

Examiners' Report

June 2012

GCE Government & Politics 6GP03 3D

Edexcel and BTEC Qualifications

Edexcel and BTEC qualifications come from Pearson, the world's leading learning company. We provide a wide range of qualifications including academic, vocational, occupational and specific programmes for employers. For further information visit our qualifications websites at www.edexcel.com or www.btec.co.uk for our BTEC qualifications.

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

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

Their contact details can be found on this link: www.edexcel.com/teachingservices.

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



Get more from your exam results

...and now your mock results too!

ResultsPlus is Edexcel's free online service giving instant and detailed analysis of your students' exam and mock performance, helping you to help them more effectively.

- See your students' scores for every exam question
- Spot topics, skills and types of question where they need to improve their learning
- Understand how your students' performance compares with Edexcel national averages
- Track progress against target grades and focus revision more effectively with NEW Mock Analysis

For more information on ResultsPlus, or to log in, visit www.edexcel.com/resultsplus. To set up your ResultsPlus account, call us using the details on our contact us page at www.edexcel.com/contactus.

Pearson: helping people progress, everywhere

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

June 2012

Publications Code UA032360

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

Introduction

A pleasing proportion of candidates had clearly been well-prepared for this examination. Subject knowledge was particularly strong and there was, for the most part, a pleasing focus on the wording of the questions.

The most popular short questions were the responses on great/superpowers and on global governance. The most popular long response was the question on multipolarity, closely followed by the question on economic globalisation. The least popular short response was the short question on the World Bank and the least popular long question was the one on economic/political integration.

The advice from the last series of questions remains valid. As usual, there were a few key differentiators between candidates' responses. The key to success in responding to the questions set is to recognize that not one, but in the case of the longer essay response, four marks, are being awarded for each script.

Whilst Assessment Objective 1 (A01) knowledge may help a candidate to achieve 12 of the available 45 marks, there are still 33 marks available for A02, synopticity and A03. A large proportion of candidates score well in A01 because they provide detailed and developed knowledge and understanding, with relevant and accurate work but they can fail to attain the marks that are available elsewhere.

The intellectual skills required to perform at the highest level in A02 revolve around the ability to provide analysis, evaluation and parallels or connections. This can be a challenge for those candidates who rely primarily on production of learnt fact and knowledge. Synopticity, where candidates are expected to provide an awareness of competing viewpoints or perspectives, can be a weak area for some.

The longer questions are designed for debate and discussion of alternative viewpoints. A03 can also be an issue for some candidates. There is a need to bring all of the earlier A0 elements into a structured and logical response, which provides balance and use of appropriate political vocabulary.

It is evident that most, if not all, teachers are aware of, and focussed on, the *Further Guidance for Route D* document. This was prepared by the previous Principal Examiner and 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.

It is worth noting the new *Threshold Indicators*, which have been added to Mark Schemes. They give an indication of the likely requirements of a Level 2 and Level 3 script.

Question 1

This was a reasonably popular question with a pleasing knowledge of the concept in general. Stronger responses were able to provide clear definitions of the two terms and were able to make a clear distinction with examples in support. Unfortunately, some candidates attempted to tackle this question with a good knowledge of sovereignty in general but without the ability to differentiate between the two terms.

External sovereignty is the capacity of the state to act independently and autonomously on the world stage, whereas internal sovereignty refers to the location of power within the state.

A level 3 response with several pleasing points made throughout. The response flows well with a good structure.

The distinction between external sovereignty and ~~state~~ internal sovereignty is simple, external sovereignty affects the way in which the state operates in the international community, whilst internal sovereignty includes the recognition that what takes place within a state's borders is entirely under the influence of the state and should not be interfered with.

External sovereignty ~~was~~ is seen to be especially important within organisations like the UN, where the rights and protection of state sovereignty is seen as important whilst dealing with other states, being enshrined in the UN Charter. ~~Furthermore~~ However, the external sovereignty of states can be impinged on, as is recent years, with the development of R2P, in 2005, ~~and~~ where sovereignty is seen to be lost if the regime in power is seen to be harming its citizens. This was seen with the NATO intervention in Libya. However, as realists and nationalists, like the Chinese and Russia, would argue, especially as in the case of Syria, intervention violates sovereignty - with both parties recognising that ~~making~~ ^{any} intervention in Syria must take their course, as Muddah neatly told William Hague.

liberal sovereignty, concern the right to conduct domestic policy free from external influence. Like the right to formulate one's own law on your policy. It also concerns where sovereignty lies within a country, whether with the people, as in a democracy/republic, or with an individual, as in the case of an autocratic dictatorship/monarchy. However, with the rise of interconnectedness, even as liberals would argue, sovereignty has been lost. There is clear external influence in countries domestic affairs, especially economic, as seen with the European crisis and rise of global economic governance organisations spreading neoliberalism. i.e. SAs in African states.

The rise of global governance and supranational organisations has seen the movement from the policy of sovereignty under intergovernmentalism to the loss of sovereignty under supranationalism, influencing on the conduct of relations with other states and thus both internal and external sovereignty.



ResultsPlus

Examiner Comments

This is a satisfactory introduction which approaches the question directly. As the response develops, the language used shows a wider understanding of the key characteristics of both types of sovereignty.



ResultsPlus

Examiner Tip

It is always pleasing to note the use of contemporary examples such as those used here.

Question 2

The majority of students were able to provide criticism of the World Bank. Criticism included the market-orientated approach of the organisation, associated structural adjustment policies, structural influence within, and criticism of, the environmental impact of previous schemes funded by the World Bank.

