



Examiners' Report

June 2025

GCE Politics 9PL0 3B

Edexcel and BTEC Qualifications

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

Alternatively, you can get in touch with us using the details on our [contact us page](#).



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 <https://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: <https://www.pearson.com/uk>.

June 2025

Publications Code 9PL0_3B_2506_ER

All the material in this publication is copyright

© Pearson Education Ltd 2025

Introduction

It was encouraging to observe that a significant number of candidates appeared to be well-prepared for this examination series. The examination paper and its questions were suitably accessible, enabling clear differentiation among candidates.

Several outstanding submissions demonstrated a successful integration of AO1 Knowledge and Understanding with AO2 Analysis in the 12-mark questions. Effective evaluation completed the requirements to ensure strong responses in the longer essay questions. More adept candidates showcased extensive knowledge and provided compelling contemporary examples to illustrate their understanding of the topics addressed in this series.

The stronger responses reflected a comprehensive understanding of institutions, theories, concepts, and pertinent issues. Many of these responses included insightful analysis, characterised by coherent and logical reasoning. Although AO3 remains a hurdle for numerous candidates, a notable proportion recognised the importance of formulating fully-relevant evaluations supported by substantiated arguments and judgments, which led to focussed and justified conclusions.

There was a relatively balanced selection of questions across the two optional sections of the paper. In Section A, the question concerning the similarities between the role and significance of the United Nations Security Council (UNSC) and the role and significance of the North Atlantic Treaty Organisation (NATO) emerged as the most frequently-attempted. Although less popular, the question on the differences between great powers and superpowers was chosen by a sizeable number of candidates.

In Section C, the question on world order since 2000 was the most chosen, followed by the question on international law and international human rights impact on sovereignty. Again, the least popular question in the section was still chosen by a large number of candidates.

Question 1(a)

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

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

Some candidates missed the focus on similarities and included, at times, lengthy explanation of differences. Other candidates missed the focus on role and significance. This was very much meant to be a question requiring focus on the two organisations, with direct consideration of relevant similarities.

Some candidates went beyond the Security Council to discuss other sections of the United Nations (UN), which were not creditworthy. Stronger responses tended to focus on their significance in terms of military action, membership including restrictive membership and security roles, although a number of other relevant similarities were also credited.

This script is representative of a candidate who has an understanding of the requirements of the question. They are able to utilise some useful knowledge and understanding in support of a reasonably clear analysis.

The candidate makes multiple references to the key elements of the question (similarities, role, significance), which ensures that they retain focus.

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

One similarity between the role and significance of the UN Security Council and NATO is the context in which they were both formed. The UN Security Council was established in 1945 with five permanent members - the USA, the UK, the USSR, China and France - as the principal organ ~~responsibility~~ of the UN on security matters. Similarly, NATO, the North Atlantic Treaty Organisation, was formed in 1949 as a collective defence unit ~~system~~ to deter Soviet aggression during the Cold War and maintain the security of its members. Therefore, both the UN Security Council and NATO were instituted against the backdrop of the Second World War's aftermath, making the way in which they are both significant similar as they were born out of security concerns within broadly the same context and period of global politics.

Another similarity between the role and significance is the extent to which they continue to play a key role in global affairs today. In 2011, the UNSC passed Resolutions 1970 and 1973 which NATO then acted upon in their invasion of Libya, assassinating Muammar Gaddafi on the grounds that he had invoked unprecedented political repression. The collaboration

between the UN Security Council and NATO here shows how their proximity is testament to their similar roles, as both institutions are key players in a globalised world and thus their role and significance is underlined by how they continue to shape global dynamics transcending just the context in which they were formed.

Moreover, both the UN Security Council and NATO have been criticised for their role and significance in what some argue is upholding Western dominance by leveraging their interests through structural power. Not only is the UN Security Council primarily comprised of traditional Western voices in its permanent seats for the USA, the UK and France, but 72% of NATO's military budget as of 2017 is accounted for by the USA which demonstrates how both institutions are similar by virtue of the way in which they arguably play out and entrench Western global dominance by delegating much of their power to the USA and its allies who can then leverage their interests in the global system through both institutions.



The first similarity is the context of their formation and ultimately suggests that both were born out of security concerns. There is some useful AO1 and AO2 here.

Similarity two is their key role today. Correct UNSC resolutions detail and broadly correct information on Libya. There is a good point on collaboration, showing similar roles.

Similarity three is Western dominance–structural power but is not overly convincing on Western dominance. There is, overall, mostly accurate information. The response gives mostly-focussed comparative analysis although factors are not always convincing.

The script lacks the depth for Level 4 but is firmly placed in the middle of Level 3.



Refer to the question throughout your answer – keep focussed.

This response provides three well-explained paragraphs with a degree of depth and with sufficient knowledge, understanding and analysis to achieve Level 4.

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

Both the UN Security Council and NATO are fundamentally similar in their ^{security} roles in the world order. For example, the UN Security Council (UNSC) has deployed many peacekeeping ~~operations~~ forces to protect their goal of international peace, for example in ~~East Timor in 2000~~ Sierra Leone in the early 2000s, where troops successfully supported the ~~on~~ legitimate government and crushed the Revolutionary United Front rebels to restore peace to the nation. They were able to carry out their important role in promoting peace and security through supporting democracy and condemning the illegal rebel attacks. NATO has also used its troops to promote goals of stability, such as Operation Active Endeavour from 2001 to 2018 which saw them patrolling the Mediterranean Sea to discourage ^{potential} ~~terror~~ attacks after 9-11. ~~These~~ Operations such as these allow NATO to promote peace and discourage ~~illegal~~ ^{undemocratic, rogue} conflicts in a similar way to the UNSC. ~~They are also~~ They are also often used in UNSC peacekeeping operations such as ~~Bosnia~~ in former Yugoslavia in 1995.

A further similarity between these organisations can be seen in their problematic ~~democratic~~ democratic functions, rendering them both less significant. The UNSC's veto power means that the 5 powers of Russia, France, the UK, China and the USA all have ^{indisputable} power over the UNSC's goals. For instance, ~~the USA~~ ^{the USA} has Russia vetoed an inquiry into the shooting down of Malaysian Flight MH17 in 2014. This creates a democratic imbalance which is inherently problematic, especially as the UK and France are no longer considered superpowers and do not deserve the veto power. NATO faces similar problems with democratic legitimacy and power balance which decreases its significance. In 2022, only 7 of 32 countries met the 2% GDP target to contribute to the budget of NATO. This means that some countries are contributing far more (such as the USA) and ~~are~~ receiving the same benefits as other countries failing to contribute. This creates a similar problem to the UNSC, as countries are utilising the benefits of the organisation without any right to do so.

