

Examiners' Report
January 2012

GCE Government and Politics 6GP03 3D

Edexcel and BTEC Qualifications

Edexcel and BTEC qualifications come from Pearson, the world's leading learning company. We provide a wide range of qualifications including academic, vocational, occupational and specific programmes for employers. For further information, please call our GCE line on 0844 576 0025, our GCSE team on 0844 576 0027, or visit our qualifications website at www.edexcel.com. For information about our BTEC qualifications, please call 0844 576 0026, or visit our website at www.btec.co.uk.

If you have any subject specific questions about this specification 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

Pearson: helping people progress, everywhere

Our aim is to help everyone progress in their lives through education. We believe in every kind of learning, for all kinds of people, wherever they are in the world. We've been involved in education for over 150 years, and by working across 70 countries, in 100 languages, we have built an international reputation for raising achievement through innovation in education. Find out more about how we can help you and your students at: www.pearson.com/uk .

January 2012

Publications Code UA030554

All the material in this publication is copyright
© Pearson Education Ltd 2012

Introduction

It was evident, once again, that a good proportion of candidates had been well prepared for the January 3D examination. Subject knowledge was strong and there was, for the most part, a pleasing focus on the wording of the questions. The most popular short questions were the responses on realism and on soft/hard power. The most popular long response was the question on sovereignty. The least popular response, perhaps unsurprisingly, was the short question on subsidiarity and the least popular long question was the one on the United Nations.

The advice from the last series of questions in the summer of 2011 remains valid. 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.

Question 1

This was the most popular question on the examination paper and a sizeable number of candidates provided thorough responses which tackled the central theme of the question. Stronger students provided a range of reasons to explain why realists believe that war is inevitable and could give examples of realist thinkers with an explanation of their views. Stronger students could also provide examples to support the argument that they presented. Weaker responses tended to be lacking in the above and often drifted into a discussion of alternative views of war.

This is a pleasing Level 3 script which remains relevant and focussed throughout. A number of realist thinkers are mentioned and their views explored and explained. There is a clear explanation of human nature, the role of the state and of anarchy and lack of order in the state system.

Realists believe that the tendency within the international system towards war may be explained largely by reference to humanity's negative, selfish nature.

Realists have a very pessimistic view of human nature. At heart, they believe that we are all selfish and competitive, and care nothing for our fellow humans. As Machiavelli wrote, humans are "ruthless, iniquitous, violent and savage." Since states are nothing but collectives of humans, they share the same fundamental character. Nation states are motivated purely by self interest, and thus they do not care what effect their actions have upon other states. They therefore will not hesitate to go to war if they feel that they stand to

You should start the answer to your second question choice on page 6

gain by doing so.

Realists also believe that people are motivated to act primarily by non-rational wants, needs and desires. The strongest of these motivators, according to realists, is the desire for power. Once again, this human characteristic is shared by states: all states want to be the most powerful actor in the global system, and the primary method of achieving this - as well as the primary means of defending that position once it has been attained - is through war.

Finally, realists believe that there is no authority powerful enough to prevent states from going to war. Unless one power can establish control, set up an order and enforce it, the humans exist in a 'state of nature', or anarchic and chaotic situation in which Hobbes said that life would be "nasty, brutish and short." Realists believe that no one has yet established order successfully on any greater scale than the nation state: as such, all nations operate internationally within

You should start the answer to your second question choice on page 6

the 'state of nature' or 'international anarchy'. Whilst liberal institutionalists would dispute this, claiming that the UN exists to maintain such order internationally, many realists would point to its failure to prevent such conflicts as the 2003 invasion of Iraq and argue that it has not successfully countered states' ability to act as they please.

Realists therefore explain the tendency towards war in the international system by claiming that self-interest and the desire for power motivate states to go to war, whilst international anarchy ensures no organisation is able to prevent them from doing so.



ResultsPlus

Examiner Comments

Pleasing knowledge and analysis throughout ensure that this scores very highly.



ResultsPlus

Examiner Tip

Most responses require a range of issues to be discussed and this example shows how a great deal of ground can be covered in a relatively short period of time. Remaining relevant to the question is central to scoring at the higher levels.

A further strong example which remains relevant throughout. A pleasing blend of relevance, description, analysis and examples.

Realists believe that within the international system there is a tendency for war. Notably, theorists such as Hobbes explain this to be due to the fact that states are power seeking as the strive for 'power after power'. Moreover, neo-realists recognise the fact that the international system is bound by constraints such as anarchy, which some may associate it with ^{global} chaos. Nonetheless, it can also be seen that war tendencies exist within the international system due to the ~~st~~ nature of humans.

