



Examiners' Report **June 2022**

GCE Politics 9PL0 3B

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.



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 2022

Publications Code 9PL0_3B_2206_ER

All the material in this publication is copyright

© Pearson Education Ltd 2022

Introduction

This was a welcome return to a full examination process following the impact of the pandemic over the last few years. To help students manage their exam preparation, Advance Information (AI) was released to centers in February, giving students guidance about the topics for which they should focus their revision. It was particularly heartening to note how well prepared most candidates were for this examination. Many of the responses made clear that candidates had developed an outstanding knowledge and understanding of the specification content and were able to demonstrate all of the associated skills which led to the construction of some truly impressive work.

It is worth noting that the longer 30-mark questions are, of course, marked using three distinct Assessment Objectives. Whilst AO1 knowledge and understanding was typically very strong, as was AO2 which covers not just comparative, though that's a focus on Paper 3 more than elsewhere, AO3 could still be a challenge for some candidates. There were some truly outstanding examples of fully relevant and sustained evaluation of political information, constructing fully effective arguments and judgments, which were consistently substantiated leading to fully focused and justified conclusions. Equally there were numerous candidates who found that the level that they achieved in AO1 and AO2 was not matched by their AO3 and this AO is, of course, worth a third of the best-fit mark.

We acknowledge that we received a number of queries about the complexity of the three essay questions in Section C. Students rose to the challenge and performance across all three questions in the section was impressive, with students clearly able to demonstrate their ability and talent in their responses. Stronger responses were more likely to cover all identified elements in each of the questions, but students who didn't, still had the opportunity to demonstrate strong knowledge, analysis and evaluation in their responses. Nevertheless, the concerns raised by teachers about the complexity of these questions was noted by the senior examining team, and due consideration to this was therefore given during the awarding of grade boundaries on this paper.

The sitting of the A level Politics examination in 2022 was only the second full running of a summer series since the new specification was first examined in 2019. Although resit papers were sat in November 2020 and November 2021, the entries for these were very small (less than 100), and we therefore did not receive the usual feedback on the level of demand of those papers. After every full series, we review how our papers have performed to understand what adjustments may be required for future series; in light of feedback from teachers about this summer's papers, we will take additional care in our review process this autumn.

Question 1(a)

This was the less popular of the options in section A, although there were still a significant number of candidates who chose to tackle this question. The question worked well in providing a full range of responses.

Stronger responses tended to tackle both institutions in parallel as they set out the similarities between the G7 and the G20. Unfortunately, a small number of candidates seemed to miss the reference to similarities and instead focussed on simply describing the two institutions or even focussing on their differences exclusively. Stronger responses also noted the emphasis on similarities in terms of membership, purpose and effectiveness as well as tackling impact on global politics. There were some excellent examples used in development of the points raised.

This response has a clear focus on the command elements in the question, covering similarities in terms of membership, purpose and effectiveness before turning to impact. This absolute focus on the question is a clear strength.

The G7 and G20 are organisations that share many similarities regarding membership, purpose and effectiveness. ~~and impact. The essay will~~
The following essay will discuss these similarities and conclude upon their global impact.

Regarding membership, the G7 represents many of the world's biggest economies and although this shared representation of global GDP was once much higher and more representative, it still to this day ~~sees~~ harbours many established, respected powers. These members follow a similar, liberal, capitalistic outlook and all work towards their shared interest.

Similarly, the G20's ~~is~~ members make up a large portion of global GDP, they are even more representative than the G7. ~~As~~ Accounting for 50% of global land, ~~the~~ the G20 ~~members~~ also works towards their member's shared goals. ~~As~~ Whilst a majority of members do share the same liberal, capitalistic outlook as the G7, ~~there~~ more variance exists within the members of the G20 through states such as China and India, however the members' goal remains the same.

Both the G7 and the G20 seem to ~~be~~ make change on issues such as climate change, terrorism, etc because as ~~a~~ global organisations, they can impact on global issues. They both do this by working with IGOs, NGOs ~~and~~ - ~~including~~ and at their meetings.

However, the ^{questionable} effectiveness of these plans and meetings is shared by both the G7 and G20. Due to the G20's extensive membership, differences naturally occur between states and therefore, due to the one state one vote policy, it can be hard for ~~these states~~ agreements to be made. Similarly, the G7, ~~as~~ although less frequent than the G20, can also find it hard to agree; this was particularly evident when President Trump was a member. As also seen in the G20, oppositions to liberal thinking will always result in conflict and disagreement.

