Markscheme

May 2017

Global politics

Higher level and standard level

Paper 2

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 Global Centre, Cardiff.

The following are the annotations available to use when marking responses.

Annotation	Explanation	Associated shortcut
CKS	CKS - Clear Knowledge Shown	Alt+0
CON	CON - Contradiction	
✖	Cross - Incorrect point	Alt+1
DES	DES - Descriptive	
DET	DET - Relevant detail	
DEV	DEV - Development	
EE	EE - Effective evaluation	Alt+2
GA	GA - Good Analysis	Alt+3
GEXA	GEXA - Good Example	
GP	GP - Good Point	
GSEv	GSEv - Good Source Evaluation	Alt+4
H Wavy	H Wavy - Wavy underline tool	
Highlight	Highlight - Highlight tool	
IRRL	IR - Irrelevant	
LNK	LNK - Good linkage	Alt+5
NAQ	NAQ - Not Answered Question	
NExa	NExa - No Examples	

	Not Relevant - Vertical wavy line	
NSEv	NSEv - No Source Evaluation	Alt+6
	On Page Comment - On page comment tool	
PU	PU - Point Unfinished	
REP	Repeat - Repetition	
RQ	RQ - Repeats question	
SEEN	SEEN_Small - Seen	
TCE	TCE - Theory is clearly explained	
TNCE	TNCE - Theory is Not Clearly Explained	
✔	Tick Colourable	Alt+7
TV	TV - Too vague	
U	U - Understanding	
UA	UA - Unfinished answer	
UR	UR - Unbalanced Response	Alt+8
VL	VL - Very limited	
WARG	WARG - Well argued	Alt+9

You **must** make sure you have looked at all pages. Please put the SEEN annotation on any blank page, to indicate that you have seen it.

The paper is marked using the generic markbands on the following page, and the paper specific markscheme that follows. The markscheme for this paper is the same for HL and SL.

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

Markbands for paper two

Marks	Level descriptor
0	● The work does not reach a standard described by the descriptors below.
1–5	● The response reveals limited understanding of the demands of the question. ● The response is poorly structured, or where there is a recognizable essay structure there is minimal focus on the task. ● There is little relevant knowledge, and examples are either lacking or not relevant. ● The response is mostly descriptive.
6–10	● The response indicates some understanding of the demands of the question. ● There is some evidence of an attempt to structure the response. ● Some relevant knowledge is present, and some examples are mentioned but they are not developed or their relevance to arguments is not clear. ● The response demonstrates limited understanding of the key concepts of the course. ● There is limited justification of main points. ● Counterclaims, or different views on the question are not considered.
11–15	● The demands of the question are understood and mostly addressed but the implications are not considered. ● There is a clear attempt to structure the response. ● The response is mostly based on relevant and accurate knowledge of global politics, and relevant examples are given and support arguments. ● The response demonstrates some understanding of the key concepts of the course. ● Many of the main points are justified and arguments are largely coherent. ● Some counterclaims, or different views on the question are considered.
16–20	● The demands of the questions are understood and addressed, and most implications are considered. ● The response is well-structured. ● The response demonstrates relevant and accurate knowledge and understanding of global politics, and relevant examples are used in a way that strengthens arguments. ● The response demonstrates a good grasp of the key concepts of the course. ● All or nearly all of the main points are justified and arguments are coherent. ● Counterclaims, or different views on the question are explored.

21–25	● A very well structured and balanced response that addresses the demands and implications of the question. ● Comprehensive knowledge and in-depth understanding of global politics is applied in the response consistently and effectively, with examples integrated. ● The response demonstrates a very good grasp of the key concepts of the course. ● All of the main points are justified. Arguments are clear, coherent and compelling. ● Counterclaims, or different views on the question are explored and evaluated.

