

Examiners' Report
June 2015

GCE Government and Politics 6GP04 4D

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 UA041724

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 4D examination. Subject knowledge was particularly strong and there was, for the most part, a pleasing focus on the wording of the questions. With one exception, there was little difference in the popularity of the short questions. The exception was Q4 on the 'war on terror' and how it differs from traditional wars. This was, by some distance, the most popular of the short questions. The most popular long response was the question on the proliferation of nuclear and other weapons of mass destruction. The least popular long response was on climate change.

Question 1

This was quite a popular question and acted as a good differentiator with some outstanding responses as well as some rather weaker attempts. Identifying a range of controversies relating to courts and tribunals was key. A number of candidates attempted this question without examples and relied on general observations. Stronger responses were able to use examples such as the ICC and special tribunals as well as to discuss controversies such as those linked to impact on sovereignty, western dominance, slow processing, lack of arrest powers and double standards.

This is a decent effort which covers a range of controversies.

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 <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Question 2 <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Question 3 <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Question 4 <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Question 5 <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	

~~Human rights~~ Western bias
Quarararra Bay

• ICC - 2002
- can't prosecute US

international courts and tribunals
invade sov

Human rights can be described as the basic rights and freedoms all humans are entitled to by the virtue of being human. They can be described as universal as they have a global reach over all of humanity. They can be seen as controversial due to reasons such as having a western cultural bias, the invasion of state sovereignty and the failure to uphold human rights in areas of the world.

The first reason in which international courts and tribunals can cause controversy is the work of the ~~IAOCC~~ ICC of 2002. This can only prosecute individuals that have committed crimes against the Geneva Convention after 2002.

The

Because of this it may be seen to be controversial. Also, not all countries have ratified the Rome Statute of the ICC, this includes the US and Russia, therefore the court is not legally binding. Also, the ICC can not prosecute Americans due to the American servicepersons act. In this sense the court may be controversial as it is not effectively upholding human rights.

Following this, the international courts and tribunals have been criticised for having a western cultural bias based on western ideology. This can be seen as the ICC has only ever prosecuted black people, which can cause controversy. Also, hegemonic abuse still takes place and atrocities such as Guantanamo Bay, Abu Ghraib, CIA black sites, extraordinary rendition still takes place by the US.

Therefore, the international courts and tribunals have failed to uphold human rights.

Another way in which controversy has been caused is the work of the international criminal tribunals. The international tribunals are often very slow to act and are very expensive. They can be said to undermine

state sovereignty as ~~at~~ Milovic, the former president of Yugoslavia, argued. Also, ~~th~~ in the case of the Special Tribunal for former Yugoslavia, Milovic was only handed in so Serbia could join the EU, therefore these bodies can be used politically which causes huge controversy. Also, these international courts and tribunals go against articles 2.1, 2.4 and 2.4 of the ~~the~~ UN which respect state sovereignty.

Ran out of time

- ICC has no police force and relies on states to hand people in.
- The ICJ has failed to prosecute ~~the~~ Assad due to Russian veto.



ResultsPlus Examiner Comments

There is a quick attempt at a definition and then a consideration of controversies such as western cultural bias, impact on sovereignty, failure in some cases to uphold human rights, double standards such as Guantanamo Bay and slowness in acting.



ResultsPlus Examiner Tip

There is credit in the bullet point identification of additional factors at the end.

This is a well structure response which provides a brief introduction and a collection of key controversies.

**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

Plan: western bias, failure of courts, state sovereignty

Human rights are rights to which people are entitled by virtue of being human. They are fundamental, indivisible, universal and absolute. International courts and tribunals are one of the major ways that human rights are protected in the modern. Such as through the ICC, ICTY and ICTR; however, there is controversy over their use.

One reason there is controversy over the use of international courts and tribunals is because they are seen to have a western bias. Firstly the human rights that they protect are the universal declaration of human rights, which many argue are western rights. They do not take account for the Cairo declaration or the Bangkok declaration which give different versions of human rights. Also every case currently open in the ICC is in Africa leading some people to believe that the ICC has a western bias.

A second reason international courts and tribunals are met with controversy is because they often have been a failure. The ICC has only managed to convict two world leaders in its time. Also many cases have been abandoned, such as the case against Muammar Gaddafi because he died before a judgement could be made. This also occurred under the ICTY with former President Milosevic dying before he could fulfil his sentence. Also the international courts and tribunals cost a huge amount of money and take a long time for cases to begin and any convictions to be made. Therefore, international courts and tribunals have been met with controversy because they have failed in protecting human rights effectively.

A third reason international courts and tribunals have been met with controversy is because they infringe on state sovereignty. Some countries, such as Russia and China have the view that state autonomy is a fundamental right for a country and so should be able to decide what occurs in that country without outside input. Since international courts and tribunals ^{can} convict ~~international~~ heads of states for their actions within a country it takes away a bit of their autonomy. This view is summed up in Article 2 of the UN Charter which states argues that nothing should cause states to interfere in the business of other states.



ResultsPlus

Examiner Comments

The definition is followed by a pleasing explanation of western bias which is explored and explained with example. Failure based on cost and time is discussed with the Milosovic example used. The final significant point is state sovereignty.



ResultsPlus

Examiner Tip

Where a range of points are required it is pleasing to note a point followed by explanation and use of example.

Question 2

There were some excellent responses to this question which made clear that dependency theory is based on the neo-Marxist perspective, which suggests that traditional imperialism gave way to neo-colonialism or dollar imperialism in the period following the end of World War 2 and that it is linked to the world-system theory in which economically advanced core areas dominate peripheral areas, dependent on agriculture and primary production. Candidates argued that the South is still dependent on the North for foreign direct investment, manufactured goods, skills and technology, and developing countries are forced to sell primary products such as coffee or cocoa at prices which do not reflect their true value. International aid is given in order to obtain political concessions and financial institutions from the North, such as the International Monetary Fund and World Bank provide highly conditional loans or use debt to force states to open their economies to trade and multinational firms.

This is a good response which covers key elements of the theory. There is a clear explanation supported with 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

Dependency theory is theory developed by marxists and explains the relationship between 'core' states (Global, rich North) and 'satellite' states (Global, poor South). It states the rich north states will exploit the resources of South poor states for their own need. Let us consider this theory in current global politics. In current world, 20% of population consume 80% of goods ^{mostly in West} and 80% only 20% of goods ^{mostly in South}.

Firstly, North states shift their production into poor South states where labour is cheap and commodities are available in big quantities. That is made through spread of TNC mostly headquartered in USA and UK. These TNCs leaves the advantage

of tax holidays and cheap labour market and generally do not promote growth and development in less countries and leave as soon as the profits are going down. The best example is ~~big~~ Shell Oil in Nigeria which actually resulted in ecological problems in region and oil spill. Also in El Salvador primary took the advantage of cheap labour.

Secondly, the inequality is created due to liberal and biased towards Western states global financial institutions. IMF and WB biggest contributors are US and EU that allows to create policies in favour of Western states such as ^{SAPs allow to use heavy subsidies to the developing countries.} SAPs. They are based on the ideas of Washington Consensus and aimed to liberate South economies to ~~make~~ in its original aim to create growth but in real terms it just opens markets to TNCs which settle and don't allow local firms to grow as they are uncompetitive. WTO is aimed to provide free and fair trade but it also biased to the Western states, for example, in CAP used by EU which clashes with the principles of fair, non-protective trade. SAPs, CAP allows western governments to keep the South agricultural goods out of their markets now creates stagnation in South markets. Furthermore, SAPs resulted in the shrink of Argentina economy ~~being~~

Thirdly, Western govern due to inadequate to this economy policies.

Dependency theory is the clear explanation of Neo-Colonialism through which rich and -dependent countries are building their economies in favour of West. For example, Western countries can force aid receivers to specialise in production of goods in favour of rich aid-suppliers, e.g. maize in Mexico and vice in South Africa. Furthermore, China is ~~investing~~ ^{has} ~~in~~ ^{90bn dollars every year} ~~South~~ dependency on primary products doesn't allow markets to develop and so boost poverty and inequality. Furthermore, China is ^{has} investing into African countries in a bid for resources but not with the main aim to create development.

Overall, Western rich states benefit from the conditions of Southern markets but keep these economies underdeveloped through various policies.



