

Mark Scheme (Standardisation) Summer 2008

GCE

GCE Government & Politics (Unit 5D/6504)

General Marking Guidance

- All candidates must receive the same treatment. Examiners must mark the first candidate in exactly the same way as they mark the last.
- Mark schemes should be applied positively. Candidates must be rewarded for what they have shown they can do rather than penalised for omissions.
- Examiners should mark according to the mark scheme not according to their perception of where the grade boundaries may lie.
- There is no ceiling on achievement. All marks on the mark scheme should be used appropriately.
- All the marks on the mark scheme are designed to be awarded. Examiners should always award full marks if deserved, i.e. if the answer matches the mark scheme. Examiners should also be prepared to award zero marks if the candidate's response is not worthy of credit according to the mark scheme.
- Where some judgement is required, mark schemes will provide the principles by which marks will be awarded and exemplification may be limited.
- When examiners are in doubt regarding the application of the mark scheme to a candidate's response, the team leader must be consulted.
- Crossed out work should be marked UNLESS the candidate has replaced it with an alternative response.

Question Number	Indicative content
1	<p>Since the end of the Cold War tensions between the US and some EU states have developed over a number of areas. The USA emerged as the only superpower and has been more willing to play the role of international policeman. However some in the US have become frustrated that the EU has not been able or willing to become more involved in a policing role of its own. Bosnia illustrated the EU's reluctance to exert power and influence on its own doorstep. The US has urged the EU to take more responsibility and not to rely on the US alone to provide stability and security. On the other hand, some resent plans for a Common Foreign Policy for the EU, and any extension of the Rapid Reaction force, which could threaten the existence of NATO.</p> <p>Overall the EU is a challenge to US hegemony. Some EU states and the USA have disagreed significantly about ways of handling the Middle East peace process in particular how to prosecute the war on terror and, of course, the war with Iraq. France and Germany have repeatedly frustrated the USA over their reluctance to play their part in Afghanistan, and they both threatened to vote against US resolution proposals in the UN against Saddam.</p> <p>Nevertheless, candidates should note that France led by Sarkozy is much more open to partnership with the USA than it was with Chirac, as is Germany under Merkel. Indeed France has pledged to commit more troops to Afghanistan.</p> <p>In making judgements consider the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Knowledge of recent US foreign policy (AO1) • Knowledge and understanding of EU states' reactions to US foreign policy (AO1) • Analysis of the extent to which relations between the USA and some EU states have become tense over Iraq, Afghanistan, war on terror etc. (AO2)

Level	Mark	Descriptor
Level 1	0-6	A limited level of skill demonstrated in analysis, interpretation and evaluation; arguments and explanations expressed in a less structured manner, making occasional use of political vocabulary and a basic level of written communication.
Level 2	7-12	A sound ability demonstrated in analysis, interpretation and evaluation; arguments and explanations expressed in a structured manner, making some use of political vocabulary and a reasonable level of written communication.
Level 3	13-20	A high level of skill demonstrated in analysis, interpretation and evaluation; arguments and explanations expressed in a clearly structured manner, making appropriate use of political vocabulary and an excellent standard of written communication.

		Candidates will discuss both aspects of globalisation and the fact that there is debate over whether globalisation actually exists. They might also mention the effect on the nation-state.
--	--	---

