

Cambridge Pre-U Specimen Papers
and Mark Schemes

Cambridge
Pre-U

www.XtremePapers.com

Cambridge International Level 3
Pre-U Certificate in
COMPARATIVE GOVERNMENT AND POLITICS

For use from 2008 onwards



UNIVERSITY of CAMBRIDGE
International Examinations

Specimen Materials

Comparative Government and Politics (9770)

Cambridge International Level 3
Pre-U Certificate in Comparative Government and Politics

For use from 2008 onwards

QAN 500/4329/8

Support

CIE provides comprehensive support for all its qualifications, including the Cambridge Pre-U. There are resources for teachers and candidates written by experts. CIE also endorses a range of materials from other publishers to give a choice of approach. More information on what is available for this particular syllabus can be found at www.cie.org.uk

Syllabus Updates

This booklet of specimen materials is for use from 2008. It is intended for use with the version of the syllabus that will be examined in 2010, 2011 and 2012. The purpose of these materials is to provide Centres with a reasonable idea of the general shape and character of the planned question papers in advance of the first operational examination.

If there are any changes to the syllabus CIE will write to centres to inform them. The syllabus and these specimen materials will also be published annually on the CIE website (www.cie.org.uk/cambridgepreu). The version of the syllabus on the website should always be considered as the definitive version.

Further copies of this, or any other Cambridge Pre-U specimen booklet, can be obtained by either downloading from our website www.cie.org.uk/cambridgepreu

or contacting:

Customer Services, University of Cambridge International Examinations,
1 Hills Road, Cambridge CB1 2EU
Telephone: +44 (0)1223 553554
Fax: +44 (0)1223 553558
E-mail: international@cie.org.uk

CIE retains the copyright on all its publications. CIE registered Centres are permitted to copy material from this booklet for their own internal use. However, CIE cannot give permission to Centres to photocopy any material that is acknowledged to a third party even for internal use within a Centre.

Copyright © University of Cambridge Local Examinations Syndicate 2008



UNIVERSITY OF CAMBRIDGE INTERNATIONAL EXAMINATIONS
Cambridge International Level 3 Pre-U Certificate
Principal Subject

COMPARATIVE GOVERNMENT AND POLITICS

9770/01

Paper 1 Concepts and Institutions (UK and/or USA)

For Examination from 2010

SPECIMEN PAPER

1 hour 30 minutes

Additional Materials: Answer Paper/Booklet

READ THESE INSTRUCTIONS FIRST

Write your Centre number, candidate number and name on all the work you hand in.

Write in dark blue or black pen.

Do not use staples, paper clips, highlighters, glue or correction fluid.

This paper contains two sections

Answer **two** short questions and **one** long question chosen all from Section A **or** all from Section B **or** the short essays from one section and the long essay from the other.

You are advised to spend 20 minutes on each short essay and 45 minutes on the long essay.

Every short essay is marked out of 25 and every full essay is marked out of 50.

This document consists of **3** printed pages and **1** blank page.



Section A: UK Concepts and Institutions**Short essays**

- 1 Explain the relationship between popular and parliamentary sovereignty. [25]
- 2 Explain why judicial neutrality and independence are important. [25]
- 3 Explain the contribution made to the running of a government department by a cabinet minister **and** its senior civil servants. [25]

Full essays

- 4 To what extent has the sovereignty of parliament been replaced by the 'elective dictatorship' of the executive? [50]
- 5 Evaluate the degree to which the strengths and weaknesses of the UK constitutional system have been affected by recent constitutional reforms. [50]
- 6 Different electoral systems are currently used within the UK. Evaluate the case for **and** against adopting any one of these systems for elections to the House of Commons. [50]

Section B: US Concepts and Institutions**Short essays**

- 7 Explain what presidential government is. [25]
- 8 Explain the role of the Supreme Court as part of the US political system. [25]
- 9 Explain how the powers of the states and the federal government are defined and upheld. [25]

Full essays

- 10 To what extent does the USA have an entirely two-party system? [50]
- 11 To what extent has George W. Bush reasserted the power of the President over Congress? [50]
- 12 Assess the effect of recent judicial activism on the US political system. To what extent does this uphold the wishes of the Founding Fathers? [50]

BLANK PAGE

Permission to reproduce items where third-party owned material protected by copyright is included has been sought and cleared where possible. Every reasonable effort has been made by the publisher (UCLES) to trace copyright holders, but if any items requiring clearance have unwittingly been included, the publisher will be pleased to make amends at the earliest possible opportunity.

University of Cambridge International Examinations is part of the Cambridge Assessment Group. Cambridge Assessment is the brand name of University of Cambridge Local Examinations Syndicate (UCLES), which is itself a department of the University of Cambridge.



UNIVERSITY OF CAMBRIDGE INTERNATIONAL EXAMINATIONS
Cambridge International Level 3 Pre-U Certificate
Principal Subject

COMPARATIVE GOVERNMENT AND POLITICS

9770/01

Paper 1 Concepts and Institutions (UK and/or USA)

For Examination from 2010

SPECIMEN MARK SCHEME

1 hour 30 minutes

MAXIMUM MARK: 100

This document consists of **17** printed pages and **1** blank page.



Generic marking descriptors for Paper 1 (short essays)

- The full range of marks will be used as a matter of course.
- Examiners will look for the 'best fit', not a 'perfect fit' in applying the Levels.
- Examiners will provisionally award the middle mark in the Level and then moderate up/down according to individual qualities within the answer.
- The ratio of marks per AO will be 3:2.
- The weighting of marks for each AO should be considered, but this is reflected in the descriptor: marking should therefore be done holistically.
- Question-specific mark schemes will be neither exhaustive nor prescriptive. Appropriate, substantiated responses will always be rewarded.

Level/marks	Descriptors
<p style="text-align: center;">5</p> <p>25–21 marks</p>	<p>ANSWERS MAY NOT BE PERFECT, BUT WILL REPRESENT THE VERY BEST THAT MAY BE EXPECTED OF AN 18-YEAR-OLD.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Excellent focused explanation that answers the question convincingly. Towards the bottom, may be a little unbalanced in coverage yet the answer is still comprehensively explained and argued. • Excellent knowledge and understanding of relevant political terms and/or institutions. Answer is comprehensively supported by an excellent range of concepts and examples that are used to sustain the argument. • Excellent substantiated synthesis bringing the explanation together. • The answer is fluent and the grammar, punctuation and spelling are all precise.
<p style="text-align: center;">4</p> <p>20–16 marks</p>	<p>ANSWERS WILL SHOW MANY FEATRURES OF LEVEL 5, BUT THE QUALITY WILL BE UNEVEN ACROSS THE ANSWER.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A determined response to the question with strong explanation across most but not all of the answer. • High level of knowledge and understanding of relevant political terms and/or institutions. Answer is well illustrated with a variety of concepts and examples to support the argument. Description is avoided. • Good substantiated synthesis. • For the most part, the answer is fluent and shows an accuracy in grammar, punctuation and spelling.
<p style="text-align: center;">3</p> <p>15–11 marks</p>	<p>THE ARGUMENT WILL BE COMPETENT, BUT LEVEL 3 ANSWERS WILL BE LIMITED &/OR UNBALANCED.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Engages well with the question, although explanation is patchy and, at the lower end, of limited quality. • Fair display of relevant political knowledge and understanding, but this tends to be used to illustrate rather than support the argument. Explanation starts to break down in significant sections of description. • Synthesis is patchy in quality. • The writing lacks some fluency, but on the whole shows an accuracy in grammar, punctuation and spelling.

<p style="text-align: center;">2</p> <p>10–6 marks</p>	<p>ANSWERS WILL SHOW A LIMITED LINK BETWEEN THE QUESTION & ANSWER.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Some engagement with the question, but explanation is limited. • Limited explanation within an essentially descriptive response. • Patchy display of relevant political knowledge and understanding that illustrates rather than supports any argument. • Synthesis is limited/thin in quality and extent. • The answer shows some accuracy in grammar, punctuation and spelling, but contains frequent errors.
<p style="text-align: center;">1</p> <p>5–0 marks</p>	<p>ANSWERS WILL SHOW A CLEAR SENSE OF THE CANDIDATE HAVING LITTLE IF ANY ENGAGEMENT WITH THE QUESTION.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Little or no engagement with the question. • Little or no explanation. • Little or no relevant political knowledge. • Little or no synthesis. • The answer shows significant weaknesses in the accuracy of grammar, punctuation and spelling.

Generic marking descriptors for Paper 1 (full essays)

- The full range of marks will be used as a matter of course.
- Examiners will look for the 'best fit', not a 'perfect fit' in applying the Levels.
- Examiners will provisionally award the middle mark in the Level and then moderate up/down according to individual qualities within the answer.
- The ratio of marks per AO will be 1:2.
- The weighting of marks for each AO should be considered, but this is reflected in the descriptor: marking should therefore be done holistically.
- Question-specific mark schemes will be neither exhaustive nor prescriptive. Appropriate, substantiated responses will always be rewarded. Answers may develop a novel response to a question. This is to be credited if arguments are fully substantiated.

Level/marks	Descriptors
5 50–41 marks	<p>ANSWERS MAY NOT BE PERFECT, BUT WILL REPRESENT THE VERY BEST THAT MAY BE EXPECTED OF AN 18-YEAR-OLD.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Excellent focused analysis that answers the question convincingly. • Excellent sustained argument throughout with a strong sense of direction that is always well substantiated. Excellent substantiated conclusions. • Excellent understanding of relevant political knowledge (processes, institutions, concepts, debates and/or theories) illustrated with a wide range of examples. • Towards the bottom, may be a little unbalanced in coverage yet the answer is still comprehensively argued. • Candidate is always in firm control of the material. • The answer is fluent and the grammar, punctuation and spelling are all precise.
4 40–31 marks	<p>ANSWERS WILL SHOW MANY FEATURES OF LEVEL 5, BUT THE QUALITY WILL BE UNEVEN ACROSS THE ANSWER.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A good response to the question with clear analysis across most but not all of the answer. • Argument developed to a logical conclusion, but parts lack rigour. Strong conclusions adequately substantiated. • Good but limited and/or uneven range of relevant knowledge used to support analysis and argument. Description is avoided. • For the most part, the answer is fluent and shows an accuracy in grammar, punctuation and spelling.
3 30–21 marks	<p>THE ARGUMENT WILL BE COMPETENT, BUT LEVEL 3 ANSWERS WILL BE LIMITED AND/OR UNBALANCED.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Engages soundly with the question although analysis is patchy and, at the lower end, of limited quality. • Tries to argue and draw conclusions, but this breaks down in significant sections of description. • Good but limited and/or uneven range of relevant political knowledge used to describe rather than support analysis and argument. • The writing lacks some fluency, but on the whole shows an accuracy in grammar, punctuation and spelling.

<p style="text-align: center;">2</p> <p>20–10 marks</p>	<p>ANSWERS WILL SHOW A LIMITED LINK BETWEEN QUESTION AND ANSWER.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Limited engagement with the question, with some understanding of the issues. Analysis and conclusions are limited/thin. • Limited argument within an essentially descriptive response. Conclusions are limited/thin. • Factually limited and/or uneven. Some irrelevance. • Patchy display of relevant political knowledge. • The answer shows some accuracy in grammar, punctuation and spelling, but contains frequent errors.
<p style="text-align: center;">1</p> <p>9–0 marks</p>	<p>ANSWERS WILL SHOW A CLEAR SENSE OF THE CANDIDATE HAVING LITTLE IF ANY ENGAGEMENT WITH THE QUESTION.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Little or no engagement with the question. Little or no analysis offered. • Little or no argument. Assertions are unsupported and/or of limited relevance. Any conclusions are very weak. • Little or no relevant political knowledge. • The answer shows significant weaknesses in the accuracy of grammar, punctuation and spelling.

Section A (UK)**1 Explain the relationship between popular and parliamentary sovereignty. [25]**General

The generic mark scheme is the most important guide for examiners and drives the marking of all answers. Assess which level best reflects most of each answer. No answer is required to demonstrate all the descriptions in any level to qualify. Examiners are looking for 'best fit', not 'perfect fit'. Provisionally award the middle mark in the level and then moderate up or down according to the qualities of the answer, using the question-specific marking notes below.

No set answer is expected. Candidates may answer the question from a wide variety of different angles, using different emphases, and arguing different points of view. The marking notes here are indicative and not exhaustive. What matters is the quality of the evaluation and the argument. That said, candidates must answer the question set and not their own question.

Specific

Popular sovereignty can be defined as the sovereignty of the people. Unlike most liberal democracies, however, the people of the UK are not the sovereign (supreme) source of political authority. The crown in parliament is. The UK has a part-written but uncodified constitution. At the heart of the constitution are twin constitutional pillars: the principles of the Rule of Law and Parliamentary Sovereignty. The latter term means that it is not the constitution (and hence the people) which is sovereign; it is the legislature. The sovereignty of Parliament manifests itself in three ways: any piece of statute law can be considered constitutional – it forms part of the constitution. A clear implication is that judicial review is inherently limited in scope. In short, there is no higher authority than Parliament. Neither can one Parliament entrench a law such that it cannot be overturned by another Parliament.

Candidates may wish to explore how the powers of Parliament stem ultimately from the legitimacy given to it by the people. As the national legislature for the UK, Parliament garners its legitimacy from its electoral connection to the public. Some may wish to reconnect the concepts of parliamentary and popular sovereignty via the idea of electoral legitimacy. The question also allows some considerations of the limits on parliamentary sovereignty: through the dominance of the executive ('elective dictatorship'); through EU membership and to an extent through the Human Rights Act (1998).

2 Explain why judicial neutrality and independence are important.**[25]**General

The generic mark scheme is the most important guide for examiners and drives the marking of all answers. Assess which level best reflects most of each answer. No answer is required to demonstrate all the descriptions in any level to qualify. Examiners are looking for 'best fit', not 'perfect fit'. Provisionally award the middle mark in the level and then moderate up or down according to the qualities of the answer, using the question-specific marking notes below.

No set answer is expected. Candidates may answer the question from a wide variety of different angles, using different emphases, and arguing different points of view. The marking notes here are indicative and not exhaustive. What matters is the quality of the evaluation and the argument. That said, candidates must answer the question set and not their own question.

Specific

The two concepts can be shown to be related in terms of the function that they perform: namely, ensuring that the role of the judiciary within a properly functioning liberal democracy is protected. Candidates may wish to explore why these two are important and the extent to which either or both have been compromised. Candidates may link their answers to wider questions about the role of the judiciary within the UK since it has no codified constitution. Independence should be explained in terms of some notion of separation from the elected branches of government. Candidates may wish to discuss how independence is maintained (security of tenure; protected salaries etc; independence in the appointment process – rather than patronage). Neutrality might be explained in terms of bias or the absence of it.

