



# Examiners' Report June 2023

GCE Politics 9PL0 02

## Edexcel and BTEC Qualifications

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

Alternatively, you can get in touch with us using the details on our contact us page at [www.edexcel.com/contactus](http://www.edexcel.com/contactus).



### Giving you insight to inform next steps

ResultsPlus is Pearson's free online service giving instant and detailed analysis of your students' exam results.

- See students' scores for every exam question.
- Understand how your students' performance compares with class and national averages.
- Identify potential topics, skills and types of question where students may need to develop their learning further.

For more information on ResultsPlus, or to log in, visit [www.edexcel.com/resultsplus](http://www.edexcel.com/resultsplus). Your exams officer will be able to set up your ResultsPlus account in minutes via Edexcel Online.

### Pearson: helping people progress, everywhere

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

June 2023

Publications Code 9PL0\_02\_2306\_ER

All the material in this publication is copyright

© Pearson Education Ltd 2023

## Introduction

This was the third full series since the creation of the new specification. It was very pleasing to see how well centres and candidates were prepared for this summer's series, especially considering the interruptions to the education of this cohort. In general, the paper was a good challenge for candidates, who really attempted to engage with some of the big debates that were covered. It was pleasing to see some strong comparative analysis of political information in the source questions, some well structured essays that really engaged with the question and an approach that focussed on the agreements and disagreements in the non-core political ideas questions.

## Source Questions

Source questions showed some effective essay structures, built on the comparative analysis of political information (AO2) building to some focussed and justified conclusions (AO3).

## Essay Questions

Essay questions were generally structured well looking to develop a real sense of debate that engaged with the question. There is still a need to develop a stronger sense of AO3 – realistically the reader should be able to write the conclusion in their head having read the essay, and it should match the conclusion written by the candidate.

## Non-core Political Ideas Questions

The focus on agreement and disagreement was clear to see in the non-core political ideas answers. The question of extent was less well covered, meaning that the AO3 was perhaps less well developed.

Generally, the political ideas questions were answered well, but it was noticeable that many candidates had clearly not allocated enough time for these answers with many coming in incomplete or shortened. Timing is very important across the whole paper.

It was good to see some strong engagement with political ideas and the debates within them. Most answers did try to engage with the debate around differences and similarities between strands, supported by thinkers, but there was perhaps a lack of emphasis on "extent".

Most candidates had introductions, conclusions and built their paragraphs around areas of agreement or disagreement or picked themes for each paragraph exploring agreements and disagreements within each theme. One pattern that did emerge was using the theme of what is wrong with the issue in question today, how should it be tackled in an ideal world and how should we move from the situation today to the ideal world. Very few answers did not use at least two thinkers from the specification.

One important point to note is that it is very important to use all the strands detailed in the specification to answer the question. In using thinkers, it is better than simply stating that a thinker supports this strand or that strand, to use the key ideas of a thinker and how they contribute to the debate between strands.

## Question 1 (a)

This question was the more popular of the two source questions, and it was well-answered. Candidates were clearly able to engage with the source, picking out the key arguments that related to the question to develop comparative analysis of political information. It was pleasing to see candidates using the source as a springboard to develop the debate and selecting relevant, and often topical, examples to really underpin their analysis and evaluation.

Stronger answers were able to really pair up arguments from the source to create a high-level debate. This really allowed candidates to show perceptive comparative analysis of political information. This debate was well backed by carefully selected examples, often very topical examples regarding some of the constitutional issues that have emerged since 2016 which were used in the more historical context of the UK constitution to illuminate analysis and evaluation. Stronger answers had a clear and logical thread in terms of their views of the question throughout, and the judgements reached were well supported by the analysis that preceded them.

Stronger answers also had a very effective structure. There was a clear introduction that set up the debate, clearly defined entrenched as well as codified, and set up a clear line of argument for the answer. The structure then used well paired arguments to reach supported judgements before reaching strong conclusions. Those conclusions were often short, punchy, and really felt part of a well-argued answer rather than simply an add on.

Some approaches made it more difficult to achieve the higher levels of the level-based mark scheme. One such approach was to use the political information from the source, but pair up arguments that did not naturally together making it a real challenge to develop effective analysis and evaluation. In addition, some answers did not really use the source as a springboard for the debate, but rather wanted to write the response more as a pre-planned essay that they already had in their mind. There were also responses that purely used the source but did not really seek to develop the debate or underpin their analysis and evaluation with any exemplification.

The last area that perhaps needs focus is the development of the AO3. Once a pair of well selected arguments had been debated, it was possible for candidates to create interim, substantiated judgements or incorporate judgements throughout. Sometimes these judgements felt merely stated rather than argued towards, undermining their effectiveness. These interim judgements need to build towards the conclusion – where the conclusion was a surprise to the reader, it was the case that the AO3 had not been well developed.

This is a Level 4 response.

The constitution of a country refers to the rules that define how government operates. In the UK, these are found in statutes and <sup>acts of parliament</sup> ~~constitutions~~ due to the nature of parliamentary sovereignty. This means that rights are not effectively protected & Devolution and questions over English law are also heavily contested which would be clarified under a codified constitution. Codification is necessary for clarity and rights.

Rights under an uncodified constitution are displayed in an "accessible fashion". This means that governments are able to quickly protect rights in reaction to events. For example, the Dunblane Massacre ~~which~~ resulted in ~~the~~ a ban on handguns in the UK, showing that an uncodified constitution adapts quickly and protects rights ~~and~~, & keeping citizens safe. Similarly, Cameron's legalisation of same-sex marriage ~~was~~ responded to changing social attitudes. This means that an uncodified constitution ~~allows~~ reflects the views of the society it serves which enhances democracy. This strongly indicates that a lack of codification protects rights.

However, "the Human Rights Act is not entrenched" and as such is subject to the wishes of government. This means the act can be repealed or updated at the governments wish. ~~Even~~ The British Bill of Rights proposal is an example of this. The conservatives wish to replace the HRA with a British Bill of Rights that would be much more specific but would leave many unprotected, particularly immigrants. Though this can be argued to be a good thing in light of the Afghan bomber protection 2006, on a large scale it is undemocratic to impose taxation on citizens without protecting their rights - as liberals view a 'social contract', the state should guarantee freedoms in exchange for power. The government has also eroded rights ~~to the~~ <sup>in the</sup> recent ~~act~~ police, crime, sentencing and courts act in which the right to protest has been greatly diminished - limiting freedom of speech, assembly as well. This was seen in practice during the coronation in which several people were arrested for possessing a rape alarm. This is entirely undemocratic to ignore the views of the governed, and to impose such large constitutional change without the consent of the people or proper scrutiny and as such makes a much stronger

case that a codified constitution is needed to protect rights.

Another way an uncodified constitution is beneficial is its "flexible" nature which allows for devolution when needed. For example, both Scotland and Wales have had established parliaments for over two decades and Northern Ireland's parliament has recently been reestablished. This provides power on a local level meaning ~~the~~ the regions can act in their own best interests.

Similarly, the expansion of metro mayors has resulted in 'levelling up' investment-like Manchester's new transport system that will begin work September 2023 - that is truly beneficial to the area as mayors and councillors seek re-election based on their policy proposal, resulting in high accountability which helps democracy. Under a flexible, uncodified constitution, these other combined authorities are able to negotiate new deals with parliament, resulting in more accountability on local levels and enhanced democracy which is a key argument for an uncodified constitution.

However, the asymmetry of powers under the

current system is inherently undemocratic. The constitution "fails to properly detail the position of the devolved bodies" which creates inequality and confusion. For example, Scotland's taxation fees differ greatly from Wales' which differ from England's. For example, the Greater Manchester Combined Authority led by Metro Mayor Andy Burnham has control over transport whereas the West of England does not. This results in more funding allocated towards Manchester's transport than elsewhere which is fundamentally undemocratic as they it results in citizens paying the same taxes but only some reap the reward. Therefore, a codified constitution must be used to set and define equal powers to all regions in order to increase accountability on local levels, ~~improving to ensure~~ efficient funding to areas and enhanced democracy through increased representation.

Overall, the UK needs a codified, entrenched constitution in order for rights to be properly protected and not at the will of the government. This is also necessary for the proper understanding of devolutionary powers. Though this may ~~question the~~ limit parliamentary sovereignty.

devolution is essentially entrenched to Scotland and Wales as a referendum is required for its renewal. Therefore, to improve equality and fairness, all should be entrenched and codified.