Question Number	Indicative content
2	<p>Globalisation impacts upon every aspect of the political and economic system, including trade, telecommunications, money, multinational firms, migration etc. It is the 'widening, deepening and speeding up of worldwide interconnectedness'. Some argue that this process is reducing the power and influence of the nation-state. The spread of economic liberalism has meant that states are losing authority to supranational institutions such as the IMF, World Bank, WTO and EU, and to multinational firms which can promise foreign direct investment, but at a price. Critics of globalisation argue that it is actually spreading US domination around the globe. They claim that states are being coerced into accepting neo-classical economic policies such as free trade, reduced government spending, higher taxes yet lower subsidies, in order to reduce their international debt to Western banks and institutions such as The World Bank and the IMF, which themselves are US-dominated. US imperialism, they argue, has arisen from the drive for economic growth, for US Dollars. It is not traditional colonialism whereby a powerful state would invade another state and impose its own citizens as rulers. Instead, the US is able to persuade a state's own government to adopt US-favoured policies. It is imperialism without military force. The anti-globalization movement has, of course, been bolstered by anti-Americans, anarchists, Islamists and an assortment of left wingers.</p> <p>In making judgements consider the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Knowledge of concerns over globalization (AO1) • Knowledge of why such concerns are popular (AO1) • Analysis of the extent to which anti-globalization has proved popular, and why. (AO2)

Level	Mark	Descriptor
Level 1	0-6	A limited level of skill demonstrated in analysis, interpretation and evaluation; arguments and explanations expressed in a less structured manner, making occasional use of political vocabulary and a basic level of written communication.
Level 2	7-12	A sound ability demonstrated in analysis, interpretation and evaluation; arguments and explanations expressed in a structured manner, making some use of political vocabulary and a reasonable level of written communication.
Level 3	13-20	A high level of skill demonstrated in analysis, interpretation and evaluation; arguments and explanations expressed in a clearly structured manner, making appropriate use of political vocabulary and an excellent standard of written communication.

Question Number	Indicative content
3	<p>The World Bank is a key actor in the international political economy, with particular relevance to development. Its formation stemmed in part because many believed that World War II was partly caused by the Great Depression, and by inflation, lack of currency convertibility and other economic problems that characterised the inter-war period (1919-1939). To address future economic problems the allies met in 1944 at Bretton Woods to set up the World Bank and the IMF.</p> <p>However, there are many critics of the World Bank, and in recent years it has become a focus of the struggle between the North and the South. There are two main controversies; vote distribution and Structural Adjustment Programs (SAP).</p> <p>Vote distributions are based on member-states' contributions funds. This gives control to a few, rich countries. Similarly, LDCs have little power in decision making.</p> <p>The second criticism is that they impose unfair and severe economic conditions on already indebted and impoverished states. The SAP, to which recipients of World Bank loans used to have to agree, required states to move towards capitalism by privatising state-run enterprises, reducing trade barriers and facilitating capital flows (thereby promoting foreign ownership of domestic firms), reducing social programmes to cut budget deficits (health and education thereby suffering) and devaluing currencies. Critics argue that the SAP violated state sovereignty and harmed living standards by cutting social services and reducing growth in order to balance budgets. Defendants countered such arguments by stating that the original policies caused the debt, monetary instability or crisis in confidence in the first place.</p> <p>In making judgements consider the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Knowledge of the role of the World Bank (AO1) • Knowledge of performance of the World Bank, and criticisms of it (AO1) • Analysis of the extent to which the World Bank has been effective (AO2)

Level	Mark	Descriptor
Level 1	0-6	A limited level of skill demonstrated in analysis, interpretation and evaluation; arguments and explanations expressed in a less structured manner, making occasional use of political vocabulary and a basic level of written communication.
Level 2	7-12	A sound ability demonstrated in analysis, interpretation and evaluation; arguments and explanations expressed in a structured

		manner, making some use of political vocabulary and a reasonable level of written communication.
Level 3	13-20	A high level of skill demonstrated in analysis, interpretation and evaluation; arguments and explanations expressed in a clearly structured manner, making appropriate use of political vocabulary and an excellent standard of written communication

