



Examiners' Report

June 2010

GCE Government and Politics 6GP04 4A



Edexcel is one of the leading examining and awarding bodies in the UK and throughout the world. We provide a wide range of qualifications including academic, vocational, occupational and specific programmes for employers.

Through a network of UK and overseas offices, Edexcel's centres receive the support they need to help them deliver their education and training programmes to learners.

For further information, please call our GCE line on 0844 576 0025, our GCSE team on 0844 576 0027, or visit our website at www.edexcel.com. If you have any subject specific questions about the content of this Examiners' Report that require the help of a subject specialist, you may find our **Ask The Expert** email service helpful.

Ask The Expert can be accessed online at the following link:

<http://www.edexcel.com/Aboutus/contact-us/>



ResultsPlus is our unique performance improvement service for you and your students.

It helps you to:

- **Raise attainment** - by providing in-depth analysis of where your class did well and not so well, enabling you to identify areas to focus on/make improvements.
- **Spot performance trends** at a glance by accessing one-click reports. You can even choose to compare your cohort's performance against other schools throughout the UK.
- **Personalise your students' learning** by reviewing how each student performed, by question and paper you can use the detailed analysis to shape future learning.
- **Meet the needs of your students on results day** by having immediate visibility of their exam performance at your fingertips to advise on results.

To find out more about ResultsPlus and for a demonstration visit

<http://resultsplus.edexcel.org.uk/home>

June 2010

Publications Code UA024041

All the material in this publication is copyright

© Edexcel Ltd 2010

Introduction

The paper attracted a similar number of candidates as in previous years. In general, many of the responses were of a good quality, in particular those relating to EU Institutions and Their Relationships. Many candidates appeared to be well prepared for these questions and were able to supply relevant detail, examples, analysis and theoretical knowledge. By contrast, common problems associated with weaker responses were a lack of knowledge and examples, and poor analysis. In addition, these responses often failed to address the specifics of the question by supplying general information about the topic, but not the actual information being asked for in the question.

Question 1

This was the most popular question, and most candidates were able to offer a number of reasons as to why labour mobility has been controversial within the EU. Chief amongst these was the increased competition for jobs and services caused by the influx of migrant workers from Eastern Europe.

In addition, many responses mentioned the 'brain drain' this has caused in the countries affected by emigration, the possibility of increased international crime, and the potential for increased racism, cultural conflict and increased support for the far right. A smaller number of candidates also mentioned the incomplete nature of social mobility in the EU caused by opt-outs from the Schengen Agreement, the limitations of the Social Chapter and the recent restrictions affecting the newest members of the EU.

The most common problem was a tendency to dwell on the history of how labour mobility had changed over the last few decades, and to discuss at some length the benefits of labour mobility to the EU. This limited the marks available to the candidate as the question was only partially addressed at best.

The issue of labour mobility has become controversial in the EU for many reasons, in particular the negative effects it has on countries both giving and receiving. It is also seen as a federalistic concept and possibly damaging to national sovereignty.

One such controversy of EU labour mobility has been the issue of immigration. Immigrant workers ~~also~~ have arguably been able to undercut local workforces, in particular since EU expansion in 2004 that led to fears in Britain and France of Polish plumbers threatening local job security.

Another controversy of labour mobility is that the departure of skilled workers to Western Europe has caused a 'brain drain' in eastern Europe, who lose not only protect one's own borders. EU members cannot prevent the movement of their citizens and sceptics will argue that EU immigration needs to be restricted.

**ResultsPlus**

Examiner Comments

This candidate's response gets them into the top mark band of the Levels mark scheme. This was a question that allowed candidates the opportunity to comment on labour mobility as impacting upon the European 'brain drain', the rise of nationalist parties such as the BNP and increased competition for jobs. As such, the best answers will see the positives and negatives of labour mobility. The answer supplied shows evidence of understanding a wide range of issues - job security, the brain drain, culture clashes and the role of the BNP, increased criminality and sovereignty issues. Overall, the answer tackles all the key features of labour mobility with good focus and depth.

Question 2

This was the least popular question on the paper, and of those candidates who chose to attempt it, many of the responses were of a less able quality. Many candidates displayed only the vaguest knowledge of what neo-functionalism theory is and were thus unable to accurately explain its implications. A common response was to discuss a vague trend towards integration and supranationalism on a gradual basis, but without mentioning the specifics of the neo-functionalist idea that these would largely occur through the process of spill-over. This resulted in many Level 1 and Level 2 answers.