~~Regarding~~ Moreover, meetings at the G7 and G20 are ~~discussed~~ mainly nondisclosed, therefore states lack accountability and therefore both organisations appear rather ineffective. This is amplified by the fact that decisions made are non-binding. The informal nature of both meetings adds to their lack of effectiveness and general impact on global politics.

Both the G7 and G20 have had some successful impacts, e.g. the G7 abd. although mainly economic: the G7 cancelling \$100 billion of global debt, doubling aid to Africa and the G20 dealing effectively with the 2008 financial crisis. However, overall it's certainly fair to argue they both have reasonably little impact on global politics and have had many failings: the G7 failing to liberalize Russia when in the G8, the G20 appearing to almost be a 'temporary phenomenon' and their shared failings to deal with climate change, terrorism or make a real world impact.

*

(Total for Question 1 = 12 marks)

TOTAL FOR SECTION A = 12 MARKS

Overall, there are many similarities amongst the G7 and G20; ~~with perhaps their most~~ notable being a continued lack of ^{true} ^{sustainable} global impact.



ResultsPlus
Examiner Comments

The response covers membership in some level of detail before turning to purpose and then effectiveness with examples used in support of assertions made. The response concludes with commentary on similarities in impact, whether that be effective or ineffective.



Clear reference to the wording of the question ensures that a response remains relevant.

Question 1(b)

This was the more popular of the options in this section of the paper.

The question worked well as there was clear differentiation between candidates based on knowledge and understanding as well as analysis. A few candidates stated the characteristics of democratic states and then autocratic states with no real attempt to highlight and explore the differences and a few candidates failed to tackle the second element of the question relating to consequences for global order, but generally this question was tackled well. Stronger responses were often able to provide, and explain, clear examples as part of their analysis.

This question focussed on differences between democratic and autocratic states. Some candidates took the approach of outlining characteristics of a democratic state and then characteristics of an autocratic state without directly comparing and contrasting.

Stronger responses tended to make clear the differences between the two on a point-by-point basis. There was also a need to consider their consequences for global order which some candidates found to be more challenging.

Democratic states are characterised by free and fair elections that are regularly held, allowing for the people in the state to be able to choose their leader/leading party to rule. This gives the government legitimacy. Autocratic states however, are not characterised by elections - but instead either of a dictatorship or one-party rule, both of which does not allow any kind of political opposition, for example North Korea and China. Democratic states, such as the UK, have regular elections where the people decide who rules, and there is always opposition to the government, both at a political level (such as opposition parties) or a local level (where people can actively oppose the government if they so choose). In Authoritarian states, usually no opposition is allowed - at both levels, so there is no democratic legitimacy whatsoever.

Democratic states, due to being elected by the people, are accountable to the people. Therefore, they need to follow the wishes of the public that the government in power is representing. In contrast, Authoritarian states are not accountable to the

people, and so they can put the state's interests over that of the people's. Democratic governments need to represent the wishes of the people in order to gain enough support for re-election in the next country-wide election. However, as there are no elections in autocratic states, they do not need to fulfil the wishes of the people.

In terms of consequences for global order, if a country is democratic, they are more likely to seek collective action and avoid conflict as war is unpopular with the people. This links to the liberal theory of the Kantian triangle, where democracy is a key factor for global peace. Democratic states are also more likely to join IGOs with other democratic states - again a liberal view. By contrast, authoritarian states do not represent the wishes of their people, and are more likely to go into conflict as a result. ~~The~~ Authoritarian states are more likely to be 'turned off' from the rest of the world in comparison to democratic states, an example of this would be North Korea. Authoritarian states do not need the will of the people to cause conflict, unlike democratic states, and also are more likely to want to expand their

global or regional power, as they do not need consent from ~~the~~ its population.



ResultsPlus
Examiner Comments

This candidate covers clear differences between autocratic and democratic states in relation to leadership and form of government as well as political participation and examples are used. There is an explanation of accountability to the public across both democratic and autocratic states. The candidate moves to consequences for global order with reference to liberal theory, likelihood of IGO cooperation and of conflict.

Question 2

Many candidates were very well prepared for this question and generally the perspectives on human nature were clearly explained.

Some excellent examples were used to develop the link between human nature and the actions of states. The different perspectives on power were less of a focus for some candidates who seemed more comfortable focussing on human nature.

The guidelines for this question on the mark scheme make clear that candidates who do not make any synoptic points cannot achieve Level 4 and are consequently capped at a mark of 9 which is the top of Level 3. The core ideas and principles of Conservatism and how they relate to human nature were the most used gateway to synoptic content and to the higher marks although, of course, synoptic content is no guarantee of access to Level 4 without sufficient wider knowledge, understanding and analysis linked to the particular question.

