



Examiners' Report

June 2011

GCE Government and Politics 6GP03 3D

Edexcel is one of the leading examining and awarding bodies in the UK and throughout the world. We provide a wide range of qualifications including academic, vocational, occupational and specific programmes for employers.

Through a network of UK and overseas offices, Edexcel's centres receive the support they need to help them deliver their education and training programmes to learners.

For further information, please call our GCE line on 0844 576 0025, our GCSE team on 0844 576 0027, or visit our website at www.edexcel.com.

If you have any subject specific questions about the content of this Examiners' Report that require the help of a subject specialist, you may find our **Ask The Expert** email service helpful.

Ask The Expert can be accessed online at the following link:
<http://www.edexcel.com/Aboutus/contact-us/>



Get more from your exam results

...and now your mock results too!

ResultsPlus is Edexcel's free online service giving instant and detailed analysis of your students' exam and mock performance, helping you to help them more effectively.

- See your students' scores for every exam question
- Spot topics, skills and types of question where they need to improve their learning
- Understand how your students' performance compares with Edexcel national averages
- Track progress against target grades and focus revision more effectively with NEW Mock Analysis

For more information on ResultsPlus, or to log in, visit www.edexcel.com/resultsplus.
To set up your ResultsPlus account, call 0844 576 0024

June 2011

Publications Code UA028090

All the material in this publication is copyright
© Edexcel Ltd 2011

Introduction

It was evident that a good proportion of candidates had been well prepared for the examination. Subject knowledge was strong and there was a pleasing focus on the wording of the questions. The most popular questions were the short response on sovereignty and the longer response on military power. The least popular response, perhaps unsurprisingly, was the long response on global economic governance.

As usual, there were a few key differentiators between candidates' responses. The key to success in responding to the questions set is to recognize that not one, but in the case of the longer essay response, four marks are being awarded for each script. Whilst Assessment Objective 1 (A01) knowledge may help a candidate to achieve 12 of the available 45 marks, there are still 33 marks available for A02, synopticity and A03. A large proportion of candidates score well in A01 because they provide detailed and developed knowledge and understanding with relevant and accurate work but they can fail to attain the marks that are available elsewhere. The intellectual skills required to perform at the highest level in A02 revolve around the ability to provide analysis, evaluation and parallels or connections. This can be a challenge for those candidates who rely primarily on production of learnt fact and knowledge. Synopticity, where candidates are expected to provide an awareness of competing viewpoints or perspectives, can be a weak area for some. The longer questions are designed for debate and discussion of alternative viewpoints. A03 can also be an issue for some candidates. There is a need to bring all of the earlier A0 elements into a structured and logical response which provides balance and use of appropriate political vocabulary.

It is absolutely important that teachers are aware of the 'Further guidance for Route D' document, prepared by the previous Principal Examiner, which can be found on the Edexcel website. This document provides additional content explanation and advice to support the initial specification document.

Question 1

This was by far the most popular short question for candidates. Sovereignty is a key concept in the specification and background knowledge was, on the whole, pleasing. The majority of candidates provided suitable definitions and supporting knowledge. Some discussion of internal and external sovereignty and of legal and political sovereignty was provided. This was, of course, a two part question and candidates needed to move to an exploration and explanation of the implications of state sovereignty for global politics. This is where weaker candidates struggled to gain marks. Sovereignty implies that states are all powerful and that there is no other authority which can challenge their authority. The implication of this is that global politics operates in a condition of perpetual anarchy. State sovereignty also implies that all states are equal, theoretically, and that there should be no intervention in the affairs of other states.

Indicate your first question choice on this page.
You will be asked to indicate your second question choice on page 6.

Put a cross in the box ☒ indicating the first question that you have chosen.
If you change your mind, put a line through the box ☒
and then indicate your new question with a cross ☒.

Chosen Question Number:

Question 1 ☒

Question 2 ☒

Question 3 ☒

Question 4 ☒

Question 5 ☒

State sovereignty was first realised as a political concept in 1648 at the signing of the Treaty of Westphalia. This treaty, which came about due to the controversial nature of the Protestant Reformation, stated that the sovereign of a state had the right to choose the religion of the state without outside interference.

State sovereignty has now come to mean that all states are equal and autonomous, that the leader of the state has the right to do what they wish in the state and that no state may interfere in the affairs of ~~the~~ another.

This has huge implications for issues such as human rights and humanitarian intervention. The concept of state sovereignty means ~~that~~ both that a state may commit human rights abuses within its own borders, and also that other states and IGOs may not intervene and try and solve the

issues, no matter how strong the moral argument against human rights abuses. This is ~~an~~ evident in China's attitude. Not only does it commit atrocities within its own borders, but it vetoes UN resolutions to intervene in any of its client states, such as the Sudan, Burma and Zimbabwe, which also have terrible human rights records. This means the the concept of state sovereignty can ~~make~~ ~~a~~ make solving human rights abuses very difficult.

State sovereignty is very closely linked with political realism. This means that, with these two ideas combined, solving ^{other} problems in ~~the~~ international relations can be difficult. It has implications for the future of development and poverty. According to the concept of sovereignty, states must not intervene in other countries' affairs. Combining this with the realist notion of self-interest creates a potent ^{argument} ~~force~~ against giving aid or debt relief to countries in the developing world as some realist countries such as Russia and China may feel that ~~for~~ less economically developed countries must sort out their own problems. This could ~~there~~ ~~real~~ seriously slow down the process of development.

To conclude, state sovereignty, formed by the Treaty of Westphalia, means that states have the right to do what they want without interference from other countries or IGOs which can be damaging to the world order in terms of human rights and development. However, there is an argument that ~~as the~~ the Westphalian concept of sovereignty is becoming less relevant due to concepts such as the UN's 'Responsibility to Protect' and the ICC.



