

Examiners' Report
June 2015

GCE Government and Politics 6GP03 3D

Edexcel and BTEC Qualifications

Edexcel and BTEC qualifications come from Pearson, the UK's largest awarding body. 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 or www.btec.co.uk.

Alternatively, you can get in touch with us using the details on our contact us page at www.edexcel.com/contactus.

ResultsPlus

Giving you insight to inform next steps

ResultsPlus is Pearson's free online service giving instant and detailed analysis of your students' exam results.

- See students' scores for every exam question.
- Understand how your students' performance compares with class and national averages.
- Identify potential topics, skills and types of question where students may need to develop their learning further.

For more information on ResultsPlus, or to log in, visit www.edexcel.com/resultsplus. Your exams officer will be able to set up your ResultsPlus account in minutes via Edexcel Online.

Pearson: helping people progress, everywhere

Pearson aspires to be the world's leading learning company. 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 our commitment to high standards and raising achievement through innovation in education. Find out more about how we can help you and your students at: www.pearson.com/uk.

June 2015

Publications Code UA041712

All the material in this publication is copyright
© Pearson Education Ltd 2015

Introduction

It is particularly pleasing to be able to report that students, on the whole, appeared very well prepared for the Summer 3D examination. Subject knowledge was very strong indeed and there was, for the most part, a pleasing focus on the wording of the questions. The most popular short questions were on the liberal approach to global politics and on the significance of hard power. The most popular long response was the question on the impact of globalisation. The least popular response was the short question on EU Intergovernmentalism and Supranationalism and the least popular long question was the one on global governance.

Question 1

The question on the liberal approach to global politics worked well as a discriminator. Most candidates were clearly well prepared for this question and the stronger candidates were able to provide a depth of explanation and examples which clearly placed them in L3 marks. This was the second most popular short question in the examination series. Candidates mentioned a range of elements including how liberalism stresses morality, peace and cooperation. Conflict isn't inevitable and compromise and a balance of interests leads to a possibility of peace and cooperation. Free trade is considered to provide prosperity and mutual benefit which encourages peace between states. A belief in internationalism was mentioned by many as well as a stress on complex interdependence which encourages cooperation. A number of candidates discussed the 'democratic peace thesis' and also discussed the development of international law and of international organisations as further indicators of and providers of peace and stability.

This is a very strong script which covers a range of elements associated with Liberalism.

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

Liberalism originates from idealism in reverse that it focuses on ideals and is optimistic about global order and the potential for cooperation. A key feature of liberalism is the notion of universal principles such as human rights. This reflects the liberal belief that all accessible humans should have the opportunity to be treated fairly and equally and can be exemplified by the UN Universal Declaration of Human Rights in 1948. Moreover, liberals favour ideals such as human rights over power politics. They believe that moral principles should guide state policy in comparison to the realist who, as Hobbes describes the world as believe life is "nasty, brutish, short". The liberal belief in morals over power politics can be seen in the 1975 Helsinki Agreement whereby

The USSR was forced to accept human rights as important. Thus liberalism takes a more altruistic approach to global politics and places consideration on morals and rights rather than power politics.

Another key feature of liberalism is the belief in cooperation within anarchy rather than each state merely pursuing their own self interests as realists believe. ~~Common~~ Commercial liberalism especially places importance on free trade as a way to ensure cooperation and ~~peace~~ ^{order} and ~~peace~~ ^{stability} as a way of securing "hands of eternal peace" as each state is mutually benefited and thus to wage war would be unthinkable. Moreover, Republican ~~liberals~~ liberals emphasise that the internal conditions of a state reflect the external behaviour. This forms the basis of the democratic peace thesis which claims democracies are not likely to go to war due to their democratic nature, as the public votes restrict their government. In comparison, autocratic regimes are unlimited by such elections and such as in Syria and Libya cause instability and tension. Thus, although stemming from different ~~the same~~ ways of facilitating peace and stability through cooperation, ~~liberal~~ a core liberal principle is the promotion of peace and cooperation.

Liberals are also ~~more~~ more in favour of international organisations in order to coordinate global affairs. Institutional liberals believe that a global legislature, ~~and~~ executive and judiciary could eventually be formed in order to regulate global affairs.

and enforce peace. This has been likened to the UN and globalisation which encompasses 193 states through a range of functions. Institutional liberalism reflects the liberal acceptance of anarchy in global affairs, but attempts to work within anarchy to reduce competition and instability. Indeed, Kant claims that "international organisations can constrain decision makers positively, by positively promoting peace" and this can be seen to be evident concerning the UN as the UN is attributed to have caused the peaceful settlement since 1945. Thus liberals favour coordination between states in order to reduce tensions and control the anarchic global and climate change international organisations which may be able to restrict nation states' volatility.

Therefore, the key features of liberalism essentially revolve around the optimistic belief of for peace and as Keohane and Nye suggest the "complex interdependencies, interdependence" in this global affair through the economy, political ideas and other international organisations.



ResultsPlus Examiner Comments

Optimism, global order and cooperation are discussed. There is a brief comparison with Realism. Free trade, the 'democratic peace thesis', international organisations and complex interdependence are all referenced.



ResultsPlus Examiner Tip

Examples help to support a line of discussion. Contemporary examples work well. There is a dated example used here but it is still valid.

global supply chain, therefore despite the factor that they have different cultures they are not inclined to work together in an economic version of 'Mutually Assured Destruction', as any tendency of war would be unthinkable as it would harm trade, suggests a positive outlook of human nature in global politics.

Furthermore, another ~~example~~ key feature of the liberal approach to global politics is republican liberalism, which suggests that the constitutional make-up of a state is vital in suggesting how a state exerts itself on the world stage. Democratic states are more inclined to cooperate and negotiate disputes, whereas authoritarian states are not. This is because authoritarian states are usually immune to popular pressure, thus the way they exert their influence in their state e.g. militarily, illustrates how they exert themselves on the world stage, using force as a mechanism. This idea can most certainly tie with states like Syria whose authoritarian regime has reflected how they deal with matters on the world stage. Thus, liberals argue that democratic states are vital for global politics and its operation efficiently.

In addition, another key feature of the liberal approach to global politics is ~~republican liberalism~~, or institutional liberalism, illustrates that just as in domestic politics there

is a body that exerts influence from above, the same can stand for global politics. In that the UN has become a vital organ for collective security and dealing with international disputes, with its global wider agenda. In this sense in contrast to realists, liberals illustrate the importance of international organisations to function global politics and act as a form of 'police' for the international system. In that UN has been considerable important in ^{peacekeeping} ~~peace~~ missions that work to deal with problems at a local level, to prevent them intensifying on to the world stage as noted in Sierra Leone 1998 to 2005, aiming to end civil war.



ResultsPlus Examiner Comments

The benefits of democracy and of international institutions are raised.



ResultsPlus Examiner Tip

Further use of examples would help to strengthen this response.

Question 2

The question on unipolarity worked well as a discriminator and was reasonably popular. A few candidates proceeded to discuss the benefits and negatives of other polar structures but the majority stayed on track. There was a great deal of support for the idea that unipolarity both exists now and has provided a degree of stability with the US as the dominant state, acting as the 'world's police force', preventing war and ensuring the status quo. Candidates argued that the dominant state has an interest in providing economic and financial stability and leadership. A number of candidates argued that the US acts as a benign hegemon. Stronger responses also put forward the view that unipolarity can lead to fear, resentment and hostility among other actors, particularly where the dominant state is considered to act as a predatory hegemon. Unipolarity, in this view, is considered to be an unstable system.

This is a reasonable response to the question set which remains relevant throughout. It comes close to straying into a consideration of whether or not unipolarity currently exists but explains that power can be measured, for example in economic, military and structural ways.