ResultsPlus

Examiner Comments

The Marxist view is identified and an explanation of core and satellite or periphery states is made. The role of TNCs is explored, with examples. The role of global financial institutions is also explored, including SAPs, the use of CAP and the WTO. Neo-colonialism is referenced as well as the global South role of primary producing.

This is a solid response worthy of L3 for the range of elements it identifies.

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 dependency theory is a Neomarxist theory based on Emmanuel Wallerstein's "Worlds-system theory". It explains how the "Core" of developed countries such as European countries rely upon resources from the Semi-periphery (most notably the BRICs) and primary products from the periphery (least developed countries). It is therefore a theory of interdependence that suggests that the developed countries depend on the developing countries and vice versa.

First of all neomarxists relate the dependency theory to the idea of ~~Neocolonialism~~ Neocolonialism whereby strong states dominate over ~~less~~ weaker developing states through structural power and transnational corporations as well as through the global economy by keeping developing countries in an "economic deadlock". Therefore neomarxists point to how TNCs and globalisation has allowed for developing countries to be exploited by developed ones as for their resources to be ~~outsourced~~ ^{outsourced} to the developed markets. This has made developing countries vulnerable to fluctuating prices as farmers compete with large TNCs, furthermore local economies have had to compromise with TNCs to keep them from moving on by ensuring cheap labour which is achieved by low labour quality and environmentally destructive methods. For example, Nigeria which

depends upon Oligiant Shell for 20% of GDP has allowed it to lower the minimum wage of its workers in order to prevent it from moving on.

This creates large inequalities as developing economies are dependent on TNCs and "Core Countries" demand which will mean greater poverty and less self-reliance of workers and farmers in the developing world

Furthermore, Neomaxists agree that the dependency theory has created "Structural inequalities" as global governance institutions such as the Bretton Woods Institutions IMF, World Bank and WTO have encouraged developing countries to open up their markets, abandon protectionism and pull back state intervention through their SAPs which were following the ideology of the Washington Consensus. Through SAPs economic growth of Latin American and Russia stagnated and state provisions of healthcare and workers benefits were pulled back as the developing country economies became reliant on neoliberal models of trade.

This furthermore led to inequalities as the World Bank (which is dominated by Western developed "core" states) encouraged developing "periphery" countries to rely on Cash Crop production. However, as developed country markets also "dump" surplus food produce upon developing countries this has caused an over-reliance on Aid and investment by foreign countries. For example farmers in Senegal used to produce chicken for 100% of its ~~own~~ local market, however, since 1970s SAPs it is now reliant on foreign prices which has meant that local chicken farmers only provide 30% of chicken nationally and has therefore become more poor as a result of over-dependency on developed country systems and countries



ResultsPlus
Examiner Comments

Identification of the Marxist perspective linked to core and periphery states. Neocolonialism and the impact of TNCs and globalisation is relevant. Examples strengthen the response and the role of structural inequalities in the global governance institutions is very helpful.

Question 3

It was pleasing to note that many candidates were able to reference directly the 'tragedy of the commons' idea as outlined by Garret Hardin and that sooner or later, the scenario would lead to tragedy as the number of cattle came to exceed the 'carrying capacity' of the land. Ultimately, all would suffer from the lack of coordination and recognition of the bigger picture. As Garrett Hardin put it, 'Freedom in a commons brings ruin to all'. The theory shows how communities over-exploit shared environmental resources; the depletion of common resources will occur as long as people are self-serving, and unilateral acts of restraint such as reducing CO2 emissions are insufficient to tackle the problem. The limited progress in establishing common action to deal with environmental concerns is evident in the disappointment attributed to the perceived failure of international conferences and agreements such as Kyoto and Copenhagen. The inability of the IPCC to bring states to meaningful action is also an illustration of this issue. Agreements tend to be non-binding or insufficient. There were a few weaker responses where candidates appeared to approach this question with no real understanding of the theory.

A pleasing response with a clear understanding of the theory and ability to link to the environment.

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 'tragedy of the commons' is a concept developed by Garrett Hardin. Hardin suggested that the global issue of environment can be likened to an analogy of the commons where each person keeps adding cattle to graze on the communal field because it is beneficial economically. However, in the long term scheme the field reaches maximum capacity and loses nutrients because it is overgrazed. Hardin suggested that this was identical to the global commons where each nation is thinking solely in terms of their national 'self' interest and therefore is unwilling to come to an agreement not to use and abuse the environment in a quest for cheap and easy development.

If each state is thinking primarily in of their self interest none of them will be willing to sacrifice it for the sake of the common good. This has been the problem for example with the China the largest CO₂ emitter globally not ratifying the Kyoto Protocol - the same can be said about the US.

Next, the tragedy of the commons becomes an issue explain again why there is conflict between developing and developed nations over the issue of climate change. Environmental issues are transnational (they affect all countries) even if only one country is contributing. Regardless of how much is contributed by each nation everyone suffers equally. This is essentially part of the tragedy of the commons. Thus although developed nations have contributed the most on the long term scale of things to CO₂ emission they argue that everyone should make an equal effort to curb emissions. Therefore believe that it was not right for Kyoto to single out developed nations for binding targets. ~~MSB~~

However, developing nations claim historic responsibility means developed nations such as the US should take the lead and developing nations shouldn't have restrictions placed on them to develop more ~~of~~ ecofriendly when these weren't in place for the already develop nations - it only makes development harder and more expensive.

thus the ~~tragedy~~ tragedy of the commons shows that although some ~~people~~ ^{nations} do not emit more than others, all nations suffer equally and thus for progress to happen all nations need to contribute. Conflict arises because ~~supranational~~ ~~binding~~ targets erode state sovereignty. Each nation wants to make their own ecological decisions, therefore the environmental crisis prevails.



ResultsPlus

Examiner Comments

A particularly clear explanation of theory and of Garrett Hardin with a range of points linking theory to the environmental crisis. These include the unwillingness of states to engage in meaningful meetings or agreements, the developed and developing world split and the universal suffering despite differentials in responsibility.

Question 3

This is a well written response with a clear focus on the demands of the question. Pleasing terminology 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 'tragedy of the commons' advanced by Garrett Hardin is the view that ~~indis~~ free access to a common pool of resources will bring ruin to all. He advances the notion that states and self-interested entities who will act as 'free riders' to gain the most economic growth, even if this does cause degradation to the environment, until the 'carrying capacity' of the ecosystem is reached. This theory has been commonly linked to the environmental crisis on several grounds.

Firstly, the 'tragedy of the commons' can help to explain the environmental crisis through the lack of concerted action that has occurred at climate change conferences. Although the 1997 Kyoto protocol set binding targets at 5-2°C below 1990 levels, ~~these~~ action did not take place

as by the turn of the millennium, emissions were 4 times higher. This exemplifies the 'tragedy of the commons' scenario because it shows that states are unwilling to sacrifice their economic progress in order to preserve the environment. The lack of binding targets since Kyoto such as at Copenhagen in 2009 shows how states continue to prioritise economic growth as they act for self-interest, showing how the tragedy of the commons helps to explain the environmental crisis.

Furthermore, the tragedy of the commons can be used to explain the environmental crisis in terms of the lack of cooperation between the developed and the developing world.

Developing nations believe that developed states should shoulder the responsibility for reducing emissions because they ~~have~~ during their industrial revolution they emitted freely with no accountability. Contrastingly, poorer nations believe they have the 'right to develop'. Developed nations refuse this claim however, arguing that we cannot blame ~~so~~ today's populations for events of the past, particularly by considering that people were

previously unaware of the consequences. This has taken place has been known such as at Kyoto where developing nations did not have to commit to the target. This demonstrates the 'tragedy of the commons' because both developed and developing nations want to hold as little responsibility as possible for curbing emissions, because they recognise that environmental protection involves 'getting richer slower.'

The environmental crisis is further explained by the 'tragedy of the commons' because many ^{natural} resources such as the oceans and the atmosphere represent the 'common pool of resources.' This is because there is no global government restricting a state's abuse of such resources, and so freedom in the commons brings ruin to all as seen by the rise in temperatures, observed particularly since the 1970s. This is therefore similar to Hardin's idea of the states representing individual farmers who seek to add more cows to their farms, despite the ecological costs.



