



Examiners' Report

Principal Examiner Feedback

Summer 2022

Pearson Edexcel GCE

In Politics (9PL0)

Paper 2: UK Government and Non-core  
Political Ideas

## **Edexcel and BTEC Qualifications**

Edexcel and BTEC qualifications are awarded by Pearson, the UK's largest awarding body. We provide a wide range of qualifications including academic, vocational, occupational and specific programmes for employers. For further information visit our qualifications websites at [www.edexcel.com](http://www.edexcel.com) or [www.btec.co.uk](http://www.btec.co.uk). Alternatively, you can get in touch with us using the details on our contact us page at [www.edexcel.com/contactus](http://www.edexcel.com/contactus).

## **Pearson: helping people progress, everywhere**

Pearson aspires to be the world's leading learning company. Our aim is to help everyone progress in their lives through education. We believe in every kind of learning, for all kinds of people, wherever they are in the world. We've been involved in education for over 150 years, and by working across 70 countries, in 100 languages, we have built an international reputation for our commitment to high standards and raising achievement through innovation in education. Find out more about how we can help you and your students at: [www.pearson.com/uk](http://www.pearson.com/uk)

Summer 2022

Publications Code 9PL0\_02\_2206\_ER

All the material in this publication is copyright

© Pearson Education Ltd 2022

# **Principal Examiner Feedback**

## **Summer 2022**

### **Pearson Edexcel Advanced Level in Politics (9PL0/02) Paper 2: UK Government and Non-core Political Ideas**

#### **Introduction**

In many ways, this was a unique exam series as the exams took place for the first time since 2019 with a cohort of students who had no experience of external examinations, a disrupted two years of education and had received the Assessment Information about the exam series. Overall, students should be commended for their resilience and hard work in dealing with this unique experience. In turn, centres should be applauded for how they prepared their students both for the pressure of exams and for the requirements of A level Politics. It was fantastic to see many students really try to engage with some of the big debates in UK politics supported with contemporary evidence.

One main area that is worth highlighting is the importance of exam technique and timing. This is perhaps the most noticeable area where the impact of having no experience of external examinations was visible. It is important that students plan their timing, and stick to it, so that they can achieve to their full potential.

There are, as with any examination, however, several areas to reflect upon and lessons to be learned, which will enable future cohorts to address the examination effectively.

#### **Question 1(a)**

This was an optional question and was less popular with students as Q1(b). A majority of students were able to use the source to develop an analysis of the different opinions it contained in relation to the question. In particular, those answers which could clearly focus on how both Houses of Parliament were effective or not in shaping government legislation.

The strongest responses were able to focus in on the question by analysing whether the Lords or the Commons are effective in shaping government legislation and the relationship between the two chambers in the legislative process. This allowed students to develop a range of different arguments from the source about whether the Lords, backbenchers in the Commons and public bill committees had influence over government legislation. Where these arguments could be highlighted with examples, especially modern examples, a stronger level of debate and engagement with the question was achieved. Considering this debate, answers could argue for a range of different views including both chambers being effective, neither being influential, one chamber

being more powerful than the other or that the effectiveness of Parliament was largely dependent of the size of the government majority in the Commons.

Interestingly students were often stronger on debating the revising role of the House of Lords over the role of backbenchers in the Commons. A particular area of confusion in the Commons was around the work of public bill committees, whose role and work were often confused with that of select committees. This may be linked to the introduction of new evidence-gathering powers in 2007 for the committees, which are non-specialist and temporary, being created for the duration of every bill, and then disbanded. In addition, students when discussing the Commons used examples that focused on the scrutiny of government, like decisions to take action in Iraq or Syria, or on PMQs, rather than having a laser-like focus on the shaping of legislation.

It is important to note that arguments that were introduced into the debate that were not drawn from the source are only rewardable with AO1. A good example of this was debates around the effectiveness of private members bills, which were not in the source, and were often debated in how the Commons might create legislation without really linking to the question, which focused on the shaping of government legislation.

One very pleasing aspect was the ability of students to bring together competing arguments from the source to create effective comparative analysis in order to build substantiated conclusions. The most effective approach taken was to pair up naturally competing arguments from the source (AO1), develop each point with wider knowledge in order to analyse comparatively (AO2) the strength of the arguments to lead to substantiated conclusions throughout the essay (AO3). Given that the marks are split evenly between the three AOs, then this approach enabled students to access the higher mark bands. This approach could be launched in a clear introduction, developed through the body of the essay and drawn to a clear judgement in the conclusion.

A broad point that is worth considering is the role of introductions and conclusions, which were absent in several answers. Introductions that work best are punchy – detailing any key definitions, setting up the debate and indicating the view that will be argued – rather than overlong and trying to cover all the ideas from the source. Conclusions that work best are also punchy and should be the natural conclusion from all the evaluation made throughout the essay rather than attempting to cram all the evaluation into one paragraph, given that AO3 is worth one-third of the marks.

Founded on the principle of parliamentary sovereignty, in the UK parliament, shaping legislation proposed by governments should be the role of the Commons and the Lords, however because there are many limitations to the power of MPs and Lords and because with a large majority the government is able to manipulate and dominate, overall Parliament is largely ineffective at shaping government legislation.

### Examiner Comment

This is a clear example of a short, punchy conclusion that sets up the debate and the main thrust of the argument the reader can expect throughout.

One argument proposed by the source that argues that parliament is effective at adjusting legislation is that 'if the government cannot maintain the support of their <sup>own</sup> backbenchers', then 'their bills will be defeated in the Commons'. This can happen via back bench

rebellions, which have been increasing in number since 2000. For example, Boris Johnson faced a large backbench rebellion of over 100 Conservative MPs voting against him ~~in~~ when he tried to push new Covid regulations through ~~in~~ the Commons in 2021, despite having a large majority because of the strength of the ~~then~~ Conservative Way Forward party faction (unit one political parties) he still had to rely on opposition to get his bill through. This is why, as

shown in the source 'the government' sometimes 'shape their proposals proposed legislation accordingly' to ensure they have support. For instance, under the coalition government David Cameron had to concede an ~~edit~~ making certain pieces of legislation less right wing to get the support from the Lib Dems he needed to pass it through parliament. Showing how this point from the source emphasises the ability of backbenchers and oppositions in the Commons to shape legislation ideologically by taming government proposals. However, the stronger argument from the source is that 'in reality 'Government bills are rarely defeated''. For instance, despite 100 Conservative MPs rebelling, Johnson will get his legislation through parliament, and from 1997-2005 Tony Blair was not defeated once in the Commons despite not always having support of his 'backbenchers'. This is both of these examples have in common that, as the source correctly reads the 'government majority prevails'. Because both governments had landslide majorities they the rebellions of 'backbenchers' mattered less, as because MPs will feel obligated to support their party if they are the ~~now~~ party in power, they can rely on the majority to still vote in their favour. Because furthermore due to the FPTP voting system, majority governments are more likely to be formed (Unit One: Voting Systems) and so for the larger proportion of time PM Backbenchers remains largely ineffective at shaping government legislation.

### Examiners Comment

Here we clearly see the correct pairing of two arguments from the source, where the analysis and evaluation is then logically developed based on well-selected and deployed evidence.

Another way proposed by the source that parliament can be seen as effective at shaping government legislation is the involvement of MPs 'in Public Bill Committees'. Here, not only <sup>are</sup> proposed bills scrutinised for errors for mistakes, but as seen in the source 'evidence from outside experts' is also given that the government may not have had access to and so can provide expert advice on whether the bill is beneficial, detailed enough or taking all the factors into account, hence 'proposals given from non-partisan ministers can alert to where changes to the legislation are needed'. In fact a survey by the Institute for Government found that 2/3 people involved in the public bill committees brought some level of expertise that helped shape and mould the bill. Hence Parliament can be seen as effective because of 'public bill committees' as one view in the source shows, because they help massively to refine legislation. However, the source is correct in stating that actually there is a 'lack of time for scrutiny' with the committees being under time pressure and therefore unable to look into the depth of detail they need to in order to refine legislation possible, but more significantly public bill committees are 'whipped'. This is because, not covered under the Wright reforms, they are not independent of the government, but actually have



a government majority and often certain party 'whips' to make sure the MPs on these committees that are part of the governing party vote in line with government desires. Hence, the legislation is not necessarily shaped by the committees but indirectly by the government, who because they hold the MPs' careers in their hand, have an overarching influence over all the scrutiny. Therefore the 'shaping' by 'public bill committees' is shown by the source to be ineffective as well because it is not done objectively but in a highly partisan way.

### **Examiners Comment**

Here we can see the correct pairing of arguments from the source about the role of public bill committees in the Commons that are then developed using own knowledge to build analysis and evaluation.

The strongest argument presented by the source in favour of the argument that Parliament can effectively make legislation is that ~~the~~ 'in the House of Lords' they do not have the same issue as public bill committees because 'they have more time for detailed scrutiny' but also they have 'many experts'. A large proportion of Lords are life peers, who have developed in particular areas so that they can ~~can~~ come up with the best recommendations for changes to bills and can identify flaws that may have been missed by career MPs in the Commons - such as Lord Sugar being a famous expert for business. As seen in the source as well ~~too~~ though, their 'contributions often worry the government' and this because many ~~of~~ Lords, like Lord Sugar often have high public profiles, and so the government feels like they have to take their 'shaping' on board because otherwise they may

be reflected in a bad light in the media (Unit One: Media and Voting behaviour) which may affect their chance at being re-elected if they ~~are~~ can be seen to be ignoring expertise, ~~such as~~ For instance, the biggest defeat of government legislation in the Lords since 1999 was over the Financial Markets bill, which many openly criticised like Lord Sugar, and made the ~~Government~~ Government to scrutinise it further and consider proposed amendments. Hence the large influence and ability of the House of Lords is certainly as strong argument considered in the source in favour of the argument that Parliament can be effective in shaping government legislation. However, an even stronger argument is that the source states is the whilst the Lords 'sometimes make passing legislation difficult for the government' they are largely ineffective at shaping legislation because it has 'limited power due to its unelected nature'. To protect the legitimacy of UK democracy, ~~the~~ the Lords cannot be given as much power as they are unaccountable to the people via the indirect democracy of general elections (Unit One: Democracy and participation) but the limits on its power means it can do very little to effectively shape government legislation. The Salisbury convention means that they cannot prevent any legislation in the governments manifesto, nor can

They stop money bills. For example despite the overwhelming defeat the Internal markets bill still passed because it was a 'money bill'. Furthermore any legislation can only be delayed by the Lords for a year, and their amendments - such as to make misogyny as hate crime in the Police, Crime, Sentencing and Courts bill, are also easily ignored. Due to their 'unelected nature' therefore they are limited from being effective at shaping legislation the more of the time because they have no genuine power to enact changes except reserve recommendations. Hence, despite being effective at shaping legislation some of the time because the government often gets 'worry' about the media influence of their 'contributions' the stronger argument in the source is that 'the House of Lords is limited' and so remains largely ineffective at shaping government legislation.

