



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

[Unit of study: Power, sovereignty and international relations]

2

Define: Power

How → Economic Hard power  
↳ Germany, EU

→ Military Hard Power  
↳ US

→ Economic global governance structure  
Resource based Soft power

Why not: → Power diffusion  
↳ COP21

: → Power limitation global governance  
new global issue

wrong → Escape justice

Power is the ability to influence other actors in global politics in order to achieve outcomes. Economically powerful states are totally able to manipulate global governance institutions for their advantage. Because of Economic <sup>Hard</sup> power, Military Hard Power, and resource based Soft power.

- 2 -

So However, some people may argue against this ~~to~~ thesis by saying that because of power diffusion and global issues Economically powerful States no longer hold sway in global governance. But they have not taken into account the ability for strong actors to avoid Global Justice.

An example of how Economically powerful States are able to control global governance is Germany and the EU. The Germany used its economic hard power to impose its will on smaller States inside the EU like in 2015 when Germany, through the EU forced smaller European States to take refugees that they did not want in <sup>too</sup> 2015. Germany showed how economically powerful <sup>States</sup> ~~governance~~ <sup>Polities</sup> can use their Wealth to manipulate Global governance with threats of ~~per~~ repercussions. However it must be said with this example while Germany certainly used its Economic Hard power to manipulate the EU its soft power played a better role to <sup>large</sup>.

Another example of how economic power can be used to influence global <sup>governance</sup> ~~polities~~ is through Hard power. This can be seen as there is a correlation between Economic resources and the ability



04AX02

- 3 -

to ~~ensure~~ fund a large scale Army. An example of this could be the P5. The P5 in the ~~UN~~<sup>UN</sup> represent the 5 most Militarily capable States in the world, with the hope that they will work together to avoid global war. However we can see how hard power can be used to manipulate global governance in the Ukraine conflict. 2013. When Russia attempted to annex the East of Ukraine up to the city of Donetsk, and ~~the~~ the Crimea, the international community attempted to condemn their actions, however Russia used its veto, which it was due to its military power to ~~stop~~<sup>stop</sup> any ~~result~~ resolutions that would threaten its national interest from passing. Therefore because of its economic power, which causes its Military power, Russia was able to manipulate global governance. ~~from taking~~

Another example of this is China's use of aid for soft power. China has promised 1.4 trillion dollars of aid to Africa. This will not only have the effect of opening up African markets to Chinese trade but will also make African States ~~to~~ work more closely with the Chinese. In effect ~~then~~ because of China's large economic power, it is able to afford to give more aid and their ~~for~~ extend its reach of soft power to include more African States. This



04AX03

- 4 -

- ☐ <sup>Proves means</sup> that if China's national interest was put in danger, for instance with the South China sea dispute or any military action against North Korea, they could call on African allies to vote in the Chinese favour in the general assembly in the UN. Thus China has used its economic power to influence global politics governance
- ☐

- ☐ However both of these points can be argued against. For many power diffusion is meaning ~~proving~~ that powerful states are becoming less and less powerful as non-state actors and weaker states importance rises. An example of this can be seen in the UN resolution that was passed in 2016 condemning the Israeli settlement in the Palestinian territory. Some would argue that this is an example of how, pure, economic power is becoming less important as
- ☐ because as power diffuses, soft power becomes more important. In this case the Obama administration of America decided not to veto the "anti-Israeli" resolution, despite America being one of ~~the~~ Israel's greatest supporters and giving ~~up~~ over 1.3 billion dollars of aid <sup>to</sup> ~~to~~ <sup>Israel</sup> ~~the~~ State. Some argued this did not take place because Obama did not wish to sacrifice American



04AX04

**ANSWER BOOKLET**  
**LIVRET DE RÉPONSES**  
**CUADERNILLO DE RESPUESTAS**

**4 PAGES / PÁGINAS**



International Baccalaureate  
 Baccalauréat International  
 Bachillerato Internacional

At the start of each answer to a question, write the question number in the box. / Avant de répondre à une question, veuillez écrire le numéro de la question que vous allez traiter dans la case prévue à cet effet. / Al comienzo de cada respuesta, escriba el número de pregunta en la casilla.

