

ResultsPlus

Examiners' Report January 2011

GCE Government & Politics 6GP03 3D

ResultsPlus
look forward to better exam results

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/>

ResultsPlus

ResultsPlus is Edexcel's free online tool that offers teachers unrivalled insight into exam performance.

You can use this valuable service to see how your students performed according to a range of criteria - at cohort, class or individual student level.

- Question-by-question exam analysis
- Skills maps linking exam performance back to areas of the specification
- Downloadable exam papers, mark schemes and examiner reports
- Comparisons to national performance

For more information on ResultsPlus, or to log in, visit www.edexcel.com/resultsplus.

To set up your ResultsPlus account, call 0844 576 0024

January 2011

Publications Code UA026409

All the material in this publication is copyright

© Edexcel Ltd 2011

Introduction

The general standard of responses in this examination session was broadly in line with previous sessions. Two general issues would, nevertheless, be worth bearing in mind. In the first place, it is clear that a number of centres have not fully grasped the significance of the changed understanding of synopticity in the new specification. In particular, they need to place a heavier emphasis on ensuring that candidates recognise that, in view of synopticity, all essay questions are an invitation to debate or discuss a particular political issue. Effective responses in this respect not only highlight the nature of that debate in the introduction to their essays, but also structure their argument around the contending viewpoints or perspectives. Second, in doing this candidates should not merely be providing an account of rival stances or arguments, showing a sometimes essentially descriptive awareness of the arguments that have been put forward. Instead, they should analyse and evaluate these arguments in order to reach a reasoned but clear conclusion, recognising that all questions require answers. How effectively their answer (or conclusion) stands up in the light of the foregoing debate and discussion very largely determines the candidate's marks in terms of assessment objectives 1, 2 (including synopticity) and 3.

A final general point is that centres should be aware that short questions (questions 1-5) continue to be marked 'globally', with only a single mark being given out of a maximum of 15, while the essays (questions 6-8) alone are marked by assessment objectives, including synopticity. This reflects the fact that distinctions between AO1 and AO2 are often difficult to draw in the case of short questions, where the latter tends to refer to 'analysis' rather than 'evaluation', and therefore overlaps significantly with 'understanding' in AO1.

The selected scripts are intended to provide illustration of a range of responses together with some of the failings the most common of which seems to be poor time management which often adversely affected the essay question. In addition there remain some weaknesses in analysis particularly in regard to globalization (which many still accept as new, American and personified by Coca Cola) and institutions in the EU.

Question 1

Most candidates who attempted this question showed at least a basic grasp of liberal thinking on global politics. The key discriminators were the breadth of knowledge and understanding of liberal theories and the extent to which these were explained in a clear and analytical way. Strong responses often made use of liberal ideas about human nature, stressing the importance of rationality and the fact that humans are moral creatures, sometimes linked to an underlying faith in balance or harmony in human affairs. Weaker responses tended to focus on just one aspect of liberal thinking about the balance between cooperation and conflict, very commonly by emphasising the implications of economic interdependence and globalisation. In less strong cases, candidates also merely stated that there is a link between interdependence and cooperation, rather than explaining how interdependence tends to foster cooperation (remembering that asymmetrical interdependence can engender conflict). Some very strong responses reflected on the full range of liberal thinking, covering interdependence liberalism, republican liberalism (particularly the democratic peace thesis) and neoliberal institutionalism.

Liberals believe that by nature, humans are cooperative and therefore the politics or the international stage will reflect this. Liberals will highlight that nations join international organisations such as the UN and EU ~~are~~ to cooperate and deal with issues such as climate change that can not be dealt with individually, they do this despite the fact it means losing some sovereignty. Furthermore, liberals believe in the democratic peace theory, this means democratic countries will not go to war with each other as they share similar values, furthermore, democratic countries are run by the people that do not have the stomach for war. Liberals also believe that in an ever increasing globalised world

where countries are becoming more interconnected and interdependent, it doesn't make sense to go to war with a country you trade with as you will damage your own economy. Liberals believe that war only occurs because of undemocratic authoritarian states wage war. Also, liberals believe that pacts and treaties as well as international organisations like the UN show that countries can and are willing to work together and seek to influence each other peacefully.