### Examiner Comment

This section develops the arguments from the source around the role of the House of Lords to reach substantiated conclusions. It is worth noting there is no requirement to link back to Component 1 in the source-based questions.

In conclusion, despite government needing to 'maintain the support of their own backbenches', 'worry' about the influence of the House of Lords' and listen to the 'experts' on public bill committees, the stronger argument provided by the source is that because their 'bills are rarely defeated', the Lords are 'limited' and public bill committees are 'whipped', Parliament overall is largely ineffective at making government legislation.

### **Examiner Comment**

The conclusion here is the view that the reader can predict from reading the rest of the essay showing that there has been a clear, logical argument throughout. This was awarded Level 5.

### **Question 1(b)**

This question was more popular. The question focused on whether devolution had created more problems than solutions whilst the source provided a range of points covering all four nations within the United Kingdom.

The stronger answers were able to develop a wide-ranging argument from the political information in the source. The question saw students using the source, then evaluating the arguments using key topical examples that had been well selected and thought out. The question allowed students to debate both problems and solutions created by devolution in England, Northern Ireland, Wales, and Scotland. This led to students arguing for a wide range of views ranging from devolution has created more problems than solutions overall, or vice versa, or making the case for one position or the other by country; it was good to see views or opinions being argued throughout the essays from introduction through to conclusion. Stronger answers were able to call on lots of recent evidence to back up the arguments including the recent election results in devolved elections, the current nature of politics in Northern Ireland, the rescinding of EVEL in 2021, and the ongoing debate around Indyref 2 in Scotland.

The one area that caused the most difficulty was the understanding the roll out and impact of devolution on England. Whilst the West Lothian Question was generally debated well, EVEL and the rescinding of EVEL was covered less well as was the debate around the role out of Metro Mayors.

It is fair to argue that with the arguments put forward by the source, ultimately, devolution has rather solved more problems than it has caused. Despite the valid arguments concerning independence, unequal devolution and strains to the union all supporting the statement, it is clear that the enhancement of democracy through "giving people more policy choices" and peace to Northern Ireland surpasses the problems caused as it answered the demands for better representation and democracy.

### Examiner Comment:

This is a short, direct and effective introduction that links to the source, lays out the debate, sets out the direction of travel for the answer and is nicely linked to ideas of representation and democracy.

In opposition to the statement, the source highlights how devolution has offered "more policy choices" as they are "governed closer to home". This is evidence to support the beneficial nature of devolution as it combats voter lethargy ~~as the~~ in the regional nations as they often feel disconnected from the central Westminster government and policies which often feel very centred on England. Devolution to Scotland is a prime example of how devolution has actually solved more problems than it has created. Through the Scotland Acts of 1998, 2012 and 2016, increasing powers have been granted to the Scottish Parliament which has brought about more tailored policies ~~to the~~ which are beneficial to the

Scottish people. For example, through devolution the Scottish parliament were able to abolish tuition fees and provide free social care for the elderly which caters to the needs of the Scottish people and provides them with policy which is comparably better than England. Moreover, devolution has offered the devolved nations opportunity to have more proportional electoral system, enhancing the quality of representation & instating a sense of "public trust in government". This is supported by the fact that in the past 15 years, there have been National party representation <sup>in government</sup> in Scotland with SNP, Wales with Plaid Cymru and the DUP and Sinn Fein in Northern Ireland. Therefore, combatting the argument that devolution has created more problems than it has solved.

On the other hand, many would point to the inconsistency of devolution as a reason for why it has created more problems than it has solved with "much of England has no devolution at all". This argument follows the line that it has created an unfairness in power with Scotland benefitting from the structure of asymmetric devolution but England lacking a substantial amount. This is evident in the "West Lothian question" as acknowledged by the source which pertains to the issue that MP's from the other nations having the ability to

vote on legislation that is only concerned with England and how their impact is unfair as they have the ability to alter the wishes of the English people despite not representing them. Moreover, the case for devolution causing more problems than it solves on this point is further re-iterated by the abolishment of the English ~~law~~ votes for English law principle ~~being set~~ in July 2021, which was meant to combat this issue. Therefore pointing to the fact that the lack of constitutional certainty over devolution has caused issues for England in particular, who arguably, the most disadvantaged by devolution.

Following on, the lack of devolution is proved by the limited measure in "metro mayors" in places like London and Manchester. However, their roles are limited as their money still comes from the central government which often has limitations and spending requirements, prohibiting their effectiveness in comparison to places like Scotland.

However, one could interpret the argument posed by the same that they are "lacking the public support" which rather proves that devolution solves more problems than it creates. Devolution has evidently been administered when there is a need for more devolution such as in Wales and Scotland. However, it is fair to say that



desire for more devolution in England is low and proved by new ~~only~~ 12-bit turnout for police commissioner is only 12% and of Mayoral elections its less than 20%. Therefore, the low turn outs are a sign that the general public in England are not in need of further devolution and so, the inconsistency in England is not a problem but just a consequence of devolution.

Similarly, On the same line of argument, devolution has indeed solved more problems than it has created through the fact it has "delivered peace" in Northern Ireland. This is evident by the fact that devolution in Northern Ireland is essential in moving on from its history of political instability and the Troubles. Now since the Good Friday Agreement and the powers devolved since 1971, there is an effective dispensation of power which curbs the threat from unionist and nationalist clashes and religious differences. Northern Ireland have powers. The Northern Ireland Assembly have enough powers to legislate on health and transport as seen during the COVID-19 pandemic, but Westminster still has reserved powers to keep the peace, and provides the opportunity for powers such as relating to broadcasting to be devolved as and when is appropriate. Therefore proving that devolution is

instrumental in maintaining peace in Northern Ireland.

However, many would point to how the Northern Ireland Assembly has "been suspended" 5 times since 1998 as proof of the fact that devolution has not been as successful in Northern Ireland and has indeed created more problems than it has fixed. This is emphasised by the fact the longest time of suspension was from 2002 - 2007, recalling that devolution has failed to bring about peace and a stable effective government to Northern Ireland and the issue persists to current day as the DUP and Sinn Fein refuse to form a government over disputes over the Northern Ireland Protocol. Similarly, the source highlights how for some devolution is seen as "a path to independence" which clearly causes more problems as it sets out to break the union. These sentiments are incredibly strong in Scotland as they have the most power and have the largest claim for independence which is evident in the fact that they have had an SNP led government since 2007 which has the agenda of independence as their key policy aim. Therefore showing that the Scottish electorate desire to have

## Independence.

Nevertheless, that point is ~~then~~ easily countered by the fact that Scotland held an Independence Referendum in 2014 and 55% of people voted to remain in the union, showing that the people are happy with the powers that have been devolved to them and want to remain in the Union. In regards to the SNP's political dominance, the party membership is comprised of many things and it is unfair to say that the SNP are only voted in because all their voters want Independence. Therefore, highlighting that the devolution has brought about more good than problems.

In conclusion, devolution has ~~brought about and~~ fixed more problems than it has created - answering a need for more regional representation and policy whilst still maintaining the union. It is true that there have been a few problems such as Independence and instability in Northern Ireland, however, these are ~~over~~ addressed by the effectiveness of devolution in places like Scotland, whilst maintaining the Union.

(Total for Question 1 = 30 marks)

### Examiner Comment

This is a high-level answer that work with the source to pair up arguments effectively, builds analysis by effectively deploying evidence and develops logical chains of reasoning. This was awarded Level 5.

### **Question 2(a)**

This question was tackled by fewer students than 2 (b). The key to this question was a clear understanding and definition of both judicial independence (independent of all external pressures, in particular improper pressure by the executive or the legislature or the media) and judicial neutrality (judges must be seen to act without fear or favour, affection or ill-will).

Stronger answers could define both terms and have a debate about whether both judicial independence and judicial neutrality was sufficient in the UK's democratic system. Students were able to focus on the impact of the Constitutional Reform Act 2005, the appointments process, pay, tenure, the live streaming of the Court, the judicial oath, and the increasing diversity of the Court. On the flip side, there was focus on the view that ministers have increasingly been misrepresenting judicial decisions, questioning judges and threatening to reform the judiciary, as well as the politicisation of the role of the Lord Chancellor and Attorney General. There were strong synoptic links here made to the role of the media in reporting on cases and the nature of the language used. In stronger answer, cases were well selected to help to illustrate the arguments.

Where candidates were confused about the meanings of the two terms, they were less able to develop clear AO2 analysis to reach substantiated AO3 conclusions. Where candidates blended both terms together or only focused on one term, this limited their ability to access the higher levels in the mark scheme. It often saw cases being stated and used as evidence of either independence or neutrality without really explaining why. The lack of definition for the two terms did see some students veering off from the question to debate issues about how powerful that Court is or how democratic it is instead.

The Supreme Court acting with neutrality would mean it makes politically unbiased decisions on a strictly legal basis. To be independent the court would have to be free from government interference and willing to make decisions based on purely legal judgement, free of government and public pressure. While constitutional norms and the legally educated, unelected nature of the courts should mean they are able to operate on an independent and neutral basis, they are too often undermined by their socially biased nature and an overreaching government and frequent media attacks. Therefore this essay will argue that the court does not sufficiently act neutrally nor independently.

### Examiner Comment

A clear introduction that defines both terms that are going to be debated before setting up a clear direction of travel for the rest of the answer.

