



Pearson

A level Politics – Global Politics model answers

March 2018

1a) Examine the criticisms that have been made of both the International Monetary Fund (IMF) and the World Bank (12 marks)

Answer A

The IMF and World Bank are organisations set up by the wealthier economies of the North to give loans to Lesser Developed Countries (LDCs) when they need money for infrastructure projects and to help during financial crises. They have been severely criticised for not doing this very well, and they have actually made some of these countries poorer.

A common feature of the loans given by the IMF and World Bank is that they are linked to Structural Adjustment Programmes (SAPs). These insist that the LDCs should open up their markets to wealthy Trans National Companies (TNCs). This allows the TNCs to dominate trade and sell far more goods in the LDC causing local companies to go bankrupt. The SAPs also tell the LDC state to reduce public spending on education, health and transport.

The IMF and World Bank have been criticised over voting rights. Every country that pays money into them has voting rights, but the largest economies have more votes. This means rich countries like the USA and European ones get to control the institutions so that the IMF and World Bank carry out their policies. The USA has so many votes that it is able to veto policies it does not like.

The World Bank gives loans for infrastructure projects such as dams, railways and ports so that LDCs are able to develop their economies. However, it has given money to projects that have made the lives of local people worse. One of these was the Narmada River Valley project in India which caused large numbers of people to lose their homes.

Many criticisms have been made of the IMF and World Bank.

Commentary

This response demonstrates accurate knowledge as it provides a clear background. There is some analysis but it is not expansive or really detailed. As such it just makes it to be a Level 3 response

Answer B

A wide range of criticisms have been made of both institutions, particularly relating to the two aspects of who controls them, and the policies they have imposed on poorer countries.

The IMF and World Bank are Western-based institutions, both deriving from the Bretton-Woods agreement in 1945 and seen as promoting and protecting western capitalist interests, particularly those of the USA, where they keep their headquarters. In addition, the leader of the World Bank, usually a US citizen, can be chosen by the US President leading to accusations of the institution being an arm of US foreign policy. Fourteen wealthy nations of the North enjoy 60% of the votes in the IMF and thus effectively control the institution. The USA has enough voting rights to veto internal changes within both institutions.

Critics, such as Klein and Stiglitz, have linked both institutions to the 'Washington consensus'; the political idea that neo-liberal policies should be promoted and followed by all countries across the world, irrespective of their unique position and needs. Both institutions have made loans contingent upon the borrowing country implementing certain 'orthodox' policies. For developing countries, these have usually been through Structural Adjustment Programmes (SAPs) imposed by the World Bank. Developing countries have been forced to accept deregulation and privatisation in order to receive financial support. This undermines the concept of state sovereignty by which nations should be free to implement their own policies and programmes without outside coercion.

In addition, it is claimed by critics such as Sachs, that SAPs have usually made conditions for citizens in developing countries worse rather than better. Such programmes have forced states to shrink the public sector leading to a lowering of education and health standards, and have damaged infrastructure and housing projects. SAPs also tie developing countries to the richer economies of the North, often benefitting transnational companies (TNCs), leading to accusations that SAPs force developing economies to become dependent on wealthier economies and are thus unable to develop and enrich themselves.

These states have been forced to focus on the demands of the West and allow local industries to collapse and public sector jobs disappear. Associated with these enforced impoverishing developments has been a rise in corruption, the worsening of human rights, and neglect for the environment leading to an overall decline in the quality of life for many, particularly poorer communities.

As such, criticisms of the two institutions have focused on the implementation of SAPs and the wide range of problems they cause developing countries.

Commentary

This is a comprehensive answer that examines criticisms of both institutions. The introduction outlines the original purpose of the two institutions but indicates that criticisms have been made of them both. The AO1 portrays accurate and perceptive knowledge and understanding. The AO2 is consistent and coherent with logical chains of reasoning that demonstrate similarities between the two institutions and draws links between processes and associated criticisms. As such it merits a Level 4 reward and can be seen as an improvement on the prior answer.

1b) Examine the effectiveness of both the international courts and tribunals in protecting human rights (12 marks)

Answer A

The international community has created both courts and tribunals which are designed to protect human rights. There have been many criticisms of these international courts and tribunals.

Firstly, Realists have criticised courts such as the International Court of Justice (ICJ) for undermining national sovereignty. States, according to Realists, should possess full control over all of their actions; which economic policies they pursue, and how they conduct their foreign policy. Also, they should decide if they want to go to war and what laws their citizens follow. If states are subject to international laws created by the United Nations then they are unable to have full legal sovereignty in their own territories.

Secondly, international courts are not very good at arresting war criminals and corrupt leaders. There are many corrupt leaders, such as President Assad in Syria, who have escaped justice. Vladimir Putin in Russia has ordered the assassination of journalists, and has invaded the Ukraine leading to thousands of deaths but he has never been tried in an international court. This is because powerful countries can do anything they like and get away with it. No leaders from China or America have ever been arrested.

Thirdly, the international courts and tribunals are very slow. They can take years, or even decades, to prosecute national leaders who have committed war crimes. This was the case with Radovan Karadzic who was sentenced to 40 years in prison in 2016 - a full twenty years after the crimes he committed. President Milosevic was never sent to prison since his trial took so long - 5 years - that he died before it finished. This shows that the international courts are very slow and not very effective.