This essay clearly defines its terms and set up a direction of travel. It uses the source as a springboard for the debate, pairing up arguments from the source effectively and building the analysis of political information by selecting and deploying some effective evidence. There is an attempt to build in from the start judgements about the question based on the political evidence.



Pairing up the key arguments from the source is a great way to start to generate comparative analysis of political information.

This is a Level 5 response.

I would ~~hardly somewhat disagree~~ with the agree with the view that the UK needs an entrenched and codified constitution, as the source persuasively argues that the constitution does not protect basic human rights or even established democratic order, is confusing and unclear to the people who's lives and futures it impacts, and the UK's future as a union is threatened by the current constitutional nature of devolution.

It is possible to argue that codification and entrenchment are unnecessary, as the current UK constitution has survived many a "political crisis", with the source specifically mentioning Brexit. ~~If~~ <sup>The</sup> current UK constitution is "flexible" enough to keep the UK stable even whilst facing constitutional mayhem surrounding the break with Europe, and has the advantage of being constantly updated as needs must, ~~then replacing~~ <sup>order</sup> which means that it maintains ~~stability~~ and keeps the UK stable and politically up to date. However, I would argue against this, agreeing with the source's view that "the current nature of the constitution has "made recent political crises worse", as the

uncodified constitution resulted in confusion and legal battling surrounding Brexit, with the constitutional significance ~~so uncertain~~ of the EU so poorly understood by the public that when questioned on the <sup>impact</sup> ~~meaning~~ of Brexit would have on the UK, Theresa May could only muster the now infamous "Brexit means Brexit". Codification of the constitution is essential as ~~the~~ it enables citizens to understand the laws of the state they live in, and would enable "the people to write the rules which govern them" thanks to their newer, clearer understanding of how the constitution works. ~~The source~~ though it is stated that best way to enable "clear" understanding "The source argues against this, of the constitution is to write "accessible" legislation that people can understand, but legislation is often cannot be accessible thanks to the historical precedents of the English legal system, and whilst putting everyone's human rights in "the Human Rights Act" which the source gives as an example, would increase clarity, putting all of the relevant constitutional laws into a single place is the logical conclusion of this, and would ensure maximum transparency and public understanding.

The source's second paragraph also argues that codifying the constitution would result in chaos as the

constitution would need to be constantly altered to ensure it didn't "go out of date" and, ~~to uphold~~ this would cause chaos, upsetting the constitutional order. However, this ~~would cause~~ is already the system that exists. The source claims that "the devolution settlement, the Human Rights Act, and the electoral system" would need altered regularly, but all of these are frequently contested areas of policy under the current system. It has been a consistent project of the Conservative party to introduce a British Bill of Rights, and ~~to~~ the right to, for example, public protest, was altered this year in preparation for the Coronation, banning certain acts of protest in the Public Order Bill. The electoral system was challenged by the Lib Dems in a referendum, and the Labour backbench is increasingly ~~focused on~~ focused on changing voting systems, whilst devolution was amended in 2020 under the UK Internal Trade act, and is adjusted constantly by current administrations. These all demonstrate that constitutional order has decisively not collapsed in the face of constant adjustments, ~~but that~~ and further, that stability of said order in the absolute sense would require codification and entrenchment. As the source notes, "the Act [Human rights Act] could be repealed or updated", and protection, not only of the constitutional order but of protections as basic as

~~the right to~~ Human Rights, requires adequate protection under the law, and entrenchment would ensure that only essential, ~~major~~ changes and modernizations are made to the constitution, ~~as~~ ensuring stability for generations to come.

Finally, the source argues that Constitutional reform would be too divisive, and give the judiciary too much power. It suggests ~~that~~ the issue of "monarchy" and debates surrounding it would need resolved, and the judiciary risk being politicized by becoming heavily involved in constitutional disputes. However, I would argue that both of these are already issues under the current constitution; monarchy is heavily debated, with former leader of the opposition Jeremy Corbyn openly identifying as republican, and ~~protesting~~ ~~over~~ the law being changed explicitly around ~~protecting~~ ~~apparently~~ to discourage protests at the coronation. Further, the judiciary do play a significant role in constitutional disputes, even forcing a Prime Minister to back down in recent years; whilst Boris Johnson did ~~rationally~~ have the power to ignore ~~the~~ ruling that his proroguing parliament was illegal, he nevertheless chose to abide by it, and this ~~clearly~~ clearly demonstrates the judiciary's ~~commitment~~ ~~to~~ active role in constitutional affairs. Further the lack of a codified constitution,

threatens the unity of the UK. The notable lack of legislative devolution in England, and the fact that the UK remains unitary in authority, devolving power from the Westminster rather than ~~entrenching~~ <sup>devoolving</sup> power ~~in~~ from the Union of willing partners, means that there are frequent disputes and changes in devolution, while ~~the 3 of the 4~~ ~~the 4~~ three of the four nations often feel sidelined or oppressed by England, and this is a consequence of the UK's constitution evolving over time in a patchwork, inherited from times when Kings actually held practical executive authority, and, as the source notes, "The constitution fails to properly detail the position of the devolved bodies" as a consequence. Entrenching the nature of devolution would likely result in fewer disputes and more ~~comfortable~~ comfortable, clear lines of regional power, while entrenchment would protect the Union, preventing the UK "splitting apart".

In conclusion, I would argue that the UK absolutely does require a codified, entrenched constitution, as the source points out it is necessary for clearer understanding of the law & in day to day life, is required to ensure the stability and protection of UK democracy and individual rights, and is necessary to soothe the many current tensions the Union, preserving

---

*it for the future.*



**ResultsPlus**  
Examiner Comments

This clearly uses the source as a springboard for the debate, showing clear analysis of the political information presented. There is a clear line of argument throughout, that is well supported by the analysis and some well selected examples.

## Question 1 (b)

This question was the less popular of the two source questions, but it was well-answered. There was a wide range of different approaches to answering the question, but candidates effectively engaged with the source to develop their debate and to reach a justified conclusion. It was pleasing to see candidates select and deploy a good range of examples that were current and more historical to really develop a view of how this question should be looked at today, and how views on this debate had changed over time.

Stronger answers were able to really pair up arguments from the source to create a high-level debate. This really allowed candidates to show perceptive comparative analysis of political information. This debate was well backed by carefully selected examples, often both pre 1997 and post 1997. It was particularly pleasing to see the use of contemporary examples, which was probably greatly aided by having many different PMs in such a short space of time. Stronger answers had a clear and logical thread in terms of their views of the question throughout, and the judgements reached were well supported by the analysis that preceded them.

Stronger answers also had a very effective structure. There was a clear introduction that set up the debate and set up a clear line of argument for the answer, with many arguing that where power lies is often defined by the popularity of the PM, how united their party was and the size of their majority. The structure then used well paired arguments to reach supported judgements before reaching strong conclusions. Those conclusions were often short, punchy, and really felt part of a well-argued answer rather than simply an add on.

Some approaches made it more difficult to achieve the higher levels of the level-based mark scheme. One such approach was to use the political information from the source, but pair up arguments that did not naturally together making it a real challenge to develop effective analysis and evaluation. In addition, some answers did not really use the source as a springboard for the debate, but rather wanted to write the response more as a pre-planned essay that they already had in their mind. There were also responses that purely used the source but did not really seek to develop the debate or underpin their analysis and evaluation with any discussion of any Prime Ministers. One issue also arose in that some candidates talked in general about the relationship between the PM and cabinet, or how collective ministerial responsibility works without really staying focussed on the question of where power mainly lies.

The last area that perhaps needs focus is the development of the AO3. Once a pair of well selected arguments had been debated, it was possible for candidates to create interim, substantiated judgements or incorporate judgements throughout. Sometimes these judgements felt merely stated rather than argued towards, undermining their effectiveness. These interim judgements need to build towards the conclusion – where the conclusion was a surprise to the reader, it was the case that the AO3 had not been well developed.

This is a Level 5 response.

Due to the fusion of powers in UK politics, the Prime Minister and cabinet form the Head of government, unlike in the US where the President is the Head of State. Whilst this source lays out convincing arguments to suggest that power lies mainly with the PM as they are seemingly growing in power; ultimately, due to the UK constitution, power lies equally with both the PM and cabinet due to cabinet resignations, Ministers' threats and in the case of a divided party.