Power, sovereignty and international relations

1. Discuss reasons why the legitimacy of a state may need to be questioned.

Responses should demonstrate a clear understanding of the concept of legitimacy. Candidates could discuss how legitimacy provides the basis for governance of a state. It requires the state to have the popular consent of its citizens to its exercise of political power over them, although it is important to recognize that such consent may manifest itself in more than one way (*eg* other than in elections). There are conditions under which states lose their legitimacy due to a lack of ability or willingness to govern, *eg* fragile/failed states, and some authoritarian states. Such states may be unable to ensure domestic peace, order, or the wellbeing of its citizens and may use force within their territory. Such states do not have a credible law and order system and often sink into civil war, genocide, a weak economy, corruption, lack of infrastructure and excesses. Candidates should then focus on the reasons why the legitimacy of such states may need to be questioned.

Reasons why legitimacy may need to be questioned may include:
● if the state as a sovereign entity is unable to fulfil its responsibility to provide for the basic needs of its people – such as legitimate and credible security systems, maintaining law and order, the proper care of civil society through healthcare, the provision of food, water, shelter and infrastructure – to an extent that people are suffering, then its legitimacy can be questioned. The international community can step in in situations such as these that require humanitarian intervention. States have a "responsibility to protect" (R2P) – a concept which underscores that sovereignty no longer protects states from external interference. States are responsible for the welfare of their people and if they are unable to be, the international community should be able to take collective action
● governments in states sinking into illegitimacy may themselves be a cause of threat for the citizens, who may need protection from them
● the problems of a state with a government of questionable legitimacy are never confined to within its own borders, but are likely to also impact on neighbouring countries, *eg* through refugee crises. The state can also become a breeding ground for terror groups and can induce crime
● failing states do not possess the basic environment in which to ameliorate the standard of living of people. They instead pay more attention to pursing their own interests
● the financial cost of such states is very high due to their lack of economic growth and the need to address destruction due to violence and a lack of law and order.

Arguments against questioning legitimacy may include:
● most of this conceptualization of lack of legitimacy in failed, fragile or authoritarian states is Western in origin and some states could contend that it does not apply to their situation
● there are no set international parameters and measures of legitimacy or of when the level of failure of a state is serious enough for it to be questioned
● some such questioning, and the interventions which might follow, could be seen as being imperialistic in nature and intent
● who possesses the authority to decide whether the legitimacy of a state can be questioned? Perspectives and outlooks may vary on this matter.

Possible examples of cases where the legitimacy of a state has come under question due to a variety of causes and also invited international intervention are: Somalia (conflict, lawlessness and

famine resulting in poverty, hunger, disease and illiteracy); Afghanistan (conflict, lack of respect for human rights, atrocities against women); Sudan (conflict, hunger, lack of access to water); South Sudan (civil war, atrocities and human rights violations, widespread food insecurity, no infrastructure and atrocities against women); or Haiti (human rights violations in the past, also currently facing a political crisis).

It may be noted that whether or not international intervention, or the questioning of a state's legitimacy happens, is likely to depend on the current agendas of other, legitimate, states.

Responses should include the candidate's conclusion on why the legitimacy of states may need to be questioned.

2. **Examine the claim that economically powerful states are able to manipulate global governance institutions to their advantage.**

Responses should demonstrate an understanding of the concept of power and the different facets of power, including possession of capabilities such as economic and military resources. Candidates could also define what is meant by global governance institutions and identify some institutions such as the UN, IMF, WTO and World Bank. From giving examples of a few economically powerful countries (notably the P5, *ie* China, US, Russia, UK and France all fall into the top band of most economic rankings), they could then go on to assess whether these are able to manipulate global institutions to their advantage.