Unfortunately, this was a two part question. Many students failed to produce a response to the second part, which required an explanation as to how the World Bank had responded to criticism. This was a key discriminator between L2 and L3 scripts. Stronger responses mentioned how the organisation has responded to environmental criticism, has placed a growing emphasis on good governance and is ensuring that projects are directed towards local needs rather than a 'one size fits all' approach.

This script achieves a level 3 mark. A number of criticisms are identified as well as the response to criticism.

Criticism of the World Bank is a common theme among anti-Globalisation protests. It is seen as a tool of Western oppression by many. An African lawyer describes it as 'a giant octopus sitting on top of Africa sucking it dry'. The main evidence which supports this view is the voting system: currently 85% of the members must agree before new rulings are made. With the US holding over 15% of the vote they hold a veto. Furthermore the UK, France, Japan, ^{Russia} and the US hold 43% of the vote between them. The system is ^{complain} ~~valuing~~ to change due to the veto. LED states ~~that~~ that they are forced into measures which hinder ~~their~~ development, despite the development goals set out to be achieved by 2015. The World Bank is seen to give advice which is in the best interest of the 'West' not in maintaining or establishing a working market. This has been addressed with the WB seeking to establish sustainable projects which generate long term jobs and profit. for example infrastructure investment in Zambia.

However often these projects come at a high price. In the 10 years between 1985-95 2.5 million people were displaced becoming refugees, due to world bank funded projects such as dams. As well as this the WB is seen to show little consideration for environmental issues. In response to this a few 'greener' projects have been launched such as crop based development, however these are slower to show benefits.

In response to criticism of western bias the WB has played an active role in re-structuring Iraq, however still working closely with the US. The major issue of the US veto and western monopoly over the WB is unlikely to be addressed whilst western leaders, such as Wolfowitz currently continue to run it.

The WB and IMF have come under criticism for not preventing the Global recession which hit in 2009. Little has been done to address this but recent years has seen a decline in investment from the World Bank.



ResultsPlus
Examiner Comments

The greatest strength of this script is the range of criticism, although further development could have been made where some of these criticisms are concerned. The balance between criticism and response to criticism is far better than many other responses.

Question 3

This was a reasonably popular question which produced a range of responses. A surprisingly large number of scripts made no reference to key expansion milestones and a number of scripts spent too much time discussing the current issues that the EU faces. Stronger responses concentrated on factors such as the creation of a free-trade bloc, the collapse of communism as an accelerator of expansion, US support and the formation of other regional trading blocs such as NAFTA. A key discriminator was the number of factors presented with explanation.

A reasonable response with key points made and some level of explanation applied.

The key driving forces behind the expansion of the EU are the economic benefits, an emergence of political + economic regionalism and the collapse of communism in eastern Europe.

The EU is a economic based structural organisation at heart, and though there has been some spillover into political interconnectiveness, it mainly focuses on + promotes economic interconnectiveness. This alone is a key driving force for its expansion, as other European states see that being members of the E.U. will benefit them economically, as it is the largest + most wealthy trading bloc in the world. Another reason is the emergence of political + economic regionalism, which means that within Europe it is believed that a ~~higher regionalism~~ ~~larger~~ by merging all the economies + the establishment of a single currency (euro) than the combined states will be stronger than the sum of its parts. It can also be argued that the ~~idea of~~ E.U. is a federal superstate, which would link with regionalism + the belief of a stronger, combined Europe as well as the giving up of sovereignty to a higher supranational body such as the European central bank or court of law.

The last reason for the expansion of the E.U would be the fall of communism in eastern europe. Of its 27 member states, 12 have joined since the end of the cold war, with the vast majority of them being ex-communist states. As a result the decline of communism in europe has actually helped the expansion of the E.U, probably due to the E.U's soft power and the economic benefits it would bring to poor, ex-communist states.



ResultsPlus

Examiner Comments

A very direct introduction which sets out a range of factors for discussion. The economic benefits are explained and there is reference to the reasons behind the growth of 2004 and 2007. Further development of some of the valid points raised would have strengthened this response further.

Question 4

This was the most popular of the short responses. There were a number of well-prepared scripts where students had clearly learnt definitions and were confident in distinguishing between the two terms.

Great powers rank amongst the most powerful in a hierarchical system with a number of factors which give them this rank. In contrast, a superpower is more powerful than a traditional great power. It is a great power plus great mobility of power. Superpowers typically possess a global reach, economic influence and strategic strength within their sphere of influence, and nuclear weaponry. Use of historic examples was key in explaining the differences between the two terms, although some pleasing contemporary examples were also used.

This is an example of a response which has a focus on contemporary examples. Although lacking the historic examples, it does enough to achieve a L3 score.

An example of a super power in our current world would be the USA. ~~There~~ There are a number of distinguishable features that super powers have over great powers such as China, Britain and Russia. Firstly a super power will be able to project its power far away from home, this can be seen by the USA having over 700 bases globally in over 100 different countries and through its invasion of Iraq and Afghanistan, far from its territory. Although a great power needs to have some projection of power away from home it may not be as far reaching, such as Russia's invasion of Georgia which it is geographically very close to.

In connection with this projection of power a superpower must have a massive military force and capability, and is dominant so that it should not be able to be rivalled militarily. This suggests that it must have nuclear capability, indeed the USA has over 3,000 nuclear war heads. ~~the~~ Whereas a great power must also have strong military capability, and should only be able to be defeated by another great power, it perhaps cannot compete militarily with a super power, but again

would be the possession of nuclear weapons.