**ResultsPlus**

Examiner Comments

Many candidates chose to interpret this question as a comparison between liberal and realist interpretations of politics. Although brief mention of realist stances is legitimate too often this was expanded to the extent that the liberal view was downplayed. This candidate got the balance right and presented a cogent argument but neglected to provide some illustrative examples.

Question 2

The most common problem with weaker responses to this question was a failure to define and explain the concept of balance of power at the outset. In some cases, candidates relied on implicit knowledge alone, but in others the balance of power was simply linked to bipolarity and the Cold War 'balance of terror'. The problem with this was either that it implied that it is only within bipolar international systems that the balance of power can emerge, or, worse, candidates ended up writing about Cold War bipolarity rather than the balance of power. Strong responses, nevertheless, were often able to draw on realist and liberal thinking about the balance of power, demonstrating, for example, why realists believe that the balance of power is the only reliable way of preventing war (power being a check on power), and why liberals have warned that the policy of a balance of power tends to lead to arms races and a ratcheting up of tension, rather than its reduction. When candidates answered this question largely or entirely on the basis of empirical knowledge, this was done more or less successfully depending on how appropriate the examples chosen were. At the very least, this question emphasises the importance of candidates having a clear and reliable ability to define key concepts.

The balance of power is the term used to describe how power is distinguished & shared out to states. An example of this would be that of the balance of members of the EU giving up their ~~or sharing some of their sovereignty~~ handing some of their sovereignty to higher authority e.g. the EU. This balance of power means that states are less likely to be in conflict or disagreement as they all share the same amount of power. This could also prevent wars from occurring as there won't be as many disputes. Though realists would argue that the only reason that the states are ~~not~~ allies and not having disputes with other states is because of out of their own national interests. This can be seen through the case of the US and Saudi Arabia. Two states with opposite ideologies co-existing and trading with one another. Saudi trades with the US for Military purposes and money in exchange for oil and land. Idealists would argue that the two have found a way to co-operate and be allies to help prevent war, ~~as~~ However, realists would say

that it is only out of their own interest. Whatever the case, the two have found a way to trade and not harm each other. This balance of power between two very different nation states show how it can prevent war and conflict from occurring and the importance of trading and being allies.

**ResultsPlus**

Examiner Comments

The balance of power was usually interpreted as bipolar and often in terms of the relationship between the USA and USSR during the Cold War. Even then the proxy wars that flourished under the allegedly peaceful standoff were seldom mentioned. This account does remedy that omission but, typically, can only consider two party balances.

Question 3

There were some very impressive answers to this question. Stronger responses demonstrated an awareness of regionalism and globalisation, and were able to highlight the often complex relationship between the two. In particularly strong cases, candidates showed an awareness of the idea that regionalism can both be a 'stumbling block' to globalisation (being a fortress that resists the pressures generated by the global economy) and a 'building block' of globalisation (enabling states to participate more effectively in the global economy). When these competing tendencies were fully developed and explained some very impressive responses emerged. Similarly, candidates that showed an awareness of 'new' regionalism often constructed strong responses. However, there were also some weak responses to this question. In some cases, these failed to show how and why regionalism and globalisation are related to one another; instead, they did little more than attempt to highlight parallels between the two phenomena. In other cases, either or both regionalism and globalisation were poorly understood or explained.

Many theorists have analysed the different ways of governing the world. One concept that clearly stands out is the relationship between globalisation and regionalism. "Globalisation" is the term used for ^{the} interlink with the economy, the politics and the cultural factors around the world. Globalisation creates one market where goods, services, capital and labour can move freely. This closely links to regionalism also.