Proponents of the neutrality of the court would point to the argument that the courts are legally trained with a commitment to the judicial oath to act free of political inclinations. Judges with expertise are selected by the JAC since the 2005 constitutional reform act and are thus free from political appointments and left and right wing labels. Those who make this argument would dismiss any argument of bias on the courts part and point to the numerous cases in which they have been

---

willing to defend the rights of minority groups, to  
defying popular opinion and tyranny of the majority,  
and dismissing accusations of social bias. The willingness  
of the courts to challenge governments on the rights  
of foreign nationals in the Abu Qatada case and stand  
up for individual rights in the Adeb's case point to  
a court able to act both neutrally and independently.  
However, this argument lacks merit as it fails to acknowledge  
the inherent social bias of the courts which occur  
as a result of their unrepresentative nature. The  
more convincing argument is that the male, white  
Oxbridge dominated nature of the courts means they  
have an inherent conservative bias which can be  
seen in their failure to challenge much of the  
anti-trade union legislation of the Thatcher era.  
The lack of women on the court has led to many  
cases, accusations of victim blaming of rape victims in  
2017. While the courts are legally trained, it must  
be recognised that the lack of social representation  
may mean they fail to be able to put themselves in  
the shoes of minority groups and thus cannot be  
said to be able to operate on a purely neutral bias,  
the danger of their possible inherent biases based  
on personal life experience cannot be prevented.  
Perhaps increasing minority representation (which is currently 0% and  
only 2 women) would be able to address this bias. //

Proponents of a neutral and independent judiciary may

point to the constitutional changes and physical separation which have enhanced the assertiveness and independence of the courts in recent years by increasing their legitimacy. Those who make this argument would look to the 2005 constitutional reform act which addressed the democratic deficit of the entrenchment of the court with ~~the~~ the legislative branch in the form of law lords. The physical separation of the courts and enhanced independence via a fixed pay and career reduced the ability of the government to attempt to exert or interfere with their rulings with whipping or threats from a carrot and stick approach. The physical and legal separation has thus increased the legitimacy and allowed the courts to act more independently, challenging the government rather than deferring. Those who make this argument would point to the Pounelland case in 2013 and more notably, the 2017 and 2019 Miller cases where the court prevented attempts of government to act in an election dictatorship and overreach with the use of article 50 and prorogation, respectively. These examples point to a court that is free to act independently, challenging a dominant government and not willing to bow to popular sovereignty. However, this argument is flawed because it fails to acknowledge how the aftermath of the cases have seen both independence and neutrality undermined. The fallout of the 2019 Miller case raised questions of the

neutrality of the court with media attacks labelling them 'enemies of the people' and government ministers like Sajid Javid naming the ruling ~~and~~ an attempt to prosecute the will of the people. These accusations of a liberal, remainer bias and judicial activism undermine perceptions of the neutrality of the courts' operation. Moreover, despite physical reparation, the courts remain subordinate to parliamentary sovereignty and thus ~~power~~ the government have expressed a will to 'renew their powers' in 2019. This points to how the independence of the courts can be easily undermined by a determined government. Accusations of bias and attempts to limit powers undermine both the neutrality and independence of the court which may be less willing to act independently and impartially in future with the fear of having their powers removed. Media attacks and parliamentary sovereignty clearly limit the ability of the courts to act independently.

Finally, some people would make the argument other reforms such as the HRA have provided the courts with a more important role in defending civil liberties and thus ~~been~~ providing a framework to challenge government bolstering their independence. Those who make the argument would point to the rising number of incompatibility statements issued by the courts to challenge government legislation in breach of rights. The ~~Uvison~~ <sup>Uvison</sup> case saw the striking down of the 2017 Fees Act and the ~~2001~~ challenge to section 44 of the 2001



terror act exemplifies how the courts have become more assertive and able to challenge rights, thus able to stand up to a government and act independently. Courts have not been willing to shrink to government opinion and the sub judice rule ensures that cases being heard are free from interference of an infringing government so that judges are free to make rulings on an independent legal basis. However, this argument lacks merit as it fails to acknowledge the growing lack of respect and undermining of the sub judice rule in recent years which has seen the independence and neutrality of court rulings ~~undermined~~ undermined.

Governments, while usually respecting the legality of decisions have increasingly questioned rulings, accusing ~~governments of overreach~~ and courts as deliberately trying to frustrate the ~~general~~ crime fighting agenda of ~~the~~ a democratically elected government, thus undermining ~~parliamentary~~ representative democracy. Theresa May's comments following the 2013 Ibrahim case that the courts were 'making the streets more dangerous' undermines the perceived neutrality of their decisions.

Furthermore, media and governments have been willing to attack the RIPA, claiming it has elevated individual rights like privacy to too high a status.

The planned repeal of the act planned by the conservatives will certainly limit the future independence of the court. Therefore we can see the

violation of the sub judice rule and willingness of governments to undermine the rights protection framework undermines their ability to act on both a neutral and independent basis in the protection of rights.

Therefore we can see while the courts have the means to act independently, as improved by the separation of the 2005 CRA, this is increasingly undermined by a willingness of the government to limit their powers. Despite commitments to neutrality, societal bias and accusations as well as media attacks and the violation of the sub judice rule have undermined this. It is clear that governments are undermining the ability of the courts to act both neutrally and independently.

### Examiner Comment:

There are plenty of synoptic links included within here back to Component 1, UK Politics and Core Political Ideas, which is a key element of the AO1 component of the answer. There is a real sense of debate, which is quite wide ranging, in here about neutrality and independence that leads to logical conclusions which are drawn together in the final paragraph. Like all answers in the exam hall, there are places where the answer could be improved; however, it clearly meets the requirements of the level-based mark scheme effectively. This was awarded Level 5.

### Question 2(b)

This question was far more popular, possibly as the debate around ministerial responsibility has been newsworthy in recent times. This question also required students to be able to clearly identify the meanings of both individual and collective ministerial responsibility and effectively evaluate if both are still important today in UK politics.

The strongest answers were able to develop an effective approach by analysing both terms and their importance over time – sometimes contrasting the fortunes

of individual ministerial responsibility with collective ministerial responsibility. One highlight was the ability for students to draw comparisons between different governments and examples to make clear evaluations. Answers that really tried to explain why they felt that either, both or neither were still important were able to really access the higher end of the mark scheme. Many were able to use well-selected current examples to really bring the essay to life.

The framing of the debate was all important in this question; the key was to really focus on analysing whether both were still important rather than just listing large numbers of examples and stating whether the minister had resigned or not. A list of examples showed strong AO1 but did not really allow students to develop either their analysis or evaluation. In terms of synoptic links, many referred to the role of the media and to how in particular collective responsibility has been impacted by the use of referenda in the UK.

One area that caused some limitations is where students only debated one of the terms or confused the two terms, limiting their ability to access the higher end of the mark scheme. Some confusion did occur around individual ministerial responsibility, with some students discussing it in terms of all MPs rather than ministers. Similarly, some issues arose where students confused votes of confidence within the Tory party in their leader with votes of confidence in Parliament and collective ministerial responsibility.

Ministerial responsibility comes in the form of individual and collective. Individual ministerial responsibility (IMR) is when a minister must resign due to personal misconduct or misleading/incompetent work in Parliament. Collective ministerial responsibility is when a minister must resign if the ministering unit is disaligned with the policies of the Cabinet. Some may argue that both CMR and IMR had no value in our political system today due to ~~depression~~ prime ministers being selective about their political allies or too much of a strong character to dismantle. While others may argue that CMR and IMR are fundamental conventions in a parliamentary system which ensure ~~the~~ ministers are held to account. On balance I would say I see to defend the notion that both CMR and IMR had no importance in our system today due to the tactical and strategic nature of it.

### Examiner Comment

Here the student has defined the key terms for discussion, before opening the debate and providing a direction of travel for the essay.

Advocates of the new ~~convention~~ IMR is still <sup>enforced</sup> ~~important~~ today would point towards the fact that many MPs in both the past and present have followed the convention when transgressing it. They would point towards the ~~fact~~ <sup>fact</sup>

In 2018, Amber Rudd resigned from the position of Home Secretary and misleading Parliament on the idea that she was unaware of immigration targets most particularly to the generation of Windrush wing in the UK. She admitted in Parliament that she had lied about being aware of such examples. They would also most recently point to the fact that ~~the~~ Matt Hancock had to resign after being caught cheating on his wife with someone else in a parliamentary office during COVID-19. This illustrates that MPs would have resigned when breaching the convention, forming some sort of accountability measure for the public as corrupt or misleading MPs are not kept in the system. This advocates for the new world proposal that IMP is not entered today.

However this line of argument may be dismissed as opponents of the new world propose that ~~it~~ although some MPs like Matt Hancock may have resigned their personal misconduct and not acknowledging their own part in COVID, Boris Johnson himself (although uneasy) is yet to resign ~~from~~ from the 'partygate' scandal which was unveiled for ~~the~~ ~~the~~ androgynous home of Christmas party in lockdown. ~~the~~ This illustrates that IMP is not important today.

as depending on the ranking of the MPs and ability as a strong leader. They are less likely to resign if in a position of authority. ~~The~~ The Guardian questioned whether Johnson would resign if the Metropolitan Police prosecute but is still yet to say anything. Rather the stronger argument is that IMR is not important today as each prime minister sets the ministerial code and ~~as~~ as it is a convention there are no legally binding limits to it. PMs are also likely to look for negotiators from their political allies such as Panni Patel in 2020 where evidence was found of her falling over servers yet Johnson released a statement claiming that she had not broken the code. This illustrates how depending on whether a minister is an asset or ally towards you, IMR becomes less prevalent, with both the PM and Home Secretary ~~at~~ not yet to ~~be~~ resign. Therefore it is imperative to argue that IMR is not important today as ministers are unlikely to be asked to resign if ~~the~~ the cabinet / ~~the~~ PM benefit from keeping them and the PM has clearly shown his autonomy above his own ministerial code. If IMR were a functioning, conventional that held precedence in our parliamentary system today then the scandal of 'party gate' and being in documents would not be brushed under the rug.

---

Advocates of the new word proposed that CMR ~~has been~~ is enforced in our system today as where disagreements have emerged within the Cabinet, members both in the past and present have resigned. They would point towards the fact in 2003 Robin Cook resigned from Tony Blair's party due to his disagreement on the Iraq war due to the issues of international disagreements and contention. They would also point towards the fact that in 2010 two Liberal Democrat leaders Resigned from Cameron's party due to disagreements on tax policy. This generally illustrates how members have resigned if they want to publicly disagree with the (Cabinet's) Party policy / line and is still relevant and unchanged today. Therefore advocates of the new word would argue that CMR is enforced today as even among CON, Lord Frost resigned over CON Plan B from Johnson as he believed that people should "learn to live with Covid" and this undeniable that it is currently unchanged.

Therefore this line of argument must be dismissed as members have clearly breached the convention of CMR yet still remained in their positions. For example under Cameron's govt Lord Theresa

May and Michael Gove got into a disagreement about the state of schools as she was the Prime Secretary and he was the Education Secretary. Simultaneously another letter they both probably shared at each other as the media yet didn't mention as Cameron asking two of his most senior ministers to resign used perfect bodies in him and the why of his govt. Although CML wants to cover the cracks (disagreements) and cleaning up the party, it also creates the same effect when being both as it depicts Cameron's challenge as a leader.