Those candidates who were able to identify the process of spill-over and the fact that this can occur on a functional, technical and political basis were able to access higher marks. Many of these answers illustrated their points with worked examples, in particular that of the Single European Market leading to the political integration of the Maastricht Treaty, or recent calls for EU scrutiny of national budgets following the adoption of the euro and the financial crisis in Greece.

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

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

Chosen Question Number:

Question 1 ☒

Question 2 ☒

Question 3 ☒

Question 4 ☒

Question 5 ☒

Neo-functionalism is the process of integrated incremental integration. The deepening of the EU is a gradual and slow process whereby issues are dealt with as they arise and ~~then~~ ^{thus} strengthen the member state bonds ^{with each other}. It is an ad-hoc approach and suggests that different situations can have a 'spill over' effect - meaning that different areas of the EU are interlinked and dealing with them causes the EU to move closer to becoming a single political entity.

Jacques Delors ^{Cited} ~~states~~ neo-functionalism as the only way in which the EU project would move forward into eventually becoming a federal United States of Europe. Examples of this process can be seen in the ~~SEA~~ Single European Act 1986 which ~~created~~ enshrined the free movement of labour, goods and services and capital in a bid to improve the internal free market of the EU. This economic advance fed into the Maastricht Treaty of 1992 where a more political integrationist approach was adopted by the EU - introducing the move towards a single currency and introducing the Social Chapter that tackled the issues of workers rights, maternity pay and so on. These issues overflow from the issues of the internal free market created in the SEA. Also Qualified Majority

volting has been increased with every treaty after Maastricht enabling a more supranational EU to develop which overrides the sovereignty of the member state. Pooled sovereignty has increased with the signing of the Lisbon Treaty in 2009. Some see this as effectively a ^{rehash of the failed} constitution of 2005 which was a natural agglomeration and progression of the previous Nice, Amsterdam, Maastricht, SEA and Treaties of Rome.

~~As many member nations (like the UK) are wary of further~~
Neo-functionalism would see the Greece crisis tackled by a European bail-out ^(as has occurred at £120bn) and then subsequently introducing a new system to ensure fiscal responsibility and reforms in the Growth and stability pact as Merkel is attempting.


ResultsPlus
Examiner Comments

This candidate achieves the top of Level 2 of the mark scheme.

The neo-functionalism question was rather difficult for many candidates to answer. The main difficulty was not fully understanding the definition of the issue and how it relates to integration.

This answer refers to a reasonable definition of the concept by introducing the concept well and referring to the deepening process as slow and gradual.

Reference to the Lisbon Treaty was worthy of merit, but there was no further evaluation of spill over issue.

Question 3

Answers to this question tended to fall into two categories. Some were done extremely well and candidates were able to offer considerable detail concerning the impacts of the reforms – the decline of agriculture within the overall EU budget, the benefits of set-aside to the environment, the reduction in food surpluses, but also the continued problems with corruption, of large farms receiving the bulk of the spending and the difficulties facing farmers in the developing world in terms of competing with EU farmers.

There were a considerable number of less able responses that simply described the various features of the CAP, the historical problems associated with the CAP or which simply described the reforms to the CAP but offered little or nothing on the impact of these reforms. These answers typically received Level 1 marks as they had failed to address the question or done so in a very partial manner. Mid-range answers were able to identify the impact of at least some of the reforms but did so with limited detail and analysis, or in a very partial manner, thus preventing them from accessing Level 3 marks.

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

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

Chosen Question Number:

Question 1 ☒

Question 2 ☒

Question 3 ☒

Question 4 ☒

Question 5 ☒

The Common Agricultural Policy (CAP) was introduced as part of the 1957 Treaty of Rome as a way of persuading the French to sign the treaty due to fears over the strength of German industry. CAP has improved the wages farmers receive and fulfils its aim of ensuring there is enough food for all member states. However, it still has its flaws.

The most significant recent change to CAP is due to enlargement. Relatively poor, former Soviet states, like Poland and Estonia, joined the EU in 2004 or 2007. Their agricultural sectors desperately require rejuvenation and the CAP provides agricultural aid for this purpose. However, they are eligible to a proportion of total CAP funds, which is a huge percentage of overall EU budgets, and more and more money is being diverted from the original member states towards the new member states. CAP and the Lisbon Treaty of 2009 has attempted to remedy this by providing a small set amount to the new member states, and the amount they receive will equalise that of the

older member states by 2014. This reform attempts to help the poorer countries but still angers the countries with a large agricultural sector, such as France and Spain, as they believe their produce is a better quality and that their environment is not appropriate for the EU's requirements.