ResultsPlus
Examiner Comments

This was a pleasing script which achieved a high level 3 mark. A clear knowledge of sovereignty and of the implications of the concept are evident in this response with some interesting observations about the impact on attempts to deal with global problems such as environmental degradation.

Question 2

This was a popular and straightforward question. The vast majority of candidates successfully described the structure of the Security Council and the system of membership with widespread condemnation of British and French membership of the P5. Most candidates also went on to point to suitable members of an expanded P5 in terms of power and geography. Stronger responses were able to use examples to demonstrate criticism of perceived veto abuse. There was some confusion from those candidates who believed that membership of the Security Council was linked directly and solely to nuclear weapons capability rather than reflecting structures of power dating to the formation of the United Nations.

Indicate your first question choice on this page.
You will be asked to indicate your second question choice on page 6.

Put a cross in the box ☒ indicating the first question that you have chosen.
If you change your mind, put a line through the box ☒
and then indicate your new question with a cross ☒.

Chosen Question Number:

Question 1 ☒

Question 2 ☒

Question 3 ☒

Question 4 ☒

Question 5 ☒

Plan

- Unrepresentative (undemocratic)

- Abuse veto

The Security Council is, essentially, the head of the UN and the body that sets and policy direction. It contains five permanent members and ten non-permanent members that serve for two year terms. It is the Security Council's primary responsibility to "safeguard and protect peace and security" and it does so with a three pronged strategy: resolutions, sanctions and, very rarely, military action. The permanent members (USA, Russia, China, France and the UK) can each veto any decision.

Yet, the organisation has come under mounting pressure and criticism in recent times and its' flaws can be divided into two problems. Firstly, established in 1945, its' makeup appears is out of date and

unrepresentative of ~~contemporary~~ modern international politics. ^{The permanent members} It contains no Islamic, African, developing or South American countries and this damages the moral legitimacy of the entire UN which can hardly claim to democratically represent the whole world. Introducing new members or redistributing some power to the General Assembly has been suggested as possible solutions but the Security Council is unlikely to sanction reform that would see its' power diminished or diluted. Secondly, the permanent members are often accused of abusing their veto ~~power~~ powers to promote self interest or protect allies. The most persistent example is the relationship between Israel and the USA. Despite the former breaking international law on numerous occasions, Washington consistently blocks any attempts to ~~essentially punish~~ punish the state. Abolishing the veto has been an often suggested solution but again, the Security Council would almost certainly block such a move.

In conclusion, the Security Council is controversial because it is seen by many to be unrepresentative and all too willing to abuse its' veto powers. Yet, the very make up of the institution makes reform very unlikely. The calls for reform look set to remain.



ResultsPlus

Examiner Comments

This is a good level 3 response which covers the range of criticisms of the UN Security Council following a mostly pleasing introduction.



ResultsPlus

Examiner Tip

Try to ensure that, alongside an introduction to the general theme of the question, the issues arising from the question are also mentioned in the introduction.

Question 3

This again was a seemingly straightforward question covering territory that previous route D examination papers have covered. The key differentiator in this question was use of examples to support argument. Certain EU institutions can impose decisions on dissenting member states and candidates needed to make this clear with reference to bodies such as the European Commission, the European Parliament and the European Court of Justice. Clearly there are arguments that the EU operates in an intergovernmental manner and this point was worth making although the core of the question required discussion of supranationalism. Whilst weaker candidates could only make general comments about the powers of the EU over states, stronger candidates were able to cover a range of institutions in discussion of supranationalism.

A definition of the term supranational in the introduction would strengthen this response.

Indicate your first question choice on this page.
You will be asked to indicate your second question choice on page 6.

Put a cross in the box ☒ indicating the first question that you have chosen.
If you change your mind, put a line through the box ☒
and then indicate your new question with a cross ☒.

Chosen Question Number:

Question 1 <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Question 2 <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Question 3 <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Question 4 <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Question 5 <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	

The EU as a regional organisation is the most supranational one on the world stage with all institutions to a greater or lesser degree holding supranational characteristics.

The highest body of the EU is the European Council which remains largely intergovernmental through its use of unanimous decision-making by the Heads of Government and Foreign Ministers to decide the strategic path of the EU. However, the passage of the Lisbon Treaty saw the creation of a President (Van Rompuy) which is supranational because speaks for the whole EU thus making the EU more supranational.

The Council of Ministers and the European Commission are largely supranational bodies too. Despite the Council of Ministers using unanimous voting to make decisions the passage of Lisbon saw a move to the use of QMV which apportions different majorities to different sizes allowing even the largest state to be outvoted which weakens the national veto which in turn sees a decline in sovereignty. The European Commission possesses unelected commissioners who make binding decisions on the EU member states and are only accountable to the Council of Ministers which makes it supranational in governance. The EU parliament also operates simple majority decision-making which allows member states to be outvoted and

subject to binding decisions.

The ECJ and the ECB are both the most supranational bodies of the EU. The ECJ enforces binding decisions over domestic law in 'areas of competence' underpinned by the principle that EU law is superior thus making it supranational. The ECB is supranational for the 16 member states that 'opt in' to the Euro as binding monetary policy decisions made as well the existence of the growth and stability pact which further shows the EU as an example of supranational governance.



ResultsPlus

Examiner Comments

This response covers a range of EU institutions and there is a focus on the demands of the question throughout the main body of the response. This is sufficient to push the candidate into level 3.

