

Examiners' Report  
June 2012

GCE Government & Politics  
6GP04 4D

## 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 visit our qualifications websites at [www.edexcel.com](http://www.edexcel.com) or [www.btec.co.uk](http://www.btec.co.uk) for our BTEC qualifications.

Alternatively, you can get in touch with us using the details on our contact us page at [www.edexcel.com/contactus](http://www.edexcel.com/contactus).

If you have any subject specific questions about this specification that require the help of a subject specialist, you can speak directly to the subject team at Pearson.

Their contact details can be found on this link: [www.edexcel.com/teachingservices](http://www.edexcel.com/teachingservices).

You can also use our online Ask the Expert service at [www.edexcel.com/ask](http://www.edexcel.com/ask). You will need an Edexcel username and password to access this service. See the ResultsPlus section below on how to get these details if you don't have them already.



### 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](http://www.edexcel.com/resultsplus). To set up your ResultsPlus account, call us using the details on our contact us page at [www.edexcel.com/contactus](http://www.edexcel.com/contactus).

### 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](http://www.pearson.com/uk).

June 2012

Publications Code UA032372

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

## **Introduction**

This paper seems to have been well received by the majority of candidates with a decent popularity split between questions. In general, candidates seemed well prepared. It was pleasing to note that definitions tended to be strong and the majority of students attempted to remain relevant throughout. Synoptic skills appear to have been further developed and very few students produced one-sided longer responses. The most popular short question was the first question on humanitarian intervention whilst the least popular short question was the question relating to sustainable development. The most popular longer question was the question on international aid whilst the least popular question was the question on climate change.

Centres should refer to the report on the 3D paper and the comments relating to the need to focus on the 4 types of marks which make up the 45 mark longer questions. They should also refer to the comments relating to the importance of the guidance document produced by the previous Principal Examiner.

## Question 1

Humanitarian intervention is military intervention that is carried out in pursuit of humanitarian rather than strategic objectives. It can be justified in a number of ways which include morality and the need to 'save strangers', strategic considerations, discrediting and weakening of sovereignty, to promote democracy and to prevent regional instability.

Most students provided a definition of varying quality and at least one justification but stronger responses needed to provide a range of justifications usually supported by examples, often contemporary.

A strong script which covers the criteria set out in the Threshold Indicators. This is a certain L3 script.

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

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

Chosen Question Number:

Question 1       Question 2       Question 3   
Question 4       Question 5

Humanitarian intervention is intervention by ~~one or a group of~~ <sup>a body</sup> in a state for humanitarian rather than military or strategic reasons. It has seen an increasing role in world politics since the end of the Cold War, ~~which~~ <sup>justified</sup> ~~was~~ <sup>was</sup> ~~driven~~ <sup>driven</sup> by a number of reasons.

Humanitarian intervention has been justified on the grounds that <sup>state</sup> sovereignty is in decline, and should no longer be put before protection of human rights. This argument was used by the USA and UK to justify intervention in Iraq in 2003, <sup>arguing prevent</sup> as Saddam Hussein's continuing breaches of human rights ~~should be~~ <sup>should be</sup> given higher priority than protecting Iraq's sovereignty; this is also an argument

used to justify one's 'responsibility to protect'. A further justification for the Iraq intervention was that Hussein was damaging the people's right to self-determination

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

determination which is enshrined in the universal declaration of human rights.

Another ~~right~~ ~~that~~ human rights are a key justification of humanitarian intervention. It is agreed that they are fundamental and universal and so should always be protected, even by armed intervention. If the state fails to protect its people then the international community may step in and protect the people, as the 'state is the servant of the people' and not vice versa; this argument was used to justify NATO air strikes in Libya where Gaddafi was refusing Libyan civilians their human rights. The state does not have the right to treat its people as it wishes, and this is an argument that could justify humanitarian intervention in Syria if the UN were to decide to intervene.

A further justification used for humanitarian intervention is if ~~internal~~ events in a state could have threatened the security of its neighbours. This was part of the justification for NATO intervention in ~~the Balkans~~ <sup>Bosnia</sup> in the 1990s, as fleeing Bosnian Muslims and Croats potentially threatened the security of its <sup>Bosnian's</sup> neighbours through mass immigration increasing poverty and disease.

levels. Furthermore, as in the case of the Kosovo intervention in the 1990s the cost of intervention may be lower than that of non-intervention. NATO's preventing Milosevic succeeding in his 'ethnic cleansing' seemed more wise than non-intervention would have, as demonstrated by the atrocities carried out in Rwanda whilst the UN failed to intervene.

Overall there are a wide range of ways in which humanitarian intervention has been justified. Not all are accepted by all nations, such as Russia and China believing sovereignty has ultimate priority over human rights, but ultimately humanitarian intervention aims to protect human rights and these are <sup>increasingly</sup> regarded as fundamental and so reasonable justification for intervention.



### ResultsPlus

#### Examiner Comments

A decent introduction with a definition. A range of factors are identified which include weakened sovereignty, universal rights and regional security. Observations tend to be supported with examples which include Libya, Iraq and Kosovo.



### ResultsPlus

#### Examiner Tip

Try to provide examples, as this script does, to support assertions made.

Another useful script with the the real strength of the response towards the start rather than conclusion.

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

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

Chosen Question Number:

Question 1       Question 2       Question 3   
Question 4       Question 5

Humanitarian intervention is military intervention undertaken for humanitarian, rather than strategic, objectives. Since the 1990s there has been a decline in the importance of national sovereignty and the policy of "saving strangers" has become a desirable political goal. Moreover, Human Rights abuses are no longer merely a side effect of war; they are basis for a new type of war. Humanitarian intervention is undertaken either because a government/leader is abusing its people's human rights, such as Libya under Gaddafi before the 2011 Arab Spring, or because governance is so weak or absent that a state descends into lawlessness, such as Somalia which hasn't had a government since 1991.