The relationship between regionalism and globalisation is quite simply the economy. ~~But~~ Regionalism often leads to intergovernmentalism bodies that develop a particular region in the world. Two common examples is the European Union and

African Union. Both are bodies that highlight the abolition of tariffs to those members. This means that goods and services can be transported within states and be treated equally to those national products. The EU in particular had set up the "Customs Union" Agreement for all its members in attempt to boost the economic growth of those members. This is a very significant link to globalisation as it creates one market which globalisation does but on a world scale.

Another significant similarity regionalism and globalisation has is the spreading of political ideologies and concepts. For example, to successfully apply to become an EU member, you have to be a democratic state that appreciates human rights. Therefore, those 27 within the regionalist body all practice laws with democracy. This creates one entity within the EU. It could be said that globalisation has a political element of spreading concepts. This being the spread of

Capitalism. Globalisation ~~is~~ enhances the free market and that is why China has become more ~~is~~ reformed than ever before in promoting free market.

Another aspect that regionalism ~~is~~ enhances is ~~the~~ cultural integration. By the EU and African Union promoting movement in its region, it integrates all its people ~~and~~ which makes it a much more utilised region ~~and~~ regarding peace and equality. This could be done by the effects of globalisation also.

In conclusion, the main relationship between regionalism and globalisation is the openness of one market and ~~is~~ enhancing the regions economy. ~~which in~~ Globalisation has the same effect with regards to the one market and integration occurs, making each nation less isolated.

**ResultsPlus**

Examiner Comments

A significant number of candidates restricted themselves to definitions, with some examples, of regional organisations and globalisation. Some did go as far as to regard regionalism as a precursor of globalisation but only a minority examined regionalism as a defence against globalisation. This account was typical of the majority in that adequate definitions were deployed but no links were made. The answer was repetitive and made little mention of relevant details.

Question 4

Very few responses to this question failed to demonstrate at least a rudimentary understanding of intergovernmentalism and supranationalism, and in a significant number of cases this was done very well. The main discriminators was the extent to which the differences between the two were explained rather than merely described, and the degree to which candidates to deepen this understanding through the use of appropriate examples. In strong responses, a clear emphasis was placed on sovereignty, with intergovernmentalism being linked to the preservation of sovereign independence while supranationalism was associated with the 'pooling' of sovereignty. Strong responses also explained the mechanisms through which these decision-making processes could operate, including emphasising the difference between majority and unanimous decision-making processes. Such responses often also illustrated these differences through carefully selected examples, with the various bodies within the EU receiving, quite appropriately, considerable attention. The UN and, though less frequently, other regional organisations were also used in this way. Weaker responses, on the other hand, tended to neglect the issue of sovereignty and often failed to explain the significance of the examples using.

The European Union is an example of a body that is both intergovernmental and supranational body. This can be seen in the EU bodies that have both supranational and intergovernmental features, for example, the Council of Ministers as it is made up of ministers from member states but at the same time, decisions are reached by Qualified majority voting therefore having implications for sovereignty.

Intergovernmentalism is where states work together to achieve shared ideas and values. It is drawn from realist theory as it privileges the state as the key actor in the international system. ~~Intergovernmental bodies, whilst state~~ The main concept behind intergovernmentalism^s that states ~~get to keep~~ ^{retain} their sovereignty; i.e. the right and authority to rule their ~~own~~ state. An example of an intergovernmental organisation is the UN. This is

intergovernmental as states do not have to pay taxes when they are members*, and membership is voluntary. This is also the case with the EU.

* Intergovernmental bodies rely on the funding from its member states.

Whereas Supranationalism is where there is one higher authority above the state. This means that sovereignty is transferred from the nation state into the one body. Member states would then be given one area of autonomous policy jurisdiction. For example, the EU can be seen to be supranationalist through the European Court of Justice. This is because ~~that~~ decisions that are made in the courts jurisdiction take precedent over national law in member states. ~~country~~. This was seen most recently when the UK had to amend its law on prisoner voting rights as it went against EU human rights laws. The UN can also be seen to be supranationalist through the idea of collective security in Article 25. Supranationalism means that the states start to think about the interests of other member states, not just their own.