Commentary

The Question asks how effective are international courts and tribunals, but this answer has concentrated almost entirely on criticisms of the two approaches, with very little on successes. As a consequence the answer also gives fairly superficial and undeveloped Knowledge & Understanding (A01) base and the accompanying Analysis (A02) is restricted. There is some comparative analysis of the two different types of institution. However, the knowledge and ideas given are correct so there is creditable information given, and this answer reaches Level 2 as it demonstrates some accurate knowledge and analysis.

Answer B

Since the establishment of the United Nations Declaration on Human Rights, a number of courts such as the International Criminal Court (ICC) and the European Court of Human Rights (ECHR), and various Tribunals dealing with specific atrocities have been created. These were all established to protect an internationalist understanding of human rights but have enjoyed mixed levels of success.

On the plus side, these courts have scored a number of successes, usually involving former state leaders. The ICTY was established in 1993 to deal with the crimes against humanity and genocide

implemented in the war that followed the break-up of the former Yugoslavia. Whilst the courts were quite slow to produce successes, they did eventually find Serbian leaders Milosevic, Mladic, and Karadzic all guilty of crimes against humanity and received long sentences. Similar tribunals set up for atrocities in Rwanda and Sierra Leone have seen Jean Kambanda and Charles Taylor, respectively, convicted for war crimes and other atrocities. As such, they have seen state crimes punished and their perpetrators brought to justice, something that may never have occurred if left to their own national courts. It is possible that these proceedings have acted as a deterrent to other national leaders around the world, since they have witnessed the work of these courts and tribunals and decided to avoid a similar fate, though it is difficult to know this for sure.

On the negative side, these courts and tribunals have experienced some severe limitations. There are widespread accusations that the courts tend to concentrate on leaders from poorer countries, particularly the black nations of Africa, whilst ignoring any atrocities carried out by the Western powers in places such as Iraq and Afghanistan. George W Bush never faced a trial for torturing prisoners in Guantanamo Bay, nor any western leader for 'illegally invading' Iraq. It is also the case that the leaders who are prosecuted are invariably those that lost out in the various conflicts, or who were later deposed from power. The victors and the leaders still in power are never prosecuted. In addition, atrocities, genocides and ethnic cleansing continue within countries such as Yemen, Syria and Myanmar leading to the conclusion that the courts and tribunals have engendered only a limited deterrent effect, with some national leaders still willing to engage in human rights abuses believing they will never be brought to trial.

Whilst international courts and tribunals have enjoyed some success in protecting human rights, there is clearly scope for considerable improvements in this area.

Commentary

This is a more detailed and comprehensive answer to the Question, examining both the effectiveness and weaknesses of international courts and tribunals. Each section of the answer combines a combination of conceptual knowledge with examples (A01) and accompanying Analysis (A02). This is done in an accurate and coherent manner with logical chains of reasoning. Ideas, institutions and concepts are all examined effectively. The answer is comparative in nature though perhaps a little more could be said on the different roles (and associated effectiveness) of courts and tribunals. This is clearly a Level 4 answer

2) Analyse the divisions regarding human nature that exist between realists and liberals (12 marks)

Answer A

Realists and Liberals have very different views on global politics over a number of features such as the state, foreign policy and war.

Realists believe in 'global anarchy' (Bull). There is no proper system of international law so states are able to act in a selfish and aggressive manner. If they are unable to obtain the land or resources that they desire they will act aggressively towards other states. They have large armed forces since they mistrust other states and they will use these in armed conflict to invade other countries and take the resources such as oil or gold that they desire.

Liberals think that states will cooperate with each other. Liberals do not like war or aggression, they prefer peace and internationalism. States should talk to each other around the table and come to agreements. They can do this through organisations like the United Nations and WTO. This means peaceful agreements can be made and war avoided.

Realists also believe that states should be strong and dominant. They want to dominate other weaker states and should be allowed to do this as it fits with human nature. States are selfish, power-seeking and aggressive. Liberals think that states are cooperative and peaceful. They are like humans and want to work with each other and have agreements.

Because of their views on human nature, realists and liberals have divisions with each other.

Commentary

Candidates are expected to provide a synoptic answer to Question 2 linking knowledge of core political ideas from Paper 1 to knowledge of the comparative theories learnt in Paper 3. Here knowledge of how Conservatives and Liberals understand human nature should be linked to Realist and Liberal approaches to Global Politics. Whilst this candidate has correctly analysed differences between Realist and Liberal views of the state, conflict and the international system, there is no link to knowledge learnt when studying the Core Politics Ideas and this means that marks for both Knowledge & Understanding (A01) and Analysis (A02) are going to be limited. This is therefore a Level 2 answer since both approaches are analysed, but non-synoptically and thus with restricted knowledge and analytical connections.

Answer B

Realists and Liberals both have distinctive and very different views of human nature which lead them to regard global politics in two very distinct ways.

Realists have a conservative view of human nature. They see humans as selfish, greedy and power-seeking. They seek security in an uncertain world. They place greater emphasis on instinct than reason and believe that human nature is fixed – humans will always behave in this manner. Realists typically see the state as an extension of human nature, states acting as self-interested, greedy and power-seeking.

By contrast, Liberals hold a more progressive view of human nature, seeing humans as rational and reasonable, driven by a desire for freedom and seeking self-improvement. By extension, states can behave in a similar manner when conducting foreign policy.