A main reason with which realists associate war within the international system is due to the nature of states. It can be seen that despite organisations such as the U.N ^{as they attempt to highlight their agenda} states are still self-seeking. ~~Moreover, due to the fact that~~ This can be seen by the fact of how states such as the USA have ultimately gained greater precedence under the U.N and ~~it~~ has allowed it to be seen as the modern day hegemon. Although liberalists would argue that modern day advancements such as globalisation has limited the prospect of

war within the international system, it can be seen that realists would relate such a transition to power politics; as states ~~can~~ participate in globalisation as means of extending their influence and interests. So it cannot be denied that the presence of power politics within such diverse global means would inevitably result in war.

In addition as Kenneth Waltz stated the international system is defined in terms of 'anarchy'. Thus, the presence

of anarchy would aid the concept portrayed by offensive realists who believe that states are power maximisers and thus create a security dilemma. The ~~presence~~^{presence} of the security dilemma was most prevalent during the cold war when states take military actions in order to counter-act the other. So with current states such as America and China heavily investing in military sectors realists would argue that a continued security dilemma exists.

Moreover, as Niccolò Machiavelli once stated humans are '~~egoistic~~ egoistic, crafty and shifting', this therefore means that humans have ~~the~~ fixed egoistical characteristics. Thus, this could be related to the concept of the creation of war as competing interests are always prevalent, which would lead to a tendency of conflict and potential war. Therefore, it can be seen that realists believe that there is a tendency for war as states are power seeking as well as humans, as well as a prevalent security dilemma.



ResultsPlus

Examiner Comments

Explanation of human nature, anarchy and of the security dilemma help this script to stand out as a pleasing response.

Question 2

This wasn't a particularly popular question and many responses tended to be relatively simplistic descriptions of regionalism in general without a clear explanation of the differences between economic and political regionalism. Stronger responses made clear the distinction between the two and were able to use a range of examples of both economic and political regionalism from a range of regional bodies.

This is a confident response which provides a range of examples to clearly distinguish between economic and political regionalism. It is a thoughtful response from a candidate who is able to explain the central features of economic and political regionalism.

Economic regionalism is perhaps the least controversial type of regionalism seen by states, as it is ~~the~~ perhaps the most necessary form, of which the greatest consequences without it can occur. It often takes 3 forms, one of which being a free trade area, such as NAFTA, ~~an~~ with Canada, ~~the~~ USA and Mexico creating little/no barriers to trade of goods and services. Another example would be the Asean Free Trade Area in SE Asia.

Another form of economic regionalism is a customs union, whereby member states agree on a common external tariff to the rest of the world (other individual states or blocs), often creating a reduced protectionism within the agreement. An example would be the South African Customs Union created in 1911, now including all

States of ~~the~~ Southern Africa (including membership of S Africa in 1995 post-apartheid).

A more advanced type of economic regionalism

is a common (or 'single') market as seen in the EU and perhaps even NAFTA, with the free movement of goods, services, capital and people within the bloc. The EU is the most prominent example here, with ~~the~~ the SEU in 1986 creating the single market, with later economic harmonisation and creation of the single currency (Euro) later on, also aspects of a single market. The purpose of economic regionalism is to increase the market of a bloc and reduce protectionist barriers, offering economic growth and development other than conquest and expansionism. It may also be a way of protecting the bloc (as in a customs union) but may also be to increase individual countries' standing with other states/blocs, acting somewhat as a 'filter'.

Political regionalism, on the other hand, is about creating a common diplomatic voice and a way of solving trans-national issues within that bloc, after

creating common laws and, to some extent, the transfer of some sovereignty to a central body.

The EU is the most advanced form, and perhaps the only true form, of political regionalism, with supranational bodies, such as the

European Parliament and the European Court of Justice, with ~~the~~ the 27 member states 'pooling' their sovereignty within these institutions.

The fact that the EU can produce laws that supersede domestic laws of member states where the EU has 'competence' e.g. employment law, and also that the ECJ can disapply domestic law, has led some to believe of a 'federalising' Europe, in which political norms and policies are, to some extent, harmonised with the ECJ increasingly its capacity as acting as a supranational actor.

Political regionalism is often seen as more controversial than economic regionalism, as many say states are very protective of their sovereignty in many areas, and that political differences and nationalism may create problems.



ResultsPlus

Examiner Comments

A range of examples makes clear a pleasing knowledge in this area.



ResultsPlus

Examiner Tip

This question demands that candidates distinguish between two terms and it is important to spend a balanced amount of time explaining each term.

Question 3

This question was a common feature on the examination papers of the old specification and there was an expectation that there would be some very strong responses. Unfortunately a sizeable number of candidates produced rather limited responses. There was a need to explain the changing role of NATO since the end of the Cold War but a number of students failed to explain the significant change in role from the original 1949 role to the post Cold War role. NATO has been described, initially, as a body created to 'Keep the Russians out, the US in and the Germans down'. An explanation of these functions alongside contemporary objectives such as peacekeeping and anti terrorism would be beneficial.