Finally, however, the ^{recent} changes in global politics have seen ^{an} ~~an~~ increase in significance for these bodies. The Israel-Gaza genocide of 2023 and the Russian invasion of Ukraine in 2022 have led to

multiple organisations calling to the UNSC to intervene in these devastating conflicts. This clearly proves that despite some setbacks, the UNSC remains a hugely significant force for peace in today's world, especially due to the rise in global conflict. Furthermore, the Russian invasion of Ukraine has boosted NATO's significance similarly. Finland became the 31st member in 2023, and ^{public opinion} polls supporting its entrance to NATO shot from 30 to 76% in 2022 after Russia's invasion. The increasing threat of Russian and European conflict has hugely increased NATO's significance on the global stage.



The first identified similarity is that of security roles. There are valid and detailed examples for both, with some analysis. It is a shame that the UN-NATO operation in Yugoslavia is not developed.

The idea that they both share a problematic democratic function is interesting and has some development and analysis.

The discussion on significance in recent times covers Gaza and Ukraine-Russia, although analysis here is weaker.

Accurate knowledge is the strength with weaker analysis, leaving it as a borderline Level 3/4. The knowledge helps to lift it to 10 marks.

Question 1(b)

This was marginally the less popular of the two questions in this section of the examination paper. Again, the question worked well as a discriminator, with a full range of marks.

At the lower end of the mark-range there was some confusion between the two terms/concepts, and knowledge/analysis of each wrongly attributed to the other type of power. Poor examples were given by some and the differences not really made clear in those responses.

At the stronger end, candidates were clear about which states were superpowers or great powers. Some presented a brief historical explanation as to the origins of both terms. Stronger responses made clear that Superpowers could be considered to have a true global reach, possession of nuclear weapons, structural power, military and economic power and the ability to exert high levels of influence globally.

Great Powers, in contrast, tend to have significant regional influence, a significant role in international and regional organisations, a large and strong economy and military power.

This is a reasonably strong response that covers a range of factors and almost reaches Level 4.

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

Great powers and superpowers are different because of their differing military capabilities. The US is now the only undisputed superpower, and this can be largely attributed to their huge military capabilities. They spend the most on their military than the following four highest spenders combined. They also have ~~at~~ around 800 military bases across 51 countries. This shows that a superpower is more powerful in terms of their military ~~than~~ than a great power because of size as well as reach. Conversely, a great power ~~with~~ will spend a lot on their military and have ~~th~~ much military power, but this will likely be more of a regional than global reach. China ~~has~~ is considered a great power and ~~has~~ spends the second ~~th~~ most in the world than the US, and this figure is still less than half what the US spend. Their military force is more effective regionally, especially when looking to China's militarisation of the South China Sea compared with the vast reach of American forces as a superpower.

Great powers and superpowers are also different due to great powers having greater economic power than superpowers.

Russia is one of the richest countries in the world, and so is able to level huge military force into Ukraine, as well as being a largely oil-based economy. This economic power is still far less than that of a superpower like the US, and the US is able to gain wealth through the growth and spread of the Washington ~~Consensus~~ Consensus, meaning that states globally are aligned with American liberal economic ideas like low tariffs. This gives the US as a superpower more financial power than a great power like Russia since many more states trade with the US than with great powers, since the Washington Consensus has become to widespread.

Furthermore, great powers have power in IGOs, though less than that of the superpowers. Superpowers like China will seek to challenge the power of the US as a superpower, through institutions like BRICS. China has gained the alliances of ~~developing~~ emerging economic states like South Africa and India, showing how great powers can gain power through alliances in IGOs. This power is still less than that of a great power. The most powerful institution like the WTO one dominated by the ~~super~~ superpower that is the USA. Upon joining, members must agree to WTO terms like liberalising their economy, as when Latvia joined it had to reduce tariffs and liberalise access to the service sector. There are beneficial

for American trade and power since they compare their trade. The WTO accounts for 97% of world trade, so while China as a great power has power in smaller 140, a super-power like the US holds more in a more powerful institution.



The candidate begins with a comparison of military capability. They provide support for their assertion with use of some figures and they compare the global reach of the USA with China and regional influence.

The second area of consideration is economic power and, again, they compare the USA with another state. This time they use Russia as a comparison although the argument is, at times, less persuasive.

The last area of focus is that of Intergovernmental Organisations. They compare Brazil, Russia, India, China (BRIC) states with the USA. Examples used cover reach and power and show an adequate level of knowledge of factors that differentiate, with some emerging comparative analysis.

AO1 lifts the AO2 into Level 3, with 9 marks.



Support assertions with real-world examples – preferably contemporary.

One key difference between great powers and superpowers is their global economic significance. Great powers, such as India and the UK, have vast resources of trade and a degree of significance in the international economic system. They tend to be the headquarters of major TNCs, such as BP in the UK or Tata in India; yet, they still face significant economic competition from the great powers, often lacking the same degree of global economic power projection and total economic stability as superpowers. Superpowers, such as the United States, have even larger economic power and influence and the ability to project this influence via investment on a global scale. For example, the United States invests over \$100 billion in Africa annually. Moreover, the economic stability of superpowers is vast, given that they normally hold the global reserve currency or at least have many states in their global sphere of influence using their reserve currency. The US dollar is the global reserve currency and is also used by many countries formally (Nigeria, Liberia etc.) and informally as a powerful economic tool. Thus, superpowers uniquely have the ability to project large-scale global

investment and often have a valuable and heavily utilised reserve currency. // Another major difference between great powers and superpowers is their ability to wield military power and project this abroad. Great powers, such as India, tend to have access to nuclear weapons and have a small independent military industrial complex. They have the power to project military influence within their local sphere of influence, often using a small number of aircraft carriers. Great powers may have a small number of military bases abroad, such as the UK's base RAF Akrotiri in Cyprus. Superpowers, alternatively, have vast numbers of foreign military bases, a large stockpile of nuclear weapons and a powerful and well-funded standing army. The United States is arguably a superpower because of its \$800 billion in annual military funding (exceeding the next ten countries combined) as well as its ownership of the majority of global aircraft carriers. These military assets uniquely allow superpowers to wield military power on a global scale, even beyond their sphere of influence. Thus, a key difference is the extent of global military power projection. // Structural power is another aspect differentiating great powers and superpowers. Certain great powers have powerful positions in IOs, such as

France's veto in the UNSC. Great powers are additionally characterised by having positions at global summits, with great powers attending G7 and G20 meetings and having particularly strong influence in COP meetings and in the UNGA. Superpowers, on the other hand, are structurally characterised by their ability to unilaterally rally votes in favour of their cause. For example, the United States often gets its allies, like the UK, to vote with it, exercising soft structural power. Superpowers also tend to chair global summits, as the US does in NATO and in the G7. Thus, a key difference between great powers and superpowers is the extent of power they have structurally.

(Total for Question 1 = 12 marks)



This response is clearly well-written and deserving of full marks.
This candidate provides very strong AO1 and AO2. Some candidates provide almost solely AO1.

The candidate begins by discussing global economic significance. There is direct comparison between named Great Powers and Superpowers.