It is justified when neighbouring countries are threatened by action in a state. For example, Milosevic's attempted expulsion of Kosovan Albanians threatened mass migration to neighbouring states, which could have a destabilising effect on these states. Moreover, when diplomatic solutions have been exhausted, intervention is

STRENGTH OF  
6.7.1  
6.7.2  
6.7.3  
6.7.4  
6.7.5  
6.7.6  
6.7.7  
6.7.8  
6.7.9  
6.7.10  
6.7.11  
6.7.12  
6.7.13  
6.7.14  
6.7.15  
6.7.16  
6.7.17  
6.7.18  
6.7.19  
6.7.20  
6.7.21  
6.7.22  
6.7.23  
6.7.24  
6.7.25  
6.7.26  
6.7.27  
6.7.28  
6.7.29  
6.7.30  
6.7.31  
6.7.32  
6.7.33  
6.7.34  
6.7.35  
6.7.36  
6.7.37  
6.7.38  
6.7.39  
6.7.40  
6.7.41  
6.7.42  
6.7.43  
6.7.44  
6.7.45  
6.7.46  
6.7.47  
6.7.48  
6.7.49  
6.7.50  
6.7.51  
6.7.52  
6.7.53  
6.7.54  
6.7.55  
6.7.56  
6.7.57  
6.7.58  
6.7.59  
6.7.60  
6.7.61  
6.7.62  
6.7.63  
6.7.64  
6.7.65  
6.7.66  
6.7.67  
6.7.68  
6.7.69  
6.7.70  
6.7.71  
6.7.72  
6.7.73  
6.7.74  
6.7.75  
6.7.76  
6.7.77  
6.7.78  
6.7.79  
6.7.80  
6.7.81  
6.7.82  
6.7.83  
6.7.84  
6.7.85  
6.7.86  
6.7.87  
6.7.88  
6.7.89  
6.7.90  
6.7.91  
6.7.92  
6.7.93  
6.7.94  
6.7.95  
6.7.96  
6.7.97  
6.7.98  
6.7.99  
6.7.100

acceptable. For example, Gaddafi made it clear in 2011 that he would not accept any diplomatic solution so NATO's involvement could be considered justified.

It could be argued that a state's sovereignty is dependent on its protection and duty of its people. If it denies them rights and abuses them, it is not fulfilling its responsibility; government is merely the custodian of a sovereignty which resides with the people, so intervention is justified if this is being abused. Moreover, if absence of democracy means that people are denied national self-determination, intervention is acceptable. For example, Saddam Hussein, a Sunni, ruled Iraq to however 80% of the population were Shias and Kurds, so ~~only~~ the majority of people were not represented by leadership, infringing their rights.

Those who claim that intervention is wrong if it is based on self interest can be criticised. Pure altruism is impractical and, ~~is~~ <sup>doesn't preclude the positives of intervening.</sup> For example, if a person were to attend a fund raising dance for the homeless to see their friends - just because fundraising was not the only, or even primary, objective ~~does~~ not mean that the action did not benefit the homeless, illustrating it is still effective.

Furthermore, if the human cost of non intervention is higher than the cost of intervention, it is justified. Whilst it may be claimed it is impossible to judge

this accurately, to take a risk averse approach in some states can cause human rights abuses to escalate to unimaginable proportions, conveying that intervention is justified.



### ResultsPlus Examiner Comments

A strong introduction with key justifications following a pleasing definition. Use of examples to support the points made all helps to strengthen the response although the argument which uses a 'fundraising dance' as an example may have been better based on a more relevant example.



### ResultsPlus Examiner Tip

Try, where possible, to use relevant examples related to the specification rather than wider examples.



## Question 2

Nuclear arms control has been difficult to achieve for many reasons. These reasons range from the security dilemma to the obvious prestige and power associated with weapons. Some additional reasons, discussed by candidates, included regional arms races and rivalries, the failure of enforcement bodies such as the IAEA, treaties such as the NPT and state sovereignty.

Relevance was an issue with this question. Some candidates appeared to lose a focus on the specific demand of the question and to discuss nuclear weapons more broadly.

This is a decent attempt at the question which raises a number of central elements.

Indicate your second question choice on this page.  
You will be asked to indicate your third question choice on page 9.

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

Chosen Question Number:

Question 1       Question 2       Question 3   
Question 4       Question 5

Ever since the Hiroshima and Nagasaki were bombed, Nuclear Weapons had earned an international tabu. They also became the universal symbol of destruction, seeding fear in whole governments. The World Community had made several attempts to restrict the proliferation of nuclear weapons and control their production, but it proved to be extremely difficult.

One of the main issues of control of nuclear weapons is the state sovereignty. Billiard ball theory is great at portraying the situation: every state is rigid and impenetrable to intrusions from outside. While it may move along with other states for a time, nobody knows what happens inside. Such a situation was in North Korea. They signed the NPT and seemed

to be following it. But as soon as they felt threatened by the world community, they withdrew immediately, declaring to have

nuclear weapons. And although sanctions were put on them and tens and hundreds of speeches condemned their actions - Koreans are still testing and developing their weapons. Only recently their test missile 'accidentally', as officials claim, flew next to Japan.