ResultsPlus
Examiner Comments

Hardin is referenced and key terms such as the 'free rider' idea and 'carrying capacity' are mentioned. The lack of concerted efforts and the focus on economic prowess next to environmental decline is clear. Self-interest and a lack of cooperation directly link the theory to reality.

Question 4

This was by far the most popular of the short responses and produced a wide range of quality in terms of responses. Weaker responses tended either to be descriptive accounts of certain elements of the 'war on terror' or to focus on a single difference between the 'war on terror' and traditional wars. This tended to be guerrilla tactics. Stronger responses provided sharp explanations of the term and explained that the 'war on terror' is the attempt by the USA and a few other states to destroy a number of groups which are considered to be responsible for global terrorism. The 9/11 attacks served as a catalyst for this war. Although the opening acts were reminiscent of traditional warfare with the assault on Afghanistan in 2001 and the invasion of Iraq in 2003, these actions gave way to a different kind of conflict. They went on to explain that a traditional war tended to be fought against a distinct state and against a uniformed and organised body of men. The 'war on terror' is often seen as a 'new' war in that it has taken many forms including asymmetrical conflicts and the weapons of the 'war on terror' are not always military. This war seeks to tackle non-state actors and terror groups. So called 'rogue' states are also a concern and a desire to limit the spread of weapons of mass destruction is also a central theme. For some, the war on terror seems to be almost exclusively directed at militant or radicalised Islam and can be linked to a clash of civilisations.

This is a decent effort with an explanation of the conflict and a number of differences identified.

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

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

Chosen Question Number:

Question 1 Question 2 Question 3
Question 4 Question 5

4) The 'War on Terror' is ^a ~~the~~ concept lead by George Bush's administration initially, that Liberal Intervention via regime change and fighting insurgency was needed in many Islamic states, such as Iraq and Afghanistan. It was sparked by the global terrorist attack on the Twin Towers in 2001, (9/11) and is branded the 'War on Terror' as in wages war on the symptom of the clash between Islamic fundamentalism and Western Liberalism, terrorism. This is supported

by the 'Clash of Civilisations' theory of the inevitable conflict between the 'West' and Islam due to their incompatibility. Also, it should be stressed that the 'War on Terror' is not a war between states, but a US led coalition in Iraq and Afghanistan against Al-Qaeda and the Taliban.

This idea of a 'War on Terror' differs from conventional warfare considerably. Firstly, the 'War on Terror' has an inescapable dimension of Identity Politics, while previous conventional wars, such as the Cold War conflicts, including Vietnam were based on ideology (Communism vs. Capitalism). This idea of identity, in the form of ^{religious fundamentalism} ~~religion~~ in the case of Iraq and Afghanistan shows the civilisational conflict between the liberal West and Islamic values of the Middle East.

Moreover, the 'War on Terror' differs from other ~~con~~ traditional wars as there is a sense of ~~As~~ asymmetry involved, due to the USA, a conventional military force, attempting to track insurgents and fight against the guerrilla tactics of the 'enemy'. This is also seen in 'New' wars, such,

as Vietnam or Algeria. This is furthered by the blurred distinction between civilian and military. As the insurgents do not wear uniforms, and have been known to hide within the general population, such as the Taliban in Afghanistan, this makes it much more difficult for the USA, to identify insurgents, ~~versus~~ compared to traditional wars, such as World War Two, when ~~Overall~~ states wore recognisable uniforms to distinguish them from civilians, and also consisted of two conventional armies fighting against one another, unlike in ~~a~~ asymmetrical war.

Overall, the 'War on Terror' differs greatly from traditional war, in the sense that it is based on identity conflict and ~~has an~~ ~~ines~~ does not include of two conventional, or equal military forces fighting against each other.



ResultsPlus
Examiner Comments

There is a brief explanation of the war on terror which develops as the response continues. The candidate makes clear that it isn't a traditional state vs state conflict, that it is a conflict possibly of identity, that it is asymmetric with use of guerrilla tactics and that there is a military civilian blur. There is reference to the clash of civilizations thesis.

Question 4

This is a strong yet slightly unusual response which discusses an element that few others discussed in their attempts.

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 'war on Terror' was declared after the 9/11 attacks on the USA, and it is a Western led attempt to stamp out terrorism. It differs from traditional warfare in the fact that it is not only conflict based. The conflict that has occurred has been asymmetrical and the fact that the conflict that has occurred has also not been ~~state~~ ^{largely unresolved.} ~~state~~

The war on terror is not only conflict based in that it is a wholly-encompassing statement for any attempts to remove and prevent terrorism. This also includes the increased level of security that have ~~g~~ been put in place in the West after 9/11, such as increased airport checks and mass surveillance, both through CCTV and online. There have also been attempts to de-radicalise the Muslim populations in the West, particularly from within Islam, who are arguably fighting their own 'war on terror' against fundamentalism. Finally, legislation has been changed, as seen by the 2001 Anti-Terrorism Act in the UK, although this has now been changed so that individuals can only be held for up to 14 days.

~~Ans~~

The conflict that has occurred as part of the 'war on Terror' has largely been asymmetrical. The invasion of Afghanistan in 2001 was done in an attempt to wipe out al-Qaeda, not as an attack on the Afghan government itself, and much of the fighting has been characterised by guerrilla warfare, as well as through mass use of IEDs. These weapons are very, the very epitome of asymmetrical warfare, as they are very cheap to make, but highly lethal, meaning that despite advanced technology and large funds, the USA and UK have struggled to overcome such simple devices.

Finally, the 'war on terror' differs from traditional wars in the fact that the conflict must have occurred during it is largely unresolved. The decision to leave Afghanistan was not made because of the defeat of the Taliban, but more because of the overall lack of morale and support for this continuing war. However, this would not be to say that the Taliban were victorious, as they are still not in power, and are fought through drone strikes by the West. ~~to this day~~ In this way, it is clear that conflict has been generally unresolved. Iraq in 2003 was also poorly resolved, as although Saddam Hussein was removed, ISIS now have significant control, demonstrating that the West were not victorious, although the air strikes currently being launched against ISIS also show that the West have not given up, and so the conflict is unresolved.

Overall, the 'war on terror' differs from traditional wars in
firstly, the fact that it is not only conflict based, secondly,
that this conflict has been largely asymmetric, and finally,
that conflicts have gone largely unresolved.



ResultsPlus

Examiner Comments

There is a brief explanation of the key term in the first paragraph but this is developed as we move to paragraph two. The asymmetric element is discussed and explained as is the fact that the war isn't and may not be resolved. There is an interesting argument about the conflict being fought in a range of non-traditional ways.

Question 5

There were a wide range of responses to this question with some, at the higher level, providing definitions and a range of examples to illustrate and support explanation. A small number of candidates ignored the term 'corruption' and instead simply wrote about poverty. Corruption is a failure to carry out 'proper' or public responsibilities (good governance) because of the pursuit of private gain, usually, in this context, involving misappropriation of aid. Aid can be channelled through recipient-country governments and bureaucracies where power is concentrated in the hands of an elite and where accountability is undeveloped. Corrupt leaders can divert resources towards a privileged few rather than towards the majority. Aid can even be used to strengthen the power hold of authoritarian regimes through subverting opponents and building up the elements of state control such as the military. Stronger candidates were able to explain that corruption and bribery can lead to economic waste and inefficiency because resources are allocated to the activities which yield the greatest bribes, commissions or kickbacks. This may be aid or expenditure based on other sources. It could be argued that investment and expenditure becomes geared towards large defence projects and 'white elephants' rather than economic development, education or health. There were some excellent examples used in stronger responses. Mugabe in Zimbabwe, North Korea and FIFA received numerous references.

There is a brief explanation or definition of key terms and then a focussed consideration of the link between poverty and corruption.

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

Corruption is the use of ~~economic~~ resources for personal gain, whereas poverty may be absolute (the inability to keep body and soul together) or relative (where people do not enjoy the living standard customary to their society).

Corruption may be seen to perpetuate poverty in a number of ways; it impedes economic development in developing countries significantly as it does not allow resources to be drawn to their most profitable use, besides the fact that endemic graft deters enterprise - if money can be made through corrupt practices, why should they bother

even building a business? Indeed, Transparency International calculates that corruption costs developing countries yearly up to \$40 bn USD. This perpetuates poverty, as economic liberals would argue, because thus no market equilibria can assert themselves and businesses can not be built.

