

Examiners' Report  
June 2013

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](http://www.edexcel.com) or [www.btec.co.uk](http://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](http://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](http://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](http://www.pearson.com/uk).

June 2013

Publications Code UA036104

All the material in this publication is copyright  
© Pearson Education Ltd 2013

## **Introduction**

**This was an accessible paper which provided a pleasing range of marks and was effective as a discriminator. The standard of response was, overall, pleasing and there were some particularly strong responses which indicated that candidates had been very well prepared for the examination. There was a reasonable spread across all questions and there didn't appear to be any widespread issues with candidate understanding of the questions set. The most popular short question in Section A was question 4 on human rights but this was very closely followed by the question on religion. The least popular short question was the question on colonialism and neo-colonialism but it was still tackled by a decent number of candidates. The most popular long question from Section B was the question on terrorism and the least popular of the long responses was the question on the environment.**

**It is worth repeating the following observations made in the report for unit 3D.**

**The key to success in responding to the questions set is to recognize that not one, but in the case of the longer essay response, four marks, are being awarded for each script. Whilst Assessment Objective 1 (A01) knowledge may help a candidate to achieve 12 of the available 45 marks, there are still 33 marks available for A02, synopticity and A03. A large proportion of candidates score well in A01 because they provide detailed and developed knowledge and understanding, with relevant and accurate work but they can fail to attain the marks that are available elsewhere. The intellectual skills required to perform at the highest level in A02 revolve around the ability to provide analysis, evaluation and parallels or connections. This can be a challenge for those candidates who rely primarily on production of learnt fact and knowledge. Synopticity, where candidates are expected to provide an awareness of competing viewpoints or perspectives, can be a weak area for some. The longer questions are designed for debate and discussion of alternative viewpoints. A03 can also be an issue for some candidates. There is a need to bring all of the earlier A0 elements into a structured and logical response, which provides balance and use of appropriate political vocabulary.**

**It is evident that most, if not all, teachers are aware of, and focused on, the *Further Guidance for Route D* document. This was prepared by the previous Principal Examiner and can be found on the Edexcel website. This document provides additional content explanation and advice to support the initial specification document. It is also pleasing to note that teachers and students are making good use of recently developed resources.**

## Question 1

Q1: This was a reasonably popular question although often tackled as a second or even third choice in answer booklets despite it being the first question on the paper. Candidates were generally able to define key terms and note at least two areas of discussion. The issues of sovereignty and the idea of human rights as a 'tool of the west' were most commonly seen. The better responses discussed the institutions involved in more detail, citing examples.

Candidates explained that International law is a controversial area in the relationship between states with some states arguing that it is a tool of the major powers to further their own position and their own version of human rights. Some candidates judged the effectiveness of international law in upholding human rights by considering whether international law is being accepted by states and whether it is being implemented. It was pleasing to note the use of numerous examples including the actions of the International Criminal Court and the International tribunals.

International law for upholding human rights can be witnessed through the 1948 UN ~~Convention~~ Declaration on Human Rights, as well as numerous other international covenants such as the Vienna Convention on Human Rights.

One key measure for upholding human rights is the role of the UN ambassador for human rights. This role involves promoting worldwide acceptance of human rights, ~~at the same time~~ whilst supporting international bodies that arise from international meetings on human rights. However, ~~the~~ whoever is in this role only has the ability to 'name and shame' those states who violate human rights law, resulting in the UN High Commissioner simply relying on observation and persuasion to stop ~~some~~ sovereign states abusing human rights.

Another key body for ensuring human rights are upheld is the UN 27-member human rights

Council. This body of powerful states meets regularly to discuss those states who have broken human rights law. However, this body has extremely little powers as it can only inform the UN general assembly, who can only then advise the UN Security Council, which is the UN body responsible for taking decisions.

Also, the 'member states' tend to 'look out for each other' when it comes to ~~the~~ punishing states for human rights abuses, and the selective nature of states which are 'named and shamed' results in many suggesting that the body is politically biased. This can be seen through the constant 'naming and shaming' of Israel and its human rights abuses.

Another international law responsible for upholding human rights is the European Convention on Human Rights. It was accepted by the European Human Rights Court in Strasbourg, France, suggesting it has significant credibility globally.

Either states or individuals can complain if they feel that their human rights are being abused, thereby ensuring citizens human rights are upheld.

However, there is a significant time lag in responses, with some complaints not being dealt with for 3 years. There is also complaint that the system is far too expensive to run.

However, with 90% of the European Court's verdicts being accepted, this high rate of compliance suggests that citizens human rights are being successfully upheld internationally.

There are also numerous human rights international

tribunals. One of these, set up by the UN Security Council in the Hague, is the International Tribunal for war crimes committed in former Yugoslavia. This ensures that those who committed war crimes and genocide can be sentenced to life imprisonment. However, many claim it is politically biased towards Serbians, and that it is far too expensive to run, costing over £100m for only one year.

There is also an international tribunal for Rwanda, after the 1994 Genocide in which 800,000 Tutsis were killed. This ensures those who committed war crimes are sent to justice and sentenced. However, Rwandans believe this has been unsuccessful, as Rwanda still has the death penalty, yet the largest sentence is life imprisonment. Therefore, ~~arguably~~, arguably, this hasn't upheld Rwandan human rights but simply 'soothed consciences' of the Western world!



### ResultsPlus Examiner Comments

There is a decent knowledge base to this response. The start of the response does focus on the United Nations in some detail but other judicial institutions are also mentioned as the response progresses.

With the 1948 UN Declaration of Human Rights, the legal framework to uphold them had its foundations established. In recent years, the effectiveness of international law in upholding human rights must be assessed in the context of the International Courts, treaties and key documents as well. Consideration must also be made of international organisations in promoting a human rights agenda.

On the one hand, international law ~~could~~ could be considered successful in that it has essentially codified numerous norms and principles related to human rights. For example, the 1948 Rome agreement enshrines multiple human rights principles (including genocide and torture prohibition), with a legal impetus for the 122 states who have signed or ratified the treaty. This gained even greater significance with the formation of the ICC in 2002 to uphold the principles established. This

court can be considered a further success in its ability to subject individual perpetrators to the rules of international law, seen clearly with the Lubanga trial in 2006. International law has also helped to uphold human rights in the context of tribunals over severe violations, most explicitly with Yugoslavia in 1993 and Rwanda in 1997. The former has since completed 135 trials of human rights abuses in Yugoslavia, with cases still pending for Mladic and those responsible for the Srebrenica massacres. Thus in the context

of courts, tribunals and agreements, there are undeniable successes for human rights.

On the other hand, one could address numerous failure of human rights in international law. For example, the 1948 UDHR, though the cornerstone of human rights law, is not legally binding on any of the 190 signatory states. In addition, the ICJ has always been limited in its ability to prosecute any states, and in this case only with their consent, limiting its capacity to uphold human rights. In a similar regard, the ECt is hamstrung by the reluctance of powerful states such as the USA to adhere to its judgements, or recognise its authority.

Furthermore, human rights atrocities like the 1994 massacre of 800,000 Tutsis in Rwanda have occurred in the context of international law, yet were not deterred. The 2004 Abu Ghraib incident or the 2002 creation of the Guantanamo Bay detention centre are indefensible violations of treaties and declarations like Geneva (1977), yet go unpunished and unimpeded due to the USA's disregard. Hence in its lack of substance, we see how international law fails to uphold human rights.

In conclusion, though some successes are evident, the main role of international law is largely advisory in the absence of a supranational enforcing body. This is typified by the sole

prosecution of the ICC in 2006, which is currently on appeal. Without authority, international law in any form cannot solidly uphold human rights.

[Sorry about my handwriting - I was quite rushed on this one]



**ResultsPlus**  
Examiner Comments

This response has a decent introduction and then progresses to illustrate a knowledge of a number of judicial institutions such as the special tribunals. Supporting knowledge is pleasing and there is a focused argument.



**ResultsPlus**  
Examiner Tip

No need to spend valuable time apologising for handwriting.

## Question 2

This was the second most popular of the short questions in Section A. Huntington's thesis appeared to be well-learned and was used with effect by a sizeable number of candidates. Some candidates were able to contest the thesis plausibly and with examples. There were a wide collection of examples used to support candidate assertions including a number of contemporary examples which worked very well. Some candidates chose to pursue a comparative argument: stressing, for instance, that though religion could be a cause of conflict, other causes were more important. There were a number of particularly well prepared and high scoring responses to this question.

It has been stated by some that cultural identities, namely religion, have ~~become~~ become a main cause of conflict in the modern and more multipolar world of today. The main ~~reason~~ motive for this assertion is the increased ~~significance~~ significance Islam has played in causing conflict in the 'war on terror'. However, this is a deeply, and perhaps simplistic, view as there are many other factors which contribute to conflict in the modern world and religion is often used as a means to unite people who share little else in common to fight for a much deeper and complex cause.