This is a wide ranging response which covers both human nature and power and includes synoptic points which would consequently allow it to access Level 4 as long as the AO1 and AO2 warranted this.

- 2 Analyse the differences that exist between realists and liberals in the ways they view human nature and power.

In your answer you must discuss any relevant core political ideas.

(12)

Realists borrow their pessimistic views about human nature from Hobbes' own pessimistic view about human nature. Hobbes argues that in a state of nature, humans' lives will be 'nasty, brutish, and short' with this, realists agree that human nature is bleak and therefore, the only way to tame this is through, what Hobbes would call 'a leviathan'. Realists recognise that states are made up of people, and if humans are naturally self-centered and egotistical, then the international world will always be in a state of anarchy. This echoes the views of Kenneth Waltz and Hedley Bull, who argue that international anarchy will always be the status quo, because humans are selfish and power-seeking creatures.

Liberals would fundamentally disagree with realists' views on human nature because, they borrow their idealistic views from Locke, who argued that humans are naturally cooperative creatures, who seek community. Thus, liberals would argue that human nature is 'positive'. However, liberals do agree that in a state of nature, humans can have the tendency to be selfish and egotistical, but liberals argue that this is what makes us cooperate, as Pinker would argue, cooperation leads to the 'better angels of ourselves'.

On power, realists argue that power is absolute, and therefore, it should be the primary goal of any state. Morgenthau argued that competition and conflict will continue, and therefore realists ~~are~~ favour the idea of gaining as much power as one can, in order to defend the nation state. This is because, you can never know the intentions of any other state, so the rational mindset to have, is to remain ready for an attack at all times. Realists would argue that power comes from economic clout, but mostly military might. Defensive realists such as Kenneth Waltz would actually argue that having this approach will only solicit a response from enemies, thus states should be aiming for a balance of power. Still, it remains that all realists agree that power is the ultimate guarantee of stability and sovereignty, so we should seek it.

Liberals, however, remain with their idealistic ~~the~~ Lockean views and argue that the militant, realist approach only leads to wars, and wars should be avoided at all costs.

Fukuyama argues in 'End of History', that the need for great power ~~of~~ and wars has ended, since the defeat of the Soviet Union, thus, liberals would argue that 'soft power' should be the primary goal of any state. Peace can be reached through diplomacy. Moreover, influence can also be gained through soft power such as cultural power, as seen in America's vast cultural influence through: education, media, and corporations. ~~At~~ Also, neo-liberals would argue that in the current world, economic power should replace military power.



The script references one of the key thinkers, Hobbes, whilst explaining the Realist perspective on human nature and explains the implications of this. This is in contrast to the Liberal perspective which is also outlined with a degree of clarity. Political commentators are used to explain and to illustrate the points made, including on power perspectives. Examples are used for illustration.



Political commentators can be used very effectively, where relevant, in order to support points made.

Question 3(a)

This was the least popular of the questions in the section but it is worth highlighting that there was very little difference in the popularity of the three options in Section C. Performance across all three questions in the section was impressive with candidates clearly able to demonstrate their ability and talent in their responses.

It was interesting to note that most candidates ultimately agreed with the statement that a trend away from globalisation and regionalism would place greater emphasis on state sovereignty and thus hinder the promotion of human rights. Some candidates chose to focus primarily on globalisation rather than regionalism when assessing sovereignty and human rights whilst others made regionalism their focus. Both approaches were able to find a route to accessing the very highest marks. Stronger responses were more likely to cover all identified elements but candidates who didn't, still had the opportunity to demonstrate strong knowledge, analysis and evaluation in their responses.

Many candidates were able to assess the value of each distinct type of globalisation in impacting upon state sovereignty and even in strengthening state sovereignty, related to the question. There were some excellent examples used in support of both views. The impact of regionalism on state sovereignty and the consequent impact on human rights was also covered very well by numerous candidates with many examples of human rights being both strengthened and weakened by a shift in regionalism as well as globalisation.

This is a wide ranging response which sets out a clear view in the introduction, even if this view is challenged and analysed at points throughout the response.

The argument that a trend away from globalisation and regionalism would place greater emphasis on state sovereignty and thus hinder the promotion of human rights, is ~~a~~ ~~fact~~. Regional bodies help to maintain human rights while globalisation encourages the spread of liberal ideas across the world. Overall, removing regionalism and globalisation would place a greater influence on state sovereignty and hinder human rights.

