

Examiners' Report

June 2017

GCE Government & Politics 6GP04 4D

Edexcel and BTEC Qualifications

Edexcel and BTEC qualifications come from Pearson, the UK's largest awarding body. We provide a wide range of qualifications including academic, vocational, occupational and specific programmes for employers. For further information visit our qualifications websites at www.edexcel.com 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 2017

Publications Code 6GP04_4D_1706_ER

All the material in this publication is copyright
© Pearson Education Ltd 2017

Introduction

A pleasing proportion of candidates had clearly been well-prepared for this examination. Subject knowledge was particularly strong and there was, for the most part, a pleasing focus on the wording of the questions. The questions worked well for differentiation and all questions appeared to be equally accessible to candidates. Most candidates had been well prepared to define and explain key terms. There were a number of outstanding responses across all eight questions.

The most popular short questions were the responses on neo-colonialism and the North-South divide. The most popular long questions were the responses on terrorism and on human rights.

The advice from previous series of questions remains valid. As usual, there were a few key differentiators between candidates' responses. The key to success in responding to the questions set is to recognise that not one, but in the case of the longer essay response, four marks, are being awarded for each script.

Whilst Assessment Objective 1 (A01) knowledge may help a candidate to achieve 12 of the available 45 marks, there are still 33 marks available for A02, synopticity and A03. A large proportion of candidates score well in A01 because they provide detailed and developed knowledge and understanding, with relevant and accurate work but they can fail to attain the marks that are available elsewhere. The intellectual skills required to perform at the highest level in A02 revolve around the ability to provide analysis, evaluation and parallels or connections. This can be a challenge for those candidates who rely primarily on production of learnt fact and knowledge. Synopticity, where candidates are expected to provide an awareness of competing viewpoints or perspectives, can be a weak area for some. The longer questions are designed for debate and discussion of alternative viewpoints. A03 can also be an issue for some candidates. There is a need to bring all of the earlier A0 elements into a structured and logical response, which provides balance and use of appropriate political vocabulary.

Question 1

The question on neo-colonialism was particularly popular and the majority of candidates were able to provide a clear explanation of the term. Explanations as to how neo-colonialism contributes towards poverty were reasonably strong with many candidates holding a focus on the International Financial Institutions and the role of TNCs.

This candidate explains the central concept of neo-colonialism partly through a contrast with colonialism. They then move on to a focus on the key themes of the actions of the international financial institutions and TNCs.

Neo-colonialism is the dominance of states through mainly economic means. It is different to colonialism in that colonialism ~~used~~ uses ~~the~~ military and political power to achieve dominance and control of another state.

Neo-colonialism is usually used to refer to the economic dominance of many states in the global south by countries or institutions from the global North, or more specifically, 'Western' nations.

One way that Neo-colonialism may contribute to poverty is through the imposition of neoliberal policies by NGOs and institutions like the IMF and World Bank. They have been criticised for their usage of a 'one-size-fits-all' policy when it comes to trying to improve development in developing nations. Policies like Privatisation, Trade Liberalisation and Austerity may have worked for developed western nations in the global north, but have proven ineffective for developing nations. For example, the IMF's Structural Adjustment Programme (SAPs) - which aimed to alleviate poverty in areas like sub-Saharan Africa only made things worse. Trade liberalisation and opening up developing nations' markets allowed for exploitation by western nations and destruction of local economies, because the IMF continually

allowed Western nations to engage in protectionism, but not developing nations. Therefore, institutions like the IMF allowed for structural dominance of developed nations by developing nations, thus further entrenching poverty by the destruction of local economies.

Another way that Neo-colonialism may contribute to global poverty is through the actions of Trans-National Corporations (TNCs). With the rise of globalisation, western firms saw opportunities in developing nations with cheap labour markets and relaxed environmental regulation. TNCs therefore exploited the labour workforces of various developing nations, for example with Nike in Bangladesh, at one point in 2004, they were paying their workers less than \$1.50 a day, below which the UN defines as 'absolute poverty'. TNCs like Coca-Cola also exploited local infrastructure and environment, like in Eastern India where they cut off an entire village's water supply for their factories, thus allowing for more poverty due to lack of basic necessities for the village's inhabitants. Therefore, Neo-colonialism contributes to poverty through the actions of many TNCs.



ResultsPlus

Examiner Comments

The neo-liberal policies of NGOs and global institutions are at the heart of this explanation of neo-colonialism. Neo-liberal policies with an emphasis on privatisation, trade liberalisation and other elements of structural adjustment programmes are discussed, as are the exploitative nature of a number of TNCs.

This candidate covers three wide areas with pleasing examples, all following on from an introduction focused on explaining the key term.

Neo-colonialism is the idea that modern global relationships are exploitative in a similar way that those colonial relationships of 16-20 were in that stronger states seek to use weaker states for their own economic gain. There are three ways this contributes to poverty: through institutions, ~~and~~ investment and trade. These criticisms are generally linked by dependency theorists like Singer.

Firstly and most importantly, neo-colonialism contributes to poverty through international institutions like the WTO, IMF and World Bank. For example, ~~the Washington Consensus~~ ~~World Bank~~ ~~SAPs~~

encourages ^{in order to make goods and trade links easy to access for rich state} neoliberal economics including deregulation, the removal of tariffs and the reduction of state expenditure. This can be harmful to developing states ^{that} ~~are~~

do not necessarily have industries that can stand up to global competition. The damage this can do was seen in the

1995 SAP in Mexico that resulted in 600 000 more people ending up in extreme poverty each year 1995-2001. Thus, international institutions and the view of development they promote is one way neocolonialism causes poverty.

Secondly, neocolonial investment is a way poverty is caused. China, for example, prey on states with large national debts and buy up their land and resources at far below their value for their own economic gain, thus depriving those states ^{of those resources and their value} and entrenching poverty. This was seen in Mozambique with a national public debt of ~~\$55~~ \$850 million where China brought up cashew farmers for a similar trend has happened ^{low prices} in cabbage farms in Congo and Angolan fisheries. Thus, investment that is neocolonial has caused poverty.

A supplementary way that neocolonialism has contributed to poverty is through

trade. Exploitative trade is seen between developed and developing states that allows the developed state to progress financially whilst condemning the weaker state to more poverty. For example, coffee is the second most traded commodity in the world, yet due to low prices set on the New York market in a wealthy state, selling states like Ethiopia struggle to balance an economy on it with 9 million Ethiopians^{reliant} on emergency food aid. Thus, exploitative trade is a way that neocolonialism causes poverty.

In conclusion there are three ways neocolonialism causes poverty. Most importantly through international institutions. Secondly, through investment. Finally, and least importantly through trade.



ResultsPlus Examiner Comments

This candidate begins with an explanation of neo-liberalism which is described as an exploitative relationship compared and contrasted with historic colonialism. There is a focus on institutions, investment and trade.

Discussion of institutions covers IMF, World Bank and WTO with discussion of SAPs and neo-liberal economics. The second area of discussion is neo-colonial investment with the debt issues and dependency connected. The final area of discussion is that of the unequal trade relationship, with examples provided.

Question 2

This was a fairly popular question and most candidates had no issue in defining and/or explaining this key term from the specification which many referenced in other relevant essays. North Korea tended to be the central example although, of course, some candidates preferred to use the examples of other states, including the United States. Clearly this was part of the response from many as to why the concept is controversial. Syria was used as an example by many who chose to discuss the differing perspectives held by the US and Russia on the Assad regime.

A brief explanation of the central term leads the candidate to three controversies with some use of examples.

A Rogue state is a state that ignores the international community & may pursue aggressive foreign policy against its neighbours + the globe at large & act independently.

Firstly, this term is controversial as it is ~~proposed~~ subjective. ~~At the~~ The 'rogue states' are merely states that wish to preserve their independence in the international system. For example, North Korea pursues aggressive policy against its neighbours to protect its regime that other states disagree with. It sees itself as an autonomous state which has the right to independent authority within its state. It is argued North Korea only has those policies to protect itself from invasion which it has been subjected to throughout its existence, especially the proxy war of the Cold War in the 1950s. Thus, this term is subjective to those who use it & are called it, therefore making it controversial. ~~North Korea has never~~ ^{hasn't} attacked any state so merely wishes to keep its control.

Secondly, it is controversial due to the provocative nature

of the term. The words 'rogue state' are "only used by the West to delegitimise a state and its policy. The US called Iran a rogue state to turn global opinion against the state, thus using it for its own aims. Therefore the term is controversial as it is manipulated by those in power for moral authority above other states. Arguably, this is a play for great power conflict & is only used as a weapon against others when the branded has no intention of truly being aggressive.

