



Examiners' Report June 2023

GCE Politics 9PL0 3B

Edexcel and BTEC Qualifications

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

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



Giving you insight to inform next steps

ResultsPlus is Pearson's free online service giving instant and detailed analysis of your students' exam results.

- See students' scores for every exam question.
- Understand how your students' performance compares with class and national averages.
- Identify potential topics, skills and types of question where students may need to develop their learning further.

For more information on ResultsPlus, or to log in, visit www.edexcel.com/resultsplus. Your exams officer will be able to set up your ResultsPlus account in minutes via Edexcel Online.

Pearson: helping people progress, everywhere

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

June 2023

Publications Code 9PL0_3B_2306_ER

All the material in this publication is copyright

© Pearson Education Ltd 2023

Introduction

The quality of work produced in this examination series is a reflection of the strength of preparation by both candidates and their centres. The questions worked very well for differentiation and all questions appeared to be equally accessible to candidates. There were a good number of very strong responses across all questions and particularly in the extended essays where candidates had managed to demonstrate relevant knowledge, analysis and evaluation in very convincing and balanced responses.

Subject knowledge was particularly strong and there were some excellent examples used in support of arguments.

The first section with a choice of two questions provided the opportunity to tackle either a question on the International Court of Justice and the International Criminal Court or on democratic and autocratic states.

The second section, with the compulsory question, was particularly accessible to candidates. Candidates were able to select recent developments, since 2000, to analyse the different explanations of realists and liberals.

The final section, with a choice of two from three questions, covered wide ranging elements of the specification from economic globalisation and poverty to regionalism, power and sovereignty to UN global governance relating to human rights and the environment.

Question 1 (a)

This was marginally the more popular of the two optional questions in this section of the exam paper. There was a good spread of marks across all levels which suggests that the question worked well in terms of differentiation.

Stronger responses tended to avoid the temptation simply to provide a description of the role, purpose, effectiveness etc of the ICJ and then later in the response to provide a description of the role, purpose, effectiveness etc of the ICC. Stronger responses tended to identify a difference and then explain that difference between the ICJ and ICC and usually provide examples to support the view. The consistent comparative analysis could be lacking where the first approach was used. The mark scheme includes indicative content and candidates were rewarded for identifying numerous differences both in the mark scheme and beyond, including differences in role, purpose, membership, power of enforcement, major power engagement, legitimacy etc. There were a very wide selection of ICJ cases used to support arguments as well as the available number of ICC cases.

After some initial confusion the script moves to provide significant knowledge and analysis. There is identification of a number of differences including, that the ICJ tends to focus on states whereas the ICC has a focus on prosecution of individuals for a range of crimes including war crimes/crimes against humanity.

The International Court of Justice (ICJ) is the UN's Supreme Judicial organ (est-1948 in The Hague), employing 15 impartial Justices to adjudicate on territorial disputes/ supply advisory opinions to its 123 signatory Member States. Unlike the International Criminal Court (ICC), it can only settle disputes called by states, rather than individuals, corporations or NGOs, such as its 2022 ~~Best~~ peaceful resolution in settling the disputed Niger - Burkina Faso border, redefining 260 miles and exchanging 18 towns through an independent body to reduce the potentiality of war/ conflict. Alternatively, the ICC - established as a permanent adjudicator for individual crimes against humanity, war crimes, and genocide - can indict individuals, thus making it a more effective system, as the ICJ's consultations are mediated through a state's government, which may ^{itself} be the source of a nation's human rights abuse. Henceforth, ~~the~~ ^{ICC} tribunals, like

The ~~ICC~~ ²⁰¹⁶ ~~in~~ ^{imprisonment} ~~of~~ ^{of} ~~Eragno~~ ^{of} on 4 counts of 'crime against humanity' for killing political dissidents after his self-disputed electoral defeat, ^{better} ~~still~~ reinforce the principle of a ^{leader's} 'responsibility to protect' its citizens' human rights, reaffirming the 'rule of law' ~~of~~ as ~~leader~~ cannot claim state sovereignty as an alibi for mistreatment. Therefore, the ICC ~~is~~ can be seen to reduce state sovereignty by prioritising human rights above borders - in accordance to the Blair doctrine Arab 'genocide affects all' - whereas the ICJ, by only resolving inter-state conflicts, ~~rather~~ than inter-personal, reinforces state sovereignty by reaffirming borders, a significant difference.

~~Also~~ ~~to~~ However, the ICC is perceived to have an ethnocentric 'winner's bias' towards liberal democracies, notably America, whereas the ICJ is perceived a greater perception of neutrality ~~and~~ ~~more~~ ~~in~~ in its judgement. Until 2016, the ICC only indicted Africans, including Thomas Lubanga (²⁰¹² Congo) and Jean Pierre Bemba (²⁰¹¹ DRC - ~~Violators~~), causing the African

Union to advise - its state members, including
Namibia and South Africa - to withdraw from its
jurisdiction. Whilst the ICJ is accused of being
'a tool of declining imperial powers' (Newalta) -
Fauling to notice ~~that~~ Bush in the 2003
Iraq invasion killing 37,000 civilians - the
ICJ can claim a greater moral authority
for its impartiality. It has operated against the
UN, for example, in the advisory opinion promoting
Chagos' decolonisation from British rule, and
can therefore be seen to better reinforce
e. equality of states under the rule of law.



Valid and accurate examples support the response. The script discusses and compares effectiveness, impact on state sovereignty, major power interference and touches on the moral authority and impartiality of the courts.

It is pleasing to note wide ranging knowledge, use of examples coupled with comparative knowledge and the depth of analysis helps to lift this response to a Level 4 mark.



Examples are used to support knowledge and to provide persuasive evidence in support of a view.

Question 1 (b)

Although marginally the less popular of the option questions in this section it was still tackled by a significant number of candidates. Some candidates focussed on similarities but failed to tackle the impact on global order and this helped to differentiate in marking. Where candidates did tackle the impact on global order they tended to discuss how similarities made the world safer or more dangerous and where similarities led to stability or instability. Similarities may have included pursuit of trade and growth, membership of international bodies and attendance at conferences, involvement in conflict, illegal actions or human rights abuses, military expenditure etc, hopefully linked to impact of this on global order.

This is a wide-ranging response which covers a good number of similarities and never moves too far from the specific demands of the question.

Democractic and autocratic states both participate in the ~~economic~~ economic globalisation in the form of economic free trade. China, an autocratic state is the largest exporter (\$2.9 trillion 2021) second to the US who exported \$2.3 trillion worth of goods. This shows how both types of states contribute to ~~economic~~ economic interconnectedness and to some extent dependence, since they ~~both~~ both engage in the economic global order. Both also invest in different developing states to decrease the North South divide - showing how both democratic and autocratic states ~~both~~ engage with the world order in a similar way economically. The US a democratic state is the largest contributor to the World Bank and therefore is directly involved in investment through projects such as the Water Sanitation project in India. China's Belt and Road initiative' too shows how autocratic states invest in developing states.

Politically, democratic and autocratic states both are involved in ~~the~~ intergovernmental

of organisations such as the UN. The United Nations Security Council's permanent members is made up of ~~both~~ both democratic and autocratic states, ~~the~~ the US, UK and France being ~~the~~ the democratic states, ~~the~~ China and Russia being the autocratic states. This shows how both ~~of~~ democratic and autocratic states participate in the enforcement of international law ~~the~~ and a more ~~safe~~ peaceful world order through participation in IGOs. ~~and~~ The ~~the~~ UN as a supranational organisation also shows how both democratic and autocratic states demonstrate a commitment to be held, to some extent, accountable to the decisions and objectives of the UN.