How the two concepts link together to protect and maintain the strength and legitimacy of the judiciary may be considered. A judiciary which lacks legitimacy may undermine the wider legitimacy of a democratic system. Answers may consider the significance of all of this in the context of the increased political role that EU membership has given to the UK judiciary.

3 Explain the contribution made to the running of a government department by a cabinet minister and its senior civil servants. [25]

General

The generic mark scheme is the most important guide for examiners and drives the marking of all answers. Assess which level best reflects most of each answer. No answer is required to demonstrate all the descriptions in any level to qualify. Examiners are looking for 'best fit', not 'perfect fit'. Provisionally award the middle mark in the level and then moderate up or down according to the qualities of the answer, using the question-specific marking notes below.

No set answer is expected. Candidates may answer the question from a wide variety of different angles, using different emphases, and arguing different points of view. The marking notes here are indicative and not exhaustive. What matters is the quality of the evaluation and the argument. That said, candidates must answer the question set and not their own question.

Specific

It is not expected that candidates must produce a 50:50 balance between the two nominated areas, but each needs serious consideration and an answer that was more than 60:40 one way or the other would be unable to score in Level 5.

Cabinet ministers are individually responsible for the behaviour of, and the actions of, their government department. What is their contribution to the running of their department? Ministers, as members of the Cabinet, must ensure that the actions of their department are consistent with the policy direction chosen by the government; as political masters (who are almost always elected – though some ministers are Lords of course) ministers must ensure that the direction of the department represents the policy direction chosen at the election, and/or promised by the Prime Minister. Ministers are responsible for initiating new policy directions within their department – ideas emanate (in theory at least) from the political executive and the minister is at the heart of this policy initiation. Ministers may act as motivators for their officials. They are, in a real sense, managers of their department. They should protect their civil servants from overt politicisation. Ministers, rather than civil servants, will be held to account for departmental actions. Major resignations may serve as examples that candidates might refer to. That ministers tend to blame the official structure and hence resist calls for resignation may equally be noted.

If ministers are the managers of the department then senior civil servants are, in theory, the servants of the minister. Senior civil servants represent the permanence, the policy expertise, and the institutional memory of the government department. The minister may initiate a new policy direction, but it is the SCS that must translate the idea into a policy that can be implemented. Candidates may note that the core principles of the Civil Service were rewritten in 2006, but that neutral and impartial advice remains the key element of the manner in which the SCS ought to serve the minister. That the SCS can exploit its informational advantage and its longevity (informational asymmetry) to resist a minister is a point that may be discussed. The contribution of a minister can be limited by the SCS; the contribution of the SCS can be seen as limited by its failure to adhere to the core principles of the Civil Service.

4 To what extent has the sovereignty of Parliament been replaced by the ‘elective dictatorship’ of the executive? [50]

General

The generic mark scheme is the most important guide for examiners and drives the marking of all answers. Assess which level best reflects most of each answer. No answer is required to demonstrate all the descriptions in any level to qualify. Examiners are looking for ‘best fit’, not ‘perfect fit’. Provisionally award the middle mark in the level and then moderate up or down according to the qualities of the answer, using the question-specific marking notes below.

No set answer is expected. Candidates may answer the question from a wide variety of different angles, using different emphases, and arguing different points of view. The marking notes here are indicative and not exhaustive. What matters is the quality of the evaluation and the argument. That said, candidates must answer the question set and not their own question.

Specific

Parliamentary sovereignty means that the UK’s legislature is sovereign. Any piece of statute law forms part of the constitution so judicial review is inherently limited in scope. The idea of elective dictatorship argues that the power of Parliament – and in particular its claim to be sovereign – had effectively shifted to the executive branch since the control of the Commons by the majority party led to the dominance of the legislature by the executive. In assessing Hailsham’s claim, candidates may offer arguments that support it, e.g. strong majorities, strong party discipline, the perceived ineffectiveness of Parliament in the performance of its scrutiny function. References to the Blair and/or Thatcher eras might be used to support this view.

On the other hand, is Parliament ineffective because the executive is often strong? Parliament has what Pakenham calls ‘latent legitimacy’ whereby it does not have to be seen to act to have power (cf. Mao’s idea of the sleeping tiger). Thatcher was removed from office in 1990 having lost the support of her party and of her cabinet. Even powerful premiers (Blair; Thatcher) do not want the embarrassment of losing even one parliamentary vote. Sizeable majorities may not be a guarantee of Parliamentary quiescence, as Thatcher and Blair both discovered.

Candidates may consider how far the executive is held in check by, for example, the media, by pressure groups, by the success of the Opposition in crafting a coherent message, by polling data. The central claim in the question suggests that in between elections there are no effective checks on the government and its power. Candidates may want to challenge this assumption. The question could also be broadened to consider models of the executive and to assess where power lies within the executive: e.g. Cabinet government; Prime-Ministerial government; Presidential Government and the Core Executive – the latter model would allow consideration of the relationship between Parliament and the Government in the wider context of political advisers and elements of the Civil Service.

5 Evaluate the degree to which the strengths and weaknesses of the UK constitutional system have been affected by recent constitutional reforms. [50]

General

The generic mark scheme is the most important guide for examiners and drives the marking of all answers. Assess which level best reflects most of each answer. No answer is required to demonstrate all the descriptions in any level to qualify. Examiners are looking for 'best fit', not 'perfect fit'. Provisionally award the middle mark in the level and then moderate up or down according to the qualities of the answer, using the question-specific marking notes below.

No set answer is expected. Candidates may answer the question from a wide variety of different angles, using different emphases, and arguing different points of view. The marking notes here are indicative and not exhaustive. What matters is the quality of the evaluation and the argument. That said, candidates must answer the question set and not their own question.

Specific

The question refers to 'recent' constitutional reforms so candidates are free to determine when they start. Many argue that Britain has revolutionised its constitution since the 1970s. Examination of constitutional weaknesses and of reforms might be located in a discussion of the fused and unitary nature of the UK constitution based upon the twin principles of the rule of law and parliamentary sovereignty. Constitutional reforms and perceived constitutional weaknesses considered might include:

Devolution: perhaps the UK constitution was the 'English Constitution'. How has devolution affected matters such as: the link between representatives and the represented, the West Lothian Question, the English Question, over-representation at Westminster?

Reform of the Lords: it may be easier to argue the existence of pre-democratic elements within the current settlement represents a weakness. Have the reforms created new problems? Answers may need to present a normative judgment with respect to how, or whether, the Lords should be elected – in what proportion, on what basis, and how such reforms will affect the wider functioning.

The CRA: what has been the impact on the constitution of reform of the judiciary by the 2005 Constitutional Reform Act (CRA).

The HRA: the passage of the Human Rights Act (1998) may be considered a constitutional reform. Discussion of the merits and demerits of the Act would allow for discussion of the nature of the constitution more generally.

Other reforms might be considered (e.g. changes to PMQs, changes to the electoral systems used in the UK) and 'unfinished business' may be considered briefly, e.g. the Lords, a written constitution, prerogative powers exercised by the Prime Minister, 'fair votes', the desirability of referendums, financing of devolved institutions.

6 Different electoral systems are currently used within the UK. Evaluate the case for and against adopting any one of these systems for elections to the House of Commons. [50]

General

The generic mark scheme is the most important guide for examiners and drives the marking of all answers. Assess which level best reflects most of each answer. No answer is required to demonstrate all the descriptions in any level to qualify. Examiners are looking for 'best fit', not 'perfect fit'. Provisionally award the middle mark in the level and then moderate up or down according to the qualities of the answer, using the question-specific marking notes below.

No set answer is expected. Candidates may answer the question from a wide variety of different angles, using different emphases, and arguing different points of view. The marking notes here are indicative and not exhaustive. What matters is the quality of the evaluation and the argument. That said, candidates must answer the question set and not their own question.

Specific

A 50:50 balance between arguments in favour and those against is not expected, but there must be a seriously balanced discussion. Candidates need to be clear about the system that they have chosen to consider and demonstrate a clear knowledge of how that system works. In considering the merits of any system that has an element of proportionality, candidates may argue that it would remove disadvantages of the present system, such as: the reduction in the over-representation of the winning party and major parties so power is not given to those without majority backing, a reduction in the number of wasted votes, the improved performance of small parties with broad support, votes not being of equal value, the limited choice available to electors, general elections being decided in only a small number of constituencies by a fraction of the electorate, and that coalition government might be produced.

In considering the disadvantages of adopting a new system, candidates may refer to some of the following: any other system may be harder for the electorate to understand and lead to voter apathy, the new system may not provide a clear outcome and produce compromise and weak government, the possible creation of two tiers of MPs, the possible loss of the one-to-one constituency link. The specific issues discussed will depend upon the system chosen for consideration.

Section B (USA)**7 Explain what presidential government is.****[25]**General

The generic mark scheme is the most important guide for examiners and drives the marking of all answers. Assess which level best reflects most of each answer. No answer is required to demonstrate all the descriptions in any level to qualify. Examiners are looking for 'best fit', not 'perfect fit'. Provisionally award the middle mark in the level and then moderate up or down according to the qualities of the answer, using the question-specific marking notes below.

No set answer is expected. Candidates may answer the question from a wide variety of different angles, using different emphases, and arguing different points of view. The marking notes here are indicative and not exhaustive. What matters is the quality of the evaluation and the argument. That said, candidates must answer the question set and not their own question.

Specific

This question examines the relationship between the three branches of the federal government, the separation of powers and the idea of constitutional checks and balances. The defining feature is not simply that there is a president but rather that there is an institutional separation of powers resulting from a constitutional separation of powers. Checks and balances are at its heart. The elected branches are elected separately and each has fixed terms of office. The executive (President) is not a member of the legislature. He or she cannot command the legislature, nor can the legislature remove the President through a simple vote (super-majorities and extra-constitutional measures are required to remove a president from office). The president is chosen by the people, not by the legislature.

Answers might discuss the extent to which the term 'presidential government' can be viewed as a misnomer (Charles O. Jones argues that the term suggests the President is powerful within this system whereas, for him, the US political system should be described as a 'separated system' with a limited and weak president). Alternatively, some candidates may argue that the system of checks and balances has been thrown out of balance by the development of a 'unitary executive' (e.g. John Yoo), and/or discuss the idea of 'separate institutions sharing powers' (Richard E Neustadt) – there cannot be a complete separation of powers since the Founding Fathers clearly intended for the powers of the federal government to be shared.

8 Explain the role of the Supreme Court as part of the US political system.**[25]**General

The generic mark scheme is the most important guide for examiners and drives the marking of all answers. Assess which level best reflects most of each answer. No answer is required to demonstrate all the descriptions in any level to qualify. Examiners are looking for 'best fit', not 'perfect fit'. Provisionally award the middle mark in the level and then moderate up or down according to the qualities of the answer, using the question-specific marking notes below.

No set answer is expected. Candidates may answer the question from a wide variety of different angles, using different emphases, and arguing different points of view. The marking notes here are indicative and not exhaustive. What matters is the quality of the evaluation and the argument. That said, candidates must answer the question set and not their own question.

Specific

The Supreme Court plays an integral role within a presidential system of government established in a codified constitution. At the heart of the constitution is the idea of separation of powers that will balance 'power against power' to create a system of checks and balances – to produce what Neustadt called 'separate institutions sharing powers'. For over two centuries, the Supreme Court has performed the primary role of acting as the ultimate or supreme constitutional court within the US. The Court is the arbiter of the constitution. It exercises the power of judicial review to ensure that the constitution is preserved. The Court can be more or less activist (Warren; Vinson) but all Supreme Courts will, at times, challenge the actions of the President, the Congress and State governments. Crucially, the Supreme Court, in preserving the constitution, will ensure that central elements within the political system are maintained – e.g. the 10th amendment preserves the essence of federalism against overly-powerful central government.

Answers may consider the limits on the Court (the lack of any power of the purse or the sword, as well as the notion of restraint) or the argument that the Court can act primarily as a political rather than a judicial body – with the debate over how to exercise the power of judicial review (strict v. loose constructionism) at the heart of all nominations hearings. How a justice exercises judicial review can shape, for a generation, the social and moral direction of the nation.

Candidates may take issue with any of the points noted above: for example, the Rehnquist Court was described as restrained rather than activist, yet whether or not a Court is activist has no bearing on whether or not a Court pursues one ideological direction or another (does restraint allow strict constructionism to dominate?). Candidates may wish to argue that, in practice, there are few limits on the Court, or that the Court follows election returns – it is never that far out of step with the elected branches.

9 Explain how the power of the states and the federal government are defined and upheld. [25]

General

The generic mark scheme is the most important guide for examiners and drives the marking of all answers. Assess which level best reflects most of each answer. No answer is required to demonstrate all the descriptions in any level to qualify. Examiners are looking for 'best fit', not 'perfect fit'. Provisionally award the middle mark in the level and then moderate up or down according to the qualities of the answer, using the question-specific marking notes below.

No set answer is expected. Candidates may answer the question from a wide variety of different angles, using different emphases, and arguing different points of view. The marking notes here are indicative and not exhaustive. What matters is the quality of the evaluation and the argument. That said, candidates must answer the question set and not their own question.

Specific

One approach to this question would be to start with the constitution of the states and the federal government. By examining the original intent of the Founding Fathers, we see a tension between the need to create a central system of government that was stronger than that created in the Articles of Confederation and the revulsion of many of the framers to the idea of vesting too much power in the hands of the new federal government. The embodiment of this tension lives in the 10th Amendment which gives some power to the federal government on the basis of an agreement (the root word at the heart of federalism) that power resided with the state governments and some, but only some, to the federal government. Any power not explicitly handed to the federal government resides with the states.

The question might be approached using the constitution as the starting point, beginning with an overview of Dual Federalism. Candidates may examine the current federal-state balance and might consider how it has changed. Some may examine how the Supreme Court has played an active role in policing the boundary between federal and state government – landmark cases tending to define the changing balance (from Dual Federalism to Cooperative, to new Federalism), e.g. *Garcia* (1983). Candidates are not expected to know a battery of such cases, but they must use some to help support and develop their arguments. Candidates may want to emphasise that, despite the changing federal balance, the states are ultimately protected from an overly powerful federal government by the 10th Amendment.

10 To what extent does the USA have an entirely two-party system?**[50]**General

The generic mark scheme is the most important guide for examiners and drives the marking of all answers. Assess which level best reflects most of each answer. No answer is required to demonstrate all the descriptions in any level to qualify. Examiners are looking for 'best fit', not 'perfect fit'. Provisionally award the middle mark in the level and then moderate up or down according to the qualities of the answer, using the question-specific marking notes below.

No set answer is expected. Candidates may answer the question from a wide variety of different angles, using different emphases, and arguing different points of view. The marking notes here are indicative and not exhaustive. What matters is the quality of the evaluation and the argument. That said, candidates must answer the question set and not their own question.