**ResultsPlus**

Examiner Comments

Virtually all candidates managed to make clear and relatively unequivocal definitions of the two international disciplines. However, few managed to illustrate the distinctions with factual support and those that did often fell into the usual error of blaming the EU for the ECHR. This candidate made valid definitions but sacrificed detail to verbosity.

Question 5

The candidates who attempted this question often had an impressive understanding of the nature and growth of Chinese power. However, too many responses failed to recognise that the question was more specific, seeking an awareness of whether China can now be regarded as a 'superpower'. Therefore, candidates who considered the nature of a superpower before considering the extent to which China conforms to this definition tended to do much better than ones who merely wrote about the burgeoning power of China. In strong cases, candidates thus wrote about superpowers possessing 'great power plus great mobility of power', or they highlighted common features associated with a superpower such as having a global reach, a predominant economic and strategic role within an ideological bloc or sphere of influence, or preponderant military capacity, especially in terms of nuclear weaponry. It would have been helpful, moreover, for candidates to recognise that the term superpower tends to be used specifically to refer to the USA and the Soviet Union during the Cold War period, inviting a comparison between the Cold War superpowers and modern China. Candidates who demonstrated strong and reliable conceptual knowledge were once again likely to be rewarded, while ones who did not even seek to offer a definition of a key term in the question tended to provide generalised knowledge.

China is a 'superpower' in every sense of the word. Economically, China has had the fastest growing economy for the last thirty years; even through the residual effects of the Global Financial Crisis (2007-10) China was still able to remain a GDP growth of 10.3% in 2010. Some economists even suggest that as early as within the next decade, China will surpass the US economically. This may explain Obama's urgency during President Hu's visit of the US on January 14th 2011, for China to make the value of Yuan.

Moreover, China's economic prowess extends beyond just its own economic success. Niall Ferguson's 'Chimerica' thesis argues that China's major stake in US debt, has now turned the US economy into being highly

reliant on the ~~the~~ growth of China's economy. Therefore, even ~~if~~ ^{though} China's growth may result in the US no longer being the hegemonic power, it is helpless, in the sense that it ~~has~~ may have to support China's economy for the sake of their own.

In addition to this, China also largely affects the EU's economy, because European mortgages, jobs and even the price of goods, due to the intensifying processes of globalisation, has become highly dependent on the extent that China exports and imports goods to and from Europe.

Moreover, on an international scale, China is a permanent member of the UN Security Council; ~~therefore~~ has veto power over UN Security resolutions. Thus, China has international political influence.

However, despite China's incredibly ~~fast~~ ^{fast} economic growth and long-time political influence, there are questions over the strength of its 'soft' power; in the sense that China's values has not been able to impose themselves on ~~into~~ the international system, as well as, the US' liberal norms and values. To this

To finalise, a key determining factor in terms of whether China will become a hegemonic power, may be the extent it can continue its growth, without having to radically reform itself domestically.

**ResultsPlus**

Examiner Comments

This was the most straightforward of the short questions and was therefore popular. The strongest answers started with a definition of "superpower" and then examined China's qualifications in terms of military (including global reach), economic and soft power.

However, most answers compared nuclear weapon totals (USA v China) and concluded on quantitative grounds that China lacked superpower status. The extract enclosed managed to omit military power entirely (most downplayed it) and then, in effect, began with the conclusion.