These two views on human nature lead to different expectations of the state and perspectives on the global order. Realists see states as power-seeking bodies, maximising their power both internally and externally. States seek to gain advantages and power over other states through competition and conflict. States are greedy and seek to exploit the resources of others. This it is believed will lead to a system of 'global anarchy', a 'dog-eat-dog' world where the strong dominate the weak. A strong state will deliver the security that insecure humans crave in an unpredictable world. As human nature is fixed, the chaotic and conflict-prone world that has always existed will continue into the future. There is no prospect of a transformation towards a better world.

Liberals, however, believe states should reflect human reason and rationality - based on constitutional principles, self-government and justice. States act in a reasonable manner working with each other and respecting other state's sovereignty through international cooperation, institutions and agreements. States acting on the recognition of the mutual benefits brought about

by internationalism are likely to advance politically and economically in a form of self-development, in a similar way to which individuals seek self-fulfilment. Ultimately, states will seek a form of world government based on peace and internationalism as humans are capable of improving and creating a better world.

Based on their more negative view of human nature, Realists, such as Morgenthau, believe that states will act in an aggressive manner when they are unable to achieve their goals peacefully. They will readily resort to conflict and aggression to achieve their selfish goals. They are likely to settle disputes through conflict and seek domination over those they regard as weaker than themselves. Liberals, by contrast, believe states should use reason, debate and discussion to settle differences between themselves, to seek international accords and enlightened agreements. Cooperation leads to advancement, whilst conflict is only used as a very last resort because of its damaging impact.

As such, their distinct views on human nature lead Realists and Liberals to have very different views of the state as an international actor, the nature of the global order and attitudes towards conflict.

Commentary

Candidates are expected to provide a synoptic answer to Question 2 linking knowledge of Core Political Ideas from Paper 1 to knowledge of the comparative theories learnt in Paper 3. Here knowledge of how Conservatives and Liberals understand human nature has been successfully linked to Realist and Liberal approaches to Global Politics. The answer given is comprehensive with both Realist and Liberal approaches effectively analysed at some length with detailed, accurate and coherent levels of Knowledge & Understanding (A01) and Analysis (A02). The theories are analysed whilst making cohesive synoptic points and the different ideas of the two theories are explained with considerable clarity. A definition of the two approaches is effectively provided by the entire answer. This meets all the requirements of a Level 4 answer

3a) Evaluate the extent to which cultural globalisation has had a greater impact on the world than any other form of globalisation (30 marks)

Answer A

Cultural globalisation is the idea that values and cultures around the world are merging together to form one global culture. This is known as homogenising culture and there is a flattening of differences between countries. Recently, there have been major developments towards a unified global culture, however, this has also provoked a backlash and opposition to global culture, especially American culture dominating the world.

Cultural globalisation can best be seen through the consumer goods that people buy. It is now common for people all over the world to buy McDonalds fast food, eat at Pizza Hut, drink Coca Cola and Starbucks coffee, drive Japanese and German cars and use Apple or Samsung mobile phones. The world economy is increasingly dominated by Trans National Companies (TNCs) and their market share is always increasing. These consumer goods are being bought by people all over the world, in Africa and Asia as well as Europe and America. This is leading to one large global market where everyone has the same culture.

Another way in which culture is being homogenised is through values. Western liberal values are spreading across the world. Western societies believe in individual justice rights and freedoms, political and legal equality, tolerance and democracy. These have been spreading into other parts of the world. Two-thirds of the world's 200 countries are now full or partial democracies. These democracies are implementing liberal Western values so that the world's cultural values are homogenising. This has been helped by the United Nations and its Declaration of Human Rights, so that all countries are having to implement the same human rights and flattening out cultural differences.

However, this has not always been popular. There has been a backlash against this, China has refused to become a democracy and is still run by one-party Communist rule. In addition, it has supported Asian values based on the family and authority which oppose Western individualism. Russia has also resisted the individualism of the West and has followed a very conservative authoritarian nationalism which has included invading the Ukraine and supporting the dictator Assad in Syria. By far the biggest backlash has come from Islamic fundamentalists such as Al-Qaeda and Islamic State. Both these groups want to stop Western influence as they see it as cultural imperialism. They have pursued a war based on terrorism to stop Western individualism, democracy and culture. They want to replace this with a very traditional conservative Islamic culture based fundamental Muslim values. This shows that cultural globalisation has much opposition and is not fully successful.

Another form of cultural globalisation is the media. People all over the world now watch Hollywood movies and American TV series such as Game of Thrones. These are very popular and make billions of dollars for American TNCs such as Fox, Disney and CNN. This means that nations everywhere are watching American lifestyles and are copying American culture. They aspire to be like Americans and to live the lives of Americans. Other forms of media such as social media have the same effect. Facebook – an American TNC – is used by people everywhere now. This means they can share their culture with people all over the world. Social media such as Twitter, Facebook and Snapchat allow consumers to connect with anyone anywhere in the world meaning cultures can be shared and flattened out across the world. The internet also allows people to connect globally. They can access ideas and cultures from anywhere they want and this means there will be more sharing of cultures and more cultural globalisation. This shows that cultural globalisation has had an extremely big impact on the world.