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

Unipolarity refers to a global system in which there is one major source of power which transcends all others. There are disagreements about the implications of such a system since determining when one exists is difficult. For example some may argue the current system is unipolar. They would argue the USA is a global hegemon (from the Greek 'Hegemonia' meaning leader) and that this arose from it defeating Russia in the Cold War. However there is debate as to whether the USA truly is the only source of great power. For example if one were to split power into three sections; economical, cultural and military, it is becoming increasingly difficult to decipher which is most

important. The 'USA remains' the only military superpower, ^{accounting for} spending 50% of global military spending, but as hard power becomes less effective does multipolarity ensue? Cultural and economical power have increasingly important in deciding where the ultimate power lies and the implications for world order. ~~As realist~~ ^{Some} argue unipolarity creates peace as none wish to challenge the one superpower. However some realists argue a balance of power, ^{between two superpowers} must exist for there to be peace, as the fear of mutual destruction keeps any aggression at bay. This bipolar system maintained relative peace until the Cold War, calling in to question whether it is the most conducive to peace. The unipolar system that existed in the wake of the Cold War was arguably peaceful however there were many wars since the victory; many of which the US has been involved (Iraq war, war in Afghanistan, etc.). This has made it more difficult to establish the main implication of unipolarity. The 'structural power' the USA has over most of the world through organisations founded at Bretton Woods do help spread the Washington Consensus and therefore foster co-operation and peace. However the apparent disregard for ^{other} cultures ~~has lead~~ has lead to tensions in the East and even religious extremism as a reaction.

In conclusion, there has been so much disagreement about the implications of unipolarity since it is difficult to establish which outcomes are better, or worse, than others. Unipolarity ~~has helped development that~~ has helped foster peace as it did in the post-Cold War era however it has also lead to conflict through the rise of challenging states such as Russia and through religious fundamentalism such as the rise of the Islamic State.



ResultsPlus

Examiner Comments

Examples of instability in Iraq and Afghanistan are mentioned. The spread of the Washington Consensus is used to illustrate both a provision of peace and cooperation as well as a cause of tension alongside cultural dominance.

This is a decent response which covers contrasting views on the implications of unipolarity.

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

Unipolarity is a situation in global order when there is one pre-eminent power, or hegemon, whose political, economic, military and cultural influence is unmatched by a significant margin. It has been argued that the USA is currently the global hegemon.

It is argued that unipolarity is beneficial for global order as through the elimination of rivals, the hegemon grants the world peace; such as 'Pax Americana' (current) or the preceding 'Pax Britannica'. Since no other state has the capability to challenge the hegemon, Gilpin argues in his 'hegemonic stability theory', there is an absence of conflict.

Furthermore, the hegemon, if benign by nature, can serve as a 'police state' and put an end to smaller conflicts between states and act as a peacemaker - as was the intention of the First Gulf War in which USA repelled

invading Iraqi forces from Kuwait.

Thirdly, it is likely that smaller states would believe in line with liberal theory and 'bandwagon' the power of the hegemon and forego selfish national interest in order to benefit from potential 'absolute gains' afforded by the hegemon, such as development grants.

However, realists argue that without a "balance of power" (order pde with equally distributed power), it is more likely that a 'malign' hegemon could be created that would use its pre-eminent power to pursue state-selfish interest on the global stage - it has been argued that the US invasion of Iraq 2003, in the face of UN ruling it illegal was an example of this. This implies that global order would be compromised and that an anarchy, would ensue.

In addition Gilpin's Hegemonic Cycle theory indicates that even if the hegemon were, benign and acted to improve other states, the rapid growth of these rival states could lead to a hegemonic war due to the fact - as argued by realists - a hegemon would not be willing to give up power.

In conclusion therefore, the disparity in views as to whether unipolarity could improve a peaceful global order or cause a more anarchic and dependent

on the nature of the hegemon and the ambitions
of the ^{other} states in the global system



ResultsPlus

Examiner Comments

Unipolarity is defined and explained with both the positive view of a benign hegemon and the negative elements of a 'malign' or predatory hegemon. Examples support the response. A reference to long cycle theory is relevant.

Question 3

This was the least popular of the short questions though there were some very strong responses where candidates were able to discuss the intergovernmental and supranational features of the EU in great detail. Strong definitions of the key terms helped to ensure that stronger responses had a good base for discussion. Intergovernmentalism refers to interaction amongst states which takes place on the basis of sovereign independence. Intergovernmentalism suggests that there is no higher power than the state. Supranationalism is based on the idea that there can be an authority that is higher than the nation-state and which can impose its will on the state. Most students made clear that the European Court of Justice can over-rule member state law which would suggest that it is a supranational body and that the European Parliament, European Central Bank and European Commission are also considered to be supranational bodies. The Council of Ministers operates through a mixture of voting principles with important decisions being taken by unanimous agreement and others by qualified majority voting. There is some debate over this institution but it is primarily considered to be an intergovernmental institution.

This is a decent response which covers a range of institutions.

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 EU was founded by Schuman & Monnet who intended the organisation to function as a federal state and therefore facilitated an 'implanting' various supranational elements to the organisation. Churchill stated that after the second world war supranationalism was the best way for Europe to defend itself against another war he called for the creation of a 'united states of Europe'. However national sovereignty remains important in global politics and thus the EU holds numerous intergovernmental elements such as the right to veto in the Council of Ministers the existence of the EU Council & the introduction of the principle of subsidiarity at the treaty of Lisbon in 2009. The EU works with a supranational core with the Single European Act, universal rule of justice and European Parliament as well as an intergovernmental organisation creating 'the speed Europe'.

Firstly the EU can be considered to be an intergovernmental organisation due to the fact that the members of the Council of Ministers maintain the veto on key issues of sovereignty. On issues such as defence and immigration the same members of the Council of Ministers are able to veto decisions about protecting their national interests and ensuring that the EU operates as an intergovernmental organisation. An example of this is when Germany vetoed a proposal to place a ban on all immigration of citizens. This will show that through the Council of Ministers the EU works as an intergovernmental organisation.

Similarly the EU Council sees the heads of state of the 27 member states come together and debate key issues. This body can be seen as an intergovernmental organisation as it sees the heads of states represent the interests of their own nation thus helping to protect sovereignty and ensuring that the EU functions as an intergovernmental organisation.

Furthermore the 2009 Treaty of Lisbon introduced the principle of ^{Subsidiarity} ~~substitut~~, which states that decisions that can be made at a state level should be made there and not at a federal level. This gives greater power to the individual states as it allows them to protect their own foreign self interests. Subsidiarity is an element of EU intergovernmentalism.

However the EU also functions as a supranationalist organisation. The single European act of 1987 saw the creation of a single European free market where goods can be traded freely. This universal nature of the act was taken further at the Treaty of Maastricht with the introduction of a single currency allowing the European Central Bank to set common ^{monetary} ~~com~~ _{commonality}.

Single free market demonstrate the supranational elements of the EU.

Furthermore the Treaty of ^{Nice} ~~was~~ introduced into the Council of Ministers. This is an example of EU supranationalism as it reduces the ^{reduces} ~~reduces~~ the ~~single~~ ^{single} sovereignty of the member states. ~~then~~ Laws may be passed ~~with~~ ⁱⁿ a majority despite the ~~vigorous~~ ^{vigorous} opposition by a state and following the ~~establishment~~ ^{establishment} of EU law ~~supersedes~~ ^{supersedes} state law ~~even~~ ^{even} if a state is ~~powerful~~ ^{powerful} in opposition. This was seen in the ~~Belgian~~ ^{Belgian} case of 2004 where the ECJ ruled the holding of refer subjects without trial to be illegal despite the ~~threat~~ ^{threat} to the nation. The restriction of state sovereignty put in place at Nice shows how EU ~~supranationalism~~ ^{supranationalism} works.