Question 4

This was quite a good discriminator with a significant number of candidates setting the debate in the present rather than the Cold War past. Bipolarity is often associated specifically with the Cold War and the era of the superpowers. Stronger candidates were able to consider both the Realist and the liberal theorist view as to the implications of bipolarity with an obvious focus on stability in the global arena. Although there was confusion from some candidates, the majority of those who discussed the competing theories were able to explain the realist belief that bipolarity provides relative stability and the countering view, from liberal theorists, that bipolarity is inherently unstable. Stronger candidates were able to make reference to proxy wars, Mutual Assured Destruction and were able to draw brief comparisons with other periods of polarity.

Indicate your first question choice on this page.
You will be asked to indicate your second question choice on page 6.

Put a cross in the box ☒ indicating the first question that you have chosen.
If you change your mind, put a line through the box ☒
and then indicate your new question with a cross ☒.

Chosen Question Number:

Question 1 ☒

Question 2 ☐

Question 3 ☐

Question 4 ☒

Question 5 ☐

Bipolarity is a distribution of power whereby there are two states with significantly more power than others on the world stage. These two powers have levels of influence which are comparable in magnitude.

Realists tend to agree that bipolarity is good thing for stability and global order. They see a 'balance of power', whereby the two dominant states ~~can~~ regulate each other, preventing intervention by one of the powers. This is in opposed to unipolarity, where intervention hegemony is a risk as no-one has the sufficient power to keep the largest power from exploiting states. The 'spheres of influence' of each of the two powers are largely stable as they fall under their power's protection. This was seen in the cold war, where NATO was developed to protect countries within the US sphere and the Warsaw Pact was signed to keep the Communist states protected from US ~~action~~. This is unlike multipolarity, where allegiances are constantly changing as states look to gain the upper hand due to either the anarchic nature of the system (structural realism) or through state egoism (classical realism); where power politics dominate.

Advocates for ~~new~~ bipolarity would point to the period of relative stability during the cold war, ~~which~~ commonly known as the 'balance of terror'. Here, ~~the fact that the US and the USSR both had huge nuclear capabilities~~ because US and Soviet power was relatively reciprocal, and war was prevented and order and stability were able to exist. However, this might be viewed as a forced argument because states all around the world became ideological battlegrounds for the USSR and US to wage 'proxy wars', as in Afghanistan and Vietnam. This suggests that bipolarity is in fact unstable, and the hostility and competition that will inevitably exist between two opposing super powers, will result in war and a disregard for the populations of the states where the proxy wars occur because they are not 'home-soil' for either nation.

~~liberals might agree~~ Neoliberals believe that the way to counter an anarchic system is through a framework of ~~the~~ global governance. This allows countries to work together in harmony and holds agree-

state states to account. However, as seen with the paralysis at the UN during the cold war (due to vetoing by either the US or the USSR), this is near an impossible during ~~most~~ bipolarity. This means that neoliberals might say that bipolarity has a negative effect on world order as it doesn't allow for an effective system of global governance as might be possible under unipolarity with a benevolent hegemon ('new world order') or multipolarity.



ResultsPlus

Examiner Comments

After a rather brief introduction, this candidate moves to an analysis of both the realist and liberal theorist view of the implications of bipolarity for global order. The response is focussed on the title throughout with a strong level of understanding and excellent examples. This ensures an excellent level 3 mark.

Indicate your first question choice on this page.
You will be asked to indicate your second question choice on page 6.

Put a cross in the box ☒ indicating the first question that you have chosen.
If you change your mind, put a line through the box ☒
and then indicate your new question with a cross ☒.

Chosen Question Number:

Question 1 ☒

Question 2 ☒

Question 3 ☒

Question 4 ☒

Question 5 ☒

Bipolarity is the idea that there are two main 'poles' in global politics and is often used to refer to the Cold War period when the USA and USSR were the two dominant states. The implications this has on global order is heavily debated between liberals who see it as unstable and uncertain and realists who see it as stable and certain. Both use examples from the Cold War to back up their arguments.

Liberals believe that bipolarity is inherently unstable and uncertain. They believe that it has a negative impact on global order as it is confrontational. During the Cold War liberals would point to the fact that while the

USA and USSR may never have been directly at war with one another, there were a large number of peripheral wars between in which both were involved. The Vietnam and Korean war were examples of this. Liberals would also argue that on a number of occasions the world was only just saved from all out war. The Cuban missile crisis very nearly led to a nuclear confrontation and when Robert Macnamara said 'we looked out', liberals would say this is precisely why bipolarity is dangerous. Rather than it being peaceful and certain, many people lived in fear of war, particularly nuclear war, and this cannot be good for global order.

Realists however take a very different approach, believing bipolarity is stable and certain. They say it is certain because people knew the USA and USSR were the capabilities of each other and knew that the risks

were not likely to have been in their benefit. Indeed ~~to~~ realists would argue that the Cuban Missile Crisis shows how bipolarity is stable as both backed down from war, something that may not have happened in a ~~un~~ multipolar world. Realists also argue that ~~the~~ bipolarity is good for world order because the two sides never did actually go to war. Furthermore realists would counter their critics by saying that while it may not always be completely peaceful it is better than unipolarity or multipolarity for global order.



ResultsPlus

Examiner Comments

This is another level 3 script which takes a slightly different approach in dealing with the question. The introduction is useful as it sets out an understanding of the demands of the question and makes clear where the response will take us. Good use of the Cold War period is made by this candidate with examples to support both the realist and alternative viewpoint.

Question 5

There were a range of responses to this question. Weaker responses discussed globalisation in general, rather than specifically cultural globalisation. Definitions were often lacking or were of globalisation in general. In addition, whilst there is a view that cultural globalisation can be equated to cultural imperialism; there is development to be made over and above a reference to McDonalds and Coca Cola. Stronger responses were able to use a more sophisticated argument to suggest that cultural imperialism was based on a global homogenisation that weakens indigenous cultures and values. Cultural globalisation is also seen to support economic globalisation which, to some, advances the interests of the major economic powers and of their transnational corporations.