Firstly, the source states that power lies mainly with the Prime Minister because key decisions are increasingly being taken outside of cabinet, for example in cabinet committees or with individual members of cabinet and so cabinet are decreasing in power. For example, it could be argued that when it comes to legislation, cabinet is simply a 'rubber stamp' as policy is decided and drawn up by smaller committees first such as the cabinet health committee making laws on smoking in cars without cabinet discussions, this suggests that the source is convincing in presenting the PM as more powerful arguing that power lies more with the PM. This can further be highlighted by the relationship between Blair and Brown during Blair's premiership; Blair made decisions with Brown personally as

Chancellor of the Exchequer and didn't inform cabinet on these decisions, ~~for~~ most notably, Brown and Blair decided that for the first time the Bank of England would have interest rate setting powers but cabinet was not consulted in such a monumental decision which suggests power lies more with the PM and their reliance on trusted allies. This also links to the idea that the PM's style of government affects ~~the~~ the balance of power between the PM and cabinet. Blair operated with a 'sofa government' which was much more informal and thus didn't rely on the formal cabinet consultations and so his style of government could be described as "spatial" by Foley which further highlights ~~that~~ that power lies with the PM. However, whilst the PM can attempt to operate with a separate mandate, ultimately, their position's safety of their position is reliant on cabinet, as stated by the source, "cabinet they can be significantly weakened by cabinet resignations ~~and~~ which therefore shows that the strongest argument is that the PM and cabinet are equally powerful. This can be demonstrated by Thatcher's premiership, whilst Thatcher throughout her time could be argued to be more powerful than cabinet, her downfall clearly illustrates that power lies both with the PM and cabinet. ~~As shown~~ As shown by the source, prominent cabinet resignations can force PM's out of their job, ~~the~~ the resignation of key minister, Nigel Lawson, weakened Thatcher's position and it became clear to her and the Conservative Party that her resignation was

imminent. This ultimately highlights that whilst the PM can hold power, when it comes down to it, ~~the~~ power does not lie more with the PM than with cabinet.

Conversely, the source argues that ~~the PM is~~ <sup>power</sup> lies with the PM because they can appoint loyal ministers and those who are ideologically aligned with the PM. The PM's prerogative power of patronage gives them the ~~power~~ <sup>freedom</sup> of selecting cabinet which can create a unified cabinet and boost the power of the PM as a result. For example, this can be seen with Remarking loyal supporters can be seen with Johnson's promotion of Sunak or Truss' appointment of Kwarteng as Chancellor of the Exchequer which allowed them both to push forward their political agenda ~~with~~ and trying to avoid cabinet scrutiny which attributes to the argument that power lies more with the PM. Moreover, the idea of removing opponents from cabinet can be seen by Thatcher's purging of the 'wets' (One-nation conservatives) in 1981 which gave her the power to push a New-Right agenda and not have to appeal to those who were not ideologically aligned with her, therefore the power of patronage clearly allows the PM to give themselves a significant power over cabinet and so it could be argued that power lies more with the PM. On the other hand, the threat of ministers' limits the power of the PM and

highlights that whilst they are powerful, cabinet is also an influential and powerful body. For example, the source notes how ministers can refuse demotions, this was prevalent in May's cabinet when Hunt refused to move posts in the reshuffle, therefore weakening May's authority and highlighting that both the PM and cabinet are equally powerful. Moreover the source highlights that ~~removing~~ sending ~~votes~~ to the backbenchers can limit the PM's power ~~and as a result they will no longer be bound by CMR~~, for example, Johnson removing the whip from El so whilst the PM can use the power of patronage to create an ideologically coherent cabinet, ultimately, if the PM is in a weak position like May was, cabinet can undermine their authority, thus highlighting that ~~the PM do~~ power does not solely lie mainly lie with the PM.

Lastly, the source stated the PM can use Collective ministerial responsibility (CMR) to control ministers and therefore boost their power and diminish cabinet's. For example, ~~putting~~ putting the 'Big Beasts' in cabinet keeps the ministers bound by CMR which means they cannot publicly speak against the government's rulings, therefore giving the PM more control over cabinet. For example, Brown & Blair having Brown in cabinet and both May and Cameron including Johnson in their cabinets in order to suppress him as a threat.

to their security of their position as PM. This suggests that CMR highlights that power lies mainly with the PM than with cabinet. However, as stated by the source, when a PM has a divided party and they themselves are unpopular, they must maintain a balanced cabinet which therefore suggests that ~~the~~ PM power does not mainly lie with the PM. For example, May adopted a ~~UK~~ bill party that was bitterly divided over Brexit and she was therefore required to include prominent Brexiteers such as Davis and Johnson in her cabinet. Moreover, CMR was suspended due to divisions over Brexit which weakened May further, for example, Johnson publicly criticised her Brexit deal this highlights that ~~the~~ power does not lie mainly with the PM as cabinet can exercise significant power and weaken the PM.

To conclude, whilst the PM is considerably powerful, ultimately, power does not mainly lie with them due to the fusion of powers and the PM is reliant on cabinet to ensure the safety of their position which has been demonstrated countless times and evidenced in this essay.



There is good, logical pairing of the arguments from the source here that provide the framework for the debate. There is a clear question focus, some good development of the ideas and some well selected and deployed examples. There is a nice use of key terminology and it is clear what is being argued throughout, although a punchier conclusion would be a nice addition that would move the mark even higher.

## Question 2 (a)

This question was the more popular of the two essays and overall, was done well. Most candidates had a clear understanding of the functions of the Commons and the Lords and used the functions as the basis for the structure of the essay.

Stronger answers were well structured and focused on the functions of the Commons and the Lords, picking say scrutiny, representation, and legislation as the three functions to build their answer around. This was often detailed clearly in the introduction, along with a direction of travel giving answers a clear path to the conclusion. The best answers were comparative, really looking to see which of the two chambers performed each function more successfully and why. This comparison was often backed with well selected evidence, much of it contemporary, to really underpin the analysis and evaluation. Stronger answers were able to draw substantiated judgements at the end of discussing each function as a series of mini steps towards the conclusion.

Synoptic elements were done well in the stronger answers and were naturally built into the essay. In particular, candidates were able to refer to democracy and participation, elections, political parties, and the media. This enhanced the knowledge and understanding mark (AO1) of the answers and provided a good basis for some strong analysis and evaluation.

Weaker answers tended to struggle as they did not define the functions they wished to debate and so lacked a clear structure or direction of travel. Some got drawn into only comparing the legislative function leaving them with a narrow basis for their essay. It was also the case that some answers merely stated whether the Commons or the Lords fulfilled their functions, and lost sight of comparing which of the two Houses were more successful. Finally, often the A03 judgements were merely stated rather than supported by the preceding debate or conclusions were somewhat of a surprise given the direction the essay had been going in.

This is a Level 5 response.

~~The Legislative Branch~~ Both the House of Commons & the House of Lords perform similar functions, they both scrutinise the executive, provide representation as well as legislate. However due to the House of Commons being the superior house as it's elected & accountable as well as it being merged with the Executive it could be argued it fulfills its functions more effectively than the Lords. However, the Lords has shown that when it comes to these functions it can be more ~~of~~ successful than the Commons.

Firstly, the view that the House of Lords can be more successful than the House of Commons in fulfilling its respective functions can be argued as accurate as the Lords can more effectively scrutinise legislation. Due to the Lords being full of crossbenchers (around 180) there is not a single majority party within the secondary chamber, which means there's less pressure on ~~peer~~ <sup>members</sup> to vote along party lines as well as less influence of the government. Moreover, the Lon-

do can more effectively scrutinise the <sup>legislation</sup> executive  
as it is <sup>in filled by a</sup> majority of professionals & experts in the  
in fields. ~~So whilst they may not hold legislation~~ <sup>This needs legislation, especially secondary</sup>  
, spends more time being examined or amended  
by the Lords which can in turn result in the  
government dropping the legislation all togeth-  
er. This suggests that whilst the Lords doesn't  
have the same power or as many questions  
as the Commons, its ability to more effectively  
scrutinise legislation due to time, its can more  
successfully perform its function than the Com-  
mons.