In terms of the 'war on terror' and the shift, in today's world, from conventional between-state conflict to forms of asymmetrical and guerrilla warfare, ~~the~~ religion has played a significant role in establishing a 'clash of civilisations' context to a modern multipolar world. Huntington, in particular, has argued that the growing significance of globalisation has meant that ~~the~~ ~~rise~~ ~~of~~ ~~terrorist~~ ~~organisations~~, like al-Qaeda, have promoted ~~religion~~ Islam as a means of opposing the west and western values that are increasingly being spread due to the interconnectedness of the modern world. A 'clash of civilisations' has also occurred due to many in the western

world viewing the Muslim world as almost a kind of 'other', as seen by Bush's statement that the 'war on terror' was a 'crusade' made up of a 'coalition of the willing'. Thus, religion has come to mean identity to a degree and has helped ~~create~~ create a world in which is divided between 'us' and 'them'. However, this view is a radical one and many liberals have argued that the idea of a 'clash of civilisations' in which religion is a significant motive for conflict is an exaggerated reaction to a less stable world order in which US hegemony has significantly decreased, and that the causes of conflict are far more complex.

The general consensus amongst liberal thinkers is that ~~modern or~~ modern or 'new' wars are caused by a range of factors, namely poverty, inequality, and a general feeling of instability in today's more multipolar world. ~~Whereas~~ Whereas the Cold War Era, ~~realists~~ realists argue, amounted to a degree of peace and stability as a feeling of Mutually Assured Destruction (MAD) prevented ~~the~~ war and destruction, ~~the~~ ~~end~~ the end of a bipolar world and the decreasing strength of the unipolar ~~the~~ hegemon, the USA, has ensured that there is less peace and less stability in the world. This causes a sense of unease, made worse by the effects of globalisation which has allowed the spread of technologies and has ~~made~~ heightened fears of WMD falling into the 'wrong' hands. Therefore, the threat of conflict has become an increasingly ~~real~~ real prospect not particularly through religious or cultural motives, but by an increasing capability for non-state actors ~~to~~ and 'rogue' states, like Iran and North Korea, to access weapons which they may use to cause an increased sense of unease at the ~~prospect~~ prospect of conflict.

Moreover, poverty and inequality are concerns which help motivated conflict in the modern world. It has been noted that, despite efforts by states and NGOs like 'Make Poverty History', poverty is becoming an ever increasing problem which makes the ~~prospect~~ likelihood of conflict more real as it causes

tensions amongst those who have and those who have not. Furthermore, the effects of climate change and the need to find resources has created conflict, as seen mainly in Africa through 'resource' wars for diamonds and other raw materials. As has sometimes been asserted, one of the main causes of war in the modern world is the ever increasing need for resources which has created a 'scramble' for resources. This is plausible as much of the world's conflict is situated in the Middle East and Africa; areas rich with natural materials. Indeed, some radical theorists have even asserted that the Iraq war was partly motivated by the desire of the US to secure oil in the Middle East.

To conclude, as realists argue, war is inevitable, however the increased multipolarity of the modern world order has made this assertion more plausible. Whilst religion has caused some to argue there is a 'clash of civilizations' in the world today, religion alone is not a motive for conflict. It seems more likely that religion is merely a way of uniting those who feel threatened by issues such as poverty and inequality, and that the more likely causes of conflict are issues such as the need for resources and the desire for power.



**ResultsPlus**  
Examiner Comments

No real definition or introduction but a well written response which covers a significant amount. The clash of civilizations thesis is discussed and there is a convincing argument relating to alternative causes of conflict.

Religion as a set of beliefs and ideologies that are broadly shared by a group of self-identifying individuals has caused a great deal of conflict throughout history, and its significance has not diminished in the modern era.

Religion as an identity has led to its role in identity politics - the idea that the interests of a particular group who share a common factor should be advanced by the group as a whole, in order to achieve actualisation and realisation of the goals of that group. Religion can serve as a powerful binding agent in this context, uniting a people under a common set of beliefs, ideals, practices and rules.

It can also lead to conflict with other groups who do not share these ideas - religion's very nature is one of absolutes, the idea that one particular belief and way of doing things is correct and that all others are in some way inferior or even sinful.

No more potently can this be seen than in the rise of Islamic fundamentalism or radical Islamism. Based on a certain

interpretation of Islam's holy text, the Quran, Islamists have sought to bring about a violent jihad against a number of groups that their interpretation of Islam sees as inferior and sinful - the decadence and cultural invasion of the West, Hindus, Jews (or 'Zionists'), atheists/irreligious, and ultimately even other Muslims whom they see as having been 'corrupted' and fallen from the true path of Islam, making them apostates - a crime punishable by death.

The underlying religious aspect of the Islamist movement may not

bits only driving factor - but the fervour of its followers, the belief in martyrdom for one's religion as a virtue worthy of infinite reward in paradise, and the infectious nature of the beliefs they expound make religion the catalyst for the Islamist movement.

Sectarian violence divided along religious lines has not been confined to the violent jihad of the Islamists - the Catholic/Protestant divide in Ireland has resulted in much escalation of violence and segregation, violence in Myanmar between Buddhists and Muslims, the often Christian fundamentalist motivations behind shootings in America (and most recently Anders Breivik in Norway), the conflict between Hindus and Muslims in countries like Pakistan and India - all too often the ideologies of religion prove as dividing as can be possible. It arguably increases and intensifies the bloodshed and reduces the chance of peaceful accord in every conflict where it plays a part, as it is so tied up in culture, identity and can be abused by those who wish to inspire people to take up arms so easily.



**ResultsPlus**  
Examiner Comments

A decent, to the point, introduction and a thoughtful discussion on the nature of religion with examples of tensions and conflicts in which religion has played a part.

### Question 3

This was a reasonably popular question which, again, produced a good range of responses. Most candidates made the point that whilst there is now a general acceptance of the need to cooperate over climate change, there remain numerous obstacles to effective action in order to make progress.

Some candidates chose to focus on very recent events in order to respond to the question and this was creditworthy. Most adopted the strategy of starting with Hardin's 'tragedy of the commons' and were able to get to the crux of that thesis. As a 'theoretical platform' this proved useful. Thereafter, many dwelt on the tension between developing/developed world. Somewhat fewer discussed radical versus reformist approaches. There was a pleasing knowledge of issues around international summits such as Kyoto and Copenhagen.

The question was usually handled competently.

Climate change is a very hot topic in global politics, although there is growing consensus that the causes of climate change are anthropogenic, this has not helped or inhibited cooperation over the issue to be achieved. There are four key obstacles to international cooperation on this issue.

Firstly there is conflict between the collective good and ~~noted~~ overall collective good of mitigating the issue, and the national interests of states to do so. This therefore presents a classic example of the tragedy of the commons. There are unequal demands upon states, arguably the industrialised world is the main cause of climate change, manufacturing is located in the developing world on the other hand developed states have based their industrialisation on current economic on the fuels that contribute to the issue namely petrol, or oil based fuels. The issue of the collective good also incentivises 'free riders' thus states are unwilling to commit rather wait until others do first, than the need for ~~the~~ commitments may reduce. Finally there is a major democratic issue. In liberal democracies politicians exist that compete over rival ~~claims~~ claims to achieve economic growth. This then is an engaged difficulty.

Secondly, there is a debate between the developed and the developing countries. Developing countries call upon a rights based argument, that is that the currently developed states prospered using the safe carbon-absorbing space. This is also a cosmopolitan view, that there is universal right to equal development. However developed countries, namely the United States (US), Japan and Western Europe argue that the effects of emissions were unknown at the time of the industrial revolution, also the people responsible are no longer alive! Thus emissions levels should be set on current pollution levels. Moreover the rights based approach arguably introduces egalitarian assumptions that are not applied elsewhere, namely the distribution of resources! A further argument made by the 'developing' is that they are unable to cope with the demands emissions limits would place upon them. This is highly tense point as it is true that the developing, particularly emerging states are the highest polluters, ~~namely~~ China. Although US leads in emissions per capita!

Thirdly, there is economic obstacles to tackling climate change cooperatively. Where as in communist (China) or Indigenous (Borneo) ~~lead~~ governments, capitalism contrast heavily with ecological principles that are necessary to ~~address~~ solve the global warming crisis. This has led to the idea that ~~capitalism~~ green capitalism is a contradiction! For instance it is built <sup>on</sup> and fosters materialism and growth where as cooperation on the issue require agreeing long term on limitations upon growth.

Finally there are ideological obstacles. The greater obstacle perhaps as the cooperation requires changing peoples values, a particularly challenging concept. Indeed this is made seemingly impossible considering that capitalist modernity is ~~centered~~

for his egoism and self interest. Supporting the anarchist concept that selfishness and greed are not a cause of capitalism and private ownership, (factors that exacerbate the emission problem!) but its consequence.