Indicate your third question choice on this page.

Put a cross in the box ☐ indicating the third question that you have chosen.

If you change your mind, put a line through the box ☐
and then indicate your new question with a cross ☐.

Chosen Question Number:

Question 1 ☐

Question 2 ☐

Question 3 ☐

Question 4 ☒

Question 5 ☐

Cultural globalisation is the spread of information and ways of life from one part of the world to the rest of it. It has often been called 'westernisation' or even 'americanisation'. The spread of western and american cultures across the rest of the world has been said to homogenise other cultures. By this it is meant that there is a cultural 'flattening out' which means that the distinctions between national identities has begun to thin. One example of this is the spread of multinational corporations whose logos can be seen across the world, the two most prevalent examples of this being McDonalds and Coca-Cola. The spread of cultural globalisation has been linked to political globalisation in that there has been a wave of countries which have waded democratisation and individualism (which can be seen as both a political and cultural ideology) with one very recent example being the Egyptian demonstrations which ended in President Mubarak stepping down from office.

Cultural Globalisation has been criticised in a number of ways. One of these is its tendency to 'flatten out' diversity. By increasing the range and scope of 'mainstream' culture across the globe it is thought that cultures will all soon be very similar. A criticism called the 'clash of civilizations' suggests that the spread of western culture to other countries harms the native civilization and causes

rebellions or uprisings which lash out either at the country which is receiving or giving the new cultural ideas. An example of this is the 'new terrorists' movements like Al-Qaeda which violently disagree with the lifestyle of the west and cause massive damage in an attempt to defend what they see as their culture which they see as under attack.

The idea that culture is homogenising across the world has also been questioned to an extent. There are countries, such as Italy, which spurn some aspects of other countries' cultures. Italy, as mentioned before, has been known to have rejected the idea of American coffee bars such as Starbucks preferring instead to keep traditional coffee shops and thus not taking on board this idea that native cultures in a country can be overridden by multinational organisations.



ResultsPlus Examiner Comments

This response makes a reference to McDonalds and to Coca Cola, but also to the flattening out and homogenisation of culture worldwide as a consequence of cultural globalisation. The candidate makes pleasing reference to criticisms such as the flattening out of diversity and backlash to western cultural imperialism. The response may weaken towards the end but there are sufficient references to key criticisms and enough of a focus on the specific question to pull it into level 3.

Question 6

The major problem with this question was the frequent absence of any definition of "global actor" or initial criteria for consideration. Answers tended to drift into a general strength and weakness of the EU or even consideration as to whether it is a Superpower or not. This was not a Superpower question. Stronger responses set criteria for assessing whether the EU is a major global actor and then debated the extent to which the EU meets this criteria.

The majority of candidates were able to debate the significance of the economic strength of the EU with some reference to the influence that this gives to the organisation and inevitably came to the conclusion that the sheer size of the EU in economic, trade and financial terms makes it a key economic global actor. Stronger candidates also discussed the structural power of the EU with reference to membership of bodies such as the WTO, G8 and G20. They also discussed diplomatic influence, soft power and may have included reference to the issue of global climate change in which the EU has played a central role.

The counter argument tended to focus on the desire of member states to retain control of their own foreign and defence policies, seen as key symbols of sovereign independence. Lack of a significant military arm with ability to project power within Europe and beyond was mentioned by most students with stronger candidates making reference to specific examples such as the EU's weakness in the 1990s in relation to atrocities in former-Yugoslavia and political divisions such as those over the Iraq war.

Put a cross in the box ☒ indicating the question that you have chosen.
If you change your mind, put a line through the box ☒
and then indicate your new question with a cross ☒.

Chosen Question Number:

Question 6 ☒

Question 7 ☒

Question 8 ☒

"The EU has developed into a major global actor"

Discuss

PLAN.

Yes

[Lisbon treaty - Ashton
B van Rompuy
peacekeeping forces
Libya - no fly zone

[one currency
Commission
Parliament

joining
together

[QMV

no

[no army
1.27 % not + 30% gdp.
Ashton can do little

[dealock after
treaties - very matter
that they agree

[financial crisis
multispeed
Europe.
BRICS

has developed into a
global actor, but
still long way to
go.

The European Union is an institution made up of 27 European states, which has its own representatives, monetary system, Court of Justice and parliament, suggesting a federation, and that it is developing into a major global actor. A major global actor would suggest an institution with

Structural power, economic, political and cultural influence and the ability to deploy forces. The EU, however, arguably, is not ~~yet a~~ yet a major global actor, politically and otherwise, because it does not have its own army, and because it is mainly intergovernmental concerning foreign affairs, deadlock and 'lowest common denominator' outcomes are expected, and controversial outcomes extremely rare. It can be argued that although the EU is an influential global actor, it still has some way to go before it can ~~compare~~ compare with huge powers, like the US and China.

It can be argued that the EU has developed into a major global actor because of the results of the Lisbon Treaty. A president of the EU was elected (Van Rompuy) as well as a High Representative of Foreign Affairs (Ashton). ~~There is now~~ ~~Someone to~~ Countries are now able to "call Europe", where before that was an impossibility, suggesting a growth in influence and availability, and that the EU is becoming ~~major~~ a major actor.

globally. Europe has sent out peacekeepers, and engaged in the "No Fly Zone" negotiations concerning the civil unrest and war in Libya. This would suggest that the EU is developing to become an important player in the international system.

However, the EU has no standing army, as would be expected in a federal union or even a supranational organisation. It also has no economic backing - with only 12.5% per annum as opposed to larger states, at 30%. This means it could not significantly help any of its member states in a recession, by increasing public spending and so creating jobs.