Finally, the term is controversial as some believe it should be applied to states in the West, namely the US. Noam Chomsky argues the US causes terror to millions in the Middle East by using drone strikes to combat Syria + IS. However, the US is therefore using aggressive foreign policy & is not keeping the peace in the international system. Moreover, the War on Terror & subsequent invasion of Iraq was branded illegal by the UN, therefore making America an aggressive state ignoring international law, thus it too should be called a rogue state, ~~rather than just that~~ making it a controversial term.



There is a discussion of the position of North Korea and the idea that a rogue state may simply be a state which wishes to remain an autonomous state, trying to protect state sovereignty rather than the traditional perspective of a rogue state as one which is seemingly more problematic for the international community.

Controversy over the use of the term by those who wish to manipulate and to claim a higher moral authority in order to damage the legitimacy of states like Iran is then followed by the perspective that the term could be applied to those states more likely to accuse other states of being rogue states. There is reference to the United States and the suggestion that it may be labelled a rogue state as a consequence of breaching certain elements of international law.

This candidate follows the formulae which often brings success of a definition leading to identification of a decent number of factors to be discussed.

A rogue state is a functioning state within the world political system that largely operates outside of the established order. The traditional example of a rogue state is North Korea, with no international trade and a despotic, nominally Communist government. Rogue states are controversial firstly as they are typically a perjorative term applied by powerful Western governments, secondly as some states who are arguably rogue but are not so labeled due to power in the system, and thirdly whether there is an unbiased definition of 'rogue state'.

Most importantly, rogue states are controversial as a concept as thinkers such as Noam Chomsky argues that given every state has external sovereignty, granted under the treaty of Westphalia

1648, no state can be judged against for pursuing a given domestic course of action. Thus, that a state such as Iran is called rogue for pursuing nuclear weaponry is a testament to Western soft power in the system as the dominant Western media shapes perceptions.

Secondly, there is the example of the US which has repeatedly flouted international law (e.g. vetoing a judgement against the US in the US vs. Nicaragua ICJ case, or invading Iraq without security Council approval), yet is not considered a rogue state as it has significant power in the world political system, meaning that rogue states are thus perjoratively labelled, not objectively.

Lastly, the concept of rogue state is controversial as it is difficult to find an unbiased definition which can be universally applied. As previously mentioned, states which could conceivably be labelled rogue are not within the current definition, and thus 'rogue states' fails to be properly applicable. Among academics, arguments persist over whether the concept of rogue states can exist without a degree of bias.

In conclusion, the concept of rogue states is controversial as it is mostly applied by Western state media, Western states which are arguably acting rogue are not labelled rogue, and academics

png

are unsure whether rogue states can ^{be defined} ~~exist~~ without an element of bias, or are fundamentally a pejorative term



ResultsPlus

Examiner Comments

Following the introduction we look at the controversy linked to state sovereignty. State sovereignty, based on the Treaty of Westphalia 1648, may suggest that states shouldn't be judged on their domestic policy, e.g. the Iran nuclear programme. The idea that the US breaches international law is supported by reference to a couple of valid examples and there is also discussion about the differences between academics as to the application of the term with a perceived western bias.



ResultsPlus

Examiner Tip

Again, a positive way to start a response with definition/explanation and a list of areas to be discussed.

Question 3

The most popular question on this paper was well answered by a good number of candidates who had a clear understanding of what was meant by the North-South divide. Candidates presented a number of reasons as to why the North-South divide may no longer be considered relevant with most focusing on the development of certain states and regions in the traditional South at a time when economic decline or stagnation appears to have affected many members of the traditional North.

Not the best explanation of the Brandt reports (and incorrect dates applied) but the response improves significantly with clear arguments explaining why the North-South divide may no longer be relevant.

The North-South Divide was first popularised by the Brandt report in the 90's and it suggests that the Northern and Southern hemispheres show inequality in terms of the spread of wealth and power. Recently, the relevance of this has come under question, as

One reason why it ~~was~~^{arguably} no longer relevant is due to the emerging BRIC economies - specifically India and China which are located in the Global South. China had maintained a 10% growth rate in its economy for more than three decades and for 2017 its expected growth is 6.6% whilst the US, a global North state, is only expected to grow by 1.5%. As well as this China has overtaken the US and become the world's largest exporter accounting for 14% of global exports. By 2050 India is expected to become the world's largest economy with

growth for 2017 expected to be 7.4%. With its substantial growth China has been able to lift 250 million out of absolute poverty. Thus both China and India in recent years have seen substantial growth in terms of their economy which has allowed them to lift more people out of poverty which potentially shows how outdated the North-South Divide has become as it has no place for emerging economies.

The North-South divide can also be seen to be outdated ~~due to~~ as it fails to draw on new, emerging trends in global inequality. The North-South divide focuses on between-country inequality - and suggests that northern economies are more developed. However, northern economies today are experiencing increasing trends in the growth of within-country inequality. A recent ~~of~~ Guardian article wrote that the UK's gap between the rich and poor was increasing year on year - with the top 1% of earners holding a total of 19% of the wealth in the UK whilst the lowest 15%.

of earners accounted for 0% of the total wealth in the UK. Furthermore due to globalisation both the UK and US have seen a sharp increase in unemployment in 2016 - TNCs in the US cut 750 million jobs on average whilst opening up 475 million outside of the US. Thus the North-South divide fails to recognise ~~with~~ the growing trend in within-country inequality - instead focusing on between.

The North-South divide may also no longer be relevant due to the emergence of more up-to-date terms. For ~~exa~~ The World Systems Theory, for example, ^{potentially} more accurately describes trends in global politics - as it gives a place to 'core' countries which dominate ^{the} global economy and 'periphery' countries which mainly provide raw, cheap products to the 'core' states - but it also has 'semi-periphery' countries - thus the BRIC economies can be accurately placed into the ~~description~~ Theory whereas for the ~~Brav~~ North-South divide - ~~the~~ global inequality is no longer as clear cut.



The rise of the BRIC states is considered, including the impressive Chinese economic growth. 'Within state' inequalities are discussed as an alternative to the traditional clear North-South divide along with the relative decline and economic position of some traditional Global North states. The relevance of an alternative analysis of global division is discussed (World Systems Theory) with the division based on core and periphery states.

This response also begins with a reference to the Brandt Reports but there is only a cursory explanation. The direction of the essay is made clear by reference to the economic rise of the South, increasing structural power of the South and consideration, again, of the Wallerstein World Systems Theory.

Theorised in the Brandt Reports of 1980 and 1983, the North-South divide is explained to be the divide in technological advancement and wealth of the conceptual "North" and "South". However, as can be seen this theory has been undermined in recent years due to the economic rise of the South, the structural power of the South and the better analysis of Wallerstein's World Systems Theory.

Firstly, one can see that the divide is less relevant due to the economic rise of the South, particularly China and India. Through China's growth rates of over 7% for 30 years, only slowing in 2016 to 6.7%, it has risen above America in GDP PPP with America now indebted to it, showing overall national development to be less relevant. This is also seen in rapid growth of India, which is predicted by 2030 to make up half of the world's economy combined with China, as well as consistent 10% growth rates in nations in South East Asia like Taiwan, as well as Africa like Botswana and Ethiopia, which coupled with economic recession in the developed world has conquered much of divide.

Secondly one can see its less relevant due to the increasing structural power of the Global South. Through the soft power rise of Brazil with the 2014 World Cup and 2016 Olympics, the increasing power within Belt and Road of China, India and Saudi Arabia, as well as the importance of G20, including 8 "South" nations over the G7 which has none, one can see that the Global South have increasing power over the structural and political element of global relations, additionally seen through the need for ^{developing} nations like China and India in discussions on global warming, seen in the Paris Climate Change Conference, once again showing a resurgent South to conquer views of Northern political dominance.

Additionally one can see its relevance has been reduced due to the importance of Wallerstein's World Systems Theory in explaining global divides. One can see his interpretation of "core" and "periphery" nations is more accurate as TNCs ^{North} exploit those in Global North and are exploited by those in Global South, seen through China acting like a ~~core~~ nation in neo-colonising Africa, seen in the railway from Nairobi to Indian Ocean funded by Chinese state to get Kenyan governmental influence, as well as Global North nations being exploited by TNCs, seen in capitalisation on cheap labour in Eastern Europe, the "core" "periphery" model more accurately explains power structures than the North / South divide.



ResultsPlus

Examiner Comments

The development of China including statistics to show the rapid and sustained growth is followed by reference to India and also the so-called Asian Tigers. The structural power of certain Global South states is covered with reference to their growing influence in the Bretton Woods institutions as well as the rise of G20 at the expense of G7 and the growing power of traditional Global South states in international conferences in areas such as global warming. There is also discussion of the alternative Wallerstein World Systems Theory.

Question 4

The question on human rights and different meanings of the term in different parts of the world was a popular question with most candidates providing a definition of human rights before moving on to discussion of three cultural views. The first of these was the universalist view presented and supported by elements of the western world. The Communitarian view and Asian values were discussed by many candidates, as was an Islamic perspective.