This response would have benefited from a better explanation of the original role of NATO but it does move rapidly to outlining the new role that NATO developed immediately after the end of the Cold War.

~~With~~ With the cold war ending in the 1990s, the ~~op~~ decline in any major opposition from Russia allowed NATO to adopt a new role.

It still manages to link the US to European security and builds the ~~be~~ ~~between~~ between the US and Europe, ~~however~~ it ~~and~~ thus link has begun to expand east- right up to Russia's border with countries like Poland joining in 1992, this means NATO has ~~to~~ begun to link the US with ~~the~~ ~~whole~~ Eastern Europe as well. Shown by its intervention in the Bosnian conflict when the UN failed to hold peace in Bosnia, between the Serbs and Muslims. Switching its role in Eastern Europe from one of defence against Communism and Russia to one

of ~~building~~ ~~per~~ stabilising the region possibly as a spring board for the US into the Middle East.

NATO has also developed extraterritorial roles that have been shown majorly in Afghanistan where NATO took the lead role of supporting

the Karzai government against Taliban insurgents, although possibly only to give legitimacy to US troops. This

could show NATO's post-transition into some kind of Global 'Police force' or a vehicle for Western interests around the world, with ex-soubt nations being drawn into the western circle via and from EU soft power although the limitations of this were shown in the Georgian defeat in 2008. NATO has also played roles in aiding the UN and African Union, ~~and~~ taking over the handling of the Libyan civil war of 2011 and the sending African Union troops to Sudan along with its 20,000 ~~strong~~ strong response force. NATO has also developed into a fast response for world disasters, also trying to defeat the Taliban in Afghanistan via the building of infrastructure not just fighting. It could also be argued that NATO has also become the military arm of the EU and pooling the EU armies would be difficult and could face large opposition. The NATO can be said to be the 'de facto' army.



ResultsPlus

Examiner Comments

The response almost acts as a list of the new roles that NATO has been involved in since the end of the Cold War but a better contrast with the Cold War period would have strengthened this further.



ResultsPlus

Examiner Tip

This question implies a significant transition since the end of the Cold War and stronger responses will make clear the role both during the Cold War as well as post Cold War.

This response has a stronger introduction which better sets out the direction that the response will be taking.

~~After~~ After the end of the Cold War and the collapse of the USSR, NATO's traditional role as a military bloc defending the West against Communism has become obsolete. Rather than simply disband, it has taken on new roles - peacekeeping, expansion, and anti-terrorism.

One of the most obvious examples of how NATO has changed since the Cold War is its membership. It has expanded into the former Warsaw Pact countries which it once opposed, effectively pushing the borders of Western Europe further east, and putting pressure on the dominant regional power - no longer the USSR, but rather the Russian Federation.

It has also taken on a peacekeeping role in the style of the UN. The two most obvious examples of this would be Kosovo, and more recently Libya. In Kosovo, as the UN was

unable to act due to the Russian veto, NATO had to intervene, even repelling Russian tanks sent to Kosovo to help Serbia. In Libya, NATO was used to co-ordinate ^{the} British, French, and American military, and carried out successful airstrikes on pro-Gaddafi forces. This is clearly something that NATO

NATO would have been far too preoccupied to do during the Cold War, and a significant way in which its role has changed since then.

Another way in which NATO's role has changed is the link between Europe and North America that it provides, which Libya is also a good example of. Previously, it was obvious that Europe and the US were on the same side, against Communism. However, now that the threat of Communism is gone, the relationship between EU countries and the US is more strained, as shown by European opposition to American intervention in the Middle East. NATO therefore tries to hold the two powers together, in the interest of national security.

NATO has also had to adapt to the changing nature of security, particularly terrorism. This was not such a problem during the Cold War, but now the developed world lives in fear of a terrorist attack. NATO therefore has a new

role in counter-terrorism, trying to make Europe and North America harder to penetrate.



ResultsPlus

Examiner Comments

Peacekeeping, inclusivity and anti-terror roles are mentioned and explained as a contrast with the defensive role of the Cold War period.

Question 4

This was a very popular question which provided a range of responses from candidates. Better responses provided clear definitions with full and accurate explanations of both hard and soft power. They also provided examples of hard and soft power in order to fully illustrate the difference between the two terms.

A rather brief introduction in the first paragraph but the candidate moves to a pleasing explanation of hard power with good examples and explanation of theory. Soft power is also explained with a range of relevant examples which makes clear the candidates understanding of the difference between the two terms.

Hard

Realists 'pure power'

Coercive - sanctions

- military etc

expensive

state sov. offensive

realism

eg. Iraq v Iran

Soft

Nye 'want what...'

'attractive'

China ~~sov~~ - 300

cost effective

legitimate

interdependence

↳ promote reciprocity.