The trend towards cultural globalisation is also shown through music, sport and fashion. Most of the big sports across the world are originally British. Football, cricket, tennis, golf and rugby are all immensely popular multi-billion dollar industries now. Premiership football is shown the world over and millions of Asians are keen supporters of top Premiership sides such as Manchester United and Chelsea. The World Cup held every four years is followed by billions and the final is usually watched by half of all the people on the planet. This is also the case with music, with British and American rock bands such as Pink Floyd and The Who and pop stars such as Madonna and Beyoncé doing sell out tours across the globe with millions of people trying to buy tickets. However, there is some resistance to this, especially in the Muslim world where western pop music has been banned in countries such as Iran, Afghanistan and Saudi Arabia. This is because they see it as corrupting their youth and they want to preserve traditional conservative values. Girls are also forced to wear the burka and hijab and are prevented from being like Western girls, following the latest fashions and having more freedoms.

All of these arguments show that cultural globalisation is having a huge impact. The whole world is now adopting cultures that originally were only found in Western countries. However, this has not been fully successful and has been opposed in China and Islamic countries.

Commentary

The answer starts with a good definition, but the rest of the introduction gives advanced notice of the problems that are going to arise in this answer. The candidate has effectively answered a different question – how successful has cultural globalisation been - to the one asked. Candidates often learn stock essay answers, and when confronted with an unfamiliar question simply give the learnt one rather than the one actually asked for

The essay answer here gives several paragraphs on how cultural globalisation has impacted across the globe. These are largely accurate and do all provide correct Knowledge & Understanding (A01) for this question. However, the concentration on cultural globalisation and the absence of any discussion of, for example, political, security or economic globalisation means A01 marks will be not be high, the incorrect focus of the answer severely limits the level of Analysis (A02) marks it can receive. Evaluation (A03) is present and relevant as there are paragraphs showing how cultural globalisation has been resisted, but the above problems again apply here. As a consequence of these issues the response is in Level 3.

Answer B

In recent times, the world economy has seen a shift towards globalisation starting with the expansion of trade in the 1960s, and accelerating rapidly with the lifting of national restrictions on the movement of finance, services, goods and people in the 1980s. Globalisation is the interlinking of national economies through the free movement of goods, capital and people and can be manifested through cultural, political, economic and social processes. It creates a more homogenised world with a flattening of the differences across political, economic and cultural sectors. This essay will discuss which of these processes has had the greater impact within the contemporary global economy.

Cultural globalisation has had perhaps its highest level of impact through the spread of consumerism, particularly the consumerism associated with consumer goods deriving from the USA. America has spread its cultural influence through the export of goods such as Coca Cola, McDonald's fast food and Levi's jeans to the extent that large sections of the population the world over are effectively buying into an American cultural experience. This, to a differing extent, has also been achieved by Chinese, Mexican and Indian food, Jamaican music, French fashion and British sports. Certain cultural traits have been able to spread across large parts of the global economy.

However, there have been distinct limits to these trends. Many nations still pursue and protect their own cultural distinctiveness, for instance the protection of the French language, Indian opposition to beef products and restrictions on Western music in many Muslim countries.

However, certain aspects of economic globalisation have not faced these issues. Whilst many states restrict external cultural influences, more basic economic goods such as white goods, other household goods such as TVs, cars and clothing items have not faced such bans and restrictions, and are widely available across the globe. Most people seek economic advancement and are only

too ready to buy foreign consumer basics. Recent decades have seen major extensions in free trade, reductions in tariffs and duties and the opening up of services to international competition

Nevertheless, even this rapid and all-changing expansion of economic globalisation appears to be reaching its limits with recent setbacks highlighted by the election of Trump as President of the USA on a protectionist ticket and the Brexit referendum result indicating a desire for some form of more national economic approach through independence.

Aspects of cultural globalisation seem to not face so many restrictions, however. This is particularly the case with the rise of international media networks, again particularly those based in the USA. News organisations such as CNN, Sky and Fox have a global reach influencing how populations see the world. Social media such as Facebook and Twitter also facilitate a cultural globalisation, whilst Bollywood and Hollywood movies and BBC TV programmes are sold widely across most of the countries of the world influencing and shaping cultural perspectives globally.

Yet even these areas face some resistance. Russian Today and Al Jazeera were launched to offer non-Western news services, and China has effectively banned foreign social media, whilst promoting the more easily controlled national Chinese social media networks.

Whilst these areas of cultural globalisation face difficulties, some aspects of political globalisation have been expanding strongly. A proliferation of international organisations such as the United Nations, NATO, regional federations such as the EU and summits such as the G7, G8 and G20 have all grown in importance, particularly since the fall of the Soviet Union, allowing greater levels of cooperation in areas such as Iraq, Afghanistan and Kuwait. These have led to an expansion of political alliances and networks not seen during the Cold War.

Political globalisation has been far from completely successful though. Nations-states, as highlighted by Realists, tend to jealously guard their national sovereignty and resist supranational organisations and international organisations, simply using them for their own national ends. Conflicts in Yemen, Syria and Myanmar clearly highlight the present limits of political globalisation, as does the UK's departure from the European Union and Donald Trump's election promising to put America First.

With the expansion of political globalisation it was hoped there would be the spread of western liberal cultural values, such as democracy, equal rights and justice and individual freedoms. To some extent, these ideas have permeated into Eastern Europe, South America and parts of SE Asia and the African continent. Since the 1980s, democracy has spread to many new regions and two-thirds of states are now democratic or partially democratic. The spread of democracy has facilitated the expansion of the ideas of individual rights and justice and ideas on equality.