Example  
 Exemple  
 Ejemplo

27

27

Example  
 Exemple  
 Ejemplo

3

3

Soft power for Israel.

However this can be easily contested by the fact that while power is transitioning and deepening to some extent it might be "overly" liberal to suggest that this is worrying the global hegemon of the global North. Instead we can see that Economically rich countries are the ones most able to use smart power to achieve their aims, not only ~~the~~ through aid but also this can be seen and therefore they are still able to manipulate ~~power~~ global governance despite power diffusion.

Another argument against the ~~thesis~~ thesis is that globalisation is making Economic power less of a factor as states need to come together to achieve ~~some~~ solve global issues. An example of this can be found in the 2015 <sup>Paris</sup> ~~power~~ or COP 21 agreement, where all of the world actors ~~so~~ co nation states



- 2 -

Came together to solve global issue of climate change. At the talks, it was widely recognised that all actors should have an equal say in order to make the deal feasible moving forward. It therefore shows that Economically rich states can no longer manipulate global governance because they of global issues are needing unilateral agreements and soft solutions.

However again we can see how this is easily rebuttable because of Powerful States being able to avoid punishment. An example of this is despite America signing the deal, one of President Trump's first actions was to reduce to almost nothing the budget of America's Environmental observation body the E.P.A. Despite this America will not, and has not, faced sanctions or punishment because ~~any~~ any actions taken could lead to counter sanctions or punishments that ~~would~~ <sup>would</sup> be very important to could be catastrophic. Therefore global issues are not a reason why ~~global~~ <sup>global</sup> Economic powers can not manipulate global governance, as if they do not match with Powerful States economic or national interest, there is no power big enough to force them to participate in multi-lateral action.



04AX02

- 3 -

In conclusion Economic powers can manipulate global governance due to their Has ~~Sacred~~ Economic power, Military power & and their ability to avoid global punishment.

The bit above is not crossed out

3

Define → Human right

Then → Not enforceable for some.

How → Global imbalance of power

→ culturally relative

→ Hard to make everyone sign how much

Against → No longer cultural relative

→ the rise of outside enforcement

Why not → Limited ability + Slowing of politics

**Question 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.**

[Unit of study: Human rights]

Human Rights are a set of inalienable and indivisible rights given to humans simply on the virtue of being human. It is true that human rights are not enforceable on all states, however this does not make them of little use to the most vulnerable.

An example of this can be found in the ICC. The ICC shows how it is impossible for Human Rights to be enforceable by all on every actor because of the global imbalance of power



04AX03



- 4 -

An example of this can be found that in the fact that of the last 10 cases that have been brought before the ICC for potential convictions ~~over~~ 9 of them have been Africans. This shows how ~~well~~ while the ICC is willing to enforce its rule on African states it is claimed that there was "no case to answer" for ~~us~~ US conduct in the Iraq and Af war of 2003. However despite global ~~an~~ power imbalance meaning that powerful large states like the US can afford to avoid punishment for breaking Human Rights this does not necessarily mean that human rights are not useful to the most vulnerable. In fact the opposite. One of the two convictions of the ICC was of Thomas Lubanga from the DRC who committed war crimes in the country. In any case because the DRC is ~~is~~ a "fragile state" and is on the "Alert status" on the fragile state index, its weakness allows for its leaders to be prosecuted. Therefore in a twisted way as long as the most vulnerable do not have their human rights violated by large powers, global power imbalance means that they are more likely to have their rights upheld by the treaties of human rights.



04AX04



**ANSWER BOOKLET**  
**LIVRET DE RÉPONSES**  
**CUADERNILLO DE RESPUESTAS**

**4 PAGES / PÁGINAS**



International Baccalaureate  
 Baccalauréat International  
 Bachillerato Internacional

At the start of each answer to a question, write the question number in the box. / Avant de répondre à une question, veuillez écrire le numéro de la question que vous allez traiter dans la case prévue à cet effet. / Al comienzo de cada respuesta, escriba el número de pregunta en la casilla.