Finally the EU Parliament is a supranational organisation. ~~Members~~ ^{Members} sit not according to their country but in their political party. They do not represent their state but represent European ideas and this is a clear example of European supranationalism.

In conclusion following the second world war the focus of the EU was to create a supranational federal state. However at the turn of the 21st century the sense of supranationalism has reached a point where state sovereignty is being ~~impinged~~ ^{impinged} on the elements of intergovernmentalism are being ~~introduced~~ ^{introduced}. leaving the creation of a dual speed Europe with a ~~fast~~ ^{fast} supranational core and an intergovernmental shell.

* Supranationalism is where decisions are made as a collective and apply to each member state as opposed to intergovernmentalism which dictates that each member state is able to make their own decisions and keep their national identity which is justified for the cohesion of intergovernmentalism.

(Total for Question = 15 marks)



ResultsPlus

Examiner Comments

Initially lacking a definition of the key terms, this response does move to discussion of a number of institutions and ways in which the EU can be considered both intergovernmental and supranational. The Council of Ministers and veto in areas such as defence is useful and it was pleasing to note a reference to the subsidiarity principle. QMV in the Council of Ministers and discussion on law making and the EU Parliament all help to strengthen this response.



ResultsPlus

Examiner Tip

A definition at the start rather than end of a response helps to provide a better focus for a response.

A good response which provides definitions and examples to illustrate a clear understanding.

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

Intergovernmentalism refers to a system of cooperation (in this case regional, in Europe), whereby states come together and make decisions based on consensus. This means that each state retains a sense of sovereignty through a national veto. On the other hand, supranationalism describes a more federal idea of an 'above the state' power, where sovereignty is pooled, and decisions made by this 'above the state' power can technically impose binding rules upon states who don't vote for that certain policy or rule. The EU, the largest and most powerful regional organisation, displays elements of both intergovernmentalism and supranationalism.

The European Committee (before the EU) was set up to "make men work together" (Monnet). This intergovernmental streak has been retained in the modern EU in the European Council, where the heads of state/government of the 28 member states come

together 4 times a year to discuss and make unanimous decisions on the strategic direction of the union. Furthermore, the Council (of Ministers), which passes important legislation and policies on matters including the Common Defence and Security Policy, until 2009 operated nearly entirely on a consensus-based decision-making system, ensuring that each state had a national veto. This was ~~so~~ expressed after the Luxembourg compromise of 1966, whereby matters of national importance in the Council had to ~~be~~ involve the use of a national veto.

However, some elements of the Council of Ministers have become increasingly supranational. After the Treaty of Nice in 2003 and ^{especially} the Treaty of Lisbon in 2009, many more policy areas fell under 'qualified majority voting', rather than previous unanimous decision-making. This meant that even the largest states, like the UK and France holding 29 of the total 352 votes, would be outvoted. Policies taking on this supranational nature included economic reform and agriculture. Since 2019, double majority voting has extended this supranational policy further. The other EU legislature, the European Parliament, also eschews supranational elements, as members sit

according to political alliances rather than their state membership. This means that national interests could be superseded by trans-border political ones, which is backing for realist thinkers. The implementation of policy is also seen to be somewhat 'supranational', as the exclusive competence of the Commission (outlined in the TFEU in Lisbon) demonstrates. It refers to certain policy areas, such as fisheries, where the EU has power to act over member states. This is mixed with elements of intergovernmentalism as some competences were under 'shared' and 'supporting'.

Finally, the EU law is collectively binding on member states through the ECJ, and other agencies, its members, such as the ENEC (an Italian electricity company) had its ruling in ENEC v Costa overturned. Overall, the institutions and functioning of the EU demonstrate how it has both an intergovernmental and supranational character.



ResultsPlus Examiner Comments

Definitions of the key terms are clear and precise. There is discussion of The Council and of both the Veto and QMV to illustrate how the EU can be both intergovernmental and supranational. Further discussion references the EU Parliament and both the Commission and ECJ.

Question 4

This was the most popular response in the first section of the examination paper and worked well as a differentiator. Some candidates failed to pursue the 'hard' economic line and some spent all of their time answering the question 'How is it significant?' rather than 'How significant has it been?' A few candidates ignored the phrase 'recent years' and focused exclusively on dated examples. There were, however, some very strong responses to this question. Stronger candidates included recent examples and discussed soft and even smart power.

A reasonable response which mentions a range of factors, clearly understanding 'hard power' and providing contemporary 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

Hard power is the use of or the threat of the use of force or economic inducements in order to influence the actions of a country or another actor. The use of military force has arguably become less significant in recent years because in an increasingly interdependent and globalised world, the threat of use of military force has become less desirable because it is now more costly for countries to intervene militarily. For example the ^{Afghanistan war} Iraq has largely been counterproductive for the USA because the nature of wars has changed and it is harder to win with just military force. Al Qaeda have used guerilla tactics which have been difficult to combat even with the USA's hard power and so the ~~attain~~ military power aspect of hard power has become less significant.

The use of economic inducements on the other hand has become more relevant as interdependence between countries means that countries can use economic sanctions to gain leverage over other countries. The EU sanctions on Russia for example have been used instead of military power because Russia relies heavily on the EU to buy its oil exports, therefore any economic sanctions on Russia would force Russia to be more cooperative. The use of positive and negative economic inducements has become more significant lately due to increased economic interdependence therefore whilst the military aspect of hard power has become less significant, the use of economic inducements has made hard power more significant.

Hard power has also become less significant due to the rise in the use of soft power. Soft power is more popular than hard power because hard power has often resulted in the destruction of areas and the killing of innocent civilians. The Iraq War is an example of this as the USA's use of hard power to overthrow Saddam Hussein's regime was very unpopular.



ResultsPlus Examiner Comments

The response begins with a very brief nod to what hard power represents and references both military and economic elements. Cost of hard power use and a growing interdependence are used to explain a demise in hard power as well the failure of hard power when faced with opponents who use guerrilla tactics. Sanctions involving the EU and Russia are relevant as is the growth of soft power.



ResultsPlus Examiner Tip

A further development of soft power to explain the growing relevance would have strengthened the response.

Question 5

This was quite a popular response and was generally well answered with most candidates able to identify at least two clear criticisms of the IMF. Many candidates provided a brief explanation of what the IMF was formed to do in order to be able to outline criticism. Most criticism of the IMF tended to focus, primarily, on issues relating to policy and vote distribution. There have been accusations that the IMF is a tool of the North in general and of the US specifically, to force global South to adopt a particular business model which benefits global North rather than South. The structural adjustment programmes, impact on sovereignty and emphasis on the Washington Consensus have been clear areas of criticism. The vote distribution of the IMF is based on member states' contributions to the IMF fund which ensures that the US has been the dominant state based on its voting strength. Changes to voting allocations do take place but continue to be an area of controversy with global South states having relatively little say in voting whilst the US, EU members and other global North states enjoy significant voting power. Some candidates went further to discuss occasional IMF support for military dictatorships and to human rights abusers as well as a failure to prevent and also remedy the global financial crisis beginning in 2007.

A very strong response which covers a range of criticisms of the organisation with decent factual knowledge. Remains relevant throughout.