Another issue of control of nuclear proliferation is the deterrent theory. This theory portrays nuclear weapons as a symbol of power rather than an actual weapon. This symbol is used only as a scarecrow, to deter any possible intruders. Iran is said to develop nuclear weapons as a deterrent against growing pressures from Israel and the West. However, it is arguable that deterrence theory is actually the rightful purpose of countries such as Iran. While those weapons may scare off invaders, there is nothing to stop them from being used either. Hence why deterrence theory is often frowned upon and dismissed.

Yet, nuclear weapons are not just a symbol of defensive power. Many nations regard nuclear weapons as mandatory for being the Great Power. A very vivid example of when nuclear-proliferation occurred to achieve status is the India/Pakistan arms race. Both states rushed to get nuclear

weapons as part of their race for superiority. Yet as soon as both states developed them and produced a moderate amount of warheads, the race stopped. Both governments admitted that they feel safer ~~has~~ both having nuclear weapons but would never intend to use them.

Hence, nuclear weapons were and are hard to control because the potential benefits of status and power are often too great, especially if sovereignty protects countries from many consequences.



### ResultsPlus Examiner Comments

The introduction could tackle the question more directly but the response does go on to identify a number of reasons why nuclear arms control has been so difficult to achieve. Sovereignty is a key point as is the deterrent value of weapons and the power and prestige associated with having them.

A useful script which makes a number of points relevant to the question despite an obvious error or two.

Indicate your second question choice on this page.  
You will be asked to indicate your third question choice on page 9.

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

Chosen Question Number:

Question 1       Question 2       Question 3   
Question 4       Question 5

Nuclear arms control, has, since their development in the 1940s been difficult to establish effectively. The 1986 Non-proliferation Treaty was designed to prevent the spread of nuclear arms but has failed for several

reasons; the weakness of the International Atomic Energy Agency (IAEA) for example to effectively and thoroughly check its members led to the revelation that although it was a signatory, Iran had been ~~developing~~ <sup>holding</sup> nuclear arms programme for 18 years. Additionally the increased globalised world and the ~~up~~ <sup>break</sup> up of the USSR meant that nuclear technology is more widely available and harder to control. Finally the unwillingness of the ~~in~~ UN Security Council permanent members, USA, Russia, China, the UK and France have not followed up on plans to reduce their numbers of nuclear weapons in their stockpiles.

one of the key reasons why nuclear arms control has been so hard is because the IAEA has struggled to monitor

countries. The A feature of the Non-proliferation treaty was to allow states to examine nuclear technology for energy or medical purposes, with technological advice from nuclear enabled states. In return they would not develop nuclear weaponry. However despite this treaty, it came out in the 1990s that Iran had been secretly developing nuclear technology. This highlighted a flaw in the attempt to control nuclear arms and was bad for the IAEA's reputation. Furthermore issues have arisen with secretive North Korea, who, in 2009 set off an underground atomic test, much to the anger of the USA and nuclear arms control treaties. Here the IAEA is unable to monitor North Korea, who cut themselves off from the world, highlighting the issue of the IAEA is unable to deal with closed countries.

the non-proliferation of treaty banned, has been ignored by states like Libya, and other anti-western states, like the use of dual entry vehicles. \*

Finally, despite these problems, the unwillingness of the major nuclear powers to reduce their stockpiles has the merit that other countries are unwilling to reduce their own stockpiles or may want to develop nuclear weapons to protect themselves if a nuclear war came about. Despite promises at the Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty, stockpiles have not been reduced, showing that nuclear arms control is difficult <sup>when significant global players are involved.</sup>

\* More concerning, the availability of nuclear weapons means it is possible for terrorists or other violent groups who wish to impose significant damage on states acquiring and using nuclear arms.



## ResultsPlus

### Examiner Comments

A range of reasons is provided. These include the weakness of regulatory bodies such as the IAEA, the spread of nuclear know how in a globalised world, the failure of the NPT and the double standards of the current nuclear weapons states.

### Question 3

Sustainable development is development that meets the needs of the present without compromising the ability of future generations to meet their own needs. The implications of sustainable development include that economic and environmental goals should be considered in conjunction with one another, limits must be placed on economic growth which means that states will have to accept getting richer more slowly. Further implications may be that there will have to be a slowing down of the exploitation of finite fossil fuel and a change in human mind set. This was the least popular of the shorter questions.

A well written response with correct use of relevant terminology and a focus on the demand of the question.

Indicate your second question choice on this page.  
You will be asked to indicate your third question choice on page 9.

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

Chosen Question Number:

Question 1       Question 2       Question 3   
Question 4       Question 5

Sustainable development first came to political prominence at the 1992 Rio Earth Summit. It is an economic and social model aimed at countering humanity's adverse effects on the environment that centers around the modification of global economic systems and social values. As such it has had numerous implications for global politics.

Firstly, sustainable development implies that society's modernization and industrialization should have continuity and sustainability in mind. This means reducing resource usage to the global carrying capacity (this implies a radical reduction in the use of fossil fuels, for example) to ensure that the same standard of living can be enjoyed by future generations. This also suggests that investment into, and usage of, renewable resources

should be greatly encouraged as they provide a far more sustainable source of energy and fuel.

Secondly, sustainable development views <sup>unrestrained</sup> capitalism, the

dominant economic model across the world, especially when unrestrained in its free-market form, as the enemy of ecological sustainability. As such it implies an adaptation of capitalism to 'Green Capitalism', as it is sometimes called, in which focus are placed on businesses and individuals for generating waste, emitting or polluting. This has been seen across the world, but not quite on the scale many believe is needed.