'Set-aside' policy was introduced in the 1990s to reduce surpluses from over-subsidised and over-producing farms. Farmers had to leave a certain proportion of their land fallow so that less food was produced, and farmers were paid to do this. Now the "wine lakes" and "butter mountains" have reduced, in large part due to better controlled subsidies, the 'set-aside' policy is no longer so appropriate. The new CAP policy has removed 'set-asides', although this has angered environmental groups, such as Friends of the Earth, who claim the 'set-aside' policy had improved biodiversity and levels of insects and meadow grasses that were becoming endangered.

Finally, a major reform to CAP is the changing role of subsidies. They enable the farmer to live on and each farmer was paid an amount proportionate to the size of their land. As this hugely benefited wealthy landowners and agribusiness instead of the small farms the EU depends on, the subsidies were altered to reflect the type of crop being produced. However, in 1998, the EU demanded that more rapeseed

oil should be grown, and increased payments to farmers who grow this. This inevitably led to a glut in the rapeseed oil supply, and a significant amount was wasted.

The latest form of subsidies increases diversification and improving the environment in the rural areas. Farmers are being paid to set up adventure trails, petting zoos, extreme sports activities and the like, in order to increase the value of rural areas, with the aim of reducing the cost of aid to farmers, as well as attempting to reduce the budget deficit within the EU.

Reforms have attempted to make agriculture more profitable and helped farmers who faced tough competition globally, but CAP still has its critics. Some say that reforms to CAP are just experiments to find the right balance between subsidy costs and food stocks and that many reforms are still required to make agriculture fairer between member states; as funds have been inappropriately divided; and to reduce wastage in farms.

**ResultsPlus**

Examiner Comments

This excellent response achieved full marks.

Understanding the CAP is key to this question, especially with the focus on what has gone previously rather than what is planned for the future. Failure to understand this would result in a weak response. However, this answer ticks all the boxes and focuses fully on the wide range of reforms that have served to significantly alter and improve CAP.

Reference to the Lisbon Treaty highlights an understanding of changes that have been introduced in recent years, whilst the set-aside policy of the 1990s was utilised as an example of how surplus has been dealt with in the past by CAP.

Question 4

This was a fairly popular and generally well answered question. Most candidates were able to identify a number of reasons as to why the Scottish and Welsh nationalist parties have adopted a pro-EU stance.

These included present advantages such as their greater international status, their involvement in the Committee of the Regions, the EU funds available to these two countries and their political representation in the European Parliament. Many candidates also identified the fact that EU membership would allow the two countries to achieve independence whilst guaranteeing economic stability and international security at the same time. A smaller number of candidates identified the fact that EU membership offers the possibility of enhanced sovereignty to the two countries, rather than the perceived loss of sovereignty that nationalists elsewhere believe to be the case with EU membership.

Many candidates also identified the benefits of CAP to two countries with a relatively large agricultural sector, the greater levels of trade enabled by EU membership and the fact that the two parties are on the left of the political spectrum and thus identify with the social aims of many within the EU. Whilst these points could be credited, the fact that they apply in general to nationalists and non-nationalists alike across the EU, meant that any analysis offered tended to remain superficial and failed to mention the more specific nature of the political positions the two nationalist parties have adopted with respect to the EU. This tended to limit the marks these responses could achieve.

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

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

Chosen Question Number:

Question 1 ☒

Question 2 ☒

Question 3 ☒

Question 4 ☒

Question 5 ☒

The nationalist parties of Scotland and Wales have adopted a pro-EU stance in recent years because they see themselves as 'independent in the EU'. When the UK first joined the EU in 1945, the nationalist parties took a Eurosceptic stance as they already felt that they had to many concessions of power above them. Nationalists felt that not only would they have to go through Westminster, but they now had an extra level of the EU. However, nationalist parties such as the Scottish Nationalist Party (SNP) soon realised that in the EU, smaller nations are welcomed and they could circumvent Westminster by pushing. The nationalists realised they could use the EU to their advantage.

Other nationalist parties to include Plaid Cymru also adopted a pro-EU stance because they realised that they could get greater independence from Westminster. The nationalist parties felt that their resources would flourish more in the EU and the SNP strongly

favoring the Euro to improve financial / trade transactions. Nationalists feel that they get greater independence as part of the EU.