Both autocratic and democratic states involve themselves ~~in~~ in proxy wars, showing how they contribute to an unstable world order. The ^{internal} conflict in Libya that occurred ~~off~~ after the execution of ~~Colonel~~ Gaddafi means that terrorist groups, funded respectively by ~~France~~ France and Russia, have taken over and cause anarchy in the region.

Both types of states participating in disrupting regions through proxy wars was also apparent

in the Cold War, as ~~that~~ the US and Russia would fund ~~the~~ opposing terrorist groups (like how the US allegedly funded/trained ~~the~~ Al Qaeda), showing how both states have the potential to disrupt the world order.



ResultsPlus
Examiner Comments

This script covers a host of similarities linked to impact on global order. They begin with participation in economic globalisation and free trade leading to economic interconnectedness and interdependence. They tackle investment in the developing world with the examples of the US through the W.Bank and the Chinese Belt and Road Initiative. There is coverage of their involvement in international organisations with the mix of autocratic and democratic states in the UN Security Council made clear. Linked to this is their joint participation in enforcement of international law and impact on a theoretically peaceful world. In contrast to this there is discussion of the joint involvement in proxy wars in which they both create instability and disrupt regions.

This script is a particularly wide ranging one and makes clear that it will focus on similarities in terms of use of hard power, economic influence and structural power.

Both democratic and autocratic states are able to impact on global order through similar uses of ^{military} hard power, economic influence, and structural power.

Both democratic and autocratic states are able to impact on global order through the use of hard military power. The use or threat of military force has allowed these states to project their interests and achieve goals by demonstrating the potential to use military power. Military hard power has been used by democratic states in order to achieve security goals, as seen in the NATO intervention in Afghanistan from 2001 to 2011, and in order to achieve humanitarian goals, as was shown by the 1999 NATO intervention in Kosovo in which military force was used to put an end to human rights abuses by Serb militias. Autocratic states are also inclined to use hard military power to achieve their goals. These goals can include territorial expansion, as was seen in Russia's 2014 annexation of Crimea and the 2022 invasion of Ukraine. Autocratic states can also use hard power in order to threaten rivals. This can be seen with North Korea's threats of nuclear attacks against South Korea and Japan, and

China's military build up in the South China Sea.

The use of military hard power by both democratic ~~and A~~ and autocratic states has been able to significantly impact the global security.

Democratic and autocratic states are also able to use economic influence to impact global order.

Democratic states are able to exercise considerable economic power through organisations such as the IMF and World Bank, in which the USA has used its 17% vote share to gain ~~an~~ influence over both organisations policies.

This has allowed the democratic USA to use ~~these~~ its economic influence to spread free market principles through these organisations. Democratic states can also use regional bodies to display economic influence. This can be seen in the ~~not~~ influence of the EU, which is comprised of democratic states in a single market.

Autocratic states are also able to use economic influence to project impact global order. This can be due to control over key resources, as seen with Russia's ~~energy~~ oil and gas exports, which previously allowed it economic leverage with European nations. Autocratic states can also use foreign investment in order to impact on global order. This is shown by China's Belt and Road initiative, which involves major infrastructure investment in over 150 countries, allowing it China to

have an impact on global economic order

Democratic and autocratic states are able to impact on global order through structural power in the UN. The UN Security Council has allowed both democratic and autocratic states the use of the veto to influence UN action. This has been used by democratic states to achieve their goals, as seen with the US's consistent vetoing of anti-Israel resolutions. The veto has also been heavily used by autocratic states, with Russia having vetoed a resolution to deplore the invasion of Ukraine. The use of the veto has allowed both democratic and autocratic states great (structural) influence in the UN, and has afforded them great impact on global order.



ResultsPlus
Examiner Comments

The involvement of democratic states in Afghanistan and Kosovo is compared with the involvement of Russia in Crimea/Ukraine and the actions of North Korea and China. There is a focus on the use of economic power in which they cover democratic state influence via the IMF, W. Bank and regional bodies with Russia and China examples such as use of Russian oil and the Chinese Belt and Road Initiative with an explanation of the impact of the above. They conclude with discussion as to the impact on global order of the actions of both autocratic and democratic states in the UN Security Council. It is pleasing to note the use of examples when a point is made as well as reference back to the original question which helps to retain focus and relevance.



ResultsPlus
Examiner Tip

This script avoids the temptation to provide a lengthy introduction explaining what autocratic and democratic states are and moves immediately to the question.

Question 2

This is, of course, the compulsory question in this section and was generally tackled well by candidates. Candidates were able to apply their knowledge of realism and liberalism to any recent developments in global politics since 2000. As with previous series, candidates who refer to only one named theory cannot achieve beyond level 1 and candidates who do not make any synoptic points cannot achieve beyond level 3.

Candidates often covered themes rather than events so there was use of perceived trends such as the increase in number of international organisations or interdependence as well as a focus on Russian action in Ukraine or even the Iraq intervention.

This script has a focus on just two developments in global politics, but in detail, which are the environment and conflict.

2 Analyse the different explanations which realism and liberalism provide for recent developments in global politics since 2000.

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

(12)

There have been significant ~~recent~~ developments in global politics since 2000, ~~the~~ namely ~~change~~ ^{increases in} cooperation ^{over} of the environment, ^{and} conflict, ~~and the~~ spread of human rights. Both ~~realism~~ ^{propose} realism and liberalism ~~the~~ different explanations for such developments.

~~One~~ One development in global politics since 2000 is the ~~area~~ increased cooperation on ~~the~~ environmental matters, such as the COPs in 2015, 2021 and 2022. For liberals, the growing cooperation on such matters stems from the mutual appreciation ~~the~~ for the need to tackle climate change. In their view, the use of IGOs (such as the UN) is necessary to ^{propose} ~~facilitate~~ these changes. ~~The UN,~~ ~~for example,~~ offers a forum for global discussion and debate. This ~~links~~ closely links to the beliefs of J.S. Mill. In *On Liberty* (1859), he believed that rational individuals would turn to reasoned discussion and debate to resolve disagreement. Thus, in international terms, the ~~was~~ increased cooperation through IGOs seems likely ^{in the} ~~for~~ liberals ^{view.} However, realists would argue that there have been ~~no~~ successful developments in terms of the environment. For realists, states are selfish, power maximising actors that will focus ~~only~~ on their national interests. This links into to the Hobbesian view of the world.

For Hobbes, humans were mutually selfish and would thus place their own interests above others. In this view, the global developments on the environment have been poor due to the self-interested nature of states. This was seen in the 2021 ^{environmental} conference, when India walked down the pledge to reduce coal emissions. Thus, for Rawls, the increased cooperation on the environment since the 2000s has been a facade, and the ~~self-interested~~ selfish nature of states has displaced any potential for ~~successful~~ actual progress.