Another difference between a super power and a great power is that a super power has the ability to act unilaterally and undertake invasions on its own, this is very much demonstrated by the invasion of Iraq by the USA under Bush, where it did not use NATO and its actions were not legitimised by a UN resolution. A great power may have the power to act in this way but not unilaterally, only multilaterally like Britain with the USA in Iraq and Afghanistan. It suggests that a great power would not have the capabilities on its own.

A super power would have a special role within global governance, and perhaps have privileged seats within the ICOS - eg USA is always the president of the World Bank and has a permanent seat on the UN Security Council. Due to ~~the~~ its influence within the ICOS it may undertake a special job of 'policing the world' and maintaining stability and uphold human rights in the globe. This can be seen through the American led humanitarian intervention in Kuwait in 1991 against the forces of Saddam Hussein who had invaded it. It was sanctioned by the UN and had much support but the UN led this. A great power on the other hand may have seats on the ICOS (Britain, France, China and Russia all have permanent seats on the UN Security Council) but are not as influential and cannot set the global agenda in the same way as a super power.

A final difference between a super power and a great power is that a super power is usually dominant across all three areas of politics, economics and military capability, whereas a great power may be strong in ~~all three~~ ^{all three} areas, and say China is particularly so economically. It is not dominant in all of them like a super power.

However there are similarities in the characteristics of super powers and great powers because they do share many of the same characteristics, however super powers just tend to be more powerful or dominant in these characteristics, and as a super power abundant power is always relative.



ResultsPlus Examiner Comments

Key elements are discussed such as power projection, military power/nuclear capability, economic and structural power. Some useful examples appear in the response.



ResultsPlus Examiner Tip

When making a point, it is always useful to provide an example. This script provides useful examples in support of assertions made.

Question 5

This was a popular question and there were some very strong responses. The term has appeared in previous questions and a number of candidates were clearly ready to provide particularly strong definitions and to provide a strong level of description using impressive vocabulary. Only a very small number of students seemed to confuse global governance with world government.

Key features include a broad, complex and dynamic multi-actor and multi-level process of interactive decision-making at the global level, where consensual decision-making operates through an intergovernmental process.

This response has a superb introduction, which makes it immediately apparent that the candidate understands exactly what is required of them.

Global governance is a complex, broad and dynamic process ~~through which~~ where decision-making occurs at a global level between states and other actors. A key feature includes 'polycentrism'; while the United Nations has essentially overarching authority ~~over~~ over all actors upon the world stage, it is by no means the only form of global governance that exists. Other frameworks through which global governance occurs include the IMF, World Bank and World Trade Organisation which also act as forums for global governance on economic issues.

Another feature of global governance includes intergovernmentalism. While supranationalism does exist (for example, it can be said that the UN Security Council is a 'de facto' supranational body), most interactions take place on a basis of cooperation of sovereign states. The G20, for example, exemplifies the way in which states cooperate with one another without ~~losing~~ surrendering their sovereignty to a higher, global authority.

Global governance is also a multi-level process. ~~while on a domestic level, the state and~~ It includes the interaction of municipal, national, regional and global organisations - for example, the WTO consists of independent states but also the regional institution the

European Union. ~~Not that~~ Within this system, all actors are equal ~~togeth~~ in 'de jure' terms, regardless of their size.

Finally, ~~it is at~~ global governance is a mixed actor process. While, on a domestic level, the state and civil society ~~are~~ act separate from activist movements and non-governmental organisations (NGOs), global governance does not just include cooperation between states but also incorporates NGOs, TNGs and activist movements. For example, 1,500 NGOs were present at the 1993 UN Human Rights conference in Vienna.



ResultsPlus Examiner Comments

Sophisticated language is used, with key terms integrated into the explanation. Some very useful examples support the script.



ResultsPlus Examiner Tip

Try to provide an introduction like this one, which makes it immediately clear that you understand exactly what is required of you.

Another very pleasing response, which adheres to the specific question asked.

Global governance is a process through which global decision making and cooperation is ~~facilitated~~ ~~maintained~~ through a multilateral system. It allows states to maintain their sovereignty whilst still being part of an interconnected world, with some even describing it as cooperation under ~~an~~ anarchy.

as it reduces anarchy without having a world government.

There are 5 main features. Global governance is polycentral, which means that it involves multiple institutes rather than one which carry out a range of actions. An example of this is in the European Union, where you have the Council, Commission and Parliament.

Another feature is intergovernmentalism. This means that the states still maintain an important role in the decision making and have the final say. This is demonstrated in some aspects of the United Nations, as each member of the security council has a veto and therefore can oppose an idea.

Global governance also tends to include multiple actors. This might be legislatures, ministers from individual states or the leaders of states themselves. It might also include working with other organisations like how the UN works with the WTO & IMF.

There is also a ^{It is also a} multilateral system, ^{where} decisions are made at different levels, by different people, with no-one level being supreme. This prevents one person or country

taking control and this is what separates ~~the~~ global governance from world government.

Finally, global governance ~~also~~ is also deformed, which means that it acts according to international norms and works in as part of the informal international regime. This helps it maintain its respect for international traditions, such as Sovereignty.

Overall, global governance has many important features, but the most important is the fact ~~that~~ that it works in a multilateral system, as this allows states to be equal and drastically reduces the chance of one state trying to control the others.



ResultsPlus Examiner Comments

This response is set out very logically, flows well and considers a number of features with a strong explanation.



