agendas or be working under governmental influence or interests of donors
- NGOs will only be able to operate in states where governments or those in power permit them to function. In other words, they do not have the authority to operate without consent of the state involved.

Reasons why NGOs have more than a limited impact on global politics could include:

- NGOs act as pressure groups and are able to influence governments on policy formulation, monitor policy implementation and ensure suitable action. For instance, the United Nations General Assembly adopted the landmark Arms Trade Treaty after over two decades of campaigning by Amnesty International
- help spread awareness among civil society and stakeholders on crucial matters related to their area of expertise
- provide legal and moral support to those in need
- provide data and inputs to policy makers
- help monitor national and international agreements
- better and faster response to issues due to lack of bureaucratic delays
- NGOs are better connected to people and their problems at the grassroots levels than bureaucracies and governments at times.

Responses should contain references to specific examples of success stories as well as limitations of NGOs. Candidates could then conclude by arguing to what extent they believe that NGOs have an effective role to play in global politics.

Human rights

3. Discuss whether subsequent human rights laws and treaties have strengthened *The Universal Declaration of Human Rights* (1948).

Responses should demonstrate a clear understanding of the UN's *Universal Declaration of Human Rights* (1948), its importance in detailing fundamental human rights, and a discussion of the subsequent treaties, covenants, and conventions that have served as the foundation for future human rights protections. Candidates should tie these more recent iterations to the original declaration in structuring their responses.

Arguments that subsequent human rights laws and treaties have strengthened the UDHR may include:

- the inclusion of specific groups (eg refugees, indigenous peoples, children, people with disabilities)
- the inclusion of specific rights (eg freedom of assembly, the right to work, the right to education, the right to self-determination)
- the three generations of rights (ie civil-political, socio-economic, collective-developmental)
- their application to a greater number of states given the increase in sovereign states that joined the UN after 1948, thereby increasing the number of governments bound by the UDHR and its subsequent treaties, covenants and conventions
- that they are indicative of an evolving and expansive international norm promoting universal human rights.

Arguments that subsequent human rights laws and treaties have not strengthened the UDHR may include:

- they have not strengthened the UDHR as much as broadened it, with the potential of weakening it through the multiplication of rights
- conflict remains between individual and collective rights
- human rights continue to be used or ignored by powerful countries for political gain, limiting their ability to strengthen the UDHR
- state sovereignty supersedes human rights
- there exists a lack of political will to enforce the additional treaties, covenants, and conventions.

Responses should make some reference to specific examples of the subsequent treaties, covenants, and conventions in their examination of their effects on the UDHR, such as:

- International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights (1976)
- International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights (1976)
- Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Discrimination Against Women (1981)
- Convention on the Rights of the Child (1990)
- International Convention on the Protection of the Rights of all Migrant Workers and Members of Their Families (1990).

Responses should include a clear assessment of whether subsequent human rights laws and treaties have/have not strengthened the UDHR.

4. Discuss the claim that negotiations are effective in promoting human rights.

Responses should include a discussion of how human rights have often been integrated into international negotiations such as trade agreements, accession into intergovernmental organizations and aid negotiations, and whether these negotiations can help promote specific human rights. In doing so, candidates may differentiate between the power of states, state and regime characteristics, and state priorities/goals. Response may reference both intra- and interstate negotiations.

Arguments that negotiations are effective in promoting human rights may include:

- International negotiations provide a forum to pressure negotiating countries on their human rights records.
- Negotiations garner international media attention that can highlight human rights abuses and mobilize pressure.
- Liberal democratic states are more likely to effectively tie human rights records to agreements.
- Foreign aid and bilateral trade agreements are often conditional on improvements in human rights.
- Negotiations mobilize NGOs and civil society to pressure governments to include human rights.

Arguments that negotiations are not effective in promoting human rights may include:

- Authoritarian and or illiberal states are more likely to resist pressure surrounding human rights issues.
- Political or economic allies are less likely to have human rights issues raised in negotiations or conditionality applied.
- Media attention surrounding negotiations is often short-lived and fails to pressure illiberal states to make long-lasting commitments to human rights.
- International attention may simply change the mode of violations without substantively improving human rights records.
- Agreements do not typically create a human rights monitoring or policing body, making it difficult to verify compliance to any agreement.

Responses should make reference to specific examples. Candidates could discuss relevant issues including the inclusion of human rights issues in negotiations dependent on state power, the sanctioning of those accused of human rights abuses in non-allied states, or the tying of human rights records to international aid or trade packages. Specific examples might include:

- human rights discussions surrounding China's accession to the WTO
- implications of human rights sanctions on individuals in countries including Russia, North Korea and Venezuela
- human rights issues in the UN-sponsored Syrian peace talks
- Turkey's human rights record as an issue in EU membership talks
- negotiations on EU refugee crisis.