Rather the stronger argument is that CML is not important today because it ministers have a strong political personality or stance, it could do more harm than good by asking them to resign. For example Boris Johnson in 2018 was the favorite rewording but had strong views on leaving Brexit. He was considered a 'Big Beast' which is why May did not ask him to resign himself ~~then~~ when when Johnson explicitly wrote articles in the ~~the~~ Telegraph about "getting Brexit done". Though he did leave in the end, it should be noted that CML is thus not important as May didn't ask him to resign and Johnson had already breached the convention and voted he coming to the party, to the point that



May harvest heropid, deemed unit to 'get  
next done'. Therefore it is imperative to agree  
that CMR is not upheld today or regarded  
as important as it ministers have a strong  
character or political personality they ~~can~~ breach  
it without have held accountable. It is  
almost like a deadlock situation, where either  
way causes damage to the collective.

On weighing these arguments it is imperative to  
agree that both CMR + IMR are not  
important today as they have been breached  
several times without accountability due to  
political alliances, strong personalities dominant to  
the party and authority. Therefore it is imperative  
to uphold the view that CMR and IMR  
are not important in our political system  
today due to it being a convention that  
is not legally binding and built/made by  
each prime minister.

### Examiner Comment

The answer clearly covers the debate on both collective and individual ministerial responsibility. It selects and deploys a range of evidence to support the analysis and builds logical conclusions. It has enough clear links here back to Component 1. This was awarded Level 5.

## **Non-core Political Ideas**

There are number of key points which are worth re-emphasising in terms of the overall skills required by the paper:

- The importance of timing so that students can complete the paper.
- The importance of using key thinkers and their ideas from the specification for that non-core idea. Thinkers not listed in the specification can be used in addition but not as a substitute for key thinkers.
- The importance of the core ideas and principles of each political idea, as well as the key terminology.
- The focus of the question is on the extent of the agreements and tensions within that political idea between the different strands/tensions rather than between the key thinkers.

### **Question 3(a)**

This question was the more popular of the two anarchism questions. As a broad question, the key to success here was an effective structure to the answer.

Students approached this in different ways – some focusing on agreements and disagreements over human nature, the state, economy and society, whilst others used a thematic approach looking at consistency over rejection of the state, liberty and the future anarchist society.

Stronger answers really developed a view throughout the answer about the level of consistency within anarchism to score higher-level AO3 rather than simply stating where they agree or disagree. This involved making substantiated judgements about the level of consistency throughout rather than simply stating the view in the conclusion. The reader should know exactly what to expect in the conclusion when they get there based on the argument throughout the essay.

In general, the debates between collectivist and individualist anarchism were well backed up using key thinkers. This really means that students were able to build the debate by examining the contributions made by the thinkers to either individualist or collectivist anarchism rather than simply stating that a thinker is a collectivist or an individualist anarchist. In some instances, the debate became focused on a debate between thinkers rather than a debate between the different strands supported by the thinkers, which limited the ability to reach the higher ends of the mark scheme.

One area to remain focused on is structure. Where students essentially provide a description the views of individualist then collectivist anarchists, the answer becomes knowledge heavy and misses out on analysis and evaluation.

Anarchism is a contradictory ideology. Despite their unified opposition to the state, they remain divided among their reasons to oppose the state, how to achieve anarchism and the economy. In this essay I will argue the views of individualist anarchists are not consistent with collectivists.

### Examiner Comment

This is short and to the point. It lays out the debate and indicates the main thrust of the argument. It is worth noting given the time and corresponding marks allocated to ideas questions, it is important for the introduction to not be overlong.

First, all Anarchists reject the state. Some, like Goldman, go further and argue that the intertwined functions of the state such as religion must be smashed. This idea is consistent among individualist Anarchists as well, as Stirner argues that the state's restriction of one's own ego is criminal and must cease. This provides a common view between Anarchists. Despite reasons being different with Goldman rejecting the state for its upholding of capitalism whereas Stirner rejects the state for its imposing nature and restrictions.

one ones ego as "one should be his own  
moral compass." Therefore, despite ~~these~~  
these differences in reason however, it is  
evident that All Anarchists reject the State  
in its current form as a "monopoly of violence  
and oppression."

### **Examiner Comment**

There is a clear attempt to develop an argument around agreement within anarchism and utilises the ideas of different thinkers from the specification.

However, under the economy there is a fundamental split. Ideologies on the collective Anarchist side such as anarcho-syndicalism contradict the ideas of economists such as Benjamin Tucker. Anarcho-syndicalism is an ideology founded around the idea of radical trade unionism which forms the basis of society. This is in contrast to the individualist Anarchist ideas of Ben Tucker that form Anarcho-capitalism. This ideology prescribes that the market should be free from outside interference and private property should be the main staple of society. This also contradicts the radical ideas of Bakunin that who regarded all private property as inherently evil. ~~Therefore, there~~ despite this, individualist Anarchist Max Stirner did actually oppose capitalism, but vehemently opposed collectivism. Therefore while there may be a tiny overlap with aspects of individualist Anarchism and

collectivist Anarchism overlapping in their opposition to Capitalism, overall this is negligible and therefore the views of individualist Anarchists are not consistent with collectivist Anarchists.

Finally, the route to an Anarchist Society is also a point of contention. Thinkers such as Proudhon saw "the propaganda of the deed" as a viable method to rid the State. By ignoring it and setting up a separate society ~~in~~ the current state would fade and wither. This is contrasted by revolutionary Anarchists on the individualist spectrum such as Stirner and even Chomsky within the collectivist strand such as Bakunin advocating for revolution. Therefore not only is there disagreement between the individual and collectivist strands, there is insighting ~~between~~ within the collectivist ideology. Therefore the route to an anarchist society is an inconsistent belief from one anarchist to another and is therefore a significant disagreement.

~~While~~ call on balance it is clear that

While collectivist and individualist-  
Anarchists are consistent over the state,  
~~they~~ individualist and ~~Anarchist~~ collectivist  
Anarchists fundamentally disagree over the  
economy and the route to a future  
society. Therefore it is rational to argue that  
the views of individualist & Anarchists are  
not consistent with collectivist Anarchists.

### Examiner Comment

The answer remains focused on the question, developing points where agreement and disagreement appear between the strands to try to make judgements about extent. The argument is built up by deploying the ideas of named key thinkers from the specification. This was awarded Level 5.

### Question 3(b)

This question was slightly less popular than 3 (a) but was still answered by many students. The most effective strategies looked to shape the essay in terms of areas of agreement over the anarchist view on human nature before exploring the disagreements. This was often done by looking at what is human nature, how is it impacted by the state, society and economy and what type of future society will allow human nature to flourish. Within this, the most effective answers were able to explore the differences between individualist and collectivist anarchism, as well as the tensions within both. The very best answers were able to make substantiated judgements about the depth of the agreement or disagreement within anarchism over their view of human nature.

One area to remain focused on is structure. Where students essentially provide a description the views of individualist then collectivist anarchists on human nature, the answer becomes knowledge heavy and misses out on analysis and evaluation. In addition, it is important to remain focused on the question and the issue of human nature – for example, the rejection of the state is an important topic to cover here but only if it is linked to human nature.

There has been a debate between political scientists over the extent to which anarchists disagree over human nature. This essay will ~~not~~ strongly argue that anarchists are fundamentally divided over ~~the~~ human nature, causing ~~them~~ anarchists to significantly disagree over which social and economic structures are best to allow human nature to flourish.

Firstly, it can be strongly argued that anarchists are significantly divided over how sociable humans are. ~~The~~ Anarcho-individualists, ~~the~~ such as ~~the~~ Egoist Stirner, believe that collectivism is extremely damaging as individuals work best independently. This is shown by ~~the~~ American traditionalist, Josiah Warren, who advocated methodological individualism suggesting ~~that~~ the individual should be at the centre of the universe and be put above all else. In contrast, anarcho-collectivist believe individuals are naturally social. This is shown by anarcho-communist, Kropotkin's rejection of social ~~and~~ darwinism, as he suggested that humans are more likely to survive by working together. This demonstrates that anarcho-collectivist believe individuals are naturally cooperative, therefore have the opposite view of humans social nature than



for human nature to flourish and reach full potential, the differences in view over how sociable individuals are between anarchists causes them to significantly disagree over what society would be best to allow this progression of human nature, thus showing anarchists significantly disagree over human nature.

Finally, anarchists significantly disagree over what economic system would allow human nature to reach its full potential. This is because anarcho-collectivists believe that collectivism must be applied into the economic system as without it, the economic system will create competition, thus causing individuals to go against ~~there~~ their cooperative human nature. This is shown as Mutualist, Proudhon, argued that large scale private property ownership is theft, therefore Bakunin and Kropotkin advocated for collective ownership of resources within communes. In contrast, anarcho-individualists ~~believe~~ anarcho-capitalists, such as Murray Rothbard, believed that collectivism removed individual sovereignty and autonomy and it prevents people making rational decisions in their self-interest. This ~~the~~ caused anarcho-capitalists, like Rothbard and Friedman to advocate for a completely free market system, in order to allow individuals rational and selfish nature to develop. ~~As~~ However, some argue this shows that anarchists agree that the state must play no role in the economic system, ~~as~~ as it promotes exploitation. Despite this,

~~anarchists~~ or anarcho-individualists, therefore anarchists ~~are~~ fundamentally disagree over human nature.

However, it can be argued that anarchists agree on human nature as both anarcho-individualists and anarcho-collectivists ~~may~~ believe that the state must be removed for human nature to progress and flourish. This is because both branches of anarchism ~~but~~ ~~to~~ have a shared view that ~~to~~ the state restricts individual freedom due to its coercive and exploitative nature. This is shown as anarcho-individualist, Emma Goldman, stated the state is a 'cold monster' and similarly, anarcho-communist Kropotkin argued that 'Where there is authority, there is no freedom' This shows that anarchists have a shared view that the state ~~is~~ prevents individual human nature from achieving its full potential.\* However, this is only a moderate agreement as anarchists are fundamentally divided over what society would be best to allow human nature to progress once the state is removed. This is ~~because~~ ~~anarchists~~ shown as Stirner advocated for a society based on a 'Union of Egoists' in which people live independently, only making voluntary contracts with others when it is in their best interest. On the otherhand, ~~anarchist~~ <sup>small</sup> Syndicalist, Georges Sorel, advocated for society to be based on trade-union like communities, ~~in~~ and similarly, ~~both~~ anarcho-communist Bakunin wanted a ~~state~~ society to be organised into communes in which people live and work together. This shows that despite anarchists agreeing that ~~the~~ society must be stateless

this demonstrates that anarchists are significantly divided over what economic system is needed in order for human nature to progress, therefore anarchists significantly disagree over human nature.