**ResultsPlus**  
Examiner Comments

After all this time I am still slightly amused to read an environment response which begins 'Climate change is a very hot topic in global politics'. This response has all of the key ingredients in a strong response. The tragedy of the commons is evident and there are a series of other arguments relating to tensions between developed and developing world and also how best to tackle the issue. This is a convincing and deserved level 3 response.



**ResultsPlus**  
Examiner Tip

Try to make a series of logical and relevant points in an organised fashion as this candidate does.

There are many factors preventing ~~the~~ effective international cooperation over climate change, with roots in ideological, scientific and other disagreements around the issue and how best to tackle it.

Perhaps the most fundamental is the fact that global warming scepticism is a substantial force in many countries, including the US where a recent PPP poll found 58% of Republicans believe anthropogenic global warming is a hoax, along with many leading Republicans such as Senator Jim Inhofe. This lack of trust in global warming science has meant the US government has been unable to ratify ~~any~~ <sup>trust</sup> serious environmental protocols and treaties, and has defeated measures such as cap and trade. ~~Other~~ Similar patterns can be seen, to varying extent, throughout most major countries.

Even among those who do ~~not~~ believe in the science behind global warming and climate change, there is still considerable disagreement over what strategies would best resolve it. Radical ecologists, for example, favour a radical change in the structure of our society, for example eco-socialists favour a small community-based system of life. Reformist ecologists favour systems like international treaties, regulations and green taxes, which may be more workable and practical, yet are still difficult to achieve. Some ecologists, including James Lovelock, believe it's too late to focus on mitigation strategies, and we must adapt to the inevitable reality of massive climate change instead.

Another reason is that the global warming debate has shown the problem of free riders in the international community. There is a conflict between the pursuit of individual national interests and the collective good: most states want to see global warming tackled, yet few want to take the lead and suffer the economic and social consequences the needed changes would require. Developed nations do not want to breach their standards of living, including high resource consumption, while developing nations do not want to threaten their development, or restrict their ability to industrialise and exploit natural resources. Every nation wants to be a free rider, letting other nations, for example the countries of the EU, do the difficult work for them.

The issue of climate change has, on a related note, also exposed the ~~fundamental~~ ideological differences between the developed and the developing world. The developed world, noting that emissions from nations like China, India and Malaysia are soaring and yet such nations have been exempt from binding guidelines under Kyoto and only given non-binding targets under the Copenhagen summit of 2009, felt that the developing world needs to begin taking a more proactive role in tackling climate change. This position is, admittedly, supported by the scientific reality that emissions reductions from the developed world alone are not enough to resolve the issue. Indeed, by 2010, the emission of the <sup>57 main</sup> Kyoto countries plus the US had fallen 9% below 1990 levels, showing not only the potential success of treaties but also the potential fact that developed world emissions alone are not responsible.

However, the response from the developing world is that they should have a chance to develop, and that requires urbanisation and the expansion of fossil fuel power (renewable energy still being limited and nuclear power carrying its own set of

commercial) Developing nations also say that a majority of their emissions are from catering to Western and developed nation's markets, for example oil drilling in areas like the Niger Delta, and sweatshop labour in China and India.



**ResultsPlus**

**Examiner Comments**

This is a particularly strong response. A series of factors are discussed. There is discussion of climate change scepticism and also of the debate between radical and reformist supporters. The response continues with discussion of the free rider principle which could be linked to the tragedy of the commons and also to the differences between the developed and developing world over issues such as responsibility and measurement.

## Question 4

This was the most popular of the short questions in Section A and candidates usually performed well here. Definitions were often very strong indeed.

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.

Most candidates showed an intuition that it got to the heart of a fundamental issue in global politics – that of radical differences of view regarding central western assumptions about ethics. Thus, notions of 'Asian values' were frequently contrasted with those western assumptions. Some of the more confident candidates discussed realist assumptions, though this was less common.

Realists have argued that the doctrine of universal human rights should not guide state policy because states should prioritise the well-being of their own citizens over others, their primary concern being to pursue the national interest. It was pleasing to note further argument that the doctrine of human rights has been criticised as being culturally biased, reflecting an essentially western, liberal model of human nature that emphasises rights and entitlements over obligations and social belonging. Candidates seemed happy to explain that some Muslim thinkers believe that human well-being is divinely ordained, and some Asian politicians champion the notion of 'Asian values'.

There was also the view that 'universal human rights' are used by western powers to justify humanitarian intervention for selfish interests.

Human rights are rights that people are entitled to by virtue of being human. They are seen as a modern and secular version of natural rights, so they are 'God-given'. Human rights are fundamental, in that they cannot be denied but a person's entitlement to human rights can never be removed. They are absolute in that they are usually essential for living a fully human life. However the most universal aspect of human rights is the fact they are universal. This means they apply to all humans regardless of sex, ethnicity or religion, and are the same throughout the world. Realists agree the idea of universal

Human rights is controversial as the doctrine of human rights shouldn't guide state policy, as state policy should concentrate primarily on the needs of its own citizens, and is responsible for protecting the welfare of life within the country's own borders. Also, states are the main actors in international anarchy and therefore should act rationally in pursuing their own interests, so the idea of universal human rights is false. Also, states will be reluctant to limit their own behaviour for the sake of human rights if it doesn't walk in their favour and go towards their own national interest. The idea of human rights is also controversial as it has been criticised for being culturally biased, representing a western, liberal model of human nature that fails to take account of the background, culture and religion of non-western countries. This is mainly advanced by predominantly Muslim countries like Sudan, Iran and Saudi Arabia that highly criticise the doctrine of human rights for not being universal, but focusing on the culture and lifestyle of western countries. Instead the idea of Asian values is put forward, which emphasises the importance

of family, and foregoing of personal freedom for the sake of society as a whole. Communitarians also find the idea of universal human rights universal, saying that we only have human rights because of the existence of society and the community and therefore owe something back. Feminists mainly agree with the doctrine of universal human rights, but agree the linguistic choice of many international human rights documents, for example, "the rights of man" are more than merely linguistic.

The idea of universal human rights is ~~is~~ largely controversial, mainly by Realists, Muslim thinkers, Communitarians and Feminists.



### ResultsPlus Examiner Comments

This is an excellent response which takes an impressive approach to dealing with this popular question. The definition is detailed and well explained. A series of criticisms is identified and explained clearly, one by one. Discussion includes the realist critique, the Islamic critique, communitarianism and the view that there is a cultural bias.

Firstly, one must define what is meant by 'universal human rights', for many conceptions of what constitutes 'human rights' do exist. It is the rights one is entitled to by virtue of being human: these include 1<sup>st</sup> generation 'negative' classical liberal rights, 2<sup>nd</sup> generation 'positive' enabling rights and 3<sup>rd</sup> generation 'solidarity rights'. The principle of ~~so~~ 'universalism' states that all of these rights are applicable to all humans everywhere - regardless of attributes or characteristics. This principle of universalism may at first appear obvious and necessary - however, this is a reading impaired by Western Bias - the West which, as the foundation for the culture itself, is rooted in classical liberalism individualism and self-determinism - ergo, human rights makes sense to legally allow for liberal self-determining individuals to operate in society. However, when taken outside the context of western civilisation they, arguably, become less

applicable and relevant, and thus, for example, the neo-conservative's aim of spreading 'USA style democracy across the world' seems vaguely neo-colonial, or even cultural imperialism, though possibly well-intentioned.

For example, Islam - and thus much of the middle east which is ruled by Islamic law, states that

moral authority can come from no-one other than Allah, and all human-imposed moral systems are wrong and should be rejected. This, thus, led to Saudi Arabia's rejection of the UN declaration of human rights in Cairo. Ironically, however, <sup>in the past that</sup> Islam is derived from much of the same religious scripture, yet the Christian protestant ideas of individualism and hard work and determination is what eventually evolved into the secular human rights we know today. Furthermore, the ~~past~~ argument in Asian cultures of their specific asian values, which prioritise loyalty, duties and responsibilities over individualism - very ill at ease with western 'Ayn Rand' of capitalism philosophy, as it thus leads to a ~~loss~~ usurping of the individual rights in favour of the communities - with some taking preference over other, and hence any

strict 'universalism' is lost.

And finally, there appears debate over the 'universality' of human rights in the west with the rise of the war on terror and the implementation of the 2005 US patriot act, where a strict universal Kantian morality gave way to a hazy

Utilitarianism, where some states take preference over others, and the majority always trumped the minority's rights.



**ResultsPlus**

**Examiner Comments**

This is another very strong response to the popular question on human rights. Again, the definition and explanation is strong. Cultural imperialism and the Islamic critique are discussed along with discussion of Asian values and a hint at US double standards. This is another well-deserved level 3 script.