ResultsPlus Examiner Tip

This response gives an indication of how, ideally, to structure a response. It is logical, clear and consequently very effective.

Question 6

This was the second most popular of the long responses and produced a wide range of marks. A number of candidates were clearly very well-prepared and produced well-structured answers with a wide range of examples.

Stronger responses discussed how economic globalisation arguably makes the rich richer and the poor less poor. They also suggested that TNCs brought opportunity, spread wealth and helped to provide decades of growth. Emerging economies built on the free market seem to support this positive view. Counter-arguments focussed on TNC exploitation of cheap labour and weak regulations. They also showed how economic globalisation can promote a western model linked to consumerism and the undermining of cultural and social distinctiveness.

Economic globalisation may indeed become the defining factor of the 21st century. As nations become more interconnected economically and national borders seem to ~~disappear~~ become less important, it seems that globalisation is defining our very way of life. Yet whether it is actually beneficial to the entire world is debated. Some have contended that it simply benefits the West and is neo-colonialism in disguise, whilst others contend that it is the main driving force steering the world to economic success. It is my opinion, however, that although globalisation benefits vast swathes of the world's population, it doesn't benefit all. As Kofi Annan ~~once~~ has suggested, if globalisation doesn't benefit everyone then it is not working - and I agree with him.

Amy Chua, the author of 'World on Fire', has also suggested that economic globalisation benefits the few rather than the many. She believes that it has led to greater inequality of wealth, and more worryingly because of the global communications revolution (the internet, and world-wide satellite) as people in nations not benefiting from globalisation are more aware of the differences.

This leads to huge levels of resentment, especially against Western Powers who are reelling in the splendours of economic globalization. ~~This leads to the rise of extreme~~ This in turn has led to a rise of things such as militant Islam. Now, I agree with Chua that globalisation is causing resentment, but I disagree that it is creating greater inequalities of wealth. Inequalities between the North and South have long been prevalent, if anything economic globalisation - with the help of the WTO - is creating a scenario in which greater prosperity is possible.

Paul Collier in his book the 'Bottom Billion' makes a similar point, and claims that if the poorest nations in the world ~~can~~ accept globalisation then they too can prosper. ~~I agree with Collier, as if one looks to examples of poorer nations opening up their markets to globalization, one observes prosperity. Ghana for instance is now enjoying a sustain level of 6% GDP thanks to embracing economic globalisation.~~

However, one can see instances in which the ~~poor~~ ^{many} are being manipulated and suffering so that the few can benefit hugely from globalisation. This is best observed in what has been termed the 'race to the bottom' whereby workers in emerging markets are being exploited pushing wages further and further down. This is highlighted by the irresponsibility of ~~the~~ MNCs such as Foxconn. This technology company is moving its operations from Shenzhen further in land to

China where wages are cheaper, with little regard for the workers. This shows the brutality of globalisation, and how often a few elite nations are taking advantage of globalisation whilst the majority are yet to reap its rewards.

In response to this though, one may argue that globalisation is undoubtedly helping and benefiting LEDCs. For instance, between 1991 and 2007 an enormous \$2.1 trillion has been invested in LEDCs because of globalisation, and ~~Sub~~ Sub-Saharan Africa is now enjoying a fast economic growth rate of 6% (larger than many Western nations' own GDP levels today). From this it seems hard to doubt that globalisation is in fact benefiting the many as well as the few.

Yet even this argument has been considered flawed by some people. Critics of globalisation say it is simply neo-colonialism - as Ha Choon Tang has argued, LEDCs now run the risk of becoming simply neo-colonial markets. China's advance into Africa, for instance, although it has resulted in a huge increase in investment to the region and the building of infrastructure, does undeniably benefit the Chinese more than the Africans. The Chinese plunder the raw materials of nations, they impose repressive or leaders condemning human rights records, and the building of the infrastructure itself is often only to benefit the Chinese operation, and they ~~are~~ even use Chinese workers. Furthermore, America - arguably

the greatest benefits of globalisation - has been criticised for what Robert Cooper calls, an 'imperialist tinge'. America has benefited immensely from globalisation, with the spread of its MNCs all over the world, and whilst the U.S. portrays this as beneficial to the world economy, as Samuel Huntington has said, it's 'globalisation to the west and imperialism to the rest.'

However, it would be naive to deny that economic globalisation hasn't had considerable success stories all over the world. Arguably, now in the 21st Century, the greatest beneficiaries of economic globalisation are the emerging economies - Brazil, Russia, India, China, as well as the South-East Asian Tigers like Taiwan and South Korea, and on also parts of Africa. China now has the second largest economy (with growth rates as high as 9.6% for Nov. 2010) and is expected to surpass America as the ~~first~~ largest by 2020. This just shows us that globalisation is impacting people all over the world, and in a positive way.

There is however one problem with this argument, and that is the one dimensional, purely economic interpretation of development and beneficiary. Yes, numerous nations are reaping the rewards of globalization, but there are considerable social and political factors that go unchanged. Over 100 million Chinese earn under \$1.25 a day - the national poverty line. In Africa, civil wars,

as HIV/AIDS and malaria are still a massive problem, and all over the world human rights aren't protected - with women, homosexuals and members of specific minority groups being treated unequally from East Europe to the middle East.

Being this in mind then, in conclusion, it is hard to maintain that globalisation is benefiting the many instead of the few. The critique of neo-colonialism and hyperglobalism are still sustained, and socio-political crises are still rife. Despite continued economic growth in many places in the world, it still seems that globalisation still isn't benefiting enough people.