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 IMF is a leading IGO with 188 members.
It was established as part of the Bretton Woods Agreement in 1944 to promote global financial stability, and its arguably its most important function is that of lender of last resort to ~~develop~~
developing countries.
A central criticism of the IMF is its failure in terms of 'surveillance' - its basic purpose of monitoring the global economy to prevent crises. This is particularly in consideration of the global financial crisis of 2008, where it failed to acknowledge the imbalances in the economy. Consequently, it can be seen that the IMF is

not critical enough of unregulated markets due to its blind following of the 'Washington Consensus' and its associated neo-liberal policies (trade liberalisation, privatisation and encouragement of foreign direct investment to name but a few.) Although the IMF has gone some way to improving the stability of national economies, by providing Flexible Credit Lines (FCLs) to prevent capital flight (Mexico currently has access to a \$47 billion credit line), this does not compensate for its fundamental failure to maintain global economic stability.

In addition the IMF can be seen to be dominated by the West. Votes within the institution are weighted according to economy, essentially meaning that influence can be bought. Most notably the USA has over 15% of the vote, amounting to an effective power of veto - a clear illustration of the hegemon's dominance in terms of setting the agenda ('structural' power is thus accumulated). Added to this, the IMF is headquartered in Washington D.C., was set up by the USA, and is, by convention, led by an European. One is left with no other option but to view the IMF therefore as an institution that was established and continues to operate to the benefit of the rich nations of the global North, with little internal reform having occurred or looking likely.

Finally, the IMF is seen as an instigator of neo-colonialism - that is to say that it is part of the global capitalist system that systematically locks Wallerstein's 'World systems theory' into place (keeping the ~~poor~~ in the periphery poor and dependent and industrialised core rich). This is exemplified by the IMF's ^{conditionalities} ~~imposition~~ of Structural Adjustment Programmes (SAPs) upon poor states in the 1980s, which ~~put~~ imposed 'Washington consensus' policies upon desperate developing states. These states had little choice but to accept, since the IMF is lender of last resort. Not only has trade liberalisation damaged infant industries (which need protectionism so states can develop competitive economies of scale) but it has allowed the global North to plunder developing markets with little to lose themselves (the EU and US maintain agricultural subsidies). Although the IMF has since introduced Poverty Reduction Strategy Papers taking more account of individual circumstances, this ~~opportunity~~ doesn't compensate for the damage already caused by 'one size fits all' SAPs.



ResultsPlus

Examiner Comments

A brief background is linked to the first point on the current financial crisis. Policies linked to the Washington Consensus and dominance by certain states, notably the US, are re-elected upon. Neo-colonialism and SAPs are also relevant areas of discussion.

This is typical of a number of strong responses which made clear the aim of the IMF before outlining in some detail at least three significant criticisms.

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 International Monetary Fund was founded under the Bretton Woods system in 1945 to police the fixed exchange rates. Its role has changed since then due to both the change in the global economic policies shifting towards neo-liberalism and the move away from fixed exchange rates. Its modern task is both to monitor the global financial system to maintain stability and act as a lender of last resort to poor countries. It has been criticised for how it has carried out both of these aims though mostly the latter.

The IMF upon granting loans to poor countries agrees a set of economic reforms that need carrying out, which questionably impedes sovereignty as the countries are in little position to turn down the loans. These conditions are based on the neo-liberal Washington Consensus and may be wholly unsuited to

the needs of the country as they might increase trade difficulties by opening up unready markets to foreign competition or by the need to reduce state size cut welfare payments or poverty reduction programmes ^{hurting} ~~causing~~ those ^{most} in need of help. Joseph Stiglitz has been critical of how the IMF's 'one size fits all' approach has exacerbated the problems caused by these countries. Incredibly the IMF has also faced criticism from free-market economists who say their intervention in an attempt to move towards free markets is also damaging as it creates artificial market conditions which do not fully allow for the development of the market.

The IMF is also seen as in thrall to the west, most notably the USA where it is based and its deputy chair always comes from, not only as they are the often the ones to benefit from the opening up of LDC markets but they also have the biggest influence on the IMF board the US having 18% voting rights the EU 31% meaning that countries who will never be highly unlikely to need the IMF have the biggest say ^{and} leading to the suggestion that they influence it for their own benefit. Susan George

notes how there is no collective body on education similar to the IMF, which she sees as established in its current form to keep world order the way it is.

Finally the IMF has been criticised as an ineffective regulator for its failure to predict the 2007 Financial Crisis or in the aftermath of it, the IMF's failure to come up with a solution, which was ~~the~~ ^{instead} predominantly G20 led. This has led to calls for greater powers for the IMF which so far has come to nothing.

In conclusion the IMF has been criticised for being unrepresentative, serving western interests, being ineffective and enforcing policies on countries unsuited for them criticisms which so far they have failed to sufficiently address.



ResultsPlus

Examiner Comments

The introduction sets out a brief background to the organisation to include aims. Impact on sovereignty relating to the Washington Consensus is made clear. The 'one size fits all' criticism is made and there is reference to US dominance and to failings relating to the recent financial crisis.

Question 6

This was the least popular of the questions but still worked well as a discriminator. The better responses were able to explain the key term and to assess the effectiveness of a range of relevant organisations. A few candidates focused solely on economic governance. Global governance is a complex process of political interaction and decision making aimed at solving problems that affect more than one state or region when there is no power of enforcing compliance. States and governments remain the most significant institutions for decision-making but intergovernmental and supranational bodies can also operate. Decisions are made by a system of horizontal and vertical interactions between officials in different levels of government working with counterparts from other states. A number of candidates assessed a wide range of institutions before coming to the conclusion that global governance may be seen more as an emerging process than a contemporary reality.

This response is typical of a stronger answer which covers a range of institutions with analysis and debate.

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

Chosen Question Number:

Question 6

Question 7

Question 8

Global Governance is largely described as a system of world with international cooperation. It has been increasingly difficult to describe global governance therefore it's defined in terms of what it's not. Global governance is defined with the help of three other global political scenarios.

Firstly international anarchy i.e. absence of a higher authority in the world which is presumed to lead to disorder and chaos. Anarchy as perceived by realists is inevitably leads to conflict & war. For realists the world if left in the

State of nature without any government or authority will end in chaos due to selfish and self-seeking nature of people. So realists see bipolarity as the most stable situation. where two powers cancel each other out. Furthermore

a single authority that is responsible for global politics. This is an extreme scenario and is highly unlikely. Global governance is described as international cooperation in the absence of a higher authority / or simply put in the absence of a World government.

Global Governance is characterized by qualities such as polycentrism where different institutions work together. Global governance is marked by intergovernmentalism i.e. cooperation of states largely on the basis of integrated international organization such as OPEC (Oil & Petroleum Exporting countries).

The biggest example of global governance can be seen as in the form of economic global governance, i.e. the Bretton Woods system, ^{in 1944} after the WWII in order to assure stability & prevent economic instability of interwar period several countries gathered together like USA (United States of America), UK etc. to formulate a system to stabilize global economy. Bretton Woods led to formation of three new bodies of global governance i.e. IMF (International Monetary Fund), WB (World Bank) and WTO (World Trade Organisation) which replaced GATT in 1955.

Bretton Woods system introduced economic policies such as fixed exchange rate in terms of US dollar which was exchangeable to gold for \$25/ounce, free trade i.e. removal of trade barriers eg. tariff, quota, dumping etc & easier loans for reconstruction of war stricken/damaged areas. Bretton Woods system was criticised in 2007-9 period as it was unable to prevent the financial crisis of 2007-9. IMF individually

was criticized as favouring dominant & developed countries & controversial conditions it placed for loans. Furthermore World Bank was criticized for its unfair voting system which was reformed in 2010. WTO however was most successful amongst the 3 organisations as it was able to reduce tariffs from 47% to 3% during its time period of 1947-2000. Furthermore it reduced non-tariff barriers to a greater extent which helped developing countries. Bretton Woods system was abolished due to its incapability to prevent & deal with 2007-9 financial crisis during which GDP of world fell by 1.7% & world trade fell by 61%. Decline of USA's hegemonic power & rise of BRIC's (Brazil, Russia, India, China) as powers of the world also led to decline of Bretton Woods as it was largely dictated by USA.