Furthermore, the High Representative can do little if states are in disagreement. She has no rights to enforce anything on these sovereign states, suggesting that the EU could only be a major global actor over uncontroversial and relatively unimportant matters, suggesting it has not yet developed into a major global player.

It can be argued that the EU is a

global actor because the EU has now got a currency, the euro, adopted by 16 member states. Monetary policy has been passed over to the European Central Bank. The EU also has a commission that acts on behalf of ~~the~~ all member states, and a fully elected Parliament that is developing a 'co-decision' ~~to~~ idea that gives it a proportionate say over affairs. By encouraging supranationalism, the EU is increasing its influence globally, where member states could not do otherwise, because of their size and geographical position (~~not rich or~~ not resources rich etc), so suggesting that the EU has become a major global actor.

However, deadlock and "lowest common denominator" outcomes are likely, due to the intergovernmental nature of the institution. This means that European countries cannot go through the EU to act on controversial global issues, because it would be unlikely that all countries agree on the issue. As seen with the Copenhagen Accord in 2009 ~~to~~, that had no

binding targets, it is very hard to get States, all with different national interests, to agree over an issue. Therefore, this could suggest that the EU is not yet a major global actor.

~~It can be considered~~ The EU can be argued to be a major global actor in international politics because of the QMV vote, which involves pooling sovereignty to achieve a fair outcome QMV, established during the Lisbon Treaty ~~during the 60th Annual~~. This could suggest ~~the~~ the EU has become a major global actor.

However, the financial crisis would suggest otherwise, that ~~the~~ the EU has not yet become a major global actor. The financial crisis of 2007 - 9 significantly weakened European countries and the US, whereas emerging powers were significantly increased (China ~~remains~~ continued with a 9% growth rate). The rise of the BRICS would suggest that the EU is not a global actor, because influence

and power is shifting to the global South. BRIC countries, rising in economic growth, population and influence could eclipse the EU's influence in years to come, suggesting its position as a major global actor is temporary.

Furthermore, Europe is developing at different rates, creating a "multispeed Europe", which does not give a unified image. This could suggest that Europe is not a major global actor in the international system; unlike states, it is not unified in its growth rates.

In conclusion, the EU is a global actor currently, while it still has some way to go concerning the deadlock over controversial foreign policy, and that it has even a small economy compared to large states, it does play a major position in current international affairs. However, emerging nations like China and India, as well as 'Tiger' nations like Singapore, could eclipse the EU in the future, in terms of military might, size and economic power. Despite this, currently the EU is the world's largest

economy, he suggesting that the EU is a major global actor, but that it still has some way to go concerning issues over foreign policy.



ResultsPlus

Examiner Comments

This is a good response with some weak points although more strengths. The introduction is decent with pleasing criteria for consideration. There are pleasing contemporary references alongside some useful historic references in support of the argument which is developed. This response gained a level 3 overall with particular strengths in A02 but was considered weaker in synoptic skills.

Put a cross in the box ☒ indicating the question that you have chosen.
If you change your mind, put a line through the box ☒
and then indicate your new question with a cross ☒.

Chosen Question Number:

Question 6 ☒

Question 7 ☒

Question 8 ☒

'The European Union has developed into a Major Global actor' The opinion here believes that the Supranational; arguably federal EU is a Major global Actor. it plays Roles Internationally around the world in all aspects of politics and economics. to me what this is there. the EU has a collective GDP of \$3654 billion, it is the largest trading bloc made up of 27 countries. it is an economic giant and so can play an effective role when dealing with the US the largest single economy and China (2nd). Though with large economic strength it doesn't mean it is a global actor. internally it is not a fully devolved federation of states, yet it still is mixed use action nationally in its structural power and policy power as a whole is absent, yet individually split. the quotes by Michael say "Economic giant, political Dwarf, policy worm" characterises the EU and it reflects this when dealing as a global actor Making it debatable on its effect of being a Major actor or not.

The EU is the largest trading block, with the USA, Mercosur or ASEAN cannot individually stand up to the collective strength of the EU. The Euro challenges the dollar in position of world currency after the collapse of the Bretton Woods Model. The EU's economic strength was most notable in the Banana war. The WTO (World Trade Organisation) the high tariffs on South American bananas upset. The EU was preferentially buying old colonial bananas to work their land. and the preferential treatment was working, other countries criticised on their

exports of bananas. Even though the EU has agreed to cut tariffs now on other Banana imports. it highlights the economic role the EU plays as a Market externally. The CAP or common agricultural policy shows the EU's strength at protecting itself internally and externally shows that economically it is more a fortress of protectionism than actual being a global actor economically. However even if it does offer members economic protection. The Banana war as well as the Airbus example where the EU paid Airbus cash to build with US Boeing, does show its effect globally on the economic profile of being a major global actor.

So the EU economically can be a major global actor because it decides whose bananas it has access? not necessarily, as structural political strength also is important in considering if the title is correct. The Copenhagen 2002 climate change accord saw the US and China being the two main powers. yet the EU was collectively not an effective 'middle man' as to speak between the two. The EU even proposed if all countries signed the EU would increase its emissions target from 10% to 20%. this is politically

disposition and a good example too of the EU as a major global actor. Just like the US and China, the hegemon and a rising superpower were effectively restrained through the EU, giving the EU some credit. While also its proposal of a increase in commission was highlighting its strong position, effectively playing with its economic hand. So perhaps we do see the EU as a global actor, to an extent.