Furthermore, corruption may not only prevent economic development but also maintain the 'poverty cycle'. This explains why the conditions of poverty are self-perpetuating; underdeveloped countries suffer bad health and educational standards and poor civic order; this in turn will lead to more civil strife, as people are discouraged with conditions or will flee seeking better opportunities. Corruption indeed affects 76% of the poorest billion people as Paul Collier, former World Bank economist identified. This means that aid and government funding will not reach its target, leading to less development. And exemplifies this where the World Bank in 2004 found that 1% of funding for health clinics actually reached its target. Thus corruption makes aid and ~~of~~ public spending less effective, with resulting poorer education meaning that economic growth will also be undermined.

Lastly, it has been suggested that ~~some~~ corruption may also favour poverty if it comes in the form of capital flight, where corrupt officials take vast sums of money and bring it to different countries, thus making countries poorer. This was the case when in 1977 ~~some~~ ^{top} officials of Zaire fled to Switzerland

taking \$5bn USD, making 'one of the world poorest countries even poorer. Most recently, however, ~~Moldova~~ experienced this with \$1bn USD (an eighth

of the state's GDP) going missing. This affects poverty as it undermines the ability of the government to use this money on spending on infrastructure which might lead to greater economic prosperity.



ResultsPlus

Examiner Comments

The negative impact of corruption on business and economic growth is explored and the impact of corruption on key areas such as health and education. The cycle of poverty is explained with aid failing to reach intended targets and public spending often ineffective as a consequence of corruption. Capital flight with corrupt leaders is also explained with an example.

There are a number of examples used to support this response and the points that it makes.

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

Corruption is prominent in developing states, which is arguably a significant hindrance to their development out of poverty. For instance, after the breakdown of Western empires post-colonial Africa was seized by kleptomaniac elites and corrupt governments, meaning the hope of continued development and prosperity for these states was quickly extinguished. Corrupt governments prevent development because they selfishly spend national money; rather than invest in education or health, they have large military budgets to protect their power and also ~~embed~~ steal millions of dollars from their countries. This is seen in Nigeria who has the highest GDP of any African country and yet is considered to experience the most absolute poverty, meaning people who earn less than \$1.25 a day so cannot keep 'body and soul' together. Corruption has prevented the 'trickle down model' in Nigeria, so the country's wealth is concentrated in a few corrupt elites. The rest are

in parity; in Zambia only 5% of girls aged 5-16 can read and unemployment is ~~increasingly~~ incredibly high in the under 35, who make up ~~70%~~ of the population.

This corruption prevents the eradication of poverty through ~~AID~~^{aid} ~~donors~~. For instance, World Bank Schemes involve local governments choosing from a number of bids as to who will contract the project. Consequently, corrupt officials negotiate a 15% kickback with the contractor, thus, reducing the amount of money available for reducing poverty. In fact, it is often the case that sub-contractors at every level of the ~~AID~~^{aid} dispensing process siphon off money for themselves, meaning when the ~~AID~~^{aid} finally reaches the poor the sum is considerably reduced.

Moreover, the absence of an effective legal system in many developing countries due to corruption increases poverty. Judges in Zambia are open about taking bribes and in other places obscure laws based on gender or ethnicity show the continued corrupt views of these nations. This prevents the country from developing because it discourages foreign investment; 'the law is what enables one to do business with strangers'. TNCs and other businesses are reluctant to invest where they are uncertain of receiving legal due process. The corrupt legal

System increases the risk of investment. This encourages poverty as TNCs can bring significant wealth to an area, providing jobs and technology that enable people to develop out of poverty. For example, Nike's flagship factory in Vietnam pays \$50 a month whilst the average is only \$18, in fact US TNCs pay on average 6x more than the locals would expect to earn. Therefore, corruption that deters this kind of investment prevents developing out of poverty, meaning there exists a direct correlation in the relationship between corruption and poverty.



ResultsPlus

Examiner Comments

Impact on education and health of corruption and diverted finance is made clear with military budgets often benefitting in order to maintain and protect corrupt administrations. Theft and corruption in Nigeria and elsewhere is used to support the developing argument and there is a useful point about the impact of corruption on outside investment via multinational companies.

Question 6

This longer essay received the fewest responses in Section B. This was possibly a consequence of the popularity of question 8 in particular. There were some particularly strong responses to this question where candidates balanced state sovereignty and selfish national interest (tragedy of the commons) with positive steps such as international co-operation in conferences such as Kyoto and Copenhagen and through the IPCC. Few candidates approached this question without a decent amount of knowledge.

This response covers a great deal of ground and sticks closely to the demand of the question as it develops. There is a pleasing mix of knowledge and analysis and a decent structure.

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

Climate change is the gradual warming of the Earth, mostly by CO₂ which causes the greenhouse gas effect.

Some liberals and reformist ecologists say that the international community has taken significant action, by Summits ~~Summits~~ such as Rio, Kyoto and Copenhagen, ~~and~~ establishment of the IPCC and NGOs.

Others, especially radical ecologists say that not enough has been done, there is still the tragedy of the commons, climate change ~~is~~ sceptic states and the Summits have failed and not done enough.

Climate change was first brought to the global attention with the 1992 Rio Earth Summit. 112 states took part in this summit and over 1,000

NGOs. The Rio Summit was only the starting point and it established the FCCC and the IPCC. The IPCC is an international panel on climate change and it established reports, authoritative documents on climate change.

Critics argue that the Rio summit was largely unsuccessful, because the FCCC is merely a framework and cannot enforce its targets and ~~during~~ back then there were still many climate change sceptic states who didn't want to tackle CC, since they believe it wasn't anthropogenic, merely a natural fluctuation.

Following Rio, there was a 1997 Kyoto ~~meeting~~ ^{meeting}, ~~more~~ the 156 states attended as well as most leaders. Arguably this was very successful, because it set targets for the developed states to cut their greenhouse gas emissions by 5% below ~~the~~ 1990 level. Kyoto also established a Kyoto Protocol in which states will aim to decrease their emissions.

Many people are sceptic of the Kyoto Protocol. The cuts in emission targets were set only for developed states such as the EU and some others. The US, however, was not a part of this

agreement, they decided to opt out claiming the cuts would make them lose over \$120bn. Canada for this very reason pulled out of the Kyoto protocol in 2011, saying ^{it} they would cost them \$14bn to cut emissions, as Canada emits most per capita.

Another huge drawback of Kyoto was that merely developed states were required to cut emissions. Not only these cuts cover 13% of global emissions, due to various countries not willing to cut emissions, but also the newly industrialising states like China and India were not included in this agreement. This was because in 1997 the emerging nations were not yet ~~the~~ the industrial giants they are today.

Global problems, like climate change require global solutions and if the US, the largest emitter of 20%, despite only 4% of world population in 2000 wanted to take advantage and act like a free rider, it gives the other states no incentive to tackle climate change. Since the US, the only superpower, closest thing to a global hegemon is uncooperative. ~~A particular problem of China is that it is not to overtake the US States are sovereign.~~ The international system is an anarchy and

the world policeman doesn't want to enforce ^{cuts} ~~cuts~~ on the other states.

The world is a global commons, as Harding coined the term the Tragedy of the Commons. The Earth is a global common that must be shared and protected by all,

this costs and states are selfish, according to Realists, therefore, it is in their interests to get as much out of the global commons as possible, without putting in money or effort. The states that act in this manner are called free riders, they hope all others will tackle CC, whilst they, themselves, will be able to put little effort into tackling this problem. This is what the US is doing, as well as China and others, they act like free riders.

Liberals on the other hand, believe that states are moral beings and it is in their interests to tackle this growing problem. The global temperatures have risen by 0.74°C in the last two centuries and 17 out of the 12 years from 1996 to 2008 have been the hottest ever recorded. Since the IPCC consists of top leading scientists and researchers, states are willing to listen, in the 2007 report ~~by~~ 4th assessment report,

The IPCC wrote that it is very likely, 95% certain that humans are ^{the main} ~~the~~ cause of global warming and that a further 2°C temperature rise could lead to catastrophic consequences, such as a 15 cm sea level rise, refugee problems, ~~more cases of~~ and

(EU)

possibly ~~the~~ places like Bangladesh and Mauritius sinking under water.

