



Examiners' Report

June 2024

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 2024

Publications Code 9PL0_3B_2406_ER

All the material in this publication is copyright

© Pearson Education Ltd 2024

Introduction

It was pleasing to note that many candidates had been well-prepared for this examination series. The examination paper and questions seemed to be accessible and were able to support differentiation. There were some truly outstanding scripts that were able to merge AO1 Knowledge and Understanding with AO2 Analysis in the 12-mark questions and also able to incorporate AO3 Evaluation skills in the longer responses.

Stronger candidates were able to supply in-depth knowledge with impressive contemporary examples, in order to make clear their understanding of the topic areas covered in this series. Stronger responses were able to demonstrate thorough and in-depth knowledge and understanding of institutions, theories, concepts and issues. Perceptive analysis was evident in many such responses, with sustained and logical chains of reasoning. Although AO3 remains a challenge to many candidates, there was a significant proportion of candidates who understood the need fully to construct relevant evaluation with substantiated arguments and judgements, leading to fully-focused and justified conclusions.

Stronger responses tended to focus carefully on the phrasing of the questions, often making repeated references to the title as they proceeded to analyse and evaluate.

Selection of options was relatively even across the two optional sections in the paper. In Section A the most popular of the two questions was the question on the International Monetary Fund (IMF) and World Bank. In Section C the most popular selection was the question on the advantages and disadvantages of globalisation. The second most-popular response was the question on hard and soft power effectiveness for states.

Question 1 (a)

This was the least popular of the two questions that candidates were able to select from in this section of the paper.

There was a pleasing range of responses. This indicated that the question had worked well as a discriminator and allowed candidates to make clear their AO1 and AO2 ability.

Some candidates missed a focus on the key element of addressing environmental issues and wrote a general response. These focussed on the differences between shallow-green and deep-green ecology. Direct comparison and contrast worked very well, where candidates avoided simply outlining deep-green ideas followed by an outlining of shallow-green ideas.

A small number of candidates focussed purely on a national, typically UK, perspective.

This is an example of a strong script that demonstrates accurate knowledge and understanding. Analysis is also strong and there is a pleasing level of comparison between shallow – and deep-green ecology throughout.

The script could provide a little more comparison but it covers much, given the time constraints. It includes reference to thinkers and theory and includes examples to show how both branches of ecologism propose addressing environmental issues.

The terms shallow green ecology and deep green ecology, coined by Norwegian environmentalist Arne Naess, set out very different ways in which ~~the~~ environmental issues should be tackled.

The biggest difference between the two are in the moral aspects to ideologies. Shallow green ecologists are anthropocentric, meaning they ~~are~~ still place human as above the environment and nature, and thus the ways in which ~~humans~~ we tackle the global warming and climate change ~~with~~ ~~the~~ prioritize human above animals, and also assume humans are responsible for the world, as set out in Genesis when humans were made steward of the environment by God. For shallow ecologists, ^{this} means ~~placing~~ ^{giving} ~~preparance~~ ^{to} ~~humans~~ ^{to} tackle environmental problems, such as energy recycling, ^{but} ~~and~~ still prioritizing humans' ^{so these tools and not too serious} needs. For deep ecologists, they reject this as moral grounds, as they see events, and believe

humans are no more superior to animals, and also believe in holism; this is the belief in the interconnectedness of nature and how humans live within these ecosystems, not above or superior to them. Thus, deep ecologists' ~~beliefs~~ are much more extreme and prioritize nature such as introducing bio regions, national parks and encouraging biodiversity. They also advocate population control or quotas, which encapsulates their lack of prioritization of human ~~rights~~ which shallow ecologists would fundamentally disagree with.

is influenced by the neo-mathematical belief that we will one day be rid of humans on earth and be able to sustain life.

Another fundamental difference is that shallow ecologists are much more reformist and far less extreme. They believe we can ~~be~~ tackle climate change while still maintaining structures in our society today, such as capitalism, and an economy which ~~require~~ thrives on growth and production.* For deep ecologists, they don't believe this goes far enough and methods must be much more extreme and radical. They advocate for abolishing our current economic structures which promote commodity fetishism (learned by Naomi Klein) which damages the environment. To tackle our environmental problems a health... ~~should~~

and capitalism cannot coexist, as argued by
George Marshall. Instead we must advocate
for 'happy economics' or 'Buddhist econo-
mics' and destroy capitalism in order to tackle
climate change - a move considered too
extreme by shallow ecologists.

* They believe incremental changes, which have futurism (i.e.
being in the interests of our children and grandchildren) as the
primary focus, are sufficient to tackle environmental problems, and
focus more on sustainable development, as covered in the
Brundtland Report of 1987.



ResultsPlus
Examiner Comments

There is pleasing use of political terminology linked to the two theories and a useful list of how both shallow and deep ecologists propose addressing environmental issues.

Shallow ecology discussion is linked with prioritising humans and to actions such as recycling, whereas deep ecologism is linked by the candidate to factors such as introduction of bio-regions, and population control. There is a useful comparison on the two approaches to capitalism, growth and production.

Total: 11 marks



ResultsPlus
Examiner Tip

Use of phrases like "another fundamental difference" and "whereas" indicate that the candidate is carrying out a sustained and direct comparison.

This is an example of a script that performs better on AO1 Knowledge and Understanding than AO2 Analysis.

Chosen question number: Question 1(a) Question 1(b)

Shallow green ecologists are sometimes known as reformist ecologists because they believe that environmental issues can be tackled by mitigating consequences ~~through~~ within a capitalist and consumerist culture. ~~Deep ecologists~~ They hold that environmental issues must be solved so that humans do not face severe consequences that would arise from global average temperature rise and extreme weather that would damage food supply and cause climate migration. They are often associated with the ideas of sustainable development where the consumable needs of the present are met without damaging the capacity for future generations to consume.

They recognise the beneficial way that economic growth can aid development & alleviate poverty and therefore support the idea of developing countries having less responsibility to reduce emissions.

Shallow ecologists believe that limits to fossil fuels and transition to green energy will maintain consumerist culture and will be enforced through existing global institutions and by the will of ~~the~~ liberal economies.

Deep-green ecologists however are sometimes known as radical ecologists because they believe that economies need to be revolutionised so that the environment is protected as an end in itself not as a means for human flourishing.

It is instead associated with Arne Naess' ideas of complex interdependence that recognises that any damage to the environment will have knock-on effects on biodiversity.

Deep ecologists oppose mass-consumerism and believe that wealth should be redistributed so global poverty can be alleviated without overall consumption being on a large upwards trend.