Many officials in the EU favored Scotland joining the EU as it has a greater population than Luxembourg and it would bring many benefits to the single market. Nationalists also adopted a ~~pro~~ pro-EU stance as they have a more direct route to Commissioners in the EU and can get their views and voices heard on the EU level. Nationalist parties have a greater say and independence from Westminster in the EU, and so have adopted an increasingly pro-EU stance.

It could be argued that the Nationalist parties have adopted a pro-EU stance because it gives them a greater say in how their country is run. For example, Scotland raised some alarm with the CFP and the coal stocks diminishing there. On the EU stage, Scotland is given an equal footing as England, which is something they cannot enjoy in Westminster. Nationalists favor the EU as they have a more direct route ~~to~~ / safety valve to pressure Commissioners for benefits to their country and their voters.

The SNP and Plaid Cymru have both stated in their manifestos that they approve of greater integration and are pro-EU due to greater concessions and independence from Westminster. It becomes clear that there are many advantages to nationalist parties of joining the EU and adopting a pro-EU stance. These regions do not want the 'awkward partner' label of the UK.

**ResultsPlus**

Examiner Comments

This candidate achieves the middle of Level 2 of the mark scheme. Nationalist parties in the UK have long since seen the EU as a useful focus for their ambitions, even since the revolutionary changes of the 1990s.

This answer looks at a range of factors that nationalist parties have focused upon greater independence, raising their profile on the international stage and moving away from the 'awkward partner' status of the UK in Europe generally.

Question 5

A popular and well answered question, which produced a good number of high level responses. Most candidates had few problems identifying a range of strengths and weaknesses associated with the ECJ. The majority of candidates identified its supranational character, its role in enhancing integration, its defence of the civil liberties of EU citizens, its level of expertise and its attempts to address areas of disagreement between the different member states on a largely neutral and internationalist basis.

Weaknesses identified were the loss of sovereignty entailed by national legislatures, the fact that the judges are unelected, the length of time often needed to reach decisions, the lack of transparency and the fact that it has limited powers in terms of enforcing its decisions.

There were few, if any, common weaknesses or errors on this question, other than candidates only offering a limited number of strengths and weaknesses, with a corresponding lack of detail or analysis.

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

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

Chosen Question Number:

Question 1 ☒

Question 2 ☒

Question 3 ☒

Question 4 ☒

Question 5 ☒

The European Court of Justice was formed in 1952 & is based in Luxembourg. Its objectives are to ensure legal rulings & act as legal sovereign in the EU & also to ensure that all member states abide by the same rules.

One of the strengths of the European Court of Justice is that it takes precedence over laws in the member states & can overrule decisions previously made. This happened in the Factortame case 1992 when the UK was declared to have unlawfully blocked Spanish vessels from fishing off the English coast & was ordered to revoke it.

Another strength the European Court of Justice has is the European Convention of Human Rights. This act regarding rights of people also takes precedence over states' individual laws regarding rights & thus the Court of Justice can declare countries in breach of ^{the} European convention. This happened in the Netherlands & France where it was revealed that female air hostesses received a

considerably lower wage than male counterparts, which the European court declared unlawful.

However, the Court of Justice also has weaknesses. It ~~cannot~~ initiate is not a legislative body & only has certain areas it can act in such as asylum ^{social} & rights. Furthermore some member states can negotiate opt outs from certain policy areas - the UK received an opt out ~~for~~ regarding the Court's presence in issues regarding justice & home affairs, showing that the Court doesn't always have unlimited power.

Another weakness of the European Court of Justice is that it is unelected, with the judges appointed - one per member state.

This enhances the democratic deficit of the EU & calls into question whether ~~the~~ member states should be accountable.

What is clear, however, is that with each new treaty, the powers of the European Court of Justice have been ~~the~~ strengthened. Under the Maastricht treaty, ¹⁹⁹² the court gained a broader legal remit in social areas, the Amsterdam treaty 2007 gave the court the powers to rule on crime, policing & asylum, & most recently, the Lisbon treaty 2009 gave the court powers over justice & Home Affairs, although this was somewhat controversial & the UK secured an

opt out from this. Although the powers of the court of justice are still increasing, there are notable flaws that would need to be rectified if the court was to take a broader legal role.

**ResultsPlus****Examiner Comments**

This candidate sits right at the top of Level 2 of the mark scheme. The question required a straight forward comparison of strengths and weaknesses in relation to the ECJ.