However, this cultural expansion of western values and not been universally welcomed and has met a fierce cultural backlash in some parts of the world. This has been the case with the national-based Communism of China, but more violently with the various religious fundamentalisms of the world. Islamic fundamentalism, in particular, has resisted liberal cultural values through promoting a traditional social conservatism across the Muslim world, though fundamentalist Hindu, Jewish, Christian and Buddhist movements have engaged in similar anti-globalisation strategies.

In conclusion, it can be seen that all the various facets of cultural globalisation – consumerism, liberal values and media influence – have had a significant impact across the world, going some way towards creating a 'global village' as champions of cosmopolitanism hoped for. However, they have met resistance from nationalists and religious conservatives and are far from universal in their impact. A similar argument could be made for political and economic globalisation. These too have

had huge impacts across the world, particularly economic globalisation, but have also met resistance from nation-states and national economies. Thus all forms of globalisation have enjoyed significant impacts across the globe but all face significant limits to what they are able to achieve.

Commentary

This answer gives a comprehensive response to the question. It has a clear structure with a lucid introduction (which contains an appropriate definition), conclusion and paragraphs that alternately argue back and forth with relation to the Question. The Knowledge & Understanding (A01) is thorough and has depth with numerous examples. The question is answered in a cohesive, coherent and appropriate manner making relevant connections and thus demonstrates perceptive levels of Analysis (A02). Evaluation (A03) is clearly demonstrated throughout the essay as substantiated counter-arguments are made that address the nuances of this question. An appropriate judgement is made in the conclusion. This is clearly a good Level 5 answer

3b) Evaluate the extent to which the European Union (EU) has been a model for regionalism around the world (30 marks)

Answer A

The European Union was originally known as the European Economic Community (EEC) and was founded in 1957. It was the first of the regional federations around the world to be established so it has been something of a model for the other regions. However, there are many problems with the EU and this has meant that it has not always been copied. Regionalism is a process whereby regions cooperate to become significant economic and political players on the world stage.

The European Union (EU) has brought together the economies of Europe. It has eventually created a single market where the states of Europe are able to trade freely with each other without tariffs and duties. It has led to the four freedoms - free movements of money, goods, services and people. Supporters of the EU maintain that this has allowed the nations of Europe to become wealthier and more prosperous.

However, this has come with many problems. In reality, the EU has allowed Germany to dominate Europe through economic means after failing to do this through military means. It has developed a system of trade where other countries are dependent on Germany, especially southern nations like Greece, Italy and Spain and these countries have become poorer as a result and now owe billions of Euros to the European Central Bank (ECB) leaving them in a financial and economic crisis. As a result, other regions have decided not to follow exactly the EU model, and do not have such strong economic ties, so that one country such as Japan, Brazil or the USA is not able to dominate the others.

The EU has also developed a political union. This is controversial and has been opposed by euro-sceptics such as UKIP. The EU has created supranational organisations such as the European Parliament and the European Commission. Each state has lost sovereignty by allowing these institutions to make certain decisions. These decisions include agriculture, fisheries, trade and the environment. This has allowed Brussels to become much stronger and to try and implement European political policies at high level summits like the G7, United Nations and climate conferences. This means that Europe can speak with one voice and be more important on the world stage.

Nevertheless, this has been very unpopular with many people in Europe. Each nation in the EU has its own political and economic interests and they are often different to other European nations. This means Brussels can impose unpopular policies which are not suitable for a country such as Britain though it might suit France. This has led to a nationalist backlash with parties emerging in every EU country to oppose Brussels federalism and supra-nationalism. In Britain, this has now been successful. The popularity of UKIP caused the Brexit referendum and Britain has now left the EU. It looks like other countries like Hungary and Austria may decide to follow Britain. Other regions such as NAFTA and ASEAN have decided not to copy the EU. They have no supra-nationalism and no loss of national sovereignty as these may cause the same problems as in the EU.

The EU has also imposed social uniformity through processes such as the Social Chapter and regulatory procedures. All the states of the EU have to now follow the same employment laws. Minimum wages exist everywhere along with the number of hours that can be worked each week – no more than 48. There are now strict health and safety measures that are the same in every state. The regulations concerning farming and fishing and manufactured goods are the same for everyone now. This is to make the single market work more fairly and effectively. Workers will receive the same treatment in every EU state, so states cannot unfairly undermine each other.

However, none of the other regional federations have copied this model provided by the EU. NAFTA, ASEAN and Mercosur have maintained their own national sovereignty. All these countries want to be able to compete with each other. They want to control legal sovereignty and create their own legislation on matters such as regulation and worker's rights. Each nation chooses to make its own legislation and retain its sovereignty so the EU has not been a model for other regions in this matter. Realists would emphasise that this is typical behaviour for a state.

As such, the EU has been copied to the extent that other regions have formed economic alliances to promote their economies and create more free trade. However, this is the limit that has been copied. EU moves towards political, security and social integration involving supranational organisations have not been copied by any other region. This is mainly because of the Realist theory that states want to keep their own political and legal sovereignty and therefore do not copy the loss of sovereignty that EU membership has entailed.