Liberals point out the case of the 1987 Montreal Protocol, which was extremely successful in banning CFC gases that are a cause of the hole in the ozone layer, all UN members were on board and the ozone layer is set to recover by 2050.

Critics, however, argue that the ozone hole was a truly global problem that would have had extreme consequences for everyone. Climate Change, however, includes not just 1 single type of gas, but various other causes and problems that need to be resolved.

There is no global consensus and states cannot be forced due to sovereignty.

Some CC sceptic states like Austria and Russia are unwilling to make decisions

that will have grave consequences on their economy. Australia in the recent G20 meeting expressed the view that in order to develop economically we must ~~not~~ ~~more~~ cannot pay so much attention to C.C. Russia, on the other hand, will benefit from warmer temperatures agriculturally as well as, due to

the melting Arctic ice, new opened shipping routes.

Not all international cooperation has been unsuccessful though, the EU proposed to cut its emissions by 20% by 2020 which is more than Kyoto promised in a shorter time span. Although this is merely regional.

The follow up of Kyoto was the 2009 Copenhagen Summit. ~~Since~~ China was still unwilling to cut emissions as well as the other emerging states. But Copenhagen extended the Kyoto agreements of emission cuts for developed states and introduced

carbon trading or cap and trade. This could be seen as an adaptation method. States that have left over quota of emission can sell it to those states who want to emit more, especially Western industrial states. This way the global emissions quota is not exceeded.

Radical ecologists who ~~before~~ advocate ecocentrism, however, believe that cap and trade is not actually helping to tackle climate change, as the carbon credits are cheap, \$5 in 2010 and this gives states no incentive to cut on emissions. It gives a false sense that CC is being tackled.

In conclusion I believe that this statement is true to an extent. The international community has taken some action to tackle CC. However, in my view, this action is not significant enough to tackle CC, since not all states are on board and CC is a global problem that requires global solutions, meaning everyone needs to cooperate.



ResultsPlus

Examiner Comments

The response discusses all of the major summits from Rio through Kyoto to Copenhagen with positives and negatives explored in each. The developed vs developing world argument is made clear and there is an awareness and use of central terms such as 'free rider' and tragedy of the commons. This is a well-balanced response.

Another example which covers a significant amount of ground with pleasing factual material used to support both sides of the 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

The tragedy of the Commons scenario proposed by Garrett Hardin in 1968 resembles the 'global commons' where self-interested states do not care for the common good.

This idea is shown with the international community who has not taken significant action to tackle climate change. As shown with the Kyoto Protocol in 1997 where the USA refused to join. Their excuse being that China and India were not involved. This reflecting a key obstacle of tackling climate change due to the conflict between developed and developing states. Developing states such as China and India have argued that the developed 'industrial giants' should take responsibility for the environmental degradation as due to their industrialisation over hundreds of years, whereas developing states have contributed little to the

problem.

However this view is contradicted as China since 2008 has become the largest emitter and has overtaken the USA. This debate between developed and developing countries has hindered the action on tackling climate change. The developed world has retreated back stating that they should not be held responsible for their past leaders.

To an extent ~~climate change has been tackled~~ ~~taken~~ action the international community has taken action in tackling the problem. As shown with the International Panel on Climate Change that was created in 1988 that provided the international community with evidence of the problem. This led to the Rio Earth Summit in 1992 where 100 governments were present thus showing states willingness to tackle the problem.

The Kyoto Protocol in 1997 has been the most significant step to tackling climate

Change as binding targets were set. For example the EU was set to reduce green-house gas emissions by 8% and the USA by 7%. The Australia on the other hand was ~~set~~ allowed to exceed it's levels. The Protocol created incentive mechanisms that made the targets seem more achievable by states. The emissions trading scheme allowed for states to ~~receive~~ receive rewards for trying to tackle climate change.

Critics however state that the ^{carbon} ~~carbon~~ trading scheme provides a loophole for states for exceed their emissions and 'free ride'. The failure to ratify the treaty by the US hindered the success of the Protocol. However goals to reduce global emissions by 5.2% of 1990's levels were ~~set~~ set. The Protocol still provided a step towards tackling climate change despite self interest getting in the way.

The Nairobi Framework of 2006 presented a regional action towards tackling climate change on a regional level. The Clean development mechanism was put in place ~~in~~ in less prosperous countries, ~~as~~ such as

Sub-Saharan Africa. This helped helped & poorer countries put in place sustainable development programs & as being ^{a step} towards reducing emissions targets.

The Copenhagen Conference ~~of~~ in 2009 was described to be a 'milestone... with much success' by the ~~UK~~ Times. This was another step towards tackling climate change. Developed and developing countries were present thus showing the international community working together to tackle a ~~big~~ global problem for the 'common good'. China, India, Brazil were present as well as the US. This ~~show~~ representing the change in world order from Bipolarity to multipolarity. The US agreed to cut its greenhouse gas emissions by 4% of the 1990's levels. This showing that the hegemonic ~~power~~ power was working with the problem, this being significant for leading the way for other states to cooperate too.

Critics to argue that Copenhagen was not a significant step in tackling climate change due to its vague targets.

For example an \$100 billion dollars was said to be donated from the developed world to help the developing world reduce their emissions. However no proper regulations for this were ever put into place or verified at the conference. The developing world contributed nothing to ~~the~~ tackling the problem. The Los Angeles Times stated that 'Obama put pragmatism and national interest before ~~deals~~ before the agreements'. This shows ~~he~~ that states were still concerned about national interest and the vague agreements were unlikely to be achieved. This therefore shows the international community as not taking significant action against tackling Climate Change.

Real Reformist methods towards tackling the problem have been adopted by the States. These include minor reforms such as recycling instead of reducing waste. States are concerned with 'conservation' and maintenance of the 'global commons' rather than radical change. This is being reflected in the past conferences. Sustainable development

is a reformist method that tends to be preferred again by states such as the US. it

Radicals would argue that the international community is a long way from tackling climate change. The behaviour of states should be changed towards values such as ~~the~~ bioequality, diversity and decentralisation. Many have argued that a world government would be the only solution to solving climate change. Instead of self-interested states who can't ~~or~~ come to a mutual agreement in tackling the problem. The lack of supranational body to tackle the problem renders ~~then~~ such solutions in useless conferences as contributing nothing to tackling climate change.

Overall the international community since the 90's has set environmental issues on the top of the global agenda but significant action towards solving climate change has not been taken. This being shown by the disagreement over who should take responsibility between developed and developing states. As well

as self-interested states not changing their ways and simply showing up to conferences to be seen as part of the international community. As well as other problems such as the financial crisis and the threat of terrorism taking a higher place on the global agenda. Therefore despite steps toward international action on tackling climate change at conferences the international community has yet to show significant act to tackling climate change.



ResultsPlus

Examiner Comments

The tragedy of the commons is referenced to introduce debate covering conferences and other elements which imply significant action or lack of. Kyoto and Copenhagen knowledge is used to argue both sides and the developed and developing world argument is made clear. Debate between reformists and radicals explains the difficulty in achieving significant action.

Question 7

This was a reasonably popular question although nowhere near as popular as Q8. There were a significant number of very strong responses which makes clear that students were well prepared for a question on universal human rights. Definitions were very strong and both sides of the debate were explored in detail with excellent examples.

Strong responses explained that human rights are rights to which people are entitled by virtue of being human. Human rights are universal in the sense that they supposedly belong to all humans rather than to members of any particular country, religion, race, gender or other group.

There is a growing body of human rights international law, NGOs such as Amnesty International and Human Rights Watch serve to expose abuses of human rights and encourage states to improve their protections for human rights.

International courts have been increasingly active in the area of human rights and Humanitarian Intervention has taken place. Counter arguments often focussed on how the concept of human rights has been criticised as having a western bias which reflects a western, liberal model of human nature that emphasises rights and entitlements over obligations and social belonging. In this respect, universal human rights can be seen as a form of cultural imperialism. Such views have been advanced most clearly by Muslim thinkers who believe that human well-being is divinely ordained, and by some Asian politicians who champion the notion of 'Asian values' or of communitarianism above individual concern.