The answer tackles the question well in lining up the pros and cons in a listed format. This is often the best way to approach this question in order to ensure a fair distribution of pros and cons in the response.

The answer uses the stalwart example of Factortame to emphasise the strength of the ECJ in terms of legal precedent.

Also, there is a good blend of how the ECJ has grown in authority and also how national governments still retain control as noted in the case of opt outs.

Question 6

This was a popular question, with plenty of solid, well prepared answers. Most candidates were able to discuss at some length the fact that the Commission has seen a general decline in its level of significance whilst still retaining a number of important powers.

The majority of responses charted the way in which the ECB, the European Parliament, co-decision making and the Council of Ministers have all played an increasingly important role in the running of the EU in recent decades. Many also highlighted the recent changes made by the Lisbon Treaty and the potential loss of power for the Commission caused by the creation of the posts of President and Foreign Secretary. Others also mentioned the proposed reforms to the Commission and its ability to oversee a 27 member union. Most candidates used examples to illustrate the ways that the Commission can be brought to account, the most popular being the 'Santer crisis'.

By contrast, the Commission remains the main initiator of policy, it is rare for the European Parliament to actually remove the entire Commission and it cannot remove individual commissioners. In addition, the Commission remains responsible for a range of policy areas, some of which have been enhanced and extended by the Lisbon Treaty.

The main discriminator between average and good responses was whether the candidate has taken notice of the 'no longer' part of the question. Some candidates just gave a very descriptive account of the powers and roles of all institutions and compared them back to the Commission. This showed knowledge, but only limited analysis and did not fully address the question. Other average answers tended to only offer an account of the Commission's decline without recourse to counter-arguments or to dwell too long on historical developments without looking at the contemporary period.

However, more able candidates were given the opportunity to be stretched and challenged by this question. They could discuss the way that the EU is evolving and how this is inevitably changing the 'balance of power'.

Many candidates also referred to the importance of remedying the perceived democratic deficit in the EU. Many came to the conclusion that the Commission was still very significant, but other institutions were gaining additional powers which were long overdue.

The best answers covered a range of issues with a considerable level of detail, well chosen examples and were able to evaluate at some length on whether or not the rise of the above mentioned EU institutions had impacted considerably on the Commission's significance.

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

Chosen Question Number:

Question 6 ☒

Question 7 ☒

Question 8 ☒

'The European Commission is no longer the most significant Institution in the EU' is a slightly factual statement when compared to the European Council.

The European Council is the highest decision body within the EU. It has the power and authority to choose which policies are passed and which are rejected. Taking a major decision task out of the reach of the Commission. Although having said that, the European Commission has the authority of suggesting the policies to the European council and implementing the ones that the Council has then chosen. This adds to the significance of the Commission as it shows they have some control over policies which the European Parliament fails to have.

The European parliament is one of the European institutions with least significance. It is often referred to as 'little more than a talk shop! This makes the European Commission a more significant Institution than

that of the European parliament. This is because the European Commission has more decision making influence than the European parliament, this is shown by co-decision making, which gives the commission a higher advantage on ~~the~~ ~~the~~ ~~the~~ the decisions themselves. For example Parliament does not have to be consulted on monetary and economic issues. However, parliament has to be consulted on issues involving the environment ~~parliament~~ and social policies, which are seen as minor decisions, almost irrelevant.

This is an example of the European commission being one of the most significant institutions in the EU as its influence is greater than that of parliament.

However, co-decision making, brought in by the 1992 Maastricht treaty, and extended in the 1997 Amsterdam treaty, has meant that Parliament has gained some control. Also, the commission is accountable to the European parliament enabling parliament to dismiss all Commissioners with reasoning if it wants too. Although parliament is unable to dismiss just one or two commissioners, they have to all be dismissed. Also, with no commissioners, there is no European Commission and therefore the European Parliament is suspended. Once again

showing the ^{greater} significance of the European Commission over the European Parliament.

The European Court of Justice is another example of an institution which the European Commission is both more significant and less significant ~~to~~ institution.

It is more significant as the European Commission is able to put forward the laws, that the European Council agrees with, that the European Court of Justice must obey and use the sentencing guidelines ~~to~~ when punishing offenders. Another significance is that the Commission is able to take member states and other institutions to the European Court of Justice. However other member states and pressure groups have the same advantage reducing the significance of the Commission.