Commentary

The answer has a planned structure with evaluation (A03) throughout and a relevant introduction and conclusion. The essay is coherent, yet it has tended to argue from a very euro-sceptic position that is critical of the EU, mentioning only in passing the strengths of the EU model. This means that it has tended to ignore the more geopolitical reasons for other regions not fully adopting the EU model and thus limits the Analysis (A02) marks. This concentration has also reduced the number of arguments that can be given, again restricting Knowledge & Understanding (A01) marks. Nevertheless, the knowledge given, although superficial in places, is largely accurate and does address the question. This allows the answer to enter Level 3.

Answer B

The European Union was founded in 1957 as the European Economic Community (EEC) in an attempt to bring together the economies of Western Europe, and prevent the outbreak of another

highly damaging European conflict. It has arguably remained the pre-eminent example of regionalism anywhere in the world ever since, and has inspired all other regions of the world to engage in similar developments. Regionalism is a process whereby states within a region cooperate to become a significant economic and political influence on the world stage and has been championed by non-Realists such as Deutsch. However, only some of the developments followed by the EU have been inspirational, whilst other elements have been avoided by the different federations. This essay will discuss the extent to which the EU model has been an inspiration to others.

Firstly, the EU was originally organised to improve trade links between its members. Over time, trade was encouraged by reducing tariffs, duties and quotas between the member states. There was also the process of harmonising regulations and other economic procedures. This allowed trade to flourish and for economic links to be strengthened between the member countries and for the respective members to see their economies grow strongly and standards of living also rise rapidly. This was particularly the case during the long post-war boom of 1947 to 1974 and led to many other regions regarding the regional process as an unqualified success. As such, it gave rise to similar associations such as NAFTA, ASEAN, APEC and later the African Union. These organisations took the EU as their basic economic model and shaped their economic strategies accordingly, strongly indicating that the EU was the ideal model to follow.

However, later developments were not copied quite so avidly. Following the economic problems that became entrenched within the global economy from the late 1970s onwards, the EU eventually responded with the creation of the Single Market in 1986, a development that followed Mitrany's functionalist idea that regions could act more effectively than nations within the global economy. All trade restrictions were ended between member states and a single harmonised free market area established in which economies could freely trade, grow and prosper. At the same time, external tariffs and duties were maintained to help EU members protect themselves from the unstable and predatory elements of the increasingly global neo-liberal free trade economy that was developing. Elements of this were copied elsewhere, in particular the idea of internal free trade, though other federations such as ASEAN have found it more difficult to impose external tariffs as a form of protection against more powerful economies, such as China and India, within the global market.

However, once the EU single market had been established it became apparent that whilst the different members had different financial, monetary and political regimes the market was not operating on a level playing field and companies in certain states had distinct advantages over those of other states. As such, and anticipated by the neo-functional ideas of Haas, the EU integrated further into its present incarnation, and implemented political and monetary union through the Maastricht Treaty in 1993 and a number of other treaties that have followed. Part of this process entailed establishing monetary union and eventually a single currency, the Euro. It also led to the growth of supranational organisations and pooled sovereignty with institutions such as the ECJ, European Commission and ECB.

This element of European regionalism has proved much less attractive to other regional federations. No other regional body has attempted to launch a single currency or supranational bodies to organise their region, though they have been considered on occasion in the African Union. There could be several reasons for this, but one key factor is that other regions of the world have much more uneven levels of economic development compared to the relatively uniform level of development across Europe. This is particularly the case in ASEAN – e.g. Burma and Singapore -

but there are huge economic disparities between, for example, the USA and Mexico and Argentina and Paraguay that make monetary union highly unlikely at present in these areas as well.

During this period, the EU region has also pioneered unprecedented levels of social and political cooperation. The European Union sees representatives elected proportionately from across the whole continent to an assembly, the European Parliament, which is enjoying increasing levels of political power and influence. The EU has acted as a single global actor in trade talks, combating international crime, attempts to reduce global warming, and in many other environmental areas. Social policies to protect workers have been established. It has also begun low levels of foreign policy and defence cooperation with the creation of the European Army and the High Commissioner for Foreign Affairs.

None of these developments have been copied by other regional bodies. States in the other regions have preferred to preserve their national sovereignty and have opted for looser, less-binding agreements. Possibly, Europe's long and unique history of persistent warfare and conflict has led to Europe being forced into finding methods to keep the peace which are less pressing on other continents such as Africa or South America. In addition, Europe has no state that dwarves the rest in terms of economic, political or demographic size and none is thus capable of dominating the rest. This is probably a major reason as to why NAFTA has not followed this development since the USA would dominate the other members, and members of Mercosur have resisted Brazilian domination. Equally, China or India could have a similar impact in Asia. As such, there are features that are unique to Europe that have little relevance to other regions and thus EU developments relating to these features are unlikely to be copied.

In conclusion, the EU has been a model for other regional bodies in that it was the first to pioneer a form of regional economic development that has proved attractive to other regions of the world also seeking to achieve rapid economic development, whilst also protecting themselves from the more predatory and unstable elements of a global economy increasingly based on free trade and neo-liberal policies. However, these other regions have been much less keen on copying the monetary and political agreements and cooperation established by the EU, possibly because these features are more relevant to Europe or the appropriate conditions for their establishment are not present in the other regions of the world. This indicates that regionalism may possibly develop in many different ways in different parts of the world.