Question Number	Indicative content
4	<p>"Genocide is a crime on a different scale to all other crimes against humanity and implies an intention to completely exterminate the chosen group... Genocide is therefore both the gravest and greatest of the crimes against humanity." The term genocide was first used in 1943 by the Jewish-Polish lawyer Raphael Lemkin who combined the Greek word "genos" (race or tribe) with the Latin word "cide" (to kill). He campaigned to have genocide recognised as a crime under international law. His efforts led to the adoption of the UN Convention on Genocide in December 1948.</p> <p>The United Nations (UN) was set up at the end of World War II to maintain peace and security between states. This would be done by dissuading states from attacking each other and organising counter-measures against aggressive states that attacked other states. Gulf War I was a clear example of collective security through the UN acting to remove the aggressive state (Iraq) from territory conquered (Kuwait). By defeating the Iraqi forces in Kuwait and southern Iraq not only would peace be restored, but also future aggressive acts by Iraq or other states would also be deterred. UN forces operated according to the concepts of collective security and peacekeeping. In collective security aggression against one member is a threat to all members and so the collective body should unite to prevent and ultimately defeat aggression. The UN role of peacekeeping typically involves acting as a buffer between two sides, to allow for negotiations or at least to stop the fighting. However, if one side in the dispute remains intent on using violence the UN forces have been unable and unwilling to impose peace. Since 1991 most disputes have been domestic, civil encounters. Under international law there has been no international aggressor and the UN has been unable to intervene. Many now argue that the UN should be able to intervene in such civil conflicts, and moreover, be able to impose peace. That is, the UN should have peacemaking powers. This inevitably imposes on state sovereignty, it elevates the status of the UN (world government?) and it creates operational and financial problems.</p> <p>Candidates will use examples to illustrate the failure of the current system to prevent genocide in Rwanda, Bosnia, Darfur etc to support the argument that the UN be given stronger powers, but will also note the mixed results of military intervention in Kosovo, Afghanistan and Iraq. Difficulties in administration and finance should also be raised, including the role of the Security Council and the Veto.</p> <p>In making judgements consider the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Knowledge and understanding of the role of UN. (AO1)

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Knowledge and understanding of recent episodes of genocide. (AO1) • Analysis of the extent to which UN has been effective in preventing genocide. (AO2)
--	--

Level	Mark	Descriptor
Level 1	0-6	A limited level of skill demonstrated in analysis, interpretation and evaluation; arguments and explanations expressed in a less structured manner, making occasional use of political vocabulary and a basic level of written communication.
Level 2	7-12	A sound ability demonstrated in analysis, interpretation and evaluation; arguments and explanations expressed in a structured manner, making some use of political vocabulary and a reasonable level of written communication.
Level 3	13-20	A high level of skill demonstrated in analysis, interpretation and evaluation; arguments and explanations expressed in a clearly structured manner, making appropriate use of political vocabulary and an excellent standard of written communication.

Question Number	Indicative content
5	<p>The Cold War was widely understood as an ideological conflict between the Capitalist USA and the Communist USSR and their allies. The end of the Cold War marked a return to nationalist conflicts with many nations struggling to define their statehood. Candidates should discuss examples of such conflicts, such as in Bosnia, Kosovo, and East Timor. However, the victory of capitalism over communism has not necessarily resulted in the 'end of history'. It can be argued that a new form of ideological conflict has developed. On the other hand, it could be argued that conflicts remain struggles for power. In the cold war the superpowers used political ideology to unify their empires and to motivate their people. Now, the war on terror, or Islamic Jihad could arguably be mere tools a power struggles.</p> <p>Al-Qa'ida, reaffirmed on 9/11 their aims of demolishing western influence and power and attacking any "infidels" (Jews and Christians especially). It is their aim to create a fundamentalist Islamic influence in as many states as possible. In response the US and her allies declared a 'War on Terror', a struggle against the forces that wanted to destroy western democracy. Some political commentators, like Samuel Huntington, would say that the post Cold War world has increased the tension between ethnic communities, especially between Islamic cultures and liberal democracy. The War on Terror is viewed as a Holy War by Islamists, they portray the US and her allies as 'crusaders', wanting to dominate the Islamic world, its oil and prosperity. In their views, the civilian casualties in Afghanistan and Iraq, the US threats towards Syria and Iran and US disregard for Arab opinion after 9/11 all confirm that this is a "war against Islam".</p> <p>After 9/11, a number of democratic governments (Israel, India, Russia and the Philippines) have used the War on Terror to repress their fringe, dissident, Muslim minorities. Islamists see this too as part of an attack on Islam. They see the conflicts in Chechnya and Kashmir as opportunities to reaffirm their aims, so as a result there are Al-Qa'ida fighters in these conflicts. They believe that the West ignores Russian atrocities in Chechnya, it ignores poverty in the Muslim world and above all, it ignores atrocities committed by the Israeli military in Palestine.</p> <p>Bush and Blair claim to be acting in defence of peace and democracy. This is not a religious war; it is an ideological struggle between democracy and totalitarianism. To win, they believe that there needs to be successful, pro-Western, democracies in Muslim areas. The war in Iraq was not merely to remove Saddam from power, it was to bring democracy to Iraq, in the hope that the new Iraq would be a beacon for Muslim democracy throughout</p>