~~By~~ By taking most of the European institution into account it is a fair judgement that the statement 'the European Commission is no longer the most significant ~~body~~ institution in the EU' is factual.

This may not be the case for the European parliament and Court of

Justice, however it is the European Council or European Council of minister that ^{is} ~~have~~ the significant Institution in the EU as they have more ~~say~~ power and authority over most of the ~~for~~ other european institution.

**ResultsPlus**

Examiner Comments

This candidate achieves Level 2 for all four marking grids of the mark scheme.

This answer clearly looks at comparing and contrasting the other institutions with the EC.

There are also some elements of stating the relative insignificance of institutions such as the European Parliament.

Co-decision powers are discussed in the answer along with the key EU institutions.

Question 7

This was a reasonably well answered question with most candidates being able to identify reasons as to why further integration may be necessary and desirable, whilst also identifying potential difficulties with further integration.

Further integration would allow the EU to compete more effectively on the world stage both economically and politically, to further develop institutions suited to an enlarged EU of 27 members, to better combat international problems such as crime, terrorism and global warming and to address the various institutional shortcomings that exist within the EU such as the democratic deficit.

On the other hand, there is the eurosceptic claim that further integration would erode national sovereignty, lead to a European super-state, erode national cultures, and is generally not supported by EU citizens. In addition, both the EU and national states are already significant players on the world stage, would find it difficult to adopt common positions, for instance, on defence, whilst further integration could lead to a decline in democratic accountability.

Less able responses tended to give general arguments for and against integration, sometimes on a federalist versus eurosceptic basis, but without actually considering the contemporary situation and thus became reliant on theory, with little in the way of detailed examples. Equally a small number of answers considered the merits and demerits of the integration that has already been established within the EU in previous decades - such answers could receive only a limited number of marks. In addition, some weak answers became confused between integration and enlargement and were not able to look beyond that initial flaw in their appreciation of the question.

The best answers covered a range of integration issues with a considerable level of detail, well chosen examples and were able to evaluate at some length on whether or not future integration was needed and desirable in the near future. Strong respondents were also able to display comprehension of the way in which further integration would be at different speeds and that 'opt outs' helped to create a two-speed Europe. They were also capable of understanding the impact of further integration in terms of the world stage and the pooling of sovereignty.

- globalisation.

- 0 countries with a new authority

- Enforce democracy
- must go forward with making
- UN can no way back.

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

Chosen Question Number:

Question 6 ☒Question 7 ☒Question 8 ☒

Since the treaty of Rome in 1957 the message from John Monnet and Robert Schuman was that Europe would not work as individual states working for their own interests, they believed that Europe needed to be a 'united state of Europe', therefore a federalist state.

However many member states are unwilling to give up their sovereignty for further integration, however Europe can be said to be at a stand still at the present time. Many journalists have noted that as considerably integrationary measures and the Single, European Market and Maastricht, with the introduction of the single currency has meant that Europe is unable to revert back to pre-treaty and therefore must go forward, with further integration. The eurozone crises has meant to some extent such as Angela Merkel that tight fiscal policy must be maintained throughout Europe, this may mean further integration and increased authority of the European Bank to place sanctions on countries who excessively spend beyond their means, for example they may

Loose their voting rights. This means that further monetary integration policy is needed. ↳ to now make ties

The president of France has gone even further suggesting that there needed to be further political union if monetary policy was to be tightened. However this is ~~seen as~~ undesirable by many member states as the policies differ considerably between them countries historically have ~~not~~ made polarised policies.

For example France is traditionally ~~integrates~~ very interventionist when it comes to economic policy, ~~but~~ wishing to subsidise the farming industry.

Whereas Germany are traditionally monetarists who believe that intervening can be detrimental to the free market. They are seen as 'hoarders of money' whereas the French are seen as pioneers of fiscal policy. This shows that further integration would leave countries completely unable to 'fix' their countries according to what is best for the country.

Furthermore integrationary steps like the European monetary Union have meant that countries within the Eurozone are unable to use competitive devaluation to ~~increase~~ increase competitiveness of the exports that they produce, however it can be argued that even these sorts of deflationary measures would not have saved Greece from having to be bailed out by

Germany, therefore the only solution appears to be further integratory measures so that countries are further restricted by Europe. This would mean that the closer Europe is the easier it could be to stop future problems such as Greece, because they would not have been able to hide vital figures from the eyes of the EU as the EU would have most if not full control over what the country was doing.