yet what about the EU's political failure on the Kosovo war in the 1990's? The EU's attempt to negotiate a ceasefire there failed dramatically. Though this is a regional example and hardly credible to be a global actor. The failure to negotiate to a poor state such as Serbia and sent a ceasefire shows the EU is weak regionally and globally and hardly worthy of being called a major global actor if it fails to effectively deal regionally. To continue this further, under the Lisbon Treaty von Weizsäcker and Barroso became president of the EU and head of EU foreign policy; effectively: however both have been minimal in their roles. Only a fortnight ago within Europe told all British foreign Ambassadors to stop EU Ambassadors for Spain or stuff of that! The lack of a united voice, highlighting the problem that Kosovo had when he was a power of US foreign policy "I know who to call, when I call the Kremlin, I don't know who to call, when I call Europe". This problem hasn't been resolved even with a delegate for EU foreign policy. The EU still takes a worse seat and because of the split in states due to nationalism hinders on the effective role of the EU as a major global actor as evidenced by such examples. Leaving the question is the little credit of the EU cannot broker a ceasefire in Kosovo? to an extent to hit its dealings between the US and China do show the EU is effective when economic terms mix with politics, such as Copenhagen.

or coalition of the willing is unknown and for arguments sake shall be said to be a European effort. However Kosovo had no EU role and showed decisive EU weakness as a global actor when 76% of air strikes were US coordinated and not supported by the majority of the EU to say and take of war. The EU feelings are primarily as it lacks a united defence force and so is a limitation on its role as a global actor. Militarily the French and British are the main contributors to Iraq 2001 and 09, and Afghanistan 2003 despite French opposition and refusal, all were seen playing an Anglo-American not EU mission, with many EU countries rejecting American Administration. EU military weakness has recently been shown by Libya and the reluctance to act without US aid, yet to call it a EU operation with the US would be wrong due to a lack of united support. Libya or Afghanistan and Kosovo is a close as the EU gets to military action yet still control their arms and the lack of a EU army limits their global capacity to act and so shows militarily no ability to act globally.

So with no military capability to act globally can it be argued there is any strength for the EU to be politically, economically, militarily a global actor? in conclusion ~~position~~ it cannot be a major global actor, as it cannot militarily intervene in Kosovo against ~~the~~ ~~small~~ and couldn't politically broker a ceasefire. This example of failure is crucial in the rejection to the Jittles view as it shows lack of regional power politically.

not Military not for the EU to be a Major global actor
Kosovo started of here. Libya and the removal of
Gaddafi has become a Anglo-franco-German operation not a EU operation
and highlights the National splits in the EU. Its lack of a UNSC
Shows it not to be in a sub of many the EU is a whole
not so its lightning to say the EU is a Major global actor to
me that is wrong as it is not unified enough for that it has
so unless we see at the copenhagen accord or even was
the EU cannot effectively be a Major global actor. Its sole
position is economic strength not to be a Major global actor
effective and collective foreign policy is needed, along with
a united armed forces able to be not effective and
individually. However this is not the case and so
the EU is not a Major global actor not so this can be seen as
a over exaggeration of its position, yet it does play a
significant role due to its huge trading, economic
weight.



ResultsPlus

Examiner Comments

Whilst not the easiest script to read, this script is worth the effort because of the strengths of the response. The candidate retains a focus on the question throughout. There is a depth of knowledge and use of several strong examples to support the line of argument. A full range of criteria for the term "major global actor" are considered and there is a balanced argument throughout with competing views discussed and debated. This was a very strong level 3 script.

Question 7

This question was an effective discriminator. A significant number of candidates did not know what was meant by "global economic governance" and simply discussed the USA and EU and their economic influence. Some candidates, whilst able to discuss the WTO, IMF, World Bank, G8 and G20, produced very one sided arguments with responses centred purely around criticism of western dominance which weakened synoptic marks.

Global economic governance refers to the framework of coordination and management that is facilitated by bodies such as the World Trade Organisation, the International Monetary Fund and the World Bank. This framework was established by the 1944 Bretton Woods Agreement, with the orientation of these institutions being shifted as a result of the collapse of the Bretton Woods system in the 1970s and the emergence of the 'Washington Consensus' in the 1980s. The purpose of global economic governance is to provide a stable framework for sustainable growth in the world economy. Those who argue that it has been effective in these respects make a number of points, including the following:

The Bretton Woods system was effective in reducing the protectionism that had contributed to the Great Depression of the 1930s. The end of the Bretton Woods system and the rise of market-orientated policies under the 'Washington Consensus' laid the foundation for the accelerated globalisation that saw a significant expansion of the world economy from the 1980s through to 2007-08.

Stronger candidates provided examples of states which had benefited from the effective management of the global economy.

Criticisms focussed on the lack of coordination and effective management of the numerous agencies involved in global economic governance. Lack of flexibility to suit different circumstances of states was a regular criticism as was a criticism of the major institutions when it came to dealing with the global financial crisis that started in 2007/08 that led to a sharp down-turn in the world economy. The inability of the institutions to control and to regulate financial markets and banking systems was a common criticism. Further arguments, raised by stronger candidates, related to failure to promote economic equality, to deal with human rights abuses, to be more transparent, to be more democratic and to deal with environmental concerns.

This was the least popular of the longer responses.

Put a cross in the box ☒ indicating the question that you have chosen.
If you change your mind, put a line through the box ☒
and then indicate your new question with a cross ☒.

Chosen Question Number:

Question 6 ☒

Question 7 ☒

Question 8 ☒

Global economic governance has increased in the international system because of the increase of economic IGO such as the International Monetary Fund (IMF), the World Bank (WB) and the World Trade Organisation (WTO). The IMF and WB are sister organisations and therefore members of one are also members of the other. ~~The WB~~ The IMF

gives loans to countries suffering from ~~se~~ severe economic problems such as a balance of payments crisis and the WB gives loans to ~~29~~ Less Economically Developed Countries (LEDCs) to help them develop economically and to try and reduce poverty in these countries, about half of all WB aid is given to African countries. The WB and the IMF were both set up in 1945. The WTO is the successor of the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade and its main aim is to promote global, multilateral free trade.