Specific

Candidates may define what a 'two-party system' is, noting the US system typically militates against the success of third parties, although discussion of third parties who have made an impact on elections (state and national) may be worthy of merit. The central argument that candidates may consider is whether in a federal system that is, in addition, characterised by the separation of powers, there are in fact 50 party systems – rather than just one. The claim is that each state has its own party system: parties are 'quasi-public institutions' regulated by state legislatures. US parties do not aggregate those with broadly similar ideological views, not least because federalism and the separation of powers do not easily allow parties to function in such a way, but also because US parties are not mass membership organisations.

The Republican Revolution in the 104th Congress (1995–97) may be cited as evidence of the resurgence of national party. Candidates may argue that since the zenith of the decline thesis, a number of factors have actually enhanced the ability of the national party leadership to lead both state and national parties (e.g. the demise of the Committee Chair; the resurgence of party leadership in House and Senate).

Candidates may focus on the nature of party and the extent to which each of the major two parties has become more ideological coherent in recent years – citing this coherence as evidence of the continued dominance of national party organisations.

11 To what extent has George W. Bush reasserted the power of the President over Congress?
[50]General

The generic mark scheme is the most important guide for examiners and drives the marking of all answers. Assess which level best reflects most of each answer. No answer is required to demonstrate all the descriptions in any level to qualify. Examiners are looking for 'best fit', not 'perfect fit'. Provisionally award the middle mark in the level and then moderate up or down according to the qualities of the answer, using the question-specific marking notes below.

No set answer is expected. Candidates may answer the question from a wide variety of different angles, using different emphases, and arguing different points of view. The marking notes here are indicative and not exhaustive. What matters is the quality of the evaluation and the argument. That said, candidates must answer the question set and not their own question.

Specific

Most answers may answer this question in relation to the policy achievements and failures of Bush (both foreign and domestic policy), but it would also be possible to consider presidential power more widely (to include perhaps: the two presidencies thesis, comparisons to other recent presidents, the idea of Bush as a 'unitary executive'). The success of a President can be measured in terms of the presidential 'support score' – how often a President wins in recorded votes in each chamber of Congress. Bush was well above the average score for his first five years in office. The limits on this measure may be discussed. There may be scope for discussing the composition of Congress and the fact that Bush had a bump in his mid-term elections in 2002, but that the Democrats regained the Congress in 2006. Answers may consider the presidential style of dealing with Congress. Answers may also analyse Bush's two terms in relation to domestic policy and to foreign policy. In his first term, Bush did achieve a number of legislative successes.

Some might consider the abuse of presidential power by Bush (e.g. his defence of the use of torture or his actions based on the claim that, in wire-tapping the foreign calls of US citizens, he has, as commander-in-chief, the power to suspend law in wartime) and thus whether Bush has brought the presidency in disrepute. Nixon claimed that 'when the president does it, it is not illegal'. In usurping legislative power, has Bush launched a similar assault on the US Constitution? Most commentators argue that Bush's White House has made an unprecedented reach for power. It has systematically attempted to defy, control, or threaten the institutions that could challenge it: Congress, the courts, and the press. It has attempted to upset the balance of power among the three branches of government provided for in the Constitution; but its most aggressive and consistent assaults have been against the legislative branch: Bush has time and again said that he feels free to carry out a law as he sees fit, not as Congress wrote it. Through secrecy and contemptuous treatment of Congress, the Bush White House has made the executive branch less accountable than at any time in modern American history. And because of the complaisance of Congress, it has largely succeeded in its efforts.

12 Assess the effect of recent judicial activism on the US political system. To what extent does this uphold the wishes of the Founding Fathers? [50]

General

The generic mark scheme is the most important guide for examiners and drives the marking of all answers. Assess which level best reflects most of each answer. No answer is required to demonstrate all the descriptions in any level to qualify. Examiners are looking for 'best fit', not 'perfect fit'. Provisionally award the middle mark in the level and then moderate up or down according to the qualities of the answer, using the question-specific marking notes below.

No set answer is expected. Candidates may answer the question from a wide variety of different angles, using different emphases, and arguing different points of view. The marking notes here are indicative and not exhaustive. What matters is the quality of the evaluation and the argument. That said, candidates must answer the question set and not their own question.

Specific

This question allows candidates to consider many elements. Candidates might present an overview of the role of the Supreme Court as a powerful constitutional court which can and does exercise the power of judicial review. Many may use landmark Supreme Court rulings to provide supporting evidence for its impact on the US political system. Some may explore the key distinction between judicial activism and judicial restraint, and may link these to the question of whether Supreme Court justices are loose or strict constructionists. Candidates may also explore how far justices can be accused of acting politically (what O'Brien calls 'politicians in robes') when taking a case, or indeed when failing to take a case – whichever way any court acts with respect to an issue, it faces the charge of acting as a political body. Some may take issue with the question, asking whether there has been any recent judicial activism, given that the Rehnquist and Roberts Courts appeared to favour judicial restraint.

Candidates may legitimately consider what the Founding Fathers expected the role of the Supreme Court to be, and may arrive at quite opposite views with respect to those intentions since discussion of original intent has raged for the past two centuries. Strict constructionists would suggest that liberal Supreme Courts have gone far beyond the role that the Founding Fathers intended for the Court. Loose constructionists might argue for evidence in the Constitution (Article III, Section II for example), the Federalist Papers and elsewhere that supports the compatibility of judicial activism with the intent of the Founding Fathers.

Some might discuss in more theoretical terms the competing notions of jurisprudence: sociological jurisprudence and legal realism may be cited in support of the view that the Supreme Court can and should move beyond the constraints of precedent (*stare decisis*) to consider the economic and social underpinnings of the law. The growth in judicial activism is often attributed to the increasing dominance of these two positions in the mid twentieth century.



UNIVERSITY OF CAMBRIDGE INTERNATIONAL EXAMINATIONS
Cambridge International Level 3 Pre-U Certificate
Principal Subject

COMPARATIVE GOVERNMENT AND POLITICS

9770/02

Paper 2 Parties and Ideas (UK and/or USA)

For Examination from 2010

SPECIMEN PAPER

1 hour 30 minutes

Additional Materials: Answer Paper/Booklet

READ THESE INSTRUCTIONS FIRST

Write your Centre number, candidate number and name on all the work you hand in.

Write in dark blue or black pen.

Do not use staples, paper clips, highlighters, glue or correction fluid.

This paper contains two sections

Answer **two** short questions and **one** long question chosen all from Section A **or** all from Section B **or** the short essays from one section and the long essay from the other.

You are advised to spend 20 minutes on each short essay and 45 minutes on the long essay.

Every short essay is marked out of 25 and every full essay is marked out of 50.

This document consists of **3** printed pages and **1** blank page.



Section A: Parties and Ideas in the UK**Short essays**

- 1 Explain what conservatives mean by the idea of 'organic society'. [25]
- 2 In what different ways has support for 'the collective' been given expression in the Labour Party? [25]
- 3 Explain the functions of political parties in the UK. [25]

Full essays

- 4 How far are the ideas of New Labour and the 'Third Way' true to the principles of social democracy? [50]
- 5 Evaluate the significance of 'modernisers' within the Conservative Party from 1997 and the extent to which they now provide the leading ideas within the Conservative Party. [50]
- 6 To what extent are all three of the UK's main parties now liberal? [50]

Section B: Parties and Ideas in the US**Short essays**

- 7 Explain the main sources of party funding. [25]
- 8 Explain the term 'iron triangles'. Why are they important? [25]
- 9 Explain who the key figures are in providing leadership within a US political party. [25]

Full essays

- 10 'Full racial equality has now been achieved in the USA.' How far do you agree with this view? [50]
- 11 To what extent are the neo-conservative ideas of President George W Bush consistent with established Republican principles? [50]
- 12 Assess the impact of the green movement on the development of ideas within US party politics. [50]

BLANK PAGE

Permission to reproduce items where third-party owned material protected by copyright is included has been sought and cleared where possible. Every reasonable effort has been made by the publisher (UCLES) to trace copyright holders, but if any items requiring clearance have unwittingly been included, the publisher will be pleased to make amends at the earliest possible opportunity.

University of Cambridge International Examinations is part of the Cambridge Assessment Group. Cambridge Assessment is the brand name of University of Cambridge Local Examinations Syndicate (UCLES), which is itself a department of the University of Cambridge.



UNIVERSITY OF CAMBRIDGE INTERNATIONAL EXAMINATIONS
Cambridge International Level 3 Pre-U Certificate
Principal Subject

COMPARATIVE GOVERNMENT AND POLITICS

9770/02

Paper 2 Parties and Ideas (UK and/or USA)

For Examination from 2010

SPECIMEN MARK SCHEME

1 hour 30 minutes

MAXIMUM MARK: 100

This document consists of **17** printed pages and **1** blank page.



Generic marking descriptors for Papers 2 (short essays)

- The full range of marks will be used as a matter of course.
- Examiners will look for the 'best fit', not a 'perfect fit' in applying the Levels.
- Examiners will provisionally award the middle mark in the Level and then moderate up/down according to individual qualities within the answer.
- The ratio of marks per AO will be 3:2.
- The weighting of marks for each AO should be considered, but this is reflected in the descriptor: marking should therefore be done holistically.
- Question-specific mark schemes will be neither exhaustive nor prescriptive. Appropriate, substantiated responses will always be rewarded.

Level/marks	Descriptors
<p style="text-align: center;">5</p> <p>25–21 marks</p>	<p>ANSWERS MAY NOT BE PERFECT, BUT WILL REPRESENT THE VERY BEST THAT MAY BE EXPECTED OF AN 18-YEAR-OLD.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Excellent focused explanation that answers the question convincingly. Towards the bottom, may be a little unbalanced in coverage yet the answer is still comprehensively explained and argued. • Excellent knowledge and understanding of relevant political terms and/or institutions. Answer is comprehensively supported by an excellent range of concepts and examples that are used to sustain the argument. • Excellent substantiated synthesis bringing the explanation together. • The answer is fluent and the grammar, punctuation and spelling are all precise.
<p style="text-align: center;">4</p> <p>20–16 marks</p>	<p>ANSWERS WILL SHOW MANY FEATRURES OF LEVEL 5, BUT THE QUALITY WILL BE UNEVEN ACROSS THE ANSWER.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A determined response to the question with strong explanation across most but not all of the answer. • High level of knowledge and understanding of relevant political terms and/or institutions. Answer is well illustrated with a variety of concepts and examples to support the argument. Description is avoided. • Good substantiated synthesis. • For the most part, the answer is fluent and shows an accuracy in grammar, punctuation and spelling.
<p style="text-align: center;">3</p> <p>15–11 marks</p>	<p>THE ARGUMENT WILL BE COMPETENT, BUT LEVEL 3 ANSWERS WILL BE LIMITED AND/OR UNBALANCED.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Engages well with the question, although explanation is patchy and, at the lower end, of limited quality. • Fair display of relevant political knowledge and understanding, but this tends to be used to illustrate rather than support the argument. Explanation starts to break down in significant sections of description. • Synthesis is patchy in quality. • The writing lacks some fluency, but on the whole shows an accuracy in grammar, punctuation and spelling.

<p style="text-align: center;">2</p> <p>10–6 marks</p>	<p>ANSWERS WILL SHOW A LIMITED LINK BETWEEN THE QUESTION AND ANSWER.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Some engagement with the question, but explanation is limited. • Limited explanation within an essentially descriptive response. • Patchy display of relevant political knowledge and understanding that illustrates rather than supports any argument. • Synthesis is limited/thin in quality and extent. • The answer shows some accuracy in grammar, punctuation and spelling, but contains frequent errors.
<p style="text-align: center;">1</p> <p>5–0 marks</p>	<p>ANSWERS WILL SHOW A CLEAR SENSE OF THE CANDIDATE HAVING LITTLE IF ANY ENGAGEMENT WITH THE QUESTION.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Little or no engagement with the question. • Little or no explanation. • Little or no relevant political knowledge. • Little or no synthesis. • The answer shows significant weaknesses in the accuracy of grammar, punctuation and spelling.

Generic marking descriptors for Paper 2 (full essays)

- The full range of marks will be used as a matter of course.
- Examiners will look for the 'best fit', not a 'perfect fit' in applying the Levels.
- Examiners will provisionally award the middle mark in the Level and then moderate up/down according to individual qualities within the answer.
- The ratio of marks per AO will be 1:2.
- The weighting of marks for each AO should be considered, but this is reflected in the descriptor: marking should therefore be done holistically.
- Question-specific mark schemes will be neither exhaustive nor prescriptive. Appropriate, substantiated responses will always be rewarded. Answers may develop a novel response to a question. This is to be credited if arguments are fully substantiated.

Level/marks	Descriptors
<p style="text-align: center;">5</p> <p>50–41 marks</p>	<p>ANSWERS MAY NOT BE PERFECT, BUT WILL REPRESENT THE VERY BEST THAT MAY BE EXPECTED OF AN 18-YEAR-OLD.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Excellent focused analysis that answers the question convincingly. • Excellent sustained argument throughout with a strong sense of direction that is always well substantiated. Excellent substantiated conclusions. • Excellent understanding of relevant political knowledge (processes, institutions, concepts, debates and/or theories) illustrated with a wide range of examples. • Towards the bottom, may be a little unbalanced in coverage yet the answer is still comprehensively argued. • Candidate is always in firm control of the material. • The answer is fluent and the grammar, punctuation and spelling are all precise.
<p style="text-align: center;">4</p> <p>40–31 marks</p>	<p>ANSWERS WILL SHOW MANY FEATURES OF LEVEL 5, BUT THE QUALITY WILL BE UNEVEN ACROSS THE ANSWER.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A good response to the question with clear analysis across most but not all of the answer. • Argument developed to a logical conclusion, but parts lack rigour. Strong conclusions adequately substantiated. • Good but limited and/or uneven range of relevant knowledge used to support analysis and argument. Description is avoided. • For the most part, the answer is fluent and shows an accuracy in grammar, punctuation and spelling.
<p style="text-align: center;">3</p> <p>30–21 marks</p>	<p>THE ARGUMENT WILL BE COMPETENT, BUT LEVEL 3 ANSWERS WILL BE LIMITED AND/OR UNBALANCED.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Engages soundly with the question although analysis is patchy and, at the lower end, of limited quality. • Tries to argue and draw conclusions, but this breaks down in significant sections of description. • Good but limited and/or uneven range of relevant political knowledge used to describe rather than support analysis and argument. • The writing lacks some fluency, but on the whole shows an accuracy in grammar, punctuation and spelling.

<p style="text-align: center;">2</p> <p>20–10 marks</p>	<p>ANSWERS WILL SHOW A LIMITED LINK BETWEEN QUESTION & ANSWER.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Limited engagement with the question, with some understanding of the issues. Analysis and conclusions are limited/thin. • Limited argument within an essentially descriptive response. Conclusions are limited/thin. • Factually limited and/or uneven. Some irrelevance. • Patchy display of relevant political knowledge. • The answer shows some accuracy in grammar, punctuation and spelling, but contains frequent errors.
<p style="text-align: center;">1</p> <p>9–0 marks</p>	<p>ANSWERS WILL SHOW A CLEAR SENSE OF THE CANDIDATE HAVING LITTLE IF ANY ENGAGEMENT WITH THE QUESTION.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Little or no engagement with the question. Little or no analysis offered. • Little or no argument. Assertions are unsupported and/or of limited relevance. Any conclusions are very weak. • Little or no relevant political knowledge. • The answer shows significant weaknesses in the accuracy of grammar, punctuation and spelling.