Conflict is another key global development to highlight. ~~But~~ the Russian invasion of Ukraine is a key development in global politics. ~~Liberals may find it harder to explain such an invasion. In their view, conflict is less likely for liberals, the Russian invasion supports their theory of the democratic peace theory and the Kantian triangle. ^{This states that} ~~in their view,~~ conflict is less likely when countries are ~~democratic~~ democratic (and thus accountable to their electorate), ^{the Kantian triangle also incorporates the idea} ~~the Kantian triangle~~ international law and an increased interconnectedness. ^{to explain why peace is more likely.} ~~The~~ Although Russia's constitution refers to the country as a democracy, a Freedom House report (2015) describes it as an authoritarian regime. Thus, liberals would see the conflict as most likely due to the authoritarian ~~government~~ of Russia. ~~In their view~~ nature of the Russian government. Conversely, Rawls would oppose such a view, believing instead that conflict is likely in an anarchic, dog-eat-dog world. In their view, the~~

Russian invasion demonstrates the selfish nature of states, who ^{may} wish to pursue their ^{own} claims using hard power and military force. ~~states~~ This links to Hobbes idea that the relationship between men is one of 'envy, hatred and war'. Realists may also link the idea to the security dilemma, a term coined by J. Herz in 1951. This has emerged due to the growing ^{military} influence of NATO in Eastern Europe, ~~including~~ ~~not~~ thus, the war may signal ~~the~~ the insecurity of Russia, who wishes to ensure ~~to~~ our survival in an anarchic international system.

Overall, there are key disagreements that arise between realists and liberals over recent global developments such as cooperation on environmental problems and the onset of conflict in Ukraine.



ResultsPlus
Examiner Comments

There is a depth of comparison between liberalism and realism on these two areas which is a real strength of the script. Comparison over developments relating to the environment is particularly clear and there is a clear synoptic link in this response. Examples are used to support both the realist and liberal perspective related to developments over the environment.

The candidate moves to a consideration of conflict since 2000 with some interesting observations linked to the democratic peace thesis and Kantian triangle which is contrasted with the realist perspective and the security dilemma.

The script covers a huge amount of ground with a lot of detail and with evidence to support both a realist and liberal perspective.

2 Analyse the different explanations which realism and liberalism provide for recent developments in global politics since 2000.

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

(12)

Global politics since 2000 has seen a shift after the supposed "end of history" described by Francis Fukuyama, and the triumph of liberal democracy. Fukuyama is a liberal thinker and he therefore argued that US winning the Cold War meant how conflict will cease due to increased interconnectedness and globalisation and shared ideas. Since 2000, this can be said to be true for some events, but it has mostly been disproved. The world is more connected than ever through the internet and the free trade. This is due to the belief that states can plough through difficulties together more effectively, for example seen in activity of IGOs such as WHO in the event of the COVID-19 pandemic. Furthermore, there are more and more collective "problems of the commons", the most notable one being climate change. Liberals argue how this needs collective action from all states, and this has resulted in the Paris Agreement of 2015. Furthermore, democracy is becoming widely spread and people show increasing willingness to uphold human rights. The ICC was established in 2009 and prosecuted heads of state including Bemba, and uprisings such as the Arab Spring have seen a shift in the world order since 2000s. Liberals would argue how this positive attitude to human rights occurs due to ~~the~~ every individual being free and only then being able to live a dignified life, as supported

by Locke and John Stuart Mill, another notable example of development in global politics which shows willingness of states to thrive within a complex web of interdependence is the rise of regional bodies such as the EU which has been included in G20 or USMCA. ~~These regional bodies also~~ The cooperation of states in face of crises, such as NATO cooperation in the response to Ukraine invasion or the swift G20 response to the 2008 financial crisis all show a liberal interconnected world.

However, there is a lot of evidence to suggest how global politics since 2000 has reasserted the dominance of the nation-state and a realist outlook. Realists have a pessimistic outlook on human nature and therefore translate it to states, as they are bound to be selfish and act in their interest, as argued by Hobbes. This leads to conflict, use of hard power, and states acting as power maximisers. The recent invasion of Russia into Ukraine is an example of a state protecting itself due to a perceived security threat of expansionist NATO. The invasion has also provided NATO with a revised role similar to one in the Cold War, further emphasizing the differences between the West and other cultures, perhaps leading to what is labelled the Clash of Civilisations by Huntington. This clash is evident in many events since 2000 - the 9/11 attacks and the following War on Terror, "humanitarian" intervention of the US and the UK in Iraq in 2003, ~~the fact that~~ which was unjustified and done in self-interest, or the fact that ~~Asian countries are not~~ many states

are starting to build up their investment to counter the West, like the China Belt and Road Initiative 2013 or rise of banks ~~that~~ ~~that~~ that counter the World Bank. The Covid-19 pandemic also points to a realist outlook - once faced with danger all nations decided to close off and protect themselves, showing that they are more likely to act in their self-interest, as proposed by liberals, seen in France refusing to hand protection equipment to Spain or Italy, for example. Furthermore, the regional bodies supposed to be mini-globalisation have been a way of excluding others, most notably seen in agricultural subsidies and the failure of Doha round of WTO. Other collective problems still do not take effect over ~~the~~ states, as famously seen by Trump's declaration he represented "Pittsburg, not Paris", when signing out of the Paris Agreement.



This script begins by explaining a liberal perspective on global developments since 2000. They cover a huge area of liberalism with commentary on the end of history and Fukuyama, interconnectedness, globalisation, free trade etc. They move to IGOs including the WHO linked to covid and more generally to problems of the commons including climate change. They return to the spread of democracy and link this to upholding of human rights with the ICC and other examples used. They also cover the rise of regional bodies including the G20 and EU and NATO cooperation over Ukraine.

The contrast is with realism and begins with a perceived reasserting of state sovereignty and selfishness with reference to the ideas of Hobbes. The use of hard power, conflict and power maximisation is discussed as is the Russian intervention in Ukraine as well as the Clash of Civilizations theory and the War on Terror. The candidate applies a realist perspective to humanitarian intervention to both the Chinese Belt and Road Initiative and to actions related to covid.

Question 3 (a)

This was the most popular of the longer questions in the section and there was a wide range in quality of answers from candidates. A large number of candidates tackled whether or not economic globalisation had reduced poverty or was a good or bad phenomenon but made little or no reference to the key term "significantly". This acted as one of the differentiators for the marking of the responses. AO3 acted as a key differentiator in many of the essays. Stronger essays tended to move beyond evaluation simply in the introduction and/or the conclusion. Stronger responses tended to provide a clear line of argument and evaluation in both the introduction and the conclusion supported by constant insightful comments and 'mini judgements' leading to a persuasive and reasoned verdict.

Where candidates agreed with the idea that economic globalisation has significantly reduced poverty they tended to focus on the positive actions of the IMF, WTO and W.Bank as well as on the benefits of free trade more generally. They explained the mutual benefits of complex interdependence brought about by economic globalisation and used figures to show the reduction in poverty in individual states or more widely. The counter argument tended to focus on western dominance of the IMF, W.Bank and WTO and the imbalance in development which had left many states and people behind. They used figures to illustrate a continued divide and often discussed dependency theory and the negative actions of TNCs.

This script begins with a quick definition and then sets out clearly which areas they intend considering which they name as international trade, aid and MNCs. They immediately focus on the term "significantly".

Economic globalisation can be ~~be~~ defined as the increase in exchange of goods, services, commodities and people, making global economies more interconnected. To evaluate whether economic globalisation has significantly reduced poverty, the areas of international trade, aid and ~~growth~~ ^{MNCs} must be assessed. ~~Similarly, the areas of~~ ~~growth~~ Overall, economic globalisation has facilitated growth in some countries and has thus reduced poverty. However, it has not 'significantly' reduced poverty because ~~such growth~~ such improvements in countries are not universal.