Thirdly, sustainable development also implies a change in human attitudes away from 'growthism' and materialism. This does not go anywhere near as far as the 'post-material' society that radical ecologists long for, but does suggest that human values needed to be more closely allied to preservation in order to ensure that all future human development can continue at the same rate. This, unfortunately, seems the implication of sustainable development that has been most ignored by the global community.

Sustainable development has a number of important implications for human society but they none of them seem to have been given the attention that they demand.



### ResultsPlus Examiner Comments

A range of implications are identified and discussed. These include reduction in fossil fuel use, consideration for future generations, investment in renewables, adaptation and a change in human attitudes.



### ResultsPlus Examiner Tip

The strength of this script is that it retains a focus on the specific demands of the question.

## Question 4

This was a reasonably popular question which produced a variety of responses in terms of score. Stronger responses had an understanding of the Brandt Reports and the way in which they popularised the North-South division in the 1980's. Stronger responses explained that the divide drew attention to the practices of TNCs as well as the structural relationship between the North and South. The poverty and disadvantage of the South is in contrast to the prosperity of the North.

A pleasing response with a clear knowledge of the theory relating to this area.

Indicate your second question choice on this page.  
You will be asked to indicate your third question choice on page 9.

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

Chosen Question Number:

Question 1

Question 2

Question 3

Question 4

Question 5

The term 'North-South divide' was first coined in 1980 by the Brandt Report. It referred to the widening <sup>economic</sup> disparity, or 'chasm', between the global Northern hemisphere and the Southern, ~~the~~ divided by a latitude of 30° North. Since it was first proffered in the Cold War era, the term contributed to explaining the economic differences, and inequality, between the 'Third World' and the 'West'. Dependency, or neo-Marxist, theorists would advance this distinction in terms of the Northern hemisphere's exploitation of the Southern's resources. Immanuel Wallerstein took this theory further in his 'World Systems'



theory of development. It spoke of how the 'core' - by which he meant wealthy, industrialised 'Northern' countries - benefited from the concentration of capital, whilst the 'periphery' - alluding to the under developed, or 'developing' 'Southern' countries - <sup>was</sup> merely used as a source of raw materials. From such a perspective the 'North-South' divide contributes to explaining global poverty by advancing a neo-colonial view of the 'North's' exploitation of the 'South'.

However, since the collapse of communism around the world in the early 1990s, this dependency perspective of development has been discredited. In its place, the 'Orthodox', or 'Washington Consensus' theory, as well as an 'Alternative' theory, have emerged. This shifts the focus of the term 'North-South' divide from exploitation to dependency. As such Southern States have been considered to rely upon Northern aid and investment to raise them out of poverty. Yet, along with this change in emphasis, the term itself has been undermined. The distinction advanced by the North-

South divide fails to take into account the growth of within-country inequality and the reduction in

between & country inequality. For example the increase in south-south trade has propelled the 'Triper Nations' and BRIC countries, most prominently China, into the higher echelons of economic internationalisation.

So it can be seen that the 1980 phrase 'North-South' divide has contributed in two different ways to explaining global poverty - subject to the time period in which it is used - and also that it is becoming increasingly irrelevant as the advance of the global 'south' is witnessed.



**ResultsPlus**

**Examiner Comments**

This candidate produces a strong response in which they clearly show an awareness of the central theme of the question. The exploitative nature of the relationship is made clear and it is pleasing to note awareness of Wallerstein. Dependency theory and other perspectives on the North-South relationship are discussed.



**ResultsPlus**

**Examiner Tip**

Theory is only useful if relevant, as it is here.

## Question 5

This wasn't the most popular of questions but it was tackled very well by a significant number of students who had clearly been well prepared. They were able to provide a knowledge of the key elements of the theory and then a range of criticisms with a wide selection of relevant and impressive supporting material. The criticisms included that the theory is simplistic and that civilisations are complex and fragmented, they overlap, there is evidence of peace and harmony between civilisations as well as conflict within civilisations and that globalisation is bringing cultural homogenisation rather than tension and conflict.

A pleasing response with a range of criticisms identified.

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

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

Chosen Question Number:

Question 1       Question 2       Question 3   
Question 4       Question 5

The 'Clash of Civilisations' is Huntington's ~~theory~~<sup>thesis</sup> stating that in the post-Cold war world, the basis of conflict is culture and religion, not political ideology as seen in the Cold War.

The theory is said to be endemically flawed as ~~it is~~ neither Islam nor Christianity is a ~~monolithic~~ civilisation, as both have religious and political differences. The Islamic world is divided as there are ongoing ~~the~~ ~~the~~ splits between Sunni and Shia Muslims. The Islamic world has theocracies (Iran), absolute monarchies (Saudi Arabia) and democracies (Turkey and Malaysia). The West has parliamentary and presidential democracies as well as Catholic and Protestant countries.

Moreover, ostensibly rival civilisations actually harmoniously coexist as is proven by the peaceful

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

Muslims of the UK who enjoy equal rights to other citizens and appreciate the rights bestowed upon them by democracy.

Also the two civilisations are wholly dependent upon each other. The west needs the Muslim world as it is rooted in ~~the~~ oil-rich countries and these are indispensable to the economies of western states. Similarly the Muslim world needs the wealth created in the west to survive through aid.

Religious terror doesn't substantiate the theory because it has been denounced by ~~at~~ many Muslims across the globe. The attacks themselves are sporadic, not regular, and ~~do not~~ most Muslims see Jihad as a personal struggle for greater enlightenment and submission to God, not a holy war against the west.

~~The growing~~ However Huntington may be correct as the universality of both religions is conducive to a clash. Both are missionary religions, all-or-nothing religions and teleological religions which may prompt a clash.