Section A (UK)**1 Explain what conservatives mean by the idea of ‘organic society’. [25]**General

The generic mark scheme is the most important guide for examiners and drives the marking of all answers. Assess which level best reflects most of each answer. No answer is required to demonstrate all the descriptions in any level to qualify. Examiners are looking for ‘best fit’, not ‘perfect fit’. Provisionally award the middle mark in the level and then moderate up or down according to the qualities of the answer, using the question-specific marking notes below.

No set answer is expected. Candidates may answer the question from a wide variety of different angles, using different emphases, and arguing different points of view. The marking notes here are indicative and not exhaustive. What matters is the relevance and quality of explanation. That said, candidates must answer the question set and not their own question.

Specific

Conservatives mean that society changes through an evolutionary process of natural development, which reflects their pragmatic approach (in contrast to those who make ideologically-driven changes so as to create their ideal society). The idea of society developing organically is one of the key points which distinguishes the conservative view from others. Whilst the focus of the answer must remain on organic society, connections need to be made to other related concepts (e.g. hierarchy and authority). Some may develop the point that conservatism is now a divided ideology and that New Right liberal ideas are at variance with belief in an organic society; and point out the paradox of the conservative New Right’s continued belief in an organic and hierarchical society. Credit should be given for making comparisons between the conservative view of society and the view of other ideologies. Answers that misinterpret the question as being all or mostly about the Conservative Party will not get beyond the lower levels.

2 In what different ways has support for ‘the collective’ been given expression in the Labour Party? [25]

General

The generic mark scheme is the most important guide for examiners and drives the marking of all answers. Assess which level best reflects most of each answer. No answer is required to demonstrate all the descriptions in any level to qualify. Examiners are looking for ‘best fit’, not ‘perfect fit’. Provisionally award the middle mark in the level and then moderate up or down according to the qualities of the answer, using the question-specific marking notes below.

No set answer is expected. Candidates may answer the question from a wide variety of different angles, using different emphases, and arguing different points of view. The marking notes here are indicative and not exhaustive. What matters is the relevance and quality of explanation. That said, candidates must answer the question set and not their own question.

Specific

Labour’s commitment to the collective reflects its ideas as to how society and the economy should be organised. This is rooted in the Party’s socialist/social democratic foundations and answers could make reference to the importance of class analysis, the idea that human nature is fundamentally benign when supported by positive interdependent relationships and the superiority of collective to individual action. Answers which briefly contrast this with the liberal model built around the individual and the conservative model built around the local community should be credited. Support for these ideas has been given expression in the Party’s commitment to social and economic justice. Reference could be made to matters such as: welfare, redistribution, progressive taxation, public ownership, state regulation and intervention, close relationships with the trade unions. This explanation could take one of a number of forms: for example, reference to the competition of ideas within Labour (e.g. between socialist and social democratic), or the Party’s reaction to changed social, economic and political circumstances (e.g. new Labour ideas being partly a reaction to globalisation and the New Right economic policies of Conservative governments).

3 Explain the functions of political parties in the UK.**[25]**General

The generic mark scheme is the most important guide for examiners and drives the marking of all answers. Assess which level best reflects most of each answer. No answer is required to demonstrate all the descriptions in any level to qualify. Examiners are looking for 'best fit', not 'perfect fit'. Provisionally award the middle mark in the level and then moderate up or down according to the qualities of the answer, using the question-specific marking notes below.

No set answer is expected. Candidates may answer the question from a wide variety of different angles, using different emphases, and arguing different points of view. The marking notes here are indicative and not exhaustive. What matters is the relevance and quality of explanation. That said, candidates must answer the question set and not their own question.

Specific

A strong answer will include a range of points with examples and some assessment as to how well these functions are performed. Key functions of political parties which could be covered include:

Policy: the development of new ideas for presentation in a manifesto.

Recruitment & support mobilisation: encouraging people to participate as voters, providing a vehicle for some to become activists, bringing together like minded people in a coalition which can have political impact.

Selection & leadership: ensuring the selection of appropriate candidates to present at elections. The process of campaigning for and holding political office provides experience and aids the selection of the best candidates for high office in the party (in and out of office).

The electoral function: parties provide the funds, personnel and ideas which form an election campaign and provide electoral choice. This process allows representatives for the legislature and an executive to be selected, in the process upholding the democratic principles of accountability and consent.

Education: parties' work, particularly during elections, through local campaigning and the media, informs and educates the public about issues and choices.

Representation: by bringing like minded people together, parties allow issues to be aired and particular groups in society to be represented in debate. Once elected as representatives, a party's councillors/AMs/MSPs/MEPs/MPs work together to speak both for their party and their constituency. Party systems and whips are central to legislative organisation and the effective running of institutions.

Government and executive leadership: manifesto ideas form the basis of a legislative programme for government, although the electoral systems at some levels produce coalitions in which policy pledges have to be negotiated/compromised.

4 How far are the ideas of New Labour and the ‘Third Way’ true to the principles of social democracy? [50]

General

The generic mark scheme is the most important guide for examiners and drives the marking of all answers. Assess which level best reflects most of each answer. No answer is required to demonstrate all the descriptions in any level to qualify. Examiners are looking for ‘best fit’, not ‘perfect fit’. Provisionally award the middle mark in the level and then moderate up or down according to the qualities of the answer, using the question-specific marking notes below.

No set answer is expected. Candidates may answer the question from a wide variety of different angles, using different emphases, and arguing different points of view. The marking notes here are indicative and not exhaustive. What matters is the quality of the evaluation and the argument. That said, candidates must answer the question set and not their own question.

Specific

A good answer needs to explain clearly the principles of social democracy as a reference point against which to assess how far New Labour and ‘Third Way’ ideas measure up to it. The inclusion of both New Labour and the ‘Third Way’ means both political and ideological ideas need to be assessed relative to social democracy. In establishing what social democratic principles mean for Labour, credit is to be given for consideration of the shifting ideological allegiance of the party during its history, providing this is done in terms of an explanation of ideas (not a historical narrative).

The principles of social democracy include social justice, collective action, a positive view of the state’s role, egalitarianism; credit should be given for an understanding of its relationship to socialism. The ideas of the ‘Third Way’ could be explained in terms of its accommodation with the market and neo-liberal economics whilst maintaining a commitment to core values of social democracy. Whether it is something distinctive (e.g. in its commitment to communitarianism and rights and responsibilities), a compromise between neo-liberal capitalism and socialism (or a modern adaptation of social democracy) may be considered. New Labour policies (e.g. PFI projects and the City Academy and Specialist Schools programmes) provide specific examples of these ideas. The ambition of New Labour’s founders to make the party electorally successful after long years in opposition might be seen as part of its social democratic tradition – or as desperation to win at any price, even by adopting Thatcherite policies.

5 Evaluate the significance of ‘modernisers’ within the Conservative Party from 1997 and the extent to which they now provide the leading ideas within the Conservative Party. [50]

General

The generic mark scheme is the most important guide for examiners and drives the marking of all answers. Assess which level best reflects most of each answer. No answer is required to demonstrate all the descriptions in any level to qualify. Examiners are looking for ‘best fit’, not ‘perfect fit’. Provisionally award the middle mark in the level and then moderate up or down according to the qualities of the answer, using the question-specific marking notes below.

No set answer is expected. Candidates may answer the question from a wide variety of different angles, using different emphases, and arguing different points of view. The marking notes here are indicative and not exhaustive. What matters is the quality of the evaluation and the argument. That said, candidates must answer the question set and not their own question.

Specific

A strong answer needs to address the changes in the Party from 1997 in terms of the different ideas which have shaped it, with reference to the people and events of the period to support this. Answers may explain the ‘modernisers’ ambitions for the Conservatives to win power again after the Blair/New Labour era by concentrating on their changes in ideas, although some reference to changes in image and campaigning are relevant. Answers may explain the ‘modernisers’ beliefs in various areas, e.g. society, the individual, the family, public services and economics. These may be related to earlier Conservative schools of thought, for example how they have drawn some ideas about society from the ‘One Nation’ tradition and ideas on economics from neo-liberal Thatcherism.

The significance of the ‘modernisers’ is that they have led the calls for change, for example during Michael Portillo’s failed leadership bid in 2001 and under David Cameron’s leadership since 2005. Recognition that not all Conservatives are ‘modernisers’ is important. The social authoritarian or ‘traditionalist’ wing remains influential. Some may evaluate the significance of the ‘modernisers’ relative to other groups within the party (e.g. Is the One Nation group still a force?). Further, one fruitful line would be to consider how far many of the leading ideas espoused by the Party under Cameron can be traced to One Nation and Thatcherite arguments.

6 To what extent are all three of the UK's main parties now liberal?**[50]**General

The generic mark scheme is the most important guide for examiners and drives the marking of all answers. Assess which level best reflects most of each answer. No answer is required to demonstrate all the descriptions in any level to qualify. Examiners are looking for 'best fit', not 'perfect fit'. Provisionally award the middle mark in the level and then moderate up or down according to the qualities of the answer, using the question-specific marking notes below.

No set answer is expected. Candidates may answer the question from a wide variety of different angles, using different emphases, and arguing different points of view. The marking notes here are indicative and not exhaustive. What matters is the quality of the evaluation and the argument. That said, candidates must answer the question set and not their own question.

Specific

Answers may consider what it means to be liberal, in terms of political theory and attitudes, e.g. towards the individual, the state and the market. Good answers will note different types of liberal theory, e.g. classical and modern or welfare liberalism and their influence on other ideologies, particularly the neo-liberalism of the New Right and the constitutional liberalism found in the social democrat and 'Third Way' tradition. Good answers will link such theoretical considerations to recent U.K. politics and include a balance of material on all three parties.

Liberal elements of the Labour Party might include consideration of its constitutional liberalism (e.g. devolution), social liberalism (e.g. introduction of civil partnerships) and to some extent its accommodation with the neo-liberal economics of the Thatcher period. This is the main claim to liberalism of the Conservative Party since 1979, although under Cameron some concessions to social liberalism are being shown. To New Liberalism and Welfare Liberalism, the Liberals/Liberal Democrats have added a focus on community politics which reflects liberal suspicion of centralised state direction as well as continuing strongly to support constitutional and social liberalism. Answers might refer to the 'Orange Book' liberals and the extent to which this reflects some return to classical liberal economic values or the fact that the modern Liberal Democrat Party is also descended from the social democratic tradition of the SDP (and Labour).

Section B (USA)**7 Explain the main sources of party funding.****[25]**General

The generic mark scheme is the most important guide for examiners and drives the marking of all answers. Assess which level best reflects most of each answer. No answer is required to demonstrate all the descriptions in any level to qualify. Examiners are looking for 'best fit', not 'perfect fit'. Provisionally award the middle mark in the level and then moderate up or down according to the qualities of the answer, using the question-specific marking notes below.

No set answer is expected. Candidates may answer the question from a wide variety of different angles, using different emphases, and arguing different points of view. The marking notes here are indicative and not exhaustive. What matters is the quality of the evaluation and the argument. That said, candidates must answer the question set and not their own question.

Specific

Candidates may present a fairly comprehensive list of the 'sources of party funding' while others may wish to locate their answer in the wider context of what US political parties are and what they do. Candidates may note that parties are amorphous organisations not easily defined. Party funding can focus upon candidates or election funding, funding from local party organisations or from the national party organisation (although much of the money raised nationally is actually spent by state and local party organisations). Presidential candidates can apply for federal match-funding, but this carries with it its own limitations. Some may wish to explore the limits placed upon party funding. The Federal Election Campaign Act (FECA) and its subsequent amendments, and the 2002 BCRA (Bipartisan Campaign Finance Reform Act, known as McCain-Feingold) might be discussed when considering 'hard' and 'soft' money. Those who discuss attempts to circumvent campaign finance laws might highlight the role of PACs and 527s.

8 Explain the term 'iron triangles'. Why are they important?**[25]**General

The generic mark scheme is the most important guide for examiners and drives the marking of all answers. Assess which level best reflects most of each answer. No answer is required to demonstrate all the descriptions in any level to qualify. Examiners are looking for 'best fit', not 'perfect fit'. Provisionally award the middle mark in the level and then moderate up or down according to the qualities of the answer, using the question-specific marking notes below.

No set answer is expected. Candidates may answer the question from a wide variety of different angles, using different emphases, and arguing different points of view. The marking notes here are indicative and not exhaustive. What matters is the quality of the evaluation and the argument. That said, candidates must answer the question set and not their own question.

Specific

Some may start by explaining what Douglass Cater meant by the term 'iron triangle' and will be able to define the groups which occupy each corner of the triangle. Answers may demonstrate that the iron triangle represents one attempt to explain policy formulation within government – with an iron triangle for each of the major policy areas (some may refer to Eisenhower's discussion of the military-industrial complex). Some knowledge of who is at the heart of a specific iron triangle (e.g. the Bureaucracy, Congressional Committees and Interest Groups) may help to clarify the answer. Candidates are free to probe beyond the question and consider whether iron triangles are important. Iron triangles represent one attempt to capture the idea of 'policy sub-governments' and candidates may want to discuss how and whether these act in the public interest (Pluralism) or against it (Elite Theory). Whether or not candidates accept the iron triangle metaphor or widen their discussion to include Hecló's less rigid metaphor (the 'issue network'), answers need to discuss whether or not the idea of a policy sub-government matters.

9 Explain who the key figures are in providing leadership within a US political party. [25]General

The generic mark scheme is the most important guide for examiners and drives the marking of all answers. Assess which level best reflects most of each answer. No answer is required to demonstrate all the descriptions in any level to qualify. Examiners are looking for 'best fit', not 'perfect fit'. Provisionally award the middle mark in the level and then moderate up or down according to the qualities of the answer, using the question-specific marking notes below.

No set answer is expected. Candidates may answer the question from a wide variety of different angles, using different emphases, and arguing different points of view. The marking notes here are indicative and not exhaustive. What matters is the quality of the evaluation and the argument. That said, candidates must answer the question set and not their own question.