They move to look at military power projection and make the argument that Great Powers have a local sphere of influence whilst Superpowers have global reach. There is a pleasing level of detail here.

Then, the candidate considers structural power and once more they provide a direct comparison.

Throughout the response, the candidate ensures that accurate knowledge is selected to underpin analysis and there is consistent comparative analysis.



Do not forget the assessment objectives.

Question 2

The question, on the differences between the realist and liberal views of the inevitability of war, worked very well as a discriminator and led to a full range of responses.

Candidates tended to focus on features such as the state, human nature, international anarchy, global governance, complex interdependence and security dilemmas.

A key discriminator was the degree of focus on inevitability. At the weaker end, candidates tended to describe key elements of Realism and then key elements of Liberalism. Occasionally, they referenced something of relevance to the actual question.

There were a few candidates who did not quite reach Level 4, despite demonstrating accurate knowledge with consistent comparative analysis, as a consequence of not including synoptic points.

This is another example of a top level script. Importantly, the candidate provides elements of synopticity to ensure they are not restricted to Level 3.

Hedley Bull 'The Anarchical Society'
John Mearsheimer 'Hobbesian world'
'delusional'

SECTION B

Answer Question 2.

Robert Keohane
Complex interdependence

Francis Fukuyama 'The End
of History & the Last Man'

Kenichi
Ohmae

- 2 Analyse the differences between the realist and liberal views of the inevitability of war. ~~It is human nature~~ - structure, anarchical?

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

(12)

While a realist would argue that war is inevitable as a consequence of the anarchic international system, a liberal argument would posit that war is not ~~inevitable~~, ~~even though structural~~ ~~liberals acknowledge that the global system may be~~ ~~anarchic~~ due to the ability of intergovernmental organisations (IGOs) and other authorities to place checks upon state egoism. For example, the open realist John Mearsheimer would interpret the ongoing Russo - Ukrainian war as an inevitable product of the anarchic ~~and~~ global system: he argued that it is impossible ~~the~~ to 'transcend this Hobbesian world' and that those who believe it is possible are 'delusional'. This is as the absence of an authority higher than the nation-state fails to punish states for instigating conflict, which, in realist theory, thus motivates states to seek hegemony at the expense of neighbours and competitors, as Russia did in its 2022 invasion of Ukraine. Meanwhile, liberals ~~such as~~ have a much more positive view of human nature: a liberal worldview would

place stock in ICJOs such as the International Court of Justice and the United Nations in taking measures to reduce war, as the ICJ has tried to do by declaring the Russian invasion of Ukraine unlawful. Thus realists and liberals disagree entirely on how likely the anarchic global system is to engender war ~~unlike~~.

There is also the subject of globalisation. A realist ^{would} ~~might~~ argue that globalisation has minimal effects in reducing the inevitability of war, as states continue to prioritise their own sovereignty and hegemony, remaining resistant to forces that erode state borders. Morgenthau, a classical realist, especially emphasised the idea of 'national interest' taking priority over morality in global politics; thus realists would argue that states remain resistant to forces of globalisation that seek to unite the international landscape in matters of ^{politics} ~~politics~~ and economy. Realists would therefore reject the view that globalisation, especially economic globalisation, is the key to establishing positive inter-state relationships. In contrast, liberals believe that ~~global~~ globalisation, especially economic globalisation, has served to drastically decrease chances of ~~the~~ war. ~~Robert~~ Robert Keohane wrote on the principle of 'complex

interdependence', inextricably ~~the~~ linking states and their fortunes together in a global neo-liberal free market. Thus, liberals would argue that economic globalisation makes war ~~practically~~ practically unthinkable, as it would lead to the loss of a state's access to ~~such a benefited~~ free trade and cheaper goods. Realists and liberals thus disagree hugely on how the extent to which globalisation of recent years has served to reduce the inevitability of war – while realists would argue that states will continue to serve ~~to~~ themselves, liberals argue, in the style of liberal thinkers such as John Stuart Mill, who was a proponent of laissez-faire economics, that ~~economic globalisation~~ states ~~are~~ have become encouraged to foster positive relationships for economic gain.

(Total for Question 2 = 12 marks)



The candidate begins with a consideration of the role of Intergovernmental Organisations (IGO) linked to the idea of an anarchical world. They reference theorist and the Russia-Ukraine war. Hobbes is mentioned before a consideration of the Liberal view, with the International Court of Justice (ICJ) used as an example.

The response moves on to consider the impact of globalisation and the realist view. Theorists are used routinely, as they move to explaining the idea of complex interdependence with some detailed analysis.

Although only two factors are considered, this response has a sustained focus. AO1 is very strong and there is the consistent analysis required, with use of synopticity, to meet the threshold and achieve a Level 4 mark.

2 Analyse the differences between the realist and liberal views of the inevitability of war.

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

(12)

Realists have an overwhelmingly negative perception of human nature, mirroring Thomas Hobbes' depiction of ruthless self-interest in the Hobbesian 'state of nature', which informs their assertion that war and conflict are inevitable in a globalised system with competing interests. In 'Politics among Nations' (1948), Hans Morgenthau argued that moral consideration always comes after national interest in global politics, leading states to pursue their own goals which may conflict with the goals of other states and inevitably culminate in ~~the~~ war, as during the 1982 Falklands War when Argentina's claim to British territory sparked a conflict of interest that culminated in war. By contrast, liberals accept war as an adverse effect of global political systems but instead emphasise the capacity of states to cooperate, mirroring John Locke's optimistic view of human nature and empirical individualism guiding a more rational self-interest than the national interest discussed by realists. In the 1970s, liberal thinkers Joseph Nye and Robert Keohane coined 'complex interdependence' which pushes forward the notion that interconnectivity of nation-states in a globalised world negates the inevitability of war as it would be counter-productive to

provoke another state upon which you may rely. Therefore, while realists believe that the inevitability of war is determined by the paramount role of national interest in global politics, liberals see a greater propensity for cooperation which negates the likelihood of conflict against the backdrop of globalisation.

Furthermore, realists still affirm the inevitability of war even in the aftermath of the Cold War, underscoring the bleak and pessimistic outlook of human nature inspired by 'Leviathan' (1651) by Thomas Hobbes. Samuel Huntington's "Clash of Civilisations" ~~theory~~ theory (1993) argues that war remains inevitable but is now cultural rather than ideological or economic. Meanwhile, liberals believe that the inevitability of war is extremely limited in a post-Cold War globalised world as Francis Fukuyama's 'End of History' theory (1992) argues that the end of ideological development and widespread adoption of liberal democracy and free-market economics as part of the Washington Consensus constitutes a decisive end to the potential for another world war, reaching an almost utopian state that is reminiscent of Karl Marx and Friedrich Engels' own socialist 'end of history'. Therefore, realist and liberal views around the inevitability of war are diametrically opposed to one another as while Huntington's theory ~~it~~ argues that ~~conflict~~ war is inevitable but now cultural, Fukuyama asserts that global war is not ever going to happen in the aftermath of the Cold War.