Klein, a deep ecologist advocated for 'system change not climate change' arguing that current global institutions were insufficient in tackling the endemic nature of environmental damage.



The introduction is factual and covers shallow ecology with a sufficient knowledge linked to elements such as sustainable development. This is justified, because it allows economic growth, which can aid development and alleviate poverty, and maintain a consumerist culture.

At this point, the candidate has not examined differences, however. They then move to explaining deep ecology. There is accurate knowledge of both shallow and deep ecology but not all knowledge is focussed on how shallow and deep ecology would address environmental issues.

In outlining shallow and deep ecology in isolation the candidate is relying on the reader to carry out the comparison and analysis. Generally, they leave the reader to identify the differences, rather than making them clear.

The AO1 is certainly stronger than the AO2, here.

Total: 7 marks



Compare and contrast directly, rather than explain different ideologies, theories or organisations, in isolation.

Question 1 (b)

This was the more popular of the two questions that candidates were able to select from in this section of the paper.

There was a pleasing range of responses, which indicated that the question had worked well as a discriminator and allowed candidates to make clear their AO1 and AO2 ability. A number of candidates continually referenced the failure of the IMF and the World Bank, rather than the phrase in the question, which was weakness. It seemed that some candidates were prepared for a failure question.

There is overlap between failure and weakness so this was not necessarily a problem for those candidates. Candidates were able to make clear that there are different weaknesses of the IMF and World Bank or that one institution has a greater weakness in one area than the other institution. This was often the sign of a stronger candidate but candidates were certainly able to access all levels of the mark scheme without focus on this point.

Most candidates focussed on Structural Adjustment Programs (SAPs)/Washington Consensus, voting dominance and western dominance generally, as well as environmental impact and failure to resolve global poverty.

This is an example of a script that just achieves a Level 4 mark. It has a good focus on the question and there is consistent comparative analysis.

Chosen question number: Question 1(a) Question 1(b)

One weakness that both the IMF and World Bank have is that they both push a neo liberal agenda onto the countries that they give loans too. A Neo Liberal economics is ~~sometimes~~ pushed by the USA, which ^{is because} ~~because~~ the USA have too much power in these institutions. This ~~is a weakness~~ This can be seen by how in the IMF a vote needs 85% to pass and the USA have 17.25%. So their approval is needed for votes, also the IMF is always run by a European. This can also be seen in the World Bank as the leader is always from the USA. This is a weakness as neoliberal economics need a democracy in place to usually work effectively and often the developing countries do not have a democracy or they democracy has corruption. Therefore the loans and advice that the IMF and World Bank give out are not suitable for these countries.

Another weakness of both the IMF and the World Bank is that their policies give TNCs too much power in the developing countries. This is because the policies try to encourage TNCs to move into the countries to help improve growth however as these companies have a lot of money they use this

to their advantage. This then leads to ~~de~~ damaging effects on the countries that the IMF and World Bank are trying to support. For example TNCs can cause a large amount of environmental damage to these countries as they are not developed enough to have the infrastructure to reduce problems such as pollution. This can be seen by how in ~~2010~~ 2010 TNCs caused \$12.2 trillion billion of damage to the environment. Also TNCs can lead to local industries dying off as they are not able to compete with their lower prices. This is a weakness of the IMF and World Bank because their policies cause new problems for the countries in need.

Another weakness of the IMF and World Bank is that they do not always consider the social consequences of their policies. This is because they will often implement policies that sound good economically but not think about how it will affect the lives of the people living there. For example the policies that create new jobs are beneficial however it often leads to exploitation as these countries don't have the laws in place to protect workers over issues such as long working hours or having a minimum wage. This can also be seen by how the World Bank tried to introduce a nation in developing countries ^{where} ~~with~~

children had to pay a small amount for school in order to raise revenue however most of the children could not afford this so it led to them prostituting themselves in order to get the money. This shows a weakness of the IMF and World Bank as they do not always consider how their policies will affect the quality of life in these countries.



ResultsPlus
Examiner Comments

The script begins well with discussion of a neo-liberal agenda and moves to USA/Western dominance of the organisations, which they explain and example.

There is an interesting point made about the relevance of democracy to the working of the two organisations. There is a lengthy discussion on Trans-National Corporations (TNCs) linked to the two organisations, and what was felt to be a slightly weaker, albeit relevant, point about social impact and consequences.

The response starts well, covers a range of factors and has consistent comparative analysis.

Total: 10 marks



ResultsPlus
Examiner Tip

Cover a range of factors, to help your answer.

This is considered to be a particularly strong response, which makes several valid points that are supported and evidenced effectively.

Chosen question number: **Question 1(a)** **Question 1(b)**

It is clear that both the IMF and World Bank share weaknesses, such as the use of Structural Adjustment Programmes (SAPs). This is due to the loans they provide acting conditionally, based on the acceptance of free market and free trade integration. This has vast criticism as SAPs ~~are~~ can be viewed as 'shock therapy', for most countries adoption of these values is detrimental to social policy and welfare. This is due to SAPs prioritising privatisation and prioritising economic growth over the stability of the population. An example of this occurred in Argentina ~~to~~, ~~£~~ with a loan of \$57bn from the IMF. Loans such as these can often lead to the breakdown of social structure ~~due~~ as economy's are not strong enough to sustain such adjustment is limited time, some loans expecting repayment in 12 years. This shows a significant weakness in both the IMF and World Bank as SAPs ~~can less~~ can reduce the benefit of the loans by potentially destroying the economy and lessening public spending that is required for development.

Further weaknesses of the IMF and World Bank

include the structural dominance that the USA has retained since 1944. In the IMF the USA ~~is~~ holds 15% of the vote share, similarly in the World Bank the USA has 9%. This shows great inequalities and weaknesses in the structures as it is ~~not~~ wholly disproportionate from the expectation of such global institutions. In the World Bank India retains only 2% of the vote share with the largest population and a growing country. This ~~shows~~ ~~is~~ ~~not~~ ^{proves} clear disparity in the structural fairness of these institutions as they allow for the USA to push their aims and ideologies ~~and~~ ~~not~~ allow for geo-strategic investment. This is a significant weakness for the IMF and World Bank as it weakens their legitimacy and effectiveness in ~~fairly~~ ~~to~~ fulfilling their aims as fairly and evenly across the globe as possible.