Moreover, growing globalisation and interdependence between states ~~has~~ has meant that they

have ~~not~~ become more aware of their differences. Al-Jazeera was used by Al Qaeda to broadcast videos all over the world which was admonished by the West as it potentially radicalised otherwise peaceful, moderate Muslims.



### ResultsPlus Examiner Comments

A brief introduction but a number of criticisms are identified. Clashes within civilisations are discussed with examples and it is made clear that civilisations are fragmented. The candidate hints at the calming effect of complex interdependence. There is a heavy focus on Islam and the West.

A further good example which covers a range of criticisms with some very useful examples.

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

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

Chosen Question Number:

Question 1

Question 2

Question 3

Question 4

Question 5

The clash of civilisations is a thesis advanced by Samuel Huntington in 1993, suggesting that global order would now be shaped via culture conflict as opposed to previously seen ideological conflict. ~~As~~ Many have viewed this thesis as an over exaggeration in the least as is seen as an over simplification of global order and neglects the importance of economic and political factors. Furthermore it appears ignorant of

The multicultural implications of globalisation. The thesis outlines specific major ~~clashes~~ cultural clash between Islam and the west however political critiques such as some groups have advanced that developments such as the ~~Arab Spring~~ Arab Spring which Huntington would view as a clash actually demonstrates ~~the~~ the 'anthithesis' of a clash and it depicts ~~the~~ the spread and event of

western style democracy with civilisations in middle eastern countries calling for freedom and democracy as opposed to supported by the fundamentalist regime. ~~They~~ ~~are~~ the 'Islamic' civilisations supposedly stands for. In defining 6 civilisations (excluding Africa) Huntington maintains water tight bloc ~~and~~ ~~has~~ ~~thus~~ with clear cultural distinctions and has thus been accused of trying to recreate 'the certainties of a bipolar world' in trying to recreate a 'cold war-like status' of global order. ~~The~~ Critics have argued that fundamentalist movements such as Al Qaeda represent a 'the capture of big ideas by a band of crazed fanatics' thus depicting that the clash is caused ~~by~~ between the US and a minority group, not all 1.5 billion Muslims are fundamentalist and that many Muslim states have fiercely criticised Islamic fundamentalism. Furthermore Huntington's

Theis is seen as an oversimplification of culture politics as it does not take into account clashes within civilisations and the same cultures. For example the Sunnis and Shias are two different sets of Muslim groups

which have been in more or less constant conflict. Furthermore as a subsequence of globalisation, migration has created significantly multicultural capitals. The majority of the western world for example London's population of 7 million is one third ethnic minorities. ~~The~~

Moreover Huntington outlined a culture clash between China and the west, ~~the~~ this has been criticised on the basis that economic <sup>relations</sup> ~~interdependence~~ is far more important than any cultural clash that could potentially prevail. The USA China is an up and coming super power thus the west will need and desire it's investment and want to maintain good political relations with it.



**ResultsPlus**

**Examiner Comments**

A much better introduction which makes clear both the core of the theory and some of the central criticism. The idea of the spread of western democracy is useful as is discussion of clash within civilisations. The candidate discusses other criticism such as the economic interdependence which lessens the likelihood of a clash and the suggestion that clashes tend to be between minority fundamentalist groups.

## Question 6

This was quite a popular question and there were a number of pleasing responses which provided strong definitions as well as detailed, example laden, argument and counter argument. Candidates raised a number of arguments in support of the assertion in the title. They argued that universal moral values were impossible and that any values presented as such were based on a western model and perspective. They argued, in particular, that the importance of individualism, as presented in universal rights, may not be applicable in other societies. It was suggested that human rights were a justification for western economic, political and military influence globally. Alternative models were discussed including 'Asian values' and those based on divine, rather than human, authority. Counter arguments tended to be based on the rolling out of treaties, agreements and institutions based on universal rights.

This is a good example which remains relevant throughout.

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

Chosen Question Number:

Question 6

Question 7

Question 8

Human Rights are the rights that people can expect to receive by virtue of being human. The UN doctrine of human rights, established in 1948, outlines the rights which follows the ideas of universalism, that rights can be applied to all people regardless of their history, culture and religion. It is on this basis that many argue human rights are a form of western cultural imperialism being imposed on many different cultures despite the fact that they argue the doctrine does not apply to them as <sup>they</sup> ~~they~~ have many different ideas about the basis of human rights and how they should be implemented. Human rights have had more emphasis since the increase of the idea of cosmopolitanism and humanitarian intervention imposing western ideas



onto different cultures who do not wish to have them.

Realist thinkers such as Hobbes and Machiavelli argue that states only follow principles which benefit their national interest. Morgenthau argued in his six principles of realism that moral

considerations do not play a part in world politics. Due to this, realists would argue that human rights are a form of cultural imperialism. If states are not willing to consider moral assumptions and therefore act on them (humanitarian intervention) or promote human rights, then it must be a form of cultural imperialism. When western states such as the US, try and emphasise human rights, critics of humanitarian intervention have argued that states <sup>like the USA,</sup> often only intervene in states to consolidate their global hegemon status, so argue the US's intervention of Iraq was more for this and other reasons, such as securing oil supplies, than to promote human rights and democracy.

Liberals disagree with the realist ideas. Liberals argue that human rights are universal and are applicable to all people through the international system, regardless of their history, culture or religion. Therefore for the West to promote human rights elsewhere around the world, it is because they truly believe that the UN declaration of human rights relates to all. The recent drive for humanitarian intervention

from states around the world (excluding veto powers, China and Russia on the UN Security

Council) is due to the moral concern to prevent and halt the suffering that the human people are experiencing according to liberal thinkers.