A brief introduction with reference to human rights includes an explanation of the conflict between Western values and a perceived Islamic theories perspective. Further divisions are then explored.

Human rights are ^{sets of} fundamental beliefs that humans are intrinsically entitled to, however the extent of these vastly differ between international communities due to where they derive their viewpoint of human rights from. For example, most Western liberal democracies adhere, and are legally bound, to the UNCHR, United Nations charter of Human Rights. However, many Islamic theocracies, such as Saudi Arabia, derive their human rights from the Koran and the established Sharia Law.

This difference in interpretation of human rights is solidified by state sovereignty. Realists believe in the importance of Westphalia principles of non-intervention between states in order to prevent any provocation that could easily lead to conflict in this anarchic world system. Consequently, as according to the Peace of Westphalia, established

in 1648, states have no mandate to ever interfere in the internal matters of another state. In addition since sovereignty ~~is the~~ provides states with absolute authority within their borders, it means states have absolute control over the civil liberties, or 'human rights', of its citizens. As a result, the UNCHR is not a universally legally binding set of rules.

Also, 'cultural relativism' plays a key role in the different meanings of human rights. This stems from the fact nations have different history, and thus have formed different outlooks on life so will value human rights in different ways. This is exemplified by the difference between the Western liberal democracy, which has firm roots in individualism, and Confucian Asia, which prioritizes the good of the community. Consequently, the execution of Akmal Shaikh for smuggling 4kg of heroin in to China highlighted this difference. For example one British MP commented "this is not

how a modern democracy should be behaving", however this viewpoint was contrasted well by the judges view that the harm to the community ~~which~~ that 4kg of heroin would cause severely outweighs the life of an individual.

Finally due to the fact human rights are segregated into three generations (1st, 2nd and 3rd generation rights) ~~there~~ it has caused splits in opinion as some cultures don't value all generations equally. This is exemplified by the difference between Western and Islamic views of the 'right not to be tortured', since many Islamic states don't define 'rajm', or stoning, as torture ~~but~~ and is an institutionalized capital punishment in 11 Middle Eastern countries such as ~~the~~ the United Arab Emirates. Furthermore,



ResultsPlus Examiner Comments

There is an interesting discussion of the realist perspective on human rights and the idea of non-intervention which suggests that human rights should not be universally accepted or imposed. The candidate moves on to a consideration of the division between those who support individualism versus those who support the importance primarily of the community. The candidate explains the three generations of rights and the focus by states on different rights depending on needs and perspective.

An enjoyable read which is well-informed and knowledgeable. The introduction covers a definition as well as providing some historical perspective of certain milestones such as the UDHR.

Human rights are those which humans are entitled to in virtue of being human. They gained prominence in the enlightenment-era of philosophy due to thinkers like Hobbes and Locke. The Universal Declaration of Human Rights and European ^{Convention} ~~Convention~~ of Human Rights (1950) have further cemented their relevance. However, Edward Shaid in his work 'On Human Rights' illustrated how ~~the~~ cultural relativism exists with different global values.

One reason human rights have different meanings across the world is due to the difference of interpretation with Islam. Islamic creeds follow the Koran and Sharia law which is far less liberal to western liberal enlightenment ideals like acceptance of homosexuality. For example, Pew Research Centre established that in Afghanistan 99% of Muslims agree with Sharia law

being the official state law. Furthermore, even 32% of Muslims in the reasonably Western (maybe not now with President Erdogan) Turkey say they agree with honour killing.

continues the Saudi Arabia strike down homosexuality a capital offense and women subordinate (only recently allowed to drive cars). This completely different interpretation shows how human rights have a different meaning.

Furthermore, some states may see them as meaning western imperialism, undermining their personal values and national sovereignty. President Museveni of Uganda has illustrated this, claiming "there is now an attempt at social imperialism, to impose western social values". Museveni is outspoken about his views on homosexuality "they are disgusting". The humanitarian intervention into places like Sierra Leone or Kosovo have therefore been criticized as the west attempting to put its own values. The UDHR of course is distinctly western in ideology, as are the 1st (liberty) and 2nd (equality) 3rd (fraternity) generations of human rights. Therefore, human rights have been claimed to have the meaning of imperialism and an undermining of sovereignty.

Furthermore, human rights may have different meanings in Asia, particularly China, due to

it being based on the philosophy of Confucius and not Islam or Christianity. Importantly too, this is becoming more significant under President Xi who is attempting to inculcate these values as a form of soft power. For Asian values, the 1993 Bangkok declaration is a key text, clearly showing how the human rights of the individual in China are second to that of the community. China uses this to justify the widespread human rights abuses and use of capital punishment.



ResultsPlus Examiner Comments

The Islamic perspective and the clash with liberal values is provided with a good number of examples. A rejection of western values and western cultural imperialism is also explored with further examples of those states and individuals who prefer sovereignty to universalism. Asian values are tackled last with the significance of the community perspective over that of rights based on the individual.



ResultsPlus Examiner Tip

Some excellent use of examples helps to strengthen this script.

Question 5

A considerable number of candidates had prepared the standard description of sustainable development as 'development that meets the needs of the present without compromising the ability of future generations to meet their own needs'. From this point they moved on usually to cover arguments relating to realistic limit to growth. Some argued that sustainable development can be seen as a way of restricting economic growth for those states and people who would truly benefit from growth, and made clear the view that there are potential double standards in developed states, insisting that developing states embrace sustainable development. Deep ecologists arguing that sustainable development isn't sufficient was also explored by many.

This is an enjoyable response which begins with a clear explanation of the concept of sustainable development before moving to three or four controversies which are well explained and exemplified.

Sustainable development ~~can be~~ is the process of economic development that ensure protection to the environment. Resources should be taken only if they will not produce shortages and long term damage. The needs of today should be met whilst not damaging the environment so it is able to meet the needs of future generation. It is supported by shallow ecologists as ~~there~~ a beneficial method of development. It is, however, controversial.

Firstly, it can be seen to be controversial in terms of state interests. By committing to ~~as~~ sustainable development it mean 'reigning in' economic growth which is not popular with many ~~the~~ ~~generations~~ Political parties within states can be seen to compete through debate over who can produce the best economic conditions. This shows how

important economic growth is considered to be and therefore why limiting it for environmental reasons can be seen to be controversial. This can particularly be seen to be the case with developing states. They feel that as they have had minimal contribution to global warming, as they are not yet industrialised so have low emissions, that they should have the right to develop as states in the global North did. This would lead to unsustainable use of fossil fuels and resources. This can be seen as a reason why sustainable development is controversial. It prevents or at least slows their process of ~~reaching~~^{reaching} a level of development they feel that they deserve.

The idea of sustainable development is also seen to be controversial in regards to deep ecologists. They argue that it simply does not go far enough. They reject the idea of anthropocentrism and therefore the idea that some weight should be given (as in the idea of sustainable development) to ensuring states continue to develop. Deep ecologists see the term as controversial as they believe that there needs to be a radical change in our approach to the environment putting it first. Eco-socialists, eco-anarchists and eco-

feminists are an example of people who believe in more radical change and therefore that Sustainable development is a controversial concept.

In complete contrast to this it can also be seen to be controversial in regards to climate change sceptics. They believe that they should not have to curb economic growth as it is not that damaging on the environment. This can be seen to be a particularly prominent ^{currently} ~~issue at the moment~~ due to president Trump who recently pulled out of the Paris agreement. Trump's actions show how sustainable development is controversial as he used the phrase 'America First' to show how economic growth ^{not sustainability} was a priority. This shows the ^{controversy over the} ~~conflict that results from the~~ concept.

Overall, the ~~first~~ term sustainable development can be seen to be controversial due to the conflict with state interests, the view of deep ecologists that it ~~too~~ does not go far enough and the view of environmental sceptics that it goes too far.



ResultsPlus

Examiner Comments

The impact of sustainable development on states and the focus of political parties, on the whole, within states on growth rather than sustainable development is an interesting one. Resistance to the concept from certain members of the developing world is followed by a clear explanation of the criticism provided by Deep Ecologists who argue that sustainable development is insufficient when there is a need for more radical action. Climate change scepticism is also discussed with reference to comments from Trump and withdrawal from the Paris agreement.

An excellent response which begins with a clear definition of sustainable development albeit attributed incorrectly. Three factors are mentioned in the introduction.

Sustainable development is the practise of "meeting the needs of the present without compromising the needs of future generations" (Brundt). It has however been seen as controversial due to its slowing of economic growth, ~~the~~ it being a scam to prevent global south developing and a lack of ~~super~~ effective global governance to enforce it as well as ~~clashing~~ with business interests.