In conclusion, anarchists are highly divided over their views on human nature and the structures that best support this nature, as they disagree over how social humans are.

### Examiner Comment

This is a strong and well-developed answer that keeps focused on human nature that perhaps is slightly let down by the conclusion. Nevertheless, the main thrust of the argument is clear throughout the essay. This was awarded Level 5.

### Question 4(a)

This question was focused on whether capitalism is compatible with ecologism. The stronger answers were able to identify where all ecologists feel that capitalism is damaging to the biosphere, and where deep ecology and social ecology have wide areas of agreement. With disagreement, the clear disagreements between shallow ecology and deep ecology and social ecology were clearly drawn out. Some answers went further to also explore the tensions within each strand.

Stronger answers really developed a view throughout the answer about the level of agreement within ecologism to score higher-level AO3 rather than simply stating where they agree or disagree. This involved making substantiated judgements about the level of agreement throughout rather than simply stating the view in the conclusion. The reader should know exactly what to expect in the conclusion when they get there based on the argument throughout the essay.

One area to focus on is structure: it is vital that *both* agreement and disagreement are covered, with some students only developing a debate on disagreement or not using all three main strands and tensions within ecologism (deep, shallow and social ecology). This limits the ability to access the higher end of the mark scheme. Where students essentially provide a description of the views of the different strands on capitalism, the answer becomes knowledge-heavy and misses out on analysis and evaluation.

Ecologism is deeply divided over Capitalism and the view that ecologism starts where Capitalism ends is wholly accurate if one only considers Deep Greens and Social ecologists but if you include Shallow Greens then it would be accurate to say that Ecologism is deeply divided over Capitalism because Shallow Green approaches can work within Capitalism because they are reformist whilst Deep Greens & Social Ecologists are revolutionary & believe that tackling ecological issues requires the end of Capitalism

All ecologists agree that the focus on Consumerism and materialism must be reined in, the extent to which they disagree. Rachel Carson criticised the current capitalist economic system as making the "Gods of Profit and production" the "key drivers" of our world. All ecologists agree that the way in which the economy operates must be altered in order to better preserve the natural world.

However, Ecologism is mainly deeply divided over Capitalism. Light greens promote green consumerism or managerialism or ideally a combination of both as a way in which we can solve ecological issues within

Capitalism - Shallow Greens propose slower, smarter & greener growth - a technocratic approach. Deep Greens completely disagree believing that there must be a period of degrowth and then the emergence of 'steady-state' economies. EF Schumacher argues that there is "more to life than GDP" which shows a clear disconnect from Capitalism as the key measure of success in Capitalist societies is GDP. Schumacher slams Capitalism as dehumanising and wasteful whilst also promoting Buddhist economics. This means a focus on quality over quantity and needs over wants. Additionally work should be creative and fulfilling rather than soul-destroying which is, Schumacher argues, what work is like for many, many people in Capitalist societies. Social ecologists and especially those on the anarchist & socialist strands agree. M Bookchin is adamant that Capitalism cannot be reformed due to its intrinsic "grow or die" nature. Social ecologists see Capitalism as a form of domination & hierarchy that alienates us from both our true Human nature and our true non-human nature.

In terms of the economy Light greens propose weak sustainability with intergenerational equity being a key feature. This is stark contrast to Deep Greens who propose strong sustainability. Shallow greens can justify exploiting natural capital as long as it is used to produce manufactured capital such as roads, schools and hospitals whilst Deep Greens oppose any exploitation of natural capital due to their ecocentric approach that not all of nature has

intrinsic value so natural capital should not be exploited as it goes against Aldo Leopold's Land ethic which argues that what we consider to be worthy of moral and ethical concern should be expanded to include all of nature including the soils, rivers & trees etc. Alternatively Deep Greens would also oppose exploitation of natural resources due to A Naess's environmental consciousness which states we must have an awakening where we spiritually connect with all of Nature.

Essentially Shallow Greens support Ltd Holism which recognises the interconnectedness of the Natural world whilst also allowing the exploitation of Natural resources which is so deeply intrinsic to Capitalism. This is because Shallow Greens follow enlightened Anthropocentrism. Deep Greens meanwhile support Holism to the fullest extent & recognise ecological issues cannot be adequately tackled by taking a mechanistic approach and looking to tinker with the edges of Capitalism. Social ecologists oppose all forms of anthropocentrism and also oppose ecocentrism which they view as misanthropic. Bookchin dismissed environmental consciousness as eco-lu-lu. Social ecologists see the root cause of ecological issues as being ~~at~~ the relationships between Humans. Capitalism causes an unhealthy relations between Humans, they argue, and thus to tackle ecological issues we must abolish Capitalism which is a system of hierarchy and domination.

Ecologists disagree to a very large extent that ecologism begins where capitalism ends - Light Greens believe

ecological issues can be tackled within Capitalism whilst  
Deep Greens & Social ecologists believe Capitalism must be  
destroyed in order to properly tackle ecological issues

### **Examiner's Comment**

This answer reveals a good use of key terminology, a deployment of the main ideas of the thinkers and remains focused on the question and covers all the three main tensions/strands within ecologism. This was awarded Level 5.

### **Question 4(b)**

The question allowed students to explore whether ecologism agrees over the issue of sustainability. The most effective strategies looked to shape the essay in terms of areas of agreement over the ecologist view on sustainability before exploring the disagreements. Within this, the most effective answers were able to explore the differences between shallow ecologism, deep ecologism and social ecology, as well as the tensions within them. The very best answers were able to make substantiated judgements about the depth of the agreement or disagreement within ecologism over their view of sustainability.

One area to focus on is structure: it is vital that both agreement and disagreement are covered, with some students only developing a debate on disagreement or not using all three main strands and tensions within ecologism (deep, shallow and social ecology). It is also important to use the ideas of key thinkers to back up the debate between the different strands/tensions rather than focusing on a debate between thinkers or simply stating that Leopold is a deep ecologist.

It could be argued that ecologists agree over sustainability, this is because they both agree that there are limits to growth and because they agree that the state has caused environmental damage, they also reject a mechanistic world view. However ~~it is~~ <sup>fundamentally</sup> they disagree over sustainability due to strong views on sustainability, differing views on ~~the economy and~~ <sup>Holism</sup> ~~facilitating environmental solutions~~ and on <sup>Human nature</sup> ~~Holism~~.

Ecologists agree on sustainability because they agree that there are limits to growth, a shallow green think tank lobby group "Club of Rome" created a model of the earth in 1972 in which they exploited the earth's finite resources and then implemented sustainable methods of preserving nature, in the end the



Earth was incredibly polluted and beyond saving. All ecologists agree that the earth's resources are finite and that they will eventually run out through consumerism and ~~chasing~~ <sup>chasing</sup> the growth of GDP which E.F. Schumacher <sup>(deep green)</sup> wrote about would deplete the earth's natural resources and destroy it through pollution. This therefore means that ecologists are united over Sustainability because they accept that there are limits to growth through a consumer society which destroys the earth.

On the other hand ecologists <sup>disagree</sup> ~~are~~ over <sup>because of strong</sup> ~~strong~~ <sup>green sustainability</sup> sustainability this is because shallow greens such as Rachel Carson who wrote about the silent spring ~~to which~~ shows the devastating effects of pesticides on nature argue for ~~weak~~ <sup>weak</sup> sustainability through green capitalism which is promoting ecofriendly products and processes as well as managerialism which promotes legal legislation and quotas on environmental preservation through the legal system. This is opposed by ~~eco~~ <sup>social ecologists</sup> ~~deep~~ <sup>deep</sup> greens such as Murray Bookchin who was an eco anarchist. He wrote about how sustainability should be encouraged through decentralised living economies where capitalism doesn't exist and local environments are

utilized efficiently for needs in his book  
ecotopia. This therefore means that ecologists  
disagree over sustainability because shallow  
greens want to take a wend approach  
through managerialism and green capitalism  
whereas eco-anarchists reject capitalism and  
embrace decentralised living democracies in  
biotic regions to sustain the earth.

Another way in which ecologists agree over  
sustainability is through their united  
belief that the state has caused environmental  
damage through industrialism. All ecologists  
~~agree that~~ embrace post materialism and  
anti consumerism, embracing the idea that  
consumerism has caused mass production and depletion  
of natural resources. In order to maintain  
sustainability shallow greens for example  
engage in politics through pressure groups  
to advocate against issues such as energy  
crises or ocean pollution, raising awareness  
for sustainability. This therefore shows  
that ecologists are united over sustainability because  
they all accept that the state has caused  
environmental issues through industrialism, therefore

raising awareness for sustainability by engaging in politics through pressure groups.

On the other hand ecologists disagree over sustainability due to human nature. Deep greens such as Aldo Leopold argued that humans are equal to soils, rivers and plants in his book the land ethic, therefore reinforcing the idea that nature should be ~~preserved~~ <sup>sustained</sup> for all forms of life and nature, this ecocentric view of deep greens is opposed by shallow greens who believe that humans are stewards of nature ~~and~~ and that nature should be preserved for future generations to benefit humans through the concept of intergenerational equity. This therefore means that ecologists disagree over ecocentrism because deep greens want to preserve and sustain nature for all forms of life and nature whereas shallow greens want to sustain the earth to benefit their future generations.

Another reason as to why ecologists are united is because of their rejection of a mechanistic world view. Eco feminist Carolyn Merchant argued that the mechanistic world view emerged after the enlightenment where

Humans believed that they could dissect and interpret the earth through different parts, emphasising a reductionistic world view of nature.

All ecologists embrace the idea that nature cannot be explained individually or exploited through holism. Ecologists argue that exploitation of the earth's finite resources is unsustainable, rather promoting small economies using the earth's budget as proposed by deep green E.F. Schumacher in 'Small is beautiful'. This therefore means that ecologists agree over sustainability, arguing that small economies should be used through the earth's budget to reduce a reductionistic depletion of resources, rather sustaining the earth through small economies.

In conclusion ecologists are united over sustainability because they agree that there are limits to growth due to the <sup>earth's</sup> ~~earth's~~ finite resources, emphasising the need to sustain the earth, because they accept that the state causes environmental damage through industrialisation and consumerism, engaging in politics to raise awareness for causes, and finally because they reject a reductionistic world view and promoting small economies using the earth's budget to reduce mass depletion of resources. However it could be argued that they disagree because shallow greens argue for weak sustainability through consumerism and capitalism whereas <sup>eco anarchists</sup> ~~deep greens~~ argue for decentralised living democracies which reject capitalism.