However, because the Commons is the senior cham-  
ber & is joined with the executive, it could  
be argued when it comes to scrutiny the  
Commons is more effective as it has more  
access to the executive and can ~~or~~ simply  
bypass the Lords. The Commons directly ques-  
tions the Executive during PMAs every wednes-  
day, which gives the opposition parties time  
to hold the government to account. More-  
over, the select committees within the  
Commons, e.g. Public accounts committee  
can hold ministers to account, with  
chain of select committees salaries being



any controversial aspects to legislation. This is power held exclusively by the Lords, suggesting that its power to delay bills and prompt rethinking of legislation suggests that the Lords can more successfully perform its functions. However, this view is flawed as the Commons can simply bypass & ignore the Lords after the 1 year delay as seen in 2004 with the Hunting Act & the 1991 War Powers Act. Moreover, the Commons can ~~pay~~ <sup>public finance</sup> pass money bills without any interference from the Lords thanks to the 1911 Parliament Act, meaning the Lords' limited legislative powers hold it back from effectively sustaining legislation. Moreover the Salisbury Convention prevents the Lords from blocking legislation in a winning party's manifesto, further showing that the Commons has more power <sup>and functions</sup> than the Lords which it can more effectively perform as it isn't as restricted compared to the Lords.

Moreover, the Lords can be seen as more <sup>successful</sup> effective than the Commons in its respective functions as it's unelected

Therefore unaccountable & can therefore which allows Lords to make decisions that aren't populist as they don't have to worry about re-election, unlike MPs in the Commons. This means they don't have to represent a constituency & try to appeal to constituents or face recall or re-election & can rather vote as they see fit rather than being motivated by other factors. Moreover, the lack of <sup>a strong majority</sup> party influence means that Lords don't have to vote as strongly along party lines as those in the Commons do. This suggests that the Lords can therefore perform its function of passing legislation & representing interests of minorities more successfully than the Commons as it doesn't have to worry about re-election and can be argued as being more educated as it's made up of experts.

However, because the Lords are appointed it fails to represent society. The Lords is made up of <sup>more than</sup> ~~majority~~ half. More than half of the Lords are over 70 and 68% of them are private.

less educated (only 6.9% of population<sup>UK</sup>) and lacks diversity. The Commons is much more diverse in terms of age, ethnicity & gender, with Rishi Sunak becoming the 1st Asian PM. This therefore suggests that the Lords fails to successfully represent society whilst the Commons does so more effectively, meaning its representative function is more successful. Moreover it is accountable & answers directly to the people, making it a more legitimate chamber.

Overall, the Lords can successfully perform many of its functions however is ultimately limited by the Commons being the senior chamber which allows it to limit its powers. Due to the Commons being elected by the people, allowing it to pass finance bills & legislation in its manifesto.



This answer has clear essay focus, comparing the Lords to the Commons in relation to three main functions, and backs up the debate with some well selected examples. There are plenty of synoptic elements built into the answer as well as a good use of key political terminology.



In the introduction, the answer establishes the three functions to be debated and this provides the structure for the essay.

This is a Level 5 response.

The House of Lords is clearly not more successful at fulfilling its respective functions compared to that of the House of Commons. It fails in all regards <sup>compared to the House of Commons</sup> ~~pertaining~~ to legislation, scrutiny and representation. However this is rightly so as the House of Commons is the more legitimate chamber ~~therefore~~.

The House of Lords is clearly ~~less~~ <sup>less more</sup> ~~more~~ successful than that of the House of Commons at fulfilling their respective functions of scrutiny, legislation and representation. ~~Although~~ <sup>Although</sup> it is clear that the Commons does dominate over these functions <sup>this</sup> albeit it is not always ~~successfully~~ successful.

It is a weak argument to say that the House of Lords is a failure in regard to legislation as the role and function of the House of Lords is not to dominate legislation but rather to amend and perfect it. This is what the House of Lords does successfully as seen with the 9th Duke of Wellington Wellington making amendments to the

Environmental Act in 2021 in order to prevent harmful sewage waste. ~~The~~ Successful fulfillment of the House of Lords legislative role can also be seen in 2023 with Sarah Mullally making amendments to The Strikes (Minimum Levels Service) Bill in order to prevent those striking from being sacked. The House of Lords influence over legislation is ~~weakened~~ weakened due to the Parliament Acts of 1911 and 1949 ~~and~~ <sup>and</sup> ~~and~~ ~~to~~ the the Salisbury Convention. However, the power they do hold is effectively carried out as seen in the previous examples. The House of Commons can ~~not~~ be convincingly argued therefore to be not as successful as its counterpart Chamber. ~~As seen with Johnson's~~ Due to an 80 seat majority, the Conservative party can easily pass legislation through the Commons and this restricts the ability of the <sup>other party MPs</sup> ~~opposite party~~ to have influence over legislation even ~~with a~~ though 58% of the electorate did not vote for the Conservatives in the 2019 General Election. Acts such as the Public Order Act from May 2023 and the Coronavirus Act 2020 have been met with complications due to failures within the

legislation to address certain issues such as in the Coronavirus Act, the state of whether the right to protest in lockdown was still legal. A strong argument to counter this is that the House of Lords must approve legislation also before it is passed therefore these mistakes are failures of both Chambers at fulfilling their legislative function. However, as previously stated, the House of Lords is under the Parliament Act 1911 and 1949 therefore it ~~cannot~~ <sup>can only ignore</sup> ~~dismiss~~ legislation from the Commons for up to a year - this results in pressure on the House to fulfill its <sup>legislative</sup> ~~role~~ <sup>role</sup> of ~~legislative~~ ~~scrutiny~~. The Commons is not subject to such therefore its failings are greater when legislation is found to be faulty. Clearly the House of Lords therefore is more successful in its legislative functions as the House of Commons holds a heavier role and with that more room for fault.

It is a well thought argument that the House of Lords is less successful at carrying out scrutiny compared to the House of Commons. The Lords have many Select Committees such as that of the Constitutional Select Committee previously chaired by Lord Norton and the COVID 19

Committee. However these committees have little significance compared to that of their counterparts in the House of Commons. The Government are expected to issue a ~~Report~~ ~~st~~ statement in response to reports made in such ~~HO~~ ~~Committee~~ House of Lords Committees however they are not expected to ~~act~~ respond proactively. It is a stronger argument that the House of Commons is more effective at its ~~ret~~ function of scrutiny as 40% of Select Committee Reports are proactively responded to by the Government, and even if not the Committees draw wider public attention. Such was seen in 2023 when the Women and Equalities Select Committee which mirrors ~~to~~ Minister Kemi Badenoch's Department, directly scrutinized Badenoch in a meeting holding the Government to account over its failure to ~~act~~ pass a ~~Menopause~~ Menopause bill which would further protect women's rights. Although it could be ~~so~~ rightly claimed that ~~the~~ scrutiny was not effectively fulfilled as the Government retained its stance against the issue, in theory the Commons fulfilled its ~~rote~~ function of scrutiny as public attention to the issue ~~was~~ ~~was~~ attentionally, the same cannot be

said for issues brought up in reports by the House of Lords Select Committees. Therefore strongly showing that the House of Commons is more successful in its ability to scrutinise.

It is a convincing argument that the House of Commons is more representative as it is elected therefore MPs have strong constituency links. However in theory this has been disproven often in recent years, such as through the role of Chief Whips to force MPs along party lines. This was seen during the COVID lockdowns where it was revealed recently that Matt Hancock agreed to the taking away of funding for a disabled centre in James Daly's constituency if he did not vote along party line. This clearly highlights that party influence uses constituency links ~~to~~ to force MPs to stay with their party's policy. ~~Although this shows strong links in Daly's~~ ~~This policy~~ 80% of constituency seats are 'safe' therefore it is a logical argument that the House of Commons is not successful at its function of representation due to the disproportionality of FPTP. In the House of Lords, Lords are not elected but it is a strong argument

that they successfully fulfil ~~represent~~ their representative function. This is because most Lords are experts such as Lord Norton ~~at~~ who is an expert on the Constitution. There are also now only 92 hereditary peers - a considerable decline from past rates. The House of Lords clearly is not fully representative as it is unelected but this is not its function. The Lords function is to provide a wide representation of expertise and this is clearly delivered. In comparison the Commons struggles to correctly represent its constituents fully.

It is clearly the stronger argument that the House of Lords is more successful in regard to legislation and representation when put in the light of the Lords specific role for these functions. The Commons in contrast clearly fails ~~at~~ more at both and in regard to scrutiny the Commons is more successful but still not perfect.