Sustainable development is seen as controversial due to its slowing of economic growth. As sustainable development is the tying together of long term economic goals with ~~the~~ protection of the environment, it can lead to slower growth as ~~not~~ faster growth has led to environmental degradation in the past. The industrial revolution led to the infamous London smogs, and a contemporary example is similar smogs in Beijing today. In order to prevent the pollution, states and businesses are being forced to use more expensive methods of obtaining growth, ~~ex~~ like renewable energy, which is often ~~less~~ more expensive and

therefore limits growth making sustainable development ~~less~~ more controversial.

Sustainable development is also controversial as many global south states view it as a method to prevent their

development. This marxist view was ~~for~~ formulated by Grabel in 1997 and ~~has~~ he argued that global north states are using ^{the} sustainable development to slow down global south economies and keep them "enslaved" (Frank) and from becoming core states; moving out of the periphery. Global South states argue that the current level of pollution was purely caused by Global North, the first evidence of climate change began appearing in the 1950's long ~~before~~ ~~begin~~ before the industrialisation of global south. Due to this, global south states, like China and India, argue they should be allowed to pollute in order to ~~catch~~ "catch up" with Global North and that Global North's economies should be forced to bear the brunt of environmental protection not theirs - making sustainable development controversial.

There is also a lack of effective global governance to enforce environmental procedures. The Bretton Woods institutions are perfectly placed ~~on~~ to install global green taxes for example but instead choose further economic gains, sponsoring projects which cause harm - flooding of several valleys in India for electrical plants. The environmental treaties such as Kyoto + Paris are ~~not~~ binding and so states have no incentive to meet

targets and often can pull out. The second largest polluter (largest per capita) the U.S. failed to ratify Kyoto and ~~was~~ pulled out Paris in 2017 with no direct consequences. The lack of an ~~there~~ so a supranational world government means sustainable development will never have its guiding and is therefore pointless and contravened.



ResultsPlus Examiner Comments

The impact on growth of sustainable development is followed by a use of political commentators to suggest that there is opposition and resistance in the Global South. The final argument is that sustainable development is doomed as a concept by the lack of effective global governance with the point made that Bretton Woods institutions tend to support and encourage economic growth and development rather than environmental concern.

Question 6

The question on the extent to which terrorism is a significant threat to global security was by far the most popular long response on this examination paper. Although widely welcomed there were a sizeable number of candidates who relied solely on knowledge and examples of terror attacks rather than on the analysis required to tackle this question. Candidates clearly needed to go beyond explaining how horrific recent attacks in the west had been if they were to progress to level 3 marks. There were plenty of examples of better responses.

A reasonable definition leads us to a lengthy, two-sided, evidence-laden argument which covers a significant amount of territory. The introduction immediately suggests that there are numerous reasons as to why terrorism may be a significant threat, as well as highlighting the opposing view.

Terrorism is the use of some level of military force against 'the innocent' in an attempt to achieve political, ideological ~~and~~ ^{or} religious goals. Terrorism can be seen to be increasingly religiously motivated as demonstrated by the actions of the Islamic State. It has been argued that it is a significant threat to global security due to the impact, the resources available to and used by terrorists and the scale of the response. However, it can also be argued that terrorism is perceived to be a greater threat than it actually is and there are more significant threats to global security. This essay will argue that whilst terrorism is important it is not as significant a threat as it is often seen to be.

Firstly, terrorism can be seen to be a significant threat to global security due to the impact of the attack. This can firstly be seen in the fact

that the ~~deaths~~^{attacks} often result in the death of innocent civilians. The worst example of this is the 9/11 attack which resulted in the death of nearly 3,000 people including children. There are many other examples including the three fatal attacks that have taken place in the UK since march. The fact that it results in death is one reason why it can be seen to be a threat. It creates an atmosphere of fear as people feel that they are vulnerable to attack. Terrorist attacks can also be seen to be a threat because they can be seen to increasingly target symbols of western power. The 9/11 attack for instance had three targets of economic, military and political significance in the US and whilst one plane crashed before the target, the other ~~destroyed~~^{hit} the World Trade Centre and the pentagon. This can, therefore, be seen to be a threat as the targets are valuable and symbolically important. They can also, especially in the case of Islamic fundamentalist groups, be seen to target the culture of western societies. This is evident in the recent attacks of the Ariana Grande concert in Manchester and the London attack on Bars and restaurants in Borough Market. This is a significant threat as it challenges

western way of life. However, these impacts can be argued to be less significant than they are sometimes made out to be. Firstly in regards to deaths the death toll from terrorism is comparatively small. ~~One~~ less than 20 attacks can be seen to have more than 100 deaths in the last 50 years. The three most recent terror attacks in the UK combined had fewer deaths than the Grenfell Tower fire where more than 70 people died. There are therefore arguably other more important threats such as conventional warfare and civil wars as 100,000 people were killed in Rwanda in 100 days. The impact of terror attacks are also not long lasting. Whilst they may target symbols of political, military and economic control they have not sufficiently damaged the economic strength or military capacity of these states. This suggests it is not that big a threat. There are other, ~~arguably~~ threats that can be seen to inflict greater damage in the long term. Climate change is one example of this. This is demonstrated in the fact that the Maldives established a plan to relocate its population to Australia should it flood ~~by the~~ due to rising sea levels. This is more severe and more permanent than the

impact of terrorism. This is evidence that there are numerous threats to global security and terrorism is not that significant a threat itself.

Another reason why terrorism can be seen to be a significant threat is the resources available to and used by terrorists. Terror attacks can be carried out by small groups or even individuals. The Manchester attack was one individual and the Borough Market attack 3. This makes terrorism a more significant threat as it means that the terrorist group do not have to build a large army and can be effective easily. Globalisation can also be seen to have benefitted terrorist organisations. It has allowed the spread of people, materials and ideas across borders. This has led to the radicalisation of people as far as Europe to Islamic fundamentalism for example. This can be seen in the Trojan Horse scandal where radical Islam was being taught in schools in the UK. It can also be seen in European residents moving to Syria and elsewhere to join ISIS. This has ensured terror organisations have larger membership, and more people joining. This gives them the potential to be a greater threat. The

main reason, in terms of resources, why terrorism can be seen to be a significant threat is the ~~possibility~~ possibility of terrorists gaining nuclear weapons. These groups would have fewer

moral qualms about using such weapons. They have a huge destructive capacity and could inflict serious damage (as is evident in the aftermath of nuclear weapons being used in Hiroshima and Nagasaki). This potential is seen in the fact that Al Qaeda expressed an interest in gaining nuclear weapons. This would undoubtedly make terrorism a significant threat. However, there are limitations to this argument about resources.

Firstly, by its very nature terrorism consists of sporadic attacks which are in reality rare. This means that they can be carried out, as mentioned before, by small groups. But this does mean that they lack the ability to carry out a concentrated, co-ordinated attack on the state they are attacking like a conventional army could. This means that whilst it is easier to launch small attacks they cannot overthrow governments. This is largely true of terrorists that seek ideological change and those that seek ~~with~~ political power (such as the IRA). This makes them a less significant threat than an

enemy state for instance. In regards to nuclear weapons they would make terrorism a significant threat however this is simply not yet the case. This suggests that terrorism has the potential to be a threat but is not yet a significant threat. This suggests that terrorism cannot be seen to be a particularly significant threat to global security at the moment.

Finally, terrorism can be argued to be a significant threat due to the scale of the response. The 9/11 attack by Al Qaeda led to the launch of the War on terror. This is the efforts by the US and its key allies to root out and destroy the forces deemed to be responsible for global terrorism. This resulted in the War with Afghanistan and then with Iraq. The fact that these states were prepared to go to war - despite public opposition especially in the case of Iraq - demonstrates how serious a threat it is perceived to be in the world political system. Terrorism has also led to the passing of legislation. In the UK the plethora of anti-terror legislation includes, among other

things, the detention of terror suspects without trial for 28 days. In America the US Patriot Act led to the indefinite detention of immigrants. These actions can be seen to conflict with human rights. This is seen in the fact that the UK Supreme Court ~~ruled~~ ruled in favour of the release of 9 terror suspects from Belmarsh prison on the grounds that their detention was discriminatory against their race and therefore against their right to non-discrimination. The waterboarding of terror suspects in Guantanamo Bay can also be seen to be against the right not to be tortured. This shows just how serious a threat terrorism is taken to be as states are willing to ~~be~~ overlook human rights issues in order to try and protect the citizens of their state from terrorism. On the other hand, it can be argued that this response is a reason why the threat of terrorism is not that significant to global security. This is because the action taken by states has made them safer. Following 9/11 there was a huge increase in airport security which has limited the threat of terrorism. There has also been an effort to increase police provision especially ~~anti-terror~~ counter-terror officers and armed police.

This is evident in the fact that the police was a heavily debated topic in the UK 2017 election campaign. In the case of religious or other extremism there has been a huge effort to try and identify the issues early on before they become a problem. This has been carried out by working with schools and Mosques. This can be seen to be a positive safety measure that has limited the significance of the threat posed by terrorism.