Hard and soft power are usually distinguishable between liberal + realist theory. Realists usually believe in the effectiveness of hard power, liberals; soft.

Hard power related to coercion - defined by realists as 'pure power'. Bound with ^{the} Westphalian system, sovereignty of a state is usually retained ~~through the~~ by the state through its 'pure' / hard power use in an anarchical system. This can be in the form of sanctions - either

general such as the full trade embargo placed on Iraq by the UN, or specific such as the military sanctions on Iran. 'Hard' power is usually more

costly than soft as it can often lead to war or conflict as the invasion of Iraq, 2003 proved - ~~the~~ 'the war on terror' has been significantly more difficult to 'win' than was suspected.

'Hard' power is usually an exercise of stronger states - as Thucydides wrote 'The strong do what they want to while the weak accept what they have to'. Therefore, it is usually related to a strong military such as that of the USA.

'The Buzard Ball' model demonstrates the need for hard power as states ~~are~~ remain isolated yet conduct international power through external methods.

Soft power is favoured more by liberals and has been defined by Nye as the ability to make states 'want what you want'. This ~~concept~~ means that soft power can be held by other actors such as (other than states) such as TNCs + IGOs. TNCs transcend national borders which ultimately gives them power as states 'want what they want' (Nye).

For example, TNCs account for 70% of world trade and 5/100 of the biggest economies are

TNCs. ~~Globalization~~ 'McDonaldization' has been coined to mean the influence of ~~the~~ such TNCs.

Soft Power also helps states gain influence
- China has set up over 300 Confucius Institutes in 80 countries giving it influence in the West. Ultimately, soft power takes time to gain but is more cost-effective than hard power and can provoke reciprocity-specific + diffuse. Furthermore, soft power is seen to be more legitimate than hard power.

Ultimately, they differ in concept due to their contrasting nature. 'Smart' power combines both coercion + legitimacy into a 'winning strategy' (Nye).



ResultsPlus

Examiner Comments

Pleasing reference to theoretical views on the worth and value of soft and hard power.

A confident response which illustrates a clear understanding of the terms and an ability to provide examples to show this awareness of the differences between the two terms.

Keohane and Nye coined the idea of 'hard' power and 'soft' power as two distinctly different elements of influence and manipulation in IR. Hard power is wide ranging but at its core is the use of coercive force to achieve the ends of the actor. This can be further categorised into military, economic and diplomatic 'hard' power. An example of economic hard power would be sanctions placed on countries; the EU is currently placing an embargo on Iranian oil in an attempt to pressure the end of their nuclear programme. It is normally

after the failure of economic and diplomatic hard power that military hard power is implemented. Realists view this as entirely acceptable as they view IR as amoral.

However the calculative quality of realists - their Machiavellian stance did lead many to oppose the American invasion of Iraq (2003). Their objection was not moral but practical. This war was an example of too much hard power and not enough soft power. Soft power is the manipulative element of power exertion. It is the utilisation of Lukes' third game of power; the manipulation

of choice. This is sometimes categorised into 'attractive' and 'repulsive' soft power. Making people want something or making them opposed of the 'other'. Soft power is arguably more effective - it was the favoured tool of fascist and communist governments. A mixture of fear and adoration leading to internal loyalty. ✱

The realist criticism of Iraq was its failure to win the 'hearts and minds' of the Iraqi people. This failure meant an inevitable resistance to a conquering regime. Nye recognised that the two in delicate combination were the key to the achievement of state aims. This is called 'smart' power.

Today we see 'smart power' being exercised by the two global leaders China and America. Leaders from both countries have said explicitly they need to work on this 'soft power'. China have done this through their global Confucius Centres - that spread Chinese culture through the globe. America's use of television and film to broadcast 'The American Dream'

is undertaken. This then gives the door for the countries to use their economic hard power to provide for those Margulies does not improve their global position.

Hard and soft power are equally ~~active~~ ^{active} ~~artificial~~ ^{artificial} - on the forced coercion of people and states and the other the shy manipulation of people's hearts. They are two sides of one coin - 'Smart power'

* It can of course be less smart than this and Liberalists like the idea of avoiding international conflict of any sort in favour of similarities and shared desire.



ResultsPlus

Examiner Comments

Knowledge and analysis are blended to produce a particularly strong response.



ResultsPlus

Examiner Tip

It is always beneficial to use contemporary examples, where possible, in order to illustrate understanding.

Question 5

This wasn't a popular question at all. Very few students tackled this question and it was often their last choice of short question. This was a two part question. Some candidates clearly didn't understand the term whilst others could provide a definition but were unable to tackle the part of the question which followed the definition.