This is a decent response which raises some central points following a definition and overview of the 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

Human rights are the rights to which people are entitled by virtue of being human. They are universal, absolute, fundamental and indivisible and secular version of God-given 'natural rights'. They are enshrined in the Universal Declaration of Human Rights (1948) and are predominantly influenced by liberal individualism (Articles 2-22).

It would seem that while human rights are accepted as important, their universality is contested by postcolonial critics. Furthermore, universal rights have been challenged by advocates of state sovereignty. Thus, while the concept of rights is accepted, their universality has been criticised.

Evidence of growing global acceptance of human rights is the fact that most states have signed the Universal Declaration of Human Rights (1948) and its subsequent International Bill of Rights which included two legally binding covenants on Civil and Political rights and Economic, social and cultural rights. Indeed, there has been a growth in cosmopolitan thinking following the end of the Cold War.

No longer can states act as an island but international documents have proved that there is an international moral duty to uphold human rights. Indeed, liberals argue that liberal thinking is universally applicable and therefore acceptance of universal rights is possible.

However, arguably this blue sky thinking is misled. Postcolonial critics have found issue with what they see as 'Western values'. Therefore, countries such as China have subscribed to 'Asian values' as outlined in the Bangkok Declaration (1993). While they accept the importance of human rights, they believe that The Universal Declaration places too much emphasis on the individual. 'Asian values', however, draw on Maoism, Confucianism and Buddhism and tend to value order and stability and the community as a whole over the individual. Therefore, duties, rather than individual individual rights are stressed. This challenges the concept that human rights are universal. This can also be seen in the Cairo Declaration 1994, where they believe divine authority and Shariah law are more important than the law of the individual. Therefore, universal human rights are arguably not possible.

On the other hand, the work of NGOs and the 'CNN' effect has arguably increased people's acceptance and support of ~~upholds~~ international human rights. NGOs such as Amnesty International and Human Rights Watch have consolidated the sense of global moral responsibility. ~~such as~~ Amnesty International has highlighted abuses such as women's rights in Afghanistan and the incidences of torture and abuse in Abu Ghirab prison in Iraq. Furthermore, they have been influential in formulating treaties and conventions such as the Convention on the Rights of Child and The Genocide Convention in 1948 which have helped consolidate human rights in the global conscience.

However, ~~international~~ NGOs have ultimately little influence over the UN and international actions. This is because of the principle of state sovereignty. Indeed, this is largely the biggest block to the upholdal and acceptance of human rights. States such as Russia and China believe in the Treaty of Westphalia 1648 being of paramount importance, taking precedence over human rights. The fact that both states have a veto on the UN security council means that they can prevent the widespread acceptance and proliferation of human

rights principles. Indeed, as Russia and especially China gain in economic and political power, such as China's growth rate of 8-10%, global self-interest and upholding of good relations often mean that human rights abuses are ignored despite being widespread in China and in Russia; for example their legislation against homosexuality. This is ~~can this seem~~ in contrast to the USA's declining power on the ~~same~~ world stage, especially morally due to their tainted image following Iraq (2003) following ~~Al-Qaeda~~. Therefore, ~~the~~ rising will the rising power of China and Russia threaten universal human rights?

This does not necessarily seem to be the case. In fact, growing tension between human rights and state sovereignty has arguably not occurred, but a balance between the two has been met with the concept of 'responsible sovereignty' gaining significance. Therefore, there is a consensus amongst politicians that sovereignty lies with the people and if that is abused then state sovereignty is no longer applicable. This can be seen in the trend for humanitarian intervention since the 1990s, indeed the acceptance of humanitarian

Therefore, ~~are~~ the question is posed that 'are human rights genuinely globally accepted, or are human rights an acceptable cover for pursuing state interests, via 'humanitarian' intervention?'

Therefore, in conclusion it would seem that amongst the general public and Western states, ~~human~~ right universal human rights are accepted. However, this does not mean they are 'globally' accepted. While Eastern countries and the Middle East may accept that human rights are important, they ~~believe~~ do not believe they are universal. Furthermore, Russia and China have suggested that they are inferior to state sovereignty and ~~believe~~ believe that human rights ~~are~~ can be compromised to uphold it. ~~Therefore~~ Perhaps as the Eastern world continues to grow in economic power, the concept of human rights will take more of a back seat?



ResultsPlus
Examiner Comments

Significant arguments on both sides ensure that this is a well-balanced and thoughtful response. Key elements in opposition to the assertion are the significance of sovereignty, selective intervention and cultural differences. In support of the statement we can find references to the Universal Declaration of Human Rights, the CNN effect, R2P and humanitarian intervention with examples.

This is a particularly strong response which provides a large number of examples in support of assertions made.

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

Plan:

Internat law: ~~ECHR~~ UHR 1948 → China camps
moral authority

X ECHR Bangkok 1992
AU HR Commission Cairo 1990
(Femtech) UN not world gov

Courts + tribunals: Fabu Benjouda
ICC has 800 staff, 100 countries.

X AU sees it as anti-African
US ignores China, Russia not ratified
lacks legit.

HI: Kosovo 1999 → Tribunal
Cosmopolitan values
Global civil society NGOs.
values.

X NGOs ignored → Al Raif Badawi.
Terrorism - western imperialism.
US Anti-Terrorism

Human rights are ~~a~~ a secular version of natural rights that ~~are~~ all everyone is entitled to by virtue of being human. They are indivisible, absolute, fundamental and universal. However, the idea that they are universal is controversial, as it suggests they are applicable to everyone worldwide, whereas this may not be the case. While liberals are hopeful that universal human rights ~~(HR)~~ have been globally accepted,

realists offer the more convincing, yet less hopeful argument.

Firstly, liberal institutionalists argue that political globalisation has led to the strengthening of IGOs and have that have turned the 'jungle of international relations into a zoo', as Woodrow Wilson says. This means states are now biased in favour of cooperation and are largely on the same page on matters, for example human rights. The UN, for example, has 193 members and Article 1(3) says ~~to~~ ~~that~~ human rights are one of its main purposes, this suggesting all member states value the importance of human rights. The significant growth of importance of the UN means the international law it produces has also become more important and accepted. For example, the ~~UDHR~~ UDHR 1948 has moral authority, ~~creating~~ ~~pressure on~~ states meaning that states are conscious to accept its notion of human rights to have soft power on the world stage; important in an ~~interdependent~~ interdependent world, say liberals. China, although it has a very different culture to the West, has recently started closing down Laogai camps since November 2013 and liberals interpret this as abiding by the ^{civic and political} human right expressed in the UDHR of 'freedom from torture', as the

UDHR is largely legitimate and exerts moral pressure.

On the other hand, realists would argue that this is an exception and China usually prioritises socio-economic rights over civic and political rights, as reflected in its own human rights law: the Bangkok Declaration 1992. ~~Realists are~~ Classical realists argue that states are selfish. China may have improved soft law lately but only not to deter future trade partners and it prioritises socioeconomic rights to increase economic growth ~~which~~ and legitimise restricting civic and political rights. Also, Asian values focus more on ~~the~~ ~~to~~ belief in ~~communities~~ the community and the family, whereas the western notion stresses individualism, therefore this is also reflected in the Bangkok Declaration. ~~Communitarians would also high~~

Communitarians would also highlight that a large variety of different cultures exist in the world and they do not appreciate having the western notion of human rights imposed on them. ~~For~~ Although the UN has 193 members, the UDHR remains soft law and not all states have signed it, for example, Saudi Arabia did not sign it, as it is too secular, if not hostile towards religion. Instead, along with 44

other states, it has joined the Cairo Declaration on Human Rights 1990, as it is based on ~~Sharia~~ Sharia law and ~~allow~~ practice does not allow practises such as changing one's religion from Islam, which the UDHR does. ~~Communitarians do stress~~ This shows universal human rights have not been universally accepted, as they are secular by definition. Also, communitarians stress that universal human rights are not ~~ex~~ accepted wholly in the West too, for example, ~~Ireland~~ Ireland bans abortion for catholic reasons, despite the 'right to life'.