The Asian values critique argue that a western notion of human rights are not applicable to Asian states due to their cultural differences such as a belief in a collective identity and the family rather than the individualism that the UNOHHR promotes. This was emphasised through the creation of the Bangkok declaration, which set out an alternative view of rights that the Asian cultures valued. Due to this, Asian cultures would argue that any effort by the western world to impose their belief of human rights onto them would be a form of western cultural imperialism.

However, critics of Asian values have emphasised the promotion of <sup>universal</sup> human rights and argue that the Asian values is a way for Asian cultures to justify their authoritarian regime and lack of human rights in their states such as China's treatment of Tibetans in Tibet and the Tiananmen Square Massacre.

The Islamic critique also argues that human rights are a form of western cultural imperialism. This is demonstrated by

Saudi Arabia's refusal to accept and implement the UN declaration of human rights, due to the fact that they impose shari'a law in their state, a strict form of Islamic rules on how to live in society. It is the West that views this as strict ~~an~~ due to their mainly liberal view of human rights, argued to be most advanced in Europe, but Islam followers argue that it is simply within the rules of their religion and as such argue that Western promotion of human rights is a form of imperialism.

A further argument that justifies the West's promotion of human rights is through the belief that many simply ~~cannot~~ do not have the capacity to argue for themselves. Feminists in particular cannot justify the treatment of women in Middle Eastern states such as ~~refused~~ ~~the~~ women were not allowed to be educated under the Taliban regime in Afghanistan and that women are not allowed to drive in Saudi Arabia. Feminists argue these women cannot fight for themselves and ~~it is~~ it is the West's responsibility to fight for the human rights of these women. The International Court of Justice is a means of making sure that people who do not have a voice receive the justice that

they deserve, in terms of receiving ~~the~~ inalienable human rights that they ~~deserve~~.

Critics of 'western' human rights argue that humanitarian intervention is a way of

Western nations implementing imperialism onto other cultures. The intervention of Libya in 2011 had the effect of removing Libya of its dictator, Gaddafi and ~~then~~ implementing a form of democracy within the state. As many African and Middle Eastern states do not follow democracies this is argued to be a form of Western cultural imperialism.

However, morals are argued to be changing and there is more of an emphasis placed onto promoting human rights.

Globalisation may have had a part in this, as people have been able to witness themselves the atrocities that occur around the world, beginning with Vietnam during the Cold War. As such, popular public opinion witnessing atrocities and the impact of non-intervention like Rwanda and Srebrenica argue that states in the West should do more to protect these people, and do not view it as a form of imperialism, merely the promotion of inalienable human rights.

Therefore, the belief of whether human rights

are a form of cultural imperialism or not stem <sup>arguably</sup> from which culture and part of the world you have grown up in or whose beliefs you consider to be correct. The idea is contested due to the conflicting values between the West and the rest of the world. Many are more likely to point out the USA in particular as inflicting cultural imperialism due to the controversy that surrounds many of its

actions in the political system such as <sup>the</sup> Iraq and Afghanistan and its desire to consolidate its global hegemony, but it is clear that ideas and beliefs are clearly defined in relation to a person's experiences and the culture that they consider themselves as belonging to.



**ResultsPlus**

**Examiner Comments**

A decent introduction which sets out the controversy in the title as well as a simple definition. A number of views are put forward. These range from the realist and liberal perspectives to an explanation of 'Asian values' and the Islamic critique. There is use of example, including events in Libya and further argument relating to the impact of globalisation.



**ResultsPlus**

**Examiner Tip**

This is a further example of a script which retains a clear focus on the demands of the question.

## Question 7

This was the least popular of the long responses although there were numerous examples of students who were well prepared for the question. Linking the theory of the 'tragedy of the commons' to climate change may have encouraged some candidates, with weaker or no knowledge of the theory, to look elsewhere. The theory has been the subject of a short and similar question in the past. Stronger responses would clearly need to explain the theory and relate it to climate change. Most responses would then move to presenting evidence to show both that cooperation has and hasn't effectively taken place to deal with climate change issues. Tensions between developing and developed states was a central theme as was an explanation of the perceived weakness of previous summits and treaties to bring about effective action. This was balanced with more optimistic discussion and evidence.

There is much to commend in this script. It demonstrates an awareness of the central demand in the question and the candidate carefully selects material to produce a relevant response.

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

Chosen Question Number:

Question 6

Question 7

Question 8

"Tragedy of the commons" is a term coined by Garrett Hardin, which refers to the clash between national interest and the collective good, regarding how <sup>states</sup> approach climate change. While 'tragedy of the commons' has had an impact on climate change, a lack of international co-operation between global north and global south states, and clashes between reformists and radicals on how to tackle climate change has also contributed to increasing problems surrounding climate change.

'Tragedy of the Commons' is a term used to describe the conflict between the collective good and fulfilling national interest. 'Global commons', like the seas and the atmosphere, are collective goods. However, global warming imposes costs on individual states, who then have to implement mitigating or adaption measures to lower emissions; which usually

comes at the expense of economic growth. A lack of responsibility regarding pollution of the air and seas has posed problems for those tackling CC. ~~Additionally~~ International co-operation surrounding climate change has been blighted by disagreements, and 'tragedy of the commons' has an impact on this. The global north and global south differ on the idea of 'common but differentiated

responsibility', which each side arguing the other should do more.