### Examiner's Comment

This answer does provide balance, looks at agreement and disagreements between the strands supported by some of the key ideas developed by the key thinkers from the specification. Importantly the answer does look to draw some

conclusions about the nature of the extent of the agreement/disagreement over sustainability. This was awarded Level 5.

### **Question 5(a)**

This was the more popular of the two questions on feminism. As a broad question, the key to success here was an effective structure to the answer.

Students approached this in different ways – some focusing on agreements and disagreements over human nature, the state, economy and society whilst others used a thematic approach looking at consistency over patriarchy, the personal is political and sex and gender. Both were effective. A more problematic approach was to essentially work a way through the different waves or tensions within feminism as this tended to lead to knowledge-heavy answers that did not provide much in terms of analysis and evaluation. It is also key that the answer does provide coverage of *both* agreement and disagreement.

Stronger answers really developed a view throughout the answer about the level of agreement within feminism to score higher-level AO3 rather than simply stating where they agree or disagree. This involved making substantiated judgements about the level of agreement throughout rather than simply stating the view in the conclusion. The reader should know exactly what to expect in the conclusion when they get there based on the argument throughout the essay.

Key thinkers need to be used effectively, by using their main ideas to open an avenue for analysis rather than simply stating that Sheila Rowbotham is a socialist feminist. However, it is important to note that more than one key thinker from the feminism specification should be used in the answers. Thinkers from other areas in the specification, such as Wollstonecraft, Friedan and Luxemburg, can be used to enhance answers but should not be used as a substitute for the key thinkers from the feminism specification.

It can be argued that most if not all feminists share a common aim, this is to end the oppression of women. However, there are considerable variations within feminism concerning the extent of oppression, how oppression should be challenged and solutions to ~~emancipate~~ the problems facing women, it is for that reason that it can be argued there is more disagreement within feminism than agreement. Examining feminist views ~~over~~ concerning the patriarchy, solutions to ending female oppression and to what extent the personal is political should evidence this.

Within feminism, it can be said that fundamentally all feminists agree on the concept of patriarchy, this is a male-dominated society that seeks to oppress women. But, despite this fundamental agreement there are significant variations over the nature and extent of the patriarchy. For liberal feminists such as Mary Wollstonecraft, the patriarchy did not represent systematic oppression, it is the liberal feminist view that there are no inherent flaws with the state, economy or society it was rather the ~~man's~~ <sup>lack of</sup> ~~man's~~

legal and political equality that limited female freedom. This view is fundamentally challenged by both Reactionary Socialist feminists and Radical feminists. For Socialist feminist Sheila Rowbotham, it was her view that the patriarchy did represent systematic oppression and most significantly that it was capitalism that worsened this oppression. For Rowbotham, the patriarchy was underpinned by the inherent flaws within the capitalist economic state. In this way, the fundamental disagreement between liberal and socialist and radical feminists over the extent of the patriarchy further the extent to which it can be agreed that there is more disagreement than agreement.

Another area in which there are significant disagreements between branches of feminism is within solutions to the oppression of women. For socialist feminists it is with the abolishment of capitalism and its values that will see the emancipation of women. Rowbotham's notion of the interdependency of female oppression and capitalism cements this view. Whereas, contrastingly in Kate Millet's *Sexual Politics* she argues that the abandonment of the family is the most effective way to dissolve the patriarchy, arguing that the nuclear family socialises children and oppresses women. This view does find support with Rowbotham who argued that the family formed a dual function, however these functions ~~there~~ were interlinked with capitalism.

rather than the Socialisation of children. There are also noticeable differences in solution with reference to reformist and revolutionary feminists. In this way, despite some evidence of agreement, solutions to female oppression further reinforce ~~that~~ how there is more disagreement than agreement.

Finally, ideas concerning whether the 'personal is political' further represent how feminism is more divided than united. Liberal feminism argues that the private sphere is beyond the jurisdiction of the state, in accordance with liberal views of minimal state ~~intervention~~ intervention. They further this notion by arguing that it is with legal and political equality that the emancipation of women will be achieved and this does not include the personal/private sphere. Although conversely, Radical feminist Kate Millet strongly advocates the notion that the 'personal is political' arguing that much female oppression originates in the family unit as also endorsed by Socialist feminist De Beauvoir who argues that women are not born they are made. In this way, despite evidence of consensus over whether the 'personal is political', overall, the fundamental differences between feminists here undermine evidence of agreement increasing the extent to which there is more disagreement than agreement in feminism.



In Conclusion, it must be noted how there are some examples in which there is agreement among feminists over broad concepts such as the existence of the Patriarchy. However, (it is when one examines the more intricate functioning and thought processes behind broad agreement that it becomes clear that to the greatest extent there is more disagreement than agreement within feminism.

### **Examiner's Comment**

This answer adopts a thematic structure to the questions, exploring differences and similarities over patriarchy, how to tackle oppression and the personal is political. Key thinkers are deployed well; however, post-modern feminism could do with some more coverage here. This was awarded Level 5.

### **Question 5(b)**

This answer was less popular than 5 (a) but still answered by many students and required a clear understanding and definition of patriarchy. Structure here was crucial, with students who focused on agreements and disagreements in a thematic way – say over the existence of patriarchy, its impacts and how it should be tackled – were able to develop clear arguments. Where the definition of patriarchy was less clear, it led to a structure that went wave by wave or strand by strand and this limited the ability to develop clear comparative analysis and draw substantiated conclusions.

The very best answers were able to make substantiated judgements about the depth of the agreement or disagreement within feminism over their view of patriarchy. This was done by building the debate through examining the contributions made by the thinkers to feminism rather than simply stating that a thinker is a liberal or socialist feminist.

To what extent do feminists disagree over their views on the patriarchy.

After the devastating murder of Sarah Everard, feminists have collectively & unanimously acknowledged the usurping & pervertive nature of the patriarchy, united over the agreement of, upon its destructive effects on the feminine & thus the ~~un~~ necessary requirement of its abolishment. Divergences surrounding the systematic nature of the patriarchy can be observed, with liberal feminists remaining an anomaly in their perception of the state not being an institutional mouthpiece of the patriarchy. This essay will argue that whilst this disagreement exists, holistically feminists are united over the nature of the patriarchy, that of which exists as the collective foundation of any further development in feminist discussion.

Despite the overall agreement within the feminist ideology surrounding the new on patriarchy, there remains bones of contention surrounding the mechanism in which it may be abolished, specifically the role

of the state. Liberal feminists characterise the state as a solution to the patriarchy rather than the problem in itself, discussing the legal authority of the state as a gradual mechanism in which women can obtain public equality & thus free themselves from the shackles of the patriarchy. ~~Radical~~ <sup>socialist</sup> feminists vehemently reject this notion, contrastingly, outcasting the state as a vessel of the patriarchy as the patriarchy in itself exists separately. Capitalism which is inextricably linked to the patriarchy. The socialist feminist views are best articulated by Charlotte Perkins Gilman who argues that capitalism relies on the existence of the patriarchy due to the exploitation & erosion of reproductive labour, as women are oppressed via their bodies, the patriarchy (a superculture of capitalism that is manifested into society & the state) they remain stagnant as "care-givers" & "mothers," as such they are intrinsically tied to the patriarchy & exploitation due to the alienation of their own reproductive labour. Liberal feminists exist at polemic contrast, instead stating that the patriarchy does not invade the personal lives of women & instead should be tackled via the public sphere (the state.) This view is best articulated by Simone de Beauvoir who states that in order to achieve a "politics of sameness" & escape the patriarchy, the state must vessel de jure legal & political equality. Founded upon the basis of liberalism, liberal feminists state that "accidents of Birth" (Mill) such as sex should not dictate your freedom & autonomy, thus the state should play an instrumental approach in uplifting women through parliamentary

representation or legislation, otherwise the "feminisation of poverty" & the "problem with no name" (Betty Friedan) will never truly be solved, thus the patriarchy, the overall inequality of women will never be abolished. Thereby, it is clearly apparent that both socialist & liberal feminist exist in antithesis in regards to the mechanism in which the patriarchy may be abolished, specifically the role & credibility of the state.

★ Nevertheless, a divergence within the Socialist Feminist strand can be observed as many socialist feminists such as Rowbotham state that the abolishment of capitalism is not adequate for the abolishment of the patriarchy. Rowbotham states the patriarchy to transcend capitalism & more similar to feudal society, thus a "revolution within a revolution" is necessary in which the abolishment of capitalism is a necessary start but not an adequate one, it must be ~~followed~~ followed by the subsequent abolishment of the patriarchy itself. Thus it is clear that even within the socialist ~~feminist~~ feminist strand, divergences surrounding the meticulous details of abolishing the patriarchy exist.

Despite the above ~~agreement~~, disagreement, upon closer inspection of the holistic feminist ideology, more agreements begin to emerge, this can be analysed through their collective & harmonious perception of the patriarchy's intrinsic damage & erosion of female autonomy & progression. Radical feminist

encapsulates this discourse by characterising the invasive & permeating effects of the patriarchy on society & reality itself. Similarly, ~~Radical feminism~~ Post Modern feminists further this discourse by examining the patriarchy to transcend mere gender & encapsulate all forms of personhood, thus infiltrating it via a multi-dimensionalist way. The views of Post modern feminism are best articulated by Bell Hooks who states the patriarchy to interact with "womanhood" ~~via~~ by means of an intersectional approach rather than linear, with intersectionality concerning the simultaneous experience of all aspects of personhood (e.g. race, class, sexuality, gender). Bell Hooks encapsulates the multifaceted perception of womanhood & thus the multifaceted way in which the patriarchy affect & disadvantage 'women.' This can be seen through the patriarchy disadvantaging ~~low~~ working class women of colour more than middle class white women, ~~for example~~ as seen in the Misogynist movement. Thus Bell Hook highlights the pragmatic transcendence of the patriarchy from only sexuality to a more destructive, dimensionalist one that affects different women in disproportionate ways. Radical feminism echo this rhetoric & evaluate that every mechanism, ~~infrastructure or~~ infrastructure or concept in society is undermined by the patriarchy, which exist separate to ideology & thus deeply erosive to female personhood. This The radical feminist view is best articulated by Kate Millet who argues that ~~women~~ ~~are~~ ~~opne~~ patriarchy exist in the ~~deep~~ deep is the "heart of our deep rooted problems," upon disqualifying gender bias from a

young age (ie playing with dolls) to the ultimate equal distribution of ~~labor~~ labor (including reproductive) only then will the patriarchy truly be abolished. The theme of the patriarchy transcending sex and existing in all institutions are further supported by Walby in their '6 Structures' argument, that of which each & every societal concept, (such as sexuality) institution (the state) & practice (the family) are solely characterised on the existence of the patriarchy, thus many radical feminists are hesitant to include men in their movements due to them as a class benefiting entirely from its existence. Whilst postmodern feminists agree with male involvement in abolishing the patriarchy, they are ultimately still united over their harmonious ~~the~~ concept of the patriarchy, which is unanimously agreed as being pervasive in its nature & much more multifaceted than liberal feminists claim it to be.