Firstly, regionalism helps to maintain rights in its member states. The EU, a supranational regional body, is a liberal institution dating back to after WWII. Its use of treaties such as the Treaty of Rome (1957) and Treaty of Lisbon increase the widening and depth of integration so increased pooling of sovereignty. The treaties are binding to signatory states. Its social workers chapter ensures fair rights and conditions to workers which promotes liberal values of fairness and equality. Arguably, without treaties and regional bodies there would be a greater sense of state sovereignty and hinder of human rights as there isn't a higher body checking nation states and holding them accountable. For example, recently the International

in Strasbourg
Court of Justice, blocked the legality of first flight
of asylum seekers to Rwanda from Britain as
it was against their human rights. This shows that
regional bodies do restrict state sovereignty to
ensure human rights. Moreover, Turkey was rejected
membership into the EU based on their ~~to~~ poor track
record on human rights. However, even with regional
bodies ~~to~~ sovereignty is still a significant factor
that does hinder human rights. Despite Poland
and Hungary being part of the EU they have
been criticised for their harsh policies of anti-
immigration and their social policies. Therefore, it can
be seen that ~~to~~ even with regional bodies, rights
are not ensured. Similarly, in ASEAN they have
not persecuted Myanmar for their treatment of
Rohingya Muslims. Therefore, despite regional bodies
have pooled sovereignty of member states,
it follows the ~~the~~ realist view of Westphalian
principles that a nation states sovereignty can never
be limited. This can be seen with the UK leaving
the EU in 2020. Ultimately, however, without regional
bodies human rights could be ~~even more~~ endangered
so treaties and pooling of sovereignty have been
beneficial to protect rights.

Secondly, globalisation has fostered a sense of

collective liberal rights. Cultural globalisation, based on the shared new experiences, has put human rights at the forefront of debate. National broadcast stations like the BBC and even YouTube report on human rights issues globally. For example, in recent news Ukraine citizens being sexually abused and even raped by Russian soldiers. However, cultural globalisation has actually created a backlash of conservatism and nationalism placing greater emphasis on state sovereignty. For example, despite homosexuality being integrated into law it is still illegal in 73 countries. Hungary's PM Victor Orban has risen as a nationalist leader in the face of a more liberalised world. Similarly, Russia's Vladimir Putin rejects the West's liberal decadence in exchange for a more conservative rule. Recently, in the 2022 French Presidential election, Marine Le Pen, a conservative nationalist, polled in at 41.7% highlighting that despite a more liberalised there has been a substantiated backlash with the rise of nationalistic leaders putting a greater emphasis on state sovereignty. Overall, in terms of cultural globalisation despite fostering a collective liberal shared value of human rights it has created a backlash, in favour of the realist perspective, with the rise of nationalistic leaders who reject this collective identity and stress

the importance of state sovereignty which consequently has hindered human rights.

Lastly, political and economic globalisation has arguably eroded state sovereignty and further promoted human rights. Hyper globalisers argue that states are no longer the main actors in global politics but also NAO's and non-state actors. For example, NAO; Human Rights Watch reports on human rights abuses to the UN including Yemen and Darfur. On the international stage of global politics, NAO's have a greater voice as well as individuals namely Greta Thunberg who provides a strong voice for the environment. Similarly, economic globalisation can force a nation state to act in accordance with human rights or are threatened with economic sanctions. However, this is not always the case. Despite Russia's economic sanctions against its invasion of Ukraine this has not deterred its continuous invasion. Moreover, it is difficult to hold powerful states accountable for human rights abuses. The US, being a prime example, has not been held accountable over its allegations of water boarding at Guantanamo Bay. As a result, it is difficult to hold powerful nations accountable economically and politically since they can simply choose to ignore.

Globalisation sceptics argue that the state remains a dominant, primary actor without global politics which has not been ever eroded because of globalisation. Furthermore, political global governance can be ignored as it is difficult to enforce. Overall, there has been steps economically and politically as part of globalisation to protect human rights. As Robert Keohane says globalisation has created a complex web of interdependence and it would be economically detrimental for a state to abuse human rights. Politically as well the UN's R2P in 2005 ensures human rights are protected. Therefore, the more convincing view is that political and economic globalisation have helped to protect human rights and as, hyper globalisers, would argue has eroded state sovereignty as states are no longer the primary actors in global politics and without globalisation rights would be in danger.