Overall, there is a strong case that can be made to suggest that terrorism is a significant threat to global security. However, there is also a very strong argument to suggest otherwise. Terrorism is heavily reported in the media and creates an atmosphere of fear that makes it appear to be more significant than it really is. As well as this the issue of terrorism is seen as more of a threat in western, developed states. For the poorest, developing states ^{it is not as reported} ~~issues of poverty and~~ or significant. There can be seen to be a number of other threats such as disease, poverty, climate change and war that can be seen to have a more significant long lasting effect. Due to the small scale, short term impact, the fact terrorists cannot easily overwhelm

governments and don't have nuclear weapons and the benefit of the response it cannot be seen to be as serious as a significant threat to global security as it is often made to seem. (Total for Question = 45 marks)



ResultsPlus Examiner Comments

Arguments supporting the view include that terrorism creates effective fear, particularly when directed at western power through symbolic targets such as those attacked on 9/11. Terrorism challenges a western way of life, and small numbers of resources can have a huge impact. Globalisation helps spread terror tactics and helps recruitment; terrorists seek nuclear weapons and overreaction has worsened the situation with human rights abuses such as Guantanamo Bay, as well as leading to interventions in Iraq and Afghanistan which have further helped recruitment of terror groups.

The counter-argument is based on the relatively small number of deaths at the hands of terrorists compared with, for example, accidents, or compared with wars and conflict such as the Rwandan genocide. Climate change may be a bigger issue and terrorism doesn't overthrow governments. The media exaggerates and terrorists don't appear anywhere near to gaining nuclear weapons.



ResultsPlus Examiner Tip

A really well-balanced response helps synopticity marks.

A lengthy and detailed introduction provides definition as well as a number of arguments on both sides of the debate before we move to the main body of the response which is perhaps a little one-sided at times.

Terrorism is somewhat of a contested definition; however, it is often associated to refer to the process of using political violence to create a climate of anxiety and fear, in order to achieve some form of political objective (Goodin). Through this notion, it is clear terrorism is a significant threat to global security, chiefly through the reactions

of states to the chaos it creates, the growing global significance of groups and the notion of the US being the globe's greatest terrorist. However, it should be noted that terrorism chiefly occurs on a regional level, often with a significant level of media attention ~~deep~~ creating wider fear, along with threats held by nuclear weapons and climate change holding a more significant threat to global security.

Michael Ignatieff refers to the notion of terrorism occurring in four forms: lone, national, global and insurrectionary. The threat, and response to lone and insurrectionary attacks can be of great threat to global security. Lone terror attacks

have seen a significant increase in recent years, with the event of May 2017 in the Manchester concert bombings highlighting this. ~~The response to this attack by the British Government was somewhat significant, due to its proposals of the effective abandonment of further attacks of this nature in Britain, along with the Orlando club shooting in 2016 and the Bataille day Nice attack also of 2016, for which one individual created a climate of terror, has further heightened the threat. In response to this new terror style~~

attacks (Wilkinson) the French government increases its military involvement in Syria, deepening the quagmire within the state, for which ISIS is based and exports its radical ideology followed by more lone terrorists. This creates further internal stability within the Middle East, leading to a greater threat to global security as more terrorists are radicalised in these areas, highlighting the significant threat to global security.

Further to this, ~~there~~ the threat of terrorism is not limited to simply lone attacks. The insurrectionist nature of groups such as FARC in Colombia, desire an outright ideological regime change towards communism within the state. If this

objective was to be achieved, it would act as a great destabiliser on the global system, as this regime would have a ~~completely~~ destabilising effect on regional bodies Colombia is involved in, and its relations with the US, ~~for whom~~ potentially creating some form of Latin American cold war. Terror groups in the Middle East, particularly so-called Islamic State, also desire to create a state in their own image, aiding in the instability in Iraq and Syria due to their desires to achieve this. With their ability

to control oil fields in the region, IS has a financial weapon which could allow it to pursue far more global goals, perhaps, the creation of some form of dirty bomb. Due to its chaotic nature, it is unlikely to conform to notions of MAD or international law, and perhaps utilise such a weapon or mass destruction, thus creating great instability and fear. This therefore would be a significant threat to global security.

Noam Chomsky refers to the US as being the globe's greatest terrorist state. This ~~is largely~~ judgement is largely formed through George Bush's unequivocal declaration of a 'war on terror' in response to the Al-Qaeda sponsored

9/11 attacks in 2001. This neo-conservative war has led to US ~~backed~~ led interventions in Afghanistan (2001), Iraq (2003) and further movements in Libya and Syria (2011 onwards). This has ~~acted~~ acted as a destabiliser on the international system as these states have ~~fallen into~~ ~~fallen into~~ ~~fallen into~~ increasingly into a quagmire of religious tension and competing ideologies, leading to rising anxiety within them and on the global stage. ~~The~~ ~~the~~ criteria which match the definition of terrorism proposed by Robert Goodin

Due to this ability by a state to create such regional instability, with the birth of retaliatory terror groups within these areas deepening the crisis, it is rather clear to see the significance of terrorism on global security.

However, the regionality of ~~extra~~ terrorism should be noted when observing its global threat. Many terror groups still largely conform to the 'old terror' style desires proposed by Phil Wilkinson, due to their desire to impose their version of a regime over a region. Al-Shabaab in East Africa is a key example of this, through its desire to impose sharia's law over Somalia. Despite its spread to Kenya, with the Westgate

shopping mall attack of 2013 and the Garissa University attack of 2015 (over 200 civilians died across these two incidents) Al-Shabaab has no desires to spread globally, nor for that matter from the horn of Africa. As such, it is perhaps more appropriate to suggest terrorism has a significant impact upon regional security, rather than global security.

furthermore, it should be noted that the reporting of terrorism has a significant impact on heightening

its significance, rather than the act of terror itself. The media response to the Manchester bombing of 2017 was one of significant magnitude, with coverage of the event acting as a main news item for over a week. In contrast, an Islamic fundamentalist attack against Coptic Christians in Egypt, which occurred at the same time, killing over 60 people compared to the 22 murdered in Manchester, received little/no media attention. The media coverage, and perhaps the sensationalist attitude of it, informs popular opinion to a great extent, leading to significant pressure being placed on state governments to respond. This response can often be far more overwhelming than the terror attack itself (as seen with the War on Terror), highlighting the sheer media coverage, rather than actual acts of terror, cause to global security.

Finally, it should be noted that terrorism is not the only threat to global security. Widespread climate change is creating a greater threat to security as states must work to create mitigation and adaptation strategies in order to reverse the ~~late~~ effects on industry, energy and poverty within the world. The destructive threat of nuclear weapons also poses a significant threat.

The destructive capability of such a weapon is far greater than that of any terror attack, and with widening proliferation, and more rogue states now with 'fingers on buttons' the ~~potential~~ likelihood of a nuclear attack is increasing. This arguably poses a far greater threat in security than that of terrorism.

To conclude, however, it is perhaps rather valid to observe that terrorism causes a significant threat to global security. With the ease of radicalisation through information sharing (time/space compression, Scholte 2003), and increasing lone strike attacks, the volatility of state reaction is perhaps the greatest threat to global security. ~~with~~ It should be noted regional stability often lends towards global security issues and the threat of nuclear weapons is somewhat undermined by the notion of MAD and the sheer number of terror attacks by comparison. Therefore it is clear to adjudge that terrorism is, if not the most, significant threat to global security.



Arguments supporting the view that terrorism is a significant threat to global security include that there is often an overreaction from states for example France increasing involvement in Syria and consequently encouraging, perhaps, further radicalisation. The impact of media sensationalism and the argument that the US is perhaps the biggest terror group in the world are part of this argument which suggests that terrorism could in fact change governments and that terrorists could develop WMD or at least the so called dirty bomb.

The counter argument includes that there are more significant issues such as climate change and nuclear proliferation and that terrorism is really a regional rather than global issue which may affect regional rather than global security.

Question 7

This was the least popular of the longer responses and a number of candidates arrived with preformed responses regarding progress or lack of progress on climate change which only partly covered the requirements of this particular question. Better responses considered the role of the Tragedy of the Commons as well as considering other barriers to effective global action such as climate scepticism, disagreements between Deep/Shallow, Radical/Reformist ecologists, divisions between developed and developing states, over responsibility.

Unlike many responses which merely gave evidence that effective action was taking place and then evidence that it wasn't, this response considered alternative barriers to effective global action.