This response begins well with a clear attempt to define and explain the significance for integration. The response does tail off but still does enough to secure a Level 3 mark.

its significance for the process of EU integration

Subsidiarity is the principle that in the EU the laws are made at the lowest levels of government possible. Meaning that there has to be a clear reason for a law to be applied by the EU and not by national or local governments. Decisions are taken in EU when ~~not~~ these powers are granted by treaties, it is more effective to take collective action than by individual states such as concerning global warming. The subsidiarity process that was introduced in the Maastricht Treaty holds back the process of integration as it shows how much sovereignty still lies in the hands of national governments rather than EU.

For EU to be fully integrated it needs to have an effective way of making law and applying it. Subsidiarity halts integration as most decisions are made by regulations and directives which are applied through national governments and are subject to slight change. For integration to become full the

laws made should be made as treaties so that they would be applied by the EU institutions and not subject to change under national governments.

The principle of subsidiarity is one of the main points

made' by 'europhiles' that the EU is not an integrated federation. As the principle remains it clearly shows that the EU is not moving towards deep integration as wished by deepeners and is led by eurosceptics.

The principle of subsidiarity can be changed as shown by the creation of the Eurozone^{with 17 members,} as by which many law making sections, powers were transferred by treaties from national governments to the EU.

The principle of subsidiarity does not strictly restrict the EU from becoming integrated, but it is rather used to calm down eurosceptics, such as the UK conservative party, whose greatest fear is the loss of national sovereignty. Subsidiarity helps to retain as much national sovereignty as possible for the 27 members of the European Union.



ResultsPlus

Examiner Comments

A good introduction which immediately tackles the requirement for a definition.

Question 6

The wording of this question suggests that a transition has taken place where the concept of sovereignty is concerned. Candidates need to make clear that this is the case whilst also ensuring that the alternative assertion can also be supported. There are a range of factors which can be explored when suggesting that sovereignty has become an outdated concept. A range of examples should be employed to show that sovereignty can both be seen as outdated as well as still of relevance.

A pleasing response to this very popular question which retains a clear focus on the question throughout. Supranationalism and Intergovernmentalism are explored as are the impact of a developed global economy in which membership of IGOs may be voluntary but realistically inevitable.

Sovereignty in the context of global politics is the ability of a state to entirely control its own affairs within its own borders without any constraints.

It could be argued that state sovereignty is now an out-dated concept. One of these arguments is that the global economic system is now so interdependent that states effectively have little or no control over their own financial markets as financial transactions now take place continuously around the globe, which affects the cost of borrowing for states. External influences such as credit ratings agencies certainly have a significant impact. This suggests that states have indeed lost sovereignty. However, states are still in control of their own fiscal policy in general, and governments still make their own economic decisions despite external influence.

The rise of supranational IGOs such as the EU also suggests that states have lost sovereignty. The EU uses QMV for several key policy areas, and as such this supra-

national decision-making certainly has implications for sovereignty of member states ~~who~~ ~~can~~ which cannot always control their own policy. However, membership of ITOs is entirely voluntary, and states can withdraw from them at any time, indicating that de jure at least, ITOs do not take away sovereignty. De facto however, the EU does as states are unlikely to withdraw from it for fear of negative economic and political implications. It should be noted however that many ITOs, ~~in fact~~ ~~are~~ ~~not~~ ~~are~~ are purely intergovernmental ^{such as the WTO} and as such do not have any negative impact on a state's sovereignty. De jure therefore, ITOs pose no problems for sovereignty due to the opt-out option, however de facto ~~are~~ some definitely do, such as the EU, which does indeed suggest that sovereignty has been lost and is out-dated.

The rise of TNCs via globalisation is a further factor to suggest that sovereignty on a state level has become out-dated. TNCs now produce and target products for a truly global market, for example Apple, a US company, targets many of its products in China. Due to the globalised nature of TNCs, it could be argued that this has had a negative impact on state sovereignty as if governments

wish to raise taxes for example, as is their sovereign right as a state, they may be prevented from doing so for fear that some of the TNCs which currently provide jobs and investment in their state may simply move elsewhere and harm the state's economy. ~~as the other hand~~ This indicates that the rise of TNCs through globalisation has indeed affected state sovereignty and ~~there~~ left it as an out-dated concept. However, it is important to note that TNCs do not legally have any political power, and that states can still technically do as they please within their own borders in terms of taxation for example. This appears to indicate that states have retained sovereignty, however in practice it appears that some element of sovereignty has indeed been lost, as states may be afraid to fully implement all policies for fear of a reduction in TNCs' investment and production.

one major reason to indicate that state sovereignty has been fully retained is the lack of a world government. ~~which~~ Realist theorists would agree that the world remains an anarchic system of autonomous states, and that states still retain full sovereignty as a result of this lack of a world government. However, it could

be argued that on the international stage, ~~that~~ the majority of states remain too weak to have any power or influence if acting autonomously, and therefore it could be argued that states are forced into co-operation, co-ordination, treaties and ITAs which has negative implications for sovereignty. North Korea is arguably the most sovereign state left in the world as it has so far resisted the effects of globalisation, however its power and influence on the world stage is minimal, and as such its existence in its current form ~~does~~ supports the idea that sovereignty is an out-dated concept.