Question 6

The responses to this question ranged considerably in terms of quality. Some very strong responses demonstrated a detailed and comprehensive knowledge of globalisation, recognising also that one of the key criticisms of globalisation is that, in a variety of ways, it favours the interests of developed states generally and of the USA in particular. They were also able to respond effectively to the synoptic aspect of the question by recognising that although some argue that the USA was the chief architect and is the main beneficiary of globalisation, others point out either that globalisation is a neutral process that benefits all states that participate in it, or that, in recent years, it has favoured emerging states and particularly China rather more than it has benefited the USA. Impressive responses also were sometimes able to examine the 'Americanisation' critique in terms of both economic globalisation and cultural globalisation. However, weaker responses tended to show a limited or partial understanding of globalisation or focused only on one side of the question, usually seeking to explain simply how or why globalisation can be viewed as 'Americanisation in disguise'. In other cases, candidates drifted away from the question itself, writing in a general and unfocused way about globalisation, rather than considering specific arguments related to the idea of 'Americanisation'.

To what extent is globalisation simply 'Americanisation in disguise'?

American	Not
<u>Economic</u> TNC's - McDonaldisation Dollar main currency	Economic recession
<u>Political</u> UN - set up by EU, democracy Hegemon.	<u>Political</u> Glob has enabled Al Qaeda to expand.
<u>Culture</u> American culture all around the world	<u>Culture</u> Each culture modifies things Communication Information revolution

Globalisation is the process of widening and deepening of the interconnectedness of ~~at~~ the world in an economic, cultural and political sense. Americanisation is an extension of this to some extent, with anti-globalists believing that globalisation has happened entirely in the image of America and that it is simply a result of its hegemonic global status.

Globalisation could be seen to be Americanisation in the sense that Transnational Corporations (TNC's) are predominantly American and could be said to be spreading American companies around the world rather than TNC's from all around the world. McDonaldisation is an extension of this, implying that companies across the world are in the image of American companies. In addition, the dollar is the most used currency, with exchange rates being tied to it. Therefore the economy is moulded around the US implying that globalisation is in fact Americanisation. However, saying this, the ability for other countries such as China and other Asian countries to benefit greatly from economic globalisation to export goods across the world at a cheaper rate than any other country shows that America has not dominated economic globalisation as others have managed to benefit from it. Also the Global Recession of 2008 enabled China to benefit, ~~showing~~ that while America was struggling, showing that globalisation is not Americanisation.

In a political globalisation sense, the UN ~~is~~ is the largest IGO in the world and it was set up by the USA. American ideals and political goals are fed through the UN, attempting

to mould other countries in the image of the US. This could be seen by the collapse of communism in 1989 and the gradual increase in countries adopting democracy. The US has used globalisation

as a way to use its hegemonic powers to transform other states into democratic entities. However, globalisation has also aided terrorist groups such as Al Qaeda and other extremists to express their views across the world, enlisting many to their regime and going against the US ideals set out in the UN charter. This shows that the US has not been able to shape globalisation around their ideals completely. ~~There are also countries~~

American cultural exports are extremely paramount to globalisation, with vast amounts of American television, food and lifestyle being spread around the world. American clothes are worn worldwide and the values of the US are expressed through the media for example. TNCs are responsible for embedding American culture into other countries by setting up American shops, and this is all fuelled by American initiative. However, the cultural exports are not limited to America, with America itself receiving influences from many other countries. Also, all the cultural influences that a country may receive are always adapted to suit a country, therefore removing the whole aspect of Americanisation from globalisation. The ~~communications~~ information revolution that globalisation has created is not in the image of America, with the citizens of most countries being able to find out information about any culture, belief or religion in the world. This in turn means that it is

down to the individual citizen to choose what cultural exports they choose to adopt.

To conclude, it is clear to see that as a global hegemon, America is able to influence the path of globalisation substantially as its power is expressed globally. The developed economy of the US enables it to establish the ability for globalisation to spread through economies and for American TNC's to express US economic capacity worldwide. However, it is up for individual countries to adapt the TNC's in the image of their own country, and countries are able to benefit from economic globalisation without the influence of the US, as did China. The ideals of democracy are championed by the US, however this can not necessarily be seen as Americanisation as it has been the political ideal of many other countries ~~for~~ before globalisation began. Cultural exports are also ~~also~~ expressed by other countries other than the US, making US hegemony less impactful ~~as~~ and the main source of globalisation. All in all, it is clear that the US has impacted on globalisation significantly however there have been other influences which mean that it is not all in the image of the (the US). Being the hegemon naturally means that globalisation is partly based on the US, however it does not appear entirely in their image.