The Tragedy of the commons is the thesis created in the 1960s to explain why environmental degradation occurs, by Hardin. This theory suggests that due to global commons such as the atmosphere and the seas this means that ~~pe~~ herds (states) will exploit this goods, as freedom in the commons 'brings ruin to us all' (Hardin). Therefore this shows that due to selfish actors and a lack of governance no process or management can be met, which is similar to the block created to managing global climate change. However, it can also be considered that other issues such as the ideological block as well as the deadlock between developing and developed countries also causes a block.

Firstly, the Tragedy of the commons causes a barrier to ~~effective~~ management as realists would argue that it recognises that states are selfish actors in a state-centric system. This is the case as like the analogy of the herds exceeding the

carrying capacity in the commons by placing more cows. This is the same with global action. Furthermore, it can be argued that states are encouraged to be free riders of the clean air that is available at the moment as they act out of national interest (Morgenthau) rather than collective interest. This is the case as like the herders, countries benefit more when they continue to use up the remaining carbon storage as this tends to allow them to continue environmental exploitation of the spaceship Earth (boulding) which due to being a closed system will lead to entropy. This is the case as countries will not take part in global agreements, such as the US in the Kyoto Protocol of 1997, so that they can continue to act out of national interest to exploit commons so that economic growth can be ensured. It could be argued that developing countries such as China also do this as despite 8/10 of the most polluted cities in the world being in China, they still take a realist approach that exploitation is better as it allows the 8-10% economic growth to occur.

However, not only is national interest shown in the tragedy of the commons significant to blocking global action that is effective but so is the block between developing and developed

countries. This occurs as due to disagreement on who is responsible and how actions should be taken this means that effective global action does not occur. For example, Kyoto Protocol may have been considered as effective global action due to the binding agreement of a reduction of greenhouse gases to be reduced by 5.2% compared to the 1990 levels, however not all countries ratified the deal. This is the case as it was aimed at developed countries only due to the higher per capita production of CO₂, ~~as~~^{as} US was 4th China per capita production. However although this may address the historical carbon storage usage, it can be argued that they did not know at the time. Therefore developed countries such as China should be included in agreements as in 2008 for the first time China exceeded US levels of pollution. However eco-anarchist would argue that the hierarchy given to states has led to domination over nature which means that as this balance is lost, no global action will be able to occur (Bookchin). This shows that due to this conflict over responsibility between developed and developing this prevents global action being effective. Although like the tragedy of the commons it could be argued that there is deadlock on

agreements due to no supranational government enforcing and policing targets and agreements made. Reformists would argue that despite realist disapproval of infringing state sovereignty this has meant that the liberal idea of global governance can be put forward as effective. This is the case as with a body above state level this ensures that targets are met, as this was an issue with the Copenhagen Accord of 2009, as due to non-legally binding soft law this led to agreements being disregarded. This is like the herders as due to their own interest they exceed the carrying capacity. However, this was also the case with Kyoto as despite the Annex 1 countries agreeing to legally binding targets, nearly no country met this as no actor was actively enforcing this. Especially as the US a global hegemon in a unipolar world refused to ratify the treaty. Therefore this shows that like liberals would point to the effectiveness on the EU on reaching targets on environmental issues, such as enforcing the use of eco-friendly bulbs, this means that targets are met more easily.

However, radical deep ecologists would argue that global action is blocked due to ideological beliefs. This is because due to the spread of

Liberalism through globalisation this has spread the idea of a McWorld (Barber) which has high consumerist levels therefore this shows that due to a 'more and more' approach in materialism and the concern about economic growth no global action can ever be effective. Therefore Naess promotes ecocentrism which promotes the idea, against liberals, that nature should not be commodified but thought as equal to us in biodiversity. Therefore this means we should find 'richness from within' and according to ecocentrists the only global action that would be effective is by removing the capitalist system and replacing it with a communist one, showing capitalism to be the main barrier.

However optimists may disagree although and suggest that global action has been effective in that consensus on the anthropocentric cause has made global warming worse with increased consumption of fossil fuels. As well as this they may point to the agreements such as the Rio Summit in 1992 that created the Framework Convention on Climate Change which gave a forum for discussion and agreements. As well as this the Copenhagen Accord set up a \$100b annual fund to help

developing meet their targets. This shows no barriers.

Overall I agree that the tragedy of the commons has contributed to being a barrier to effective management or action on the environment. This is due to the selfish actors and lack of world government. However, I think that disagreement between rich and poor countries has also added to create ~~are~~ barriers as well as the overall ideological conflict of liberalism that causes nature to only have value by meeting human needs and commodification.

- developing vs developed also conflict over the right to development which causes a battle over remaining carbon space.



ResultsPlus

Examiner Comments

There is an explanation of the Garrett Hardin theory which helps to explain the problems facing those who wish for effective global action over the environment. The candidate also references alternative barriers.

There is a great deal of commentary on the Tragedy of the Commons theory and this is followed by the developed versus developing state issue with examples taken from disagreements including major conferences such as Kyoto and Copenhagen. There is further discussion of the Radical ecologist stance and criticism of the more Reformist approach.

There is a great deal of knowledge, fact and statistics in this response, as well as consideration of the Tragedy of the Commons and alternative barriers to effective global action over the environment.

The 'Tragedy of the Commons' is a theory published by Garrett Hardin in 1968.

The 'Tragedy of the Commons' was a theory by Garrett Hardin to explain that the global commons - air, oceans and land ~~resources~~ were guaranteed to be unsustainably exploited due to the self interest of nations (realist perspective). ~~He stated the global commons~~ This is because ~~there~~ ^{states} will ~~be~~ disregard ~~the~~ the implications which utilisation of natural resources for instance of polluting of the atmosphere will cause on the global health of the world ~~as a result~~ ^{there} This theory can be said to be the main barrier to effective global action over the environment which has largely occurred through international climate conferences - the most recent being in Paris 2015.

~~This~~ The tragedy of the commons can be said to be the main barrier to effective global action because of the inherent conflict between national and collective goods. This is seen ~~as economic~~ ^{in Brazil as} they ~~do not protect~~ deplete their natural resource - The Amazon as it is a huge source of economic growth contributing to the reason why Brazil

has been able to sustain such high economic growth rates into a BRICS nation. However, there is inherent conflict with the collective good and interest of the ~~global~~ health of the world. This is seen as many nations would like Brazil to maintain its Amazon forest as it is termed the 'green lungs of the earth' so is essential for regulating CO₂ levels ~~which are~~ - high levels causing ~~the~~ global warming. Therefore the short term economic development of Brazil has been prioritised ~~by~~ meaning ~~of~~ ~~that~~ global action is unable to be effective as sovereignty of nations ^{means} ~~is~~ ~~that~~ ~~being~~ ~~and~~ international efforts cannot force the Brazilian government to stop deforesting the Amazon. therefore no matter whether they agree to cut emissions - 30% Paris Climate Conference, this is increasingly unlikely to ever be achieved when national self interest takes precedence over collective interest.

However, others argue that the tragedy of the commons is not the main barrier as national self interest has seemingly been put aside for the sake of reducing climate change - the most prominent current effect of the Tragedy of the commons seen by ^{global temperature} a 1.8°C rise since 1880.

This is evident as global action has largely been taken through Climate Summits such as ~~that~~^{the} Kyoto Protocol where EU countries have agreed to cut emissions by 80%. However, as sovereignty still remains these nations are able to determine themselves how to reach these targets. This is seen in the UK where there has been a significant shift towards gas instead of coal as it emits half the greenhouse gases per kg of fuel. Therefore, the ~~states~~^{UK} have put their own self interest aside as it was coal in which it could mine but instead a greater dependence on Russia for gas and oil has occurred - many believe this not to be in their interest since Putin has been power as Russia is becoming increasingly politically volatile - seen with the ~~recent~~^{recent} ~~crisis~~ invasion of Crimea.

However, it can be said to be the main barrier to effective global action because there is very apparent conflict between the developing and developed states which is causing the Tragedy of the Commons. This is seen as states disagree on who should cut their emissions and by what - thus self interest and conflicting views are causing ~~an ineffective~~^{ineffective} global action. This is seen by the Kyoto Protocol where developed states such as the EU had to cut emissions and

USA at 71% actually were argued to be one of the main causes of the tragedy of the commons by polluting the ~~world~~ atmosphere for a hundred years - far more than under developed nations. This protocol however lost credibility and was less likely to succeed because the developed states such as the UK were ^{angry} ~~disappointed~~ that the developing states could carry on polluting how they desired without any constraints. This is important as this demonstrates Hardin's theory that self interest will always prevail thus, it countries such as France and the UK feel that the protocol is unfair they are far less likely to attempt to achieve their emission cuts. This is said to be particularly ineffective as China is the second largest polluter at 7.8 CO₂ tonnes per capita thus for them to be exempt means global action ~~is~~ is severely limited.