**ResultsPlus**

**Examiner Tip**

There is much to learn from here in terms of structure and response to a particular question.

## Question 5

This turned out to be a very focused kind of question and often the responses were shorter here than for Qs 1-4. The better responses brought in examples of e.g. the IMF, WTO and World Bank. The most confident of all were able to discuss ideas such as structural dominance and neoliberal hegemony. There were some pleasing definitions -

Colonialism is the practice of establishing control over foreign territory and turning it into a colony as a form of imperialism. Colonialism tends to be associated with the historic examples of the western powers, particularly between the 15th and 19th centuries with key targets being Africa, Asia and South America. Colonialism involved military and political dominance with open and overt actions. Neo-colonialism involves economic domination with a less open and more covert dominance without direct political control, as, for example in so-called US dollar imperialism. The weapons employed in neo-colonialism may be structural dominance in key international financial institutions such as the IMF, WTO and World Bank, control of market philosophy, use of multinational companies etc.

Most candidates made an assertion that the dominant global powers have maintained control over the lesser powers with a shift from colonialism to a more subtle variant of neo-colonialism.

Colonialism was a phenomenon of the 19th and 20th centuries, which was characterised by the acquisition of colonies (faraway territories) by European superpowers (namely France, Britain, Germany, Portugal etc) which not only established their own systems of political and economic rule on their territories, but also socially reconstructed the local populations of their territories. The roots of the North-South divide are themselves found in ~~the~~ 'colonialism' of the 19/20th centuries. These colonies were also used as markets for manufactured goods produced in the <sup>swiftly</sup> ~~very~~ industrialising countries of Europe, and were also used as a ground for exploiting natural resources. Neo-colonialism, on the other hand, is a modern phenomena, mainly characterised by the countries of the North's (old colonial powers as well as superpowers like the USA) ability to exploit

the global south (old colonies like <sup>largely</sup> those in sub-Saharan Africa) for their own benefits.

Whereas colonialism was marked by a direct intrusion and rule by colonial powers on their territories, as well as a direct physical drain and shifting/transportation of resources from colonies to ruling countries, neo-colonialism's strategies are more indirect. Bodies of global governance like the IMF and World Bank, examples of the driving forces of neo-colonialism, drain the peripheral areas of the world of their resources and transport them to the 'core' through an 'indirect' usage of strategies and 'conditionalities' attached to their loan agreements. Firstly, their Structural Adjustment Programs (conditionalities) are shaped on the principles of a free market which prohibit government spending on anything but debt repayment and the removal of all trade barriers. This exposes economically weak countries to the foreign market, and therefore indirectly leads to a transportation of wealth from the south to the north as southern countries cannot compete with the economies of the north. Furthermore, less government spending on welfare ~~leads~~ means that the south ~~is~~ further <sup>steeply</sup> ~~steeped~~ into poverty, not directly due to the exploitation of the south as in colonialism, but indirectly

due to the conditionalities of bodies that are largely populated by western economic experts who line these agreements to benefit their own states. However, whereas colonialism was marked by <sup>regimes</sup> 'forced' ~~regimes~~ onto the local population, neo-colonialism is characterised by the agreement of the governments of the south to work with the IMF and World Bank in order to rid themselves of economic stagnation and get out of the poverty trap.



**ResultsPlus**  
Examiner Comments

This response is clearly from a candidate who is comfortable dealing with both terms. The differences identified by the candidate are key here. The time period difference is explained as is the nature of the type of dominance. The direct against indirect nature of dominance is also discussed and there are useful examples of neo-colonialism.

Colonialism is the theory or practice of gaining political and economic control through the use of military force. It is associated with multipolarity and the development of empires. Neo-colonialism on the other hand is the control over economic practices of a weak country by an ~~stronger~~ economically more developed one through the use of structural power.

The first big difference between the two is the brutality in which they are carried out. Colonialism is by nature very overt and obvious with clear signs of domination by the colonising state who will seize all control of the region being colonised. It is associated with the 'Age of Empires' where the size of empire was a measure of a country's power. Neo-colonialism however is a much more covert affair where the economically stronger country will hold the developing states in an economic debt without direct control over the region.

A second difference between colonialism is the methods which they use to gain and maintain power over a state. Colonialism uses military force to overthrow rulers and set up regional governments to maintain control over the seized region. Neo-colonialism on the other hand relies on structural power and multinational corporations, leading to the belief that 'multinational companies are the gun-boats and soldiers of neo-colonialism.' (Davidson) This power is reinforced by the conditionality and

regulations' enforced by the International Financial Institutions which force states to embrace the Washington Consensus as written by Reagan and Thatcher. This forces states to open their borders & allowing the exploitation of weak states by TNCs.

A third difference between the two is the time period in which they occur. Colonialism is related to the multi-polar balance of power which occurred during the great power period and 'Age of Empires' of the 17<sup>th</sup> to 19<sup>th</sup> century when European powers expanded empires across the globe. At its peak the British Empire consisted of one fifth of the land surface of the world. Neo-colonialism on the other

hand is a comparatively modern phenomenon. Some argue it started at the end of WWII when the USA emerged as the dominant world power while others believe it was after the creation of the Bretton Woods institutions that it really gained momentum.



### ResultsPlus Examiner Comments

There is much to praise in this response which certainly achieves a level 3. There is a strong and particularly effective introduction and a series of differences is worked through with clear explanation and example. The overt and obvious nature of colonialism is contrasted with the less obvious neo-colonialism which also employs different methods and takes place in a distinct time period when compared with colonialism.

## Question 6

As always with questions on terrorism, this was popular. A few of the weaker responses didn't grasp the concept of 'global' terrorism. These weaker responses in general tended to be one-sided: most commonly, there was much focus on terrorism as a major threat but a lot less on how it could be seen as a relatively small threat compared to e.g. conventional warfare and in terms of human casualties. The question enabled candidates to demonstrate their knowledge of recent terrorist activities and this was creditworthy. Definitions were mixed in quality - Terrorism involves violent acts which are intended to create fear (terror), are perpetrated for a religious, political or, ideological goal; and deliberately target or disregard the safety of non-combatants (civilians). Global terrorism is terrorism that has a global reach, particularly as demonstrated by the 9/11 attacks on the USA.

Central arguments made by candidates included that: the 9/11 attacks demonstrated how the world's most powerful state, in military as well as economic terms, can be vulnerable to external attack when it is no longer vulnerable to conventional attacks by rival states. The terrorist threat is enhanced by the suggestion that terrorist networks may be attempting to acquire and use weapons of mass destruction coupled with the fact that the threat of global terrorism is so great because it requires few resources and can be carried out by small groups or even lone individuals. Increased global flows of peoples, ideas and information also make global terrorism particularly difficult to contain or prevent. The actions of recent terror groups have provoked a response from the major powers, the United States in particular, which may make a global 'clash of civilizations' more likely. Candidates counter arguments tended to stress that: the scale of death caused by terrorism is minimal when compared to deaths caused by other global issues such as famine, disease or environmental degradation. Although 3,000 people died in the 9/11 attacks, this is very small by comparison with the scale of death that has occurred as a result of conventional warfare. Terrorism, by its nature, consists of a series of sporadic attacks on a variety of targets, and is very different from the concerted, sustained and systematic destruction that is wreaked by mass warfare conducted between states.

Terrorism refers to the threat of non-state actors who seek to create a climate of fear, apprehension and anxiety. This is normally achieved through high profile, conscience shaking acts, assassinations, bomb plots and attacks on civilians. This normally in an attempt to further the terrorists' political ends. The question is over the extent to which terrorism is the threat which should be most concerned about as if impact it has the threat has been exaggerated.

One of the reasons terrorism is seen a threat

and is so difficult to prevent is because it is often carried out by lone terrorists or clandestine groups who ~~have~~ ~~little~~ do not face the same economic and political problems which states do when they act in a violent manner, suggesting that in fact they are a ~~great~~ major threat as they are harder to prevent. Furthermore, terrorists are seen as impervious to any kind of diplomatic or global pressure due to their normally radical ideological beliefs meaning that they cannot be coerced into changing

their attitude easily. The clandestine and ~~small~~ aspect of a few terrorists working on ideological grounds makes it hard for states to protect themselves and thus it is a major threat.

Furthermore, terrorism now has a global aspect which it didn't have before. This is most obviously demonstrated by the 9/11 attacks. This makes it more of a threat because instead of being on a narrow and regional based problem terrorist attacks can occur anywhere in the world due to the process of globalisation.

Globalisation has been exploited by the transnational terrorist group Al-Qaeda. Furthermore, the fact the most militarily powerful nation in the world (America), who faces no threat from conventional warfare was hit by such a devastating attack as 9/11 suggests that maybe terrorism should be held in high regard ~~with~~ it in respect the respect that it is the ~~great~~ threat to global security.