This has an effective structure. There is a focus on comparing the Commons and the Lords, with well selected evidence to underpin the analysis and evaluation. There is clear synopticity and use of key terminology. This essay in particular is strong at looking at the comparison of the two chambers when it comes to the legislative function.



Synopticity can be naturally built into an answer when considering the big debates about the Commons and Lords. Issues around the role of parties, representation and the impact of the electoral system are all part of the debate.

## Question 2 (b)

This question was by far the less popular essay question and there was a good range of different answers to the question. Structure was important here, with clear introductions, well thought through paragraphs and a clear conclusion vital to scoring well.

Stronger answers had a clear understanding of the nature of select committees, such as departmental select committees, the PAC, the Standards Committee, the Backbench Business Committee and Liaison Committee and could explore whether they were the most effective way for the House to hold the Executive to account. Having explored the effectiveness of select committees, then stronger answers went on to compare the effectiveness of select committees versus other methods such as PMQs, Ministerial Questions, Urgent Questions, votes of no confidence (It is worth noting that there was still confusion over the difference between a vote of no confidence in the Commons in which MPs from all parties decide whether they want the government to continue versus the actions that take place within a political party in relation to their leadership). This analysis was backed with well selected evidence, again much of it contemporary. Where the answers really tried to compare the different methods to see which was more effective, they really developed effective analysis in a logical way that led to substantiated conclusions.

The synoptic element was again largely well done across the whole range of answers. Many candidates focussed their synoptic elements on links back to political parties and elections.

Weaker answers were able to provide analysis and evidence for other methods to hold the Executive to account but had very little to say about select committees or entirely focused their answer on select committees omitting to debate any other methods. There was also a tendency in a minority of answers to lose focus on the question being about the House of Commons and explore other ways the Executive could be held to account like the Lords, the Courts, or the electorate.

This is a Level 5 response.

One of the main functions of the House of Commons is to hold the executive to account by scrutinising government decisions and legislations. ~~It~~ under the Wright reforms 2010, select committees have proven to become a significant method in holding the executive to account for its actions by questioning government departments and the prime minister. However, other effective forms of holding the executive to account also exist, such as the opposition who regularly question the government and use short money to develop opposing policy. Overall however, the ~~now~~ decreased partisan nature of select committees and their detailed scrutiny mean that select committees are the most effective ~~method~~ <sup>way</sup> in for the House of Commons to hold the government to account.

Select committees exist for each of the government departments, along with some non departmental committees, such as the Liaison committee and the Public

accounts committee. Select committee members are ~~elected~~ decided ~~based on~~ to ~~the~~ ~~can~~ reflect the composition of the House of Commons, meaning there is usually an inbuilt government majority, suggesting they are significantly limited in their efficacy of holding the government to account. Furthermore, Select committees' recommendations only need to be acknowledged by governments, leading to between just 40%-50% of recommendations being actioned in 2015. However, select committees have proved extremely significant in holding the executive to account, as demonstrated by the Windrush scandal. A select committee report in 2017 led to the resignation of Amber Rudd (Home Secretary) over deportation targets, demonstrating select committees have a significant ability to hold the executive to account. Furthermore, whilst ~~exec~~ membership reflects HoC makeup, select committees are usually made up of ~~the~~ popular and moderate backbenchers due to the

election process, who are more likely to be critical of the government. For example, Jeremy Hunt of the health select committee was extremely vocal about the government's inadequate Covid response, despite being a conservative MP. ~~This demonstrates~~ Furthermore, ~~at~~ some select committees, such as the Public Accounts committee, have had up to 88% of recommendations actioned, demonstrating that select committees can be <sup>an</sup> extremely effective ~~to~~ method for the HOC to hold the executive to account.

In the HOC, the opposition's role is to scrutinise the government through the development of policy and the use of ~~PMQ~~ PMQ's, which require the prime minister to answer questions and allows effective accountability of the executive. For example, in 2020, Labour adopted Marcus Rashford's position on free school meals, which the conservatives rejected but later made their policy. This demonstrates how the opposition can effectively hold the government to account and successfully

influence policies. Furthermore, the opposition is able to question members of the executive and the prime minister on policy and legislation, forcing justification from ministers. This demonstrates the opposition's significant ability to hold the government to account. However, the opposition's ability to hold the government to account through policy making and PMQ's is significantly limited. For example, a large government majority with a great deal of control makes it almost impossible for oppositions to effectively hold governments to account, as their motions can easily be ignored and struck down, as done so by May, who prevented ministers from voting on opposition motions. Furthermore, PMA's lack a great deal of in depth scrutiny, as leaders aim more to achieve soundbites which will appear on the media, such as Starmer's 'charge of the lightweight Brigade'. Thus it would appear that PMQ's and the opposition have significant limitations

on their efficacy in holding the government to account, as they provide a more shallow level of accountability in comparison to select committees, therefore suggesting select committees are more effective.

Public Bill committees are a former method which the House of Commons uses to effectively hold the government to account. PBC are assigned to specific legislation, allowing in depth scrutiny of legislation and making amendments before it passes parliament. This demonstrates effective accountability of the executive as it ~~shows that~~ prevents legislation to be passed without in depth scrutiny from the HoC. However, the efficacy of Public Bill committees is significantly limited by scheduling motions which prevent in depth scrutiny of an entire bill, reducing the depth of the accountability. Furthermore, unlike select committees, PBC's are extremely partisan, as members are nominated by party whips and votes are whipped to reflect the party line.

Therefore, the ~~gov~~ executive retains a great deal of power over PBC's in comparison to select committees, making PBC's a less effective method for the HOC to hold the government to account.

Overall, the nature of party politics in the House of Commons means that large majorities which are created by FPTP can dominate the accountability function of the HOC. Select committees remain to a larger extent than other methods of accountability, relatively unpartisan, and therefore most effective. Their unpartisan nature and ability to scrutinise government work in large amounts of detail make them the most effective method ~~to~~ for the HOC to hold the executive to account.



There is a good question focus in this response. It has a strong grasp of select committees, and compares select committees to other ways to hold the Executive to account including the role of the Opposition and the Public Bill Committees. There is good political terminology utilised, some well selected examples and synopticity back to Component One.



The ability to utilise key terminology from the specification is a really important to writing with clarity about the big political debates.

### Question 3 (a)

This was the more popular of the two questions and was generally well answered with reference to the key strands within anarchism. Candidates were able to show both where collectivist and individualist anarchism agrees and disagrees over this issue, supported by using well selected thinkers.

Stronger answers had a clear direction from the start, and that argument was pursued throughout. Paragraphs were built around the critique of the existing state, the nature of the stateless society and how to get from the existing state to the stateless society. Candidates were able to show agreements between the strands and disagreements both between the strands and within the strands. Thinkers were generally well selected and deployed to back up the arguments being made. The very best answers were able to have a clear focus on extent from the introduction, through the paragraphs to the conclusion.

Weaker answers tended to state the position of the different strands on the state, rather than really focussing on any comparative analysis to highlight agreements and disagreements. There was perhaps a much greater tendency to leave judgements to the conclusion rather than building them into the essay. One area that did seem to cause confusion was how the different strands proposed getting from the existing state to the stateless society. The difference between revolution – an attempt to transform social, economic, and political relations versus insurrection, which is the transformation of the self, which leads us no longer to let ourselves be arranged.

This is a Level 5 answer.

Anarchists believe in a utopian society that is fundamentally free from the state, and whilst there are some disagreements towards methods and extent, Anarchists are to a great extent united in their views on the state.

Firstly, both individualist and collectivist anarchists believe in freedom from the state, and the abolition of the state. This is because Anarchists believe that the state is a ~~manipulative~~ manipulative body, ~~which~~ which inhibits our freedoms and goes against our interests. The anarchist thinker Emma Goldman stated that "The state is a cold monster", as it crushes our individuality and constrains us. Instead of the state, anarchists have a core idea that anarchy is order, and that humans would thrive in a stateless world. This is the view of

a utopian world, in which we would have freedom to pursue our own individual passions, free of the corruptive state.