In Conclusion, whilst there remains some undeniable disagreement over the mechanism in which the patriarchy may be abolished, feminists are overall united over their views of the foundation of the patriarchy, this exists as the necessary common denominator between all strands in which any further feminist discourse of collaboration can be built upon. It is for that very reason that feminists overall agree on their views of the patriarchy as they are all fundamentally striving for its removal.

### Examiner's Comment

There is good balance to this answer, it focuses on the question and effectively develops the debate between the strands about the extent of agreement and deploys the ideas of key thinkers effectively for the most part to back up the arguments. This was awarded Level 5.

### **Question 6(a)**

This question was focused on the consistency within multiculturalism in its approach to diversity. The stronger answers were able to identify where all multiculturalists feel diversity is of real value to society, is important for culture and identity and helps to counter marginalisation and oppression. With disagreement, the clear disagreements between the strands over what type of diversity, how far it should extend and its relationship to the nature of tolerance within society.

Stronger answers really developed a view throughout the answer about the level of agreement within multiculturalism to score higher-level AO3 rather than simply stating where they agree or disagree. This involved making substantiated judgements about the level of agreement throughout rather than simply stating the view in the conclusion. The reader should know exactly what to expect in the conclusion when they get there based on the argument throughout the essay.

One area to focus on is structure: it is vital that both agreement and disagreement are covered, with some students only developing a debate on disagreement or not using all three main strands and tensions within multiculturalism (liberal, pluralist, and cosmopolitan). This limits the ability to access the higher end of the mark scheme. Where students essentially provide a description of the views of the different strands on diversity, the answer becomes knowledge-heavy and misses out on analysis and evaluation.

There were a number of areas of confusion that arose - in particular with the view of cosmopolitan multiculturalism which supports diversity to allow individuals to pick and mix from different cultures until cultural differences dissolve into one single identity and culture rather than valuing diversity as a good in itself.

~~Multiculturalists would~~ Multiculturalism does not tend to take a consistent view of how diversity should look within society but there is general agreement and consistency that diversity is desirable and good for society.

One way in which multiculturalism does take a consistent view of diversity is through the agreement that diversity is good and desirable within society as it provides social advancement and cohesion through recognising different cultures in the idea of politics of recognition. However, whilst multiculturalism has a consistent view of ~~that~~ <sup>why</sup> diversity is desirable for society, it is very inconsistent on how much diversity they wish for especially between liberal multiculturalists and pluralist multiculturalists. Liberal multiculturalists do again follow the consistent view of multiculturalism that diversity is desirable in a liberally multicultural society, they would argue for 'shallow' diversity. This is the acceptance of different cultures within a society but only tolerating



these cultures' beliefs in a liberal framework. Liberal multiculturalists would argue that humans at the deepest level are morally autonomous individuals and all are the same. They argue that diversity should only go ~~for~~ so far as it does not infringe on someone else (harm principle by J.S. Mills). Whereas pluralist multiculturalists would argue that diversity should be a priority and have no limits to a person's culture. They advocate for 'deep' diversity compared to liberal's 'shallow' diversity and Parekh's value pluralism where diversity is desirable and should be fully acted on as there is no such thing as the 'good life' and so no restrictions should be placed on anyone's culture. Again, this is inconsistent with liberal multiculturalists. However, whilst they wish to achieve 'deep diversity' they do not suggest how liberal, 'western' ideals can co-exist harmoniously with differing ideals and Isaiah Berlin argued this as he said there is no way for 'deep' diversity currently in reality as there has been no way for a pluralist multicultural ideal of society with differing cultures to co-exist harmoniously. This suggests that in fact there is some consistency within multiculturalism as majority of ~~the~~ multiculturalism in reality agree diversity is desirable but the utopian ideals of pluralist multiculturalists' value pluralism (Parekh) and deep diversity are not really

possible and so shallow diversity has been accepted within multiculturalism for now.

It can be argued that multiculturalism does not have a consistent view of diversity at all as the cosmopolitan multiculturalists would argue against any diversity in a cosmopolitan multicultural society. This differs greatly from liberal and pluralist multiculturalists as ~~they~~ cosmopolitan multiculturalists wish for a one-world perspective and a 'melting pot' of cultures within society. They argue that multiculturalism to them would include a 'pick'n'mix' approach where individuals could for example do a yoga class, eat an Indian meal and attend ~~of~~ a British pub night all in one day and this argues for hybridity rather than diversity. Pluralist multiculturalists would particularly disagree with this as cultural identity is an individual's identity. As Charles Taylor argues, individual rights and minority rights are essentially the same as an individual and cultural identity is the focus for their way of life. This shows a clear inconsistency with multiculturalism and views on diversity. But, it can be argued that ~~Finally~~ there is some consistency with the transition to a cosmopolitan multicultural society's views on diversity and cultural identity with the

liberal and pluralist multiculturalists views as they all desire diversity and have consistency of the view that diversity is good for society.

Finally, the importance of diversity and how it is protected is important to multiculturalists ~~as they~~ and is fairly consistent within multiculturalism.

Most multiculturalists would agree that minority rights are needed to a certain degree to ensure diversity. Kymlicka suggested three different types of minority rights to protect the marginalised groups in a diverse multiculturalist society including: polyethnic self-governing and representation rights. These are coherent in ensuring diversity in ~~some~~ pluralist multiculturalist's views and the transitional part of moving to a cosmopolitan multiculturalist society but there is some inconsistency with minority rights to ensure diversity in liberal multiculturalism. This is because they do not want the group rights to harm an individual's right. They may say that in private, these marginalised groups can do things such as ~~female~~ forced/arranged marriages, wearing a burkha and so on but not in public as it might infringe another individual's freedom. This shows some inconsistency on how to ensure diversity is achieved through

minority rights and cosmopolitan multiculturalists would argue once society has no marginalised groups minority rights are not needed as there is arguably no diversity as everyone is a product of a 'melting pot' of cultures.

In conclusion, there is not a consistent view of diversity in multiculturalism as there is more disagreements on how diversity should be achieved such as the extent of minority rights and also how much diversity they wish to see. Cosmopolitan multiculturalism has the most inconsistencies as they do not want a diverse society of separate cultures, they want a diverse society where everyone has a one-world perspective and shares cultures. But, there is consistency in the view that overall, diversity is desirable to a society in multiculturalism.

### **Examiner's Comment**

On reading this answer, it is clear what question it is answering due to its clear focus and structure. It is stronger on disagree than agree but there is balance in the coverage of agreement, particularly in the penultimate paragraph. This was awarded Level 5.

### **Question 6(b)**

The question allowed students to explore whether multiculturalism agrees over the issue of the protection of minority cultures. The most effective strategies looked to shape the essay in terms of areas of agreement over the multiculturalist view on the protection of minority cultures before exploring the disagreements. Within this, the most effective answers were able to explore the differences between liberal, pluralist, and cosmopolitan multiculturalism. The very best answers were able to make substantiated judgements about the depth

of the agreement or disagreement within multiculturalism over their view on the protection of minority cultures.

One area to focus on is structure: it is vital that both agreement and disagreement are covered, with some students only developing a debate on disagreement or not using all three main strands and tensions within multiculturalism. It is also important to use the ideas of key thinkers to back up the debate between the different strands/tensions rather than focusing on a debate between thinkers or simply stating that Parekh is a pluralist multiculturalist.

One area of confusion that did develop was the mixing up of liberal ideas with those of liberal multiculturalists. The toleration of group differences is not seen as the same as treating members of minority groups as equals; what is needed is recognition and positive accommodation of minority group practices - for Kymlicka, this is about group-differentiated rights based on the liberal principles of autonomy and justice. However, liberal multiculturalists like Kymlicka, cannot accept that any group would have the legal right to restrict the basic civil liberties of its members.

Multiculturalists to a <sup>lesser</sup> greater extent agree upon their support of minority rights. All multiculturalists believe that it is vital for minority rights to be protected through further action from the state, but differ in their reasons and their extent of support.

Liberal multiculturalists such as Charles Taylor argue that minority rights must be protected by the state through actions that go further than introducing anti-discriminatory laws. Taylor argues that minority groups must be socially recognised and that because of his idea of the politics of recognition, formal equality must be given to minority groups to protect their rights. Similarly, pluralist multiculturalists and cosmopolitan multiculturalists argue that the role of the state must extend beyond anti-discriminatory laws. ~~Pluralist~~ pluralists <sup>like Bhikhu Parekh</sup> believe it should extend to being active in the social and economic injustice in order to fully protect minority rights. Multiculturalists

still argue that the role of the state must extend  
in order to protect minority rights.

However, multiculturalists disagree over the extent to  
which minority rights should be protected. Pluralists  
like Isaiah Berlin support deep diversity and the  
concept of value pluralism, <sup>that</sup> all cultures and  
their values are correct and should be accepted. This is  
because pluralist multiculturalists believe that there  
is no 'right or wrong' answer in regards to  
the way culture should be practiced. Contrastingly,  
liberal multi-culturalists like Will Kymlicka  
believe in shallow diversity and believe that only  
practices which fit into the liberal framework of  
ideals should be accepted. For example the president  
of France, Emmanuel Macron who is a liberal believes  
that practices such as wearing the hijab and burka  
are illiberal and oppressive, therefore he has placed  
a ban on these in the public sphere. This  
greatly differs from pluralist thinkers like Parekh  
who reject the liberal framework and argue it is  
too narrow and allows for only one version of  
the 'good life'. This shows that multiculturalists  
do not agree over the extent of their support for  
the protection of minority rights.

In addition, multiculturalists disagree over their reasons for supporting minority rights. Liberal multiculturalists like Kymlicka justify the protection of minority rights through justice, freedom and autonomy. He argues that without minority rights being protected minority groups are infringed of these core liberal values and concepts. Contrastingly, Charles Taylor argues that culture is embedded in humans and that it plays a vital role in identity therefore minority rights must be protected. This shows that multiculturalists have differing views on why ~~minority~~ minority rights should be protected, and on support of protection of <sup>minority</sup> rights.