Lastly, ~~neither~~ ^{both} the IMF and World Bank ~~are~~ are weakened by their overly-ideological approach to ~~is~~ spreading free trade and neo-liberal values. Such global institutions have been criticised due to ~~not~~ ~~is~~ placing too much value ~~on~~ on western ideology and enforcing the Washington Consensus. It ~~is~~ ^{has} recognised most recently in Afghanistan, such ~~was~~ ~~its~~ economic ideas cannot be

candidate 'one size fits all' For this reason the IMF and World Bank ~~show~~ ^{are weakened} due to the ~~the~~ amplifying of the West/Global North. This can lead to the formation of the World Dependency Theory and strengthens the impact on the 'bottom billion' that have not benefitted from neo-liberal values, such as Sub-Saharan Africa. like Burundi Faso. ~~The~~ Therefore a prominent weakness is found in the IMF and World Bank due to their disregard and blind faith in neo-liberal values to create growth, when it is clear that this is not always the case and should be accounted for.



ResultsPlus
Examiner Comments

The script begins by covering SAPs with detailed explanation as to how this has led to weakness in both organisations. An example is used to support this view.

The candidate moves to a discussion on structural weakness linked to a perceived US dominance and weaker representation for other states. The candidate links this effectively to the suggestion that weakness is based on questionable legitimacy.

The candidate continues to cover the "one size fits all" criticism although this could be developed further. They also link the institutions to Dependency theory and ultimately suggest that weakness is linked to blind faith in neoliberal values to create growth.

Total: 12 marks

Question 2

The question on the anarchical society and society of states theory worked very well as a discriminator and led to a full range of responses. Focus tended to be on the concepts of anarchy and cooperation and some candidates provided a depth of knowledge on Hedley Bull and the English School.

Candidates were able to access all levels without a focus on Hedley Bull, as long as they were able to cover both the realist and liberal views that are associated with the theory.

Some candidates simply gave all of the knowledge that they had on realism and liberalism and seemed to 'hope for the best'. They were rewarded where their knowledge, understanding and associated analysis were relevant. A large number of candidates included synoptic elements in their response.

This is an example of a comfortable Level 4 script, which covers significant ground in the time available.

The candidate has a clear understanding of the requirements of the question.

2 Analyse how realism and liberalism differ over the main ideas of the anarchical society and society of states theory.

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

(12)

Hedley Bull's 'English school' model of the anarchical society draws on key elements of both realism and liberalism. It accepts the core assumptions of realism, namely the statist model (that states are the most powerful actors of the world stage.) The theory also assumes the realist view of international anarchy between states due to the lack of an overarching sovereign. This represents a scaled up version of the traditional Hobbesian view of the state of nature represented in international relations where states, like individuals, ruthlessly pursue their own self interest. Liberalism would reject this principle, arguing that, as individuals are inherently benign and cooperative, states will be too; a system of cooperation exists between states naturally and inherently, rather than a state of international anarchy.

However, the anarchical society model argues that out of this international anarchy, rules and norms can emerge leading to cooperation in a

'society of states' model. This reflects Rousseau's 'stag hunt' scenario: although there are risks in cooperation, states will do so for mutual gain, as rational actors. This contradicts the perspective of realists, who believe true cooperation cannot exist due to a lack of trust between states - the prisoners' dilemma. Anarchical society theory argues shared values and norms will gradually develop through rational state actors cooperating for mutual gain in intergovernmental organisations, a liberal perspective on international relations. Liberals believe in the rationality of human nature, and therefore states, and that they are naturally cooperative. However there are some differences: liberalism states these shared values ~~emerge~~ exist naturally due to human nature, whereas the society of states theory argues they will develop over time; it argues also that states will decide to ignore or work outside IGOs on a temporary basis when it conflicts with national interest, whereas liberals argue it will always be in a states' interests to cooperate with others. Finally, the anarchical society theory is modelled on the principle of states as the only significant actors, while liberals prefer a 'mixed actor model' which

argues the significance of non-state actors like IGOs, NGOs and TNCs.



There is evident awareness of the origin of the theory and that it brings together elements of realism and liberalism.

Synopticity is required to achieve the highest level and it is duly provided. There is a contrast between the stag hunt theory and the prisoner's dilemma.

After continued contrast and comparison between realism and liberalism, the candidate concludes with a discussion linked to the realist state focus versus the liberal mixed actor model.

There is a really pleasing knowledge throughout and an absolute focus on the question.

Total: 12 marks



Focus on the specific question to secure a top level score.

Synopticity is also required to achieve the top level.

This is an example of a script which is placed at the top of Level 2, with some accurate knowledge.

Some knowledge is selected appropriately to underpin analysis and there is some emerging comparative analysis.

2 Analyse how realism and liberalism differ over the main ideas of the anarchical society and society of states theory.

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

(12)

The Anarchical society and society of states theory was introduced by Hedley Bull in 1977. Realists believe ~~the~~ Bull supports the Realist principle that state nation states seek to exert power and influence over other states, he ~~is~~ supports Hobbes theory that ~~on~~ a strong rule is necessary to protect the nation state. Bull would support the ~~Chinese~~ ^{realist} Chinese developments in the South China Sea, as he believes it as a realist way of protecting the nation state. In the South China Sea, China began to build structures to assert power and influence. In ~~this~~ this way, Bull supports the idea that a state should seek to assert power and dominance, however, he rejects the idea that conflict is inevitable due to this.

This differs from the liberal view, whilst Bull believes in the realist theory of the exertion of power, he also uses liberal thought in his society of states theory. Bull supported Locke's view that nation states are naturally cooperative and that human nature is rational and will work together. Bull argued that due to this natural cooperation, nation states are able to create a 'society of states' where the states become intrinsically linked. Bull ~~would have supported~~ ^{'model was seen in} the rise of the G20 following the 2007-2009 global financial crash. The G20 began aiding the global economy in order to help boost it for all nations. These global economies pumped \$1 trillion into the global economy, so that the financial crash would not continue to harm the global economy. Bull's model is in support of institutions.

such as the UNO, as he believes supports the liberal principle that humans are naturally cooperative. However, Bull rejects that liberalism is too idealistic, whereas realism is more likely, with states seeking to assert international power over other states.

Liberal thought and realist thought differ in relation to the anarchical society theory. Realists believe that states exert power, whereas liberals believe that states work together, although Bull thought this to be achievable, but too idealistic.



The response shows a knowledge of Hedley Bull and provides a synoptic link, which would make it eligible for Level 4 if it met the standard throughout the rest of the response.

The response explains elements of realism with an example. The introduction is a little mixed because it provides some knowledge of the theory and some basic link to Realism and Liberalism.

The candidate explains how realism differs from the Liberal view and explains the Liberal view with reference to a society of states and also provides an example to illustrate this.

The script does not go beyond providing some accurate knowledge and some emerging comparative analysis. Within Level 2 it is closer to the description of Level 3 than Level 1 and therefore is placed at the top of Level 2.