In conclusion, the view that a trend away from globalisation and regionalism would place of a greater emphasis on state sovereignty and hinder human rights is a convincing one. Regional bodies foster shared values and rights as does cultural globalisation. However, despite this human rights

are sometimes in danger so there is a convincing argument to suggest that without regionalism and cultural globalisation rights would be hindered. Similarly, political and economic globalisation have seen nation states acting in their own self-interest despite the economic risks. An increasing trend is the rise of nationalistic leaders who place a greater emphasis on state sovereignty rather than co-operation and regionalism which may be seen, in the future, to hinder rights further. Overall, without globalisation and regionalism state sovereignty would be emphasised as well as being a hinder on human rights.



There is a clear introduction in support of the assertion in the title of the question.

The response opens with a discussion on regionalism including EU supranationalism and the widening and deepening of integration with pooling of sovereignty as well as binding treaties. The impact of the Social Chapter and rights for workers is covered with the consequent impact on sovereignty and impact on human rights if eroded or removed. It is, of course, the ECHR rather than ECJ which impacts on Rwanda flights and there is commentary on Turkey and application to join the EU impacted by human rights record. The argument is made that sovereignty is still significant and does impact on human rights even with regionalism and examples are provided. There is a reference to ASEAN and to the Realist perspective on sovereignty even in an era of regional bodies.

There is discussion of the impact of globalisation and speculation as to the impact of erosion of globalisation. There is an interesting argument that cultural globalisation can lead to a backlash which reinforces sovereignty with examples provided. NGOs are referenced and their impact is discussed with use of human rights examples. The operation of major powers who appear to be able to ignore human rights standards is relevant to the response and examples are provided. The globalisation sceptic argument is represented as is the complex interdependence view and the hyper globalisation perspective including the impact of R2P.



An introduction, which is able to clearly set out the direction of a response, is a real strength.

Question 3(b)

This was the second most popular of the optional questions in the section.

A broad range of responses were provided including some outstanding responses at the top of the highest level. As with the other questions in this section, candidates were given the opportunity to bring together different parts of the specification in consideration of the question asked. The broad nature of the question opened up a wide body of knowledge for reference and contributed to supporting candidates in demonstrating the knowledge, understanding, skills of analysis and evaluation required to access all levels of the mark scheme.

Again, some candidates chose to do this with a focus on a particular element in the question. For example, some candidates chose to focus on inequalities within countries and some chose to focus on inequalities between countries when contrasting with the actions of particular countries and political institutions. Many candidates focussed on the particular actions of the USA and/or China, but other countries were used very effectively in developing argument. Some candidates chose to focus on the actions of the IPCC whilst others chose to focus on the UNFCCC and particular summits including Rio, Kyoto, Copenhagen, Paris and Glasgow.

This is a very wide-ranging response which covers a significant amount of ground. Knowledge and analysis are the real strengths of this response.

There has been a slow rate of progress over climate change results. Some would blame this on the inequalities between countries which leads to a lack of consensus which therefore blocks action. It can be argued that ~~these are~~ ^{this is} more at fault than the actions of particular states and political institutions.

However a more credible argument would be that states actions are more to blame due to their lack of commitment and serious changes. This is reflected in the deep ecologist view that states lack a change of attitude which leads to a lack of seriousness.

Though shallow ecologists would argue that no one is to blame as there has been progress, ^{which is} evident by the climate change conferences over the years.

One reason for the lack of action and the slow rate of progress over climate change results can be blamed on the inequalities between countries. This leads to conflict between developed and developing countries as they disagree over who should pay more. Developing countries have less wealth than developed countries and therefore believe that it should not be them who pay. However developed countries see this as unfair and this leads to a lack of cooperation which means

that there is a lack of progress ^{at} conferences which leads to a ~~lack~~ ^{lack} of progress in tackling climate change. for example at the Rio Earth Summit 1992 the burden was placed on developed countries to pay more. however us saw this as unfair and therefore failed to provide leadership which led to a lack of action and progress over climate change results.

However arguably it is not due to the inequalities between countries but the lack of agreement between developed and developing countries in general. for example they disagree over who is responsible and also how emissions should be measured. This means that they disagree over who should pay due to responsibility and not because inequalities exist between these countries. for example developing states blame developed ~~as~~ ^{due} to their industrialisation over the past 200 years which means that they are responsible for most of the current emissions in the air. for example ~~the~~ India is responsible for 3% of cumulated emissions in comparison to the US' 16% and the EU's 15%. however developed states, like the EU, would argue that their emissions have been steady and declining whilst India and China are the current biggest polluters which means that they are causing the current crisis. with India set to reach 1/5 of the world's total emissions. however India and China have both been investing in more green

technology would could reduce their emissions too in the future. This shows their lack of cooperation due to neither side taking any responsibility and this is not because of inequalities - however the developing world has been left behind and they argue they should be able to develop in the same way that developed states did. This shows that inequality may be an underlying cause for the lack of consensus.