However, others argue that there are ^{other issues} ~~far more~~ which mean global action is ^{not} effective. Firstly any action which is taken is extremely fragile. ~~This~~ This is seen currently by Trump announcing that he is pulling out the Paris Climate Conference as he believes it to be unfair. Thus all the ~~efforts~~ ^{one of the} made towards what was hailed as the ^{most}

successful environmental agreements has been destroyed simply by ~~and~~ an ~~ad~~ administrator change - thus a huge barrier is political stability. This is seen as Trump's environmental secretary has even denied there being any relationship between the CO_2 and global warming. ~~How~~

However, others would argue that this is an example of the Tragedy of the Commons as Trump is prioritising his national self-interest seen by him wanting to 'take trade back from China' thus the revitalisation of the Rust Belt will be hugely polluting, thus any climate change target will be unlikely to be met.

However, other ~~name~~ which can be said to be a greater than the Tragedy of the Commons is the nature of the global commons ^{meaning} ~~seen in the air~~ it is very difficult to police. This is seen as the term was described by Boulding in 1966 to be a 'space ship' as it is a closed system meaning pollution travels and circulates around the world but cannot be monitored by who it was created, ~~and~~ ^{and} when. Therefore, it is very difficult to ensure that nations are keeping to emission targets leading to the free rider problem. ~~or~~ Additionally, as sovereignty is always in place there is little way of enforcing ~~or~~

reproussions or consequences when states do not achieve their emission targets. This is seen by the UK continually missing their targets for CO₂ emissions reductions yet the UN the chief international body which coordinates these agreements has not enforced any type of punishment against the UK. Therefore, the UK is likely to keep on missing ~~etc~~ targets as there is little deterrence not to - however if there were grave consequences it is likely national interest would prevail again and no nation would sign up to the treaties in the first place.

Additionally, another huge barrier is the issue of TNCs. The environmental global policy is unable to effectively target TNCs which cause much of the pollution ~~was~~ caused in the modern world. This is because many Western TNCs have relocated to underdeveloped nations to manufacture their products such as Apple in China. Here the environmental laws are far less stringent - can cause disasters such as the Bhopal disaster - thus, pollution is far greater than it would be ~~otherwise~~ in a developed nation. As these profits such as Cargill or

~~\$1.629 billion~~ \$3.029 billion are much greater than developing nations they are unable to enforce ~~the~~ new harsher environmental laws on TNCs as they are heavily reliant on them for jobs and FDI. Thus, greater effective international effort is needed to constrain the polluting effects of TNCs.

Overall, it is clear that the major barrier to effective global action is ~~not~~ the tragedy of the commons as states are the principle actors negotiating these climate summits yet they allow their national interests to prevail such as by pursuing unsustainable methods of development and by conflict obstructing progress in the form of developed, developing ~~conflicts~~ ^{conflicts}.



ResultsPlus

Examiner Comments

The Hardin Tragedy of the Commons theory is explained in some detail and examples are used to make clear understanding of the theory. There is a strong argument to discredit the Tragedy of the Commons theory utilising positive action as a sign that states can effectively cooperate. The Developed and Developing world division is explored as is the role of TNCs in this well-supported response.

Question 8

Although less popular than Q6 on the examination paper it was clear that a good number of students were well prepared for a question on the extent to which universal human rights are adequately protected. There was a pleasing knowledge of humanitarian intervention, international law, and of courts and tribunals, among other contributors to human rights protection. Candidates were also able to identify continued obstacles to protection including state sovereignty, cultural differences and failed interventionism or lack of international resolve.

This response begins with a definition of human rights and then moves on to explaining the significance of international courts and tribunals, humanitarian intervention and actions of NGOs Versus differences over the concept of human rights and the eternal obstacle of state sovereignty.

Tribunals - Milosevic 1993 40 years
Ad hoc

ICC - western dominance - Cultural relativism - Asian
supranationalism

NGOs - Amnesty /

Human rights are rights specified to humans
due to the fact of being a human, they're
virtue, non discriminatory and are enduring through
ones life. There are a number of ways in
which human rights are protected through formal
institutions such as the international criminal
court and tribunals and through humanitarian
intervention alongside with human rights
NGOs. There is scepticism of how adequately
they're protected due to the issue of
western dominance and the strength of
sovereignty to prevent protection.

A key way in which human

rights have been seen to be protected in the past is through the use of Special tribunals, as seen after the Yugoslav war in 1993 and for the Rwandan genocide. Successes of these tribunals included the imprisonment of Milosevic a former head of state of Yugoslavia and ~~and~~ an apprehension rate of 76%. Ostensibly this displays how international law and global institutions have been effective in prosecuting and bringing to justice those who have abused human rights in the past. Furthermore the notion that a former head of state (Milosevic) was apprehended showcased the rejection that human rights can be abused under the idea that it was in the sovereign jurisdiction to. This displayed a pivotal shift after the 1990s ~~the~~ to a cosmopolitan view that ~~the~~ gross human rights abuses ~~to~~ were to be punishable, consequently deterring possible atrocities in the future due to the imprisonment.

Although the Ad hoc courts showed considerable successes, it is down to the Security Council to erect these and try abusers - this is not likely to

happen in the case of Assad of Syria as close Ally Russia is likely to VETO any resolution seeking his imprisonment. Although the Adhoc courts displayed a ^{positive} ~~positive~~

g-contribution to the protection of ~~the~~ rights it is still clear how they can be dismissed if it isn't in the global interest.

This interest can also be seen to stunt the protection of Human rights as certain Human rights may not be internationally established. First generation human rights are considered to be western dominated as they comprise of ~~values~~ values such as freedom to speech, freedom of religion are some examples. First generation human rights can be seen to come into complete contradiction to "Asian values" that stress the importance of community over individualism and the protection and welfare of the state through non intervention. In addition western civil rights ~~are~~ are depicted as a form of western imperialism in which states have taken much disliking to as they perceive it to be a form of oppression and hegemony. This is clearly personified in how this affects international courts

the ability to protect human rights. The 54 member of the African union told its members to reject any ruling from the international criminal court due to it falling as a "victim of hypocrisy and hegemony". This was personified when the ICC issued ~~an~~ international warrant for the arrest of Omar al Bashir from Sudan due to ~~to~~ war crimes in Darfur. Even though the ICC issued this warrant it has been ignored by the African union as he recently visited a summit in South Africa. It is clear that due to the diverse cultural relativism states express, there is no secured or guaranteed human rights norm. Not only does this present a major barrier to the protection of human rights but Sovereignty stands as one of the most defining factors for the failure of international courts as ~~the states~~ ~~these states~~ ~~state~~ ~~obligation~~ apprehension can only be secured by the state. An alternative model to the ICC could be a form of supranational law that would require global jurisdiction over member states. As seen in the European court of human rights it has achieved apprehension rates of over 90% in cases.

However the ~~likely~~ likelihood of this happening remains ~~low~~ weak as countries such as the USA, China and Cuba are not part of a club that is voluntary let alone one that requires the transfer of sovereignty.

An alternative way in which human rights have been protected in the world is through the work ~~of~~ of non governmental organisations such as Amnesty international and Human rights watch, that provide a clear link to "on the ground" human rights abuses and to civilian populations. Examples of success include the leaked information of the ~~the~~ Abu Ghraib prison scandal ~~in~~ in Iraq during the "war on terror" and most recently exposing torture camps in Syria used by the president in 2017. Not only have NGOs been successful in exposing human rights abuses but they've contributed to the formation of treaties such as the land mine treaty of 1997. A positive the NGOs provide in the protection of human rights that international courts do not is the exposure they provide to the public, sometimes referred to as the "CNN effect". public accountability and leaks provide strong insights into the nature of how human rights

are abused around the world - consequently NGOs have created strong consensus internationally for the further spread of human rights to other regions of the globe, pressurising governments and holding them accountable.

Although NGOs have been championed for their work in this field they however have remained redundant in one ability to protect the "universal" side of Human rights. In authoritarian regimes such as North Korea, ~~and~~ China and Russia ~~the~~ NGOs influence remains minimal over a sovereign state.

States remain ~~the~~ the only and most influential bodies who can fully protect human rights but this doesn't mean that work of NGOs should not be championed !

Following from this point, if human rights can only be protected via states then humanitarian intervention is an alternative way in which international rights can be appropriately ensured. Intervention in Iraq (2003) and Libya (2011) have all served as a purpose in which, when domestic states have failed to protect human rights then it is justified that foreign intervention must be used to alleviate domestic abuses. Initially this

comes into contradiction with the realist notion of non interference in states domestic policies and intervention is criticised by realists as states are immoral ~~the~~ subjects that only cares for the national interest. However as time has changed and the impact of cultural globalisation has proceeded, states have become more inclined to protect subjects from human rights abuses as they're part of "the global society". Although humanitarian intervention has been deemed morally successful in the past as it has removed the Abuses (Gaddafi, Saddam Hussein) it has developed a notion of the west furthering their hegemonic influence in other regions of the world. Cases such as the "war on terror" and cases of Gharaib prison scandal and Guantanamo bay, the west has been heavily criticised for trying to impose their supposed utopian universal human rights whilst at the same time have initiated "Black sites" in Poland and detention centres. Consequently this resentment against the west has damaged its ability to protect human

rights as its damaged soft power
has severely weakened its active foreign
policy in deciding whether to intervene.