Institutions such as G7-8 and G20 which were established after failure of Bretton Woods are considered good examples of global governance where group of 8 or group of 20 countries worked together to deliberate upon issues of global politics.

particularly the 2007-9 crisis of the financial sector.

WTO which was replaced in 2001. WTO however was most successful amongst the 3 organisations as it was able to reduce tariffs from 47% to 3% during its time period of 1947-2000. Furthermore it reduced non-tariff barriers to a greater extent which helped developing countries. Bretton Woods system was abolished due to its incapability to prevent & deal with 2007-9 financial crisis during which GDP of world fell by 1.7% & world trade fell by 61%. Decline of USA's hegemonic power & rise of BRICs (Brazil, Russia, India, China) as powers of the world also led to decline of Bretton Woods as it was largely dictated by USA.

Institutions such as G7-8 and G20 which were established after failure of Bretton Woods are considered good examples of global governance where group of 8 or group of 20 countries worked together to deliberate upon issues of global politics particularly the 2007-9 crisis of the financial sector.

United Nations although can be categorized as a form of intergovernmentalism for its general assembly runs on the concept of ~~one vote~~ one country-one vote. The issues of global politics are deliberated in General Assembly & all states are *quasi* equal power in voting however UN is criticized for its highly paralyzed Security Council which has permanent 5 members that have the veto power. This portrays UN as a organization run by great powers rather than mutual cooperation of 192 countries that are the members of UN.

Today's world is highly recognized as characterized by multi level governance where power is distributed ~~into~~ between three levels supranational, national & local. However sovereignty is the core feature of all states therefore international organizations are largely condemned for hampering sovereignty & largely unaccountable & undemocratic.

Intergovernmentalism for realist is not possible

as states are self seeking and selfish and national interests are kept before the interest of all countries. Although in a highly globalized world, all issues e.g. environmental, ^{terrorism} global warming etc have an international nature and need to be solved by mechanisms of global governance. This is not done in reality. The organizations that characterize global governance are largely flawed & viewed as the tool of hegemony or the super power USA. So the system of global governance if working appears to be real & marked by intergovernmentalism rather than supranationalism however they are dominated by leading countries especially USA which is considered as the hegemonic power or are largely presumed to be protecting interests of developed world. Despite liberalist view of inevitable global governance due to globalization. In reality global politics operates with a system of global hegemony where USA in particular dominate these tools of global governance for increasing its power.

The spreading of ideologies & culture - the process which is declared as Americanisation & westernisation. The system of global governance operating in the world ~~the system~~ therefore is largely ineffective. Despite existence of several institutions working hard in hand for global peace & prosperity such as United Nations, Group of 7/8, International Monetary Fund, World Bank, World Trade Organisation. that aim at producing world order in fields of peace, finance, trade, security and politics. Despite its apparent criticisms the supporters of global governance believe that it's wrong to state that global governance system has emerged and operating but it's still emerging and is not fully established. Therefore it's inadequate to state that global governance is a myth rather than reality. For even though the institutions of global governance are flawed they are being reformed and have surmised all difficulties eg. 2007-9 financial crisis therefore it may take time for an effective system of global governance to be established fully.



ResultsPlus

Examiner Comments

A comparison with alternative global structures such as global anarchy and global government helps to explain what global governance is and is not. There is a focus on global economic governance and the IMF, W.Bank, WTO as well as G8 and G20 etc. The UN and the Security Council are discussed as well as hegemonic dominance in the system. There is a suggestion that effective global governance is an emerging power.



ResultsPlus

Examiner Tip

This response stays 'on track' throughout and is therefore relevant and scores points throughout.

Question 7

This was quite a popular response with most responses covering economic vs. military factors with a recognition that membership of the WTO has to be balanced with a lack of unified military power. Well answered responses tended to provide a clear assessment of what significant global power means with a consideration of political, military, economic and structural factors.

Most candidates were able to discuss economic power and to explain that the EU clearly has significant economic influence, especially as European integration has embraced both political union and monetary union. The sheer size of the EU in economic, trade and financial terms makes it a global power. It is a significant trading bloc with a significant currency which ensures a wide reaching influence. Less well explained was the significance of the EU in terms of structural power where it is able to operate as a non-state actor in bodies such as the WTO, G8 and G20. The EU also has a degree of soft power which it has been able to use in relation to a number of areas including the ICC and on the issue of global climate change. The primary criticism of the EU in terms of being a significant power is that progress on establishing a Common and Security Policy has been limited. Member states continue to retain control of their own foreign and defence policies, seen as key symbols of sovereign independence.

This is a wide ranging response with a pleasing level of debate and knowledge.

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

A significant global power would be expected to exert influence on a worldwide scale. This being through factors such as the hard power of its military and economy, potential structural power and in a growingly liberal world for this to be completed by soft power. The EU originated in 1957 as the European Coal and Steel Community with 6 members, and has now expanded to a now more influential region of 28 member states.

The EU demonstrates global influence through economic power. It is the world's largest integrated economy, with 520 million consumers and a GDP of \$17.4 trillion.

The sheer size of this market gives it global influence, particularly as it has embraced both political and monetary union.

It also has the largest share of world exports with 26%. The size of the EU in financial, trade and economic

factors makes it a force to be reckoned with in international politics.

Plus, it is now the world's second currency with 22.2% of global currency reserves, 5.5 times that of the Yen or Pound Sterling.

Finally, in economic terms, it is the world's largest donor of aid with its foreign aid budget at a value of £7.29 billion in 2014. All factors

~~demonstrate~~ convey how EU is a global player.

However, enlargement since 2004 has weakened the EU economically. Its population rose by 20% but GDP only increased by 5%, with 7 out of the new members with GDP per capita 70% lower than EU average. This curtails its ability to project economic power as funds are diverted to deal with own internal economic weaknesses. Another factor weakening global power is a lack of a common currency, with the UK negotiating an opt out clause and 10 EU members still not members of the Eurozone. A two-speed Europe cannot speak with "one voice". The Eurozone crisis has also weakened global influence, with Portugal, Ireland and Italy all having sovereign debt of greater than 100% of GDP; Greece's as dangerously high as 175% of GDP. This has produced worry amongst international investors that EU states will default on their debts, creating a domino effect and leading to questions about credit worthiness. This significantly detracting from global player credentials.

The EU does possess significant structural power through being the only non-state to be represented in a ~~small~~ number of international bodies. Firstly, the G7/G8 and the increasingly important G20, which enables it to have more of a say in global economics and exert influence. In addition to this, its presence as the largest integrated economic area in the world allows it to shape globalisation to its advantage in the WTO. This can be seen with negotiation of TTIP ("the biggest bilateral trade deal in history"), whilst also giving them more influence with likes of Japan and China.

Despite this structural power economically, the EU is not represented in the UN Security Council with a permanent seat. This ~~is~~ majorly disadvantages them, as this is the most influential, or main body, for discussing global issues. Instead individual states like France and ~~the~~ UK represent themselves, neglecting their respective individual influence, but not the EU's.

As well, it is not represented in formal International Financial Institutions of IMF and World Bank with both have significant global importance and reach with 187 members. This limits its structural influence.