Level 2

Total: 6 marks

Question 3 (a)(x)

This question seemed to be answered quite well by most candidates, who were able to employ contemporary examples to support their line of argument.

There was a minority of candidates who confused the two terms, particularly with reference to economic sanctions. The term 'effective' was key in this question and stronger candidates made it a focus throughout their responses.

Some candidates were keen to discuss the use of smart power. This worked well where they were able to use it to measure and compare state effectiveness in the use of both soft and hard power.

This was considered to be a top level script, which is particularly strong on AO1 Knowledge and Understanding as well as AO2 Analysis.

AO3 is a little weaker than the other AOs but this is still a very strong response to the question posed.

Chosen question number: Question 3(a) Question 3(b) Question 3(c)

States do not find the use of hard power to be more effective than soft power, as they are at their most effective when establishing their smart power. While hard power is ~~increasingly~~ ^{increasingly} important in ~~ensuring~~ ^{ensuring} a nation's security, their use of soft power (i.e. cultural) and economic ^{smart} power is of most effectiveness.

~~When nations combine their soft and smart~~
~~Neither 'hard' nor 'soft' power are of greater effectiveness, but when combined, they~~
~~allow nations state to exhibit power globally.~~
Hard power can often be detrimental to a nation's objectives, and ~~thus 'smart' and 'soft' power are of greater effectiveness.~~

Joseph Nye's notion of 'smart power' is of ~~most~~ ^{most} effectiveness to nation states, as it allows them to ~~also~~ exhibit economic power globally, while fostering amicable diplomatic ties. China's 'Belt and Road' initiative has invested over ~~\$~~ \$1 trillion in over 150 nations, seeing China grow in a major player in global actor in the global south. China's 'vaccine diplomacy' in 2021 saw them give 9 billion equivalent vaccines to the developing world, while

the Trump administration was engaged in
nativist 'vaccine nationalism'. This context
allowed China to boast its image
globally, while it took advantage of
its economic might through its creation
of the vaccine. This 'debt diplomacy' saw
nations like Honduras pivot to China,
challenging the notion of "the US being
a big dog, everywhere, while China is
a big dog in its own backyard". China's
principal use of its 'smart power' was
its devaluing of its currency in the 1990s.
This saw Chinese exports rise significantly,
while it was able to establish amicable
ties with Europe through free-trade.
The US has also been a great exponent
of 'smart power', as by using its military
hard power to establish over 800 bases
globally, it has been able to align itself
with nations all over the world - notably
in the middle east. The EU's Cotonou
Agreement is a further example of the
effectiveness of 'smart power', as it
encourages nations to foster beneficial
human rights laws to gain access to
lucrative free-markets. However, it would be

crisis to suggest that 'smart power' works for all nations, as for many with smaller economies, or a less defined set of values, a combination of the two isn't viable. Despite this, for ~~smart power~~ by combining their 'hard' and 'soft' power, states are able to maximise their position on the world stage.

Furthermore, there is great value in suggesting that 'soft power' is more effective than 'hard power' as it allows nations to spread their culture and influence globally, in an amicable, non-violent way. The Chinese 'Confucius Institute' has been key in spreading Chinese values of collectivism globally as a bulwark against western individualism. This has helped China as by spreading its values, ~~the~~ it has challenged the western value based order. Besides, for its power on the UN Security Council, a key reason why China's perception of Uyghur Muslims has gone unpunished is its support globally. By spreading its ideology, China has created a bloc against western values which challenge it. Soft power can

also be used in a much more visible way. Both the Queen and Sir David Attenborough's address at the COP 26 summit in Glasgow (2021) were key in establishing the UK's agenda for greater environmental sustainability. By exporting popular icons globally, the UK has been able to establish its identity in the post-colonial world. The spread of western liberalism and materialism through Hollywood news also key in setting up the neo-liberal 'Washington Consensus' post-war. It also played a part in the fall of the USSR, as communism could not compete with western materialism. PJ O'Rourke's view that "no one wants to wear Bulgarian shoes" highlights this. Nevertheless, soft power can be limited, as it is often only effective where the ~~the~~ ^{exporting} ~~exporting~~ nation has an absence of 'hard power' too. For example, although the US was able to disseminate western values, its military dominance and role as a global policeman in the Carter heyday of the 1970s - 80s.

Soft power in many ways more effective than hard power, as it allows nations to push their values and agendas globally, yet in a peaceable way.

Although the effectiveness of 'smart' and 'soft' power are greater than that of 'hard' power, ~~for~~ it too is still of utmost importance in establishing a nation's identity globally. Russia's use of 'hard' power in its ~~and~~ invasion of Ukraine on the 24th February 2022 has been effective for Putin, as it has established Russia as a nation to be feared. Its recent influence in Georgia has also been key in threatening the EU, as Putin wished to avoid his dominance on the continent to prevent further expansion. That said, Putin's use of hard power has been limited, as his 'Special military operation' in Ukraine has been stagnant and ineffective, as his objective of ending NATO expansionism has been undermined by the accession of Finland and Sweden. This highlights how hard power can be limited in its effectiveness, as at best

it establishes military authority, it can often provoke reactions from states deemed as hostile. Israel's use of hard power in Gaza has also been detrimental to its global standing - with ICJ and ICC directives calling for Netanyahu's arrest. Gaza highlights how 'smart power' or 'soft power' would be of greater effectiveness, as Israeli leadership toward a two-state solution would've seen international support and peace in the region. As the US war on terror exhibits similar traits, or rather than ending terrorism, it tarnished the west's image. Overall, hard power can be effective in establishing authority, and power, however, 'smart' and 'soft' power are often much more effective as they are peaceable and ^{diplomatic}.

Overall, the use of hard power is of lesser effectiveness than soft power as it can often be detrimental. In truth, the combination of the two into 'smart power' is much more effective, as it establishes power and ~~dominance~~ ^{influence} in an amicable way. In a recent Leading Podcast Dr Comfort Eno explained how the US's use of soft and smart power has been a leading exponent in its legacy in the post-colonial world, thus



This response covers a huge amount of territory in terms of AO1 and examples are used throughout in support. The introduction may not be as strong and convincing as other responses but the response does grow in strength as it progresses.

There are contemporary examples used in support, and perceptive analysis of points raised. The candidate does discuss smart power at times but that is within a framework of comparing and contrasting hard and soft power.

AO3 evaluation is not as strong. At the very top end, evaluation needs to be fully relevant, fully effective, substantiated, justified and focussed.

Nevertheless this is, overall, a very strong response.

Total: 27 marks



Remaining relevant is key to achieve the higher levels.

You can achieve this by referencing the specific central words in the question, periodically.