International trade ~~has grown with the~~ is a key area to assess, and it can be argued that this has ~~had~~ caused a significant reduction in poverty. The growth of international aid and the 'opening-up' of economies has facilitated global growth. According to a World Bank (WB) report, since China's market reforms in 1991, it has experienced an average of 8% of growth since. This unprecedented growth has had a significant impact on its extreme poverty levels, reducing from 88% (1981) to 0.5% (2016). A similar trend has occurred in India. They ensured to exploit ~~the increase~~ international trade via their reduction in tax per importer, which reduced from 80% (in ~~the~~ 1990s) to 30%

(in the late 1990s). Such a change has likely helped tackle the poverty levels in India. These have fallen significantly to 7% (2019). It is also said that Indian escapes poverty every 2 minutes, and this is likely helped by their increased participation in international trade, facilitated by economic globalisation. On a global scale, the extreme poverty rate (based on ^{2020 figures of} \$2.20 a day) has fallen from 35% (1990) to 8.4% (2019). International trade has also greatly increased since, therefore suggesting that economic globalisation has significantly reduced poverty. However, ~~there is~~ clear this has not been the case for all areas. Sub-Saharan Africa, for example, still has an extreme poverty rate of 40%. Moreover, according to a UN Water development report, only 24% have access to clean water. Despite their participation in international trade, it seems that their largely low-valued products and reliance on agricultural output has meant that extreme poverty has still remained high, far from a significant reduction. India also ~~has~~ still ~~has~~ ~~has~~ high levels of extreme poverty in agricultural areas. A Singh (2012) report showed that 40% of those living in rural areas could be considered 'poor' and 25% working in agriculture are still in extreme poverty. Overall, ~~there~~ however, there ^{has} been a ^{large} significant reduction in poverty, likely aided by international trade. Yet, ~~this has not~~ it must be

noted that this has not been universal. Whilst China and India have acted as a 'equalising' trend, Sub-Saharan Africa has acted as a 'disqualifying' trend, with many still left in extreme poverty. Thus, to go as far as a 'significant' reduction may be hard to justify.

The growth of multi-national corporations (MNCs) has also been facilitated by economic globalisation. It can be argued that these have had a significant impact on reducing poverty. MNCs provide jobs, investment and training schemes, which can be crucial to lifting people out of poverty. According to Brookings, an increase of FDI by 10% in Venezuela and Mexico, leads to a 2.2% increase in wages, thus helping to reduce poverty. Shell has also arguably had a positive impact on Nigerian poverty levels. It has invested over \$13 billion into LEDCs and contributed \$15 billion in Corporation tax (2015). Such monetary support can have a positive impact on domestic economies, thus decreasing poverty. MNCs have also had a positive impact in India. A Dutch equity firm, Rabo Equity Advisers, invested \$100 million into Indian agriculture, lifting many farmers out of poverty. Thus, MNCs can ~~not~~ lead to a reduction in poverty. However, ~~AAI~~ it must be noted that MNCs can also worsen the position of

the poorest. MNCs may lead to the "race to the bottom" whereby developing countries may lower wages, regulation costs and standards to attract FDI from MNCs. This has likely been the case in Indonesia. According to John Pilger, Indonesian workers work in hot and poor conditions on an average of 72p a day. For every \$100 of AP shoe that is sold, they receive 40p, thus swelling rather than decreasing, their poverty. Poor regulations as a result of MNCs have also been seen in Bangladesh. The factory fire in Dhaka 2012 seems to have been caused by poor regulations and a lack of safety equipment. Moreover, an Oxfam report shows that conditions on Coca Cola sugarcane farms in El Salvador are very poor, with many ~~workers~~ employees working on chemical farmland. Overall, therefore, the growth of MNCs has helped some ~~employees~~ workers in developing countries, lifting them out of poverty. But, it seems that ~~from~~ most workers have not benefited from the increased investment, ~~at~~ and instead face themselves working in poorer conditions and for lower wages. Thus, it seems that MNCs have not 'significantly' reduced poverty.

Aid is also an important factor to note. This has grown as a consequence of economic globalisation, notably as

multilateral aid through economic ICOs. Aid can help lift people out of poverty. This was the case in the Kockelle aid to South East Asia, which greatly improved its agricultural sector by diversifying crops. Targeted aid in rural areas in 2000 has also led to positive growth, with an annual average growth rate since 2005 of 8%, now helping lift people out of poverty. Mozambique similarly saw a growth rate of 12% after targeted aid in its country. ~~However, then~~ now, perhaps aid has had a significant impact on reducing poverty. However, it must be noted that not all aid has been beneficial. For example, aid to Bangladesh actually saw the country grow smaller, having little impact on helping people escape from the poverty cycle. Corruption may also act as a barrier to effective aid. This was shown by the fact that President Aracha stole \$2-3bn of aid investment. Moreover, 99% of aid to rural health clinics in Chad has been "lost" due to corruption. ~~An~~ tied aid can also have a negative impact on poverty: ~~For~~ ~~the~~ 75% of UK's aid has been tied, such as aid to India which, in return, saw them buy millions^{of} pounds worth of helicopters. Such tied aid may open up developing countries to exploitation ~~and~~ which may worsen the position of the economy and lead to ~~a~~ a worse position for those in poverty. Overall, therefore, there has been some success

with targeted aid. But, to go as far as to say that this has led to a 'significant' reduction in poverty seems hard to justify. Tied aid and corruption may, instead, place the economy in a worse position.

Overall, therefore, economic globalisation has helped to reduce poverty, but to say that this reduction has been 'significant' would be too optimistic. Perhaps the most effective reduction in poverty has come from the growth of international trade and the integration of economies into the global trading system. This has led to unprecedented growth in countries such as China and India, and have reduced their poverty rates. MNCs have had some positive impact on reducing poverty, but this remains limited, and may have instead led to exploitation and the "race to the bottom".

Aid has also seen some success, but there is no doubt limits to its ability to reduce poverty. John Pilger has argued that aid needs to be much more targeted to have a lasting effect on poverty. Overall, therefore, economic globalisation has reduced poverty, but this has not been 'significant' and many parts of the world are still stuck in extreme poverty.



They move to an in depth consideration of free trade with reference to the W.Bank and Chinese growth including figures linked to the opening up of markets. They stress the link to poverty reduction and then move to the case study of India. The repeated use of the term significantly makes clear that this is their focus throughout. The counter argument is made clear with reference to sub-Saharan Africa and parts of India and this is supported with additional use of figures. The section includes mini conclusions.

The second section covers MNCs and there is discussion as to how they impact on poverty through provision of jobs, investment and training and the extent to which this is significant. There are case studies relating to Venezuela and Mexico and the actions of Shell in Nigeria as well as India. A counter argument is based on the cases of Indonesia, Bangladesh and El Salvador. Once more there is a mini evaluation where the success or failure of MNCs in terms of significantly reducing poverty is discussed.

The final section relates to aid and they cover diversification of crops in S E Asia as well as targeted aid in Sierra Leone and aid leading to growth in Mozambique. A counter argument relates to Bangladesh, Chad and India with more figures used to illustrate.



There is a focus on the key terms of the question throughout the response. The conclusion is evaluative and follows a consideration of what they argue to be the most important elements of the essay and this helps to secure a clear top-level mark.

This script is a persuasive response which does consider both sides of the argument despite leaning heavily in one direction.

^(EG)
Economic globalisation is the process of states becoming increasingly more interconnected and interdependent. It could be argued that economic globalisation reduces poverty as MNCs provide a basic income, & economic institutions also have a human development aspect and these institutions have reduced conflict which causes poverty. However it is much more convincing to argue that ^{EG} it has not reduced poverty due to dependency being created, the human cost of SAPs and the stalemate the WTO creates preventing poverty reduction.