Responses should include the candidate's position on whether or not human rights can be promoted successfully through negotiations.

Development

5. Discuss the view that there have been more losers than winners from globalization.

Responses should include a definition of globalization, as a process by which the world's local, national and regional economies, societies and cultures are becoming increasingly integrated and connected. Such processes may lead simultaneously to both greater homogeneity as well as greater fragmentation as different groups within global politics react differently. It is likely that candidates will acknowledge that globalization has both benefits and drawback and that its benefits are not evenly distributed. It is also likely that candidates may distinguish between different forms and/or consequences of globalization: economic; political; cultural, etc. Finally, it is expected that candidates will offer some means by which 'losing' and 'winning' may be determined

Arguments that support the view (wording may vary) may include:

- The financial crisis of 2008 led some governments to be more protectionist and to question trade cooperation, making trading conditions harsher for developing countries.
- Some governments have adopted more nationalist economic policies such as austerity leading to lower living standards for middle ranking and poorer workers.
- Globalization of communications has encouraged economic migration exacerbating refugee crises.
- Global labour markets have become more restricted as free movement of labour has been restricted or questioned within trade blocs.
- The rise of political populism is a symptom of the declining reputation of globalization.
- Environmental crises arising from climate change are claimed to be associated with globalization and have become more intense.
- Globalization creates greater intra- and interstate inequality, at least at first.

Arguments against the view may include:

- Countries such as India and China have continued unaffected by the financial crisis of 2008 on their paths of globalization and free trade since 2008, with large increases in population and living standards.
- There were always losers from globalization and the years since 2008 are no different: inequality in the distribution of wealth and income is a longer-term trend.
- Losers from globalization, such as low-income workers in rich countries, are outnumbered by the rising middle classes in developing countries.
- Technical change has accelerated, contributing to higher standards of living globally.
- Globalization of communications has increased awareness of the plight of those who lose from change.
- Free trade and globalization were never of benefit to all: economists like Stiglitz argue the benefits of globalization were inequitably distributed, and free trade deals favoured powerful multinationals only.

Responses should contain references to specific examples, both economic and non-economic examples are equally valid. It is likely that many candidates will refer to Dependency Theory and/or World Systems Theory as one means of analysing the claim. While this is a potentially valid approach, it is expected that candidates will establish a clear link between the forces of globalization, particularly in its contemporary iteration, and these theories. More sophisticated responses may advance a more disaggregated view of the state when evaluating the claim – different levels of analysis may highlight that winners and losers exist within the same state as well as internationally.

Responses should include a clear conclusion that balances the arguments for and against the validity of the view.

6. To what extent does development depend on the presence of institutional factors?

Responses should include definitions of development and institutional factors. The former should be acknowledged as a contested and multidimensional concept while the latter is defined as: “The UN, IMF, World Bank, WTO, partnerships between developing countries, efficacy of national and local institutions”. Some candidates may also define ‘institutional factors’ as a set of implicit principles, norms, rules and decision-making procedures around which actors’ expectations converge in a given issue area and which define identities and roles.

Arguments that support the view (wording may vary) may include:

- A well-functioning state is needed to promote sound markets and the consumers and producers that inhabit them. This can only be done with the presence of institutions, which reduce uncertainty in market transactions.
- International organizations such as the IMF, World Bank and WTO provide a background level of stability to the international economy, though their actions can be controversial.
- The presence of institutions is necessary as development cannot proceed without protection of property rights and a legal system to enforce contracts.
- Markets and effective entrepreneurship depend heavily on the presence of stable financial institutions and a viable currency. If a market-led development is presumed, these institutions must be present.
- The state should be able to intervene if development is harmed by unscrupulous producers, so the presence of strong institutions is vital.
- If institutions are not present and strong, development can lead to serious and unsustainable downsides, such as social injustice, increasing inequality and exploiting elites.

Arguments against the view may include:

- The institutions referred to may be necessary but they are not sufficient to maintain the continuation of stability and economic success, which is important to development.
- Once in existence the institutions may be subject to corruption and lose their effectiveness in sustaining development.
- Institutions transplanted from other economies or the international economy may lack local knowledge and context and therefore be unable to sustain development.
- Without a stable macroeconomic environment (low inflation, functioning labour markets *etc*) development will not occur even in the presence of sound institutions.
- Without external viability (stable exchange rate, viable balance of trade) development will not occur even in the presence of sound institutions.

Responses may focus on international institutions such as the IMF, World Bank, European Central Bank and WTO, or on national/local institutions such as a central bank or the legal system, giving references to specific examples. It should be noted that in Global Politics, as per the definition above, institutions are more than just physical entities. Alternatively, as development can be measured through the Human Development Index, for example, responses might focus on provision of healthcare and education through state institutions.