In an increasingly liberal world with growing interdependence and interconnectedness, ~~to~~ and the rise of soft power, the EU shows great credentials. Soft power is the ability to influence other actors by ~~soft~~ persuading them to agree to or follow norms or aspirations that produce the desired behaviour. The EU won the Nobel Peace Prize in 2012 for the "advancement of peace and reconciliation, ~~between~~ democracies and human rights", sending out a significant soft power message and ~~can~~ encouraging states to work with them.

Other events have had a similar effect, such as being at the forefront of the Climate Control debate in Kyoto 1999 and Copenhagen 2009, and playing a significant part in development of International Criminal Court. ~~But to mention~~ The EU also promotes soft power through human rights, ~~commitment~~ ~~commitment~~ through FCHR, particularly Children and Women's rights. ~~Events such as~~ The appointment of two women (Catherine Ashton and Federica Mogherini) as High Representative for Foreign Affairs and Security Policy (HR/ASP) enhancing this wide-reaching soft power influence.

On the other hand, there is some debate over the relative significance of soft power. The NATO chief Rasmussen said "soft power alone is really no power at all", potentially implying states may not pay great attention to soft power. Events such as the ~~the~~ Iran Nuclear Programme talks do not add to EU soft power influence, even if it is labelled the E3 + 3 (when really it was the P5 + 1). It is still individual states representing ~~themselves~~

themselves and exerting their influence. This is reinforced by Hollande and Merkel travelling to Moscow to negotiate peace between Ukraine and Russia. Once more individual states showing influence through soft power with ~~HR~~ HR FASP
Federica Mogherini sidelined; the EU not speaking with "one voice" yet again.

Some say that the Common Foreign and Security Policy shows the EU's ~~the~~ influence. The development of the VP of Commission and High Representative FASP enabling greater consistency, cooperation and coherence; enabling EU speak with "one voice" and raising their profile in the world. The EU has already spoken with one voice in Kosovo, Bosnia and Macedonia, and is ongoing missions such as the EU navy operation Atalanta countering piracy off the coast of Somalia. The EU now has 13 delegations and offices across the world, with 16 ongoing missions as a result of European External Action Service. If that is not being a significant global player, then what is?

However, there has been failings of
CFSP on multiple occasions. The EU failed
to stop all out war between different
factions in Bosnia, instead it brokered a
peace deal. The EU stood back and
watched Yugoslavia disintegrate into ethnic
cleansing and genocide of Muslims, once
again the US rectified the situation by leading
it with air strike campaign. In Libya,
the UK and France worked effectively together,
taking decisive action, yet the EU was
largely a bystander once more. Not to
mention, the EU has no army, how
can it be a significant global player
with no army?

In conclusion, the EU possesses significant
economic capabilities - economically (size of market
foreign aid), in addition to unique structural
power for a regional block and soft
power projections. But, its lack of
a single currency, the Eurozone crisis
and its lack of an EU army hinders
its credentials as a major global player.



ResultsPlus
Examiner Comments

'Significant global influence' is discussed and the importance of different types of power is made clear. There is a reference to economic, military and structural power with each considered in turn, including counter arguments. The structural debate includes membership of G8 and G20 but no P5 Security Council power. There is also discussion on the role or lack of role for the EU in international financial institutions. Soft power and influence is contrasted with foreign policy weakness.

This is a well-constructed and wide ranging response which is clearly worth a L3 mark.

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

Chosen Question Number:

Question 6

Question 7

Question 8

Military	- EDA	- NATO?	- NATO	<u>Synoptic</u>
	- ECSPD	- Combined...	- 8000 planes	
Econ	- Combined power	- Trade	- Not a single state	- EUROzone
	- WTO etc		- level of centralisation	
Pol	- Member of G8/20	Russia?	<u>UNK to how much</u>	
	- EU Gov	- Aid budget	<u>it a global power</u>	
Cul	- GDP v good	Underpinned?		
	- Space Race			

In order to be classed as a global power, the EU (the regional body of ~~the~~ 28 member states which holds elements of intergovernmentalism and supranationalism) must display elements of capable power, relational power and structural power (Strange, 2006). This shall be fed in to an assessment of the EU's power globally in four representative areas: Military power, Economic Power, Political power and Cultural power.

The EU has found it difficult to create a common foreign and defence policy, as due to its nature as a regional bloc, member states have been

reluctant to cede sovereignty over military decisions to the EU. Realists would affirm that such sovereignty over matters of national importance is invaluable. However, after the Treaty of Lisbon in 2009 appointed a high representative for foreign affairs, who is now Federica Mogherini, the European Defence Agency (established at the Berlin plus agreement in 2004) has some power, shown by the 2003 EUFOR Concordia mission to Macedonia, which proved successful. The ability to hold military power is considered important as a capability, as it acts as a deterrent from external intervention, is easily quantifiable and as a constructivist might point out, gives the perception of brute strength. ~~is~~

However, the EU's military capability is poor, as it still relies on its own member states. Even though the military might of the 27 states combined creates the world's largest military power, creating consensus between them is difficult, especially when so many states have differing allegiances to the USA, Russia etc. Furthermore, states are wary of downgrading the status of NATO by joining a military EU. Some have suggested that the EU would act in tandem with NATO, bringing its military states up, as they are 'separable, but not separate' (Smith, 2013). However, the EU as a sole body has

very limited military power, and so its global power rating may suffer. ~~Liberal~~ liberals and neo-liberals could argue that in an age of terrorism and cyber-warfare, traditional 'hard power' factors are actually not as important (such as possessing aircraft carriers), so as the decreasing importance of military power continues, the EU's global status may relatively improve.

Economically, the EU is extremely powerful, with a combined GDP of \$17.68 trillion, making it the largest economy in the world. Internal coordination of economic matters makes the EU stronger, as its exclusive competences cover ~~the~~ the customs union and free trade area, meaning in a representative way, it can act over its member states. After the 1997 Treaty of Amsterdam, monetary union for ~~all~~ some nations (excluding the UK, Greece and Denmark) has given power to the ECB, allowing for financial cohesion in the Eurozone and thus the exposure of the Euro as a tradeable currency. All of this is important for the EU's global power status as it shows power as a capability. With vast wealth, the potential of a large military is there, as is the potential to use that money to exert cultural influence globally with large TNCs and high standards of education. Furthermore, as a large trading power ~~with~~, the ~~fast~~ EU is a popular trading partner.

However, the notion that the EU is a protectionist free-trade area and customs union means that 76% of trade takes place between EU nations. Though this is good for member states it does little for global states. Furthermore, there have been developments to suggest that the Eurozone is a failure, with what financier George Soros calls a 'deficient Euro setup'. In 2013, the Greeks had to awkwardly accept a \$178bn bailout package, and the fiscal policy of the EU was nearly collapsing. This did little for relational power of the EU, as the 2000s decade has seen a reduction in trade (though this may be a knock on effect of the 2008 financial crisis). It is important to remember that the EU is not a state, and in its ascendancy to global power this is its main drawback. Member states still have domestic control over tax powers and financial regulation, rendering the EU useless in those policy areas.

Overall however, as a bloc, the EU has a very large amount of capable power in its wealth and internal economic power. It can use this as relational power in its multitude of international trade agreements, and go on to possess vast structural power because of its deep pockets. Despite this, it doesn't quite rival

the USA in economic power, as the dollar is still the reserve currency, and it is not a single nation-state.

The EU does possess elements of structural political power and relational political power as a single entity. It has been included in the G7 at the 2015 talks in Brno, and is a full member of the G20 (in both examples, ^{some of} their member states are also present, meaning they are almost doubly represented!) Furthermore, the EU has 33% of voting power in the WTO, and has been seen to hold relational power over some African industries like the cocoa industry in Ghana. Furthermore, as EU law is binding on its member states, it is effectively able to jurisdiction over an entire continent, giving it power that can have global effects. Its aid budget for 2009-2014 was over \$1.3 billion dollars, meaning it is effectively able to strengthen its diplomatic ties.