Commentary

This is a well-argued, coherent, concise and comprehensive answer to the question, successfully addressing the different nuances and geopolitical considerations associated with this subject. It considers an extensive range of areas – political, social, military and political - thus demonstrating thorough and in-depth Knowledge & Understanding (AO1). The question is addressed accurately, concisely and coherently without deviating from the subject and there are logical chains of reasoning with appropriate use of theorists giving high A02 Analysis marks. The essay structure constructs highly relevant evaluation (A03) as arguments and counter-arguments are set out logically throughout the essay. This merits a level 5 reward

3c) Evaluate the extent to which the rise of other states has diminished the US as the global hegemonic power. (30 marks)

Answer A

A hegemonic power is the leading state within a collection of states. This power enables them to enjoy massive political, economic and security influence and to shape the international agenda to suit their own ends. The US has been a hegemonic power since WW2, during the Cold War and since the collapse of the Soviet Union and has been extremely powerful during this whole period. Its influence is now declining because it faces opposition from China, Russia and Islamic terrorism. This essay will discuss whether the US is still a hegemon.

On the one hand, the US is still a hegemon. The US is still the world's largest military power. It spends nearly 50% of all the military spending done by states across the planet. It spends about ten times more money on the military than either Russia or China. It has more nuclear weapons and aircraft carriers than any other state. It possesses 700 military bases in more than 100 other countries, dominates NATO and other military alliances, and this, the US believes, will allow it to win two major wars fought at the same time on two different fronts. No other state comes remotely close to this.

The US is also a major economic power as it still has the largest national economy of any country. It still makes up over 20% of the world economy. American companies are the largest Trans National Companies (TNCs). In many areas of the economy American TNCs have the largest market share. Coca Cola, McDonalds, Starbucks and Pizza Hut are dominant in the fast food industry across much of the globe. Amazon, Netflix, Facebook, Apple and Sky are now the major players in the world of media, films, TV programmes, social media and their products are used and watched by billions of people across the globe. This means the US has both economic power and the soft power of culture.

The US is also a powerful political power. It is one of the five permanent members of the UN Security Council and regularly vetoes UN proposals to maintain its superiority. It is the leading member of NATO, the G7 and G20. It also has a very large influence on both the IMF and the World Bank. All of this makes America the pre-eminent global political power. It is able to shape political agendas, oppose policies it does not like – such as the UN funding contraception and abortion agencies. The US has been able to form alliances to oppose countries such as North Korea, Iran and Cuba. No other state has as much political power as the USA.

On the other hand, US hegemony is in decline. Most importantly, this is because of the rise of China. China has a population of 1.3 billion people and its rapidly expanding economy will inevitably make it the biggest economy on the planet within a few years. Once this happens, China will be more powerful economically than the USA and its companies will have more influence around the world. This is already happening in the developing world, where most money for development in Africa, South America and poor parts of Asia comes from China. In some ways this can be seen by Donald Trump now just concentrating on creating jobs in America and not doing trade deals with Asia anymore.

Russia has also opposed US power. It has invaded Crimea and other parts of the Ukraine and taken them over against the wishes of the US. Russia has also played the biggest role in the civil war in Syria. It has supported the dictator President Assad – who America wants to be replaced by a democracy – and this seems to be becoming successful, so Russia will continue to be more influential here. Russia is also supporting Iran against the US and it has given some backing to

North Korea. This shows that Russia is able to resist US power and this is becoming more and more common.

Finally, US influence has been restricted by the rise of Islamic terrorism. This was predicted by Samuel Huntington in his famous 'Clash of Civilisations' where he claimed other civilisations would oppose US hegemony because they have different cultures, not different ideologies. Islamic terrorism, such as the 9-11 attack and many other attacks, has restricted US influence in many parts of the Muslim world. It has had to leave Iraq and Afghanistan and it cannot successfully influence the conflicts in Syria and Yemen. Islamic terrorists oppose American imperialism and want a very conservative religious society where there are no individual rights. This is becoming more popular and successful and shows that America is less and less influential in this very large part of the world.

In conclusion, on the one hand the US remains a powerful hegemon, but on the other hand it is a hegemon that is in decline.

Commentary

The answer to this question has been given in two separate sections. Firstly, a series of arguments outlining the hegemonic powers of the USA and then a section on how those powers are being challenged and are in decline. The problem with this approach is that it limits the opportunities to continually provide Analysis (A02) points, and in particular Evaluation (A03) points. There is no real chance to offer comparisons and contrast throughout the essay. This means the higher skills are not being accessed appropriately. Nevertheless, there is a large amount of Knowledge & Understanding (A01) points even if it is done in a somewhat list-like manner, and at times the understanding is superficial. Unfortunately, the last paragraph does not relate to 'the rise of other states' but to a general ideological movement, so can receive little credit. As a 'best fit' we can see stronger AO1 than AO2 and AO3 and is given a Level 3 reward.

Answer B

After the fall of the Berlin Wall in 1989 and the collapse of the Soviet Union in 1991, the US was left as the world's only superpower. Its cultural, political and economic reach across the world was unmatched and no other power came even remotely close to its level of influence. This was a development welcomed by supporters of unipolarity such as Kindleberger and Gilpin. The US was clearly a global hegemonic power – a leading state in the community of states - and at that time, the only one. Events since, however, have undermined the position of the US as a global hegemon able to shape the world in its own image. The rise of China, the continued importance of Russia, the economic influence of the EU states and resistance from state-sponsored Islamic fundamentalism have all restricted the ability of the US to shape international developments according to its own national agenda and suggest a more multipolar world.