Another reason why they disagree over who should pay is due to their lack of agreement on how emissions should be measured. For example developing states believe that it should be ~~per~~^{per} capita to show that the west uses the most consumerist and polluting lifestyle. However developed countries think it should be in gross terms to show that the developing world are the biggest polluters. It can be argued that this disagreement is due to the inequality between the countries which makes the developing world look poor excluded and a lack of cooperation. Though overall this shows that it is wider than the issue of inequality as there is no consensus between developed and developing countries which leads to a lack of targets and slow progress over climate change.

However shallow ecologists ~~should~~^{would} argue that there are

been progress and this is evident by the Rio Earth Summit 1992 which showed that there was a need for cooperation to tackle climate change. This was followed by Copenhagen, Paris 2015, Katowice and most recently Glasgow 2021. In the last conference they decided to limit their targets to 1.5 degrees which shows progress. People are trying to reduce the impact of climate change which reflects why ^{shallow ecologists} ~~realists~~ recognise progress. Furthermore there has been a growth in green tech investment which shows the move to sustainable development which is progress for shallow ecologists.

However from a deep ecologists perspective there is no progress and a complete lack of action. ~~This~~ ^{The} is not based on the inequalities between countries, but on the action (or lack of action) of states. Deep ecologists believe there needs to be a radical change and a paradigm shift in our consciousness where ~~we~~ ^{there} needs to be a move away from ~~an~~ ^{the} current anthropocentric view to an ecocentric view. States and people need to recognise the right for nature to "flourish and bloom" (Nozick) and not see themselves as just Capra's "web of life". This shows that people's anthropocentric attitude has led to a lack of action ~~over~~ ^{and} progress over climate change. States have not been radical enough in their approach and lack urgency for progress to be made.

Realists would also blame the actions of states for the lack of progress over the ~~an~~ ^{climate} change crisis. This is due to the realist belief of state egoism and power maximisation which means they would not 'waste' their resources on the climate over the military. This is also due to their belief that politics is a zero-sum game. This means that if developed nations paid they would live out in an international anarchic world. This can be seen by Bush failing to cooperate over Katrina as he put his nation's interests first. Similarly Trump leaving Paris for his nation's interests. This shows that state actions are more relevant for the lack of progress as they are unwilling to compromise and cooperate due to state egoism and putting their nation above others. However liberals believe in cooperation and mutual benefit for all so the ^{states} are likely to work together to tackle climate change and this is seen through the various conferences. It also reflects their view of complex interdependence and shows how all are impacted. Despite the need to cooperate, the realist argument for the lack of cooperation due to national priorities is a stronger reason for the lack of progress.

‡ The lack of progress can also be blamed on political institutions. For example even though targets were reached

at Paris 2015 and Glasgow 2021, there has been a lack of progress due to the real commitments by states to reach their targets. This can be due to the realist self-interest state view - however it can also be blamed on institutions as they lack coercive power to ensure that these targets are met and that states keep their promises. This shows ^{there} is a lack of incentive for states to comply and cooperate with laws due to the weakness of institutions. ~~the~~ ^{Paris} target of 2 degrees was also still too high to avoid irreversible CC which shows they lack effectiveness - however a more credible argument would be that states are unwilling to cooperate as they may not see it as their problem.

This shows that there has been a lack of progress due to the inequalities between countries which has led to a lack of consensus and where targets have been made they have not been urgent enough as states have been unable to reach a consensus. However a more credible argument is that the lack of consensus between states and the refusal to pay and cooperate is due to the actions of states and their realist approach which makes action and progress slow as they are only interested in their own gains. It can be blamed on political institutions, though only to a small extent. Deep ecologists would also blame the attitude of states for their lack of urgency due to their anthropocentric view which means that there ^{has} ~~have~~ been a lack of progress over tackling climate change. This again shows how it is largely due to the fault and lack of actions of states.



There is a weighing up of different perspectives in the introduction which gives us a taste of where the rest of the essay is likely to go. The introduction references the inequalities and actions of states debate with a nod also to the Deep and Shallow ecologist perspectives.

The response covers disagreements between developed and developing countries over responsibility with particular reference to India, China and the United States. This includes the measurement per capita debate and disagreement. The candidate references Rio, Copenhagen, Paris etc and the targets set within these conferences. There is a reference to the Deep vs Shallow ecologist debate and an explanation of Realism and what it may tell us about the likelihood of state action. The candidate considers the Liberal complex interdependence perspective and then the actions of political institutions. There is an attempt to bring all of the different perspectives and viewpoints together in the conclusion.