Globalisation has also had the effect of ~~an~~ a global flow of ideas, people and

'people. Arguably this has added a further dimension to the threat posed by terrorists. An example of this is the emergence of so-called 'home grown' terrorists. Demonstrated by the 7/11 London tube bombings in which British citizens who were indoctrinated by radical Islamist ideology and committed acts of terror on account of it. The fact that the global nature of modern terror means it can infiltrate the societies it is trying to terrify demonstrates the unique threat it holds. As the MI5 officer, Jonathan Evans, said, 'our ~~most~~ ~~serious~~ ~~concern~~ ~~is~~ ~~that~~ ~~Britain~~ ~~has~~ ~~experienced~~ ~~a~~ ~~credible~~ ~~terrorist~~ ~~attack~~ ~~plot~~ ~~about~~ ~~once~~ ~~a~~ ~~year~~ ~~since~~ ~~9/11~~ ... The threat is real'. This shows a globalisation has made a terrorism a genuine threat to global security.

However it has been argued that the reaction to global terrorism, the war on terror, or what George Bush called the 'crusade' on terror is as much a threat to rights and global security. Outrages such as Agha-Qasbi and water boarding in Guantanamo bay have seen mass human rights violations across the world. Even in the UK, detention without trial has been brought in. As Lord Hoffmann stated, 'The threat to the life of the nation comes not from terrorism... but from laws such as these'. It has been argued that terrorism has created an overreaction from states which threaten the global security, with actions such as the ~~long~~ ~~invasion~~. War on terror.

However, Even though 9/11, the worst catastrophic act of terror in history killed 3000 civilians this is very little in comparison to

Conventional warfare. It has been argued that the sporadic nature of terrorist attacks reduces its threat and that it is not as significant a threat compared to the systematic devastation which occurs in conventional warfare many more people die. Therefore terrorism is not as major threat to international global security compared to conventional war.

Furthermore, terrorism rarely causes overthrow a government or a regime in the way in which revolution or war can. This renders it less of a threat to global security. This means it is difficult for terrorism to have significant political influence and it will always be typified by a few sporadic attacks on civilians but not by a change of regime.

This is linked to the goal of terrorism. Terrorism only seeks to create an over-reaction from the government it is attacking. This means that the threat comes not from the terrorist but from the states themselves. As seen by the global war on terror, arguably during the war on terror the greatest threat to global security was the invasion of Iraq.

and the death of hundreds of thousands of civilians. Without the reaction from the 'terrorised' state, the threat which terror carries is nowhere near as significant. This means it can easily be averted and rendered useless.

Further ~~similarly~~ Similarly, Terrorism relies on people popular support in order to be a successful major threat. This is why it is often considered a 'heart and minds' issue. This reliance on popular support can be undermined by a response with scrupulous ethics and 'soft' power. This means that terrorism can lose its support, if the 'terrorised' nation keeps the moral highground. This also means that terrorism is a limited and avoidable threat.

In conclusion, whilst terrorism may not have as devastating an effect as conventional warfare, the random and violent nature of its attacks make it the major threat. Whilst wars are often made on humanitarian grounds or prevented by diplomatic pressure, the ~~covert~~ <sup>covert</sup> nature of terrorism renders it almost impossible to prevent. As demonstrated by the 9/11 attacks where America, who faces no military opposition, was hit with a devastating

attack. Furthermore terrorism involves a reaction which can lead to global terror conventional war and lead to global instability such as the war on terror.



**ResultsPlus**

**Examiner Comments**

This response covers the standard formula for success. There is an effective definition and introduction which sets up a two sided debate, supported with evidence and relevant throughout, leading to a conclusion. The candidate is careful to tackle the global element of the question and makes some interesting points about globalization. Both the original and counter argument is convincing.



**ResultsPlus**

**Examiner Tip**

A standard but effective format to this response ensures likelihood of a level 3.

Terrorism is defined by Goshin as the attempts to create, using violence, a climate of fear and apprehension for the furthering of political goals. (2006). Greenham (1982) defines it further as a 'weapon of the weak', meaning it is used by those who have no hope of defeating their opponents in a conventional armed conflict. Some will argue that terrorism poses a great threat to international security. They will advocate that it is now found global reach, the and the advent of 'catastrophic' or 'hyper-' terrorism mean that it now poses a greater danger than ever before. On the other hand, sceptics will argue that terrorism is not a serious threat to global security. They argue that; there are different ways to protect against terrorism the international community can employ, terrorism by its very nature poses only a sporadic and minor threat, and that the impact of it depends entirely on the reaction of the targeted nation.

The first way in which it could be argued that terrorism is a serious threat to global security is the now undeniable and dangerous ~~global~~ global nature of terrorism.

The truly global nature of ~~terrorism~~ terrorist sects such as al-Qaeda is shown by the disparity of its attacks - claiming credit for incidents in places such as Yemen, Egypt, Spain, the UK and the USA. This therefore opens up the ability for mobile terrorist organisations, that can communicate and recruit people from across the world thanks to the globality of communications technology. Terrorists are not just global in the sense of their organisation and attacks, but

These arms are also global. The jihadi nature of Islamist terrorism which seeks to punish 'infidels in the West' leaves open a huge potential target area. Furthermore, the global nature of terrorism also makes it more difficult to defend against. The practical impossibility of taking an offensive effort against a clandestine, mobile organisation, ~~as shown in the~~, is shown by the struggles felt in the 'war on terror'. Not only do states such as the USA have to fight groups that transcend borders without thought, they must battle with the notion of external sovereignty and remain respectful of borders themselves. The potential problems with this was demonstrated in the international community's reaction to Obama blatantly disregarding Pakistan's sovereignty to assassinate Osama Bin Laden in 2011. Therefore, it can be argued that the truly global nature of terrorism means that it poses a serious threat global security.

On the other hand, states themselves have ~~become~~ begun to develop and implement effective strategies for combatting ~~strategies~~ terrorist threats. Classically, the most vulnerable states to terrorism are liberal democracies as they most maintain a respect for individual rights and liberties, and contain checks on government power. Therefore, these states have begun to strengthen state power in an attempt to protect against the global terrorist threat, including measures such as extending detention without charge (Patriot Act USA 2001 means that terror suspects can be held for indefinite periods of time), increasing the rigidity of security checks at target zones such as airports, or introducing more intrusive measures to acquire information on possible terrorist suspects. Not

only in these efforts being made, but they are also highly effective - as shown by the failure of an attempted attack on Heathrow in 2006. Furthermore, there could be possible diplomatic solutions to the terror problem: States could find a peaceful end to terrorism but examining the political causes of the terrorist threat rather than its manifestations. In the case of Islamic terrorism, this would certainly include finding a solution to the Israel-Palestine conflict.

On the other hand, these measures carry with them many risks. Firstly, the fact that these nations predominantly are liberal democracies means they can't be as rigorous as they perhaps would like, due to the potential damage met both internally and externally. Furthermore, these measures seem to target specific groups, which affects only a sliver of the internal population, or feed the claims of terrorist organisations abroad. The Iraq and Afghanistan wars, and the perceived alienation of the Muslim community in Britain can perhaps be pointed to as an alleged cause of the home-grown bombers in London 7/7.

A further possible danger of terrorism to global security is the birth of 'catastrophic' or 'hyper' terrorism. This refers to the ability of terrorist organisations to do more potential damage than ever before. There were over 3000 civilian deaths as a direct consequence of the 9/11 attacks on the USA. These attacks were not just catastrophic in physical terms, but the psycho-social impact was also huge. The targets of 9/11 were symbols of world democracy and financial power.

and was the first machine since Pearl Harbor that destroyed the myth of US invulnerability. The rapid growth in military technology, and its availability, caused in no small part by the collapse of the Soviet Union means terrorists can do much more damage. Allison claims that unless the world can come together to form a consensus of an banning nuclear weapons, a nuclear terrorist attack within the next decade, was very eventually inevitable. The ideological cause gives catastrophic terrorism much more weight, as it opens up the possibility of a multitude of targets, and the potential that it could never be solved. Therefore, due to the catastrophic nature of terrorism, it poses a great threat to global ~~safe~~ security.

On the other hand, sceptics will argue that the very nature of terrorism means that it poses little threat. Although 2,000 people died as a result of 9/11, this is a minute number when compared to the battles of conventional warfare, which terrorism has seemed to replace (over 100,000 people died at the battle of the Somme). Catastrophic terrorism also is of no major concern, as the nuclear technology is not only scarce but very expensive, and simply just not something that clandestine terrorist organisations such as al-Qaeda can get their hands on. Furthermore, the impact of terrorism relies ~~to~~ mainly on the reaction of the impacted nation. Noam Chomsky argued therefore that the wars dealing with the terrorist threat was only an attempt to unite America under a common enemy, and that the actual terrorist threat was greatly exaggerated. Terrorism is totally reliant on the media to cause fear and strengthen the

terrorism which is important. The simple solution is just to quell media coverage and government and public reaction. However, terrorism does not pose as much of a threat as it may seem to global security.