The IMF has been perceived to be effective because it gives loans with very low interest rates to countries ~~such as Ireland~~ to help them get out of a crisis. For example, during the recent economic crisis the

IMF gave loans to Greece and Ireland, however it has been criticized for the conditions it attaches to the loans.

Followers of the Liberal approach to global politics believe that global economic governance is effective because it reduces anarchy in the global system because states, as liberals believe do have ethics and morals, feel obliged to follow the rules and policies of organisations such as the IMF, WB and the WTO. They also believe that global economic governance has been effective because it has given states a forum to discuss ideas and to form mutual co-operation and to build trust and therefore liberalists believe that economic global governance reduces conflict.

For liberals the WB is a prime example of states acting altruistically because they are giving aid to poorer nations. However, the Marxist-Marxist ~~perspective~~ approach to global politics completely dismiss that ~~globalis~~ global economic governance is effective because they believe that although richer states give loans and aid they attach conditions to them primarily to force the recipient countries to stabilize their economies but reducing government spending in attempt to reduce debt, to privatise state owned assets to make

money from them and to liberalise their markets to open up to foreign trade. Marxists would say that these richer nations only donate aid to better themselves for example the Multi-national Corporations exploit the cheaper labour from LEDCs to increase their profits but then instead of re-investing this money back into the LEDC they leak the profits back to their home countries.

These conditions were mostly used in the 1980s and the 1990s and were known as the 'Washington Consensus'.

~~For~~ Marxists would say that ~~the~~ privatising state assets is not good for the citizens of that country and they would point to the privatisation of the water supply in Bolivia which resulted in higher prices because private companies wanted to increase profits but this to riots within Bolivia.

The World Trade Organisation has been praised by Liberals who believe that encouraging free trade leads to reduced conflict because states are interdependent ~~of each other~~ on each other and therefore more considerate. For example, free trade has led to Globalisation and this has led to China holding approximately \$3 trillion ~~£~~ in its reserves this means that the USA needs to protect China's interests in its decision

and policy making because if China sold these the American economy would be in severe trouble. However, similarly, ~~the~~ China needs to consider the USA in its policy making because it heavily relies on the USA's markets to sell its products to. Therefore, liberals believe that ~~economic~~ global governance is effective because it has made states wary of irritating each other.

However, ~~Marxists~~ believe the success of the WTO has been questioned because the Doha Round, also known as the Development Round, which is the latest rounds of negotiations has been frozen because LEDC wanted to copy the medicines of EDC's companies without paying them ~~but~~ ~~but~~ and it was frozen after Brazil and China led a walk out of the discussion.

Furthermore, Marxists, believe that the economic global governance has been ineffective

because the policies LDCs have been forced to implement have not benefitted their infant industries and ~~have~~ have ~~acted~~ actually increased poverty. They also believe that ~~that~~ the economic global governance undermines democracy because of the weighted voting system which means that EDCs have more control therefore Marxists say it is

ineffective.

Moreover, liberals say that economic global governance has been effective because it has led to the benefits of 'comparative advantage' therefore global production has increased.

But Marxists dismiss the idea of 'comparative advantage' because they believe this theory is flawed because LDCs do not have the machinery, skills or capital to produce better goods so are stuck producing primary goods which have little value therefore remain poor. The importance and effectiveness of economic global governance was increased in the 1970s because of the end of the fixed currencies when all the currencies were pegged against the dollar. Therefore ~~the~~ economic global governance ~~has~~ is effective.

The economic global governance has been criticized because they have done little to reduce ~~an~~ environmental problems and the WB has only spent 1% on the environment and gave S. Africa a tremendous amount of money to develop the 4th largest Coal Mining Unit.

In conclusion, economic global governance has been effective to some extent because without it LEDCs would have not received any

aid ~~that~~ and has been praised by liberals but marxists believe that its success has been limited and may have actually worsened the situation ~~because~~ especially in African countries ~~the~~ for example the Deep Water Horizon crisis in Nigeria, where huge amounts of oil has been spilled. On the whole, they have been effective because more aid has been donated to poorer countries.



ResultsPlus

Examiner Comments

This is a level 3 response with particular strength in synopticity. Competing viewpoints are debated throughout and there is also a focus on the question. The introduction could benefit from a definition of global economic governance but the key institutions involved in the process are introduced early in the response. Whilst most responses focussed on the negative elements of governance, this response also discussed positive elements such as providing a forum for debate and reduction of anarchy in the global system as a consequence of the work of the key International Financial Institutions.

Question 8

This was the most popular of the longer responses on this paper and there were many pleasing responses. Stronger candidates were able to illustrate the competing viewpoints over this area of debate with some excellent examples.

Military power has traditionally been viewed as the chief currency of international politics. Realists argue that war is endless and imply that military power remains the only sure guarantee of a state's survival and security. Many candidates were able to explain that the security dilemma means that fear and uncertainty will always persist in international affairs. They also identified that there are new security challenges which have emerged, notably terrorism, that cannot be contained by non military means alone. Stronger candidates were also able to explain that military power has increasingly been used for ethical purposes, notably to facilitate humanitarian intervention and to support peacekeeping and peacebuilding initiatives.

The counter argument, raised by candidates, included that military power is redundant because large-scale high-intensity conflict has disappeared in many parts of the world, linked to the expansion of democratic 'zones of peace'. In addition, there has been a general shift from war to trade, as globalisation has increased economic interdependence and encouraged states to advance national prosperity through strategies of increased competitiveness. Many wars appear to be unwinnable because of the wider use of strategies of terrorism, insurrection and guerrilla warfare.

There was plenty of opportunity for debate from stronger candidates.