Question 3 (a)(y)

This is an example of a lower level script that finds it difficult to evidence knowledge and understanding, analysis, and, particularly, evaluation.

Chosen question number: Question 3(a) Question 3(b) Question 3(c)

~~States will use~~ The use of hard power is excessive force in order for a state to gain control, whereas soft power is slow and stable ~~type~~ management of another state in order for a state to benefit. Both hard and soft power are used in order to gain benefit for a state, this occurs due to the realists view that states are selfish and only care for their purpose. This essay will discuss the effectiveness of both hard and soft power in ~~order to discuss~~ ~~types of~~ ~~geopolitical~~ ~~systems~~ ~~potentially~~ the multipolar world we live in today.

Currently the world can be considered a multipolar system where multiple countries and regions dominate the world stage. The use of hard power to gain control over another state could be considered ineffective however if the state attempting is a superpower it is possible to enforce hard power. For example Russia's attempt of invasion of Ukraine in 2022 shows how hard power can be effective with limited consequences. This is explained by the fact that Russia is a superpower which is expressed as a state with incredible military and intergovernmental influence. Russia's intergovernmental influence as a permanent member in the United Nations Security Council has allowed the prevention of significant instant actions imposed on them, such as military threat. This ~~is also~~ Military threat is also reduced due to

their military size. However due to the complex interconnectivity of the globalised world countries such as the UK has been able to reduce Russia's use of economic instruments by slowing down their economy. For example freezing Russian bank accounts in the UK. In conclusion while hard power is incredibly effective at achieving objectives to occur instantly, the globalised world causes the instant effectiveness of hard power to be lost simultaneously in the long run due to other credible nations and regions. Therefore hard power in a multipolar world is highly inefficient.

Soft power Soft power has a positive outlook from liberals, since the slow and stable use of power over a country can impact be beneficial for both. For example the UK government has used soft power over Rwanda in order to place illegal migrants entering the UK. The reason this could have a positive outlook is that it prevents illegal activity, therefore benefiting the UK and also providing an influx of possible workers for Rwanda. However due to the multipolar system, with the growth of regions such as the EU, the UK has adopted and kept the European Convention of Human Rights which has ultimately eroded sovereignty in the UK, leading to significant delays in the process of the Rwanda bill. Therefore in conclusion, while soft power is a longer process due to significantly powerful countries and regions affecting the process, the slow development of soft power is ultimately effective in the long run.

In conclusion, hard power and soft power possess issues due to the multipolar society. However the multipolar society can be seen as beneficial for liberals as it helps prevent the promotion of hard power occurring, and the use of soft power will occur more frequently, in order for states to help gain from each other ~~states~~ peacefully and with stability. Although the realist perspective will see a multipolar society negatively as the use of hard power will become less effective as states can not operate in their own self interest. Therefore with both realist and liberalist perspectives, ~~at~~ with their different standpoints on hard and soft power both see hard power largely ineffective especially in the long run and soft power is considered ultimately more effective.



The response begins with an introduction that could be more convincing. There is no clear view set out and there are references to multipolarity that have questionable relevance.

The argument in support of hard power is based on Russia in Ukraine and concludes with a statement, rather than evaluation. The discussion on soft power is unclear and there is a further reference to multipolarity. The end is inconclusive.

There are examples in this response but they are not clear. There is an attempt at comparison and an attempt to answer the question, of sorts.

The response is two-sided. It has some accurate knowledge, some emerging analysis, but only superficial evaluation.

Total: 8 marks



Give a clear statement of view in an introduction, which will hopefully run as a thread throughout the response and be justified in the conclusion.

Question 3 (b)(x)

This was the most popular of the questions in this section of the examination paper. Most candidates seemed well-prepared to address the central debate.

The argument in support of globalisation and of its advantages seemed to be the view supported by the majority of candidates.

Many candidates took the approach of covering a response in three sections, with a focus on political, cultural and economic globalisation. There was some reference to globalisation sceptics, hyper-globalisers and transformationalists.

Question 3 (b)(y)

This is a typical response that covers economic, cultural and political globalisation.

It has an introduction that sets out a view. This is supported throughout and affirmed in the conclusion.

Chosen question number: Question 3(a) Question 3(b) Question 3(c)

The view that the advantages of globalisation outweigh the disadvantages depends on the strengths and weakness of three kinds of globalisation. Economic, cultural and political globalisation have all altered the international system drastically since the 1990s, with each benefitting some and hindering others. Ultimately it appears that globalisation has certainly eroded state sovereignty but the large-scale advantages it provides makes it worth it.

Economic globalisation has resulted in the world-wide growth of the neo-liberal form of free-market economics. This system has promoted an increase in economic interdependence as demonstrated by both international bodies such as the G7 or G10 and regional ones such as the EU. According to the Democratic peace theory this economic interdependence should promote international cooperation and thus discourage conflict. It is certainly true that states are now increasingly cautious to

take military action for fear of the economic sanctions that may be imposed. However, some nations appear unbothered by this such as Russia who have continued with their invasion of Ukraine in spite of sanctions ~~putting~~ ^{on things} like Russian gas. Indeed, autocratic states seem undeterred despite sanctions they might face thus meaning economic globalisation has failed to check the activities of self-interested states. Overall, economic globalisation may lead to a drop in global poverty levels and aided ~~being~~ previously underdeveloped states through new initiatives such as Africa in the Belt and road initiative, clearly demonstrating the advantages of economic globalisation outweigh its faults.

Cultural globalisation has led to the international commercialization of many different states ranging from the mass appeal of Hollywood to the development of rapid modern communication.

④ Cultural globalisation has both produced and been accelerated by the newfound ability to communicate internationally instantaneously, both affordably and efficiently meaning it is available to nearly every demographic.

The long-range influence of the World wide web and internet has resulted in cultural immersion through streaming^{tv} for example. However, critics highlight how cultural globalisation is resulting in the loss of traditional dialects, practices and entertainment. Many feel that the 'Mc-Donaldization' of the world is threatening local cultures ~~for~~ with consumerism^{driven by profit} resulting in mass-produced products and experiences which lack the unique concepts of their individual cultures. Overall, whilst it is clear individual cultures ~~are~~ that are threatened should be preserved and protected, the advantages of cultural globalisation have resulted in more choice and variety than ever before, allowing the world to experience different cultures and providing the invaluable benefits modern technology provides for international communication.