However, it has recently been under threat politically due to the rise of anti-EU parties within its member states, such as UKIP in the UK and Front-National in France. This citizen-based resentment exacerbates the democratic deficit the EU suffers from, which new Commission President Jean-Claude Juncker promised to improve. Realists would agree that the way justified majority voting in the Council circumscribes state sovereignty is a matter of concern and further limits the legitimacy and thus global

power of the EU. Furthermore, as the EU is not a nation-state, realists would agree that it can never be a global power, as they follow a state-centric model of global politics. Liberals, and especially neo-liberal institutionalists, would instead suggest that a multipolar world could feature both state and non-state actors. Overall, the EU does possess global reach politically, and despite categorisation from both within and the outside (Russia), it ~~is~~ is a significant global power.

Finally comes cultural power. The EU is known for high levels of research and development, having 8 of the world's top 20% universities and contributing 32% of global spending. This means that through soft power of attraction rather than coercion (Nye, 2004), the EU will be able to strengthen its image overseas. Furthermore, an effective space programme by the European Space Agency managed to land the Philae lander on a comet in 2014, further increasing the EU recognition.

However, as a cultural power, critics would agree that its member states are the ones who bear the success, such as the ~~EE~~ UK film ~~industry~~ music industry, and the South of France for its films. Furthermore, general anti-Western sentiment in Asia has limited the

ultural power of both the EU and USA is far more
of that from China and Russia (Lowe, 2012).

In conclusion, ~~the~~ the EU does, as a single
entity, hold vast amounts of capable power. It is developing
a military agency, and has the world's largest GDP,
which garners important international recognition. Even
though, militarily, ~~the~~ the EU ~~is~~ ^{is far more} ~~nothing~~ compared to
a ~~major~~ nation state, the EU has power, as
neo-functionalists would assert, that successful political
integration can amount to the status of a significant
global power. This is further compounded by the soft
relational power of European ~~of~~ culture, which by attracting
global tourists, has entrenched ~~the~~ the EU status of
a 'significant global power'.



ResultsPlus

Examiner Comments

Different types of power are raised for consideration and the transforming power of the EU is made clear. There is an interesting argument that the decline of hard power is helping the EU to become more significant. Economic power is discussed with reference to the G7, G20 and WTO. Discord in the EU at nation state level is discussed as well as the rise in soft power and cultural attraction.

Question 8

This was by far the most popular question with a wide spectrum of responses in terms of quality and understanding of the question. A few candidates decided to answer a question on whether globalisation was a positive or negative phenomenon rather than the actual question on whether impact has been exaggerated. A number of candidates failed to get to grips with all three types of globalisation which suggested that they didn't really understand the phenomenon. It was pleasing to note that some candidates were happy to outline the theoretical views on the impact of globalisation. Globalisation sceptics argue that the impact of globalisation has been significantly exaggerated. They would argue that states remain the principal actors on the world stage. Sceptics point out, for example, that the overwhelming bulk of economic activity still takes place within states. National economies, in other words, are not as irrelevant as globalisation theorists usually suggest. Only a tiny proportion of states are unable to control what happens within their borders. Furthermore, the trend towards regional and global governance does not spell the demise of the nation-state. Liberals and especially so-called 'hyperglobalisers' portray globalisation as a significant development in international politics. The impact of globalisation has been greatest on the state and on sovereignty, with states penetrated by external influences to a much greater extent than previously occurred. The decline of the state is apparent through the greater importance of non-state actors, including transnational corporations, NGOs, terrorist organisations, transnational criminal organisations and so forth.

This is a wide ranging response which covers all elements of globalisation with a pleasing level of debate and analysis.

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

Globalisation is not denied by either sceptics (realists) or hyperglobalists (liberals), but the extent to which it has impacted the globe and international relations is a point of ~~some~~ contention. Hyperglobalists would disagree ~~with~~ with the statement as they believe we are now living in a globalized world due to economic interdependence, political cooperation and the homogenisation or flattening out of global culture. On the other hand, Sceptics would agree with this statement due to nation states still retaining most economic control, the weakness of political international institutions and that cultural globalisation is hybridisation.

as it flows both way. Realist argument seem most convincing.

Firstly, liberals would state the importance of economic interconnectedness and interdependence that has started to significantly absorb national economies into a global one. For example, the EU and the Euro that means those member states have allowed their economies to transcend their borders. Furthermore, the impact of economic globalisation has been

*TNC's far more economically significant, war-mot = economic size of power
clear in the rise of the BRIC nations, with China growing an average of 8-10% annually. We are living in a world of permeable borders where money flows are instantaneous and hard to keep track of. Like the global economic crisis of 2007/8 leaving few nations unscathed due to the interconnectedness of the global economy - John Burton's waves model that involves states, TNC's, IGO's.*

On the other hand, realists would point out that international trade is nothing new with economics always opening up to other nations, starting the belief national economies are being absorbed into a global economy as largely exaggerated. Furthermore, the majority of trade ~~that~~ still takes place within national borders and not between nations showing we are not a global economy. Furthermore, economic globalisation cannot be seen as 'global' as 80% of international trade is between developed and not developing states.

Secondly, liberals would disagree with this view on in terms of political globalisation as Joseph Nye points out there has been a horizontal shift of power from the national to international / regional level. ** Institutions of global economic governance, IMF, WTO and World Bank are widely used by all states and act as a forum for international cooperation and discussion to

** which can be seen from the emergence of a global civil society. take place. This links to the idea of the disaggregated state as there is no longer one political representative of a nation but communications between nations at all national levels. This has seen a pooling of sovereignty through IGO's as states have more force as a regional blocs. For example the EU has a seat in the WTO as an economic superpower, the UK on it's own would be far weaker, EU is unique however as its supranational.

On the other hand, realists argue that such IGO's erode state sovereignty and are weak and ~~not~~ ineffective which is an inherent feature of intergovernmentalism. Decisions take a long time to be reached and although they provide a forum for economic discussion but ~~the~~ the rest of the political power is retained by the nation state. As intergovernmental laws or treaties do not have to be signed up to by all states or states can pull out e.g. Non proliferation treaty that wasn't signed by India or Pakistan. States still make their own laws and can act externally as they please making political decisions autonomously.

Lastly, liberals would disagree with this statement as cultural globalisation has been particularly prominent in recent years. As state borders are increasingly permeable the flow of goods, money, service and people has greatly increased taking culture from around the globe with it. Furthermore, with the rise of technology, the internet, 24 hour news, mobile information flows and communications across borders has increased. This causes a ~~global~~ global homogenisation of culture as ideas of democracy and western values is shown through American TV programmes, TNC's and goods that can now be brought worldwide. Cultural globalisation has been called 'Americanisation' for these reasons as 150 of the world's biggest 500 corporations are owned by America.*

Opposing this is the realist view which is sceptical ~~to~~ of the extent of globalisation and highlights that cultural globalisation flows two ways - ~~to~~ ~~its~~ ~~both~~ cultural hybridisation as despite western ideology infiltrating other nations this has happened vice versa as there are many different cuisines, sports and ~~and~~ religions that are not typically western ingrained in our society, for example Indian cuisine is the UK's favourite dish. Furthermore, not only does cultural globalisation flow both ways it has been absorbed and adapted by societies who still largely retain their own cultural practices for example the altered McDonalds menus, McDonalds kebabs in Turkey.