Further integration would be seen as desirable to enhance peace among the member states as negotiations would not have to be made as further integration would mean the loss of sovereignty from the member states to make decisions. Therefore it would avoid 'Eurocrisis' and be empty chairs that were seen in the 1960s and the 1970s. However further integration would not enhance democracy within the EU as many of the institutions are not directly elected. Therefore it could be argued that without reform to the institutions would become an unelected dictatorship as even the directly elected European Parliament ~~does not have~~ is not the most powerful institution within the EU.

Furthermore integration would mean that the countries of the EU would lose further sovereignty, this would mean that such things as tax harmonisation would

not be beneficial to all member states, this is because the social models of the European Union are so vast and varied from the Scandinavian model of high tax and social welfare to the Anglo-Saxon model of Britain. Further integration would mean that eventually a 'European Social model' would have to be found, and this is not beneficial to member states who have centuries of old traditions, it would mean a change of life.

General public opinion is also that they do not see themselves as 'European citizens', many member states enjoy the differences between the countries that make them unique, further integration may impose on traditions and cultures within the EU. However the break up of Europe or the European monetary union would mean that as many countries revert back to their old currencies, strong countries will be 'flooded' at the 'new deutsche mark' will 'sky rocket' as inflation goes out of control, meaning that they lose competitiveness in the global markets.

Therefore it is necessary and desirable for countries like Germany to push for further integration within the monetary union. However integration outside of that area is seen as less desirable by countries who have strong traditions and culture and differences in common foreign and security policy.

a) many countries like Sweden are in fact neutral. However it can be argued the common foreign and security policy must be made more cohesive or intergovernmental to serve Europe on the world stage so that they are less reliant on NATO and the USA, this was evident in the conflict in Yugoslavia.



ResultsPlus

Examiner Comments

Another candidate who achieves Level 2 for all the grids in the mark scheme.

The answer makes an astute comment in that the efforts to integrate the member states are almost impossible to reverse and that the only direction is forward into further integration.

Although the analytical style in this response is relatively simplistic, it is clear that the candidate understands the wide ranging issues that relate to EU integration and how much it is 'truly' wanted by the member states.

Question 8

Of the three long questions, this one produced the fewest high level responses. Most candidates answered the question reasonably well, but without fully getting to grips with the requirements of the question. It was largely tackled by candidates in the form of comparing the strengths and merits of EU institutions and their capacity to undermine the UK Parliament. Very few responses related their answer to the zero-sum game or positive-sum game.

Many candidates offered a generalised response on the issue of whether EU membership had been positive or negative for the UK. Often these were couched in terms of eurosceptic versus europhile. This was acceptable as long as the issues covered related to parliament, but many did not. Many of the answers covered the superiority of EU over UK law, the increased use of QMV and the loss of the veto, the transfer of policy competences to the EU, and the fact that the executive will use the EU to push through policies it desires but believes it will find difficult to implement through the national parliament.

The fact that parliament can still pass legislation to withdraw from the EU, the fact that opt-outs had been achieved and that certain policy areas have been reserved for national parliaments were the most common arguments supporting the continued importance of the UK parliament.

The issue of sovereignty was not particularly well addressed. Many candidates said little on the subject, and of those that did, it invariably related to the loss of sovereignty. Very few candidates covered the idea of 'pooled sovereignty' and parliament's ability to deal with international-based problems in a more competent manner. As such, weak answers were only able to see the relationship that the UK Parliament has with the EU in somewhat simplistic terms.

Stronger answers were able to comprehend the extent to which the UK Parliament has been undermined and also allowed to continue as a sovereign decision making body. In addition, strong responses were able to provide examples of the UK Parliament being undermined or of retaining the status quo.

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

Chosen Question Number:

Question 6 ☒

Question 7 ☒

Question 8 ☒

Membership of the EU has been beneficial to the ^{whole Parliament} EU, however it has also undermined its sovereignty and ability to govern, on many occasions. This has resulted in a growing amount of Euro-scepticism particularly amongst conservatives and has undoubtedly been the cause of much division since 1975.