Shortly after the collapse of the Soviet Union, Iraq invaded Kuwait in 1993. The US put itself at the head of an unprecedented international military coalition of over 50 countries which was able to quickly push Saddam Hussein out of Kuwait and weaken his regime. It appeared at this time that the US could pursue almost any foreign military venture it wanted whilst enjoying widespread foreign backing for such ventures. This contrasts sharply with recent crises in the same region. The armed internal conflict in Syria has seen the US playing only a minor role – mainly that of destroying Islamic State. Most of the political running in Syria has been made by a resurgent Russia

and to a lesser extent Turkey. US influence has been limited. This is similar to the situation in the Ukraine, where the US has been unable to force Russia's expansionist nationalism to respect Ukrainian national sovereignty. It is clear that the US can no longer enjoy the unbridled influence it once possessed.

A similar state of affairs exists in the economic realm. US firms, particularly the oil and gas companies and a number of high street stores and restaurants, once dominated much of the international global market. As free trade, international capital transfers and movement of workers spread backed by neo-liberal ideological thinking in the 1980s and 1990s it was invariably US companies that were at the forefront of this trend. The majority of successful and well-known transnational companies (TNCs) were American ones such as Exxon, Coca-Cola and McDonalds. Whilst it's true that these and other US companies such as Amazon, Apple and Microsoft remain world leaders, they have met with determined resistance from other parts of the world. The EU states, collectively, are economically larger than the US and have tended to get the better of the WTO trade deals between the two powers in recent decades. The US has also met economic resistance from the states of ASEAN and other regional blocs. Most notably, China is now the world's second largest economic power, and across the developing world is now often the leading global economic investor and developer. However, probably the most significant symbol of declining US economic influence is the election of Donald Trump on a semi-protectionist ticket, almost admitting that US companies cannot successfully compete internationally.

Politically, the US remains a significant political player. It is a leading member of the United Nations Security Council, the G7 and NATO, spends close to the same on armaments as the rest of the world put together (and ten times more than Russia and China), possesses more nuclear weapons than each of the other nine nuclear powers and dominates the affairs of the IMF and World Bank. It clearly possesses much hard power and has used this to eradicate the threat from Islamic State in Iraq and Syria and to keep North Korea largely isolated.

Nevertheless, there are clear limits to this power and signs of increasing multipolarity. China is increasingly influential in the western Pacific and the US appears to be slowly losing influence in this region. It has failed to prevent North Korea from developing nuclear weapons. As Russian influence has revived, the US has failed to form any form of coalition to oust President Assad in Syria and been forced to leave Iraq and Afghanistan with its objectives only partially implemented. On matters such as combatting global warming, the US remains isolated as the only state that has failed to ratify the Paris Agreement. An inability to even deal competently with Mexican immigration has led to Trump's support for a border wall between the US and Mexico, notably not paid for by the Mexican state. In many conflicts, the US is notable by its absence. It appears to be playing either a limited or no role at all in the conflicts in Myanmar, Ukraine, and the Yemen as Trump follows a semi-isolationist foreign policy that concentrates only on America's direct interests. This leaves the field open for other aspiring states.

Finally, it appears that the vaunted prowess of US soft power is also in decline. It is true that since the decline of the Soviet Union, some form of liberal democratic capitalism, even if only partially implemented, has spread into many new areas of the globe, particularly those formerly under Soviet influence. US transnational companies have followed the spread of democracy, and particularly the influence of the media as Hollywood, CNN, NBC, Netflix, Amazon, Fox and others have spread US films, TV programmes and social media across the globe to billions of avid consumers.

This is a trend that continues, but is being increasingly resisted. US companies face competition from both state and private institutions in Russia, the EU, China and the Islamic world. Bollywood

makes more films than Hollywood, Al-Jazeera aims to dominate the news agenda in the Middle East as Russia Today does in central Eurasia. The US has found it particularly difficult to prevent the spread of Islamic fundamentalist ideas, influence and terrorism sponsored by states such as Iran and Saudi Arabia as they compete against each other in large areas of the Muslim world and its periphery. US cultural hegemony is clearly far from complete and actually quite limited in this region now.

In conclusion, it can be seen that the US, whilst remaining a partial hegemon, is clearly restricted in its ability to shape global events. It may well possess half the world's military might, and continue to enjoy significant political and cultural power, but the dogged resistance of Putin's conservative nationalism, the rapid economic rise of China, the regional cooperation of the EU states and the religious conflict between Iran and Saudi Arabia have all placed severe limits on US hegemony and its international reach. This indicates that the world is moving away from unipolarity towards a multipolar world order.

Commentary

This is a sophisticated and comprehensive answer to the question. It shows all the requirements of a high level answer – thorough and in-depth Knowledge & Understanding (A01) across a wide number of areas, concise and accurate answering of the question to give high A02 Analysis marks and consistent Evaluation (A03) throughout with argument and counter-argument. The introduction, which contains a definition, sets the scene and a judgement is given in the conclusion which can be seen the answer moving to in the body of the essay. It places the argument within a wider theoretical context and explains the way in which the US position has changed in recent decades – a dynamic approach to the question. It is thus clear Level 5 answer.