one final reason to suggest that sovereignty is indeed an out-dated concept is the idea that states are sovereign until the international community dislikes what they are doing. A good example of this is Libya. Technically a sovereign state, NATO intervened militarily in the interests of humanitarian protection, leading to the overthrowing of the regime. Realists would argue that regardless of human rights and democracy, a sovereign state should be able to do what it pleases within its own borders. Another example at the time of writing is Iran. Theoretically as a sovereign state it has a right to pursue a

Nuclear programme, however this is unacceptable to other states within the world such as Israel and the US, and therefore economic sanctions have been applied, breaching its sovereignty. On the whole, the spread of globalisation, democracy and human rights, increased interdependence and the rise of ITOs such as the WTO suggest that global issues ~~like the~~ require global solutions, and that states can no longer deal with issues on their own. States also have increasing international obligations, and therefore for these reasons I believe that state sovereignty is becoming out-dated. Although ~~not~~ states retain de jure sovereignty, in many cases de facto they do not and therefore to some extent I agree that state sovereignty is now an out-dated concept.



ResultsPlus Examiner Comments

A stronger definition could have been provided but the candidate moves to tackling the central theme of the question almost immediately. Arguments both for and against the assertion in the title are apparent throughout with some pleasing examples.



ResultsPlus Examiner Tip

Try to fully develop all of the points raised in a response. Further development of the points raised on human rights and dealing with global issues would have helped here.

Question 7

The second most popular of the longer questions which, once more, provided a variety of strength in responses. Whilst most candidates were able to explain the rise of the BRIC states, only a small number of candidates were able to examine the potential consequences of a move to a multipolar system.

The move to a shift in the balance of power in the world economy was well covered as reflected in the growing importance of bodies such as the G20 and the rise of economic powerhouses in the East as the West seems to lose influence. Nevertheless, the USA remains the largest economy and maintains a hi-tech lead.

The USA also maintains a military dominance and also continues to exert disproportional structural power in a variety of international institutions despite the growing significance of rising powers.

Unfortunately, a number of responses failed to recognize the counter argument and produced responses which exclusively supported the assertion in the title.

An interesting response which begins with a most persuasive argument that there is a changing world order. The counter argument is then employed to suggest that significant change is actually an exaggeration. Whilst some of the later argument is less persuasive, this remains a balanced response.

The rise of emerging powers is set to alter the international system as we know it, with the growth of China, Russia, Brazil and India comes the decline of the USA. And it is these emerging powers or the 'BRICS' that set out the clear argument that the USA is a hegemon in decline. The emergence of these powers could turn the present unipolar world, where we see the USA as the 'world's policeman', into a multipolar world where at least 3 'poles' have the majority of military and economic strength and political influence. We could see the international system as a 'pole-less' world order where power is diffused due to the emergence of the BRICS and there are no real poles at all.

It is clear economically that the nature of world order is going to alter as soon as 2020 when China is predicted to overtake the US economy. Likewise

economies of Russia, Brazil and India are largely productive and have been growing much more rapidly than Western economies in recent decades. The argument that the USA is a hegemon in decline comes from the growth of the BRICS, also damaged by the 2007/9 financial crisis has put huge doubts into the structure of Western economies and this has resulted in even more borrowing from emerging powers like China - who the west are becoming heavily reliant on during the economic downturn.

With economic growth will come military prosperity and expansion. Although the USA is, as Joshua Goldstein said 'the most important single actor' and has the most productive and active military - China will soon follow. China is already the second biggest military in the world and it set to rival the USA's military in coming years. The role of India's naval programme has set to make India more of a military power and Russia has also reasserted itself militarily showing that Russia is not just an energy superpower - but also has many other factors that will lead to Russia changing world order so that there is no longer just a single hegemon.

There has also been a great rise in the BRICS soft power - Chinese programmes promoting Chinese culture have been well received showing that there is a myth of Americanisation and in fact the East have

used all the benefits of globalisation to help their economies and soft power prosper. The decline in USA's soft power has helped the emerging powers grow - US role in Guantanamo Bay weakened American moral outlook, and their roles in cooperate

organisations and growing world wide inequality.

However it is argued that these emerging powers are still generations off of challenging the US and altering the present hegemonic world order.

It is argued that none of these powers are able to rival the US hard power, US have a 4 fold lead of China when it comes to military productivity and US has a defence budget that's 46% of global spending - showing that none of the emerging powers would be able to rival American hard power.