Differences, however, appear in attitudes as to how the state is abolished. Anarchists - Communists such as Bakunin maintain a ~~strong~~ collectivist view that ~~freedom~~ <sup>liberty</sup> can be achieved through "propaganda of the deed", or a mass general strike, whereas other thinkers such as Goldman ~~more~~ originally maintained a belief in a violent revolution, before advocating a peaceful revolution after witnessing horrors in the Russian revolution. The differences can be seen as top-down, or bottom up (insurrection), where society ~~erects~~ ~~or~~ overcomes the state or gradually rises above the need for it. On balance, however, the differences only arise in terms of methodology; anarchism is united in the belief that the state is unnecessary.

Another way in which Anarchists are united in their views on the state is that it is corruptive. Anarchists believe that our human nature is 'plastic', and ~~be~~ that we ~~our~~ are molded by our surroundings, so a state

which sees the US tyrannically corrupts our nature; Kropotkin, another thinker, believed that it was impossible to achieve change through the state itself, as any who enter the system are corrupted by it, and therefore it is needed to resist, to overthrow it. After the abolition of the state, we would be equal as humans, and all social hierarchy would dissolve as state-encouraged competitiveness would vanish. Differences, however, are present in the views of how we would function without a state: individualist egoists such as Max Stirner believed that we "do not aspire to live collectively, but alone", arguing that we would exist in a state of self-interest, independent of any state or society. On the other hand, Anarchists mutualists such as Pierre-Joseph Proudhon believed that the state would dissolve, but we would exist via trade of goods, ~~freely~~ free from profiteering, encouraged by the overbearing state. On balance, however, once again the ~~state~~ consensus is that the state corrupts our human nature, and differs only, applies in reference to living within society or outside of it.

The final view, in which Anarchists are

critic in their view of the state is in the context of the economy. Anarchists believe in economic freedom, an extreme liberal version of liberal thinking, where the state does not interfere in the individual's economic choices, nor does it exercise ~~power~~ <sup>control</sup> through taxation, which Max Stirner referred to as 'slavery', as it ~~is~~ <sup>is</sup> exploited humans for nothing in return. There are, however, differences present in anarchist views, as Anarcho-syndicalists believed that trade unions would be the main driver of change and the method to make the economy free from the state. This collectivist view understood humans as innately social, and therefore unions would be the best way to drive out the state. On the other hand, Anarcho-capitalists believed that instead of the state, we would function independently within the capitalist system, where the free market ~~is~~ <sup>is</sup> satisfies all needs and wishes. This is an individualist understanding of humans and how the state inhibits their freedoms, and maintains that the collectives are incorrect in assuming that humans should function together. On ~~both~~ balance, however, the predominant view of the state in the context of

Economy is that it has no place in it, and that a free economy is needed.

In conclusion, while there are some differences in anarchist views of the state within its strands about methods, and human nature, all anarchists are in great agreement that the state is corrupting, has no place in the economy and should be abolished, showing that Anarchism is extremely united in its view of the state.



**ResultsPlus**  
Examiner Comments

There is a clear line of argument here from the start, with effective comparative analysis between the different strands to show agreement and disagreement. There is a good use of key terminology from the specification and thinkers and their ideas are used well in support of the arguments being made.



**ResultsPlus**  
Examiner Tip

Judgements can be made throughout the essay, starting from the introduction all the way through to the conclusion helping to build effective AO3.

This is a Level 5 answer.

Despite all branches of Marxism supporting the removal of the state, different branches such as individualists and collectives have different reasons for why this should be the case, largely due to the impact of the state on human nature, society, and the economy.

One reason for collectivist Marxism seeing a need for the state is due to its impact on human nature. Collectivists such as Trotskyists saw people as naturally cooperative and communistic, and saw the state as inhibiting this human nature from flourishing due to its perpetuation of inequality. By the state having an oppressive role, and forcing individuals to work under a capitalist system, this naturally inhibited the cooperative aspect of human nature. This shows that the state would have to be removed in order for individuals to flourish, as the restriction on their cooperation and <sup>social</sup> ~~social~~ <sup>needs</sup> ~~social~~ is lifted. A similar view is held by individualist Marxists, since they too see the state as inhibiting the human

rather, albeit a different perspective of it. For example, individualist thinkers such as Stirner saw the individual as the 'center of their moral universe,' highlighting individual rationality since they know what is best. In order to promote this egoistic base on human nature being fulfilled, the state would have to be removed (by insurrection in Stirner's eyes.) This shows that individualist anarchists also see the state as playing a restrictive role on individuals, showing that it must be removed. Therefore, despite collectivist and individualists having differing views on human nature itself, they both see the state as a restrictive and corrupting force, meaning that it has to be removed.

Another reason why collectivist anarchists see the state as ~~negative~~ negative is that it upholds a poor economic system. Collectivist thinkers such as Burnham advocated for common ownership of wealth due to it better suit a naturally cooperative and communal human nature. The state instead upholds capitalism, which creates many inequalities, as workers are not adequately rewarded for their labor. This shows that collectivist anarchists see the state as a negative force due to its role in upholding a capitalist economic system, with thinkers such as Goldman describing it as a 'bad master.' On the other hand, many capitalists would disagree, saying that ~~the~~ the state is still negative, but not for upholding

capitalism. Anarchic capitalists such as David Friedman see the state as highly inefficient in providing services and therefore promote the free market as an alternative. The laws of supply and demand can still provide all state functions such as courts which will have a duty to remain neutral in order to continue to receive business. This shows that despite socialist anarchists and anarchic capitalists disagreeing both advocating for the removal of the state, it is for different reasons. Collectivists see the upholding of capitalism by the state as oppressive, whereas anarchic capitalists see the state as inherently flawed, showing that despite overarching consensus, they are not united on why the state should be removed.

Finally, a collectivist anarchist view on the state is that it should not play a role in society. Collectivist thinkers such as Kropotkin advocated for small voluntary communes forming, operated by direct democracy. This removes the need for the state in society, which is perceived by collectivists as a corrupting force - eg. Emma Goldman stating that people in a state influenced society, "clinging to their master and love the whip." This shows that collectivist anarchists see the state as having no role in society, since a more small scale society removes oppression and caters better to human nature (eg. by implementing common ownership of wealth).

Similarly, individualist anarchists see no role for the state in society due to its restricting the freedom of individuals. Thinkers such as Stirner described a 'union of egoists' in which self-interested individuals could be capable of altruism if it benefited their own interests. Furthermore, in contrast to the state which enables the pursuit of one's ego, since no restrictions such as laws would be in place. This shows that individualist anarchists also see the state as not having a role in society, since it only serves ~~to~~ to restrict individuals and their ability to freely cooperate. Therefore, anarchists are largely united in their view of the state, since both very branches see it as unnecessary and in fact restricting in society, with collectivists instead promoting small state communes with direct democracy, and individualists promoting a 'union of egoists'.

To conclude, despite differing in the view of the state in terms of its impact on the economy, highlighted by collectivists seeing it as a 'good machine' and anarchists seeing it as inefficient, anarchists are largely united in their view of the state. Both very branches see it as a corrupting and restrictive force in regards to society and human nature, with many agreeing that it must be removed in order for both ~~human~~ individuals and society as a whole to flourish.

Therefore, analysts are united to a large extent in their view of the state.



**ResultsPlus**  
Examiner Comments

Strong question focus with an effective structure. There is good comparative analysis between the different strands supported with the effective use of key thinkers.

### Question 3 (b)

This question was less popular than 3a, and there was a wide range of responses, but was in general answered well. The key was to really focus clearly on the principle of economic freedom, rather than just writing a pre-planned essay about the economy more generally.

Stronger answers had a clear conception of economic freedom and were able to remain focussed on this principle throughout. Stronger answers were built around the themes of why economic freedom is important, why it does not exist under current economic models and how economic freedom could be achieved. Candidates were able to focus on the agreements and disagreements between collectivist anarchism and individualist anarchism, supported by thinkers are build up a sense of extent throughout the essay. Many answers placed anarcho-capitalism as the odd strand out, with virtually no real agreement with the rest of anarchism beyond their rejection of the state's role in the economy.

Weaker answers tended to position the views of the different strands side by side, rather than comparatively analysing them to build up judgements on the extent of agreements and disagreements. There was also a tendency to focus on just the economy and forget about the importance of economic freedom.

One knowledge area that caused some confusion was the view of Max Stirner on capitalism and private property. Stirner is opposed to capitalism, and to the liberal concept of property rights; property for Stirner is not a moral ideal but rather is simply what we have the power to attain and so the entire world is the property of the Egoist. Therefore, the idea of property rights is entirely meaningless.