In conclusion, ~~although~~ although governments have made their best efforts to protect themselves, the new found global reach of terrorist organisations, and the advent of catastrophic terrorism means that terrorism now poses a much greater threat than ever before. 9/11 shows that the ideological motives behind the new wave of terrorism imply that firstly there might be no foreseeable solution, and the willingness to use catastrophic weapons has increased.



**ResultsPlus**  
Examiner Comments

A further strong response which follows a similar format to the first example. The response begins well as it sets up both sides of the discussion to come. The global element of the question and the concept of catastrophic terrorism are covered in what becomes a particularly well balanced and informed response.

## Question 7

This was not as popular a question as 6 or 8. It is possible that the word 'remain' concerned candidates with the implication of a demand for very up-to-date knowledge. As always with questions on the global environment, a lack of knowledge about the key global conferences can let down a response. Less stress was shown than in former years on the view amongst some scientists that serious environmental degradation is not occurring – this reflects a growing consensus. Some candidates adopted a 'comparative' strategy; they argued that e.g. global recession, nuclear proliferation and other issues have become more prominent. This was creditworthy.

Candidates explained that, in recent years, states are more willing to recognize the potential consequences of failing to tackle environmental degradation and that global warming, in particular, has been at the top of the agenda of environmental problems since the early 1990s. Candidates referenced a series of global conferences which have taken place in order to attempt to develop a common and united reaction to environmental decline from Rio in 1992 to Kyoto in 1997 and Copenhagen in 2009. Counter argument stressed that whilst there have been a number of global initiatives relating to environmental concerns; meaningful progress has been slow to emerge.

Several concerns have been raised about the value of agreements made in the major summits. The divide between developed and developing states over responsibility for environmental decline has manifested itself in arguments relating to how to measure states responsibility for current decline and who should shoulder the responsibility and economic impact of dealing with future problems. Global recession, nuclear proliferation and other issues often seem to take a higher place on the global agenda than the environment.

Environmental issues have been a frequent topic of international debate since the establishment of the UN. Due to the very simple fact that environmental issues do not respect border or national boundaries, international action has long been seen as necessary. While national action has a role and other international issues cannot be ignored, the environment must remain, and does remain, prominent in global politics.

If the environment has been a frequent topic of annual debate, in a way few other issues have been. The environment has been the climate change has been the topic of yearly discussions on the matter, with the 2009 summit in Copenhagen seeing global developing nations accept unbinding emission reduction targets for one of the first times. International agreements have been reached on a variety of issues, including politically low-key ones such as biological and

natural diversity, and historically successful ones like the Montreal Protocol to banning CFCs and ultimately helping close up the ozone layer hole. That is not to say the environment has been a priority of the global community. Minimal action has been taken on polluter pays rules, not for example, and international political capital for strong binding emissions targets, new treaties on toxic waste dumping, or solid funding sources for an agreed green development fund established by Copenhagen, is low, and such means are unlikely. The environment is seen as an important issue for global foreign policy-makers, yet it is far from the biggest one, and many of the steps it calls for, including a new approach to development, are seen as unpopular. Economic considerations currently reign supreme.

Yet the potential global impacts of environmental issues are massive. Deforestation poses the threat of the tragedy of the commons, or the exploitation of shared resources for individual or national gain despite awareness of the long-term mutually harmful costs, requires international action. Deforestation is a major threat to natural wildlife diversity, including the paucity of undiscovered resources and medicines and the important role played by the dead, delicate microbial ecosystem, and is also due to have broader environmental impacts. Rainforests' role as a carbon sink is being threatened by deforestation. Economic losses are also expected, with some estimates saying deforestation could reduce global GDP by 7% by 2050. The problem of deforestation carries international repercussions, and so calls for international solution. Despite the 1992 Rio Earth summit establishing international agreement on forest preservation, deforestation has continued, with 88% of South Asia's forests, 90% of Madagascar's, and over 99% of Haiti's forests, all gone.

International cooperation is needed to ensure compliance with the law, fight the illegal timber trade, and ensure this international problem can be solved. The same problem can be seen with overfishing. Due to the tragedy of the commons and violation of already agreed

fishing quotas 61,000 tons of blue-fin tuna are caught in Malta annually - the legal limit is 29,500, the rest for tuna recovery is (10,000) tons is threatening an important global resource. International cooperation on climate change is also required, with the issue threatening hurricanes for the US, desertification and floods in Africa, and the spread of tropical diseases like malaria through regions like the Middle East and southern Europe.

However, there is a role for national solutions in tackling environmental issues. Many of the greatest achievements in the fight to control environmental problems, including the US's Acid Rain Program and the EU's successful emission trading scheme, have happened on national or regional levels. Even sub-national success stories, such as an emission trading scheme in New England or the Western Climate Initiative involving western states and provinces in Canada, the USA, and Mexico have been successful. There is a role for national action on ~~the~~ even issues like climate change, with ~~some~~ environmental issues like habitat preservation requiring a focus on national solutions, yet ultimately international action is needed. A national system of pollution payments, emission reduction schemes, acid rain prevention programs, or flood prevention schemes, along with many other important environmental priorities, ~~requires~~ does not carry the same weight as international action. An oil spill in American waters, for example, can

impact Mexico or Caribbean states. The problems in the Niger Delta caused by pollution or radiation fallout from Chernobyl, and the impact of ~~natural disaster~~ disasters like hurricanes, oil spills, gas leaks (like the Bhopal leak), and many more do not respect national boundaries.

However, ~~some~~ if geo-scientific solutions, like using carbon scrubbing technology or using iron filings to boost plankton growth, are pursued, international action will not be needed. However, these solutions are limited in scope, only address certain environmental issues like climate change, and

are mostly based on unproven hypotheses, not concrete scientific theory. Additionally, adaptation strategies for environmental problems like climate change, while not as effective as mitigation as it does not address the cause, do not require international action to be effective. It helps, but is not a requirement. Many theorists and scientists, like Lomborg, see it as too late to address <sup>mitigation</sup> ~~adaptation~~ anyway, and present adaptation as the way forward.

Ultimately, the environment is an issue with global repercussions, one that has global impacts and requires global solutions to address. ~~It does~~ International action has been difficult to achieve, especially with the focus being on economic issues, and national and regional solutions not playing a role, yet international action is needed and it's an international issue.



### ResultsPlus Examiner Comments

There is some impressive knowledge in this response which suggests a well-read candidate who is happy to discuss the environment more generally than most. Whilst most candidates focus on climate change, this candidate is willing and able to extend the debate and is rewarded for doing so. The introduction isn't the most convincing read but there is much of value that emerges from this script.

The environment is undoubtedly an international problem, though some manifestations of particular problems are local, the problem of climate change, logging, deforestation, pollution and the loss of biodiversity are global problems - particularly ~~the~~ climate change as it is present in every state. Therefore it is clear that what is necessary to resolve these problems, particularly from the point of view of liberal commentators, is international cooperation. What is slightly more questionable is how prominent the environment remains as ~~an~~ a problem that must be worked out, i.e. - to what extent is the environment ~~the~~ a priority issue for states.

The answer is surely best reflected in the lack of attention and time that world leaders devote to it. The environment <sup>appears</sup> to be a pressing issue ~~to~~ if the number of UN conferences on climate change reflect the importance - Rio, Copenhagen (2009), ~~the~~ Cancun (2010), Durban (2012). These environments discussions have produced some agreement between world leaders ~~that~~ as to the steps that

cooperation must take. The Copenhagen Accord (2009) for example, sets out clear commitments from most developed and, perhaps even more importantly, developing nations to reduce carbon emissions. The talks in 2010 in Mexico produced further agreement and set out the establishment of a \$100 billion climate fund to aid developing states in capacity building. Clearly this level of cooperation shows that the environment is a prominent global

issue.

But while all this agreement may all be very visible, critics have derided <sup>their</sup> these conferences as hot air and show but little else. While earlier drafts of the Copenhagen accord <sup>reduction</sup> plain set out a 50% in World Emissions by 2058 and even promised to set individual state targets by 2020, the final copy made no such promises and was altogether more vague. The accord was also not a legally binding agreement and so cannot be enforced. This reflects the realist worldview - namely that states pursue their own interests selfishly in order to protect their sovereignty and on issue like climate change which involves setting up self-imposed restraints on economic growth and so power will not be prominent, and will always be a lower priority than defence or the economy.

However, more optimistic liberal commentators, and less radical ecologists, consider states willing to act cooperatively in order to achieve double gains. As avoiding ~~the~~ a global temperature increase of 6°C is vital for every state, they ought to feel compelled to work together. This view in turn would see disastrous effects of flooding, droughts, rising - which would make the environment into both a security and an economic problem. As it is a threat that affects all states, it can be more easily challenged together, it is clear that they will cooperate. An example that illustrates this is the Montreal Protocol (1987) which banned the use of CFCs worldwide, which

were creating havoc on the ozone layer. This was the most ratified UN convention ever - a testament to the prominence of the environment as an international problem.