BRICS do not have the kind of leadership militarily that the USA has and ultimately the USA is the single most important actor on the world stage. US has 700+ bases in 100+ countries and has the military to intervene anywhere throughout the world and sustain multiple operations - something the emerging powers could not do. Shown in the USA's unilateral approach to Iraq + Afghanistan although through the UN - they didn't have support of countries like France and Germany - none of the emerging powers could possibly do so in the way that the USA can.

Economically the USA still is the number 1 economy in the world despite predictions about China - and predictions about China could be proved wrong - China's economy could overheat or economic progress could be stopped by

internal/social upheavals. Despite recent downturn in the US economy they still have a highly productive economy that is very resilient and still maintaining the USA's hegemonic status showing that the emergence of powers like the BRICS are decades away from rivaling the USA's economy.

The USA still have great soft power globally that's unrivalled - 'Americanisation' still creates a view of the world in the American view - why Pakistani men wear 'Chicago Bulls' t-shirts, none of the emerging powers would be able to have the kind of cultural impact that the USA has had on the world.

The USA also have a great advantage that they have a relatively low age profile whilst their rivals China + Russia are aging - USA will provide a new generation of skilled workers whilst China especially will need to put more money into social welfare with such an aging population perhaps altering their growth and stopping them changing the world order into a multi polar / tri polar one. USA spend 40%

of global spending on research and development and are famous for having Swiss skilled workers available, unlike India / Brazil who still have education and poverty problems all across their countries as still developing countries.

In conclusion, the rise of the emerging Power at present has not altered the nature of world order because, Joshua Goldstein said the USA is the 'single most important actor', the USA unrivalled hard and soft power have stopped the emergence of the BRICS from stripping it of its hegemonic status and it is perhaps too premature to right off the USA from the growth of the BRICS as China's own internal and social problems may stop it from rivaling to be the new world hegemon in the future - like wise India and Brazil are still poverty ridden countries with great domestic problems that are stopping the emerging powers from changing the nature of world order.



ResultsPlus

Examiner Comments

A strong introduction which immediately makes clear the reason for the assertion in the title of the question. Arguments for and against are employed and a decent conclusion is provided.

Question 8

This was the least popular of the longer questions but there were numerous strong responses which were able to draw on a wide knowledge of UN peacekeeping operations, both successes and failures.

Examples such as Bosnia and Rwanda were employed to illustrate failure alongside an explanation of this failure which focussed on inadequate resources and ill defined or poorly equipped operations.

Equally, the stronger candidates were able to provide examples where the UN has succeeded in keeping the peace and promoted good governance and democracy, monitored elections and provided humanitarian aid.

This response covers a significant number of conflicts as it attempts to explain the arguments for and against the view that the UN has a history of peacekeeping failures. This helps to lift this response above the large number of responses where examples were rather thin or even non-existent. The response sticks to the actual question throughout which provides for a strong A02 mark.

The UN was formed at the end of the second world war with the primary aims to ensure peace and stability, develop friendly international relations, encourage cooperation and act as ~~the~~ centre for collective action. In the UN Atlantic Charter of 1944 did not declare it as a peacekeeping institution however after the 1992 Agenda for Peace ~~and~~ this is now regarded as the UN's principle role. The longevity of the UN's peacekeeping missions implies it has some degree of success however as does its winning of 10 Nobel Peace Prizes. However it can be contested by many that peacekeeping effectiveness and ensuring stability in ~~the~~ areas of conflict is largely variable on the ^{cooperation} strength of the Security Council, nature of the conflict itself, strength of the mandate and supply of resources. These factors greatly ~~also~~ contribute to the overall success or failure of a UN peacekeeping mission, however ultimately it is to be noted that ~~desp~~ despite failures, the UN is the ~~of~~ most prominent institution in this field gaining it some merit on the basis that

it does attempt at least to establish international peace

The Security Council is seen as the central organ of the UN ^{structure} which ~~and~~ has been criticised by some as ~~structurally~~

~~flawed~~ a structural incoherence and a conglomeration of organisations and divisions, each made consisting of people from different backgrounds, ideologies and goals. This therefore is a fundamental flaw of the UN Security Council. During the Cold War the Security Council could undoubtedly be viewed as ineffective, giving credence to the realist argument which theorised that state interest held primary over international. For example Russia ~~the~~ during the Cold War the USSR used her veto powers 93 times in order to block the membership of Italy and Spain to the UN. In this period the ideological tension between the US and USSR meant policies were almost impossible to pass and the Security Council was therefore stagnated meaning peacekeeping was ineffective and almost impossible.