Proponents of the view that EG reduces poverty may argue this due to the role of MNCs. Economic globalisation has facilitated foreign investment of these companies such as Apple, Nike and Samsung in the developing world. For example, Nike has over 40 factories in Indonesia, employing over 170 000 staff. This helps to reduce poverty as it enables more people living in disadvantaged areas to access better paid jobs and break out of a cycle of rural poverty. Nike pays all its workers in Indonesia ~~at~~ the minimum wage, showing how it has contributed to poverty reduction through the promise of a higher income ~~and~~ and this MNC development has helped to reduce the number of those living in extreme

poverty by around 7%. This again shows how much of an impact EG has on poverty reduction and by allowing companies to grow and employ more people from the developing world all sorts can subsequently be raised. However, it is much more convincing to argue that this is not the case. EG has actually entrenched poverty by allowing MNCs to grow. According to Wallerstein, MNC growth creates dependency. Economic institutions that push the Washington consensus for trade liberalisation creates too soon. This means that they are dumped with cheap manufactured products and become dependent, entrenching poverty as cheap MNC produced goods overrun their economy preventing its development to a proto industrial state as it can't compete so cannot alleviate poverty in the long term due to lack of industrial growth. Furthermore, this means that these countries now become dependant on MNC investment which takes advantage of cheap labour and raw materials, trapping developing states in poverty and periphery status. This can be seen in DRC, 175th in HDI index and is trapped in a state of exploitation by companies such as Samsung who exploit its resources such as coltan. Thus, by facilitating the growth of MNCs and allowing therefore this exploitation to go unchecked, it's clear that ~~is not the case~~ as EG has allowed this to happen.

it does not reduce poverty, it in fact entrenches it and makes it unreasonable to develop and get out of periphery status.

Proponents of the view that economic globalisation has significantly reduced poverty may argue this because economic institutions such as the World Bank have a development focus as well, helping reduce multidimensional poverty. The World Bank through IDA has helped to improve human capital within developing states. For example 84 million more people now have access to clean water and ~~76%~~ an increase of 76% - 95% of girls in sub-Saharan Africa are now in education. This reduces multidimensional poverty as quality of life has clearly improved significantly for those that the World Bank ~~helps~~ helps, ^{which also reduces the North-South divide} showing how institutions created out of economic globalisation do reduce global poverty. Furthermore, this also reduces income poverty as with better education these people are now able to access better paid jobs, helping to get them out of poverty. However it is much more convincing to argue that economic globalisation has not reduced poverty significantly. First, a significant reduction would entail multidimensional poverty in the developed and developing world to have parity, something which is still far from the case. Despite World Bank intervention most ~~are~~ multidimensional poverty is still concentrated in sub-Saharan Africa, showing whilst it has reduced, it is not ^a ~~in~~ part with the developed world as

and the N-s divide remains strong. it is not a significant reduction. Moreover, economic institutions that have arisen out of economic globalisation can be harmful and can increase poverty. Conditionality of SAPs given by the Bretton Woods ~~and~~ institutions can be harmful and can increase poverty. For example, IMF SAPs to Greece during the debt crisis were contingent on Greece implementing austerity measures including public service cuts. ~~As a result, for~~ this increased poverty as well as less money in the economy, growth slowed pushing more people into poverty and more people who had less public services to rely on to alleviate their poverty due to the measures. There was a 15% increase in poverty in Greece due to these SAPs clearly showing how economic ~~and~~ institutions can be harmful and actually increase poverty due to their blanket one size fits all solution of the Washington Consensus and therefore economic globalisation has not reduced poverty through the institutions that have arisen out of it. If at all both have not risen equally, there is still a gap between the developed and developing world and SAPs have a negative impact on poverty.

Finally, proponents of the view may argue that EG has significantly reduced globalisation because it has facilitated complex interdependence, reducing the likelihood of conflict, which causes poverty. Friedman's per theory states how nations in the same supply chain

won't go to war with each other as it would be mutually harmful. EG facilitates the increasing trade ties between nations states and thus reduces the chance of conflict which in turn reduces the likelihood of ~~conflict~~ poverty due to this conflict. Moreover, EG has enabled countries to work together to increase economic growth as it is mutually beneficial, as can be seen in the WTO Uruguay Round, reducing \$40 billion worth of tariffs, thus reducing poverty ^{from 8-18 trillion dollars} as there was a result increasing economic growth which then trickles down to the poorest in societies, reducing poverty. However, it is much more convincing to argue that this is not the case. EG cannot have reduced poverty significantly because as significant improvement means developing states benefit as much as developed which is not the case. Despite EG building consensus and cooperation, ~~as~~ a realist would argue that ultimately states still act in their national interest ~~and~~ and want relative gains. This can be seen in the stalemate of the Doha development round, where the EU is refusing to remove CAPs on products which would enable economic growth, and thus poverty reduction to occur in the developing world. This shows how developed states are still benefitting much more than developing, meaning that EG cannot significantly reduce poverty as the stalemate in the Doha round shows the obstructive nature of developed states which hinders the economic growth of the developing states, preventing them from reducing poverty to the same extent. Therefore, EG has not significantly reduced poverty as developed states maintain a lot of power and are out for relative gains so

Under the program that developing states can make
in terms of their poverty reduction.

To conclude, ~~EG has not~~ although it could be
argued EG reduced poverty as MNCs have provided a
basic income, World Bank has reduced ^{multi} ~~the~~ dimension
poverty and complex interdependence reduces the chance
of poverty occurring due to conflict this view is flawed
and lacks merit. It is far more convincing to argue EG
has not significantly reduced poverty as significant trade
require parity between developed and developing
states, something which is not facilitated and
also EG can be seen to have a negative impact and
increase poverty through MNCs creating dependencies and
the harmful impact of SAPs.



The response begins with a brief definition and then provides a range of criteria or areas for discussion which include MNCs, dependency theory, SAPs and the actions of the WTO.

They move to discussion of MNCs in some level of detail and range of discussion with an initial focus on the benefits of this element of economic globalisation. There are examples used before they move to the negative elements of MNCs including a link to Wallerstein and dependency theory.

They move to discussion of the W.Bank and the different levels of support that it provides, explaining mixed success, particularly in sub-Saharan Africa. They discuss wider Bretton Woods institutions and SAPs with examples.

There is a final area of discussion which covers complex interdependence linked to economic globalisation which is an interesting argument and they start to focus more closely on the term significant in their response. There is discussion of the role of the WTO and of the Doha round in particular and there is an evaluative conclusion.

Question 3 (b)

Though not as popular as question 3a this was still covered by a large number of candidates, equal to the number of candidates who chose to cover question 3c. There was a tendency for some candidates to tackle the perceived positives and negatives of regional bodies rather than to carefully consider whether states were more likely to succeed and hold significant power as sovereign states rather than as members of regional organisations. The European Union tended to be the main regional organisation of discussion although some candidates were able to cover other regional bodies including the AU and ASEAN as well as NATO.

When considering the benefits of regional organisations, candidates tended to focus on their power within decision making entities or involvement in global conferences with a range of examples given, including the EU at G7 and G20. They discussed the economic benefits of some regional organisational membership and in representing member interests in negotiation with large and powerful states. Counter arguments tended to focus on the perceived success of certain states who do not fully engage with regional organisations. The lack of an independence of decision making in the best interest of sovereign states was also used as a counter to the idea that membership of regional organisations was more likely to enable states to succeed and to hold significant power.

This script begins with a clear and focussed introduction in which they make clear that they will make an assessment based on economic elements as well as influence in the world and security. They make a commitment to regional organisations.

Regional institutions have significantly increased in power over recent decades, and this has led to many questioning whether they are actually beneficial to the state. Whether the state will be stronger economically, have more influence on the world stage and have greater security are the three key aspects of the debate, and they clearly show that, to a greater extent, states will be more successful through and powerful through membership of regional organisations.