The failures of the past have stunted
the west's ability to protect as unintended
consequences such as the idea of
Islam vs the west have appeared,
damaging its idea as a "global policeman"

In conclusion International
courts remain a dominant force in the
protection of human rights as failed
military campaigns have severely damaged
the prospects of the west retaining
its cultural hegemonic status as the
protector of all rights in the world.



ResultsPlus Examiner Comments

The candidate develops an argument based on the positive elements of Special Tribunals, with Yugoslavia used as an example where even a former state leader could be prosecuted, although this is tempered by an explanation of the power of the Security Council's ability to veto action in areas such as Syria. Further negative concerns are raised such as cultural differences, African resistance to the ICC, and the general impact of state sovereignty. There is a more optimistic explanation of the value of NGOs like Amnesty and of media exposure, or the so called CNN effect. There is discussion of the positive and negative consequences of Humanitarian Intervention and a perceived loss of US credibility as 'the world policeman'.

This is a wide-ranging response which uses numerous examples and commentary from political commentators to support a balanced response.

The question of universal human rights became centre-stage in international relations following world war two, where the overall conflict cost 3% of the global population, of which the Nazi atrocities cost killed 6 billion million. After the collapse of the Soviet Union in 1991, the USA was able to protect human rights in accordance with the 1948 UN declaration on the issue because they were now the unrivalled global hegemon. However, in the modern context, universal human rights are not adequately protected.

The UN has failed to adequately protect human rights. Of its members, 76 criminalise homosexuality, with 5 of those countries punishing the orientation by death. The inequality is severe considering the ongoing genocide in Chechnya, which is the sort of type of atrocity the UN was created to prevent. Moreover, the right to freedom from discrimination on the basis of sex is not protected as 60% of women do not have access to basic education and 830 die daily from pregnancy. The UN has also failed to promote human rights in developing states, instead witnessing a cultural backlash. For example, former

Prime Minister of Singapore Lee Kuan Yew characterised rights such as divorce as 'western ills' a sentiment also widely discussed in the 2017 Iranian election. Furthermore, the UN's bodies specifically designed to protect human rights, the Commission and Council have failed. The latter was disbanded in 2006 after a block vote from the African union allowed ~~Muammar~~ Gaddafi to chair. Yet, the former is just as ~~ineffectual~~ ineffective as it was challenged by Saudi Arabia in 2013 and has had membership from Cuba, Pakistan and Venezuela. Since membership allows states to prevent internal investigation, it proves the assumption of realists such as Waltz that state egoism prevents institutions protecting human rights. This can be seen in the modern context as with the UN's failure to investigate Myanmar despite 100,000 fleeing Rohingya Muslims fleeing in the last 3 years and reports of the sixth stage of genocide because ~~Ang San San~~ the current Prime Minister was a ~~former advocate of democracy~~ ^{and is now allied to the west} formerly imprisoned for advocating democracy. Thereby, the UN has failed to adequately protect human rights.

However, the UN has made monumental strides in protecting human rights. For example, they

claim to have been instrumental in increasing democracy from 44 to 123. The UN can also be seen as a force behind greater acceptance of human rights. This acceptance was shown in the 2017 legalisation of same-sex marriage in Taiwan, the first Asian state, suggesting that 'Asian values' are not in conflict with human rights. In 2015, the UN also set a calculable path toward greater human rights recognition with the 3 Sustainable development goals, suggesting that although their path toward universal recognition of human rights has been fraught, it is still in progress.

On the other hand, ^{the} international ~~criminal court~~ ^{criminal court, ~~and~~} ~~private court~~ ^{the highest} and international law in general has failed to adequately protect human rights. All 39 of the ICC's convicts ~~not~~ have been African, described by British ~~Q~~ QC Griffiths as "the same civilising mission as the late nineteenth century". This post-colonial objection has led to many impacted the court's efficiency. For example, 13 convicts are still at large, with high profile suspect Omar Al-Bashir making a state visit to South Africa in 2009. The state of South Africa depeded its actions due to the court's racial bias and withdrew in 2016. Moreover,

international law has also been ineffective because it is controlled by the great powers. For example, in 2014 China vetoed investigation into North Korea. Since the court requires membership to investigate, it corroborates the realist assumption that states act only in their own interests. Thus, the US can block investigation into its crimes in Iraq and Afghanistan ~~and similarly Israel~~ on the basis that no court outranks the domestic supreme court. Lgo, international law has failed to adequately protect human rights.

Conversely, international law has protected human rights. This was evident in the tribunal for Rwanda which indicted 29 accused persons and the tribunal for Yugoslavia that convicted Serbian dictator Milosevic and Republika Srpska's Karadzic. The ICC has also had success: for example, in 2006 they ^{indicted} Charles Taylor for his role in the Sri Lankan civil war, the first leader of a state to be convicted for crimes against humanity since the Nuremberg trials. For representatives of the ICC, the issue is merely that the institution is in its founding

stages and they expect greater powers and successes in the future. Consequentially, international law has somewhat protected human rights.

However, the war on terror and humanitarian intervention has not adequately protected human rights. The 2001 and 2003 invasions of Afghanistan and Iraq instead unleashed what critical theorist Kaldor dubs ~~second~~ ~~entire~~ 'new wars' that have undermined the right to life with the 2 million that have died in the middle east since 2001. Moreover, they have failed to protect the right to democracy, as feminist and former Afghanistan women's minister Sima Samar agrees because the ^{US installed} replacements were ~~hand-picked~~ ~~for~~ ~~the Taliban~~ acted as a 'rubber stamp' while decisions were decided by the 'powerful ones'. Furthermore, feminist critic ~~has~~ criticised the Bush-Lennon Bush's ~~ostensible~~ ~~goal~~ aim to ostensibly protect human rights as a ~~to~~ smoke screen for domestic construction while the USA battled internal divisions addressed in the modern context by the 'black lives matter' are. Thus, Trump's 'muslim ban' ~~establishes~~ ~~data~~ distracts the national conversation ^{from} ~~from~~

international rights abuses. Also, Marxist Chomsky argues that humanitarian intervention actually exacerbates rights abuses. He illustrates the point with the example of Milosovic - all but one of his crimes against humanity occurred after NATO bombing. Therefore, he's concluded that humanitarian intervention has failed to protect human rights.

On the other hand, humanitarian intervention has had some major successes. For example, the 1991 'No fly zone' over Northern Iraq supplied aid without actually violating sovereignty. Similarly, the 1994 Operation Restore Democracy in Haiti successfully restored rights such as elected representation. Moreover, the ^{NATO} intervention in former Yugoslavia ~~also~~ stabilised the ~~first violent conflict~~ as first armed combat on the ^{European} continent since 1945. So, humanitarian intervention has somewhat protected human rights.

Overall, human rights are not adequately protected in the modern ^{world} context.

because institutions are systematically incapable to combat abuses and ^{the liberal notion} there is an apparent global move away from universal rights and instead towards sovereignty and national identity.



ResultsPlus

Examiner Comments

There is an historic background leading to a discussion of United Nations' failings and examples. Human Rights institutions are referenced, as is the realist perspective. A more optimistic view of the United Nations follows, again with examples, and there is an explanation as to the strengths and weaknesses of the International Criminal Court and of International Law more generally. The success and failings of Special Tribunals is discussed as are the negative elements of conflicts in Iraq and Afghanistan, and there is room for more general positives and negatives of Humanitarian Intervention.

Paper summary

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

- Short responses tend to be stronger where they provide a brief definition or overview of the main theme or Key Term.
- In order to gain a higher level, short responses will typically require at least three points to be made in relation to the question with explanation and examples.
- Longer responses will require, at the higher level, a debate or explanation of more than one side of the debate.
- Use of political commentators and evidence in support of points made will tend to strengthen a response.
- It is evident that most, if not all, teachers are aware of, and focused on, the *Further Guidance for Route D* document. This was prepared by the previous Principal Examiner and can be found on the Edexcel website. This document provides additional content explanation and advice to support the initial specification document. There are numerous other valuable resources including past papers and mark schemes. It is also pleasing to note that teachers and students are making good use of recently developed resources as well as researching to provide contemporary examples to support responses.

Grade Boundaries

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

<http://www.edexcel.com/iwantto/Pages/grade-boundaries.aspx>

Ofqual



Llywodraeth Cynulliad Cymru
Welsh Assembly Government

Pearson Education Limited. Registered company number 872828
with its registered office at 80 Strand, London WC2R 0RL.