The global south argues the global north have a duty to bear the heavier burden ~~as~~ as they have emitted far more greenhouse gases (GHGs) and therefore have a historical responsibility to make ~~the~~ a concerted effort to cut emissions. GS states would also argue they have simultaneously prospered from industrialisation, the processes which damage the environment, and therefore must contribute. The idea of 'common but differentiated responsibility' originates from the RIO Earth Summit of 1992, where states signed the United Nations Framework

Convention on Climate Change (UNFCCC) which locked states into an agreement to curb emissions and hold annual 'Conferences of Parties' (COPs) to debate the effectiveness of current measures and discuss potential new ones. 'Common but differentiated responsibility' put the onus on GN states to cut their emissions and do more to be environmentally friendly, as they have ~~the~~ a historical responsibility to do so.

GS states also argue that they will be disproportionately affected by global warming, and they shouldn't be bound by emissions targets because that will hinder development.

Contrastingly, global north states argue the south should do more, as a collective effort is needed to combat the

effects of CC. China ~~has~~ surpassed the USA in terms of volume of emissions in 2008, although per capita, the USA emits four times higher Carbon dioxide. The Kyoto Protocol of 1997

did not set any legally binding targets on states to achieve, which angered the global north, and is significant because emerging states like China and India are big emitters. Those in the global north feel this is an example of states acting as 'free riders'; doing little to contribute but gaining from other state's endeavours. They feel this acts as a disincentive and dulls the drive to reduce climate change, as it shows a lack of collective effort.

Global north states would also argue they should only be judged on current emission levels, as the effects of emissions in early industrial times were unknown.

The clash between developed and developing states was evident at the Copenhagen CoP of 2009. While radicals would say the CoP was a failure as no successor to the Kyoto Protocol was formed, reformists would cite the large number of states present (163) and the 'meaningful agreement' in the form of the Copenhagen Accord, as significant signs of progression from Kyoto.

Radicals would bemoan the power politics that plagued the conference and arguably that it ~~had~~ stopped any concrete measures from being set. China were accused of flexing their evergrowing political muscle, and showing their new level of influence, obstructing <sup>the path to</sup> meaningful talks ~~and~~ states Developed states also seemed reluctant to make bold moves and commitments in the midst of a global financial crash. Did developed states show a lack of effort and drive, and prioritise repairing their



the national and global economy at Copenhagen?

Reformists would argue that progress was made in the form of China and the United States making commitments to curb emissions, which never happened at Kyoto. The fact that Brazil and India also drafted The Copenhagen Accord also showed a willingness and a new found acknowledgement of the problem of climate change from developing states, reformists would argue.

It could be argued at the CoP, states were looking after their national interests, namely focusing on their economies.

~~Radicals and reformists would each argue that climate change has been tackled~~

Radicals and reformists come from different ends of the environmental spectrum. Radicals would ~~criticise the~~ blame the ~~problems~~ problem of CC on the free market system, and the desire to maximise profits, instead of protecting the environment. They would accuse developed states of looking for the cheapest and easily accessible <sup>energy</sup> sources, i.e fossil fuels, in order to secure short-term profitability.

They would call for ambitious legally binding targets to be set <sup>on states</sup>, and for more green interventionism from the state and therefore a move away from the capitalist system that is the root of the problem.

Reformists, or modernists, see a balance between industrialisation as ~~the~~ ecology as the right approach. They ~~be~~ are sceptical about the level of CC, believing environmental NGOs have created

panic around the subject, and the effects are exaggerated.

They would rely on green innovation, through schemes like carbon trading, which is something radicals would oppose and

~~would criticise the Kyoto~~ see as one of the faults of the Kyoto Protocol, i.e. creating a loophole for states to exceed their targets by trading carbon, as well as treating it like a commodity. Reformists would also stress sustainable development, as future generations have a right to the same standard of life ~~that~~ that we have today.

In conclusion, I believe ~~rational interest~~ ~~has~~ climate change has manifested itself from 'tragedy of the commons' and namely state self-interest. The clash between global north and global south states at recent COPs has reinforced this argument, as both developed and developing states look to protect short term interests, like the US & China. However, does the Rio Earth Summit and Copenhagen Accord, as well as the foundations for a new legally binding agreement in 2015, counter this?



### ResultsPlus

#### Examiner Comments

A strong introduction which shows a pleasing knowledge of the theory of the 'tragedy of the commons' and how it applies to this debate. The conflict between developed and developing states is made clear with a discussion of the common but differentiated responsibility concept. There is an awareness of key summits and agreements with both positive and negative outcomes as well as the reformist and radical debate.



### ResultsPlus

#### Examiner Tip

This is clearly a knowledgeable candidate who has carefully selected relevant material from their knowledge as required for this particular question. Knowledge has to be applied to the question.

## Question 8

This was the most popular of the longer question. There was a particularly wide range of marks awarded for this question with superb responses as well as a few candidates who seemed to struggle to move beyond a one sided response based on little evidence. Stronger candidates explained that aid can be beneficial in socio-economic development and that the problem is that insufficient aid is given. The international target of 0.7 per cent of GNP aid donation has been met by very few states and that aid may only 'paper over the cracks'.

The counter argument tended to focus on a view that quantity of aid was less significant than quality and directing aid more effectively would help. There is a view that aid is counter productive as it can discourage initiative and self-reliance and that it can entrench corruption and oppression.

Another example of a response which remains focussed on the specific question and accumulates marks as a consequence.