Arguments supporting the claim may include:
● realists believe that international institutions in fact only reflect the existing distribution of power amongst states in the world and support the interests of the stronger. More powerful states create and mould institutions in a way that benefits them
● economically powerful states possess advantages such as the ability to finance and fund governance institutions, and more influence in setting the agenda than less powerful states
● economic power could also translate into political power. For instance the P5 member countries tend to dominate the executive organ of the UN through their veto power and can use it to effectively snub majority decisions, to block possible action such as responses to a military or diplomatic crisis, and generally to bring down any resolution not favourable to their own interests or outlook
● economically powerful countries can possibly "buy off" co-operation from smaller states. Lending by international financial organizations is often said to benefit the interests of powerful states. They can dole out concessionary aid, investment and finances to smaller states
● decision making in institutions such as the IMF is not based on an equal vote, but on the basis of the payments that each member state makes to the organization. This naturally places power and influence in the hands of the economically powerful states. For this reason, the IMF has been often criticized for bias towards the major stakeholders – the US and G7 countries.

Arguments against the claim may include:
● global institutions can help soften states' behaviour, making them more cooperative, rather than dominant
● states possessing economic power are not necessarily able to translate it effectively into influence at the global level. They may need other variables such as strong and skilled leadership to achieve this
● countries can use soft power effectively to further their own interests, and need not be economically powerful to do so
● institutions may shield weaker countries and regulate the arbitrary actions of more powerful members. Weaker states could possibly choose to come together in order to protect their own interests
● the rules and mechanisms set out by international organizations/institutions impose constraints on the arbitrary behaviour of economically powerful states. Institutional membership entails a commitment to abide by certain rules. Any reluctance or failure to do so would have an impact on the reputation of a powerful state. There could also be legal implications for these states in cases of non-compliance with clearly set-out rules
● even the economically powerful states are interdependent on other states to further some of

their own national interests, such as the pursuit of economic development and the managing of potential problems such as climate change.

Possible examples supporting the claim could include reference to instances where economically powerful states such as the US and China have used their veto power to their advantage:
● In 2014, China and Russia vetoed a UN resolution that would have sent actors in the Syrian Civil War, including the Bashar al-Assad regime, to the International Criminal Court
● Similarly, Russia vetoed a resolution that would have created an international tribune to prosecute the pro-Russia separatists in eastern Ukraine who are thought to have shot down Malaysian Airlines flight MH17 using a Russian-made missile in 2015.

Answers may note that Bretton Woods (formally known as the United Nations Monetary and Financial Conference) institutions have come under criticism for imposing many conditions on borrower countries which are in the lenders' interest and which could harm economic circumstances in the borrower countries.

Responses should include the candidate's conclusion on whether or not economically powerful states are able to manipulate global governance institutions to their advantage.

Human rights

3.   **Examine the claim that human rights as presented in treaties and covenants are not
     enforceable and are therefore of little use to vulnerable populations.**

Responses should demonstrate knowledge of the relationship of treaties and covenants to the
Universal Declaration of Human Rights in 1948, and provide examples of such agreements and
examine their effectiveness in protecting the rights of the vulnerable.

Arguments in favour of the claim may include:
● because these agreed treaties and covenants are not enforceable law, states and individuals
  are free to violate them without legal consequence
● these agreements do not have any major effect on the working of international law and
  therefore cannot be seen as universally binding
● states may view the implementation of strategic economic policy as more important than the
  enforcement of treaties and covenants. A good example of this is the Kyoto Agreement, and
  developing states' refusal to conform to limits on pollution
● weak states and vulnerable populations do not have the power or the connections to power to
  take advantage of the protections of treaties and covenants. Their "enforcement" would have to
  be in the form of amendments to trade agreements or economic co-operation that might refer to
  regional agreements such as the 1975 Helsinki Final Act or the 1990 Charter of Paris for a New
  Europe by the OSCE.

Arguments against the claim may include:
● agreed treaties and covenants still act as a moral imperative for UN member states and
  perhaps some non-members
● they promote an awareness of rights within the international community
● they promote co-operation among states, and there is some promise that they may be more
  easily enforceable in the future, with increased interconnectedness
● they are useful in identifying important aspects of human rights, and those who have violated
  these precepts
● they can still act as a basis for punitive action, for example, bans on trade and cultural
  interaction with states that have violated these agreements (examples may be given of when
  this sort of punitive action has been taken against states who have violated agreements).