The candidate begins with a consideration of human nature and reference to Hobbes and the state of nature. There is also consideration of Morgenthau and national interest, which is mentioned but not really developed. They contrast with reference to John Locke and a more optimistic view of human nature.

The candidate moves to Nye and Keohane and to the idea of complex interdependence negating the inevitability of war but analysis is limited. There is some repetition on human nature and reference to the division between the Huntington Clash of Civilisations theory, and Francis Fukuyama, End of History idea.

This candidate has made some good points and evidences useful AO1, including theorists. There is some repetition.

They receive 9 marks with AO1 knowledge and understanding stronger than AO2, which is mostly focussed but not fully consistent.

Question 3(a)

The first question in this section was the least popular one but was still chosen by a large number of candidates. When evaluating the view that regional organisations have played a key role in addressing contemporary global issues, it is important to be clear on what regional bodies are and what contemporary global issues they may cover.

Most candidates decided, accurately, that contemporary global issues may include conflict, poverty and environmental degradation, alongside a few other factors, which may have included Covid or immigration.

Some candidates found the question difficult, as a consequence of mistaking global institutions for regional bodies. The specification makes clear that regional bodies or organisations may include the European Union, African Union, Arab League etc. Any other clear regional body was acceptable.

Discussion of NATO was acceptable but bodies that are clearly global rather than regional were not. Some candidates wrote in great depth about global bodies like the UN, World Trade organisation (WTO), International Monetary Fund (IMF) and the World Bank, which clearly are not regional.

Stronger candidates were able to move their discussion and examples beyond sole consideration of the EU.

This is an example of a strong, top level response where the candidate clearly understands the requirements of the essay and retains focus throughout.

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

Regional organisations have grown in importance in recent years, however there is much debate over their success in addressing contemporary global issues. In order to overcome this, it must be considered how they reduce the likelihood of conflict, reduce poverty and protect human rights. For these to be successful, regional organisations must be effective in their aims. Overall, despite some limitations, regional organisations do play a key role.

One global contemporary issue they play a key role in is reducing the likelihood of conflict. This is because of regional organisations' ability to create a consensus and unified stance against conflicts. Therefore, this makes them more powerful when challenging aggressive states. For example, the EU have made a united front against the Russian invasion of Ukraine. This has put significant pressure on Russia, also strengthened by economic sanctions. Similarly, many regional organisations also possess military forces. Between 2003 and 2023, the EU carried out over 37 overseas operations. Similarly, the African Union has used its military forces in domestic conflict like Somalia in 2023. This makes them far more effective at reducing the likelihood of conflict because

They are able to enforce Nations to be cooperative. Therefore this shows that regional organisations do play a key role in reducing the likelihood of conflict. However, critics argue that they are in fact ineffective at this. This is because, due to state sovereignty, individual states have their own geostrategic alliances, reducing their ability to present a united front on issues. Consensus strengthens this argument, as especially in large regional organisations, this has been a difficult issue. For example, during the Rohingya Crisis in Myanmar, both Thailand and Indonesia encouraged ASEAN to have a strong response, while Cambodia (close ally of China) emphasised their non-interference policy, resulting in a weak response. This demonstrates how ineffective regional organisations can be at responding due to own state interests, highlighting the limited role ~~states~~ regional organisations have in competing global issues. Although there are certainly some weaknesses in organisations, overall regional organisations have played a key role in global contemporary issues. This is because they increase the unity of states in regions and allow strength in numbers when challenging aggressive states. This influence is significant in preventing conflict. Therefore, they do play a key role.

Another global contemporary issue they play a significant role

in addressing is reducing poverty. This is most notably seen in their endorsement of economic globalisation. In particular, both the EU and ~~USA~~ USMCA have encouraged trade and the reduction of tariffs. This can lead to states taking advantage of this, increasing their wealth, allowing countries to increase expenditure, reducing poverty. The EU's Single market and currency reinforces this idea, making trade amongst states. The USMCA has also been effective at encouraging trade, between USA, Mexico and Canada. Even more political ~~organ~~ regional organisations have had some success, with 54 out of 55 African Union states agreeing to no trade barriers. Similarly, ASEAN members are all part of RCEP, the largest free trade zone in the world. These regional organisations all provide states with opportunities for trade, and therefore help to reduce poverty by helping developing states. As a result, this demonstrates that regional organisations do play a key role in addressing poverty. However, critics argue that this role is limited. This is because of reduction in trade recently due to the election of Trump. The USMCA has failed to prevent Trump's tariff war, negatively affecting states and non-state actors like China and the EU in particular. As a result, this has interrupted trade, limited economic opportunities for states which help them to reduce poverty. Similarly, many look to the dependency theory and world systems theory, which argues

economic globalisation traps developing states in a state of dependency and under development. As a result, they are trapped in poverty, suggesting regional organisations are enhancing this. Therefore regional organisations have played a ineffectual role in addressing poverty. Although, some critics argue economic globalisation has actually increased poverty through dependency, this is doubtful. Although there is no doubt developed states have majority benefited from trade more, overall developing states have still been able to grow wealth, unaided before economic globalisation. In particular, Asian members have been able to grow and develop into emerging economies, credited to the economic opportunities provided, allowing them to more effectively reduce poverty. Therefore, they do play a key role in addressing global contemporary issues.

A final global contemporary issue they play a key role in addressing is human rights. This is through many regional organisations strong structure, providing them functions to address human rights concerns. The African Union for example, has its own court allowing it to rule on human right breakings. Similarly the EU does to, allowing it to rule on cases in member states.

~~Although there is~~ The protection of human rights has also been encouraged by trade, creating requirements for trade, which protect human rights.

For example, the USMCA requires that 45% of car parts be made by workers on a minimum of 16 dollars an hour. This therefore protects workers for ill fair pay, enforcing their human rights. This therefore shows regional organisations playing a key role in addressing global contemporary issues. However, critics argue that regional organisations have instead played a limited role. Although many do have structure, some also don't. The USMCA for example, lacks any good governmental structure, making it ineffective at ruling on cases regarding human rights. Similarly, many states are reluctant to call out human rights cases abuses due to self-interest or alliances. For example, ASEAN has failed to address human rights abuses in Myanmar, due to its close links to China. Also, many regional organisations have simply talked the talk, and not acted on it. Therefore, regional organisations have been unable to address these concerns effectively, suggesting they have a limited role. Overall, although regional organisations play less of a role in addressing human rights than poverty and conflict, to some extent they are still effective. The EU and AU in particular have been effective at addressing these cases, while ASEAN and Arab League have proven more difficult as evidenced by their non-interference policy. Therefore, although not to a great extent, they do play a role in addressing human rights concerns.