ResultsPlus

Examiner Comments

A useful script with many positive elements. The introduction is balanced and gives an indication of where the student intends taking us.

Argument tends to be supported with examples or comment relating to political commentators. Counter-argument follows argument in order to strengthen the mark for synopticity.

A number of interesting points are raised.



ResultsPlus

Examiner Tip

Try to make clear in which direction you intend taking the examiner, with a clear introduction. A clear introduction gives a good first impression.

Economic globalisation refers to the growing interdependence and interconnectedness of the planet's nation's economies, whereby the free flow of capital is increasingly allowed between them. On the one side, hyper-globalisers such as John Naberger and Thomas Friedman argue that economic globalisation has universally benefited all those who have taken advantage of it, as it creates greater wealth through free trade, the free market and global capital markets.

However, globalisation sceptics like Amy Chua argue that ~~global~~ economic globalisation has in fact increased ~~and~~ the poverty in developing countries and has ~~not~~ indeed created greater wealth, but focused it into the hands of a few - meaning that she believes that economic globalisation creates greater inequality of wealth.

~~Undoubtedly~~ Undoubtedly, though, globalisation has benefited at least some economies. John Naberger ~~and~~ points to the story of Kenya and Taiwan who were, in 1983, equally poor. Taiwan then embraced globalisation and Kenya did not and closed the door. Now Taiwan is 20-times richer than Kenya, which is plagued by corruption and economic stagnation. ~~The~~ This has also been displayed ~~in~~ all around Asia, with the huge growth of China

and India, along with the "Tiger" economies which, as well as African countries like Botswana and Ghana.

This is because economic globalisation, it is argued, promotes the creation of jobs worldwide, meaning that businesses thrive, people become richer, and the ~~global~~ ~~economy~~ "borderless" global economy benefits as a result.

Moreover, it has been argued by Thomas Friedman

in "The World is Flat" that economic globalisation actually reduces conflict and war through the fact that every country is part of the same global supply chain. He argues is - and he calls this the "Bell Theory" - that countries ~~are~~ that are part of the same global supply chain have no incentive to go to war, since they are so interdependent - a sort of economic version of "mutually assured destruction" in a way. This point is backed by the fact that he points out that no two countries have gone to war since they ~~attained~~ ~~McDonalds~~ McDonalds expanded into those countries. However, some point out that world trade actually peaked in 1914 (known as the "first age of globalisation" to some), yet world war broke out, and they use this to disprove Friedman's point. However, World War I broke out ~~also~~ for many other reasons like power transition and multipolarity that are not so present today. Thus Friedman's "Bell Theory" stands.

Economic globalisation also reduces conflict by creating interdependence in terms of creditors and debtors.

The prime example of this is between the US and China, whereby both nations are obliged to cooperate as conflict would result in the collapse of both of their economies. Arguably, they are both tied together because of China's huge holding of US debt and China's reliance on US domestic demand for their exports.

So, the argument that globalisation benefits the many is strong, as hyper-globalisers point to the miracle economic performance of Asian economies, as well as the effect on the living standards of the respective populations this has had. After all, economic growth remains the only sure indicator that people will gradually be lifted out of poverty. China has been lifting millions out of poverty

as key flock to the cities to take advantage of new job opportunities created by globalisation. And India has seized the advantage of its huge English-speaking labour force and has led the "call centre revolution". Furthermore, it is obvious that the interdependence as a result of globalisation has decreased the potential for conflict between states.

However, there is great evidence given by globalisation sceptics like Amartya Sen that economic globalisation has led to greater inequalities of wealth in those countries that have had huge economic growth. Also, ~~Paul Rost~~ ~~Paul Rost~~ points out that Sub-Saharan Africa has in fact stagnated since the 1980s, when globalisation really took hold. In the 1970s, the Sub-Saharan African economies were, together, growing at a reasonable rate (with a few exceptions, of course). But since then, as Ha-Joon Cheung shows, these growth rates have declined. This is because globalisation sceptics argue that globalisation is largely American imperialism, imposing free-market reforms on developing countries that are not ready to face the full brunt of competition. They also argue that America is only doing this to gain favourable terms of trade so they can gain exports of natural resources cheaply, manufacture arms, and then sell them back to the developing-country population.

Ha-Joon Cheung is the main advocate of infant protectionism to protect infant industries and then only open up once they are ready to face international competition. He argues that globalisation benefits the few, which are the developed nations such as the US. He also claims that these "peripheral" states are being exploited by "core" states, so that they never reach

a proto-industrial stage of development, and are thus trapped in the primary sector (agriculture). The evidence for this shows all over Africa, as the most countries rely almost entirely on natural resource exports for their economic growth, and do not have a balanced economy of agriculture, manufacturing and services. They therefore need to be able to develop under protectionism initially. Ha-Joon Chung actually points out that the UK and US were extremely protectionist during their ~~early~~ economic rises in the 18th and 19th centuries respectively.

Angie Chua also argues that globalisation only benefits the few in those countries where the economy is growing rapidly. Despite China's rise to economic prominence, it is still a developing country with millions in poverty. In fact 100 million still live on less than \$1.25 a day. India has also experienced an increase in aged poverty since it "took advantage" of globalisation. Chua thus argues that economic globalisation creates greater inequality of wealth, leading to social resentment of the elite class who have benefited. She says that the economic growth is not worth the social problems it causes.