Other commentators ~~consider~~ <sup>though</sup> maintain that for every success there are some failings. This partly reflects the fears of relative losses and free riders - those states that do not contribute but still benefit from the environmental collaboration of others. However, mostly this lack of cooperation is due to a schism between the developed world and the developing world, ~~not~~ over who carries the burden of responsibility. Developing states point out

that when the now-developed world was in the process of industrialisation there were no limits on carbon emissions or pollution. However, by 2013, the developing world became the greater consumer of oil and will overtake the developed world in terms of emissions within a few years. This explains America's refusal to sign the Kyoto Protocol (1997), as they did not wish to be regulated while China got a free ride. This disagreement shows that petty interests and concerns over who is culpable take precedence over actual success of cooperation, which ~~shows~~ underscores the environment as a low priority issue.

A further critique of the prominence of the environment as a prominent global issue comes from the ~~the~~ more radical ecologists. They maintain that if there were no true concern over the environment, then states would be left behind the Capitalistic model of political-economy, which demands constant growth ~~which~~ <sup>the</sup> limited resources

cannot justify. This capitalistic greediness has cut down significant portions of the Amazon rainforest for cattle grazing land in Brazil, and poisoned the waters of Nigeria (Due to malpractice by Royal Dutch oil). It is not sustainable, and it witnesses a lack of commitment to any sort of environmentally friendly global government.

But this is not the sole interproblem,

The Convention for International Trade in Endangered Species (~~CITES~~) (CITES) was written with the help of the secretariat of the free trade organization GATT. The IMF and the World Bank both include environmental protection as a necessary requirement in order to receive a loan as part of <sup>their</sup> Poverty Reduction Strategy Papers. Western governments have recently been successful in paying Latin American states to stop logging. If capitalism is inherently anti-environmental, then these examples are truly bizarre.

The environment remains a global issue in terms of headlines, in democratic states a commitment to protecting the environment is a near certainty in our markets. But I do not ~~see~~ consider the environment to be a genuinely prominent issue in the minds of statesmen and governments, nor for trans-national companies. If it were, I believe the urgency of the situation - emissions must peak by 2015 if the temperature rise is to be mitigated - would be better appreciated and the agreements

like the Copenhagen accord would not be so  
paltry. Therefore I do not believe the environment  
remains. or indeed ever was, a prominent global  
issue.



**ResultsPlus**

**Examiner Comments**

This is a further example of a candidate who is comfortable discussing the environment beyond climate change. There is a pleasing knowledge of key conferences and also of factual material relating to agreements between states. The radical Vs reformist debate is also evident in what is a clear level 3 response.

## Question 8

This was quite a popular question. Often candidates who began with the Brandt Report and were able to outline the general points arising from this were usually able to launch themselves confidently into a competent essay. The stronger responses demonstrated a better ability to counter the contention in the question; however, there was a strong tendency amongst most to give little weight to such a counter. The best responses tended not just to demonstrate a knowledge of the main institutions (e.g. the WTO, IMF and World Bank) but were also able to discuss the complexities of e.g. structural dominance and neoliberal hegemony. Responses to this question tended to be long: candidates frequently had a lot to say.

Central argument stressed that there is a view that poverty in the South is based on global North dominance of military, political and structural power. There is plenty of evidence that the major powers have structural dominance in bodies such as the IMF, WTO and W.Bank and that the economic philosophy of the world is based on western free market liberal philosophy which may benefit global North rather than the South. A sizeable number of candidates mentioned that multinational companies are often seen as a tool of global North dominance along with manipulation of international law and institutions. Candidates' counter-argument focused on the idea that poverty in the South is caused by other factors such as environmental issues, conflict, overpopulation, corruption, debt etc. and that global South should shoulder some, if not all, of the responsibility for its own weakness. A few candidates also made the case that, possibly, far from being hampered by the free market philosophy of the major western powers, global South has suffered from a reluctance to accept the ideas of the Washington Consensus and that growth will take place as this is rectified. Examples of rapidly developing economies were often used here.

The issue of poverty and development has become a prominent issue in global politics, at the forefront of debate, since the end of World War 2. This is due to the fact that de-colonialism failed to bring about economic and social progress for 'third world' countries. Whereas some academics believe that the poverty within the 'South' is purely down to the irresponsible actions of the 'North', others suggest there are other key reasons and explanations.

Immanuel Wallerstein's 'World Systems Theory' is used by many to explain how the poverty of the South is purely due to the actions of the North. Wallerstein used the conceptual, rather than geographical terms, of 'core' and 'peripheral' countries to analyse global inequality. 'Core' developed countries in the North, such as the USA and the UK, rely on exploiting 'peripheral' countries in the South, such as Sub-Saharan Africa, in order to achieve economic growth levels. Meanwhile the East, including China and South Korea, are viewed as 'semi peripheral' countries, as they are the manufacturing powerhouse of the modern world and rival the 'core' countries in technology, research, and development. Therefore, Wallerstein's theory suggested that the 'core' countries exploit the 'peripheral' countries for raw materials, keeping them in a 'poverty trap', as witnessed in Sub-Saharan Africa, where the economy cannot diversify into manufacturing, and relies on agricultural exports to the 'core' countries. The 'core' countries also exploit 'peripheral' countries for cheap labour, as witnessed by large UK chains such as Primark which had manufacturing houses in 'peripheral' countries such as Bangladesh. This exploitation results in high <sup>levels of</sup> working hours, extremely poor working conditions, and low wages throughout the 'South'. Therefore, arguably, the constant exploitation of 'peripheral' countries represents how the poverty of the South is due to the 'core' countries in the North.

However, many disagree with this view, using Rostow's Modernisation Theory to explain the global poverty of the 'South'. Rostow argued that there was a

single, identical path to development for each and every country, reflected by the path of the industrialised 'North' countries from subsistence, agricultural societies, to modern mass-consumption ones. ~~Through~~ <sup>Rostow</sup> ~~identifying~~ <sup>identify</sup> five main stages of economic development, from traditional agrarian societies, following steps of 'pre take off', in which capital mobility developed, and a drive to

~~modern~~ 'nativity', where living standards rose and the economy began to diversify, Rostow explained how each and every country must follow the exact same path to development. In conclusion, the argument is put forward that the current poverty witnessed in the 'South', is simply the characteristics of Rostow's 'pre take off' stage of development, and it will eventually progress to a mass-consumption, industrialised society, regardless of the actions of the countries in the conceptual 'North'.

In conflict with this view, many suggest that the actions of the 'North' through their continuous donation of aid to the 'Southern' countries, is one of the reasons that the developing world is stuck in a poverty trap. The giving of aid is ineffective and actually has a negative effect on 'Southern' countries, as it massively distorts economic markets. For example, Northern countries 'dump' surplus food on the developing world, at a price much lower than the market price, in order to provide 'food aid' to citizens. However, this often results in local peasant farmers losing their business, increasing local unemployment and therefore, further increasing poverty levels in local communities. This can be witnessed in Senegal, where chicken farmers used to make a

in Senegal, where chicken farmers used to make a good living, providing 100% of the chicken. However, since 'Northern' countries in the EU 'dumped' chicken as food aid, at below 50% of the market price, Senegal chicken farmers can only provide 11% of the chicken. This example reflects how aid from the 'North' has created a dependency from 'Southern' countries, reducing the business for local firms and ensuring living standards remain extremely low.

Despite this view, some suggest that the aid given from the North is actually beneficial to the 'South', especially in times of humanitarian emergencies. As Singer claimed, ~~not~~ not providing aid when the Northern countries have the resources to do so, would be the 'moral equivalent of murder'. Recent aid has been at times of emergency, such as the ~~the~~ crisis in Syria, where citizens were struggling to meet their basic needs, an example of absolute poverty. In conclusion, aid, a key action from the North, has arguably helped to reduce poverty in the South, at times of deep conflict, civil war, or famine.