To conclude, regional organisations do play a significant role in addressing global contemporary issues. Although state sovereignty and the consensus-based nature of them do limit the power of regional organisations to address these issues, overall they are still effective because they allow states to create a united front, and align with the liberal view of reaching for a common good. Therefore, they have been effective at addressing issues, allowing them to play a significant role.



This response covers conflict, poverty and Human Rights. It sets a view, and a clear direction of areas to be covered, in the introduction.

A range of relevant regional bodies is covered and the candidate avoids consideration of any other global institution or body. Their coverage of conflict and poverty is stronger than their coverage of Human Rights.

Conflict coverage includes the European Union (EU) and African Union (AU), with examples provided, counter-arguments considered and there is a series of mini-conclusions/evaluations.

Poverty coverage includes use of the EU, USMCA, AU and, again, there is a counter-view and use of mini-conclusions. Human Rights coverage includes the AU, EU, USMCA and Association of South-Eastern Nations (ASEAN) with examples and mini-conclusions/evaluation.

The conclusion agrees with the introduction. There are three areas covered in some real detail with impressive knowledge and sustained analysis at times.

AO1: Accurate with some in-depth knowledge

AO2: Consistent and with perceptive analysis

AO3: Mostly relevant and sustained

Total: 27 marks



Set out a clear view in the introduction and give a sense of where the discussion is likely to head.

Intro

PI - Yes - Rwanda plan, not possible due to ECHR.

Negative impact on UK State sovereignty

No -

Yes -

No -

~~Planned~~

Regional organisations such as the EU, Arab League and ASEAN, will play a part in the function of their respective member states. However, their global influence can be argued, especially in relation to world-wide issues.

One argument that regional organisations do play key roles in addressing global issues is the efforts of

the EU during Covid-19. During the pandemic, the European Union made significant efforts to limit travel, establish ~~high-risk~~ high-risk areas, and distribute vaccines. This shows an influence on a globally-relevant problem, which helped to limit the spread of the virus and prevent further casualties. However, it can be argued that the limited scale of this action makes the EU less globally relevant. For example, the US experienced some of the highest death rates under Covid-19, and did not receive the same level of aid from the EU. This demonstrates the regional limitations of the organisations in question, which are only able to create significant impact on their member states, rather than on a global scale.

Another point made to say regional organisations have effected change when faced with global issues is in migration. In cases of persecution in nations such as Syria, the EU has facilitated ~~some~~ migration for refugees/asylum seekers. By providing passage through its member states, the EU demonstrates efforts to effect change with wider global ~~issues~~ (non-European) issues. However, this can also be argued to demonstrate small-scale influence on ~~in~~ addressing

global issues, and can be argued to spark further problems for its member states, unable to ~~be~~ handle large numbers of immigrants. This can be seen to be the case in the UK, where issues with immigration have influenced attempts to change policy and implement strategies to lessen the ~~the~~ economic impacts ~~and~~ e.g. the Rwanda plan.

To conclude, regional organisations such as the EU cannot be seen to play key roles in addressing global issues due to their limited, and region-specific ~~power~~ influence which fails to make a global impact.



The introduction is brief and gives no real sense of view or direction.

There is discussion of Covid and the EU but only very general statements. There is a strange observation about EU support for the USA. It is largely unconvincing, particularly on immigration and is limited to consideration of the EU only.

Question 3(b)

This was the second-most popular of the questions in this section of the examination paper and the majority of candidates seemed well-prepared to approach the central debate.

The majority of candidates considered the UN and the WTO when looking at international law and UNDHR, European Court of Human Rights (ECHR), tribunals, International Criminal Court (ICC), International Court of Justice (ICJ) (where relevant) and Humanitarian Intervention (when linked to institutions) on Human Rights. Focus could be on both or either areas.

There was some interesting discussion on Responsibility to Protect (R2P).

A few candidates focussed on the success and/or failure of international law and international human rights institutions but without focussing on the central theme of sovereignty. They did not achieve the higher levels of marks.

Stronger candidates had a real depth of knowledge of relevant cases or actions, which were often contemporary.

This is an example of a response that just achieves the highest level with accurate knowledge, often bordering on thorough and in depth.

Analysis is consistent and sometimes perceptive. Evaluation is mostly relevant.

International law and international human rights institutions have had a significant impact on state sovereignty. On one hand, it can be argued that humanitarian interventions and international courts and tribunals ~~have been~~ have had a significant impact in the reduction of state sovereignty. On the other hand, it can be argued that the impact on state sovereignty has been limited by veto powers, poor enforcements, and lack of jurisdiction. Overall, it can be argued that human rights institutions have not had a significant impact on state sovereignty.

Firstly, it can be argued that Humanitarian interventions by the UN and the Responsibility to Protect doctrine (R2P) have significantly threatened Sovereignty. UNSC resolutions can allow humanitarian interventions ^{to protect rights} as they are binding on all member states. For example, in ~~2002/2003/2004~~ 2003, resolution 1509 launched intervention in Liberia. Furthermore, ^{the early} 1990s Australian-led intervention in East Timor successfully led to restored and long lasting peace. ~~The~~ R2P, endorsed in 2005, states that member states are

justified to intervene in order to protect human rights in other ~~states~~ states. ^{a viewpoint supported by liberal principles} For example, in 2011, intervention in Libya under the R2P principle led to the prevention of massacre in Benghazi and successfully overthrew Gaddafi's regime. Hence it can be seen that humanitarian interventions and R2P have significantly threatened state sovereignty as it has allowed states to act in other sovereign states without 'consent'. On the other hand, it can be argued that humanitarian interventions have not undermined state sovereignty as when they occur it is because they are essential in protecting civilians and they represent international legitimacy. Furthermore, UNSC ~~members~~ P5 members can use their veto in order to block resolutions. For example, Russia has repeatedly used its veto to block resolutions for addressing Assad's human rights abuses as ~~it~~ ^{this} is one of Russia's key allies, and has prevented resolutions on its invasion of Ukraine in 2022 to protect its national interest. Overall it can be seen that although resolutions can be vetoed by permanent members, international human rights interventions and R2P have significantly reduced state sovereignty as the vast majority of states cannot protect their sovereignty as they do not have veto powers.

Secondly, it can be argued that international courts such as the ICJ (International Court of Justice) and the European Court of Human Rights (ECtHR) have had a significant impact on state sovereignty. States that accept the ICJ's jurisdiction are forced to enforce its rulings. For example, in a territorial dispute between Costa Rica and Nicaragua over the San Juan river, the ICJ ruled in favour of Costa Rica and Nicaragua had to pay reparations for environmental damage. This can be seen as a significant loss of sovereignty for member states. Furthermore, ECtHR's decisions ~~has~~ have also threatened sovereignty, for example in 2002 the UK had to adopt the Gender Recognition Act following an ECtHR ruling.★ On the other hand, it can be argued that these institutions have not had a significant impact on state sovereignty. Firstly, the ICJ can only make rulings on states that agree to its jurisdiction, and hence it can't infringe on the sovereignty of states that do not do so. For example, the ICJ was unable to investigate the US's human rights abuses during the war on terror such as torture and indefinite detention at Guantanamo bay. Furthermore, the ECtHR can be seen as having a limited impact as rulings are often ignored. For instance, Russia has ignored ECtHR rulings.