Specific

Many may note that party leadership can be considered at local, state and national levels. Parties have local party personnel (ward, precinct), personnel at city level, then county level, then Congressional district level, then state level. There are also national party leaders in the House, the Senate and, perhaps, the White House. Candidates are not to be expected to provide detailed coverage of all of these levels, though some may want to. Candidates do, however, need to give some sense of whom they consider to be the key leaders within the party (so judgements can be made here). Some may focus on national party organisations – perhaps the DNC and the RNC (as well as the Democratic Leadership Council and similar Republican organisations). Candidates may choose to describe the leadership provided within the federal government by leaders in Congress: the Speaker in the House, the minority and majority party leadership, chairs of powerful committees (e.g. House Rules), whips, the party caucuses in each chamber, the role of party chairpersons. Some answers might discuss changes to national and state parties and their roles (e.g. the impact of primaries on candidate selection and election). Some might consider how far it is possible to lead a US party: e.g. Gingrich's failed attempt to lead with the Contract for America, Pelosi's current attempt after the recent mid-terms.

10 'Full racial equality has now been achieved in the USA.' How far do you agree with this view? [50]

General

The generic mark scheme is the most important guide for examiners and drives the marking of all answers. Assess which level best reflects most of each answer. No answer is required to demonstrate all the descriptions in any level to qualify. Examiners are looking for 'best fit', not 'perfect fit'. Provisionally award the middle mark in the level and then moderate up or down according to the qualities of the answer, using the question-specific marking notes below.

No set answer is expected. Candidates may answer the question from a wide variety of different angles, using different emphases, and arguing different points of view. The marking notes here are indicative and not exhaustive. What matters is the quality of the evaluation and the argument. That said, candidates must answer the question set and not their own question.

Specific

Candidates need to suggest their own criterion for deciding what exactly constitutes full racial equality. Candidates will also decide the scope of the question: to focus solely on African Americans or to widen the debate to include other racial groupings (including Caucasians).

There are many valid approaches both to defining this term and to assessing how far it has been achieved. One approach would be to distinguish *de jure* from *de facto* equality. It would seem reasonable to suggest that the various amendments, plus the role of the Supreme Court and the role of the elected branches, have established *de jure* equality in the US. Against that foundation, candidates could then assess how far *de facto* equality exists.

The current debates on Affirmative Action might form the centrepiece of some answers, given that the debate is, at heart, about the extent to which one pursues *de facto* equality having achieved *de jure* equality. Also relevant could be the questions of how far one seeks to undo the legacy of 75 years of segregation (and two centuries of slavery) and how far one focuses on racial equality when other forms of equality may be relevant (e.g. socio-economic equality). Some candidates may use landmark Supreme Court cases in their answers, e.g. Gratz and Grutter (2003), to focus on the manner in which Affirmative Action has affected Caucasian Americans.

11 To what extent are the neo-conservative ideas of President George W Bush consistent with established Republican principles? [50]

General

The generic mark scheme is the most important guide for examiners and drives the marking of all answers. Assess which level best reflects most of each answer. No answer is required to demonstrate all the descriptions in any level to qualify. Examiners are looking for 'best fit', not 'perfect fit'. Provisionally award the middle mark in the level and then moderate up or down according to the qualities of the answer, using the question-specific marking notes below.

No set answer is expected. Candidates may answer the question from a wide variety of different angles, using different emphases, and arguing different points of view. The marking notes here are indicative and not exhaustive. What matters is the quality of the evaluation and the argument. That said, candidates must answer the question set and not their own question.

Specific

Candidates may start by addressing some of the following questions: How do we identify established Republican principles? What are neo-conservative ideas? What variant of neo-conservative thinking does the President best encapsulate – if any? They may view the Republican party as having a two-dimensional cleavage: the first separates members along a 'welfarist-market' axis, with those at one end suggesting the state can/does have an interventionist role in providing welfare; those at the other end, often termed Fiscal Conservatives, viewing big government as bad government (Reagan, at least in his rhetoric, illustrating the latter). The second axis is 'liberal-authoritarian' – those at one end accepting a multilateral role for the state while those at the other are unilateral (although, crucially, accepting an interventionist foreign policy). The term Social Conservatives would cover many. Some may note 'neoconservatives are likely to be authoritarian and free-market' Neoconservatives argue they are free-marketeters and authoritarian, but interventionist in foreign policy.

Analysis of how Bush's approach is consistent with established Republican principles will need to consider various dimensions, such as: social issues (e.g. education reform; health and also welfare policy), fiscal matters (tax cuts in his first term), foreign policy (e.g. Axis of Evil speech, Doctrine of Pre-Emption, War on Terror). Some may question how consistently neoconservative Bush has been during his two terms. The removal of Paul Wolfowitz and John Bolton from within the inner circle might be cited as one example of his lukewarm embrace of neoconservatism.

12 Assess the impact of the green movement on the development of ideas within US party politics. [50]

General

The generic mark scheme is the most important guide for examiners and drives the marking of all answers. Assess which level best reflects most of each answer. No answer is required to demonstrate all the descriptions in any level to qualify. Examiners are looking for 'best fit', not 'perfect fit'. Provisionally award the middle mark in the level and then moderate up or down according to the qualities of the answer, using the question-specific marking notes below.

No set answer is expected. Candidates may answer the question from a wide variety of different angles, using different emphases, and arguing different points of view. The marking notes here are indicative and not exhaustive. What matters is the quality of the evaluation and the argument. That said, candidates must answer the question set and not their own question.

Specific

Candidates may want to work from the evidence that suggests the two major parties have adopted positions that reflect the pressure brought to bear by the activities of the green movement. They may also discuss whether we can assess how the activities of the green movement have shaped party policies, and/or consider the role of pressure groups and the influence of the media in shaping party policies.

While it is not necessary to present a long-term historical perspective, candidates may be rewarded for some context, e.g. noting the Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) created in 1970. Nixon was no advocate of the environment and was conscious of the need to avoid placing what he saw as an undue regulatory burden upon business. Yet he created EPA after a growing body of pressure from the environmental movement, e.g. Carson's *Silent Spring*, the Torrey Canyon oil spill, toxic waste found near Niagara, the first Earth Day conference. In short, EPA was created because of the pressure of the environmental movement.

Candidates may note that while the electoral system militates against the success of the green movement, the two major parties have, arguably, adopted of late many of the issues placed centre-stage by the green movement.

The Democrats:

Candidates may build a picture that suggests the green movement has shaped more recent Democrat thinking. Gore, in 2000, gave a great deal of weight to the environment, partly because of the influence of the Democrat Leadership Council (DLC) over the previous decade, and in large part because of the influence of Ralph Nader. Nader made a big impact in the 1996 campaign – despite his meagre electoral successes (largely restricted to the Pacific states where he gained half of his entire votes). In 2000, Nader seemingly pushed Gore to discuss environmental issues, though Gore may have alienated some of his moderate Democrat support in so doing. In 2004, the state Democrat parties placed environmental issues within their mission statement. Gore won the Nobel Prize for *An Inconvenient Truth* and leads criticism of US failure to tackle climate change.

The Republicans:

George W. Bush has, arguably, avoided the influence of the green movement. He did not sign the Kyoto protocol and used Executive Orders to weaken environmental standards that EPA had put in place. In his second term, Bush made legislative proposals to expand use of the Arctic Wildlife Reserve in Alaska. However, other Republicans have engaged with environmental issues, e.g. the Tuesday Group (moderate Republicans favouring bipartisanship) have debated green issues.



UNIVERSITY OF CAMBRIDGE INTERNATIONAL EXAMINATIONS
Cambridge International Level 3 Pre-U Certificate
Principal Subject

COMPARATIVE GOVERNMENT AND POLITICS

9770/03

Paper 3 Ideologies and Philosophies

For Examination from 2010

SPECIMEN PAPER

2 hours

Additional Materials: Answer Paper/Booklet

READ THESE INSTRUCTIONS FIRST

Write your Centre number, candidate number and name on all the work you hand in.

Write in dark blue or black pen.

Do not use staples, paper clips, highlighters, glue or correction fluid.

This paper contains five options.

Answer **both** questions set on each of **two** options.

For each option, you are advised to spend 20 minutes on part (a) questions and 40 minutes on part (b).
The time allowed for part (a) includes time for reading the two texts.

Every part (a) question is marked out of 15 and every part (b) question is marked out of 35.

This document consists of **6** printed pages.



If answering on this option, answer **both** sub-questions.

1 Liberalism and the Individual

Passage A

Liberalism stands for liberty, but it is an error to think that a policy of liberty must always be negative, that the state can help liberty only by abstaining from action, that invariably men are free-est when their government does least.

(William Beveridge)

Passage B

This is the greatest danger that today threatens civilisation: State intervention; the absorption of all spontaneous social effort by the state, that is to say, of spontaneous historical action, which in the long run sustains, nourishes and impels human destinies. When the mass suffers an ill-fortune or simply feels some strong appetite, its great temptation is that permanent, sure possibility, of obtaining everything – without effort, doubt, struggle, or risk – merely by touching a button and setting the mighty machine in motion. ... The contemporary state and the mass coincide only in being anonymous. But the mass-man does in fact believe that he is the State, and he will tend more and more to set its machinery working on whatsoever pretext, to crush beneath it any creative minority which disturbs it. ... The result of this tendency will be fatal.

(Jose Ortega y Gasset)

- (a) Compare the views on the nature of the state expressed in these two extracts. [15]
- (b) Evaluate the ways in which liberals have sought to reconcile the claims of the individual with those of the state. [35]

If answering on this option, answer **both** sub-questions.

2 Conservatism and the Nation

Passage A

The forces of Conservatism will stand where they have always stood. We will stand for the nation. Conservatives believe in nation because nations allow justice and fairness to be defended as part of a shared moral understanding, and Conservatives believe in justice and fairness. Conservatives believe in nation because nations depend on tradition and protect tradition, and Conservatives believe in the value of tradition. When Conservatives defend nation we are accused of defending everything that is small and narrow and petty in life. I believe that, on the contrary, when Conservatives defend nation we are defending so much that is great and large and generous in life. So Conservatives believe in nation and we will defend nation.

(William Hague, speech at the annual conference of the British Conservative Party, October 1999)

Passage B

England consisted in the ... habits, the institutions and the culture that I have described in these pages. Almost all have died ... the institutions and customs that I have described depended on England being a somewhere and a home. They have therefore been dismantled, either by corruption or decree ... [My father's] protest was a protest against the forces that were disenchanting England; and if he identified these forces with big business, and big business with the Tory Party, was he wholly wrong?

(Roger Scuton, *England: An Elegy*, 2000)

- (a) Compare these two assessments of the significance of 'nation' for Conservatives. [15]
- (b) 'Conservatives believe in tradition; they are suspicious of change.' How far do you agree? [35]

If answering on this option, answer **both** sub-questions.

3 Socialism and the Common Good

Passage A

Hitherto, every form of society has been based, as we have already seen, on the antagonism of oppressed and oppressing classes ... But does wage-labour create any property for the labourer? Not a bit. It creates capital, i.e. that kind of property which exploits wage-labour, and which cannot increase except upon condition of begetting a new supply of wage-labour for fresh exploitation.

(Marx and Engels, *The Communist Manifesto*, 1848)

Passage B

The prospects of this struggle do not depend on the theory of the concentration of capital in the hands of a diminishing number of magnates, nor on the whole dialectical scaffolding of which this is a plank, but on the growth of social wealth and of social productive forces, in conjunction with general social progress, and, particularly, in the intellectual and moral advance of the working classes themselves.

(Eduard Bernstein, *Evolutionary Socialism*, 1899)

- (a) To what extent does Bernstein disagree with Marx and Engels' ideas about class struggle? [15]
- (b) To what extent and why has socialism departed from the ideas of Marx? [35]

If answering on this option, answer **both** sub-questions.

4 Democracy and its critics

Passage A

The deliberate and deadly attacks, which were carried out yesterday against our country, were more than acts of terror. They were acts of war. This will be a monumental struggle of good versus evil, but good will prevail. Freedom and democracy are under attack. The American people need to know we're facing a different enemy than we have ever faced. This enemy hides in shadows and has no regard for human life. This is an enemy who preys on innocent and unsuspecting people, then runs for cover, but it won't be able to run for cover forever. This is an enemy that tries to hide, but it won't be able to hide forever. The United States of America will use all our resources to conquer this enemy. We will rally the world. We will be patient ... This battle will take time and resolve, but make no mistake about it, we will win. But we will not allow this enemy to win the war by changing our way of life or restricting our freedoms. ... America is united. The freedom-loving nations of the world stand by our side ... This will be a monumental struggle of good versus evil, but good will prevail.

(Speech by President George W Bush, 12 September 2001)

Passage B

No one argues today about three facts that are known to everyone.

First, for over seven years the United States has been occupying the lands of Islam, plundering its riches, dictating to its rulers, humiliating its people, terrorising its neighbours ... Third, if the Americans' aims behind these wars are religious and economic, the aim is also to serve the Jews' petty state [Israel] ... All these crimes are sins committed by the Americans and a clear declaration of war on Allah, his Messenger, and Muslims.

(Osama bin Laden and others, 'Jihad against Jews and Crusaders')

- (a) To what extent do Bush and bin Laden take different positions? [15]
- (b) 'Representative democracy is one political system among many: its values are not inherently better than any other.' Assess this view with reference to at least two political systems you have studied. [35]

If answering on this option, answer **both** sub-questions.

5 Global Ideological debates

Passage A

Sovereign states are waging a war of competitive deregulation, forced on them by the global free market. A mechanism of downward harmonisation of market economies is already in operation. To imagine that the social market economies of the past can renew themselves intact under the forces of downward harmonisation is the most dangerous of the many illusions associated with the global market. Instead social market systems are being compelled progressively to dismantle themselves, so that they can compete on more equal terms with economies in which environmental, social and labour costs are lowest. If sources of revenue – capital, enterprises and people – are free to migrate to low tax regimes, mutually agreed coercion does not work as a means of paying for public goods. In general terms the contradictions between social democracy and global free markets seem irreconcilable.

(John Gray, *False Dawn: the Delusions of Global Capitalism*, 2000)

Passage B

Fear not. Globalisation may constrain governments in some ways, but it does not seriously undermine their powers. Why? Because neither companies, nor people, nor even money are really footloose and fancy-free. All of them are still more or less tied to places, and so governments still have sway over them. Even if people were entirely free to move, very few would. Taxes are not simply costs; they bring benefits too. Competition for investment can actually raise environmental standards. Why, then, do politicians often tell us we don't have a choice any more? Are they simply mistaken, like Thomas Friedman and Noreena Hertz? Or, do they just find it convenient to lie to us? The truth is probably a bit of both.

(Philippe Legrain, *Open Word: the Truth about Globalisation*, 2004)

- (a)** Compare the views that these two writers offer on globalisation and its consequences. [15]
- (b)** 'Globalisation is rendering the nation-state obsolete.' How far do you agree? [35]

Permission to reproduce items where third-party owned material protected by copyright is included has been sought and cleared where possible. Every reasonable effort has been made by the publisher (UCLES) to trace copyright holders, but if any items requiring clearance have unwittingly been included, the publisher will be pleased to make amends at the earliest possible opportunity.

University of Cambridge International Examinations is part of the Cambridge Assessment Group. Cambridge Assessment is the brand name of University of Cambridge Local Examinations Syndicate (UCLES), which is itself a department of the University of Cambridge.