**ResultsPlus**

Examiner Comments

This was a very popular question but most answers followed the Friedman line in assuming that the universality of Coca Cola and McDonalds were evidence of American global domination both economically and culturally. However, an encouraging number of responses adopted a more cynical approach and began examining the realities of, for example, cultural influence by considering such factors as language and tradition. The chosen sample is an excellent example of the broader approach to globalisation whilst giving due deference to synopticity.

Question 7

Less strong responses to this question often lighted on the reference to the EU and then wrote generally about the nature of the EU, failing to place the EU in a general context of regional integration. As such, they failed to deal effectively with the issues raised by the question itself. Stronger responses, on the other hand, demonstrated a grasp of the wider phenomenon of regionalism, showing an awareness of the nature and significance of non-European examples of regional integration, before examining how and why the EU might be considered to be a unique example of regionalism. Where the non-European dimension of regionalism was clearly understood, good use was made of examples such as NAFTA, Mercosur and, particularly, ASEAN. Such responses often emphasised that, in its most common form, non-European regionalism operates on the basis of trading blocs within which there is little or no pooling of sovereignty. EU integration can therefore be regarded as unique in a number of respects, notably that it involves an important dimension of political union, providing, perhaps, the world's only clear supranational governance, and that it has engaged in monetary union through the creation of the euro. In good answers, attention was given to both how and why the EU is different from other regional bodies in these respects. Strong responses, nevertheless, also dealt with the other side of the argument, recognising that claims about EU federalism (thus distinguishing it from the intergovernmentalism that reigns within other regional bodies) may have been exaggerated. Similarly, some very good responses noted that there are parallels between EU integration and regional integration in Southeast Asia, particularly as ASEAN has attempted, at times, consciously to model itself on the EU.

The EU is a union of 27 European countries who have come together to reap the benefits of pooling their sovereignty & becoming a single market economy.

The EU started out as the European Economic Mechanism, both in its early days it was only a free trade area between a few states in central Europe, it fastly grew to its 27 members. The first way in which it is unique is that its membership policy the Copenhagen criteria make prospective members change economic policy, human rights policy & all manners of laws etc when they

sign up to all parts of the EU & have to abide by all treaties. This makes them unique as other inter-governmental organisations (IGOs) may only make them adapt to new economic policy like the IMF were as the EU ensures that they fit in economically, legally & socially.

Second reason why they're unique is they are the only union which has its own currency. The Euro is the national currency for 16 out of the 27 members. This cannot be said for any other state alliances. This allows them to support each other economically through inclusive growth, making what's best for one better for all as new economic policy can be more uniform.

Most regional inter-grations for instance ASEAN only are economically integrated were as the EU is politically, legislatively & judicially integrated. This is because the Maastricht Treaty ~~introduce~~ introduced 2 more 'pillars' to the EU & now it has an executive called the Commission, a parliament acting as a legislature & the

European court of Justice which is the Judiciary. This makes it look like a Federal state. The EU can act ~~independant~~ independent of the ~~the~~ member states making decisions on their behalf.

As the EU can act independent of its members it brings me to my third point that the EU is a supranational body in many ways its commission & parliament both make more laws than any individual national parliament & EU law is higher than any state law, ~~the~~ the European court of Justice can also strike down state law if it contravenes EU law. This supranational element cannot be seen anywhere else and is ~~that~~ the main reason that the EU is so unique as a world actor it has power to force members to comply with laws it makes & act on behalf of its members.

The EU is also similar to other organisations it was a ~~Free~~ Free Market this can also be seen in Asia where Asean are creating a free market & economic union in which they are hoping to develop

an EU like system. There are also free trade agreements between Canada, USA & Mexico.