Candidates would be advised to remember that AO3 needn't be reserved for a final conclusion but that AO1, AO2 and AO3 would ideally be present throughout a response.

Question 3 (c)

This question was marginally the most popular question in this section.

Once more, there was a pleasing range of marks with clear differentiation. Most candidates decided to use the examples of conflict, poverty, human rights and the environment when considering the impact on contemporary global issues. Many candidates were able to construct particularly impressive responses without accessing the full range of the above listed contemporary global issues and alternative valid discussion was also, of course, credited. The European Union tended to be the focus of attention when considering regional bodies, but there was a good range of other regional bodies used both to highlight the strengths and also weaknesses of regional bodies in impacting on contemporary global issues. Many candidates decided to discuss the Bretton Woods institutions as a collective but a sizeable number of candidates decided to focus on the impact of the IMF, World Bank and WTO individually, often with a focus on one institution. The vast majority of, but not all, candidates recognised that the word "impact" was central to exploring and considering the question.

This response covers a decent range of contemporary global issues which are clearly signposted. There is a clear focus on the question throughout.

As two key components of the global stage, regional bodies such as EU and NAFTA, and the 1944 Bretton Woods institutions both have considerable impacts on global issues. Whilst it could be argued that in regards to human rights protection regional bodies have a ~~more~~ slightly greater, and more positive, impact, ~~the~~ overall it is clear that the IMF, WB and WTO have a much more significant impact ~~and~~ on the global issues of poverty and conflict.

On the one hand, in regards to the global issue of human rights it could be argued that regional bodies have a greater impact than the Bretton Woods institutions, although this is a very slight difference. The largest example of regional bodies having an affect positively on the advancement of human rights protection is seen in the EU. The EU expresses ~~the~~ considerable emphasis on human rights - supporting both the ICC and the ECHR. Moreover, the ECJ acts as a supranational branch of the EU and therefore has the power to enforce protection of rights within member states. The EU also has considerable coercive power in protecting the rights of citizens in non-member states. For example, in order to join the EU, a country must work to make its

ideology more in line with EU ethical values and the EU Charter of Fundamental Rights - seen clearly by Turkey abolishing the death penalty out of desire to gain compatibility with the EU. This displays how the EU as a regional body is able to have a considerable impact on the global issue of human rights, both within the region and outside it. In contrast to this, the Bretton Woods institutions, as solely bodies of economic development, have little impact on human rights protection and certainly not a positive one. This is especially clear in the World Bank which does not require good governance as a necessity for receiving loans. This results in the WB providing loans to countries in which human rights abuses are present - for example the WB provided \$30 billion to the Suharto regime in 1960s Indonesia despite the mass murders and oppression of political opponents that was widely known. This shows how the Bretton Woods have less of a positive or expansive influence on human rights than regions. However, it is important to recognise that other than the EU, the majority of regional bodies have little influence on human rights. The EU is by far the most advanced region - with deep integration both economically and politically. Meanwhile, other regions - especially those of solely economic function - do not concern themselves with human rights. This is seen clearly when Brunei introduced the death penalty for gay people in 2019 and ASEAN did not intervene.

out of respect for Bruner's sovereignty. It is in this way that we see that the difference in influence between Bretton Woods institutions and regional bodies is very sharp. However it does remain that, due to the EU's considerable influence, regional bodies ~~are more~~ have more of an impact overall on human rights.

However it is evident that in other global issues, regional bodies have less of an impact. This is seen clearly in regards to ^{reduction of} conflicts. Some may argue that regional bodies do have a significant impact on reducing conflict due to providing cooperation between member states. For example, with the foundations of the EU rooted in the 1951 ~~economic~~ ~~agreement~~ ~~of~~ ~~steel~~ ~~and~~ ~~coal~~ industries, ^{the threat of} a war in Europe was massively reduced as the interconnection of economies meant conflict was neither desirable nor feasible. This same reduction of conflict can be seen in modern regions such as NAFTA where deep economic cooperation provides greater stability and reduced risk of conflict between members. However, we see that regional bodies have much less significance in conflict resolution beyond the relationships between member states. By looking at Russia's relationship with both the EU and NATO, it is explicitly evident that regional bodies can actually create conflict as tensions build between those within the region and those

outside. In contrast to this, the IMF, WB and WTO can be argued to reduce conflict on a global scale rather than just within regions. As the dominant driving forces of economic cooperation - providing trade agreements and facilitating partnerships between states - these institutions have the ability to ~~provide~~ reduce the risk of conflict through a manifestation of the Dell peace theory. This describes the liberal conception, built from the Kantian ideas of complex interdependence from his 1795 'Perpetual Peace', of global economic cooperation providing the basis for reduced conflict between states. Therefore, we see that it is substantiated to argue that the ~~sanction~~ world institutions have a greater impact on conflict reduction because they create cooperation on a wider, global scale, whilst the significance of regional bodies is largely contained between its member states.