Regarding freedom of expression and human rights abuses in Chechnya. Furthermore, the UK has not given prisoners the vote despite the ECtHR's ruling to do so in 2005. Hence, it can be argued that the ability of these institutions to ~~pre~~ infringe on state sovereignty is limited, reflecting a realist perspective that states hold ultimate sovereignty and hence will ignore rulings to do what is in their national interest. Hence it can be concluded that international law and institutions such as the ICT and ECtHR, which is meant to uphold the ECHR, have not had a significant impact on state sovereignty due to limitations in enforcement which show that states are still ultimately sovereign.

Lastly, it can be argued that the ICC (International Criminal Court) and that UN special tribunals have reduced state sovereignty. The ICC is responsible for holding heads of states accountable for human rights abuses. For example, Thomas Lubanga was sentenced to 14 years in prison for war crimes in the Democratic Republic of Congo. Similarly, ^{Liberian president} Charles Taylor was sentenced to 50 years in prison along with 15 other individuals for atrocities committed during Sierra Leone's civil

war by the UN special tribunal for Sierra Leone.

It can be argued that these institutions infringe on state sovereignty as it ~~also~~ allows them to ^{legally} pursue individuals in sovereign states. On the other hand, it can be argued that their impact on state sovereignty is limited. Many powerful states including Russia, China and the US do not acknowledge the ICC, meaning that over 70% of the global population is outside its jurisdiction. Furthermore, rulings are often ignored, such as the case against president Kenyatta in Kenya. This demonstrates that state sovereignty ultimately remains and that states can avoid rulings that they do not agree with. Hence it can be argued that the ICC and UN special tribunals have not had a significant impact on state sovereignty.

In conclusion, it can be seen that although international law such as the European Convention on Human Rights (ECHR), and international institutions such as the UN, ICTJ, ECHR, and ICC have ~~for~~ limited state sovereignty in order to protect human rights, ~~as~~ they have not significantly impacted sovereignty as it has been repeatedly ~~shown~~ that states can ignore rulings or ~~veto~~ intervention in order ^{to} protect their national interest and

hence they have retained state sovereignty.

★ The ECtHR upholds the ECHR, and rulings are presented to prevent member states from flouting international human rights standards.



The candidate covers the UN and also the concept of R2P.

Libya is used as an example and there is a useful counter-argument, which uses Russia in relation to Assad as well as Ukraine.

The candidate also discusses the ICJ and the ECHR. There are useful examples and a counter-argument including Russia and Chechnya.

AO3 is demonstrated at the end. The candidate moves to a consideration of the ICC and to Special Tribunals. They include useful examples as part of an effectively-organised structure.



Uses Point-Evidence-Explain to ensure you gain marks for all AOs.

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

② International law

① International human rights courts

③ Special UN tribunals

Eval ~~view~~ ^{view} signif impact on State sov

It is clear that international law and international human rights institutions have ~~little~~ a hugely significant impact on State ^{in terms of} sovereignty for states that sign up to them and willingly enforce any decisions that are made. They have less of an impact on State sovereignty for states that don't sign up to them or refuse to cooperate with rulings.

There is a weak but valid argument that international courts such as the ICC, ICJ and ECHR have a limited impact on State sovereignty, and this is certainly the case for states that aren't part of them or refuse to accept and enforce their rulings. For example, countries such as the USA and China ~~are~~ are not ~~formal~~ ^{official} members of the ICC so people in their countries can't be prosecuted against, meaning the impact on state sovereignty is limited. Furthermore, the ICJ has ruled that Israel's occupation of land in

Palestine is unlawful and unadvisable, and the ECHR has ruled Putin's invasion of Ukraine is illegal.² However, the impact on State Sovereignty of these decisions is limited as the courts have no way of enforcing their decisions, and the illegal invasions continue.

However, the much stronger argument is that international courts do have a significant impact on State Sovereignty for the vast majority of states, which accept rulings and enforce decisions. For example, the ECHR ruled against the UK government in the 1980s Dudgeon case, claiming a right to a private life had been violated, thus threatening the UK's sovereignty, as it was forced to enforce the decision.

Furthermore, since its establishment the ICC has successfully convicted 10 criminals in Africa, thus threatening African Sovereignty.

Overall, it is therefore clear that specifically for states that are members of international courts, and are willing to enforce their decisions, they clearly have a significant impact on State Sovereignty.

There is a weak but valid argument that international law has a limited impact on State Sovereignty, and this is certainly the case for states that refuse to sign up for it. Furthermore, as there is no 'nightwatchman' or global police force, even

States that do sign up to international law can get away with it without punishment, showing the impact on state sovereignty is limited. For example, this is certainly the case with the USA's treatment of prisoners at Guantanamo Bay, and the UK's invasion of Iraq. Therefore, as there is no effective way of ensuring it is stuck to, or ensuring states don't leave it (such as with the ~~£~~ UK supposedly replacing the ECHR with a British Bill of Rights), the impact of international law on state sovereignty is limited.

However, the much stronger argument is that international law has a significant impact on state sovereignty. This can be seen in how if countries sign up to international law such as the convention against torture, or the convention on the rights of a child, their sovereignty is threatened as they are meant to follow the rules. Even if measures of enforcement are limited, their sovereignty is ~~threatened~~ threatened as decisions have been made about how the nation state should be run, above the level of the nation state. Furthermore, if a state doesn't follow international law which it signed up to, ~~it~~ it may face consequences such as sanctions in the case of Russia or intervention^{as} in the case of ~~yugoslavia~~ Bosnia or Kosovo, once again threatening state sovereignty.

Overall, it is therefore clear that although methods of enforcement are somewhat ineffective, the stronger argument is that international law itself can threaten sovereignty, but the consequences of not following international law but signing up to it can also be a significant threat to state sovereignty.

In conclusion, it is clear that although enforcement can be inconsistent and ineffective, international law and international human rights courts certainly have a significant impact on state sovereignty ~~in some~~ for states that sign up to them, in forcing them to make ^{certain} decisions or not make certain decisions.

★ State Sovereignty can be referred to as the ability and authority to have complete power and control over one's own borders.

★² Furthermore, despite being convicted by the ICC Omar al-Bashir was able to evade capture in Sudan, showing courts impact on state sovereignty is limited if individual countries are unwilling or unable to enforce rulings.



This response has a view and remains consistent with it throughout the response.

Their focus is on the ICC, the ICJ and the ECHR. They consider both sides of the argument in consideration of points raised and they give some useful examples.

Knowledge and understanding is mostly accurate. Analysis is mostly focussed. Evaluation is generally relevant.