The African Union & the EU both have peace keeping forces due to history of wars in the regions. This element is very small in the EU with the Euro corps rarely being deployed were as in Africa it is a very big aspect with these peace keeps taking over the role of the UN.

A final uniqueness of the EU can be found in the Schengen agreement where states let members of other EU countries in without a passport this means that movement of labour within the EU is huge. This cannot be seen in other unions as most countries aren't as liberal as the members of the EU & believe that to maintain sovereignty border controls are vital.

The EU's EU is very unique for a number of reasons its liberal attitude to pooling sovereignty for greater collective gain is seen through the creation of

law making & enforcing as well as the
soon to be in place Diplomatic Service
moving the EU towards being a federal

super state. although many aspects of
the EU are shared with other regional
integration unions with similarities
growing as some unions integrated more
the scepticism of some EU members has
frozen progress & groups like ASEAN will
soon be nosing at the EU's heels

**ResultsPlus**

Examiner Comments

This question was designed to evoke straightforward assessments of the EU. Uniqueness has been seen in the establishment of the EU (and its ancestors) out of the disasters of World War 2 but it has gone further than an unofficial peace treaty in developing the bases of a federal state. Such features as the euro, ECJ, widespread QMV, social coherence all distinguish the EU from apparent rivals such as NAFTA. Although this question was relatively straightforward, problems were posed by the sheer amount of relevant material which led many candidates to resort to a descriptive response rather than an analytical one.

Question 8

There were, in a sense, macro and micro responses to this question. Candidates who adopted a macro response looked at the effectiveness of the UN in ensuring international peace and security from the perspective of the UN Security Council. In this light, often impressive knowledge and understanding was demonstrated of the difficulties posed to the Security Council's effectiveness by its decision-making processes and especially by the P-5 structure. Good responses reflected not only on the paralysis of the Security Council during much of the Cold War period, but also reflected on the extent to which this paralysis has been overcome in the post-Cold War period. Micro level responses, on the other hand, tended to consider the UN's effectiveness in ensuring peace and security by examining the UN's record in peacekeeping. In some cases this was done very well, especially when candidates were able to discuss the success or otherwise of particular peacekeeping operations, and also recognised that the focus of UN peacekeeping has changed significantly since the early 1990s, especially through a greater emphasis on multi-dimensional peacekeeping or what has increasingly been termed 'peace-building'. An important discriminator was also the degree to which candidates were able to evaluate arguments on both sides, enabling them to reach a reasoned conclusion. In too many cases, candidates merely described the UN's role in ensuring peace and security, noted some of the UN's successes and failures, but did not sufficiently deal with the issue of 'extent', by suggesting whether, on balance, the UN had been effective or ineffective.

The United Nations (UN) is a global structure consisting of 192 member states, and aims to embody and promote the principles of universalism, cooperation and global harmony in the international system.

In light of this, the structure's role was largely a moribund one during the Cold War (1947-89), as the bipolar international system ^{was} dominated by Capitalist US, and Communist Soviet power and their overbearing conflict. The engagements and persistent use of indirect military force by both sides made the UN inept in maintaining global peace and security.

However, the Cold War is now over; therefore, in line with the liberal internationalist

-to argument, the UN has an important role in ensuring and maintaining peace because state foreign policy is inter-locked with UN principles. Moreover, institutionalists believe that the high compliance with UN norms and values, this

makes the institution an effective one. However, I must assert that, as the number of liberal democracies has risen, so has concordance with human rights, coupled with a significant reduction in inter-state conflict. Therefore, the UN is not essential in the sense that the rise in the level of peace in the international community has not been a result of its existence. In short, it is coincidental.

On another note, the UN has also been ineffective in mitigating the prevalence of intra-state conflict, especially in the global south. The ongoing civil war in Chad is a prime example of the re-birth of ethnic and nationalist conflicts, often spurred out of corruption and mass poverty. Therefore, the UN has arguably improved inter-state interaction ~~was~~ institutionalists, such as Robert Keohane agree, but it has not established global security.