Example  
 Exemple  
 Ejemplo

27

27

Example  
 Exemple  
 Ejemplo

3

3

An other reason why ~~power~~ Human Rights treaties and covenants are unenforceable is because of Cultural Relativism. This can be seen in the Cio declaration of 25 1948, where States ~~came together~~ to Muslim leaders and States came together to declare human rights, "in-isolation" because they do not follow their cultural code. This makes it hard for human rights to be enforced because some states view it as Western "imperialism" that is trying to break down their culture enforced on their culture unfairly and that therefore they will not follow it. However this again ~~can~~ is not a reason that human rights are not useful to the most vulnerable. Without the ~~pen~~ with the present of human rights being there it allows the most vulnerable in society to question what is their "cultural norms". An example of this could be the Arab spring in Egypt in 2013 where Egyptians challenged Hosni Mubarak's leadership based on the fact that he was not



- 2 -

providing the civil liberties or social support put out in ~~the~~ UNHR and other human Rights documents. In conclusion then we can see that while universal relativism makes it impossible to ever truly impose human rights conventions, the treaties and conventions give the most venerable a standard to which to judge their leader and sets a ~~pre~~ precedent that allows these people to question their leadership.

~~Another~~ Another reason why human Rights or conventions are not enforceable is because they are almost always enforced by Western actors. This reduces the legitimacy of the convention because as ~~the~~ mentioned before it makes it look as if Human Rights are being enforced on other regions by the West. A perfect example of this is the Iraq war of 2003 where the US claimed to move into Iraq on the premise of insuring the human rights of its people. ~~and insuring human rights~~ However this was clearly not true and instead led to America ~~officially~~ ~~clearly~~ ~~not~~ breaking many of the convention themselves. This damages the legitimacy of the convention as other States begin to see how America used them as they cover for their Realist national interest. This makes



04AX02

- 3 -

other states not only reluctant to sign the treaty but also sets a precedent that it is okay to break the conventions you have signed. This makes the convention very hard to enforce because how can you use them to punish one State if you do not punish all States.

However, despite the fact that <sup>so-called</sup> "humanitarian ~~human~~ intervention" ~~is~~ does make it harder to enforce human rights. This does not mean that humanitarian intervention is bad for the most vulnerable. Despite the terrible loss of life in Iraq thanks to American intervention ~~it was~~ since 2003 the number of girls in school in Iraq has risen by 2.7 million people. This shows how humanitarian intervention can actually be a positive for the most vulnerable as while western values victimised and oppressed some aspects of Iraqi society, it actually liberated others and allowed those who had been most vulnerable in Iraq, particularly women, access to human rights that they previously did not have.

However we can ~~criticise~~ ~~criticize~~ ~~criticise~~ criticise this thesis by using the example of globalisation. We can say that actually ~~it is the state~~ globalisation has led to the formation



04AX03

- 4 -

world norms that means that the ideas of Ethnocentrism and cultural relativism no longer hold sway. This shows that States can't simply say use cultural relativism as an excuse not to provide global rights. An example of this is used before is the ideas of the Arab spring, which fought for certain rights, particularly the from the first and second generation rights. This shows that while Human Rights conventions are conventions are perfectly enforceable and that states need to be held to account for breaking the treaties.

However while this can be refuted by the growth of nationalism in the west, rallying against so called "global norms", it must be pointed out that not wither this point against the thesis does not mean that Human Rights are useless, in this scenario in fact, the conventions and treaties signed form the foundation for global norms that are therefore highly valuable to the poorest and most vulnerable.

