6.1 Theories of Global Politics: Test Pack

EDEXCEL 9PL0 · about 20 minutes

Total Marks

Name: _____ Date: ____ / ____ / _____

Answer all 12 questions. Allow 20 minutes. This topic practice pack is not a complete examination paper.

1 Define international anarchy in the study of global politics.

(Total for Question 1 is 1 mark)

2 State two liberal reasons why cooperation between sovereign states is possible.

(Total for Question 2 is 2 marks)

3 Explain how a security dilemma could develop when two neighbouring states each describe their military preparations as defensive.

(Total for Question 3 is 3 marks)

© Revision Library | revisionlibrary.co.uk

4 Compare how realism and society-of-states arguments can interpret the coexistence of the Paris climate agreement in 2015 and Russia's invasion of Ukraine in 2022.

(Total for Question 4 is 8 marks)

---

5 Russia launched a full-scale invasion of Ukraine in 2022. Explain a realist interpretation of this development and a liberal qualification of that interpretation. Do not assume that explaining a war justifies it.

(Total for Question 5 is 6 marks)

© Revision Library | revisionlibrary.co.uk

Mark scheme · 6.1 Theories of Global Politics: Test Pack

Question 1

Identifies the absence of an overarching authority above sovereign states; anarchy does not simply mean disorder. **B1**

Answer: International anarchy is the absence of an overarching authority above sovereign states.

Question 2

Identifies any one valid liberal reason for cooperation: for example, mutual gains, institutions providing rules or information, economic interdependence raising the costs of conflict, shared norms, or confidence in human reason. No particular reason is compulsory. **B1**

Identifies a second distinct valid liberal reason from these examples or another valid reason; award independently of the first choice. Institutions and interdependence can earn both marks without a separate reference to mutual interests. Do not credit a restatement twice. **B1**

Answer: Shared interests can create mutual benefits; institutions can establish rules and improve trust.

Question 3

Initial military preparation seeks greater security. **B1**

Uncertainty about intentions causes the neighbour to interpret it as threatening. **B1**

Reciprocal arming or countermeasures increase tension and can reduce security for both; hostile intentions are not necessary. **B1**

Answer: One state strengthens its forces to feel safer. Its neighbour cannot be certain of its intentions and sees a threat, so also arms. Both may end up less secure despite defensive intentions.

Question 4

Accurately applies realism to Paris in 2015, for example interpreting agreement as cooperation where national interests overlap. Full marks are available for developed comparisons across both events without using anarchy or enforcement terminology. **B1**

Develops the realist account of Paris, for example explaining why states can coordinate over a shared problem while remaining concerned with national benefits or relative gains. Connect this account to the society-of-states account, here or elsewhere in the response. **B1**

Accurately applies a society-of-states argument to Paris in 2015 through shared norms, rules or reciprocal commitments. **B1**

Develops this account by explaining how shared expectations, trust or reciprocity can sustain cooperation. Credit a comparison of realist interest-based cooperation with the ordering role of shared rules; identifying agreement alone is not development. **B1**

Accurately applies a realist power or security argument to Ukraine in 2022, for example interpreting military force as a means of pursuing state interests. **B1**

Develops the realist account of Ukraine, for example explaining how conflicting interests can lead states to use force despite cooperative relationships elsewhere. Connect this account to the society-of-states account, here or elsewhere in the response. **B1**

Accurately applies a society-of-states argument to Ukraine, for example recognising that shared rules can be violated without all rules becoming irrelevant. **B1**

Develops this account by comparing the coexistence of rules and violations with realist emphasis on power or interests. Explain how cooperation at Paris and conflict in Ukraine can coexist; accept a supported realist or society-of-states emphasis rather than requiring one preferred interpretation. Award equivalent distinct comparative reasoning, including a developed shared premise, within the eight-mark total. Do not double-credit a repeated point or count a comparison again merely because it repeats earlier applications. Integrated comparisons can earn full marks without a separate conclusion. **B1**

Answer: Realists can interpret Paris as cooperation where national interests overlap: a shared environmental problem can make agreement useful to states pursuing their own interests. Society-of-states arguments instead emphasise how shared rules and reciprocal commitments can build trust and common expectations, supporting coordination. Realists can interpret Ukraine as evidence of military power remaining a means of pursuing state interests when they conflict. Society-of-states arguments recognise that common rules can be violated, but a violation does not show that all rules have lost their significance. Thus both accounts can explain cooperation alongside conflict: realism stresses how far interests align, while society-of-states arguments give shared rules a role in sustaining some order despite breaches. Reaching the Paris agreement does not alone establish successful implementation, and the invasion does not alone establish a particular motive.

© Revision Library | revisionlibrary.co.uk

Question 5

Identifies any one accurate realist idea relevant to the invasion, such as state power, security, self-help, relative gains or the possibility of war. No particular realist explanation is compulsory.	**B1**
Applies the chosen realist idea to the invasion, for example interpreting the use of military force as a means of pursuing power or security. Accept a supported interpretation without assuming that the event establishes a particular motive.	**B1**
Develops the realist explanation by explaining how the chosen mechanism can produce conflict, for example that competing state interests can make force a means of seeking relative power. An explanation through anarchy or enforcement limits is also valid but is not required. Do not credit the same point twice across identification, application and development.	**B1**
Identifies any one valid liberal qualification, for example that institutions, shared interests or interdependence can support cooperation without eliminating every conflict.	**B1**
Applies the liberal qualification to the interpretation of the invasion, for example explaining that one war does not establish that cooperation is impossible in other relationships or policy areas.	**B1**
Develops the liberal qualification by explaining why it limits the realist interpretation, for example that institutions can constrain behaviour to differing degrees, so failure to prevent this war does not prove they never matter. No separate disclaimer about justification or motives is required for full marks; award all six marks for a developed realist interpretation and liberal qualification. Do not double-credit a repeated qualification.	**B1**

Answer: Realists emphasise state power and security. The invasion is an example of a state using military force, which a realist can interpret as a means of pursuing relative power when state interests conflict. This interpretation does not establish Russia's particular motives. Liberals can qualify it by pointing to cooperation through institutions and shared interests. One conflict does not establish that cooperation is impossible in other relationships or policy areas: institutions can constrain behaviour to varying degrees, so their failure to prevent this war does not show that they never matter.

© Revision Library | revisionlibrary.co.uk