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

Chosen Question Number:

Question 6

Question 7

Question 8

International aid is the transfer of goods or services from one state to another with the intention of alleviating suffering in the recipient state. ~~However,~~ The largest attempt to reinvigorate the giving of international aid was at the UN Millennium Development Summit in 2000 which, along with the Millennium Development Goals, states pledged to donate 0.7% of their GNP a year to ~~aid~~ international aid to developing countries. This, ~~by 2007, had~~ ~~has~~ ~~currently~~ only been met by 5 OECD states, with most states donating between 0.2-0.4% of GNP to developing countries. While some may argue that this is the only problem with international aid, ~~the~~ neoliberals and free-market economists argue that the concept is fundamentally flawed. Indeed, it does seem that aid can ~~be~~ do more harm than good, even if states did give enough.

~~'Free-market economists argue that~~

Some argue that the global trading system does not 'raise all boats' and ~~thus~~, with the 'core' exploiting and taking capital from the 'periphery', ~~exemplify~~ exemplifying the world systems theory and thus displaying fundamental flaws in the global capitalist system. From

this perspective, if ~~some~~ rich countries were to give enough to poor countries in aid then this would create a system of a counter-flow of significant amounts of capital from the 'global North' into the 'global South', or from the ~~core~~ 'core' into the 'periphery', thus levelling out these fundamental flaws in the global trade system. However, these funds would have to be substantial if they were to significantly reverse the world systems theory and this is currently being obstructed by one obstacle; the reluctance of rich states to donate enough to the poor. In this light, this is the only problem with international aid.

Alternatively however, free market economists argue that simply giving money to poorer states will never promote development and thus, this problem will always remain with regards to international aid, no matter how much money is donated by the rich. They argue that giving capital ~~to~~, food, clothing or other material commodities to poor states discourages enterprise and business, creating 'welfare states' reliant on 'handouts' from the rich. They point to the fact that \$568 billion has been donated to Africa by the rich states over the past four decades ~~and~~ yet nothing can be shown for the good use of this money. From this view, no matter how

much rich states give to the poor, international aid will inevitably fail.

Furthermore, international aid ~~is~~ has another fundamental

problem: it can fuel corruption. Capital or commodities are often donated bilaterally (from rich governments to poor governments) ~~and~~ however, no real checks or mechanisms exist for ensuring that this is used appropriately or distributed fairly. Money may be used by repressive governments to maintain their lifestyles of luxury while their people remain in poverty or ~~they may use~~ governments may use aid given to bribe their people for support. For example, in October 2010, Human Rights Watch found that the Ethiopian government had been using aid in a corrupt manner; the state had been donated fertilisers yet farmers who refused to support the government were denied these. In this sense, the fact that rich countries do not give enough cannot be regarded as the only problem with international aid.

On the other hand however, ~~it~~ some argue that states do not have to give commodities directly to a state government. By supporting or creating schemes such as infrastructure projects like the building of roads or the creation of irrigation channels, states both encourage enterprise, provide a long-lasting opportunity to prosper and benefit from this aid while also avoiding corruption.

Those who support this type of aid argue that the fact the countries like China, India and Brazil were once recipients of this type of aid and are now thriving economies point towards how successful international aid could be if only rich states were prepared to

invest in such aid, and contribute higher sums of money towards projects in developing countries.

In addition, while some may argue that international aid fundamentally discourages enterprise by giving 'handouts', it could potentially give rise to enterprise. This is because, currently, many within developing countries have to focus on subsistence farming in order to ~~survive~~ survive as without this food grown they would not be able to live. This therefore deters individuals from setting up profit-making businesses as they become too pre-occupied in meeting the day-to-day food requirements. It can be argued therefore, that if <sup>rich</sup> states donated enough with regards to food products then this would allow individuals in developing countries to prosper by giving them time to set up businesses that would otherwise have been focussed on food production.

However, free market economists and neoliberals have drawn attention to the flaws in this theory and have shown how rich countries have simply stunted growth in developing states. In the 1980s, ~~chicken~~ chicken farmers in Ghana and Senegal supplied most of the chicken meat demand in their states however since the EU has started ~~donating~~ 'dumping' cheap chicken in these countries, less than 50% cheaper than internal prices, farmers ~~end~~ in Ghana and Senegal have experienced a decline in their sales and they now only provide 11% of demand in their countries. In this light,

international aid in the form of cheap food ~~or any~~ ~~qualities~~ has stunted the growth of businesses in developing countries and ~~the~~ ~~entire~~ this are extending poverty in these areas. If rich countries were

to give more this would arguably exacerbate this problem, therefore displaying the inherent problems in the international aid idea.

In conclusion, ~~rich~~ rich countries have failed to ~~provide~~ donate substantial amounts of international aid to developing countries however this is not the problem. International aid is a fundamentally flawed concept that, on a long-term basis, entrenches poverty, discourages enterprise and gives rise to corruption even if rich countries



**ResultsPlus**

**Examiner Comments**

A strong and relevant introduction which is knowledgeable and well directed. Discussion of the core and periphery model of poverty and further central areas such as corruption and the support that aid can give to authoritarian regimes. There are examples used in support of argument.

## Paper Summary

This paper worked well as a discriminator between scripts and appeared to be accessible to all candidates.

Further advice

- Focus on the fact that four marks are available for the longer responses and that candidates need to demonstrate all four skills in order to maximise their score.
- The guidance document produced by the previous Principal Examiner helps candidates to prepare for future papers.
- Candidates, in this series, seem to have further developed the ability to present definitions and a clear indication, in introductions, of where their argument will progress. This should continue to be encouraged.



## **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](mailto:publication.orders@edexcel.com)

Order Code UA032372 June 2012

For more information on Edexcel qualifications, please visit

[www.edexcel.com/quals](http://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