In conclusion, despite the fact that Human Rights are unenforceable this does not mean that they are not valuable to the most vulnerable. In fact it



04AX04

ANSWER BOOKLET  
LIVRET DE RÉPONSES  
CUADERNILLO DE RESPUESTAS

4 PAGES / PÁGINAS



International Baccalaureate  
Baccalauréat International  
Bachillerato Internacional

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

[Unit of study: Peace and conflict]

Example  
Exemple  
Ejemplo

27

2 7

Example  
Exemple  
Ejemplo

3

3

8

Define → Peace

Thesis → Peace is the ~~not~~ not just absence  
of war

How → not just Behaviour → Minis protocol

→ Assassination

→ Sierre Leone Peace/

→ Contention

Northern Ireland <sup>reconciliation</sup>

Against → Unachievable → no society is total

→ no society is blue for peaceful, but must  
stable, Finland → highest HDI

Peace is the absence of war, as well  
well as a state of more harmonious  
relations. Peace is a lot more than

the absence of war in the long run. This

is because ~~off~~ Peace is not just about  
addressing the behavioural aspect of conflict

but also the latent level as well. Some however

might argue that this wrong because positive

peace is impossible, but they have not taken

into account how important the road towards

positive peace is for long term peace.



-2-

An example of how merely dealing with the, as ~~guttering~~ put it, "Behavioural" aspect of global politics politics is not a formula for long lasting peace. An example of this could be the cease fire in the Syrian conflict in 2016. From this we can see that simply by stopping the violence we do not deal with the reasons that the violence took place. This caused the fighting to break out again only three weeks later. We can see that while negative peace is an important part of creating peace itself it can be argued that it is only in the short term, and that in order to create long lasting and permanent stability and peace, positive peace must begin to take shape. Positive peace is a more ~~transverse~~ fair and just society where the assumptions and contradictions are dealt with to insure that unlike in Syria, peace can be maintained.

However to build Positive peace the State must at first underline the ~~contradictions~~ contradictions of the conflict. An example of this is the ~~and~~ how Sierra Leone transitioned out of conflict after their 2002 civil war. The Sierra Leone's used a "Peace and reconciliation" committee to help to ~~to~~ try to solve the contradictions of the civil war. This allowed



04AX02

- 3 -

them to move out of a simple war limiting phase, to actual peace building, which meant that as a society they could move on. The effect of this was to make Sierra Leone a lot more stable than its counterparts in sub-Saharan Africa where negative peace was all that was achieved, places like Sudan after the 2015 partition of the country. Therefore ~~the~~ ~~can~~ which is still left South Sudan as the third most fragile state in the world according to the fragile state index. We can see then that ~~from~~ Sierra Leone achieved a more positive peace than South Sudan, by trying to partially solve the contradictions that were the ~~last~~ ~~more~~ ~~later~~ reason of the conflict. This in turn meant that Sierra Leone kept its peace for a much longer time period than Sudan. In conclusion this means that ~~see~~ in the long term the absence of war is not enough to maintain peace.

Another reason that peace in the long term is not just simply absence of war ~~is~~ is that ~~long~~ ~~long~~ long term peace must also ensure that states address the assumptions that helped to cause the conflict. An example of this is the Good Friday or Belfast agreement that meant that ~~states~~ ~~was~~ brought Northern Ireland out of negative



04AX03



This allowed Northern Ireland like Sier Leone to transition away from peace keeping to peace building and in this can be contrasted by the Ukraine conflict in 2013, because ~~the~~ despite the signing of the Minsk protocol which brought

However it, must be acknowledged that the Northern Irish conflict has been going on for a much longer period of time. In conclusion however, we can see that states in less the assumption and fears of the conflicting sides are addressed positive peace can never be achieved and states will always be in a state of negative peace that causes



04AX04

**ANSWER BOOKLET**  
**LIVRET DE RÉPONSES**  
**CUADERNILLO DE RESPUESTAS**

**4 PAGES / PÁGINAS**



International Baccalaureate  
 Baccalauréat International  
 Bachillerato Internacional

At the start of each answer to a question, write the question number in the box. / Avant de répondre à une question, veuillez écrire le numéro de la question que vous allez traiter dans la case prévue à cet effet. / Al comienzo de cada respuesta, escriba el número de pregunta en la casilla.

Example  
 Exemple  
 Ejemplo

27

27

Example  
 Exemple  
 Ejemplo

3

3

is not stable in the long run.