Responses should include a clear conclusion that balances the arguments for and against the claim.

Peace and conflict

7. With reference to just war theory, evaluate the decision of a government to go to war in one conflict.

This question requires that candidates show understanding of just war theory. Answers should systematically discuss the different elements of just war theory and give arguments for and against. 'War' can be defined as *armed conflict* between at least two states, nations or groups, over a prolonged period of time. Candidates will only need to discuss one party in a war. Some candidates might even challenge the concept of "just war" itself.

Answers should include elements of just war theory, *jus ad bellum*:

- Competent authority
- Just cause
- Right intention
- War used as a last resort/necessity
- War proportional to the act that triggered it
- Reasonable hope of success

Arguments in favour of the decision of going to war may include:

- The authority taking the decision was competent: they were in an official position to do so, and had been well-informed about the conflict for some time.
- The cause was just: the only universally accepted just-cause is self-defence, but even here debate can take place as to what exactly self-defence is.
- The intention was right: The aim of the war is to secure a lasting peace.
- All other options had been tried and had failed, therefore the only way to solve the conflict was through war.
- War was proportional to the act that triggered it. The intrusion into a country's sovereignty was so serious that war was the only proportionate answer.
- There is a reasonable chance that the war will be won.

Arguments against the decision may include:

- The authority taking the decision was not capable of taking this decision competently or did not have the official position to do so. *Eg* non-state actors might be considered incompetent.
- The cause was unjust, and informed more by short-term expediency than by anything else.
- The intention was not right.
- There were other ways of trying to solve the conflict in a non-violent way that had not yet been tried, therefore war was not the last resort.
- The act that triggered the war did not threaten the state that declared the war in its existence.
- The chances that the war will be won within a reasonable time were small.

Answers should include references to specific examples. For example:

- Syria–Islamic State
- USA–Iraq (2003)
- Iraq–Islamic State
- Mali/UN-forces–Tuareg fighters/IS groups
- Somalia–Al-shabab militants
- South Sudan, different factions fighting
- Thailand–Muslim rebellion in the south
- Russia–Ukraine
- Any other valid examples should be positively rewarded.

Responses should include the candidate's conclusion on whether they consider going to war was justified in the case of their example.

8. **“In order to be able to solve a conflict it is necessary to understand its conflict dynamics.” Discuss this claim with reference to *either* an interstate *or* intrastate war you have studied.**

The question requires that candidates apply some of the theory they have learned to a practical situation and assess whether this theory is valuable in understanding the conflict. The answer requires candidates to assess the extent to which the study of conflict dynamics does or does not improve the solvability of conflicts and it is expected that some basis for determining whether a conflict has been ‘solved’ will be presented. Answers should give a balanced overview of the merits and limitations of solving a conflict through its conflict dynamics.

It is important to note that the conflict must have reached the stage of a violent conflict. This means that if no actual physical harm has been done, the conflict cannot be considered violent.

Answers may include:

One of the following models

- PIN-model (Positions, Interests, Needs)
- Galtung’s conflict triangle, also known as the ABC-triangle (Attitude, Behaviour, Conflict)
- The conflict cycle
- Any other clearly structured approach to understanding the dynamics of a violent conflict. This approach should identify the parties to the conflict, their aims, and explain why this has led to a conflict. The approach should lead to a better understanding of what the conflict is about and what role the different parties play.

Arguments in favour of understanding conflict dynamics may include:

- It helps understand the roles of the parties in the conflict.
- It helps understand what the conflict is about.
- It can show a way out of the violence.
- It can help reveal the deeper issues at stake, beyond the visible violence.
- It is, ultimately, necessary for a positive peace to be achieved.

Arguments against using conflict dynamics may include:

- Violent actions need to be stopped immediately, there is no time for a deeper study. For a negative peace to be achieved, conflict dynamics do not need to be understood.
- It is about the personalities leading the conflict, they need to be taken into account.
- Only looking at the dynamics leads to a superficial understanding of the conflict, because this risks reducing the conflict to a model instead of attending to its particularities. This is a particularly sophisticated approach – that devotion to a model determines/constrains one’s perspective and conditions us to only see what the model predicts.

Answers should include references to specific examples. For example:

- Syria
- Mexico – drug related violence
- Colombia – conflict between the government and the FARC
- Afghanistan – this is mostly a conflict between the government and the Taliban, but the presence of foreign troops may be discussed
- Iraq – the conflict between the government and ISIS. Discussion of foreign involvement is essential.

Any other relevant examples should be positively rewarded. Responses should include the candidate’s conclusion on whether or not studying conflict dynamics helps to understand the conflict.