Nevertheless with the collapse of Communism in the Soviet bloc in 1991 it can be argued a new world order was established. President Bush contested it marked a new era one in which collective ^{action} security ~~can~~ could be used to solve disputes between states and other international problems. The UN Security Council's ability to define and respond to security threats ~~gives~~ gives it a huge role in the effectiveness of peacekeeping as swift condemnation as evidenced in the Gulf War of 1991, prevented casualties ~~are~~ and was also the first example of where collective

action was successful. The Russia did not veto against the removal of Iraqi troops from Kuwait despite its trade links with Iraq. In this sense a period of stalemate in the Security Council was ended after the Cold War justifying Bush's optimism for collective security and breaking the history of infrequent peacekeeping action. As evidenced by the increase of peacekeeping missions which include twenty between 1991-1995.

Nevertheless the Security Council can also be viewed as a hindrance to the UN's peacekeeping role, even after the Cold War. Although intervention did increase, it can also be argued that peacekeeping is ~~seen as~~ the exception rather than the rule. For example ongoing civil wars in failed states such as Somalia remain largely ignored by the ~~Secur~~ UN potentially reflecting the realist opinion that states are the key actors in international relations and so act accordingly with their national interest in mind. This can be evidenced by US intervention in Iraq, regarded as a ~~not~~ tool to exploit resources similar to NATO's involvement in Libya. Furthermore the self interest of the permanent members of the council influence where to intervene but more crucially where not to.

The strength of a UN Security Council Mandate can influence whether or not intervention takes place at all and also the success of peacekeeping once it is evoked. Successful mandates proposed by the UN include its peacekeeping mission in East Timor. In 1999 Australian led intervention ~~forces forced~~ led to its liberation from Indonesia, partly because the mandate

was so strong and stated peace was to be established by "all means necessary". However the UN did find itself in complete control of a country with no stable government and was

underequipped to deal with the problem, undermining its success.

Permanent members can be deterred from allowing intervention if a mandate is seen as weak. For example China and Russia recently vetoed a resolution for intervention in Syria over the vagueness of the mandate which did not clearly detail the extent of force troops were allowed to use. Their decision could also reflect the interest of China and Russia as intervention was to be justified on humanitarian grounds with questionable human rights abuses in their own countries. China and Russia would be reluctant to pass resolutions that could be one day used against them. Potentially the most prevalent example of where a weak mandate caused the a UN peacekeeping mission to fail is in ^{the} 1991 Balkans crisis. After declaring 'safe zones' UN peacekeepers had to watch on as civilians were massacred in these zones as they did not have the mandate to use their weapons to protect them.

Therefore the nature of conflict the UN is attempting to deal with can also determine the success or failure of a mission. When the perpetrator is obvious to the UN they can effectively set about to evoke sanctions, such as in the Gulf War and more recently Iran's build up of Nuclear Capabilities which may or may not lead to sanctions from the UN as the US are increasingly calling for, despite facing resistance from

China who do a lot of trade with Iran. However when conflict is not as clear cut as an aggressor and a victim the UN faces difficulties. This can be evidenced by the 1994

Civil war in Rwanda, arguably the UN's biggest failure as they were powerless to solve the dispute right in front of them.

With the genocide of 1 million Tutsi and also Hutus, Rwanda was a country torn apart by competing national interests. The UN blue helmets however were powerless to cease the conflict as it was unclear which side was truly at fault, the peacekeepers were in danger and withdrew in 1994 leaving the state in turmoil, a clear example of their peacekeeping failure.

Peacekeeping can also be largely dependent on the resources of the UN. Troops, police forces and equipment are rallied by the Secretariat whilst the mandate goes through the Council and is provided by often poorer nations. Although Truman once said "it is the responsibility of larger nations to guide the way to international peace," the burden of providing blue helmets often falls to poorer nations due to location and a laxed policy on human rights. This can also at times lead to questionability of quality of troops. The Zed report 2000 established a zero tolerance of sexual abuse and stated severe penalties for troops engaging in misconduct, nevertheless lack of training can often lead to abuses, ~~lower~~ undermining the morality of peacekeeping.

In conclusion UN peacekeeping enjoys a history of both successes and failures ^{which can be} and is largely attributed to the mood swings of the permanent members of the Security Council. However it should be noted for attempting to intervene in many

Situations of conflict across the globe. With the changing nature of conflict, for example terrorism, peacekeeping does however need to evolve and the UN can no longer be viewed of as 'hostile'.



ResultsPlus

Examiner Comments

A balanced introduction which suggests that both sides of the argument will be explored.



ResultsPlus

Examiner Tip

A question like this one will demand a wide range of examples in order to lift it to a L3 response. There should be examples of both success and failure. This response is wide-ranging with use of Somalia, East Timor, the Balkans, Rwanda and even recent examples such as Syria.

Paper Summary

It is evident that most, if not all, teachers are aware of and focussed on 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.

It is particularly pleasing to note that teachers and students are making good use of recently developed resources.

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 UA030554 January 2012

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

Ofqual
.....



Llywodraeth Cynulliad Cymru
Welsh Assembly Government