However this thesis can be argued against. While it's true that negative peace in the long run may not be effective in the long run, it is also true that negative positive peace is simply unobtainable, because no state can be purely harmonious. This comes from the Realist perspective can be up held with the example of the American State. While America is certainly considered a stable State it is easy to think it does not have positive peace. We can point to race relations in America as an example for this as over one in three Black males in the country will at some point be put in prison. This is in course the Black prison population to be the most much higher percentage of prison inmates, than the percentage of the people in America who are black. As a result Black American society is certainly not harmonious.



- 2 -

and is in fact not in ~~regard~~ positive peace. Yet we can't describe America as fragile or indeed not peaceful in the long term. Using this argument we can say that because positive peace is not a requirement for long term peace, and because positive peace ~~usually~~ does not exist, negative peace is the only type of peace and ~~therefore~~ therefore peace is simply the absence of war.

Realists would also argue that negative peace is the only type of peace because it is the only peace that allows states to ~~be~~ pursue their realist interest.

Realists would point out that in reality ~~for~~ the world of global politics is in a constant state of conflict for which peace is a temporary measure. They would point to the fact that despite the world being ~~is~~ free from large inter-state battles, this is being compensated for by a rise in intra-state wars. We can see then that, at least in the realist view

States can't be in positive peace, as to do so means not pursuing their own national interest and living harmoniously. For Realist this is impossible and therefore positive peace is impossible. Therefore for Realist negative peace is the only peace because ~~there~~ ~~was~~ only absence of war can allow states to pursue their national interest.



04AX02

- 3 -

However, these two points can be contradicted by looking at how a more harmonious, if not perfect society or region can achieve lasting peace. Firstly we can use the examples of Finland and Ireland who ~~are~~ <sup>are</sup> members one and five on the HDI scale. This means that these countries are not perfect, but have certainly gone upon the path of achieving positive peace. Therefore it is no surprise that both Ireland and Finland are amongst the most stable states in the world according to the ~~the~~ fragile states index. In essence we can see how that states who may not be positively peaceful, but at least pursue positive peace are more stable in the long run, evidence for this can be found that both both Finland and Ireland are ~~amongst~~ <sup>more</sup> more stable than America according to the fragile state index. Therefore we can see that positive peace ~~they~~ <sup>is</sup> is an important part of peace, as states that do achieve close to it are more peaceful and stable in the long run.

Equally we can point out the EU as ~~an~~ <sup>an</sup> example of how from the liberal view point both national interest and regional positive peace can be achieved



04AX03

- 4 -

This is because EU actors like France and the UK can effect pursue their national interest, as seen by their involvement in the 2011 Libyan conflict, while also maintaining a very ~~harmonious~~ harmonious relationship with the European Union. This is evidenced by a single currency, free movement in the Schengen region and a long term lack of war ~~for 45 years~~ since the 1945 the end of the cold war. However while this true it must also be pointed out that States due to the Britain leaving the EU in 2016 we can see that positive peace may not be present in the EU in the ~~past~~ present time, however, ~~or~~ certainly in the last 20 years we can see how the EU has achieved a more harmonious relationship between many States while not sacrificing their national interest. This means that positive peace is possible in global politics and then, ~~that is~~ is an important part of the definition that can't be ~~improved~~ improved. By definition then, Peace can't just be another form of the absence of conflict or war, but instead in the long term must be a also about building a harmonious relationship between actors.



04AX04

**ANSWER BOOKLET**  
**LIVRET DE RÉPONSES**  
**CUADERNILLO DE RESPUESTAS**

**4 PAGES / PÁGINAS**



International Baccalaureate  
 Baccalauréat International  
 Bachillerato Internacional

At the start of each answer to a question, write the question number in the box. / Avant de répondre à une question, veuillez écrire le numéro de la question que vous allez traiter dans la case prévue à cet effet. / Al comienzo de cada respuesta, escriba el número de pregunta en la casilla.



Example  
 Exemple  
 Ejemplo

27

27

Example  
 Exemple  
 Ejemplo

3

3




In conclusion then. We can see that in the long term Peace is a lot more than just an absence of war. This is because in the long term, ~~for~~ <sup>for</sup> peace to be present ~~you~~ <sup>there</sup> the contradiction and assumptions of conflict ~~are~~ <sup>must</sup> be addressed, and because positive peace is possible.