UNIVERSITY OF CAMBRIDGE INTERNATIONAL EXAMINATIONS
Cambridge International Level 3 Pre-U Certificate
Principal Subject

COMPARATIVE GOVERNMENT AND POLITICS

9770/03

Paper 3 Ideologies and Philosophies

For Examination from 2010

SPECIMEN MARK SCHEME

2 hours

MAXIMUM MARK: 100

This document consists of **15** printed pages and **1** blank page.



Generic marking descriptors for Paper 3 sub-Q (a) [short essays]

- The full range of marks will be used as a matter of course.
- Examiners will look for the 'best fit', not a 'perfect fit' in applying the Levels.
- Examiners will provisionally award the middle mark in the Level and then moderate up/down according to individual qualities within the answer.
- The ratio of marks per AO will be 1:1.
- The weighting of marks for each AO should be considered, but this is reflected in the descriptor: marking should therefore be done holistically.
- Question-specific mark schemes will be neither exhaustive nor prescriptive. Appropriate, substantiated responses will always be rewarded.

Level/marks	Descriptors
<p style="text-align: center;">3</p> <p style="text-align: center;">15–10 marks</p>	<p>ANSWERS MAY NOT BE PERFECT, BUT WILL SHOW EXCELLENT UNDERSTANDING OF THE TEXT AND RELATE IT STRONGLY TO THE QUESTION.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Excellently focused response that brings out the similarities and differences in the extracts in a sustained, point-by-point comparison that understands the views being expressed, relates parts to the whole seamlessly and answers the question convincingly. • At the top end, uses examples from beyond the two texts under discussion to amplify the explanation/provide context. • Towards the bottom, may be a little unbalanced in coverage yet the answer is still comprehensively argued. • Excellent understanding of relevant political knowledge (processes, concepts, debates and/or theories). • Candidate is always in firm control of the material. • The answer is fluent and the grammar, punctuation and spelling are all precise.
<p style="text-align: center;">2</p> <p style="text-align: center;">9–5 marks</p>	<p>ANSWERS WILL SHOW REASONABLE UNDERSTANDING OF THE TEXT, OR RELATE A SOUND UNDERSTANDING LESS STRONGLY TO THE QUESTION</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Explanation that makes a solid attempt to respond to the question, identifying some of the substance of the comparison, but does not make the comparison explicit (listing rather than juxtaposing points) and/or shows a limited understanding of the views. • No further examples and/or context are provided. • Limited understanding of relevant political knowledge, illustrated with limited examples from the text under discussion. • Unevenness in the coverage of material. • The writing lacks some fluency, but on the whole shows an accuracy in grammar, punctuation and spelling.

1 4–0 marks	<p>ANSWERS WILL SHOW LITTLE UNDERSTANDING OF THE TEXT AND LITTLE ATTEMPT TO RELATE TO THE QUESTION.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Only the most basic comparison between the passages and the most basic understanding of the similarities/differences. There is little or no engagement with the question.• Little if any engagement with the material. The answer may paraphrase the passages and/or compare the factual material in them rather than the views that they offer.• Little or no awareness of relevant political knowledge, with no sign of understanding.• The answer shows significant weaknesses in the accuracy of grammar, punctuation and spelling.
----------------	--

Generic marking descriptors for Paper 3 sub-Q(b) [full essays]

- The full range of marks will be used as a matter of course.
- Examiners will look for the 'best fit', not a 'perfect fit' in applying the Levels.
- Examiners will provisionally award the middle mark in the Level and then moderate up/down according to individual qualities within the answer.
- The ratio of marks per AO will be 1:3.
- The weighting of marks for each AO should be considered, but this is reflected in the descriptor: marking should therefore be done holistically.
- Question-specific mark schemes will be neither exhaustive nor prescriptive. Appropriate, substantiated responses will always be rewarded.
- NB Answers are required to make critical use of political ideas and texts studied during the course. Responses which fail to enter into critical discussion of ideas and texts are very unlikely to attain a mark above Level 1.
- Evaluation refers to the argued weighing up/assessment of factors in relation to their significance in explaining a issue or in explaining linkages between different factors.

Level/marks	Descriptors
<p style="text-align: center;">5</p> <p>35–29 marks</p>	<p>ANSWERS MAY NOT BE PERFECT, BUT WILL SHOW SOPHISTICATED UNDERSTANDING OF THE QUESTION AND DRAW COMPREHENSIVELY FROM THE IDEAS AND TEXTS STUDIED IN THEIR RESPONSES.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Excellent focused critical analysis and full evaluation of ideas and texts that answers the question convincingly. • Excellent sustained argument throughout with an excellent sense of direction that is strongly substantiated by an excellent range of supported examples. Excellent substantiated conclusions. • Excellent understanding of relevant political knowledge (processes, concepts, debates and/or theories). • Towards the bottom, may be a little unbalanced in coverage yet the answer is still comprehensively argued. • Candidate is always in firm control of the material. • The answer is fluent and the grammar, punctuation and spelling are all precise.
<p style="text-align: center;">4</p> <p>28–22 marks</p>	<p>ANSWERS WILL SHOW MANY FEATURES OF LEVEL 5, BUT THE QUALITY WILL BE UNEVEN ACROSS THE ANSWER.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A determined response to the question with clear critical analysis and evaluation of ideas and texts across most but not all of the answer. • Argument is strong and sustained, showing clear awareness/understanding, but parts are underdeveloped and/or the range of substantiating evidence is not even across the answer. Strong conclusions adequately substantiated. Description is avoided. • Good understanding of relevant political knowledge. • For the most part, the answer is fluent and shows an accuracy in grammar, punctuation and spelling.

<p style="text-align: center;">3</p> <p>21–15 marks</p>	<p>ANSWERS WILL SHOW A SOUND UNDERSTANDING OF THE QUESTION AND DRAW FROM THE TEXTS STUDIED IN THEIR RESPONSES.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Engages with the question although analysis and evaluation of ideas and texts is patchy and, at the lower end, of limited quality. • Tries to argue and draw conclusions, but not well sustained and supporting evidence is patchy. There may be significant sections of description. • Reasonable understanding of relevant political knowledge. • The writing lacks some fluency, but on the whole shows an accuracy in grammar, punctuation and spelling.
<p style="text-align: center;">2</p> <p>14–8 marks</p>	<p>ANSWERS WILL SHOW A LIMITED UNDERSTANDING OF THE QUESTION AND A LIMITED USE OF/REFERENCE TO TEXTS STUDIED.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Some engagement with the question, but analysis and evaluation of ideas and texts are limited/thin. • Limited argument within an essentially descriptive response. Irrelevance may characterise parts of the answer. Conclusions are limited/thin. • Understanding of relevant political knowledge is limited and/or uneven. • The answer shows some accuracy in grammar, punctuation and spelling, but contains frequent errors.
<p style="text-align: center;">1</p> <p>7–0 marks</p>	<p>ANSWERS WILL SHOW LITTLE UNDERSTANDING OF THE TEXT AND LITTLE ATTEMPT TO RESPOND TO THE QUESTION.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Little or no engagement with the question. Little or no analysis or evaluation of ideas and texts. • Little or no argument. Assertions are unsupported and/or of limited relevance. Any conclusions are very weak. • Little or no relevant political knowledge. • The answer shows significant weaknesses in the accuracy of grammar, punctuation and spelling.

1 Liberalism and the Individual.

(a) Compare the views expressed in these two extracts on the nature of the state. [15]

General

The generic mark scheme is the most important guide for examiners and drives the marking of all answers. Assess which level best reflects most of each answer. No answer is required to demonstrate all the descriptions in any level to qualify. Examiners are looking for 'best fit', not 'perfect fit'. Provisionally award the middle mark in the level and then moderate up or down according to the qualities of the answer, using the question-specific marking notes below.

No set answer is expected, but the question asks candidates to compare and answers in levels 2 and 3 need to show evidence of genuine comparison of the similarities and differences between the two passages. Answers might use matters of provenance, date and context to aid their comparison. The marking notes here are indicative and not exhaustive. What matters is the quality of the comparison. That said, candidates must answer the question set and not their own question.

Specific

Candidates may argue that Passage A gives a positive view of the state, whereas Passage B gives a negative view. This approach might provide the basis for a more detailed comparison of the passages as candidates examine the nature of the state.

Passage A argues that the state can help people achieve liberty and freedom, challenging the view that the state should abstain from action. The passage is suggesting a greater and positive role for the state than that suggested in Passage B. In direct contrast, Passage B suggests that state intervention is dangerous as it discourages spontaneous action and encourages reliance upon the state. Passage B also suggests that the state will crush creativity whereas Passage A sees state activity as liberating individuals. Some may point out that Passage B is more closely linked to the ideas of classical liberalism and a negative view of the state whereas Passage A reflects the interventionist views of 'New Liberalism'. Any such reference is to be credited, although such a contextual point not directly asked for in the question.

- (b) Evaluate the ways in which liberals have sought to reconcile the claims of the individual with those of the state. [35]

General

The generic mark scheme is the most important guide for examiners and drives the marking of all answers. Assess which level best reflects most of each answer. No answer is required to demonstrate all the descriptions in any level to qualify. Examiners are looking for 'best fit', not 'perfect fit'. Provisionally award the middle mark in the level and then moderate up or down according to the qualities of the answer, using the question-specific marking notes below.

No set answer is expected. Candidates may answer the question from a wide variety of different angles, using different emphases, and arguing different points of view. The marking notes here are indicative and not exhaustive. What is important is the quality of the critical analysis and degree of evaluation. That said, candidates must answer the question set and not their own question. Further, they are required to refer to specific theorists to support their answer in considering the strengths and weaknesses of the arguments put forward to reconcile the claims of the individual with those of the state. Any answer that fails to do so cannot be given a mark above level 3.

Specific

Candidates need to evaluate a variety of ways in which liberals have sought to reconcile the claims. Candidates may suggest that as responsibilities of the state increase, the liberty of the individual decreases and that this is at the heart of the problem for liberals. Answers may suggest that the more limited the claims of the state, the less difficulty there is in reconciling the claims of the individual, and illustrate this with specific reference to the writings of some of the classical liberals. Some answers may argue that there is not a problem in reconciling the two as, in order to increase the liberty of the individual, it is necessary to increase the role of the state – such answers will need to support this with specific reference to the writings of the later nineteenth and early twentieth century 'New Liberals', such as Green and Hobhouse and Lloyd George, who argued that without increasing the role of the state some people would be unable to achieve liberty. This idea may be further developed with reference to the works of writers such as Beveridge and the authors of the *Orange Book* (2004). Answers may suggest that to ensure individual rights are protected, the power of the state needs to be increased, and support this with specific reference to thinking on, for example, the issues of women and/or minority groups.

2 Conservatism and the Nation

(a) Compare these two assessments of the significance of 'nation' for Conservatives. [15]

General

The generic mark scheme is the most important guide for examiners and drives the marking of all answers. Assess which level best reflects most of each answer. No answer is required to demonstrate all the descriptions in any level to qualify. Examiners are looking for 'best fit', not 'perfect fit'. Provisionally award the middle mark in the level and then moderate up or down according to the qualities of the answer, using the question-specific marking notes below.

No set answer is expected, but the question asks candidates to compare and answers in levels 2 and 3 need to show evidence of genuine comparison of the similarities and differences between the two passages. Answers might use matters of provenance, date and context to aid their comparison. The marking notes here are indicative and not exhaustive. What matters is the quality of the comparison. That said, candidates must answer the question set and not their own question.

Specific

Both extracts are concerned with nation, though Scruton is concerned with England while Hague refers to nation in the abstract (candidates might infer that since this speech was made at a British party conference, Hague is including the four nations of the UK – or they might suggest that, notwithstanding the context, Hague had only England in mind). Candidates would be expected to know that Hague was party leader at the time; they might well identify Scruton as a Conservative thinker. Candidates might argue that Hague is outlining classic conservative values of tradition, justice and fairness, and suggesting that the nation is the best way to do this. He argues that national values are 'large and generous' and that the Tories both stand for and defend these values. Although Scruton does not state who is to blame for the dismantling of the customs and institutions of England, and was writing under a Labour government, his support of his father's comment suggests that Scruton does not agree that the Tories stand for national values and their defence: indeed the Tories were identified with the forces which were 'disenchanted England.' He would thus disagree with Hague that 'conservative values stand where they have always stood.' Both writers do, however, agree that national habits and institutions are valuable.

- (b) **'Conservatives believe in tradition; they are suspicious of change.'** How far do you agree? [35]

General

The generic mark scheme is the most important guide for examiners and drives the marking of all answers. Assess which level best reflects most of each answer. No answer is required to demonstrate all the descriptions in any level to qualify. Examiners are looking for 'best fit', not 'perfect fit'. Provisionally award the middle mark in the level and then moderate up or down according to the qualities of the answer, using the question-specific marking notes below.

No set answer is expected. Candidates may answer the question from a variety of different angles, using different emphases, and arguing different points of view. The marking notes here are indicative and not exhaustive. What is important is the quality of the critical analysis and degree of evaluation. That said, candidates must answer the question set and not their own question. Further, they are required to refer to specific theorists to support their answer in considering the strengths and weaknesses of the arguments put forward as to what extent and why conservatives value tradition. Any answer that fails to do so cannot be given a mark above level 3.

Specific

Answers may start by considering to what extent, and why, tradition is a key conservative value. They might argue that valuing tradition is something which conservatives of all complexions have in common, to a greater or lesser degree. They might suggest that conservatives value tradition because it is tried and tested. At a national level, it breeds cohesion ('One Nation' Toryism might be mentioned; Oakeshott might be quoted; de Gaulle might be referred to) and might also support hierarchy. In analysing this, candidates might go on to relate tradition to other key conservative values.

Answers may distinguish among types of conservatism, suggesting that neo-conservatives might value tradition as a way of bolstering foreign policy: defence of the American way of life, for example; interesting comparison with Putin in Russia would be possible here. In contrast, answers might analyse the line (taken by Stuart Hall among others) that Thatcherism was revolutionary in its approach, and that neo-liberal modernisation involved a departure from traditional conservative values; for contemporary resonance, Sarkozy's presidency could be considered here. They might also consider that conservatives are suspicious of the rigidity of ideology, and that if something proves itself to be in need of change, then changed should be welcomed – for pragmatic reasons. In a British context, they might look, for example, at Redwood on economic reform, Joseph on education reform, or Cameron on social justice.

3 Socialism and the Common Good

- (a) To what extent does Bernstein disagree with Marx and Engels' ideas about class struggle? [15]

General

The generic mark scheme is the most important guide for examiners and drives the marking of all answers. Assess which level best reflects most of each answer. No answer is required to demonstrate all the descriptions in any level to qualify. Examiners are looking for 'best fit', not 'perfect fit'. Provisionally award the middle mark in the level and then moderate up or down according to the qualities of the answer, using the question-specific marking notes below.