Furthermore, in regards to the global issue of poverty, regional bodies have less of an impact than the IMF, WB and WTO. Some may argue that regional bodies have significant influence on poverty reduction by raising the living standards of their member states. ~~This is true~~ This is portrayed through the EU's Social Development Fund which focuses on bettering the lives of populations in EU states and similarly in the African Union's adoption of a Plan for Employment and Poverty Alleviation in 2004. Regional bodies clearly have

a significant impact on poverty alleviation within the region - expressed in the 63% rise in GDP for ASEAN members between 2007 and 2015. However, like the impact on conflict resolution, this influence is not seen on the wider global scale. Due to protectionist policies such as the EU's CAP which subsidises EU farmers and so drives out producers from the global south, poverty alleviation of states outside regional bodies is much less effective. This is seemingly showing regional bodies to fit Wallerstein's World Systems Theory - of core states benefiting whilst peripheral states miss out. In contrast to this, the IMF, WB and WTO have the sole purpose of economic development and so consequently poverty alleviation - especially the World Bank. Through loans and advice, these institutions work to reduce global poverty levels - ~~to~~ arguably contributing to the global reduction of poverty of 1.9 billion people in 1990 to 836 million in 2015. The significance of the IMF can be seen through their vital role in the bailout of Greece after the 2008 financial crash. In this way we can see that the Bretton Woods institutions can have more of an expansive impact on the global issue of poverty in comparison to the influence of regional bodies which is eroded by their protectionist policies.

Overall, despite a very slight display of more influence in regards to human rights protection, regional bodies largely have less of an impact on global issues than the IMF, World Bank and WTO. In regards to both conflict reduction and poverty alleviation, regional bodies can be seen to lack the expansive global influence that the Bretton Woods institutions hold and are therefore less significant.



The introduction provides a degree of balance by explaining that both have an impact but in different areas with regional bodies impacting more, in their view, on human rights and the Bretton Woods bodies having more of an impact on poverty and conflict. There is discussion relating to EU support for the ICC and links to the ECHR as well as connection to the ECJ with supranational power.

Human rights are considered with an explanation of the link to human rights through EU membership and to the ECHR in contrast with the World Bank which has less concern for good governance. There are detailed examples given. The candidate compares and contrasts regional bodies with the Bretton Woods Institutions (BWI). They also consider degrees of impact between different regional bodies including the EU and ASEAN. as well as NAFTA and there is discussion relating to NATO.

The section on conflict considers tensions between Russia and the EU and NATO with a suggestion that regionalism can contribute towards conflict as well as attempt to reduce it. The BWI are also considered in relation to conflict with the point made that the BWI operate on a global scale.

Poverty is considered with the view that the BWI seek to reduce poverty globally. Regional bodies provide benefit but not globally. and there are tensions caused by regional body policies like the CAP. BWI impact on poverty including support for individual countries and during global recession are discussed.

The conclusion is rather brief, but there has been a relevance and focus throughout the response with AOs covered throughout in different areas.



This candidate clearly attempted to cover a range of contemporary global issues which they decided should include human rights, conflict and poverty.

Paper Summary

Given the disruption of the last few years, caused by the pandemic, it was very pleasing to note the quality of much of the work produced in examination conditions by candidates.

- Stronger responses tended to focus carefully on the phrasing of the questions, often making repeated references to the title as they analysed and evaluated.
- Section A questions, the initial 12-mark questions, will assess AO1 and AO2 and candidates need to be prepared to provide both knowledge and analysis in their responses.
- Section B, the compulsory 12-mark question, will also assess AO1 and AO2 and again candidates need to be prepared to provide both knowledge and analysis in their responses. It is worth remembering that candidates who do not make any synoptic points cannot achieve Level 4.
- Section C questions are usually the most challenging for candidates. They cover three assessment objectives and development of the skills of evaluation can be a challenge for some candidates.

Grade boundaries

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

<https://qualifications.pearson.com/en/support/support-topics/results-certification/grade-boundaries.html>