In light of this, there is tension

within the UN Charter itself - article 1(2) (rights of states) and article 2(5) rights of people. It is unclear whether the UN supports or forbids the use of intervention. UN peacekeepers have not been present in

areas like Darfur (2003) and Rwanda, both of which have ~~had~~ been rife in genocide and other acts of horrific violence. Whereas, in Kosovo (1999) NATO troops were allowed under a resolution of the UN Security Council to intervene. Thus perhaps there is a strong case for the UN being ineffective, as it does not have a clear and consistent policy on intervention. Moreover, this strengthens the realist argument that structures like the UN, only serve the self-interests of states. The "War on Terror" (2001-present) has proven that states no longer use intervention for the benefit of the 'other', but for the promotion of the 'self'.

Despite the UN's main purpose to create a greater a sense of universalism in the international community, it cannot even achieve this within its internal mechanisms.

The permanent-five of the Security Council (Russia, UK, USA, China and France) is in absolute direct contradiction to the concept of universalism, as it embodies power-politics. Therefore, the UN

is ineffective in being 'soft'. However, as Waltz argues 'cooperation is difficult to achieve, hard to maintain and dependent on the power; therefore, perhaps the UN is effective in

in realising the mistake of the League of Nations, in not understanding that without recognising power-politics the Institute cannot survive.

Critics of the UN's efficacy, however, argue that UN is not effective in enforcing supranationalism into its member states, because in recent years both the US and China have been direct breaches of UN legislation. China because of its poor domestic human rights record, and the US for its illegal invasion of Iraq in 2003.

This also supports the realist argument that states, and states alone are the principal actors of the international system, as they can essentially 'pick and choose', which rules to follow. Thus, perhaps the UN is not effective in enforcing global governance.

On this note, the UN is not a World Government, but as structural realists argue, anarchy is a 'defining element' (Waltz) of state foreign policy behaviour; therefore, for the UN to be effective in its global governance, it must behave as if it were a World government. Perhaps

The UN is not effective in the political sense, but in terms of cooperation. The Kyoto Protocol and the growing corpus of treaties

generally evidence that the UN is an effective forum for multilateralism.

In the final analysis, the UN's principles of universalism, cooperation and the possibility for peace, has risen to the international stage since the end of the Cold War. However, globalisation has bred new threats, such as transnational terrorism (Al Qaeda operates in over 50 states), economic/financial crises and it is yet to be seen how the UN will make itself adapt to these challenges. On this point, as we are in an embryonic stage of the post-Cold War order, the UN may not be the epitome of effectiveness now, but in line with the liberal argument, as states become ever more globalised, the UN may become a necessity if the human race is to ever fully adopt the Kantian notion of 'perpetual peace'.



ResultsPlus

Examiner Comments

This was, perhaps, the most challenging of the essay questions given the amount of material to be considered. Most candidates stuck with an assessment of traditional peacekeeping; in particular Rwanda and the former Yugoslavia. A few considered the impact of other UN actions such as peacebuilding and humanitarian aid both immediate and long term economy building. This essay was one of the most mature responses.

Generally the standard of responses was high with few candidates failing to complete the paper. There was plenty of evidence of high standards of knowledge and good communication; in addition, the majority were able to handle the difficult idea of synopticity with some skill. The start and finish remain the major areas of intellectual discrimination. Too many introductions did not address, coherently, the major ideas behind the question and even failed to define the major areas of analysis. A disappointing number of conclusions failed to directly answer the question; it would be useful for all candidates to re-read their introduction before writing the conclusion so ensuring that they do answer the question.

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 publications@linneydirect.com

Order Code UA026409 January 2011

For more information on Edexcel qualifications, please visit
www.edexcel.com/quals

Edexcel Limited. Registered in England and Wales no.4496750
Registered Office: One90 High Holborn, London, WC1V 7BH

Ofqual




Llywodraeth Cynulliad Cymru
Welsh Assembly Government