No set answer is expected, but the question asks candidates to compare and answers in levels 2 and 3 need to show evidence of genuine comparison of the similarities and differences between the two passages. Answers might use matters of provenance, date and context to aid their comparison. The marking notes here are indicative and not exhaustive. What matters is the quality of the comparison. That said, candidates must answer the question set and not their own question.

Specific

Candidates may argue that for Marx and Engels struggle is central to their theory, and they generalise that all societies are based on class opposition. Candidates would be expected to identify that for Marx and Engels the current oppressors were the bourgeoisie and the oppressed were the proletariat. Their argument is based on their theory of capital, namely that it is a property based on wage labour and it is inherently exploitative of the working classes, and that capital cannot flourish without more and more workers to exploit. Strong answers might identify that this is connected with the theory of 'emiseration,' whereby the accumulation of capital further impoverishes not only the working classes, but forces some of the bourgeoisie into their ranks, too. In contrast to this, Bernstein speaks of the growth of social wealth and the improvement of society. Unlike Marx and Engels, Bernstein does not assume that the accumulation of capital will necessarily lead to emiseration. Indeed, the evidence in the late nineteenth century suggested that the opposite might well be the case. Candidates might explain that Bernstein, in contrast to Marx and Engels, speaks of the prospects of moral and intellectual improvement of the working classes in a capitalist system, thereby effacing the need for a violent revolution. Strong answers might explain well the 'dialectical' reference in Bernstein, identifying that this refers to Marx and Engels' theory of historical development, and see that the first sentence of Marx and Engels sets out a dialectical relationship between the classes. Sophisticated answers might pick up on Bernstein's use of the word 'theory' and see that he was arguing that Marx and Engels' own method meant that socialists should alter their view of capital in the light of the evidence to which Bernstein here alludes.

(b) To what extent and why has socialism departed from the ideas of Marx?

[35]

General

The generic mark scheme is the most important guide for examiners and drives the marking of all answers. Assess which level best reflects most of each answer. No answer is required to demonstrate all the descriptions in any level to qualify. Examiners are looking for 'best fit', not 'perfect fit'. Provisionally award the middle mark in the level and then moderate up or down according to the qualities of the answer, using the question-specific marking notes below.

No set answer is expected. Candidates may answer the question from a variety of different angles, using different emphases, and arguing different points of view. The marking notes here are indicative and not exhaustive. What is important is the quality of the critical analysis and degree of evaluation. That said, candidates must answer the question set and not their own question. Further, they are required to refer to specific theorists to support their answer in considering the strengths and weaknesses of the arguments put forward. Any answer that fails to do so cannot be given a mark above level 3.

Specific

Candidates might use the distinction between means and ends as a way of organising their analysis, arguing that evolutionary socialists (such as Bernstein) believed that parliamentary, democratic means were justifiable – in contrast to the revolution predicted by Marx and Engels. They might also distinguish between fundamentalist and revisionist socialists. Answers might argue that revolutionary socialists also departed from Marx, discussing (for example) Lenin's vanguardism and Stalin's 'socialism in one country'. Answers might show that all socialists are committed to equality, but this might take various forms. Similarly, all engage with the question of the critique of capitalism. Stronger answers may show a greater range of examples and thinkers to consider the broad range of approaches adopted during the Twentieth Century. In a British context, they might, for example, look at the rise of the welfare state and Crosland, might consider New Labour / The Third Way. Equally, answers might consider a range of other possible global examples, such as: Scandinavian social democracy, Mao's China, Nehru's India, Chavez's Venezuela. The strongest answers will tackle the 'why?' aspect of the question fully, seeing that circumstance, individuals and ideology shaped the development of socialist thought.

4 Democracy and its critics

(a) To what extent do Bush and bin Laden take different positions?

[15]

General

The generic mark scheme is the most important guide for examiners and drives the marking of all answers. Assess which level best reflects most of each answer. No answer is required to demonstrate all the descriptions in any level to qualify. Examiners are looking for 'best fit', not 'perfect fit'. Provisionally award the middle mark in the level and then moderate up or down according to the qualities of the answer, using the question-specific marking notes below.

No set answer is expected, but the question asks candidates to compare and answers in levels 2 and 3 need to show evidence of genuine comparison of the similarities and differences between the two passages. Answers might use matters of provenance, date and context to aid their comparison. The marking notes here are indicative and not exhaustive. What matters is the quality of the comparison. That said, candidates must answer the question set and not their own question.

Specific

Both extracts agree that there is a war being fought, but they disagree about who started it. Both agree that there is an attack on their respective ways of life: Bush argues that freedom and democracy are under threat, while Bin Laden et al. see the attack as a religious one. But while Bush argues that his aims are to protect freedom and democracy, Bin Laden et al. argue that Bush's aims are also religious and economic. Bin Laden et al. are much more specific in listing the history of the crimes which they claim the US has perpetrated against Muslims. Bush also argues that enemy hides, and it is the job of the US and its allies to root it out. In contrast, Bin Laden et al. argue that the US's declaration of war is 'clear.' Both argue that the other has little respect for human life: Bush uses this phrase, while Bin Laden et al. speak of terror and humiliation.

- (b) **'Representative democracy is one political system among many: its values are not inherently better than any other.'** Assess this view with reference to at least two political systems you have studied. [35]

General

The generic mark scheme is the most important guide for examiners and drives the marking of all answers. Assess which level best reflects most of each answer. No answer is required to demonstrate all the descriptions in any level to qualify. Examiners are looking for 'best fit', not 'perfect fit'. Provisionally award the middle mark in the level and then moderate up or down according to the qualities of the answer, using the question-specific marking notes below.

No set answer is expected. Candidates may answer the question from a variety of different angles, using different emphases, and arguing different points of view. The marking notes here are indicative and not exhaustive. What is important is the quality of the critical analysis and degree of evaluation. That said, candidates must answer the question set and not their own question. Further, they are required to refer to specific theorists to support their answer in considering the strengths and weaknesses of the arguments put forward as to the value of democracy. Any answer that fails to do so cannot be given a mark above level 3.

Specific

Answers need to show an awareness of the values of representative democracy. A wide range of comparisons could be made, e.g. a contemporary comparison such as the one illustrated in the text, or a more historical comparison such as fascism or communism. This choice will of course direct the focus and content of the paragraphs. One approach would be to identify the values of representative democracy, explain their significance, and set out the critique of these which the contrasting system offers. Answers might assume that representative democracy is liberal democracy; they might equally say that fascist and communist regimes claimed to be representative and democratic, and broaden the focus of their comparisons accordingly; they might contrast all of these with pre-modern absolutism, for example.

Answers might analyse individualism and then suggest that because liberal democracy values the individual, it values a system which secures plurality and toleration. Thinkers such as Locke and Mill might be deployed here; answers might also look at Rawls and ideas of justice and fairness. In contrast, answers might suggest that toleration might be viewed as cowardly, weak or decadent, and adduce evidence to support this view. Whether examples are contemporary or historical, examiners should look for a theoretical understanding of the political thought underpinning the question. Answers swamped by historical narrative will have lost their focus on the question.

5 Global Ideological debates

- (a) Compare the views that these two writers offer on globalisation and its consequences. [15]

General

The generic mark scheme is the most important guide for examiners and drives the marking of all answers. Assess which level best reflects most of each answer. No answer is required to demonstrate all the descriptions in any level to qualify. Examiners are looking for 'best fit', not 'perfect fit'. Provisionally award the middle mark in the level and then moderate up or down according to the qualities of the answer, using the question-specific marking notes below.

No set answer is expected, but the question asks candidates to compare and answers in levels 2 and 3 need to show evidence of genuine comparison of the similarities and differences between the two passages. Answers might use matters of provenance, date and context to aid their comparison. The marking notes here are indicative and not exhaustive. What matters is the quality of the comparison. That said, candidates must answer the question set and not their own question.

Specific

Gray offers a very pessimistic view of globalisation. In economic terms, he argues for downward harmonisation, where capital will flow to areas where costs are lowest. In contrast, Legrain says that this is not happening, since companies, people and money are still geographically determined. Gray is also pessimistic about the consequences of these economic trends for social democracy, suggesting that the basis of public spending is collapsing. In contrast, Legrain suggests that these global economic factors are not necessarily the key ones, in that people choose to stay where they are, presumably for personal reasons to do with family and culture; and even if there were a free labour market, people might still desire the benefits which higher taxation brings, and accept the burden. He also disputes the idea of downward harmonisation, saying that competition can raise standards, for example in terms of environmentalism. Legrain disputes the idea implicit in Gray that globalisation has certain inevitable consequences, and ends by stating that there can be political gain in saying this.

(b) 'Globalisation is rendering the nation-state obsolete.' How far do you agree? [35]General

The generic mark scheme is the most important guide for examiners and drives the marking of all answers. Assess which level best reflects most of each answer. No answer is required to demonstrate all the descriptions in any level to qualify. Examiners are looking for 'best fit', not 'perfect fit'. Provisionally award the middle mark in the level and then moderate up or down according to the qualities of the answer, using the question-specific marking notes below.

No set answer is expected. Candidates may answer the question from a variety of different angles, using different emphases, and arguing different points of view. The marking notes here are indicative and not exhaustive. What is important is the quality of the critical analysis and degree of evaluation. That said, candidates must answer the question set and not their own question. Further, they are required to refer to specific theorists to support their answer in considering the strengths and weaknesses of the arguments put forward for the obsolescence of the nation-state. Any answer that fails to do so cannot be given a mark above level 3.

Specific

Answers might set out the rationale for the modern nation-state, mentioning its historical development from early modern period through ideas of liberal internationalism. Indeed, some might see an irony in the Wilsonian belief in free trade guaranteeing peace and self-determination and national collective security in the light of this question. Answers might consider some of the following questions, drawing on contemporary writers on globalisation (such as Naomi Klein, Legrain, Giddens, Jameson, Steger, Gray, Monbiot): What are the implications of globalisation for international law? Can governments provide social welfare for their citizens and remain competitive? Are national borders necessary, meaningful or indeed policeable? Has the role of government been replaced by corporations and NGOs? Some may note, as Anderson points out, that nations can also be seen as cultural artefacts: Are national cultures being dissolved by globalisation?



UNIVERSITY OF CAMBRIDGE INTERNATIONAL EXAMINATIONS
Cambridge International Level 3 Pre-U Certificate
Principal Subject

COMPARATIVE GOVERNMENT AND POLITICS

9770/04

Paper 4 Contemporary International Debates: Contexts and Comparisons

For Examination from 2010

SPECIMEN PAPER

1 hour 40 minutes

Additional Materials: Answer Paper/Booklet

READ THESE INSTRUCTIONS FIRST

Write your Centre number, candidate number and name on all the work you hand in.

Write in dark blue or black pen.

Do not use staples, paper clips, highlighters, glue or correction fluid.

Answer **two** questions.

Every essay is marked out of 50.

Substantiated examples and critical evaluation must be drawn from various countries/regions of the world, and candidates will be expected to compare and contrast at least **two** of these in their answers, neither of which may be the UK or the USA (although either or both may be referenced for supplementary context or comparison).

This document consists of **2** printed pages.



Answer **two** questions.

- 1 How effectively have any two countries or regions you have studied responded to issues surrounding racial difference? [50]
- 2 'The championing of human rights is a liberal indulgence.' How far do you agree? [50]
- 3 To what extent are democracy and material prosperity necessarily linked? [50]
- 4 Assess the reasons why democracy has proved more effective in one regime than in another. [50]
- 5 'Sovereignty is an increasingly problematic concept.' Assess this proposition. [50]

Permission to reproduce items where third-party owned material protected by copyright is included has been sought and cleared where possible. Every reasonable effort has been made by the publisher (UCLES) to trace copyright holders, but if any items requiring clearance have unwittingly been included, the publisher will be pleased to make amends at the earliest possible opportunity.

University of Cambridge International Examinations is part of the Cambridge Assessment Group. Cambridge Assessment is the brand name of University of Cambridge Local Examinations Syndicate (UCLES), which is itself a department of the University of Cambridge.



UNIVERSITY OF CAMBRIDGE INTERNATIONAL EXAMINATIONS
Cambridge International Level 3 Pre-U Certificate
Principal Subject

COMPARATIVE GOVERNMENT AND POLITICS

9770/04

Paper 4 International Contexts and Comparisons: Contemporary Debates

For Examination from 2010

SPECIMEN MARK SCHEME

1 hour 40 minutes

MAXIMUM MARK: 100

This document consists of **8** printed pages.



Generic marking descriptors for Paper 4

- The full range of marks will be used as a matter of course.
- Examiners will provisionally award the middle mark in the Level and then moderate up/down according to individual qualities within the answer.
- Examiners will look for the 'best fit', not a 'perfect fit' in applying the Levels.
- The ratio of marks per AO will be 2:5.
- The weighting of marks for each AO should be considered, but this is reflected in the descriptor: marking should therefore be done holistically
- Question-specific mark schemes will be neither exhaustive nor prescriptive. Appropriate, substantiated responses will always be rewarded. Answers may develop a novel response to a question. This is to be credited if arguments are fully substantiated.
- NB Answers are required to compare and contrast several countries/regions. The minimum specified is two, neither of which may be the UK or the USA. Answers which break that requirement are very unlikely to attain a mark above Level 1.

Level/marks	Descriptors
<p style="text-align: center;">5</p> <p>50–41 marks</p>	<p>ANSWERS MAY NOT BE PERFECT, BUT WILL REPRESENT THE VERY BEST THAT MAY BE EXPECTED OF AN 18-YEAR-OLD.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Excellent focused comparative analysis that answers the question convincingly. • Excellent comparative arguments sustained throughout with a strong sense of direction. Excellent substantiated comparative conclusions. • Excellent comparative understanding of relevant political knowledge (processes, institutions, concepts, debates and/or theories) supported by a wide range of concepts and examples. • Towards the bottom, may be a little unbalanced in coverage (i.e. may rely more on one aspect of the comparison than the other in order to illustrate the argument) yet the answer is still comprehensively argued. • Candidate is always in firm control of the material. • The answer is fluent and the grammar, punctuation and spelling are all precise.
<p style="text-align: center;">4</p> <p>40–31 marks</p>	<p>ANSWERS WILL SHOW MANY FEATURES OF LEVEL 5, BUT THE QUALITY WILL BE UNEVEN ACROSS THE ANSWER.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A good comparative response to the question with clear analysis across most but not all of the answer. • Strong comparative argument throughout, but parallels/contrasts are not always developed. Strong comparative conclusions adequately substantiated. • Strong but uneven range of relevant political knowledge used to support analysis and argument. Description is avoided. • For the most part, the answer is fluent and shows an accuracy in grammar, punctuation and spelling.