In disagreement with this point, ~~it~~ it is often put forward that the Structural Adjustment Policies imposed by the 'North', ~~are~~ through the institutions of the World Bank and the IMF, have rapidly increased in-country inequality levels for the developing nations of the 'South'. After the 'Washington Consensus', a neo-liberal shift in the ideological focus on development, the IMF and the World Bank, applied 'structural adjustment'

to their loans, only lending money to developing countries with 'strings attached' as to how to re-structure their economies and societies. Some policies the IMF and World Bank imposed through SAPS ~~were~~ included fiscal discipline by governments, the privatisation of some state industries and trade liberalisation. This has had devastating effects on the 'Southern' countries, and, as Joseph Stiglitz suggested, has actually increased poverty levels. The policy suggestion of fiscal discipline often results in reduced spending on health and education, affecting human development as citizens suffer from poor health, and the workforce becomes less skilled, increasing unemployment levels. Meanwhile, privatisation of state industries has been a key factor of increased poverty in the developing world, as seen in Tanzania, where the water supply was privatised by the government. The failings of SAPS ~~are~~ imposed by the 'North' can also be seen by countries who refused to accept such guidance from the IMF. For example, in the midst of the Asian financial crisis, Malaysia refused a loan from the IMF, whilst Thailand took one, with conditionalities attached'. After the Asian financial crisis, Malaysia quickly recovered whilst Thailand suffered years of social and economic disruption, and to government policy changes, suggested by the IMF. Therefore, this all suggests that the policies imposed by Northern institutions such as the IMF, have massively increased in-country inequality for 'Southern countries', increasing poverty levels for citizens across the world.

However, arguably, some of the Structural Adjustment Policies imposed by the IMF and the World Bank have done the opposite of increasing poverty in the 'South', but have increased living standards and helped countries progress to economic development. One of the key policies of SAPS is trade liberalisation, which can be seen to make the world 'flatter' (Friedman), by 'levelling the trading playing field' between industrialised and developing countries. Therefore, these policies aim to increase export levels for 'Southern' countries, increasing GDP levels in the future. ~~The~~ China is a key example of how integrating in the world economy can bring increased income levels and living standards to a country, whilst the economic stagnation of North Korea proves that a lack of trade reduces GDP in the future. In conclusion, arguably the actions of the IMF in the 'North', has not increased poverty in the 'South', but encouraged developing economies to engage in trade, providing a stepping stone for their future development, as readily seen by the 'BRICS' economies.

Despite this view, many suggest that the ~~the~~ focus on the 'free market', encouraged by the 'North', is a bad influence on the development and reduced poverty levels of the 'South'. Firstly, 'Northern' countries such as the USA protected their industries before opening them up to trade, suggesting that the 'North' is asking the 'South' to do as we say, not as we did. Surely if the suggest

path isn't the one taken by industrialised societies today, it could go horribly wrong? Equally, there are some real world examples that the free market of the industrialised North will not reduce poverty in the 'South'. The Zapatista movement in Mexico rejects capitalism, and is based on Marxism and Anarchism, embracing self-managing communities. This community has seen living standards rise for all, suggesting policies of the 'North' will not help to reduce Southern poverty, either today, or in the future.

Many also suggest that the actions of multi-national corporations of the 'North' have increased the 'North-South' divide, through exploiting 'Southern' citizens for cheap labour, resulting in extremely poor working conditions and increased poverty levels.

However, many suggest that Multi-National Corporations provide jobs for people of the 'South', improving their skills and opportunities, whilst providing investment for a country.

To draw a conclusion, as the 'North' continues to suggest a path of development on the 'South' that they did not take themselves, whilst dumping 'aid' on countries and distorting global markets, it is clear that the actions of the conceptual 'North' has increased poverty only in the 'South'. In addition to this, although the 'North' stresses 'trade liberalisation', to reduce poverty for the 'South', due to protectionism.

such as agricultural policies in the EU, the  
rule playing field will never be 'level' between  
the 'North' and the 'South', as the 'North'  
continues to exploit the 'South'.



**ResultsPlus**

**Examiner Comments**

This is an enjoyable and wide ranging response which tackles a number of viewpoints. All arguments are well presented and convincing. A well-considered response which is deserving of maximum marks.

The global 'South' has often criticised the 'North' of exploiting their labour, political corruption and natural resources for their own economic gain whilst leaving the 'South' no better off. Yet the 'North' argues the skills and technology and employment brought by Transnational Corporations (TNC's) bring prosperity to all, ~~and~~ <sup>ending</sup> poverty.

Wallerstein criticises the 'North' with his World Systems theory and argues that the policies of the 'North' do restrict on the 'South' and perpetuate structural inequalities. This neo-Marxist approach holds that the Core is where all the money flows to, the home of the TNC's and the Global North. Living standards are high and people are rich - the Semi periphery - ~~the~~ where BRIC countries exist, provide the manual labour and where the main production of goods takes place. The periphery, where living standards are the lowest, wages are lowest and natural resources are extracted and people are exploited. The low wages keep people working because they need the little money they get as well as the fact the unskilled workers can be very easily replaced due

to the amount of plentiful unskilled workers available. Some manner of prosperity is found in the Semi-periphery but again is limited to the select few and acts as a buffer between the Core and Periphery - ensuring no revolt or rebellion as they have far more to lose than the TNC's. This ~~is~~ <sup>creates</sup> a process of fear + need which keeps people in their place and so a structural inequality due to the policies of the 'North' keeps the South poor.

However one aspect that Wallerstein overlooks is that of the Semi-periphery. Brazil, India and China are BRIC Countries in the Semi-periphery and have enjoyed massive economic success. China has lifted 250 million people out of absolute poverty in the last few years, an unprecedented statistic. The prosperity in this layer is being shared and people are becoming more well off, subsequently living standards are also being raised as GDP per Capita rises. It's the policies of the ~~rest~~ North that have brought this prosperity.

Globalisation is seen ~~as~~ arguably as a 'Northern' thing where TNC's from the North set up in the South. The Company then brings technology, skills and ~~employment~~ employment to the region and where rates of pay are higher than what they would normally earn, this sharing of resources thus 'flatters' the world. Again examples include China and India and possibly even Dubai where every major brand and company in the

world can be found, a remarkable achievement from ~~world can be~~ the desert it was 40 years ago.

As the employers have money, it's ~~taxed~~ taxed by the state who then spend on infrastructure and hospitals etc, thus the state starts to develop. More skills are needed and so other companies start into invest and soon enough direct capital is flooding in and the state thrives consequently.

However that's an optimism that has been short lived. The trickle down economics preached by free market advocates of the free market have not materialised. Many millions still live in poverty and slums in India. In Africa, where some TNC's have set up, money

floods back to the Core and low wages are kept as low as they can be in the S periphery and semi-periphery as the workers get more from the TNC's than their previous job, but only a little more. Yet the little more they get stops them from starting. Thus they have no disposable income, they have nothing to give in taxes. This free market, Washington Consensus has thus failed. An example being the recent building collapse in DD, Dacca, Bangladesh. Some have cited this tragedy to do with globalisation, David Staley made this point on Question Time recently, he's calling globalisation a 'great catastrophic failure'!

Advocates of the free market, and Washington Consensus are quick to point at their success through structural adjustment programmes. Loans given to countries of economic liberal policies in par with Rostow's modernisation theory. South Korea is their biggest achievement, and other tiger economies who have taken SAP's from the IMF and World Bank and now their economies are thriving, eg. Global TNC Samsung from South Korea. The IMF and World Bank argue that economic liberalism and free market policies inspire entrepreneurship and gives incentives for people to work hard and achieve.

However the achievements of SAP's are related: The 'North' did not develop in the way Rostow claims. The 'North' protected their economies and sectors until they were mature enough to compete in the global world. South Korea and China equally took protectionist measures. Such as ~~devaluing~~ devaluing currency, etc.

encouraging savings etc before opening up to the free market and cutting taxes, deregulation and privatisation. SAP's led to the debt crisis in Europe and Latin America and public expenditure cuts drove economies to a halt and 'animal spirits' and investment were killed. Poverty rose sharply and living standards plummeted. Many former countries didn't see the prosperity they were promised. Malaysia + Turkey rejected SAP's and are now leading to very promising economies. The IMF and World Bank have taken note and dropped SAP's for Poverty Reduction Strategy Papers which are still free market, Keynesian influenced but encourage more public expenditure in essential public expenditure such as hospitals and primary education.

Though some prosperity has been brought by the policies of the North, much of the good has been extracted and taken to the North. SAP's have failed and are misguided in how the 'North' developed and all this amounts to what what some call a neo-colonialism. Structural inequalities by inequalities by the free market 'North' have caused and perpetuated the the poverty in the global 'South', ~~which is a tragedy~~ though perhaps not wholly.



### ResultsPlus Examiner Comments

This is another decent response for this question. Wallerstein is referenced once more and with good effect. The dominant economic philosophy of global North is also discussed with arguments on both sides of the title.

## **Paper Summary**

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

- **Ensure a focus on the exact wording of the questions.**
- **Try to provide a clear structure to responses.**
- **Try to provide definitions and/or an early indication of where the response will be directed.**
- **Provide examples where possible and try to make them relevant and contemporary.**
- **Ensure that, with the longer responses, all assessment objectives are covered.**
- **Make use of the Further Guidance for Route D document**
- **Make use of the Threshold Indicators used in the Mark Schemes.**

## **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 Edinburgh Gate, Harlow, Essex CM20 2JE