Possible examples where human rights laid down in treaties or covenants have proved to be
unenforceable could include instances when the US, China and Israel, all members of the Security
Council, have refused to sign treaties and covenants enforcing pollution standards and human
rights standards, amongst others. Candidates may also note that state sovereignty is recognized
as trumping any obligation to adhere to international standards regarding human rights practices.

Responses should include the candidate's conclusion on whether or not human rights as
presented in treaties and covenants are not legally enforceable, and are therefore of little use to
vulnerable populations.

4. **Discuss the claim that development in industrializing countries often violates universal rights to a clean environment and to the humanitarian treatment of labour.**

Responses should demonstrate knowledge of the primary argument of industrializing countries, which is that the more advanced industrialized nations developed without being limited by the restrictions on pollution and fair labour practices that are of concern today, and so they (industrializing countries) too should be allowed the same leeway in developing their own industries and economies: China and India have been particularly vocal in making these arguments.

Arguments in favour of the claim may include:
● in developing countries whose economies depend on natural resources, the obligation to reduce environmental pollution may undermine their economic growth and hence their competitiveness in the world market. It can be argued that it is the responsibility of already developed countries to aid the developing ones financially and technically to combat climate change
● an argument has been made that current labour abuses, especially as regards migrant workers, *eg* in the Middle East, need to be tolerated in order for developing states to catch up with the more advanced countries.
● candidates may cite WW Rostow's theory of *Stages of Economic Growth* (1961) that in order to get to a successful capitalist system, countries have to pass through five stages of development, including a stage where they are able to recruit enough labour to produce industrial goods. This sort of thinking led to actions like the attempted depopulating of the Vietnamese countryside through fire, in an attempt to push enough people into the cities where their only hope of survival was to work in a factory
● the rapid destruction of the environment and lack of environmental standards in China and India where international standards on pollution controls are ignored, or violated, in favour of development.

Arguments against the claim may include:
● the clear counter-argument to this claim is that all humans have the right to a clean and disease-free environment, and all workers have the right to an abuse-free work environment. These rights are protected by treaties and covenants, such as the Kyoto Protocol on Climate Change, the 1979 Geneva Convention on Long Range Transboundary Air Pollution, and the various fundamental conventions of the International Labour Organization (ILO) such as the ILO Declaration of Fundamental Principles and Rights at Work (1998).

Possible examples of violations of human rights in the pursuit of development through industrialization abound. For example, controversies have become apparent with the expansion of higher education in the Middle East, with New York University in particular accused of allowing abusive labour practices in the attempt to build their new campuses in Abu Dhabi as cheaply as possible: migrant workers were not awarded the same protections found in the University's labour guidelines that ensure fair wages, hours and living conditions.

Responses should include the candidate's conclusion on whether or not claims for development in industrializing countries violate universal rights to a clean environment and to the humanitarian treatment of labour.

Development

5. **Evaluate the claim that inequality encourages, rather than prevents, development.**

    Responses should demonstrate knowledge of definitions of inequality and development, though introductory definitions are not required if understanding is evident from the way the concepts are used in the response.

    There are different understandings of equality and inequality: inequality has dimensions in disparities in wealth and income, property rights, gender rights, *etc*. Key concepts are equality, inequality and development. Candidates are likely to refer to the distinction between development and modernisation, and to capitalism whose current expression through neoliberalism advocates minimal political interference.

    Arguments for the claim may include:
    ● development requires the existence of an elite whose savings and wealth can be used for long-term investment to start and enhance the development process
    ● some candidates may cite trickle-down theory, which argues that the spending of the rich provides numerous opportunities for the poor
    ● the elite offer standards of living and behaving for emulation by the rest of the population who will be incentivised to adopt them too
    ● it is in the interest of the elite to make opportunities available for others
    ● poor countries are able to perceive the higher living standards and consumption of rich countries and this encourages them to engage with development
    ● development depends on access to education, healthcare *etc* and rich elites have the power to introduce and foster these.