Put a cross in the box ☒ indicating the question that you have chosen.

If you change your mind, put a line through the box ☒
and then indicate your new question with a cross ☒.

Chosen Question Number:

Question 6 ☒

Question 7 ☒

Question 8 ☒

military power is an aspect of hard power, and refers to the use of military ~~resources~~ 'sticks' or tactics to coerce states into behaving in a certain way. The relevance of military power upon global politics is open to debate, with the liberal standpoint arguing that military power is ^{much} less relevant now as a result of cooperation and interdependence through trade and the spread of democracy. Additionally the liberals will argue the limitations of military power and highlight instead the potentials of soft power and economic strength. Realists on the other hand

will argue the ever relevant and dominant position of military power, most evident within humanitarian intervention and new security challenges posed by terrorists.

The obsolescence of war is fundamental to the liberal standpoint on the decline of military power. The main factors that have eroded the presence of war reside

within the spread of democracy as a result of globalisation. The spread of democracy thus works to satisfy the liberal view of the peaceful outcome of the Democratic Peace Thesis, with the principle here being the ~~interdependence~~ shared values and interdependence between states allowing for peace and cooperation as opposed to conflict. Fundamentally, democracies do not go to war with each other. With the spread of democracy comes widening zones of peace and thus enhanced peace and stability. Moreover the obsolescence of war can be highlighted through the ~~moral~~ transformation of ~~ideas~~ morals under the international law of the UN. Here, moral attitudes towards have been changed and developed to deter the ideologies of conflict and war.

comes the prospect of a conflict of great powers, each wishing to develop and exert military dominance to ensure their security and power on the world stage. The military assertiveness of Russia can be used to highlight this, with its conflict with Georgia demonstrating its willingness to exert military power in an attempt to retain or preserve influence within its sphere of 'Near Abroad'.

The ~~a~~ prospect of trade not conflict, adopted by the Liberal standpoint, works further to highlight the decline in military power. Globalisation allows economic interdependence between states, making the prospect of war a lot less likely due to its unprofitable outcomes. Furthermore, trade allows a cheaper, easier way to achieving prosperity when compared with the costly, dangerous elements of ~~as~~ the use of military power to achieve further prosperity. It is believed by the Liberals that "trade builds trust" and therefore with an increasing interdependence found through the free market, trust between nations will grow and insular nationalism which may lead to aggression will see a decline.

The nature of new war and the new challenges and security risks it brings is a argument highlighted by the realists for the dominance of military power. Terrorism is the key factor here, with globalisation allowing terrorists the ability to operate on a transnational basis. The risk of weapons of mass destruction is a further challenge to state security, with the increased flow of ideas and information through globalisation enabling biological and chemical weapons to be built by terrorist organisations much more easily. As a result of these threatening prospects to state security, and moreover the terrorist attacks of 9/11 and 7/7, states are finding it necessary to improve their military capabilities, creating more sophisticated military techniques in order to protect ~~the~~ domestic security from these new risks. The military dominance of the USA can highlight the continued presence of military power, most recently highlighted through the invasion of Iraq under the War on Terror. Here, the USA disregarded the international community and persisted

unilaterally to invade Iraq in order to protect the interests of the nation state.

The strengths of soft power and economic influence are important in highlighting the decline of military importance. The EU's possession of soft power through the ENP and its ability to offer membership allows it to determine the behaviour of potential members, ensuring, for example, commitment to the Copenhagen Criteria. The influence of economic power is further important, with those economically ~~stronger~~ powerful states able to offer aid and trade concessions in return for standards of behaviour from other states. The downfall of the Bush administration's War on Terror is further valuable for highlighting the decline of limits of military power, with the tactics of insurgents and guerrilla warfare challenging even the strongest military power.

Realists on the other hand will highlight the importance of military power

for humanitarian intervention and in times of humanitarian crisis and emergency. The repercussions of non-intervention could be highly detrimental to regional stability for example, whilst presenting issues such as migration crises. Without military power, humanitarian interventions such as Sierra Leone, East Timor and Northern Iraq would not have been possible.

In conclusion, the obsolescence of military power is most evident under the progressions made by globalisation in spreading democracy and interdependence through trade, in turn working to promote peace and stability. ~~Soft power~~ However, the little is far from being totally justifiable, with the dominance of military power still highly evident within current global politics. ~~The recent humanitarian interventions~~ The importance of military power for protecting state security is vital, whilst challenges ~~to~~ passed by new war work only to increase the relevance of military power. Therefore

it can be concluded that military power still enjoys a great relevance, however an over emphasis of this form of power alone may prove counter effective.



ResultsPlus

Examiner Comments

This was a well balanced response which clearly achieves level 3. There are real strengths and synopticity, in particular, is clearly evident with argument and counter argument running throughout the response. Interdependence, democratic peace thesis, zones of peace and increase in trade is balanced against examples such as the Russian Georgia war, the battle against terrorism and the dominance of the US which is partly built on military strength. The Iraq war is a good example to show the value of military power but also to suggest a value in alternatives like the use of soft power.

Grade Boundaries

Grade boundaries for this, and all other papers, can be found on the website on this link:

<http://www.edexcel.com/iwantto/Pages/grade-boundaries.aspx>

Further copies of this publication are available from
Edexcel Publications, Adamsway, Mansfield, Notts, NG18 4FN

Telephone 01623 467467

Fax 01623 450481

Email publication.orders@edexcel.com

Order Code UA028090 June 2011

For more information on Edexcel qualifications, please visit

www.edexcel.com/quals

Pearson Education Limited. Registered company number 872828
with its registered office at Edinburgh Gate, Harlow, Essex CM20 2JE



Llywodraeth Cynulliad Cymru
Welsh Assembly Government