Conor Woodman in "Unfair Trade" also points out that TNCs often exploit the working populations of countries for their cheap labour. He argues that the working conditions are appalling in factories like factories in Vietnam and Foxconn factories in China (Foxconn has the highest suicide rate of any TNC in the world). Economic globalisation, he says, therefore only benefits the few.

In conclusion, though, globalisation does indeed benefit the many in the long run. But Paul Collier's

concern argument in "The Bottom Billion" is correct. The Asian economic powerhouse have benefited from globalisation and history shows that economic growth always produces ~~impr~~ improved living standards in the long-run. And problems of the Sub-Saharan African economies are not ones as a result of globalisation, but as a result of bad governance, natural resource curse and corruption.



ResultsPlus

Examiner Comments

Again, a strong introduction which immediately makes clear where the script will be heading. Very pleasing use of political commentators illustrates that this is a very aware and well-read candidate. Examples are always relevant to the argument, rather than inserted as an attempt to try to show some wider knowledge.



ResultsPlus

Examiner Tip

This script uses more sophisticated language than the previous one, which shows that the candidate is comfortable with key elements and theories.

Question 7

This was the most popular of the long responses and produced a range of quality. Definitions tended to be clear but the big difference between scripts tended to be the inclusion, or not, of historic examples and the use of realist and liberal views on the question.

There is an argument that multipolarity increases the likelihood of war. This is based on the perceived fluidity and uncertainty of multipolarity. Multipolarity may cause shifting alliances and may encourage reckless behaviour. The counter-argument is that multipolarity tends towards multilateralism, cooperation, integration and peace, helped by global governance.

A well-written and confident script, with a wide-ranging commentary and discussion of the likelihood of conflict and instability in a multipolar system.

~~The regional organisation with the most economic integration is the EU. Some intergovernmental bodies such as the African union are not economically integrated at all but~~

Multipolarity is the distribution of power throughout the international system on three or more states. Some people argue we are currently in a multipolar system as the rise and substantial economic growth of Brazil, Russia, India and China have spread power more evenly throughout the world order. However some argue that although China (the leading state of the BRICs) grew at 10% every year over the last decade and is predicted to overtake the US by 2016, it is unable to compete with the US in political or cultural areas.

They argue that the USA remains a hegemon in a unipolar system since the collapse of the Soviet Union and a bipolar system.

Realists would argue that the potential of a multipolar world cannot be maintained. They adopt an almost Hobbesian view of human nature and therefore expect states to behave in the same way. They believe states are self-interested and preoccupied with power and influence as this is the only way to ensure self-preservation, safety, glory and the necessities of a state to provide for the population. Realists believe that states are autonomous, sovereign

actors in an anarchic system and therefore are not governed by any global law or conventions. The international system is therefore characterised by fear, suspicion and competitiveness in order to achieve a hegemonic position from which a state can be dominant in the international system. Realists would argue that in a multi-polar world every state would be competing for the hegemonic position or as Hobbes would describe it 'a war of all against all'. A hegemon or a bipolar balance of power is the only way to achieve temporary peace as using military and economic control a hegemon would be able to construct and control the rules of a liberalised economy. This is reflected in the way the USA plays a central and some argue dominant role in institutions such as the UN, the WTO and the IMF. Often these institutions were initiated and constructed with the US at the center, so this would complement the realist ideas that a hegemon could regulate the behaviour both economically and politically of other states in the international system. Realists argue a bipolar distribution of power as demonstrated in the Cold War could also bring peace. An equal balance of power creates a mutual fear and competitiveness in each state. Neither state will initiate war unless they are entirely certain of success as neither power wants to lose the power and position they have obtained. This however cannot always be maintained and may result in war or a change in the balance of power. The Cuban missile crisis demonstrated this theory in that neither state was willing to initiate war and so a tense peace was created.

Alternatively Liberalists believe that a multipolar world is the ideal balance of power for creating peace. Liberalists hold a more optimistic view of human nature more like Locke's view of human behaviour in the state of nature. They believe that states are naturally cooperative and willing to compromise to avoid war, and that war is only turned to as a last resort. This is visible

in the vast number of International and Intergovernmental organisations that have arisen in recent years who can hold global jurisdiction or regional jurisdiction, like the UN or African Union. This is also visible in some of the ways the cold war was resolved as communication and trade links were established between the two powers in order to reduce the risk of war through cooperation. Liberalists believe that a multipolar world with equal states is the optimum balance of power because it enables states to engage in debate and resolution of conflicts and cooperation on mutual interests without the threat of superior military and economic power. They disagree with the Realist view that bipolarity and hegemony will produce peace. A Bipolar balance of power can only encourage a relationship of distrust, resentment and aggression and also enlarges state egoism and military spending. This is illustrated in the way military spending and fear of conflict rose during the Cold war rather than a feeling of peace. Similarly they argue hegemony also creates a feeling of resentment and competitiveness in the international system. This may also cause instability as second level powers conspire to overthrow the hegemonic power. However this view is more disputed as it is part of hegemonic ability to be able to inspire trust and cooperation in second level states reducing the risk of this type of coup. Liberalism and Realism present opposing views on the potential conflict and instability created by the multipolarity balance of power. However it could be argued that Realism is outdated in a more globalised and interconnected global structure. As states become more economically interconnected and politically interconnected, states are more willing to cooperate and discuss areas of conflict more diplomatically rather than using hard power tactics. This kind of interconnectedness was illustrated by the recent ~~change~~ change of interest rates in China showing they too are affected by the global economic crisis. The rising importance of soft power

is shown by China and Germany's joint cabinet meeting recently. ~~and~~ Some Liberals especially 'hyperglobalisers' have argued that states are now 'post sovereign' as they are unable to control effects of global events on the internal mechanics (often economical) of their state. This makes the realist outline of competing states rather more unlikely as it would not only damage their opponents economy but also their own and their allies as investment and trade links are disrupted. This web of interconnection and interdependence was illustrated by the 2008 global financial crisis when the American bank Lehman Brothers collapsed it subsequently caused the near collapse of 10 other banks including RBS and some Icelandic banks. Therefore the Liberalist theory of cooperation and interdependence appears more realistic, suggesting that a multipolarity is unlikely to result in conflict and instability.