Next, liberal institutionalists would again point to ~~the international~~ IGOs for their IGOs to prove the global acceptance of human rights but in this case regarding ~~as~~ international courts and tribunals. ~~In the~~ In 1993 and 1995, the UN set up ad hoc courts to try war criminals from Yugoslavia and Rwanda, inspiring the creation of the International Criminal Court ~~for~~ (ICC) in 2002. It ~~so~~ indicts criminals across borders for war crimes, genocide and crimes ~~of~~ against humanity, all of which are condemned by the universal notion of human rights. Perhaps the ICC has been a success as it includes 800 staff from 100 countries, showing that states all over the world are in consensus over

the universal notion of human rights that it promotes. Also, the prosecutor Fabou Benouda, is African, eliminating any insults about it being anti-African. Instead, the ICC has seen a large proportion of states stand together ~~in~~ in the face of mass violations of universal human rights.

Despite this, realists point out that it has not been wholly successful in uniting the international community. For example, it remains widely viewed as an anti-African court, as it has only convicted two people in 13 years: 2 Congolese warlords. It tends to focus on the Middle East and Africa, while the US can ignore 2 ICC indictments as world hegemon. This can lead states to ~~see~~ lose faith in universal human rights as a whole, if they see the institutions that hold them up as biased. In addition to the US's non-ratification of the Rome Treaty that set the ICC up, Russia and China are also not members. This may be because Russia and China have their own human rights issues at home, such as in Tibet and Chechnya. This means they protect state sovereignty and do not support universal human rights so much, as they could be used against them. As they are great powers and

have large populations, this greatly dents the thesis that universal human rights are globally accepted.

Finally, liberals argue that cosmopolitan values are spreading due to cultural globalisation and are widely accepted. This is the idea that human rights are truly global and everyone is of equal moral worth and we should even 'save strangers'. This makes humanitarian intervention legitimate for example in Kosovo in 1999 to end ethnic cleansing. This was ~~accepted~~ successful and widely appreciated in Kosovo, where many children were then named 'Tonibler' as a credit to Blair, who pushed for the intervention. Also, cultural globalisation has led to a growing civil society meaning ~~states~~ NGOs promote these liberal universalist values and humanitarian intervention.

However, realists argue that states are ultimately sovereign and can ignore NGOs, for example, Amnesty International flagged up the fact that ~~blogg~~ Saudi blogger, Raj Badani, was being publicly flogged as a punishment, yet ~~as~~ it seems he will still be executed for blogging despite: the international uproar Amnesty International

created. Therefore, ~~states~~ ~~that~~ Saudi Arabia has proven ~~univer~~ the ease with which universal human rights can be ignored.

Also, critical theorists argue that ~~cultural~~ cosmopolitan values have not been widely accepted worldwide, as ~~many~~ ~~say~~ it can be perceived as Americanisation and western imperialism. This can lead to cultural backlash in the form of terrorism. For example, 66% of terrorist attacks were by 4 ~~ret~~ Islamic fundamentalist groups in 2013, suggesting Huntington's 'Clash of Civilisations' thesis is a reality. While these radical Islamists believe ~~destroying~~ killing civilians of a corrupt liberal democratic race is legitimate, they certainly don't agree ~~that~~ with ~~secular~~ ~~univer~~ ~~the~~ ~~is~~ Secular, western notion of human rights. Also, the US is keen to torture terrorists, for example at Abu Ghraib in 2004, suggesting human rights are not universal and ~~need~~ should be restricted severely by punishment.

To conclude, ~~the~~ universal human rights are not at all globally accepted. They are widely ~~are~~ accepted in the West but even then not ~~fully~~, as Ireland proves. However, they

are definitely not globally accepted, as so many alternative forms of international law have been created to counter the UDHR and so on, which are targeted not so legitimate anyone. The most conclusive evidence, however, is the rise of terrorism to show its absolute contempt at liberal universalist values, and universal human rights.



ResultsPlus
Examiner Comments

The definition is solid and there is a convincing argument centred on the UDHR, role of the UN, IGOs such as the ICC, spread of cultural globalisation and other NGOs. A counter argument includes Asian values, the Communitarian view, Islamic critique and failings of the international human rights institutions.

Question 8

This was certainly the most popular longer question on the examination paper and worked very well as a differentiator.

Stronger responses were able to draw on a detailed knowledge to support key arguments. Students argued that, not only do these weapons have the potential to inflict massive collateral damage with devastating implications for civilian populations but they are also key assets in the security dilemma and in development of state power.

The actions of the United States in attempting to prevent the proliferation of weapons of mass destruction have been linked to conflicts such as the Iraq war, Libyan intervention and Syrian conflict in recent years. There is ongoing concern about the Iranian nuclear situation and potential conflict involving Israel. North Korea continues to be a cause for concern. Whilst most attention has focussed on the nuclear threat, the relative ease in which chemical and biological weapons can be developed has led to a growing concern about these types of weapons. The perceived failure of the International Atomic Energy Agency, Nuclear Non- Proliferation Treaty and other safeguards has led to increased concern also. Counter arguments tended to suggest that nuclear and other WMD were almost unusable in a more interconnected world and that there were greater threats to global security which may include a clash of civilizations, terrorism, environmental degradation and even polar shift.

Weaker responses tended to be rather one-sided, arguing that nuclear and other WMD were or were not the major threat to global security.

This is a good response which provides a convincing argument for nuclear weapons being the major threat to global security. The focus may be on nuclear weapons but an argument based on their proliferation, the terrorist link, loss of bipolar MAD, regional tensions and tactical nuclear weapons with a reduced threshold for use is convincing. A counter argument discusses alternative threats to global security which include terrorism, environmental degradation and make clear the argument that nuclear weapons may simply be symbolic unusable weapons.

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

Nuclear proliferation entails the acquisition of nuclear weapons by more states (horizontal proliferation) or the stockpiling of these weapons by nuclear states (vertical proliferation). Since their first and only use in 1945, nuclear weapons and their implications have on global security have divided theorists, with realists tending towards the fact they maintain peace whilst anarchists argue they will only ever reduce security.

One reason for the realist argument is that nuclear proliferation has meant more states have weapons and have acquired nuclear weapons. These states have become more military minded in terms of government such as North Korea which itself is a rogue state. This means that nuclear weapons and other weapons of mass destruction are simply getting into the wrong hands. The attempted acquisition of these arms by terrorist groups such as Al Qaeda further this argument as Hitchens states "there are people in this world who wish for an apocalypse, and there are weapons in this world that enable them to bring this upon us". It is hard to refute this logic, as more states with questionable governments, and even terrorist groups acquire these weapons, nuclear proliferation can be seen as the most immediate nuclear threat to global security.

Furthering this argument is the realist themselves. The logic of bipolarity and thus mutually assured destruction (MAD) is negated when more states acquire these weapons, as the numbers no longer add up. Kenneth Waltz argued that the greater number of superpowers, the greater chance of miscalculation, and seeing as there has been a rise in the number of great powers acquiring these weapons e.g. China and India, then global security is far removed from the messy concept of MAD during the bipolar period of the Cold War. Especially given the regional tensions, particularly in the Middle-East, that proliferation is heightening, for example Iraq-Iran, India-Pakistan and the Arab-Israeli conflict. All of these tensions are made much more serious given the prospect of WMDs.

being used, moreover due to the development of "batteries" or "tactical nukes", which are used at reducing the widespread damage and concentrating it on smaller areas. These developments near proliferation can be seen, with much justification, as the major threat to global security.

Thirdly, it is easy to overlook the most simple threat posed by nuclear proliferation which is their effect if they are used. Whilst competing arguments that will be discussed such as terrorism and climate change can be seen as the major threats to global security, neither are as immediately devastating as the impact of nuclear weapons. Since 1945, their development and proliferation has led to their destructive capacity being over 10,000x greater than the bombs dropped on Hiroshima and Nagasaki. The consequences of such weapons being used could cause a 'nuclear winter' which could kill all life on Earth within 6 months. With such devastating consequences, it is easy to see why some argue that nuclear proliferation is the greatest threat to global security.