~~The~~ Political globalisation has led to the formation of many non-state actors within the international political sphere. The UN, for example, aims to defend international human rights and provide aid to those who need it. Regional groups too such as the African Union and European Union have led to more cooperative

promoting economic growth through more efficient trade. However, political globalisation comes with the most significant disadvantage of globalisation; the erosion of state sovereignty. The exercising of a state's sovereignty defines its own government but increasingly international agreements, organisations and treaties result in the surrender of it. Trans-national cooperations such as Exxon-mobil and Dutch Gas Co. for example are able to influence the political policies to a greater extent than ever before thus threatening the state's inherent right to rule and govern itself. Intervention in Human Rights cases could also be seen as an example of this as intervention in states such as Kosovo, Rwanda or Sierra Leone is undermining the state's authority.

Overall, globalisation's ^{advantages} can be seen to outweigh its disadvantages - certainly from a liberal standpoint. The increased interconnectedness of states not only provides economic growth decreasing poverty, but a greater cultural understanding of ~~the~~ states as a whole as ^{a myriad of international influences} increasingly enter the world population's zeitgeist as a result of the internet. The 'hollowing

out' of state sovereignty is certainly its greatest disadvantage and the one most offensive to realist's state-centrist anarchic world-view. However, the genuine threat to state sovereignty appears diminished by the inability of many former IGO's to effectively sanction states - the ICC for example can put out arrest warrants for Israeli president Netanyahu but the UN lacks the ~~authority~~ ^{and mandate} authority to actually enforce these measures and undermine the states authority ~~to~~ in reality this leaving the state's sovereignty intact. Therefore it appears the ^{appearance of} sacrificing ~~of~~ sovereignty to comply with beneficial trade or human rights measures is worth it. Thus, the economic, cultural and political benefits of globalization clearly outweigh its disadvantages as ~~the~~ nearly all ~~of~~ states are able to reap the benefits of modern fiscal, technological ~~and~~ and security developments worldwide.



The response begins by asserting a support for advantages, although there is a reference to sovereignty with the implication that an erosion of sovereignty is a disadvantage. This is, of course, debatable.

Economic globalisation is covered with a series of points both in favour of advantage and also disadvantage. Some of this is perhaps a little undeveloped.

The candidate moves to cultural globalisation, with a couple of advantage points and one disadvantage point, with examples.

The candidate then moves to political globalisation with one key point as an advantage and one key point as a disadvantage, again, with a couple of examples.

The point on sovereignty is a little unclear as to whether it reflects advantage or disadvantage but the introductory comment suggests disadvantage.

The conclusion agrees with the introduction and brings in a few additional points/examples.

The AO1 is probably the greatest strength here, with accurate knowledge demonstrated throughout. Analysis is generally consistent and the candidate is considering both advantages and disadvantages in time. There are some mini-judgements made and there is some substantiation of points made, which is rewarded in AO3.

Total: 22 marks

This is an example of a higher level script, which is particularly strong on knowledge and understanding. Although a little weaker on evaluation in AO3 it performs well in AO2, with solid analysis throughout.

Chosen question number: Question 3(a) Question 3(b) Question 3(c)

The advantages of globalisation do outweigh the disadvantages. Globalisation has numerous advantages, such as complex interdependence through political globalisation, and greater interconnectedness which has spread ideas and people globally, fostering development and diversity. That said, globalisation has its disadvantages, principally the neo-imperialism spawned on by economic globalisation through the Neo-Classical Development Theory.

Firstly, 'complex interdependence' through political globalisation has established relative peace in the post-war era, and has established a rules based order on human rights. With the founding of the United Nations (UN) and the ^{1st} Declaration on Human Rights (UDHR, 1948) global interconnectedness and cooperation has been largely peaceful and amicable. There has not been due to the consensus and discourse put forth by the UN since 1945, there has not been a major war. ~~It is~~ Political globalisation through

the UN and regional bodies has promoted the Democratic Peace Theory, which sees peace between nations who uphold the rule of law and representative institutions, as seen with the EU and its Common Agreement.

Moreover, the spread of consensus over human rights has seen the world become a more law-abiding place. The liberal idea of complex interdependence, later cooperation, and mutual ~~advice~~ advancement. Furthermore, humanitarian intervention under the UN Responsibility to Protect (2005) has seen joint-cooperation between states in Timor Leste, Kosovo and Côte d'Ivoire. That said, political globalisation has been limited by realist state egoism as nations are not bound by international law - as seen with the US use of extrajudicial rendition - and often humanitarian intervention proves a dead letter - as seen with the failure of Obama's 'red line', and western inaction to resolve the ongoing genocide in Gaza. The UN is also largely a 'talk shop', which is undermined by the likelihood of a veto from the UN Security Council - also seen with the rejection of ceasefire deals due to in Gaza due to US veto. Nevertheless, despite the numerous pitfalls of the UN and political

globalisation as a whole, it has been influential in limiting conflict since 1945 by its promotion of democracy and complex interdependence.

The interconnectedness spurred on by globalisation has also been greatly advantageous due to its spread of ideas and diversity. With the rise of the internet in the 2000s, the spread of technology has been accelerated, as global TNCs and governments can work together to develop their futures. The recent advances in AI are only possible due to global cooperation - as seen with the G7's AI Summit in Feb 2024. Moreover, the rise of the internet ^{through globalisation} has also allowed governments to be held to account. Julian Assange's work to reveal secrets of US involvement in Iraq, coupled with Bellingcat's work with Alexei Nавalny to share the horrors of Putin's despotic regime have given greater power to citizens than ever before. This could yet be even more significant in future, as with the rise of global ~~autocracy~~ ^{autocracy} through the 'CRINK's

transparency and global communication is of greater significance than ever. ~~The result of people through~~ Although critics claim that greater connectedness through the internet may be detrimental to society through a rise in cybercrime - with North Korea being a known exponent - this view is limited, as transnationalists would argue that nation states will adapt to such changes. Furthermore, the movement of people through globalisation has been greatly advantageous to the west, as immigration has allowed the NHS to survive here in the UK for example. Although globalisation sceptics critique this, the economic and cultural advantages of immigration are undeniable. While greater interconnectedness and ^{and cultural} globalisation risk homogenisation and weaken the power of nation states, ~~global~~ globalisation has been more advantageous than disadvantageous as it has propelled technological advancement and innovation.