Also, as championed by Naomi Klein and her 'No Logo' 2001, there has been a real backlash to globalisation
* spread of western ideology can also be seen in 2011 Arab Spring when many middle eastern countries had democratic revolutions.

particularly cultural as nations ~~and~~ and individuals are keen to retain a sense of national identity.

Realists, in regard to economic globalisation, would argue that although economies do rely on each other it has been a slow, uneven, and in some cases, ~~not~~ un-noticable process as the USA is still the dominant hegemon producing 30% of global economic output in 2010. Transformationalists (critical theorists) would say economic globalisation has created the dependency theory, are known as world systems theory in which the 'core' rich nations are relied on by the poor 'periphery' nations for trade or TNC investment in which case is not globalisation but exploitation by America and the west.

To conclude, ~~that~~ the evidence suggests the realist argument of globalisation sceptics is most convincing. Although the interlocking of economies has been occurring as demonstrated by the global financial crisis of 2007/8 this is the most prominent and obvious form of globalisation. ~~Realists~~ Realists would agree the impact of globalisation has been exaggerated as political globalisation is weak, many states are more disaggregated but intergovernmentalism is still the decision of the state as it is consensual. Political globalisation is a lot deeper in Europe, however, due to the

unique supranational nature of the European union which has led members to demand more sovereignty back, etc. Furthermore, cultural globalisation can not be denied to flow both ways and even though there is American domination we are no where close to the 'flattening out' of global identities. Therefore, I agree globalisation has been exaggerated because it has also been met with a backlash to stop integration happening any further by the anti-globalisation movement, Battle of Seattle 1999, Occupy wall street 2011.



ResultsPlus
Examiner Comments

The response immediately introduces the hyperglobalist Vs sceptic argument and then proceeds to discuss economic, political and cultural globalisation from both perspectives. There are a good number of examples and a pleasing depth to discussion and debate.

This is, again, a pleasing response. It ranges widely with a great deal of supporting material and convincing argument is sustained 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

Globalisation is the deepening & strengthening of interconnectiveness in an economic, cultural & political context. It is the idea that differences between states are being 'flattened out' & are replaced by an ever more "borderless world". Sceptics, who are predominantly realist, agree that the ^{reduction} ~~entirety~~ of state sovereignty & differences is wholly exaggerated and the state is still the most dominant actor in economic, cultural & political affairs. Denying the significance of globalisation however, liberals would agree that globalisation has reshaped international politics that the emergence of a pluralist, interconnected & borderless world that is therefore peaceful due to the reduced significance of the state. Between the two is transformationists who accept globalisation, but say the core features of the state & global politics are the same. It is important to assess the relevance of these views to determine whether globalisation is exaggerated.

Firstly, Realists, such as Kenneth Waltz, argue that the liberalisation of the global financial system, which comes in the form of free trade & TNCs, is supported due to the established role of the state as the dominant actor, identifying the extent of the "borderless world." Hirst & Thompson argued in 1999 that the majority of economic activity remained within national state borders, suggesting economic globalisation is supported. Such a belief is evidenced by the fact that India, a key emerging economy, has 53% of its workforce in agriculture. Although this argument is strong for the majority of economies, the liberalisation of the global market have been hampered ~~that~~ that ~~has~~ free trade increasing 30% since 1980, creating an effectively global & free economy. However, realists ~~are~~ agree in the "globalisation" theory that this has not necessarily reduced the significance of state sovereignty as the state remains the dominant actor. China prevented newspapers & the UK did not allow Huawei to buy up telecoms, highlighting the continued importance of the state. Therefore, realists strongly suggest the 'global economy was created by states & for states' as it is in their interest.

However, liberals such as Theodore & Ely Mize, argue that the rise of TNCs, which have increased from 7,000 in 1990 to 25,000 today, is a result of the liberalisation of free trade. They argue that economic globalisation is not suggested as we live in a interconnected of single global economy. As a result, the fact is not that we are moving away from state control in the 'markets as the markets of governments' suggest that globalisation cannot be suggested if since states are challenged by a new actor, TNCs, that can move freely in a borderless world. Although realists argue states control these actors, the ~~reality~~ reality is that states aim to attract TNCs, evidenced by the Rijkman's Law a statistic that which contributes 50% to its GDP. Hoffmeyer like Anthony Giddens argue that this increased role has resulted in a reshaping of international politics, challenging the power of the state in the state actor. Overall, despite the fact that realists are correct in arguing states can control TNCs, economic globalisation is not suggested as all states need to be interconnected to survive, reducing the realisation of sovereignty.

However, sceptics & non-liberalists, such

as ~~the~~ Marshall in the 3rd wave of globalisation agree that the impacts of cultural globalisation which see media & communications result in what Scholte described as 'deterritorialisation' are completely exaggerated as a result of hybridisation & cultural regeneration. Globalisation draws upon local & international cultural elements to produce ^{different} a hybrid cultures meeting the impact of globalisation. This can be seen by children in the West Bank wearing Arsenal shirts, but also possibly a shirt from a western culture, whilst Americans see things completely differently to South Koreans, who see an as 'Dakota'. The impacts of globalisation ~~are~~ that come with globalisation are greatly exaggerated & Benedict Anderson's 'Imagined Community' supports such a notion. Similarly, realists would agree that ~~cultural~~ cultural narrowing is a force, with backlashes towards neo-imperialism growth. This 'cutting the fuse' argument suggests that a global culture is limited & the spread of media & communications are quite easily be limited by the state, evidenced by China, whilst still evenly overall in the global economy.

Despite this notion, hyperglobalists would

agree that cultural globalisation has
 monoculture, evidenced by the McDonald &
 Coca-colaisation theories, as well as a
 limitation on state sovereignty as states cannot
 control the flow of information and their
 borders. This is illustrated by the technological
 determinism theory, which argues that with
 the digital revolution comes the single global
 market, which reduces state sovereignty.
 Overall, it is clear that hybridisation might
 be the result of a monoculture & over its impact,
 which include 'deterritorialisation', but it is
 unlikely the case that the spread of media
 & communication is ~~is~~ unstoppable, ^{reducing} ~~limiting~~ state
 sovereignty & its ~~is~~ the control of borders.

Finally, realists would agree that the impact
 of political globalisation, especially cooperation
 on an international level, is completely
 exaggerated due to its unlikelihood in a
 system of anarchy & the dominance of the USA.
 E. A. Oye describes global governance as a
 limited system of cooperation under anarchy,
 evidenced by the US's inability to persuade all
 or even states to sign crucial change
 agreements like at Kyoto. Therefore, the
 impacts of political globalisation are

the analysis, it is also clear that despite the two arguments, the points are correct in saying that economic & political globalisation are strong aspects of a country's sovereignty. However, the points are correct in saying that political globalisation is essential.



ResultsPlus

Examiner Comments

The definition and explanation at the start is clear and effective. There is an excellent debate relating to trade and coverage of economic, cultural and political globalisation with supporting evidence throughout.



ResultsPlus

Examiner Tip

This response makes every word count as they remain focussed on the particular question throughout.

Paper Summary

Based on their performance on this paper, candidates are offered the following advice:

- As ever, the advice from the previous series 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 learned fact and knowledge.
- Synopticity, where candidates are expected to provide an awareness of competing viewpoints or perspectives, can be a weak area for some. The longer questions are designed for debate and discussion of alternative viewpoints.
- A03 can also be an issue for some candidates. There is a need to bring all of the earlier A0 elements into a structured and logical response which provides balance and use of appropriate political vocabulary.
- It is evident that most, if not all, teachers are aware of and have focused 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 also 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>

Ofqual
.....



Llywodraeth Cynulliad Cymru
Welsh Assembly Government



Pearson Education Limited. Registered company number 872828
with its registered office at 80 Strand, London WC2R 0RL.