However as previously mentioned, there are other phenomena that could pose greater threats to global security due to the weaknesses in the nuclear agreement. Firstly, terrorism can be seen as a much greater threat due to its reality. Concepts such as MAD are still in place, as seen by the lack of nuclear war, whereas terrorism is on the rise and leads to the death of over 1000 people a month in Iraq alone, just from car bombings (in 2014).

because of the link of reality secondary nuclear conflict, it can be argued more immediate threats, such as the ideological and physical threats posed by terrorism are greater to global security, as their implications are much more widespread in practice, rather than purely theoretical like nuclear fallout or nuclear winters.

Furthermore, it is not only nuclear weapons that can bring about the end of human life on Earth, climate change also has this capability and so its threat to global security must be taken into account. Whilst it is not as immediate, theorists, such as James Lovelock warn of "total anarchy and chaos" by 2050 due to the coming "ecological catastrophe" we are going to be faced with. This raises the interesting point that when this happens, there may be too little time to deal with it, thus global security will still be an issue both before and after the event. With progress, the threat is purely before the dreaded consequence and thus its threats to global security are purely are fold, and whilst catastrophic and major there would be little anyone could do about it, whereas the cold wars Lovelock warns of could upset humanity and global security for a much longer time.

Finally, gathering the previous two counter arguments, nuclear proliferation can have positive effects on global security whereas terrorism or the potential resource wars caused by climate change cannot. Whilst theorists agree that proliferation

embodies the conditions of MAD, they are seeing nuclear weapons purely in the light of their physical use. This is not the reality, as nuclear weapons have adopted a much more symbolic rather than purely military role. They are more a sign of achievement as in the case of India and China rather than the original desire for them which was fostered like the Americans. This argument is backed up again by the lack of nuclear war since prohibition began, with over 80 states now being 'nuclear' and no nuclear wars breaking out since and not just no nuclear wars, but also nothing like the ones seen in the first half of the 20th century - which adds to the argument that prohibition is not a threat to global security - but, instead, it enhances global security.

To conclude, whilst the counter arguments are strong, it would only take one event to dispense them and this is their downfall. One to the fact only one bomb would have to be dropped in order for there to be such widespread destruction, prohibition of such weapons has to be seen as the greatest threat, even more so than climate change. This is because of the nature of those now wishing to acquire nuclear weapons i.e. terrorist groups and pariah states such as North Korea. Christopher Hitchens' argument is irrefutable in the sense that there are weapons capable of bringing the apocalypse and people who wish for this to happen in positions to acquire such weapons and it is this reason that tips the balance

terrorism nuclear proliferation the greatest threat
to global security



ResultsPlus

Examiner Comments

This is a well-balanced response which covers a significant amount of ground although doesn't reference other weapons of mass destruction.

There is much to commend in this response. A convincing argument is developed in support of both sides of the debate and strong examples are provided.

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

Nuclear proliferation is the spread of nuclear weapons both vertically, in terms of pure numbers of weapons, and horizontally, in terms of the number of actors who possess such weapons. The sheer immense destructive power of nuclear weapons and the fears over their use mean that some have labeled proliferation the biggest threat to global security. However others disagree saying the threat is not as big and may even point to other security issues.

Certainly from a realist perspective proliferation can be seen as a major threat. Realists see state security as vital and the growing nuclear proliferation threatens the security of states and could cause more states to seek to acquire nuclear weapons in order to protect themselves. This could, in effect, create a vicious circle where more states seek to build their nuclear armaments because others seek to do so too, creating an unstable, volatile arms race as seen in the 1950s and early 1960s, between the US and USSR, a period of severe instability and tension, nearly causing a nuclear conflict. This threat of a new, larger arms race can be seen as a major reason for concern and could indeed be taken as evidence for nuclear proliferation.

being the major threat to world security. If realist ideas of state security are implemented to try and ensure protection then an arms race would certainly threaten global peace. Furthermore, structural realist views from theorists such as Waltz would say that any arms race would take place in an anarchic global system where states act more in confrontation than co-operation. Adding nuclear weapons to this would create an even greater chance of conflict, showing how much of a threat proliferation can be.

The type of state acquiring nuclear weapons is also a concern and a possible threat. With regimes run by unpredictable dictators, such as in North Korea, seeking to gain nuclear capability, the threat from nuclear weapons increases. A rogue state may seek to use their nuclear weapons as a bargaining tool in confrontation with other states and could be seen to be more likely to use a nuclear weapon than in the democratic states that already possess weapons due to the dictator's ability to act with impunity. Furthermore states such as Iraq are often less secure and there is more chance that a nuclear weapon may fall into the hands of a group that would seek to use it. The security of nuclear weapons in Pakistan has been a major cause for concern in recent years with fears that radical Islamists may seek to acquire a nuclear weapon for terror purposes. This growing fear over the states and groups wanting nuclear weapons shows

how horizontal proliferation can be seen as a major threat to global security, or rather than the previous bi-polar stability seen in the Cold War, a multipolar nuclear world would be much more unstable, particularly if dangerous, unstable states gain nuclear capability.

The destructive power of nuclear weapons and other WMDs means that they can be seen as a bigger global threat than other issues because of their ability to cause potentially global damage. Ethicist Peter Singer points to the environmental impact of nuclear tests, with some Pacific islands still uninhabitable due to radioactive fallout, as an example of how much nuclear weapons can damage the environment. Groups such as CND and Greenpeace have often called for the abolition of nuclear weapons due to their impact and their potential to cause damage not only to mankind but to world ecosystems. A nuclear war, ~~would create~~ especially since the development of mutually assured destruction, would cause damage to the whole world on a level no other threat could match and possibly cause extinction events. This shows how proliferation and the increased threat of nuclear weapons means that nuclear weapons are a very significant threat to both the political and environmental security of the world.

However some theorists and commentators such as US news anchor Sean Hannity, have called nuclear proliferation "a problem amplified out of proportion." They point to the slow level of horizontal proliferation with only North Korea gaining limited nuclear capability in the last 10 years as a sign that nuclear weapons are not as big an issue as some like to make it. Furthermore commitments to reducing vertical proliferation as seen in the START treaties and the Non-Proliferation Treaty mean that the number of nuclear weapons has actually decreased with the US and Russia making large cuts during the 1990s. This could show that nuclear weapons may not be such a threat. Indeed a liberal would point to the increased international co-operation over nuclear treaties and the commitment to prevent further proliferation seen in the Iran negotiations as evidence for suggesting the international community is trying to reduce the threat of nuclear weapons and create a more harmonious, peaceful world rather than continue with confrontation. This means nuclear weapons may not be the global threat they once were.

The emergence of other threats to world security can also be seen to challenge the claim that nuclear weapons are 'the' major global security threat. The War on Terror has created global fear comparable to that of the Cold War and the

battle between radical Islamism and Western culture can be seen as a true 'clash of civilisations' that has potentially worldwide ramifications, due to the global terror threat and the increase in security as a result. Furthermore unrest created by the severe global financial crisis, and the growing fears over climate change and the impact that will cause for mankind means that to many nuclear proliferation is seen as just one of a number of issues that can threaten global security. Indeed the environmental issue could be labelled as more of a threat due to the difficulties in preventing further global warming, when compared to the relative ease of preventing proliferation.

Overall it can not be denied that nuclear proliferation is ~~a~~ ^{now} still a very major threat to global security. The fears over ^{the} ~~its~~ pure destructive ability of nuclear weapons, and the types of state wishing to acquire them means that it is undeniable that there is a threat. However it could be argued that other issues prevent it from being seen as the single biggest global threat and the reduction in overall weapons numbers mean that nuclear weapons are not as much of a global issue as they were 30 years ago particularly when compared to their coverage

in the media against issue such as terrorism and climate change.



ResultsPlus

Examiner Comments

Discussion on the impact of both horizontal and vertical proliferation precedes a convincing argument that there is a significant threat to global stability. Arguably, the arms race and security dilemma are consequences of proliferation which includes two dangerous 'rogue states' such as North Korea. Radical Islam and the search for WMD by terror groups is mentioned, as is the end of the bipolar stable MAD period which has been replaced by a far less stable multipolar nuclear world. The counter argument has a focus on the positive arms control talks and treaties that have taken place and recent movement in the issue of Iranian nuclear ambitions. Alternative causes of concern such as a clash of civilizations are referenced.

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 across both 3D and 4D. As usual, there were a few key differentiators between candidates' responses. The key to success in responding to the questions set is to recognise 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, 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 and contemporary examples.

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.