However, there is great merit in suggesting that economic globalisation has been disadvantageous as it has

established a neo-imperialist dominance over the global south through the Neo-classical Development Theory. The 'Washington consensus' has established neo-liberal principles of free-trade globally, while it aims to reduce conflict - through the Pell Theory of Conflict Resolution - and reduce poverty, it has had the adverse effect. Wallerstein's World Systems Theory explains how WTO sponsored free-trade and reduction of tariffs, and IMF sponsored SAPs have left the global south dependent on US money. Many countries have suffered from social dislocation as a result of SAPs - as seen in Sierra Leone with its civil war after the collapse of its public services. The cuts to spending prove disastrous for many. For instance, although the WTO promotes trade - which has grown to \$99.8 trillion pa, this exacerbates inequalities within nations. The Gulf states may appear rich due to their selling of their natural resources (oil and gas) yet may live in conditions of modern day slavery. Qatar's inequalities are highlighted

at the 2022 World Cup, whereby billions were spent on infrastructure, while hundreds of workers perished. By promoting free-trade, economic globalisation has exacerbated inequalities - leading only to a superficial appearance of greater global wealth. That said, the Bretton Woods Organisation donated \$200 billion collectively to help the global south recover from covid, and NGOs such as the Gates Foundation have ~~donated~~ ^{addressed} illness and destitution in Africa. Notwithstanding critics claim that this aid provided by institution of economic globalisation is harmful. Dambisa Moyo's Dead Aid explains how aid from the global north stunts entrepreneurship and industry in the global south, and Ha-Joon Chang's Structural Theory calls for the global south to shy away from economic globalisation to advance themselves. Although economic globalisation has been advantageous in spreading aid, it has left the global south in a state of post-colonial dependency.

Overall, despite the numerous disadvantages of globalisation - for example the UN's ^{relative} inability to address the ^{Cyprus, Sudan} conflicts ^{which made 2022 the most deadly year since 1945} and the dependency of the global south on the global north, globalisation is largely advantageous. Although the spread of democracy ^{and peace} has not quite fulfilled Fukuyama's prediction in The End of History (1992), globalisation has made the world a more peaceful, interconnected place. ^{since 1945}



The response begins with an assertion that advantages outweigh disadvantages and also gives us a taste of both views, with reference to complex interdependence as well as to neo-imperialism.

Rather than take the approach of covering each type of globalisation in a highly signposted way, this response moves back and forth between points but always with a focus on the demands of the question. Complex interdependence and the Democratic Peace thesis are outlined with examples and there is discussion linked to human rights and to humanitarian intervention, again with examples.

A counter-view is presented with contemporary examples in support. There are numerous other arguments related to issues such as diversity and interconnectedness and to technology advantages. There are many examples used and a counter-argument, which is also well-examined.

A lengthy and interesting section on economic globalisation follows, with examples and mini-evaluation as before. Both views are evidenced after being presented and explored. There is theoretical awareness and a useful conclusion. The response is wide-ranging and very much focussed on the question.

Total: 26 marks



Contemporary examples support this response.

Question 3 (c)(x)

The final question in this section was the least popular one but still answered by a large number of candidates.

Some candidates discussed repeatedly the success or failure of global governance in dealing with human rights, rather than the actual demands of the question, which had a focus on unity and disunity. There is some crossover between the two but also important distinctions between the two approaches and demands.

The question provoked a wide range of responses at all levels. Weaker responses often had a focus on national government when the question demanded discussion of global governance. There was much reference to the UN and to the International Criminal Court (ICC), International Court of Justice (ICJ), special tribunals and to the Universal Declaration of Human Rights.

There was also some discussion related to the rise and fall of humanitarian intervention. The most popular examples for discussion related to Ukraine, Gaza and also to Chinese human rights violation.

This response certainly covers both sides of the debate and does so by directly comparing and contrasting each view throughout, rather than setting out one view and then the other.

The script is not perfect and has the odd error, but is consistent in provision of strong knowledge and quite strong analysis and evaluation.

This is a really wide-ranging response, which helps to push through the levels, but to achieve a solid top level there needs to be accompanying perceptive analysis and fully relevant evaluation.

Chosen question number: **Question 3(a)** **Question 3(b)** **Question 3(c)**

Global governance when dealing with human rights has been historically very united, however, recently we have seen the importance of state sovereignty and national interests be prioritised instead. In the early 2000s especially, the world saw many humanitarian interventions aiming to protect human rights and there are a number of institutions committed to furthering human rights protections. However, global interdependence does also mean, many states are hesitant to get involved in interventions which may impact national interests.

Some might argue that global governance has been divided in regards to humanitarian interventions and protecting human rights. Many states fundamentally disagree over human rights issues. For example, many are critical of the Middle East for a lack of protection for women's rights, while states have claimed this is simply a Western Bias. Iran publically claimed that the UNGA resolution regarding its treatment of minorities, for example, in 2022 was biased and chose to ignore the ruling. States are also divided

over rights such as same-sex marriage. In the UK, this is protected by Cameron's Same-Sex Marriage Act 2014, while 67 out of 193 states still criminalise same-sex relations. Many states have fundamental disagreements over what constitutes protected human rights so global governance might be seen as inevitably divided. However, despite this, global governance is clearly quite united over some interventions.

~~Resolutions~~ The early 2000s saw the rise of Kofi Annan's Responsibility to Protect (2005) which argued that states have a duty to protect human rights globally. Subsequently, Blair, Clinton, and Annan headed many humanitarian interventions.

Notable successful interventions include Bosnia or Kosovo (NATO) or Sierra Leone, which further demonstrated the UK's prioritisation of human rights over national interests as they had no other reason to aid in the tribunal against Charles Taylor. Although not all interventions have been successful - Rwanda, Libya (Gaddafi), etc. - the UN often still attempts to protect human rights where it can. So in this sense, it is clear that global governance is more united than divided over the funding of humanitarian interventions to protect human rights.

Some might argue the ICC suffers an African bias, as all convictions from 2002 to 2023 were of African people, however, the convictions were still successful. They convicted Kambanga, former PM of Rwanda, after the Rwandan genocide, alongside Khmer Rouge warlords after the events in Cambodia. Other institutions like the ECHR or ECtHR have seen regional success as well, protecting human rights across Europe. So clearly, in regards to institutions protecting human rights, global governance is very united rather than divided as there are numerous institutions and ruling which are coupled to regarding protecting human rights.