	<p>the Middle East. Similarly, Turkey would be rewarded for its pro-Western, democratic secularism by further integration into the West, and ultimately EU membership. In the meantime, there is no doubt that Guantanamo Bay has cast doubts on US respect for international law, democratic states have behaved illiberally, and democracy in Afghanistan and Iraq is far from liberal. Sept 11th 2001 was a set back, albeit a temporary one after which there may be renewed faith in liberal organisations such as the UN and in democracy.</p> <p>The Cold War was arguably a conflict of ideology. The Capitalist democracies led by the US against the Communist states, led by the USSR. The 1990s, however, saw a shift towards nationalism as the main source of conflict. The 9/11 attacks and the subsequent 'war on terrorism' is arguably a 'Clash of Civilisations' as predicted by Huntington. Candidates should discuss the extent to which this new conflict is one of free, democratic post-Christian and Jewish states against Islamic Fundamentalism. Clearly protagonists would like to portray the conflict as one of ideology, Holy War. Strong candidates will also assess the extent to which the conflict is a traditional realist conflict over the quest for power</p> <p>In making judgements consider the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Knowledge of ideological conflict, such as during the Cold War (AO1) • Knowledge and understanding of recent conflicts (AO1) • Analysis of the extent to which conflicts have increasingly become nationalistic (AO2)
--	--

Level	Mark	Descriptor
Level 1	0-20	A limited level of skill demonstrated in analysis, interpretation and evaluation; arguments and explanations expressed in a less structured manner, making occasional use of political vocabulary and a basic level of written communication.
Level 2	21-38	A sound ability demonstrated in analysis, interpretation and evaluation; arguments and explanations expressed in a structured manner, making some use of political vocabulary and a reasonable level of written communication.
Level 3	39-60	A high level of skill demonstrated in analysis, interpretation and evaluation; arguments and explanations expressed in a clearly structured manner, making appropriate use of political vocabulary and an excellent standard of written communication.

Question Number	Indicative content
6	<p data-bbox="491 405 1378 775">Diplomacy is the art of conducting negotiations between nation states. Diplomatic skills are tested when international relations are handled without hostility being aroused. Of course, national interests are not always complementary and when interests are not mutually compatible tension increases and international disputes develop. Most disputes are resolved diplomatically, particularly when both parties have friendly relations, because the costs of military conflict far outweigh the benefits. Even when states are unable or unwilling to compromise, such as the UK and Spain's dispute over Gibraltar, they will agree to disagree, rather than either side pressing for outright victory.</p> <p data-bbox="491 835 1378 1346">Some disputes are much more likely to result in military conflict and diplomacy proves ineffective. Candidates should use their knowledge of conflicts to discuss the ability of diplomacy to resolve some disputes, but how on numerous occasions diplomacy proves futile. If neither side in the dispute recognizes the authority or position of the opponent, then conflict becomes likely. In the Israeli-Palestinian conflict, for example, neither side recognized their opponent. The Hamas leadership has not been recognized by the Israeli government, and Hamas itself does not recognize the legitimacy of the Israeli state. Thus diplomacy proves difficult. Moreover, mistrust and suspicion cloud all attempts at diplomacy. Only outright victory is regarded as an acceptable solution, and those who are willing to make concessions are deemed to be weak and tend to lose the respect and support of their people.</p> <p data-bbox="491 1379 1378 1480">Candidates should discuss the role of diplomacy in resolving international disputes. Attention should also be given to mediation, such as by the UN, EU or USA.</p> <p data-bbox="491 1514 1126 1547">In making judgements consider the following:</p> <ul data-bbox="544 1581 1378 1720" style="list-style-type: none"> • Understanding of the role of diplomacy (AO1). • Understanding of the different types of dispute (AO1) • Analysis of the extent to which diplomacy has successfully resolved some disputes, but not others (AO2).