ResultsPlus

Examiner Comments

A mostly effective introduction, which provides a definition and some indication of the level of argument that we can expect. Pleasing comparisons and contrast between multipolarity and bipolarity as well as unipolarity. Good examples are used and there is a real strength of argument, which helps to ensure that this becomes a L3 response.



ResultsPlus

Examiner Tip

Note how this student is open to both sides of the argument and how the response moves from one side to the other and back again repeatedly.

Multipolarity is a situation where there are no dominant powers in the international system, ~~and~~ instead there are ~~add~~ multiple states vying for a predominant position. Realists advocate the theory that ~~multipolar~~ multipolarity tends to cause instability and heightens the chance of conflict in the ~~because~~ international system because multipolarity typically causes anarchy. This is counterproductive towards achieving peace because realists suggest that anarchy only intensifies human nature into being more aggressive. As each state attempts to consolidate its power in a multipolar world, expansionist behaviour will only increase as states try to gain a territorial or tactical advantage over one another. This type of behaviour occurred prior to the events of WWI, where Britain, Germany and France all had empires to a certain extent, but Germany wanted to expand its power and influence in the hope of ~~emerging~~ emerging as the dominant power in central Europe.

However, liberals counter this view by stating multipolar worlds are more preferable to Unipolar or bipolar systems.

Liberals highlight that a system in which no one state holds dominance forces states to seek alternative methods to achieve their aims. In multipolar systems states are more inclined to develop relations with other states and co-operate with one another instead of resorting to conflict. Liberal thinkers emphasise that military build ups in one ~~to~~ state only encourage a similar response from another state, therefore creating an arms race as seen during the Cold War period. Liberals therefore consider

multipolar systems to curb aggression and prevent hegemonic behaviour developing. However, history would contest this point highlighting liberal beliefs about conflict to be relatively Utopian and unpragmatic in nature.

It is for this reason that realist theory has held sway over international relations, because it takes a more practical approach to analysing the best ways to prevent conflict and instability.

Many realist thinkers, despite the tension that existed during the Cold War claim that a bipolar world is a more effective way of ensuring peace and stability in the world. During the Cold War between the USA and Soviet Union there was an equilibrium of power, where neither state had an advantage over the other. Because of this balance of power conflict was ~~kept~~ continuously averted as it ~~is~~ was not in the interest of either state to pursue actions of aggression. The closest the USA and Soviet Union came ~~to~~ to all out war ~~was~~ was during the culmination of the Cuban Missile crisis, where Soviet engineers ~~we~~ were attempting to construct missile ~~sights~~ sites in Cuba. This ~~is~~ potentially devastating situation was ~~not~~ ~~prevent~~ narrowly prevented from escalating because the ~~threat~~ consequence of mutually assured nuclear destruction was too great. In effect, having two bases of power in the world ~~assures~~ ensures that neither one will take any hostile action towards another because the cost would be too high. This is why realists advocate the idea of countervailing powers in the international system which fundamentally stops one power becoming the dominant power.

~~Another reason~~ In addition, during the post Cold War period America emerged as the dominant superpower in the world after the collapse of the Soviet Union. This geopolitical shift from east to west effectively made America a hegemonic state and allowed it to consolidate its ~~its~~ cultural, economic and political influence across the world. Since ~~this~~ the collapse of the Soviet Union, ~~the~~ the world has enjoyed relative peace with no further ~~out~~ outbreaks of world war. Minor conflicts have arisen over the decades, most notably the American invasion of Vietnam, Iraq and Afghanistan, but also the events of the recent Arab Spring in Libya, Egypt and Syria. This

therefore illustrates how peace tends to be maintained when either one or two powers are dominant in the world. Multipolar systems can therefore be criticised for causing conflict and instability, but it depends on whether you take an optimistic liberal approach, or pessimistic approach towards viewing human nature. The latter would suggest multipolar systems only strengthen anarchy and the ~~pre~~ human predisposition to be aggressive ~~towards~~ towards one another. The former view would advocate the human nature's potential good and our ability to work past our differences to adapt and become more co-operative with each other.

Historical evidence would seem to support the realist view because both WW1 and WW2 were caused during a period where more than one power was trying to achieve supremacy. In WW1 it was Britain, Germany, France and Russia. In WW2 it was Britain, France, Germany, ~~Italy~~, Russia, America and Japan. ~~and~~

The second world war was the most devastating in terms of loss of life and damage which is down to how many ~~power~~ states were trying to achieve dominance. ~~Therefore~~



ResultsPlus

Examiner Comments

The definition is clear but the introduction is rather busy with a one-sided argument. The script develops with both a realist and liberal perspective made clear and there are some excellent examples which provide pleasing knowledge marks, as well as supporting the developing arguments.



ResultsPlus

Examiner Tip

If you intend creating a two-sided argument, as this script does, then make that apparent in the introduction.