Evaluate your argument throughout your response.

Question 3(c)

The final question in this section was the most popular one and provided the full range of responses.

Only a relatively small number of candidates found it difficult to understand the key concepts of unipolarity and multipolarity. The vast majority of candidates focussed on US hegemony in consideration of unipolarity. They considered emerging powers such as BRICs and even regional bodies like the EU, when arguing in support of multipolarity.

A few candidates argued that the world is now dominated by the USA and China only, but linked this to multipolarity when it would, of course, be bipolarity. When assessing countries for unipolarity or multipolarity the majority of candidates focussed on political, military, economic, cultural, security and structural strength and issues. The stronger candidates were able to identify development and potential change, given the question reference to the year 2000.

This is an example of a candidate who appears a little confused by the demands of the question. They also seem to lose focus and this prevents them from developing the elements that would gain them marks.

There is clearly no requirement to rewrite the exam question in full at the start of the response unless, of course, the candidate feels that that is in some way beneficial to their own understanding or focus.

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

"Evaluate the view that the world order since 2000 is more multipolar than unipolar"

3c) Since the 2000s there has been a great amount of development through poorer country's such as China and India. Before the year 2000 the USA was always seen to have a dramatic lead in power in economy, military etc... However within recent years China has developed dramatically using great measures in order to achieve growth and increased value in the world. Although there are many other states which are increasing in their influence I have concluded that the world is a unipolar over a multipolar.

A reason to help support my viewpoint that we are currently in a unipolar world is that China have made vast increases in their level of graduates in STEM subjects. This increase of people with high qualification has helped boost China's status and advances. This is due to the fact that

if a high number of ~~people~~ china's people are possessing high quality jobs they are able to achieve higher tax brackets. This increased number of incomes into the economy will allow china to make great ~~and~~ advances to their economies, militaries and potential trade agreements seen in BRICS allowing them to gain a higher level of importance globally. This shows a greater point for a unipolar world as china has been able to make improvements to help them. ~~However a reason to argue~~ level power with the USA.

However a point to help show that the world is a multipolar world is through the increased amount of military alliances and power globally. Russia, china and many countries have made agreements as well as some of those in the middle-eastern ~~countries~~ areas this helps pose a great threat towards Nato and the USA which has previously been known as the global policeman and differing out of their control have increased their power. This stops the USA from having the monopoly. Nuclear weapons within numerous amounts of countries have dramatically increased since the 2000s. This helps

create a multipolar world as vast amounts of differing countries have great power decreasing other countries ~~like~~ likelihood of going against them. This is a weaker point ~~however~~ as although many countries may possess nuclear weapons they may not have the military knowledge that the USA have in order to use these items effectively.

Another point to help support the view point that today's society is a unipolar world is via the fact that China ^{with} ~~has~~ little to no aid were able to bring themselves out of poverty using their open door policy. This helped dramatically increase the economy as great amounts of ~~off~~ TNCs saw the great opportunities within China as a great way to produce profits. The cheap labour and increasing trade services and deals ~~a~~ resulted a highly attractive region to produce their materials. The growth of these TNCs has dramatically increased globally ^{since the 2000s} creating a global shift toward Asia. This help support the stronger argument that since the 2000s it has been a unipolar world as a China has been able to match and potentially overtake the position of the economic superpower, creating a more secure

environment for its people.

However a point to argue that the world is ~~the~~ multipolar ~~is~~ through ~~the~~ emerging and developing countries such as India. India has recently seen since the 2000's the cause a great threat to country's such as China and the USA in the competition to be the super power. This is through their increased amounts of labour being made available as well as great opportunities in their healthcare with increasing numbers of student ~~with~~ graduating with high level degrees. This shows threads for a multipolar world as there are many other countries which hold great power via their economies and other factors such as the UK and Russia just like India ~~hold~~ resulting in many different areas having the power ~~the~~ globally. This however is the weaker point as although India has a growing power it in no way competes with the power China and USA have creating a Unipolar world between these countries.

A Finally another point to show that today's society is a unipolar ~~po~~ world is that the

power China and USA hold within trade agreements. Numerous amounts of developing countries rely on them for resources. Recent tariffs and quota Trump has brought forward has helped bring to light the issues that can be faced if the movement of goods is limited between these countries, aiding their power over others.

Overall I believe that since the 2000's increasingly improvements made to China have allowed them to gain great power that the USA had already achieved. Although many developing countries are on the correct paths to gain this power ~~as they~~ at this current time they are still dramatically behind ~~the~~ China and USA. This helps conclude that with today's society since the 2000's globally it is currently a unipolar world with China and USA being the key powers.



The introduction gives us a few general thoughts and there is an assessment or view. The points made are generally unconvincing and their focus is lost and confused.

The candidate is unclear on whether unipolarity is based on two states (which clearly it is not) or they maybe imply that China is the sole hegemon (unconvincingly).

The candidate covers military alliances, the economic growth of China and India and there are a few examples that are not overly persuasive.

There is some accurate knowledge, some emerging analysis and some relevant evaluation although sometimes weak and unconvincing.

This is a mid-Level 2 response.

With the progression of the international landscape ~~from~~ the USA largely operating as the world's primary superpower immediately following the end of the Cold War to the rise of emerging powers such as ~~that~~ ^{those} ~~that~~ of China, it is possible to question whether the world has shifted to multipolarity since 2000. ~~with~~ ^{considered} A world order that is 'more multipolar than unipolar' would involve a variety of nation-states competing ~~for~~ rivalling each other in terms of their ability to exert power. ~~In consideration of states with their~~ ^{however} Thus, in consideration of various forms of power ~~such as~~ ^{from} soft political and structural power to hard military ^{or economic} power, it is possible to conclude that the world order has distinctively shifted from its more unipolar organisation in 2000.

Firstly, one might argue that the US continues to possess unparalleled amounts of soft political power. It continues to occupy major positions in notable intergovernmental organisations (IGOs), such as ~~as~~ ^{residing} one of ~~the~~ as one of the permanent five in the UNSC, ~~and~~ holding a dominant vote share in Economical IGOs such

as the IMF (International Monetary Fund) and the World Bank. ~~That, as Susan Strange terms~~
~~Furthermore, the USA's participation in NATO is almost~~
Furthermore, NATO's continued existence is effectively contingent upon the USA's continued participation — America funds 15.8% of NATO's annual budget. ~~What is 2021, only 8 member states~~ This gives further weight to President Trump's continued threats to pull out of NATO, and to follow this line of argument, America is thus able to ~~put~~ exert pressure upon NATO's other member states, lest the military alliance dissolve completely. This, as Susan Strange terms it, is structural power, and the USA's ability to exert influence upon other nation-states through leadership positions in IGOs ~~will~~ continues to give it an unprecedented position of influence, ^{showing that} ~~marking~~ the world order has been unchanged from unipolarity since 2000.