~~The most significant argument against~~ ~~to suggest that~~
states

~~The~~ ~~view~~ The ~~view~~ view that countries are more likely to succeed alone rather than through regional organisations is often supported by suggesting regional groups weaken the economic power of states. This is because the regional group decides on policy as a whole, and while the economic policy decided on may benefit the region, it may not be in the state's national interest. For example, the single currency across within (most) EU states has benefitted Germany, but not helped Italy. Furthermore, the economic ^{crisis} ~~crisis~~ 2007-2009 was especially bad in the PIGS - Portugal, Italy, Ireland, Greece and Spain - because their economies were weaker and they all used the euro. This could be used to suggest

that regional economic integration is not to the state's advantage. Also, the renegotiation of NAFTA in 2017, now it is now USMCA, was US-driven, ~~due~~ partly due to the perception that it led to the outsourcing of jobs to Mexico, thus harming US citizens. Although this all suggests that economic regionalism harms the individual state because it weakens their economy and ~~and~~ leads to the outsourcing of jobs, this is in fact a weak argument because it is clear that states can benefit greatly from economic regionalism and are able to negotiate better deals as a group. This is highlighted by ~~how~~ the impact of Brexit - Obama said that if the UK chose to leave the EU it would be 'at the back of the queue' for a trade deal with the US. ~~†~~ This has indeed been the case, and the UK is struggling to negotiate trade deals currently, whereas it was skilled at asserting its interests from within the bloc. ~~For the~~ ~~adds~~ Also, economic regionalism increases prosperity - the EU is collectively in the third largest economy in the world, with an economy of around \$16 trillion. Trade between NAFTA/USMCA members has more than tripled, increasing prosperity across the region. This demonstrates how economic regionalism aids countries to grow, and also helps them negotiate good trade deals ~~from~~ with other states or regional blocs. Overall, while it is true that economic regionalism can

Sometimes cause economic problems, it is clear that it largely aids economic growth and enables states to ~~assert~~ ^{more} negotiate better trade deals, as part of the group, showing that to a greater extent, states are more likely to succeed and hold power when they are members of regional organisations than when they attempt to assert their interests individually.

Critics of regionalism may also argue that security regionalism leads to states ~~being~~ being less successful and less powerful. This is largely as they may find themselves being forced to get involved in intervention and also constrained as to their military power. Members of ASEAN, for example, have agreed not to develop nuclear weapons, which some may interpret as detrimental to ^{an individual} states' power, especially when considering that ~~other~~ there are strong states in the region, such as India and China, who are nuclear powers. ~~Also, they~~ This then could be seen as greatly limiting states' power and influence, thus showing they are better alone than as members of a regional group. Also, the African Union has a peacekeeping role in Africa, and this has led to it sending troops to, for example, Darfur in Sudan, and to Somalia. This could be interpreted as not in state's national interest, - ~~for~~ suggesting they would save military spending and citizens' lives by intervening less, suggesting

countries are less powerful and less likely to succeed when they are members of international organisations or regional organisations. However, this point is very weak because it fails to acknowledge the benefits of collective defence and the intergovernmental aspect of most regional groups. Within the AU, for example, states only join ~~harder~~ in with military intervention if they wish; there is no compulsion to do so, so state sovereignty is maintained. Indeed, they are more likely to be effective if they cooperate, showing that regional ~~or~~ groups neither ~~reduce~~ ^{limit} power nor reduce the success of a country. Also, the principle of collective defence enhances sovereignty because it strengthens the state's ~~rough~~ defined borders. NATO is a key example of a security-based regional group, and it was successful in preventing any attack from the USSR on member states throughout the Cold War. Although there are various reasons behind Russia's invasion of Ukraine in 2022, it is not a ~~coincidence~~ ^{coincidence} that Ukraine is one of the few countries bordering Russia who is not part of NATO - this suggests that NATO has been extremely effective at protecting smaller states who might otherwise be vulnerable to Russian attack. This demonstrates that security-based regional organisations increase the power of smaller states, rather than otherwise. Overall, it is clear that while not every policy pursued by

regional groups is necessarily in the nation's best interest, as a whole they protect borders and thus enhance sovereignty; within the majority of regional groups, states can also opt-out of policies they dislike. This shows that to a greater extent, countries are more likely to succeed and hold power as members of regional groups rather than as sovereign states.

Finally, perhaps the most significant argument a critic may make against regional organisations is that they significantly reduce political power. Regional organisations may sometimes become supranational in nature, exemplified by the EU, and thus can dictate to states, meaning countries may have to accept policies they disagree with. For example, the European Commission is the most powerful body within the EU, yet it is made up of non-elected commissioners who must swear to uphold the interests of the EU, over the interests of the home country. This can lead to the EU seeking to overrule governments and citizens, such as when it forced a second referendum on the Lisbon Treaty in Ireland. Also, economic integration often leads to political integration - USMCA members have the same laws standards on working conditions and the environment, to stop but this limits what national governments can do in these areas. This could suggest that states will hold more power and be more successful if they do not become members of regional organisations. However, this

is flawed, because the effects of pooling sovereignty are beneficial - states hold more power together than they do alone. This is highlighted by the recent dispute between Lithuania and China over Lithuania's involvement with Taiwan; alone, Lithuania would never have been able to stand up to China, but because it is part of the EU the bloc protected it, so it has been able to continue trading with Taiwan. This highlights how states are stronger, so more powerful and more likely to succeed, as part of regional groups. Overall, it is true that states often have to cede some political power to regional groups, but as otherwise they wouldn't work, but the enhancing of sovereignty through pooling it shows states are less successful if they try to act 'individually'.

In conclusion, it is clear that to a greater extent, states are better off within regional organisations. This is shown most clearly through economic regionalism, and the UK's struggles since leaving the EU, but also through the enhanced security of borders and the fact that pooling sovereignty gives states greater influence on the world stage. Therefore if states have less power and will be less successful if they act as sovereign states rather than as part of a regional group.



The first section covers the argument in support of sovereign states with the idea that regional organisations can weaken economic power with decision making passed to a regional body rather than to states. There is consideration of the impact of a single currency within the Eurozone for individual states including Germany and the PIIGS as well as renegotiation of the NAFTA and the outsourcing of jobs that can take place within trading blocs. It is pleasing to note evaluative consideration emerging from phrases such as “ this is a weak argument because”. The counter argument is covered with consideration of Obama statements about trading agreements which ultimately leads to further AO3.

The script moves to security considerations with the intervention and constraints of regional organisations discussed. ASEAN power and influence is compared with that of India and China and AU involvement in Darfur and Somalia is also discussed. Again, the candidate evaluates the argument quite clearly and explains in some detail why they come to this mini conclusion, with reference to NATO and Ukraine, making the point that collective defence enhances sovereignty and that security groups increase the power of smaller states.

There is further discussion focussed on the impact of regional organisations on political power with reference to EU supranationalism and the argument that there is often a focus on the interests of the EU above the nation state. There is further discussion before a relatively brief conclusion in which they weigh up a number of the earlier points.

Question 3 (b)

This response retains a clear focus on the particular demands of the questions throughout.

~~It is~~ It is less convincing to argue that countries are more likely to have power and succeed as sovereign states rather than in regional organisations. Regional organisations enhance state sovereignty, because by pooling sovereignty smaller nations are provided a larger voice in the global state, politically, economically ^{and} militarily.

Sovereignty is when the nation state has absolute power and does not give any of this away. Whilst the unity of regional organisations such as the EU, ASEAN and the AU can influence their success and power, they are ultimately the best way of achieving such.