Question 8

This was, by far, the least popular of the longer questions and produced a number of weaker responses, where students tended to focus on a single example of economic and political integration without further development. The EU is the clearest example of a regional project which has moved from economic union to political union. Moves from the 1980s onwards have brought about a degree of political integration which can be made clear through a description of qualified majority voting, restrictions on the national veto and the supremacy of EU law. There are similar examples and tendencies elsewhere, such as ASEAN, although not as developed.

Even within the EU, 'spillover' from economic integration to political integration has not proceeded as fast as many would wish and the 'deepening' of the EU has been weakened by 'widening'. The emphasis in other regional bodies still seems to be on economic rather than political integration which suggests that the EU may be exceptional in the transition that has taken place from economic to political integration.

An interesting example which attempts to stick strictly to the specific question. There are a number of strengths as well as some obvious weakness but this is still one of the better scripts.

~~Plan~~
Intro: Define economic and political integration.
Judgement.

Yes	No
<p>• All regional organisations have or are spilling over EU, ASEAN, AU.</p> <p>• Political integration is the next logical step to control economic integration.</p> <p>• Economic integration has drawn states closer, they want to co-operate through political channels.</p>	<p>• Some are resisting spillover.</p> <p>• Political integration is no different to Empires and is therefore not logical. Rome has existed since 1000 years.</p> <p>• State egoism will always mean state chooses for its interest - realist.</p>

~~Concl - Judgement~~
~~Sum-up.~~

Economic integration is the merging of state economies to make one common economy. Political integration is the giving a higher body to the ability to make decisions on behalf of states and often involves the pooling of sovereignty. Within regions this is often done in regional organisations like the European Union (EU) and Association of South East Asian Nations.

ASEAN). ~~Economic~~ With this in mind, economic ~~and~~ integration inevitably leads to political integration to a small extent however in most cases ~~it~~ it is the next logical step.

§ Economic integration will inevitably lead to political integration as most regional organisations (ROs) have ~~are~~ or are spilling over. Examples include the EU, ASEAN and the African Union (AU). The EU is the classic example of where spill-over has occurred. It has gone from a RO that controlled coal and steel to a free market and now to a governing body that has its own law and regulations. Another RO in the world seem to suggest that the EU is not an isolated case. ASEAN, argued to be the other RO like the EU, was just a RO that regulated trade and established free trade agreements. However evidence now suggests that spill-over into political integration may occur as it holds talks with its members, and even China, about establishing Asian culture zones and allowing it more powers. This spill-over is also evident with the AU which based itself on the EU and can already be argued to have spilled over as it gets more involved in helping/controlling its members, an example being its involvement in Somalia to try and eradicate the terrorist threat. So economic integration will inevitably lead to political integration as ROs ~~states~~ have or are spilling over.

However, this may not entirely be the case as some ROs are trying to stop/reduce spill-over and

authority to enforce the 'one country' policy. As a result of this, its political power have inevitably dropped as member states see the surge of its control and ask for more over other areas. It can be argued the same thing is happening with ASEAN as it tries to enforce its free trade agreement between its member states and China. As China is not a member of ASEAN, it is even more important political integration occurs so as to give it the authority to enter discussions. This desire of creating something to cooperate to achieve a common goal is the basis of Liberalism. So political integration is inevitable as it is the next logical step to control political integration.

However, realists would argue political integration is ~~not~~ not logical. Realists believe that states are the only key players and that these international structures are made by states for states (structure I). They would argue that in every RO there is one dominant member who will make sure any policies made in the RO benefit its national interest (state egoism). Therefore this makes ROs no different to empires. An A perfect example is Germany and France dominate the EU and are currently trying to force Greece to adopt financial measures it doesn't like so as to keep the European economy afloat which will benefit them. This is ~~not~~ how political integration is necessary for an RO to become a higher body to enforce agreements, it simply weakens most states and strengthens the dominant ones. Therefore this means political integration can not be logical and therefore can not be inevitable.

Economic integration inevitably leads to political integration to a small extent although in most cases it is the next logical step.



ResultsPlus

Examiner Comments

A decent introduction, which attempts to make clear the distinction between the two terms, as well as the possible link. There is some repetition and a sense that the candidate loses their way but there is also a great deal to admire. The link between economic and potential political integration is made clear and there is some discussion on the realist perspective of the likelihood of political integration. The candidate tries hard to remain relevant throughout.

Paper Summary

This paper worked well as a discriminator, with a wide range of marks achieved across all questions.

Further advice

Please note the advice in the introduction on awareness of A01, A02, A03 and synoptic skills.

Please note the advice in the introduction on awareness of the Further Guidance document available on the Edexcel web site.

Focus on definitions and on relevant introductions, which set out the argument to be pursued.

Use examples to support arguments.

Grade Boundaries

Grade boundaries for this, and all other papers, can be found on the website on this link:

<http://www.edexcel.com/iwantto/Pages/grade-boundaries.aspx>

Further copies of this publication are available from
Edexcel Publications, Adamsway, Mansfield, Notts, NG18 4FN

Telephone 01623 467467

Fax 01623 450481

Email publication.orders@edexcel.com

Order Code UA032360 June 2012

For more information on Edexcel qualifications, please visit

www.edexcel.com/quals

Pearson Education Limited. Registered company number 872828
with its registered office at Edinburgh Gate, Harlow, Essex CM20 2JE



Llywodraeth Cynulliad Cymru
Welsh Assembly Government