Despite this, all multiculturalists agree that the role of the state should to some extent expand to protect minority rights. Not only this but they agree minority rights should be protected. However, they differ on their extent of support as liberals believe in shallow diversity and pluralist multiculturalists advocate for deep diversity. Not only this but their reasons behind supporting the protection of <sup>minority</sup> rights differs. Therefore to conclude, the above evidence shows that to a lesser extent multiculturalists agree over their support for protection of minority rights.

### Examiner's Comment



In the exam hall, this is again a strong attempt to engage with the question and, from reading the answer, it is straightforward to work out what the question is. A range of key thinkers are deployed to support the debate between the key tensions/strands. This was awarded Level 4.

### **Question 7(a)**

This question focused on whether the different types of nationalism have a consistent view on self-determination, and an effective definition of self-determination was very helpful to writing a clear, structured answer.

The most effective strategy was to structure the essay around areas of clear agreement between the types of nationalism and the areas where there was strong disagreement. This allowed for analysis to be developed through the essay to reach substantiated conclusions about whether nationalism is consistent in its approach. Much of the focus was on the consistency between liberal and anti/post-colonial nationalism and the inconsistency with expansionist nationalism.

A more problematic approach was to essentially work a way through the different strands/tensions within nationalism, as this tended to lead to knowledge-heavy answers that did not provide much in terms of analysis and evaluation. It is also key that the answer does provide coverage of both agreement and disagreement.

Stronger answers really developed a view throughout the answer about the level of agreement within nationalism to score higher-level AO3 rather than simply stating where they agree or disagree. This involved making substantiated judgements about the level of agreement throughout rather than simply stating the view in the conclusion. The reader should know exactly what to expect in the conclusion when they get there based on the argument throughout the essay.

Key thinkers need to be used effectively, by using their main ideas to open an avenue for analysis rather than simply stating that Rousseau is a liberal nationalist.

## Self-determination - right to self-governance

Yes	No
Lib - Rousseau Wilson Dewey	con - von Herder expansionist - scramble for Africa - Hitler
- black nationalism / pan-Africanism Cranley United States of Africa	

Self-determination refers to nations having the right to self-governance, meaning they decide how they are ruled. Although some strands argue that nations should have the right to self-determination, the fact that others, such as expansionist nationalists, do not support this concept makes it fair to argue that nationalism does not have a consistent view of self-determination to a very large extent.

Nationalism cannot be seen to have a consistent view of self-determination. Liberal nationalists ~~cannot~~ apply the values and

concerns of nationalism and apply them to the nation, resulting in their belief that because humans are free and rational, so are nations. Key to this view is father of modern liberal nationalism, Rousseau, who argued that nations have the right to self-determination, so long as they enact on the demands and wishes of the people rather than enable it. Rousseau was concerned that it's important for a nation to have active participation in order for self-determination to be valid. Examples of this is Woodrow Wilson's 14 points, which argued that all nations should be self-determining. Similarly, there has been large growth in the demand for self-determination in devolved bodies in the UK (Scotland, Wales and Northern Ireland) who demand further independence. On the other hand, Conservative Nationalists are far less concerned with self-determination, because they are more concerned with the strength and stability of a nation, as well as preserving tradition, culture and history. They are influenced by E. von Herder, who argued that as a cultural nationalist, argued that the Volk, (the people), should focus on learning their

unique history, folklore, and language and traditions (Volksgeist). This shows nationalism does not have a consistent view of self-determination, because some strands are not concerned with the concept. However, they are consistent to a small extent. Both liberal and cultural nationalists support it in some way; with conservative nationalists, their support for self-determination can be seen in the Brexit vote to leave the EU. Supporters of leaving the EU argued that it undermined UK parliamentary sovereignty, in order for the UK to be a self-determining nation, it had to abandon the EU. Nevertheless, with one strand seeing self-determination as crucial, and the other believing that it is not a large concern, makes it clear that nationalism is not consistent with its view on self-determination to a large extent.

Another reason nationalism cannot be considered consistent in its view on self-determination is because of a disagreement between strands about whether or not nations have the right to self-governance. Expansionist nationalists generally believe that they are superior to other nations, also known as racial chauvinism. Because of

this expansionists want to subjugate other nations and exploit them economically. This strand comes from the 17th, 18th, 19th and early 20th century, where different nations, especially European, took over other nations. They are influenced those like Charles Maurras argued that because a nation is superior, it must be aggressively expansionist, setting in other nations, controlling them, then exploiting them economically. Examples of this is The Scramble for Africa, where different European nations took over, exploiting the continent for economic benefit. Another key example is Hitler believing that the Aryan race was superior, ~~and therefore~~ in comparison to Slavic people, giving him the right to control them. On the other hand, Black nationalists ~~believe~~ argue that black people had been scattered across the world, but were all one people who ~~needed~~ <sup>need</sup> to be united. They are heavily influenced by black nationalists, Marcus Garvey who wanted to unite all descendants of Africa and create a 'United States of Africa', which would have self-determination, controlling its own nation and economy. This shows there is a large disagreement about the strand, with one arguing that <sup>not all</sup> nations have the right to the concept, and the other arguing

All nations should. However, there is a small extent to which nationalism can be perceived as consistent in their view on self-determination. Expansionist nationalists believe that their nation has the right to self-determination and similarly, Black nationalists believe that if they created a nation, they would also share this right. Nevertheless, with one strand ~~to~~ seeing to strip nations of their self-determination, dominating and controlling them for their own gain, and another seeing self-determination as a fundamental concept to ~~praise~~ <sup>praise</sup> ~~that themselves~~ <sup>their capability</sup> to white people, it is clear that nationalism ~~is~~ is not consistent in its view on self-determination to a large extent.

In conclusion, nationalism ~~does not~~ does not have a consistent view of ~~nationalism~~ <sup>self-determination</sup> because they disagree on which nations share this right. Although there are some ~~disagreements~~ agreements that certain nations should have self-determination, this agreement is extremely broad, and with one subjugating ~~other~~ nations, and others believing it is a fundamental value, it raises large questions as to whether nationalism is consistent in its view <sup>of</sup> self-determination.

### Examiner's Comment

This answer shows the value of planning upfront and starts with a clear definition of self determination to work with in the rest of the answer. The

answer really tries to engage with the question and the nature of extent. This was awarded Level 5.

### **Question 7(b)**

The question allowed students to explore whether nationalism has a common view of the nation. The most effective strategies looked to shape the essay in terms of the commonalities with nationalism on the nation before exploring the disagreements. Within this, the most effective answers were able to explore the differences between the various strands and tensions introducing much of the key terminology around progressive/regressive, inclusive/exclusive and rational/romantic. The very best answers were able to make substantiated judgements about the extent of the common view within nationalism over the nation.

One area to focus on is structure: it is vital that both agreement and disagreement are covered, with some students only developing a debate on disagreement or not using all the main strands and tensions within nationalism. It is also important to use the ideas of key thinkers to back up the debate between the different strands/tensions rather than focusing on a debate between thinkers or simply stating that von Herder is a conservative nationalist.

Within nationalism, conflict arises over the role and power of the nation. Whilst there is some general agreement over the nation being a way to achieve self-determination and protecting the national identity, there is strong disagreement, over the particularly from expansionist nationalists over the nation.

Firstly, it can be observed that both liberal and post-colonial nationalists agree that the role of the nation is to encourage self-determination and to be based on the will of the people.

Liberal nationalist Rousseau promoted the idea of 'general will', that the nation was based on the consent and will of the people, supporting the French Revolution to be based on the will of the people. Similarly, Marcus Garvey believed in the idea of black pride and the idea that a black people black nation needed to be founded.



away from white interference, allowing black people to become self-determined and reject white colonialism through the nation-state. This then shows consensus between liberal and post-colonial nationalists, both viewing the nation progressively and to be based on the will of those it governs over.

Conservative nationalists and expansionist nationalists could also be said to agree over how the nation should promote the unique culture. Conservative nationalist von Herder expresses this in his terms 'volksgeist' which means the cultural and spiritual essence unique to each nation. Expansionist nationalist Charles Maurras takes this further, providing a much more exclusive view of the nation as he believed in monoculturalism; the idea that one culture dominates in society and the nation should only promote this, whereas conservatives believe it takes time to adhere to the culture of a nation the ideas of Maurras show how expansionist nationalism is much more radical in terms of its views of the nation state.

In fact, expansionist nationalists completely

disagree with the ideas of liberal and post-colonial nationalists as they believe only some nations are supreme enough to become self-determined. In comparison, liberal and post-colonial nationalists believe all nations have the right to self-determination. Maurras' ideas of the supremacy of one-nation state above others can be seen in his advocacy of imperialism ~~to~~ to unite the nation under military glory, an idea that liberal and post-colonial nationalists seek to overcome through ~~a~~ self-establishing a self-determined nation.

However, it could be argued that there is some form of agreement between expansionist and post-colonial nationalists as Garvey, similar to Maurras, believed in a form of an exclusive nation. Garvey promoted racial separatism as it would allow black people to find their own identity away from white oppressors. Whilst this does show some commonality over the type of nation it also shows how post-colonial nationalism has a much more progressive view of the nation whereas Maurras' ideas can be seen as regressive as he seeks

to make the nation exclusive to allow it to dominate over others. fundamentally opposing post-colonialism.

In conclusion, whilst liberal nationalists and post colonialists agree, there is deep disagreement between them and expansionist nationalists, showing how nationalism does not have a common view of the nation state but rather different branches use the nation state to promote opposing values, such as self-determination in comparison to imperialism as well as an exclusive or inclusive nation, therefore meaning nationalism has a common view of the nation to a small extent.

### **Examiner's Comments**

Balanced, good use of key thinkers and their ideas to support the debate between the strands. The AO1 and AO2 are perhaps stronger here than the AO3 but there is an attempt to grapple with the concept of extent. This was awarded Level 5.

### **Paper Summary**

The following key points should be taken away from this exam series:

- This was an extraordinary exam series; students and centres should be congratulated for their readiness to sit this unique exam series.
- The importance of exam timing.
- The need to plan answers so that responses have a clear structure that focuses on the demands of the question.

- In source questions, the importance of contrasting competing arguments from the source; this is done by developing the arguments included in the source using own knowledge to create analysis and reach substantiated conclusions throughout.
- The questions are on the big debates in politics, so answers should read like a debate where competing views are considered to reach a clear judgement on the question.
- The use of contemporary examples can really strengthen analysis in answers to the questions in Section A.
- The effective use of key terms from the specification helps lift the quality of responses.
- The importance of introductions and conclusions.
- In non-core ideas, the higher-level mark bands are achieved by focusing in on 'extent', and the debate needs to be developed using the ideas of key thinkers from within that section of the specification.