~~Firstly~~ Firstly, there are extensive political advantages to get states if they are members of regional organisations which allows them to be more powerful and successful. The EU, for example, protects these states' shared political values of democracy and human rights from being eroded and ultimately is a more powerful political power abroad. The EU's ~~large soft~~ large-scale use of soft power accelerates the status of its member states, this evident through its conducting of peace talks and donations of over € 23.4 billion euros to aid developing states maintain industrialisation whilst reducing

their environmental impacts. The ^{political} power that they have collectively therefore makes them crucial within negotiating bodies, the organisation present, for example, as having 'observer status' in the UN ~~at~~ since 2011 and through its seat in the G7, where they can lobby political issues in favour of the EU's shared political values. This claim of enhancing the power of states / their success ^{EU} politically can be disputed because they reduce the power of individual nation states to negotiate policy internally, this being a supranational organisation, whereby states give away some sovereignty to central bodies of authority such as the European Commission. This is why the UK withdrew from the EU in 2016 following the Brexit referendum. However, this is less convincing, because alone the UK has less political influence this evident because although, unlike the USA, EU, they are a permanent member of the UN security council, they were not invited on the visit to China of the France PM and EU representative ^{in April 2023} over Taiwan with the US, therefore, the political power of a collective group of states is greater than a sovereign state and ~~to~~ sovereign states which act individually are not more likely to succeed.

Furthermore, regional institutions such as the EU,

A/EAN and the USMCA also function to further the economic interests of individual sovereign states. This can be seen as all 3 of these regional organisations have created free trade blocs which have removed tariffs and so have provided greater market places for goods. The EU has gone further in creating a unified currency, the euro, and ~~an~~ a Central European Bank. They also have policies such as the Common Agricultural Policy which places tariffs on imported agricultural goods from outside of Europe, prioritising the economic interests of industry within the EU. The statement that pooling sovereignty regionally enhances a state's economic power can be disputed, because organisations such as the EU can ~~prevent~~ ^{restrict} the formation of bilateral trade deals outside the EU, for ~~independent~~ ^{independent} nation states, with equally economically powerful countries such as the US (the world's biggest economy) and China (the world's largest exporter of goods). However, this argument is less convincing. Sovereign states' membership of regional organisations enhances their power economically because it provides guaranteed markets for trade and the EU, being the next largest ~~best~~ free trade bloc in the world, enhances this argument. Also, during financial crashes, such as the 2008 financial ~~crisis~~ ^{crisis}, the regional

organisation / currency was beneficial. For example, the European Central Bank was crucial to Greece's ~~the~~ recovery following their debt crisis in 2009, buying up their debt and ~~the~~ also reducing their loans to the IMF / money owed to the IMF. (They did this to maintain the collective strength of the euro and effectively enhanced state sovereignty by empowering Greece economically). Therefore, it is most compelling that states are not more likely to hold power or succeed as sovereign states, this is evident due to the benefits of their membership to regional organisations and the economic protections it seems to provide.

Finally, it can be argued that sovereign states who are not members of economic organisations are somewhat more likely to be ^{militarily} ~~economically~~ powerful / achieve ~~the~~ military success. This can be seen because the EU's response to the Russia-Ukraine war was failed to co-ordinate unified action, because whilst declaring their solidarity for Russia, Germany (a member of the EU) was simultaneously blocking the transport of weapons to Ukraine via Estonia and was later reluctant to develop sent over tanks in late 2022. By contrast, the sovereign state of the US succeeded in providing military aid, sanctions to

Russia and £ \$2 billion in financial assistance (this similar to the UK whose ability to impose economic sanctions was much more efficient, because they had not devolved their power elsewhere. Thus, it can be said that sovereign states are militarily stronger and so more likely to succeed because their is no requirement for responses to be unified, co-ordinated. However, this is less convincing. Although the EU, alongside other regional organisations such as ASEAN and the AU, are not as developed in conducting military foreign policy, the EU can largely work with NATO (another European organisation which coordinates western military responses) to work with them to resolve international external disputes. These regional organisations are however very effective in preventing external intervention to their member states, this being because as a single body, all of them possess developed militaries they are beneficial to deterring invasion. For example, in a post-Cold War Europe, countries who were previously Soviet-blocs, such as Poland have become part of the EU to increase their sovereignty and so provide them widespread protection to deter military intervention from Russia. Therefore, it is more convincing that regional organisations, rather than sovereign states

enhance power and chances of success militarily because collective responses have greater military resources (which have a large impact) although difficult to coordinate, and deter the other powers due to the threat of collective action.

Overall, it is less convincing that a sovereign state has greater power / is more likely to succeed than regional bodies. This is because regional bodies which pool sovereignty can enhance the authority of smaller nations politically, economically and militarily, thus increasing their representation on the international stage.



The response begins with a clear view expressed and with a range of reasons provided which indicate that we will be looking at political, economic and military implications of retaining sovereignty or belonging to a regional organisation. They begin with a consideration of the political consequences and advantages of belonging to a regional organisation and use the European Union as an example with reference to use of soft power and membership of international bodies but also consider the negative implications of membership of a regional organisation with an evaluative conclusion. They move to consider the economic implications and discuss the Euro, central bank and CAP as well as the negative implications of regional organisation membership in terms of trying to negotiate individual deals with examples. The military implications are covered in a consideration of the EU response to the Ukraine situation with both the strengths and weaknesses of collective action and regional organisation membership considered.

Question 3 (c)

Most responses to the question posed in Q3c provided a clear consideration of the strengths and weaknesses of the global community in dealing with the issue of the environment and the issue of human rights. It was pleasing when candidates were able to directly and consistently compare global governance across the two areas. Many candidates covered the UN Declaration of Human Rights 1948 and commented on the ability of the global community and more specifically global governance through the United Nations (UN) to successfully address human rights concerns. There was pleasing use of examples of UN decision making in the UN Security Council to both commend and condemn global governance relating to human rights. Large numbers of candidates chose to discuss a number of the special UN tribunals and to link the actions of the International Criminal Court to the United Nations where applicable.

The environment tended to focus on the UNFCCC and the environmental summits that have taken place, including Rio, Kyoto, Copenhagen and more recent summits including Paris. Candidates tended to focus on the almost universal commitment to tackling environmental degradation but, of course, contrasted this with the perceived inadequate actions of states. On the whole, candidates seemed well prepared to consider the merits and flaws in global governance across human rights and the environment but some struggled to evaluate the relative success of each.

This script immediately recognises that the focus of the response has to be on global governance through the United Nations. The candidate makes clear that they will consider global governance through a focus on UN institutions, the actions of powerful states and non-state actors linked to the UN. The introduction is well organised and clear in direction and outcome.

The United Nations is a collective group of nations who increasingly work together in global decision-making in a wide variety of different organisations. The extent to which the UN address human rights issues more successfully than environmental concerns can be examined through UN institutions, ~~powerful~~ the actions of powerful states and the rise in non-state actors through the UN. I believe that despite increasing focus on the environment, the UN so far has better addressed human rights issues.