EU membership has always been an issue of great contention amongst the Conservative party, with there being ardent supporters such as Kenneth Clarke and John Major. Whilst simultaneously there has been many notable sceptics, such as William Hague, Ian Duncan Smith, as David Cameron, and in earlier years Margaret Thatcher, who was not a supporter but later developed a great deal of resentment

Major's decision to sign the Maastricht Treaty in 1992 wrecked havoc upon the Conservative Party, this was because of the unified stance they adopted. Whilst many rejected the bill he still signed it, ~~the~~ consequently the cabinet broke down with the policy of collective responsibility ~~going~~ diminishing. This meant function could no longer function properly as Major found it ^{increasingly} difficult to pass legislation, regularly bringing Parliament to a standstill. The great divisions which were caused under John Major's government exhibit just how detrimental the EU can be to the UK Parliament, especially when legislative ~~that~~ is passed which results in the decentralisation of powers, which effectively undermines ^{and weakens} the government's authority.

Membership of the EU also means that the House of Lords is no longer the most superior court, this power is given to the European Court of

Justice (ECJ). This ^{As} ~~was~~ a direct
 consequence of this, Parliament
 legislation can no be overruled ^{which} ~~as~~
 was seen with the Factortame
 case. Initially ~~the British~~ Parliament
 declared that other European fishing
 vessels were not permitted to
 fish in British waters, ~~how~~ However,
 the ECJ ruled that this was
 a breach of European fishing laws
 as this ~~was~~ ~~leading~~ & Parliament
 was overruled. Again this a clear
 example of Parliament being
 undermined by ~~the EU~~ ^{the ECJ} and
 shows the negative effect
 membership has upon our sovereignty.
 And as was seen with the
 signing of the Maastricht Treaty,
 this issue caused even more rifts
 through parliament, adversely
 affecting its coherence and ability
 to function.

However, we must remember
 that Britain maintains the right
 to leave the EU at any time.
 Essentially, it is Parliament

feels it is being treated too seriously than it can stop this immediately, which ~~shows~~ ^{showing} that the EU is only as powerful and its legislation is imposed on Parliament by choice, thus removing much of their right to complain as nobody from Brussels is forcing them to endure the effects of membership.

In addition to this fact it must also be remembered that neo-functionalism is a political theory of the EU, which therefore member states are allowed to arrange opt-outs from ^{aspects or} treaties. They feel as privileged as too damaging to their national rights. For instance this has been seen as the case with Britain and the single-currency, because the UK Parliament ~~wanted~~ did not want members of the EU organising exchange rates as this was viewed as a serious limitation upon powers. ^{It is} Eight years after the Euro ~~was~~ ^{became} put into dominant currency for the currency.

throughout Europe and still Britain remains exempt from it. This displays the fact that ultimate power still is still in the hands of the UK Parliament, rubbishing claim that the EU has seriously undermined it.

Finally, it must be remembered that ~~much~~ all of the EU's decisions involve key members of the UK Parliament, who hold positions as ministers and commissioners. Here the idea of Pooled ~~sovereignty~~ sovereignty is in full effect as ~~the~~ UK ministers are having a say in the whole of Europe the EU's operations. The fact that ~~the~~ ~~an~~ MPs are consulted before major decisions occur means that ^{they have granted} ~~their~~ consent ~~has been given~~, which again renders it difficult to support the claim that the UK Parliament has been seriously undermined.

Yes, the EU has damaged and undermined Parliament's authority as seen

with the Factortame case and it has caused major divisions. But it has to be remembered that all of this has taken place with UK ~~Minister~~ Parliament representatives' consent, who have signed treaties and ~~agreed~~ ^{agreed} to legislation. Clearly if they felt their rights were being infringed they would seek opt-outs, ask for amendments or simply leave the EU. This shows that despite the power ~~EU~~ the EU ^{wields} over Parliament, ultimately ~~the~~ strength ~~lays~~ still lies with Parliament, and therefore it has not been 'seriously' undermined.

Grade Boundaries:

Grade	Max. Mark	A*	A	B	C	D	E	N	U
Raw boundary mark	90	61	54	47	40	33	27	21	0
Uniform boundary mark	100	90	80	70	60	50	40	30	0

a* is only used in conversion from raw to uniform marks. It is not a published unit grade.

Further copies of this publication are available from
Edexcel Publications, Adamsway, Mansfield, Notts, NG18 4FN

Telephone 01623 467467

Fax 01623 450481

Email publications@linneydirect.com

Order Code UA024041 June 2010

For more information on Edexcel qualifications, please visit
www.edexcel.com/quals

Edexcel Limited. Registered in England and Wales no.4496750
Registered Office: One90 High Holborn, London, WC1V 7BH



Llywodraeth Cynulliad Cymru
Welsh Assembly Government