    Arguments against the claim may include:
    ● wealthy elites are often not interested in risk-taking but prefer to invest in land or indulge in conspicuous consumption
    ● trickle-down theory is contestable, and there are counterclaims that development needs to involve everyone if it is to be effective
    ● inequalities are so great that the poor have little opportunity to emulate the rich
    ● wealthy elites often keep power and influence to themselves
    ● rich countries and multinational corporations are able to exploit poor countries by making use of their resources but repatriating profits to themselves
    ● education and healthcare are expensive and require a broad tax base to finance them, but the wealthy elite are relatively few and sometimes find ways to avoid paying taxes
    ● development sometimes depends on breaking down or establishing property rights, both of which are usually opposed by wealthy elites
    ● development can be interpreted in different ways.

    Some responses may also include reference to bottom-up routes to development such as microfinance loans, which often support female enterprise in countries where there is gender inequality. Educating girls is another way of fighting back against inequality. Both these initiatives are sometimes supported by rich countries.

    Possible examples may include reference to countries where inequality has been growing rapidly

in the last ten years, *eg* Argentina, Russia and Egypt, all of which have faced challenges in growth and development, and to countries where equality (including gender equality) has increased, such as in Malaysia, Cuba and Ecuador.

Responses should include the candidate's evaluative conclusion on whether or not inequality encourages development. While the question is deliberately provocative, any properly substantiated argument should be credited.

6.   To what extent is the achievement of political and social stability essential for development?

Responses should demonstrate knowledge of definitions of political and social stability, and development, though up-front definitions are not required if understanding is evident from the way the terms are used in the text.

This question focuses on the key concept of development, and the factors that inhibit or promote development. It is likely that some candidates will explore political and social stability together, rather than consider these separately; however, this is not prescriptive and no set answer is required.

Arguments that political and social stability are essential may include:
● political and social stability provide a suitable environment in which financial institutions and investment can reach maturity
● political and social stability provide a suitable environment in which long-term changes in societies can be achieved *eg* provision of schooling, leading to an educated workforce
● political and social stability provide a suitable environment in which changes in values and attitudes can take place without conflict (avoiding the conflict that comes about as a result of rapid change)
● features of development such as healthcare, education and infrastructure all require long-term horizons and stability throughout the process
● stability is a prerequisite for attracting foreign investment *etc.*

Arguments that they are not essential may include:
● to bring about development it is sometimes necessary to undertake violent reforms and changes to shake off unchanging traditions; regime change may be necessary before development can take place
● to bring about development it is sometimes necessary to change from an inward to an outward orientation, with consequent exposure to competition and the turbulence of world markets, *eg* India in the 1990s
● changes in cultural values, mores and beliefs may need to take place before development can take place, *eg* attitudes to moneylending.

Possible examples of countries where a stable political environment has encouraged development might include Brunei, Botswana, Uruguay, Oman, and Mauritius. Examples of countries where political instability has inhibited development might include Syria, Yemen, Somalia and Libya (which might also be seen as failed states).

Responses should include the candidate's conclusion on the extent to which political and social stability is essential for development.

Peace and conflict

7. **Compare and contrast *two* different approaches to peacemaking in *one* armed conflict you have studied.**

Responses should demonstrate an understanding of the term, "peacemaking", possibly by defining it. In conceptual terms candidates may distinguish it from peace building or peace keeping. Following Johann Galtung's conceptualization of peacemaking, many students may refer to this a process of changing universal attitudes through dialogue and mediated negotiations (mitigating or eliminating cultural violence). The UN defines peacemaking in similar terms as generally including "measures to address conflicts in progress [that] usually involves diplomatic action to bring hostile parties to a negotiated agreement." However, candidates are likely to consider all third party intervention as "peacemaking" and this understanding should be accepted. It is possible that students will distinguish peacemaking from peacekeeping and peacebuilding. The former is defined as the potential use of force to police an existing peace agreement, and peacebuilding is the effort to build sustainable positive peace (removing structural violence) in a post-conflict scenario.