This is on the boundary from Level 5 to Level 4.

[To what extent do anarchists disagree on economic freedom?]

The freedom of the individual is a fundamental principle of anarchism. This applies mostly to the damage of the state and restriction of personal liberties. However when one looks at economic freedom, there is certainly divergence within anarchism. Whilst individualist anarchists believe the primacy of the individual means self-interest is the best way for the economy to function, collectivists believe that freedom should be placed in the context of co-operation and equality. Disagreeing on the level of co-operation, the use of capitalism and private property, anarchists disagree to a fundamental extent.

One of the one had there is limited agreement within anarchism that any state intervention in the economy is bad and that freedom ~~is~~ from it is key. This is shown by a dislike by all anarchists of not only the managed capitalism prevalent in the 21st century but

also the Soviet 'state socialism'. This was a issue with both collectivists and ~~individualists~~ individualists, with collectivists arguing that the exploitative position held by the upper class is only assumed by the state, whilst individualists saw any state control over individual freedom in the economy as coercive. Both believe state intervention in the economy would undermine the freedom of people as the state being 'a cold master' as described by Emma Goldman, would act to restrict liberty.

However there is fundamental disagreement over the level of co-operation that would exist within the economy. Egberts, such as Max Stirner, believed a fundamental element of freedom was the ~~idea~~ concept of the supreme individual free to do as he pleases without obligation or duty. The free pursuit of self interest in the economy was supported by ultra-liberals and figures such as Ayn Rand and her promotion of unrestricted capitalism became highly caducous with individualist attitudes towards the economy: the individual is free and so should the market be to ensure the unrestricted pursuit of self interest. By comparison, collectivists believe co-operation is fundamental to the ~~economy~~ economy. ~~Individualist~~ ~~individualist~~ Peter Kropotkin's concept of 'mutual aid' was supported by a subversion of darwinism in which the success of the human race depended on their

rationality to conclude they needed the support of others and that collective endeavour would be more successful.

Therefore the economy should be based on free individuals voluntarily co-operating to create wealth for the collective.

Individualist see this obligation to the collective as a restriction on personal freedom and the pursuit of self interest and therefore are in fundamental disagreement.

~~Another area of conflict is~~ Another area of conflict is the possession of private property. Proudhon believed it was the supreme right of the individual to own the ~~property~~ property he created. This is a view adopted by many individualist anarchists. So long as the property is not based on the labour of others, private property is a key aspect of the individual's freedom to pursue his self interest in the economy and reap its rewards. By contrast collectivists believe 'private property is theft' as put forward by ~~the~~ the anarchist Pierre Joseph Proudhon in his book 'What is Property' of 1840.

~~Another~~ Proudhon's concept of mutualism instead prohibited the exchange of goods and services, as influenced by the Watchmakers of Switzerland, were principles of ~~voluntary~~ voluntary co-operation as provided and exploitation prevented.

This restriction on the type of trade one may engage in, and the removal of personal gain for personal effort comes into conflict with much individualist anarchist thought



## Question 4 (a)

This question was the more popular of the two questions on ecologism and was generally well answered. Most candidates really engaged with the question of whether ecologism is united in the need for radical change to the existing world. Candidates were generally able to show where the strands were united, and where they were in clear disagreement and supported the debate by drawing on the key thinkers.

Stronger answers had a clear direction from the start, and that argument was pursued throughout. The very best answers were able to have a clear focus on extent from the introduction, through the paragraphs to the conclusion.

Stronger answers generally arranged their structure around different themes such as humanity's relationship to nature, the economy, sustainability, and the state. Within each paragraph, they showed areas of unity and where there was clear difference. Most answers saw both social ecology and deep green ecologism as radical in contrast to a more reformist approach by shallow greens, whilst recognising the differences between deep greens and social ecology.

Weaker answers tended to state whether each strand was radical or not, rather than really focussing on any comparative analysis to highlight agreements and disagreements. This tended to limit both the analysis and evaluation. There was also a tendency to only cover two strands, deep and shallow greens, omitting entirely social ecology which limited the breadth of the answer and the ability to really draw out comparative analysis. Thinkers tended to be confused, with Murray Bookchin often being seen as a deep green despite his clear opposition to their ideas, or as a reformist despite his deeply radical philosophical outlook.

This is a level 5 response.

The extent to which ecologism is united in the need for radical change is reliant on what the ~~stron~~ different strands goal is and their view on the relationship between humankind and nature. Light greens believe we can make society more sustainable by working within the existing state and economic structure, adopting a reformist approach. Whereas, dark greens and social ecologists believe radical change is needed to create a partnership between humans and nature, this includes destroying the state and capitalism. Therefore, ecologism is not completely united in the need for radical change, it is partially united.

Light greens reformist approach comes from their view of enlightened anthropocentrism, so although all the strands oppose anthropocentrism they are not united on what humankind's relationship to nature should be. Enlightened anthropocentrism sees humanity as the steward of nature, not the master, and this is based

on ~~the~~ the principle of intergenerational equity. Whereas, dark greens completely reject enlightened anthropocentrism, as do social ~~ec~~ ecologists, as they believe it is not radical enough. Dark greens believe in ecocentrism, which sees nature has having intrinsic value rather than instrumental value which light greens do not completely reject. Ecocentrism according to Aldo Leopold places humanity as a 'plain citizen' of nature rather than a steward or master of nature. Dark greens see the need for a radical change in the relationship between humans and nature, which according to Leopold's Land Ethic, extends the community worthy of moral and/or ethical consideration to the 'soils, waters, plants and animals, ~~off~~ or collectively: the Land'. This involves a radical kind of spiritual revolution ~~to~~ in the form of developing an environmental ~~conscious~~ consciousness. Although social ecologists agree that there needs to radical change, they see this as being as the result of smashing systems of domination and hierarchy, destroying human to human oppression. Bookchin <sup>calls</sup> ~~better~~ ecocentrism 'eco-19-10', nonsense that is deeply misanthropic. Therefore, light greens are fundamentally not united in the ~~the~~ need for radical change as they believe reforming the existing structures and systems is enough, whereas dark greens and social

ecologists are clearly united in the need for radical change, but are divided as to what this looks like.

Most ecologists agree that the existing economy and its focus on GDP and exponential growth is the leading cause of ecological destruction.

However, Light greens believe that the existing capitalist structure can be reformed to ensure the sustainable management of resources, to fit within the Limits to Growth (Club of Rome Report 1973). Although dark greens agree with light greens that there are limits to growth, they completely reject the idea that this can be met by reform. Social ecologists are united with dark greens that capitalism cannot be reformed so must be abolished. This is supported by Bookchin who says that capitalism must 'grow or die' because ~~the~~ limiting or greening capitalism is no more possible than persuading a human to stop breathing. Therefore, ecologism is not united in its approach to capitalism as dark greens and social ecologists ~~can~~ reject it and propose radical change in how economic life should operate, ~~this area~~ and light greens believe you can harness capitalism by green capitalism and green consumerism. This suggests that there is

a fundamental disagreement on the need for radical change.

Both dark greens and social ecologists want to destroy capitalism, replacing it with decentralised small scale production for real needs and not wants. Schumacher advocates Buddhist economics where production of goods is for 'simplified and reduced needs' ~~to~~ because he believes that 'there is more to life than GDP'. This marks a radical change from traditional economics that breeds off consumerism and materialism. This is hugely different to light greens who do not believe radical change is need as they believe you ~~can~~ the market can force corporations to green ~~up~~ in order to meet the demands of ethical consumerism. This involves working within the system, and is therefore not radical.

Therefore, ecologism is clearly not united.

In conclusion, light greens reformist approach clearly separates them from dark greens and social ecologists who see the only solution to ~~rad~~ ecological destruction as radical change and overthrow of existing structures. However, the <sup>part</sup> agreement on radical change between dark greens and social ecologists means that

ecologism is partially united in the need for radical change.



**ResultsPlus**  
Examiner Comments

There is a clear question focus here, and all three strands are covered to generate a debate about whether ecologism is united in the need for radical change. There is a good use of key terminology and when thinkers are used here, they are tied to the key ideas that they have contributed to the debate about ecologism.

## Question 4 (b)

This question was the less popular of the two questions although candidates generally engaged well with the debate on how divided ecologism is in its view of the state.