However, it would be myopic to discount to growing ~~own~~ political power of other nation-states, particularly as America's political influence ~~is~~ is not as ~~last~~ lasting as one may expect. For one, despite the USA's ~~occupies~~ historical occupation as a 'global policeman', furthering a Western liberal agenda across the globe, it is easy for countries to remain resistant — to this day, 64 countries

still criminalise LGBT + identities, and Russia introduced new measures in 2023 to re-categorise homosexuality as a mental illness. These examples speak to the ability of nation-states to reinforce their own state borders and national sovereignty, rejecting the influence of a singular power; thus, American's ~~input~~ ~~input~~ the preservation of a unipolar world order is ~~also~~ disrupted by growing resistance to political globalisation. Furthermore, it is important to acknowledge ~~that~~ the political influence of emerging powers that rival America. For example, ~~the~~ China's establishment of the Asian Infrastructure Investment Bank provides a powerful alternative to the American-dominated World Bank — even more notable is that a total of 110 countries (including European countries), are signed up to it: this suggests a willingness, even in the West, to divert to other leading world powers. China ~~spoke~~ has further ~~it~~ garnered diplomatic influences ~~to~~ via its Belt and Road Initiative (2013), which has invested billions into developing the infrastructure of other countries — 90 ~~countries~~ countries are signed up to this. This is also not ~~to~~ mention major structural groups that exclude America, such as the BRICS, which have been meeting annually since 2009. ~~the~~ Russia's position

on the UNSC as a member of the permanent five with vetoing power can also be seen as proof that the USA is not as unchallenged as it may ~~often~~ be ~~seen~~ ~~as~~ ostensibly: resolutions cannot be passed without the consent of a ~~the~~ nation-state with a drastically contrasting ideology. Thus, there ~~are~~ are plenty challenges to the idea that an incredible number of challenges to the idea that the ~~USA~~ may continue to stand ~~alone~~ world may continue to exist in a unipolar order: the USA's powers have become increasingly limited given the structural and political influence of other world powers.

This is ~~not~~ also the case in terms of hard military ~~or~~ or economic power. ~~While one may argue that~~ One can argue that the USA is unrivalled in terms of hard power: this can be seen in ~~the~~ ~~fact~~ its ability to weaponise the web of complex interdependence, using tariffs to exert influence over other countries such as in the ongoing China-US trade war. The USA also possesses approximately 750 military bases across the world. Both ~~of~~ ~~these~~ ~~examples~~ examples speak to a continued domination of the world order by the USA - with its ability to exert economic influence ~~as~~ as a consequence of the ~~the~~ world's ~~the~~ acceptance of the Washington Consensus (free

market neo-liberal economies), as well as its rendering of military assets internationally, the USA almost seems to still be a ~~map~~ superpower, as superpowers are characterised not only by their influence, but the mobility of their influence.

However, these arguments become less effective when one considers the lessening efficacy of hard power. The USA's 750 military bases and huge arms spending matter little ~~in the~~ in an international landscape wherein over-~~use~~ employment of hard power leads to isolation from important structural bodies and a loss of soft power overall: Russia has proven this by becoming somewhat of an 'international pariah', excluded from the G7 following its annexation of Crimea in 2014 — there have been further calls to expel it from the UN after the Russian invasion of Ukraine in 2022. Furthermore, even if hard power held as much ~~as~~ significance in determining polarity in the modern day, the USA is not without its rivals: again, China's People's Liberation Army is the largest army in the world, with 2 million active personnel, and ~~although~~ while the 25% tariffs that the ~~the~~ 2018 Trump administration placed upon Chinese goods were a powerful display of ~~the~~ weaponised

interdependence, China's retaliatory tariffs led to a loss of 245,000 American jobs. Thus it is proven that while economic globalisation means states are reliant on the USA, the USA is in turn reliant on other states. Given, however, that the 2003 US-UK invasion of Iraq already led to widespread anti-American sentiment, it is demonstrable that acts of exercising hard power are ~~not~~ no longer as effective as soft power, of which the USA is ~~the~~ increasingly being following the increasingly isolationist attitude of the current Trump administration. Thus the world order looks to be in no way unipolar when hard power is taken into consideration.

In conclusion, ~~the~~ while it may seem that the world order ~~is~~ has been unchanged since 2000, in reality, the USA's position as ~~a~~ the sole dominant world power has been challenged significantly by a ~~wide~~ variety of emerging powers. In our modern international landscape, where hard power is no longer as effective as it was in a world with less advanced media and publication, it can then be said that the world order ~~is~~ more multipolar than unipolar.



This response provides three well-explained paragraphs with a degree of depth and with sufficient knowledge, understanding and analysis to achieve Level four.

The candidate begins with consideration of IGO dominance including in the SCUN, the IMF, WB, NATO and the structural power this provides. There is clear AO2 and AO3.

There is consideration of economic power with both sides of the argument developed. There is evidence in the form of China with the Belt and Road policy and Asian Bank, as well as Security Council debate.

The candidate moves on to discuss US hard power and this includes Trump tariffs, widespread military bases and use of the Washington Consensus. They counter with the negatives of use of hard power but there is a brief drift as they move to discuss Russia and touch on soft power.

The response has accurate and thorough knowledge, although not always in depth. There is consistent analysis and mostly relevant evaluation.

Paper Summary

Based on their performance in the examination, candidates are offered the following advice:

- Candidates should be made aware that Section C questions are assessed based on three objectives, each carrying equal weight
- AO1 Knowledge and Understanding often represents the strongest aspect of candidates' work; however, there is a distinction between targeted knowledge specific to the question and broader knowledge that may not directly relate
- AO2 Analysis reaches its peak when it is insightful and consistently presented throughout the response
- AO3 is most effective when it is directly relevant and sustained, rather than merely appended as an afterthought in the conclusion. It is gratifying to see candidates clarify their stance in the introduction, with ongoing 'mini-judgments' seamlessly woven into the response, culminating in a conclusion that substantiates their perspective
- Stronger responses tend to pay close attention to the wording of the questions, frequently making direct references to the title, whilst analysing and evaluating
- For Section A, the initial 12-mark questions assess solely AO1 and AO2, with no requirement for evaluation. Candidates should be ready to provide both knowledge and analytical depth in their answers
- Section B's compulsory 12-mark question will similarly assess AO1 and AO2, necessitating a combination of knowledge and analysis. It is crucial to note that candidates who do not include any synoptic points cannot reach Level 4 in this question. Moreover, those who refer only to one named theory cannot achieve beyond Level 1
- Section C questions are intended to foster debate and discussion, thriving when candidates continuously consider and balance alternative viewpoints
- It is particularly commendable to witness the incorporation of contemporary examples to bolster assertions, with candidates able to make use of examples right through to the date of the examination

Grade boundaries

Grade boundaries for this, and all other papers, can be found on the website on this link:
<https://qualifications.pearson.com/en/support/support-topics/results-certification/grade-boundaries.html>