<p style="text-align: center;">3</p> <p>30–21 marks</p>	<p>THE ARGUMENT WILL BE REASONABLY COMPETENT, BUT LEVEL 3 ANSWERS WILL BE LIMITED &/OR UNBALANCED.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Engages soundly with the question although comparative analysis is patchy and, at the lower end, of limited quality. • Tries to argue and draw conclusions comparatively, but this breaks down in significant sections of description. • Good but limited and uneven range of relevant political knowledge used to describe rather than support analysis and argument. • The writing lacks some fluency, but on the whole shows an accuracy in grammar, punctuation and spelling.
<p style="text-align: center;">2</p> <p>20–10 marks</p>	<p>ANSWERS WILL SHOW A GENERAL MISMATCH BETWEEN QUESTION & ANSWER.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Limited engagement with the question, with some understanding of the issues. Analysis and comparisons are limited/thin. • Limited argument with limited comparative elements within an essentially descriptive response. Conclusions are limited/thin, with limited comparative quality. • Patchy display of relevant political knowledge. • The answer shows some accuracy in grammar, punctuation and spelling, but contains frequent errors.
<p style="text-align: center;">1</p> <p>9–0 marks</p>	<p>ANSWERS WILL SHOW A CLEAR SENSE OF THE CANDIDATE HAVING LITTLE IF ANY ENGAGEMENT WITH THE QUESTION.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Little or no engagement with the question. Little or no comparison offered. • Little or no argument. Assertions are unsupported and/or of limited relevance. Any conclusions are very weak. • Little or no relevant political knowledge. • The answer shows significant weaknesses in the accuracy of grammar, punctuation and spelling.

NB

Substantiated examples and critical evaluation must be drawn from various countries/regions of the world, and candidates will be expected to compare and contrast at least two of these in their answers (neither of which may be the UK or the USA, although either or both may be referenced for supplementary context/comparison).

1 How effectively have any two countries or regions you have studied responded to issues surrounding racial difference? [50]

General

The generic mark scheme is the most important guide for examiners and drives the marking of all answers. Assess which level best reflects most of each answer. No answer is required to demonstrate all the descriptions in any level to qualify. Examiners are looking for 'best fit', not 'perfect fit'. Provisionally award the middle mark in the level and then moderate up or down according to the qualities of the answer, using the question-specific marking notes below.

No set answer is expected. Candidates may answer the question from a wide variety of different angles, using different emphases, and arguing different points of view. The marking notes here are indicative and not exhaustive. What is important is the quality of the argument and the comparative analysis. That said, candidates must answer the question set and not their own question. Further, they are required to support their answer with specific examples which are drawn from at least two countries, neither of which may be the UK or the USA (although either or both may be referenced for supplementary context/comparison). Any answer that breaks this paper requirement is unlikely to attain a mark above level 1.

Specific

Candidates might choose countries which have opted for contrasting policies, or they might opt for countries which have adapted similar policies: in either case, the best essays will have a strong focus on the effectiveness of these policies. Candidates might discuss affirmative action and show how effective policies such as this have been in securing access to higher education and to the professions. They might debate whether the policy has had any effect in mitigating racial tensions or divisions, and whether or not affirmative action has run its course. Some may make reference to different social groups/classes and/or to regional/state differences. Candidates might consider multiculturalism (e.g. in Canada, France, Germany, Italy) and various models of integration/assimilation, assessing their strengths and weaknesses in theory and practice, considering whether religion is the key 'problem'. The rise of radical Islam might be discussed here, or Israel's treatment of the Palestinians. Candidates might assess Australia's recent approaches to aboriginal issues (e.g. Howard's Northern Territory National Emergency Response scheme), New Zealand's recent handling of Maori interests or India's current attempts to deal with caste problems (e.g. consideration of Dalit politics, the BSP and the rise of Mayawati). Candidates might choose to discuss other responses, such as: those following recent EU enlargement, issues in post-apartheid South Africa, the relevance of the mandatory detention of asylum seekers by Howard's government in Australia. Consideration of how issues surrounding race have fitted in with broader social policies, or how they have impacted on class divisions, or how they have lessened or else exacerbated racial tensions (e.g. Paris riots) would be very relevant.

The strongest answers might be very comparative in their approach, adopting a thematic structure which compares how various countries/regions have dealt with a series of identified issues.

2 'The championing of human rights is a liberal indulgence.' How far do you agree? [50]

General

The generic mark scheme is the most important guide for examiners and drives the marking of all answers. Assess which level best reflects most of each answer. No answer is required to demonstrate all the descriptions in any level to qualify. Examiners are looking for 'best fit', not 'perfect fit'. Provisionally award the middle mark in the level and then moderate up or down according to the qualities of the answer, using the question-specific marking notes below.

No set answer is expected. Candidates may answer the question from a wide variety of different angles, using different emphases, and arguing different points of view. The marking notes here are indicative and not exhaustive. What is important is the quality of the argument and the comparative analysis. That said, candidates must answer the question set and not their own question. Further, they are required to support their answer with specific examples which are drawn from at least two countries, neither of which may be the UK or the USA (although either or both may be referenced for supplementary context/comparison). Any answer that breaks this paper requirement is unlikely to attain a mark above level 1.

Specific

Candidates might start by considering why human rights are valued by liberals of the Western political tradition, explaining the importance of the individual and the belief in an international legal framework to preserve inalienable rights. Answers might chart the development of a human rights framework via the Geneva Convention, the United Nations, the HRA, etc. and consider differences between universal rights and national citizenship. Some might say that a respect for human rights is not confined to so-called liberal regimes of the West, citing examples of authoritarian nations which subscribe to the UN Universal Declaration on Human Rights, and the Covenants on Civil and Political Rights and on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights. Some might discuss specific initiatives such as the Genocide Convention. Regional developments such as the HRA or the OAU's Banjul Charter would also be useful. Some might consider the proposition in the light of specific events in the recent past, such as the behaviour of UN troops in Rwanda in 1994 and/or NATO troops in Kosovo in 1999 and their actions/failures to act when faced by ethnic cleansing, or the current inability of the international community to prevent atrocities in Burma or Darfur or Tibet. Some might consider the plight of indigenous groups in Latin America or Australia or parts of Africa, comparing realities to local circumstance. Answers might interrogate the ideological focus of the question, and look at how pressure groups such as Amnesty International or religious groups such as the Quakers have contributed to the debate. Candidates might look at the reconciliation commission in South Africa and/or the tribunals in Rwanda or Bosnia as attempts to bring a rights framework in response to civil war, arguing that human rights frameworks have been possible where existing (non-liberal?) regimes have broken down. If they pursue this line of argument, they might cite regimes which have been successful in maintaining power and curtailing human rights, e.g. post-1977 China, Israel with the Palestinians. Further, they might question whether, in reality, democracy reduces state repression. The attitude taken by Singapore might make for a particularly illuminating case study of this question.

3 To what extent are democracy and material prosperity necessarily linked?**[50]**General

The generic mark scheme is the most important guide for examiners and drives the marking of all answers. Assess which level best reflects most of each answer. No answer is required to demonstrate all the descriptions in any level to qualify. Examiners are looking for 'best fit', not 'perfect fit'. Provisionally award the middle mark in the level and then moderate up or down according to the qualities of the answer, using the question-specific marking notes below.

No set answer is expected. Candidates may answer the question from a wide variety of different angles, using different emphases, and arguing different points of view. The marking notes here are indicative and not exhaustive. What is important is the quality of the argument and the comparative analysis. That said, candidates must answer the question set and not their own question. Further, they are required to support their answer with specific examples which are drawn from at least two countries, neither of which may be the UK or the USA (although either or both may be referenced for supplementary context/comparison). Any answer that breaks this paper requirement is unlikely to attain a mark above level 1.

Specific

Some might begin by considering what 'democracy' is. Considering representative democracy would be one route, though some might argue that one-party states and dictatorships in, for example, China and North Korea claim democratic credentials. Candidates might argue that democracy and material prosperity are inextricably linked, citing the comparative wealth of the West and its more liberal democratic tradition with the relative poverty (in GDP terms, at least) and political instability of, say, many African regimes. The Scandinavian democracies would provide a wealth of examples within which to explore democracy in the context of great material prosperity. Candidates might argue that while these two things may tend to be linked, they are not necessarily so. The democratic credentials of post-apartheid South Africa would make one good case study. So too would the oil-rich states of the Middle East which are far from democratic. Can there thus be a direct or simple connection between great material prosperity and democratic politics?

India is a vibrant multi-party democracy, but the majority of its citizens are poor by western standards, and millions are poor by the UN definition of the term. Yet India has always been ruled by civilian, democratically elected governments and prides itself on being the world's largest democracy – unlike neighbouring Pakistan which provides a striking contrast around which to consider the necessary seedbed for successful democratic politics. Post-Mao China has embraced liberal capitalism, but the regime remains determined to maintain a one-party state and keep in place extensive restrictions on its populace (e.g. controls over ISPs).

Looking at the question from the other end, does poverty preclude democracy? The examples of Botswana, India, Mexico, and Venezuela would suggest 'no' whereas Burma, Eritrea, Mauritania and Zimbabwe might argue the other way. Is the degree of poverty/prosperity more important? Or, does the international pattern indicate that other causal factors play such a significant role in individual cases as to prevent any necessary link between material prosperity and democracy?

4 Assess the reasons why democracy has proved more effective in one regime than in another. [50]

General

The generic mark scheme is the most important guide for examiners and drives the marking of all answers. Assess which level best reflects most of each answer. No answer is required to demonstrate all the descriptions in any level to qualify. Examiners are looking for 'best fit', not 'perfect fit'. Provisionally award the middle mark in the level and then moderate up or down according to the qualities of the answer, using the question-specific marking notes below.

No set answer is expected. Candidates may answer the question from a wide variety of different angles, using different emphases, and arguing different points of view. The marking notes here are indicative and not exhaustive. What is important is the quality of the argument and the comparative analysis. That said, candidates must answer the question set and not their own question. Further, they are required to support their answer with specific examples which are drawn from at least two countries, neither of which may be the UK or the USA (although either or both may be referenced for supplementary context/comparison). Any answer that breaks this paper requirement is unlikely to attain a mark above level 1.

Specific

Candidates might start by defining democracy and, if so, should be aware that a number of definitions are possible (not just representative democracy); the claims of, say, Cuba or Pakistan or Russia or Tanzania to be democracies might be investigated. Is a definition of democracy built around political rights and civil liberties too narrow? Should other indicators be brought into the definition, e.g. economic freedom, the nature of property rights? One line of enquiry would be to consider the relative economic positions of nations, seeing whether democracy is more likely to flourish in regimes which can raise taxes effectively and use this money to provide welfare benefits, thereby demonstrating the benefits of democracy. The example of Russia might be used but, equally, the wealth of Russia and its oligarchs might be cited as evidence that economic factors alone cannot account for the strength of democracy in a country. Many in Putin's Russia associate democracy with weakness.

A tradition of democracy (or not) might be discussed: the viability of the Westminster model in ex-colonial Africa would provide a good case study. Divergent developments in the Indian sub-continent are illuminating. In that context, what impact does the death of the founder of a state during its infancy have on its ability to put down strong democratic roots – cf. the death of Jinnah and the murder of Aung San set against the long political life of Nehru (counteracting the murder of Gandhi) in influencing the very different political paths taken by Pakistan, Burma and India.

Religion would prove another significant context for consideration. For example, do Buddhism and democracy or Hinduism and democracy tend to go hand-in-hand? Is there an intrinsic reason why so few Muslim states are democratic (Turkey and Malaysia would be especially illuminating)? The presence or absence of significant religious tension within a nation might also be considered here, and that might take discussion into matters of race/ethnicity. Peace might also be cited as a key factor in creating a stable environment within which democracy can succeed, with examples cited, for example, from post-Franco Spain or post-1989 Poland to confirm the hypothesis but the cases of, say, Israel or Sri Lanka challenging it. Then there is the role played by the citizen as patriot – in the Western tradition from Pericles' funeral oration through the Gettysburg address to post-9/11 rhetoric, patriotism has been seen as the foundation for and ultimate protector of democracy.

5 'Sovereignty is an increasingly problematic concept'. Assess this proposition. [50]

General

The generic mark scheme is the most important guide for examiners and drives the marking of all answers. Assess which level best reflects most of each answer. No answer is required to demonstrate all the descriptions in any level to qualify. Examiners are looking for 'best fit', not 'perfect fit'. Provisionally award the middle mark in the level and then moderate up or down according to the qualities of the answer, using the question-specific marking notes below.

No set answer is expected. Candidates may answer the question from a wide variety of different angles, using different emphases, and arguing different points of view. The marking notes here are indicative and not exhaustive. What is important is the quality of the argument and the comparative analysis. That said, candidates must answer the question set and not their own question. Further, they are required to support their answer with specific examples which are drawn from at least two countries, neither of which may be the UK or the USA (although either or both may be referenced for supplementary context/comparison). Any answer that breaks this paper requirement is unlikely to attain a mark above level 1.

Specific

Answers will need to show a clear understanding of the concept of sovereignty and of different types that can exist (e.g. external and internal, *de jure* and *de facto*). Some may focus on the growth of multi/supra-national institutions that cut across traditional national boundaries, making the concept problematic, and therefore focus on institutions such as the UN, NATO, the IMF and the EU and/or organisations such as multi-national companies. In the other direction, what of sovereignty in 'internationalised' areas, e.g. recent Russian claims to Arctic seabed and Canada's assertions of sovereignty over the North West Passage now that it is open to shipping every year, or the posturing in the Antarctic by various nations despite international treaties. Some may focus on practical issues of sovereignty within federal/confederal states, such as Canada and Switzerland. Candidates may consider what sovereignty means, say, in Iraq, Kosovo, Palestine or Tibet. The extreme case of Kuwait during the First Gulf War (a government in exile recognised by virtually every government around the world, even though its territory was controlled by Iraq) illustrates just how flexible the concept can be. Equally, some might look at states that are pressurised by more powerful neighbours, e.g. differing situations of parts of the ex-Soviet Union (e.g. Chechnya that has been invaded twice, the Ukraine where Russia exerts influence via control of gas supplies).

Some candidates may argue that it is no more an increasingly problematic concept than in the past. Answers may consider how sovereignty is bestowed (flowing from the people?) and problems of reconciling *de facto* and *de jure* sovereignty (e.g. Taiwan and China, Kosovo and Serbia, Tibet and China). Some may validly suggest that sovereignty is far less relevant today as nation states give way to supra-national institutions and national boundaries are transcended by big business and international finance, illustrating such an argument with a range of examples, e.g. the influence of oil companies over Nigeria or the kind of terms dictated by the IMF to Indonesia and the Philippines after the SE Asian financial crash of 1997. Equally, some may consider the impact on national sovereignty of the economic power of other states (e.g. Canada's on-going struggle to maintain economic independence from the USA).

University of Cambridge International Examinations
1 Hills Road, Cambridge, CB1 2EU, United Kingdom
Tel: +44 1223 553554 Fax: +44 1223 553558
Email: international@cie.org.uk Website: www.cie.org.uk

© University of Cambridge International Examinations 2008