Firstly, the UN has established an increased number of institutions to combat ~~the~~ global issues. Looking at the environment, the United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change has played a pivotal role in addressing climate change. Firstly, the 1997 Kyoto summit introduced the Cap and Trade system along with binding targets on emission reductions. The C&T system provided a financial incentive for countries to hit this target of a 5.2% reduction being able to sell excess 'emission tokens' to countries who have gone over target. The 2009 Copenhagen summit under the UNFCCC saw ~~an~~ developed nations pledge \$210 billion to developing nations in order to adapt to climate change which shows worldwide commitment and the 2015 Paris agreement

saw legally binding targets placed on countries to reduce emissions. This shows a successful focus by the UN on climate change with China and India pledging to cut emissions to 60% and 40% of 2005 levels respectively and the EU targeting to be Net Zero by 2050. Therefore the UN has successfully gone towards combatting environmental issues. However, the Paris agreement allowed countries to decide their own NDCs (emission targets) and due to 'significantly unambitious' targets by Russia in particular, global temperature is still forecast to rise by 3°C compared to the 1.5°C target. Therefore it can be said that by analysing UN institutions human rights issues have been better addressed. Firstly, the UN negotiated the terms of the Rome statute which countries signed to create the ICC. While some countries do not recognise the ICC's jurisdiction, it has been successful in enforcing Human Rights through the prosecutions of Katangwa and Lubanga in the DR Congo civil war. The UN also set up special tribunals in response to conflicts which successfully set international standards and prosecute offenders. The Rwandan tribunal established rape as a form of genocide and set a precedent for media could be guilty of encouraging genocide as a crime against humanity showing changes to international law. The Cambodian tribunal saw the prosecution of 3 officials in Rougi's government and the Sierra Leone tribunal prosecuted head of State, Charles Taylor, showing that the government weren't

exempt from international law. ~~and~~ Therefore, UN institutions are much more successful in ~~and~~ protecting and enforcing human rights with it being binding on some nations while environmental institutions are not binding and place too much responsibility on the developed world.

Secondly, we can examine the UN's influence on powerful states in ~~related~~ relation to human rights and the environment.

~~Powerful states are those~~ Weaknesses in human rights protection suggests a greater success for environmental concerns. The veto power of the UN Security Council significantly weakens the enforcement of international law. Russia have used the veto 152 times since the cold war preventing intervention in Syria due to alliances with the Assad regime and also in its own invasion of Georgia and the Ukraine. This suggests a limit to human rights protection as powerful states in the UNSC can not be prevented from ~~impugning~~ rights. As well as this, the UN has had a significant impact on powerful states on ~~over~~ environmental issues with developed countries committing to the Global Apollo Programme in which just 0.2% of the ~~the~~ countries GDP is committed to advancing green technology. Biden's re-entring of the Paris agreement also shows the growing concern and the success of the UN in tackling environmental issues. Despite this, Trump's withdrawal from Paris and Russia's ambitious ~~targets~~ INDCs of just 70% of 1990 levels suggests failure of

the UN ~~is~~ is solving environmental issues. This suggests a greater focus and therefore success is placed on ~~the~~ human rights issues. Since the Cold War, the US has been committed to spreading liberal values and have done so through UN peacekeeping missions. Firstly, intervention in Bosnia and Kosovo helped to spread democracy and the protection of rights with the enforcement of the Dayton peace plan agreement in Bosnia and the enforcement of the UN police commissioner Richard Mark as head of police in Kosovo. This shows how the UN and powerful states have been successful in ~~sp~~ protecting human rights. The UN intervention in East Timor also established their independence and move to democracy and therefore, via the democratic peace thesis, made conflict and human rights violations less prevalent. ~~It~~ This shows how the spread of democracy has resulted in powerful states having greater ~~success~~ focus on Human Rights rather than the environment via the UN.

Finally, the UN have endorsed a number of non-state actors in summits and decision making. The number of environmental non-state actors suggests great success on the issue. Firstly, Greta Thunberg addressed ~~the~~ the UN at the 2019 summit emphasising the need for commitment to reducing climate change. As well as this, the 2018 Marrakesh Summit placed greater need for non-state actors to combat climate change encouraging the

development of the C-40 cities group in which 90 cities around the world commit to ~~de~~ reducing emissions and increasing green space as well as the Breakthrough Energy Venture funded by billionaires such as Gates with the aim to fund greater green technology. This shows how the global community has placed greater pressure on solving climate change. ~~and~~ This can also be seen in the growth of non-governmental organisations such as Extinction Rebellion or Greenpeace who protest and campaign for environmental protection. Despite this, while this raises attention to the issue, human rights based non-state actors have had greater focus and a more hands-on approach. Firstly, work by Amnesty International has uncovered Human Rights abuses with the Windrush Scandal in the UK and the prosecution of the Rohingya Muslims in Myanmar and China. Global celebrities such as Emma Watson have also fought for greater rights for humans with the He for She campaign. ~~Humanitarian~~ Humanitarian relief programmes such as Christian Aid or the Red Cross ~~at~~ following the earthquake in Turkey and Syria this year also shows a great success in providing relief. UN charities such as Water Aid and the UN High Commissioner for Refugees have been crucial in protecting the 7 million ~~relocated~~ relocated people around the world following natural disasters and protecting their human rights. This shows UN non-state actors to have a more hands on and effective role in human rights ~~issues~~ than environmental issues.

In conclusion, I believe that the work of UN institutions and non-state actors have more successfully protected human rights than environmental concerns due to the binding nature of institutions and interventions and the more hands-on approach by NGOs in providing relief and protection of human rights.



The first section covers institutions and begins with a consideration of the environment with knowledge of Kyoto with cap and trade, binding targets and emission reductions all open for discussion. There is detail on further conferences including Copenhagen, Paris and a good level of detail. They also consider the negative elements of environmental global governance before moving to human rights global governance. Human rights global governance considers UN special tribunals in Rwanda, and Sierra Leone as well as the actions and merit of the International Criminal Court. There is a conclusion drawn and this explains why human rights global governance is considered to have been more successful.

The candidate moves to consider the actions of powerful states and begins with an evaluation of the actions of the UN Security Council including veto use relating to Syria, Georgia and Ukraine. The environment is also considered with reference to the actions of Biden and Trump. The candidate returns to UN peacekeeping missions and questions their effectiveness in protecting human rights with examples before an alternative view based on actions in East Timor.

The final section relates to non-state actors linked to the UN and gives examples linked to both the environment and human rights including the UNHCR. There is a relatively brief conclusion.

Paper Summary

The key advice remains to focus on the demands of the assessment objectives.

Not all candidates appear to recognise that different assessment objectives are expected in different questions with AO1 and AO2 expected in section 1 and section 2 of the examination paper whilst the final section demands not only AO1 and AO2 but also AO3.

The key to success in responding to the longer questions set is to recognize that the performance level of an essay is decided by all three of the assessment objectives. In the final extended essay section, whilst Assessment Objective 1 (AO1) knowledge may help a candidate to achieve a theoretical 10 of the available 30 marks, there are still 20 marks available for AO2 for analysis of political information and AO3 for evaluation of political information.

A large proportion of candidates score well in AO1 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 AO2 revolve around the ability to provide an analysis with chains of reasoning, drawing on similarities and differences within political information with connections between ideas and concepts.

With AO3 the evaluation will, at the highest level be based on fully effective arguments and judgements, which are consistently substantiated and lead to fully focused and justified conclusions.

Many successful candidates are able to make clear the direction that they propose to follow through their introduction. There are examples in this report where candidates outline a view and then put forward a set of criteria or signposts that they intend to follow in their response and this often indicates that a well-considered and thoughtful response is about to follow.

Whilst AO3 is of significance in the longer questions within the final section of the examination paper, it is important that candidates recognise that AO3 is not expected in the first two sections of the examination paper and that AO1 and AO2 time can be reduced if spent on unnecessary and unrewarded AO3.

Where quotations are used it is certainly beneficial to make clear why they are being used and how they support whichever argument is being made. In isolation a quote may illustrate some level of knowledge but it does need to be made relevant.

Grade boundaries

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

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