Level	Mark	Descriptor
Level 1	0-20	A limited level of skill demonstrated in analysis, interpretation and evaluation; arguments and explanations expressed in a less structured manner, making occasional use of political vocabulary and a basic level of written communication.

Level 2	21-38	A sound ability demonstrated in analysis, interpretation and evaluation; arguments and explanations expressed in a structured manner, making some use of political vocabulary and a reasonable level of written communication.
Level 3	39-60	A high level of skill demonstrated in analysis, interpretation and evaluation; arguments and explanations expressed in a clearly structured manner, making appropriate use of political vocabulary and an excellent standard of written communication.

Question Number	Indicative content
7	<p>There is now widespread agreement that climate change, or global warming, is occurring. This is almost beyond dispute. What are disputed, however, are the causes of global warming, and, whether global warming will have dire consequences, or if it will have beneficial consequences in some cases and in others can be addressed using modern technology.</p> <p>Furthermore, achieving concerted int'l action on climate change is complicated since the tradition within International Relations is state-centric, centred around concepts of state sovereignty and the belief that states pursue their national interest. Moreover, int'l environmental problems tend not to be caused by deliberate acts of national policy, but instead are the unintended side-effects of broader socio-economic processes. Non-state actors such as firms are at least as important as states in that their activities will lead to environmental damage. However, states do legislate within their territories and so should play a central role in developing and enforcing environmental solutions.</p> <p>Environmental pessimists argue that humans are causing global warming. They are also alarmed at the impact of global warming. Higher temperatures will speed the melting of the polar ice caps and sea levels will rise. Also the frequency of violent storms and extreme weather has increased bringing devastation to many areas (note the effects of el Nino).</p> <p>On the other hand environmental optimists point out that the Earth has natural warming and cooling trends, and since the Earth cooled slightly in the 1950s and 1960s any warming will have little overall effect. The Bush administration have found scientists who claim that CO2 is unlikely to cause any significant temperature change. Other optimists claim that the only chance of a modest climate change is high. Indeed, some optimists argue that some areas will benefit from global warming. Why should northern Britain worry about higher temperatures? Growing seasons will lengthen and quality of life will improve. Inevitably some areas will suffer from rising sea levels or longer dry periods, but other areas will benefit. There will be winners and losers.</p> <p>In making judgements consider the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Knowledge of the main climate and environmental concerns (AO1) • Knowledge of attempts to address climate and environmental issues (AO1) • Analysis of the difficulties encountered in tackling such issues (AO2)

Level	Mark	Descriptor
Level 1	0-20	A limited level of skill demonstrated in analysis, interpretation and evaluation; arguments and explanations expressed in a less structured manner, making occasional use of political vocabulary and a basic level of written communication.
Level 2	21-38	A sound ability demonstrated in analysis, interpretation and evaluation; arguments and explanations expressed in a structured manner, making some use of political vocabulary and a reasonable level of written communication.
Level 3	39-60	A high level of skill demonstrated in analysis, interpretation and evaluation; arguments and explanations expressed in a clearly structured manner, making appropriate use of political vocabulary and an excellent standard of written communication.