Responses should give details of the nature of the chosen armed conflict and the parties involved, including any third and/or associated parties. Answers should discuss the key contradiction(s) that exist and show the incompatibility in the different positions adopted by each party, their vital interests and their needs. Answers may analyse the conflict symmetry, indicating any power imbalance, and use this to explain how third party intervention can empower one party to force a more powerful party to the negotiating table. If answers do not define the terms of reference exactly as given above, they should not be penalized, however their own definitions of these will need to be given clearly.

Points of comparisons between approaches to peacemaking may include:

The different peacemakers in the armed conflict may all…
● have something to gain from intervention (vested interests)
● present themselves as neutral
● seek to force parties to the negotiating table
● may use violence, but ultimately seek to de-escalate violence
● have a level of tolerance beyond which they will withdraw
● will claim legitimacy and responsibility in taking action.

Contrasts between approaches to peacemaking may include:
● hard power (force) vs soft power (influence) used by different peacemakers
● silent intervention vs public intervention
● legal right or responsibility to intervene vs assumed right
● collaboration between states (coalition) vs independent state action.

Do not expect reference to all these points. Depending on the armed conflict chosen there may be other valid similarities and differences which candidates may identify, and these should be rewarded.

Possible examples of armed conflicts could be: disputed areas between Sudan and South Sudan;

Jammu and Kashmir, between Indian and Pakistan; Nagorno-Karabakh between Azerbaijan and Armenia; or armed conflicts in Taiwan, or in Crimea. Examples may also refer to a disputed area within a sovereign state such as in Tibet (now an autonomous region within China) or Kurdish areas in the Middle East, or disputes which have, it appears, been settled, such as in Northern Ireland within the UK.

Responses should include the candidate's conclusion on the differences and similarities between two different approaches to peacemaking in one armed conflict.

8.   Discuss the view that peace is more than simply the absence of war.

Responses should demonstrate awareness of the main concept of peace, particularly the concept of a positive peace. While candidates are not required to explicitly define a negative peace, examiners should recognise that many candidates may do so. In that case, a negative peace is defined as simply the absence of war or of direct physical violence (a simplistic understanding of peace), contrasted with a positive peace, defined as a positive condition in which individuals are able to reach their potential, and where there is an absence of all kinds of violence, not only direct physical violence, but also psychological, cultural or structural violence.

*Arguments that peace **is** simply the absence of war may include:*
● These arguments will be limited, but a pragmatic response would be that any form of peace must involve the absence of war, defined as the most extreme form of violence. Until there is a cessation of hostilities no progress can be made in rebuilding a society or healing its rifts. In global politics this is a political objective: the United Nations aim is to keep peace and prevent war.

*Arguments that peace **is more than** simply the absence of war may include:*
● peace is a social goal, and is only narrowly defined as the absence of war: it is more positively defined as the absence of all violence, including structural violence: defining violence then becomes important
● examples of violence that exists after the end of hostilities make clear the need for a broader definition. Peace needs to be sustainable, not merely a temporary truce
● "positive" peace aims to address the root causes of violence and eliminate them: *"*Peace is not merely the absence of some negative force–war, tension, confusion, but it is the presence of some positive force–justice, goodwill, the power of the kingdom of God." Martin Luther King, Jr.

Possible examples of post conflict structural violence that could be referenced, to make the point that peace needs to be more than merely the absence of war, include:
South Sudan; Palestine under occupation; former Yugoslavia; Kashmir; North Korea; Crimea.

Examples of cultural and structural violence that may or may not be addressed post-conflict are malnutrition; poverty; disease; poor sanitation; lack of services, health care, education, law and order; discrimination based on caste, creed, gender, mental or physical (dis)ability; racism; sexism *etc.* However, the point may be made that suffering these ills may still be preferable, if the alternative is to undergo the suffering and tribulations of an armed conflict, in the hope of resolving them. If a peaceful state is defined as one in which no cultural or structural violence exists, can any state be truly defined as being peaceful?

Responses should include the candidate's conclusion on whether or not peace is more than simply the absence of war.