Some people argue that despite state sovereignty being important, in a globalised world, its importance is decreasing as we lean more into protecting fundamental rights - liberal point of view. This is evidenced by the R2P (Kofi Annan) and previously mentioned interventions. As a world, human rights based culture is expanding as vital protections become more important, especially in the more Western, liberal, democratic countries. However, in reality state sovereignty and national interests do still have considerable influence. Many states/institutions hesitate to be involved in human rights abuses

where it may impact significantly on the supply-chain which interconnects the world. For example, there was no intervention in China during the genocide of the Uighur Muslims, as China is part of the PS and a powerful (nuclear) global player. There was little intervention regarding many Middle Eastern abuses in Saudi Arabia, for one, as they are a key ally to Russia and supplier of key resources. Even now, the ongoing occupation and war of Israel on Palestinian people is causing outrage and protest globally, and yet the US still condemns other countries for supporting Palestine and backs Israel due to their alliance. Famously, Nikki Haley (Republican candidate) even signed a bomb from Israel, supporting the massacre of Palestinian people. It is not uncommon at all that we experience extreme divide globally over human rights when it comes to the national interests of the largest global players. Even in the UK, the ruling of the ECtHR regarding prisoner voting rights was ignored and the ruling in Turkey to drop the case against civil rights activist Osman Kavala was ignored. When states do not agree with a ruling regarding their own actions it is more than easy for them to ignore the decision as, at the end of the day, states still retain sovereignty over deciding

bodies like the ICC, ICJ, UNGA, UNSC, etc.

So overall, it is clear that in this sense global governance is divided over human rights as state sovereignty and national interests remain the priority.

Generally human rights are something global governance is united over. There have been many globally backed humanitarian interventions (Rwanda, Bosnia, etc.) despite some disagreements elsewhere (EU divisions over intervention in Syria). There are a number of global institutions dedicated to protecting human rights, such as the ICC and ICJ, and although not everyone recognizes their rulings, resolutions (UNGA), or decisions, they do still have significant soft power and influence as moral authorities. However, state sovereignty and national interests ~~can~~ win out, especially when it comes to the larger global players such as the PS, particularly the USA, China, and Russia, who are often able to ignore rulings regarding their human rights abuses (Uighur Muslims, Guantanamo Bay, Ukraine War, etc.). Regardless, overall, there is definitely more unity in global governance than division over human rights.



The response begins with the assertion that, historically, there has been unity but also that there have been challenges that may suggest some level of division.

The response really does move from unity to division point and back again in repetition, although the majority of points are actually focussed on consideration of division.

There are plenty of examples, almost all fully correct, and the response has a wide range and pleasing level of depth.

The conclusion supports unity, although this may not fully tie in with the general direction of the essay.

The response is clearly at the higher level in terms of knowledge and understanding. It also has consistent analysis and mostly relevant evaluation.

Total: 25 marks



A top-level response needs perceptive analysis and fully relevant evaluation.

Question 3 (c)(y)

This is an example of a lower level script, which has difficulty with AO1, AO2 and also with AO3.

This is an example of a weaker script, which is not convincing.

Arguments are limited in number and knowledge is much weaker than other examples.

Chosen question number: Question 3(a) Question 3(b) Question 3(c)

It is my view that global governance, like the UN, has been more divided in dealing with Human Rights. This is due to the imbalance of punishment and the lack of power within UN international courts, and UN tribunals.

Firstly, the UN lacks coercive power within states, it is evident that countries like the US have opposed international court rulings, the ICJ but there is also great power rivalry within the ICJ due to the 'P5' (permanent five members). For example, although over 30,000 Palestinian deaths, the US continues to impose any rulings against Israel. This is probably due to their economic investment where in 2022 America made \$60 million. Moreover, the court's ruling on ceasefire was overruled by 14 members but imposed by 1, America. With this it is clear that there is a division when dealing with human rights, specially because the 'P5' is outdated.

as France and the UK are no longer leading powers. Additionally, human rights are divided by the UN when examining Tribunals and humanitarian interventions. For instance, Libya ~~was~~ although the intervention it is now considered as a failed state due to the lack of efforts from the UN.

On the other hand, when examining the ICC it does propose a united view that ~~human rights~~ ^{the} breaking of human rights international law can be against anyone including Head of States. For example, Slobodan Milosevic was punished for life along with Military leader for genocide and ethnic cleansing. However, this argument lacks substance as the Iraq War is seen as extremely illegal but powerful Heads of States like Blair never got punished for the atrocities. Including the "Malign hegemony" stated by Noam Chomsky of those that got away with breaking human rights law during the

Nicaragua Case in Guatanamo Bay with tortures. Nonetheless presenting an extreme divided view although the united essence of the ICC.

As whole, it could be said that international doesn't exist as it only seems to affect smaller nation-state whilst powerful ones get away with atrocities, thus establishing a divided view on human right due to the lack of coercive power of global governance



The introduction suggests that there has been more division than unity. It really focusses on one point, which is not immediately clear.

It moves to discussion over disunity in the ICJ which the candidate seems to link to a lack of unity in the five permanent members (P5) in the UN Security Council. There is an unclear statement about Israel and a figure is offered as supporting evidence. Again, this is unconvincing. There is, however, a mini-judgement at this point.

There are several other assertions but these are not linked to the question. There is an attempt to use an example linked to the ICC, but again, this is not clear. There is a reference to a lack of prosecution of Blair and a quick reference to Chomsky, before an unconvincing conclusion.

Overall, this is an unconvincing response. It focusses only on discussion of one point, which appears to be that of double standards in prosecution.

There is some:

- accurate knowledge and understanding, albeit not always clear
- emerging analysis but only in a few places
- relevant evaluation, primarily in the introduction and to an extent in an unclear conclusion

Total: 10 marks

Paper Summary

Based on their responses to this paper, candidates are offered the following advice:

- It is always worth highlighting to candidates that the Section C questions are marked according to three Assessment Objectives with an equal weighting across the Assessment Objectives
- AO1 Knowledge and Understanding is often the strongest element in candidate work, albeit with a distinction between targeted knowledge and understanding of a topic, question and theme, compared with broad knowledge, which may not be fully relevant to the question that is asked
- AO2 Analysis is at its strongest when it is truly perceptive and where it is consistent in a response
- AO3 is at its strongest where it is fully relevant and sustained throughout the response, rather than included as a final thought in a conclusion to a response. It is pleasing to note where a candidate clearly has a view that is set out in an introduction and where continued 'mini judgements' flow through the response and lead to a conclusion that affirms and substantiates that view
- Candidates should focus carefully on the phrasing of the questions, often making repeated references to the title as they proceed to analyse and evaluate
- Section A questions, the initial 12-mark questions, will assess AO1 and AO2 only, and without a need for evaluation. Candidates need to be prepared to provide both knowledge and analysis in their responses
- Section B, the compulsory 12-mark question, will also assess AO1 and AO2 and again candidates need to be prepared to provide both knowledge and analysis in their responses. It is worth remembering that candidates who do not make any synoptic points cannot achieve Level 4
- Candidates who refer only to one named theory cannot achieve beyond Level 1
- Section C questions are designed for debate and discussion. They perform well where there is on-going consideration and balancing of alternative viewpoints
- It is particularly pleasing to note the use of contemporary examples in support of assertions

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>