Stronger answers had a clear direction from the start, and that argument was pursued throughout. The very best answers were able to have a clear focus on extent from the introduction, through the paragraphs to the conclusion.

Stronger answers generally built their essays around either areas of agreement then areas of disagreement or used themes for each paragraph and explored unity and division within each theme. Many answers used the themes of a critique of the existing state, what the future state or stateless society should look like, and how to get from here to there. Stronger answers generally saw a clear level of unity between deep greens and social ecology in opposition to the existing state, and the need for a radical transformation to a society that was based on localism or bioregionalism, whilst arguing that the method of transformation and reasons for transformation remained very different. This was put up against the more reformist approach of shallow greens.

Weaker answers tended to position the views of the different strands side by side, rather than comparatively analysing them to build up judgements on the extent of unity or disunity. There was also a tendency to only cover two strands, deep and shallow greens, omitting entirely social ecology which limited the breadth of the answer and the ability to really draw out comparative analysis.

This is a top of Level 4 answer.

There are 3 main strands of Ecologists, Shallow greens, Deep greens and social ecologists, namely eco-anarchists & eco-feminists. Overall, ecologism is divided in its view of the state as whilst shallow greens are open to state intervention to save the environment deep greens & social ecologists, specifically eco-anarchists are very opposed to state intervention.

Firstly, all strands of ecologism agree that sustainability is fundamental to the ideology. However, they disagree on the type of sustainability and the states role in enforcing it. Firstly, shallow greens support weak sustainability and doing more with less. They support the state and believe it has a role in implementing sustainability and also can aid the strong belief in technological solutions. Shallow greens belief in the state is evident through Rachel Carson and her role in persuading the US government from using DDT pesticides. However, in stark

Contrast, deep greens & social ecologists believe in strong sustainability & oppose the state. Deep greens such as E. F. Schumacher, oppose economic growth & believe that humans need to preserve natural resources and therefore opposes that state that facilitates the depletion of finite resources. ~~instead~~ In his book, "Small is Beautiful" his insistence in preserving natural resources is evident where he pushes for Buddhist economics which focuses on maximum quality of life & minimum use of resources. ~~to the~~ Similarly, social ecologists such as Coral Merchant oppose the state as she believes it facilitates the domination of women & nature which is hugely damaging and needs to be replaced with a new society which facilitates a sustainable bond between humans & nature. Therefore, the three strands <sup>are mainly</sup> ~~mainly~~ <sup>divided</sup> ~~disagree~~ over the role of the state in implementing sustainability as whilst deep greens & social ecologists are united over their distrust for the state shallow greens want the state.

Secondly, All the strands are united, that ecology is a central theme of the ideology however they disagree over the type of ecology & how the state interacts with it. Shallow greens such as Rachel Carson in her book 'Silent Spring' highlighted how she views humans as the 'stewards of nature' favouring

Enlightened anthropocentrism, where humans should look after the earth so it continues to sustain human life. ~~She believed with modified ecocentrism~~ In contrast, Deep Greens disagree and believe Enlightened anthropocentrism is incompatible with the modern economy & State. Instead they favoured ecocentrism where humans aren't at the top of the pyramid of nature, but instead all equals. Aldo Leopold, in his book "Sand County Almanac" argued for his theory "the land ethic" opposing shallow greens views & instead arguing that humans don't live off the land but with it. He also argued there needed to be radical change in order for ecocentrism to work in the state. Similarly, social anarchist, Murray Bookchin, despite disagreeing with Enlightened Anthropocentrism & ecocentrism, also believed in the need for radical change. However, instead to implement 'Social Ecotopia' where decentralised self governing communes run themselves and develop a more in tune & harmonious connection with nature.

Lastly, All ecologists agree that the Earth's resources are finite & scarce however they disagree on the solution to the issue, & the states role in it  
materialism & consumerism

Shallow greens such as Rachel Carson favour quality of life but don't completely break away from materialism instead favour getting richer at a slower pace. Strong belief that with modified environmental ethics the state could ~~modify~~ allow the industrial economy to run whilst still facilitating ecologism. Deep greens disagree and thinkers such as E. F. Schumacher <sup>views</sup> opposes the obsession with GDP hugely damaging & argues there needs to be a clean break from happiness & consumerism which the state prevents. Lastly, social ecologist Murray Bookchin in his book, "ecology of freedom" agreed with deep greens that the state encourages humans to dominate one another & become self-interested & arrogant towards nature & ~~but~~ believes radical change is needed to remove the state.

In conclusion, Ecologists are divided over the view of the state with shallow greens seeing a need for it and deep & social ecologists disagreeing



This answer covers all three strands and generates a line of argument that it sticks to throughout. There is lots of key terminology deployed and key thinkers are well used. There is a good structure used here but perhaps the conclusion was shortened due to time constraints.



Ensuring all the strands are used in the answer helps to build breadth and effective comparative analysis.

## Question 5 (a)

Feminism was the most popular of the non-core ideas and this was the most popular question on feminism. Generally, this question was answered well, with candidates really engaging with the debate.

Stronger answers had a clear direction from the start, and that argument was pursued throughout. The very best answers were able to have a clear focus on extent from the introduction, through the paragraphs to the conclusion.

Stronger answers tended to build their essay around different themes to highlight the level of agreement and disagreement. It was popular to look at what was wrong with the existing economy, what should the economy look like and how should we transform from the existing economy to the ideal economy. Stronger answers were able to utilise all four strands in their answers and support the debate by highlighting the critical contributions from the key thinkers from the specification.

Weaker answers tended to position the views of the different strands side by side, rather than comparatively analysing them to build up judgements on the extent of agreement or disagreement. There was also a noticeable tendency to not include post-modern feminism despite its important contribution to this debate. Weaker answers also tended to simply name thinkers as part of a strand, rather than really using the key ideas of the thinkers to support the debate between the strands.

This a Level 5 response.

All feminists believe that women are excluded in the economic world and most <sup>feminists</sup> believe that the economy exploits the labour of women and refuses to give them economic equality of opportunity to men. However, there is vast disagreement on ~~the~~ whether the patriarchal nature of the economy and the economic and public sphere ~~are~~ should be centred on and whether ~~they~~ <sup>is the</sup> ~~are the~~ root cause to the mistreatment and oppression of women or whether it is simply a factor within a more deep and complex system.

Socialist feminists such as Sheila Rowbotham deeply stressed that the patriarchal, male dominated structure of the economy and the capitalist system that economy was built on were the root causes to female oppression, and in order to combat this system, there must be a radical social revolution involving the overthrowing of capitalism, <sup>in the work "Women's Consciousness and Men"</sup> she believed that in a socialist society, women would be more likely to have the equality of opportunity in the workplace.

and have the liberty to climb to senior roles <sup>usually aimed by men</sup> that they were prevented from reaching ~~as~~ within a lower status in a capitalist system. Whereas Radical feminists, such as Kate Millet, criticized <sup>the</sup> Socialist feminist ~~focus~~ <sup>intent</sup> focus on economy, and stressed the bigger picture of social and deep-rooted psychological factors, and so social revolution would not be enough to be an efficient solution to the oppression of women. In her work 'Sexual politics' 1969, she implicated that patriarchy was all-pervasive and so required complete cultural revolution in order to ~~address the social~~ <sup>abolish patriarchy</sup> in all the sectors it had influenced, ~~Society conditioned issues~~ specifically focussing on the idea that patriarchal values are passed down generation to generation, ~~in~~ mainly through the influence of media, and so cannot be significantly be improved purely through social revolution. However, both Radical and social feminists do believe in the revolutionary approach in response to economy, and both believe that women are exploited and demeaned to; both Kate Millet and Rowellman said: 'Cheap labour' and both ~~stressed~~ reflected on the need to abolish the nuclear family in order for women to be free of 'domestic slavery'. Therefore, both Liberal and Socialist feminists disagree on their centre aims in order for women to achieve liberation from oppression, Socialist feminists

Strongly focussing on economy and revolutionary change in relation to capitalism over all other factors, but Radical feminists criticised this large focus on economy, stressing that other factors such as social and psychological were where patriarchy was most strongly ingrained.

~~Furthermore~~, Liberal feminists such as Charlotte Perkins Gilman believed that in order for women to achieve economic freedom and equality in the workforce, there must be legal reform. In her work 'Women and Economics' she primarily focussed on the reformation of legislation to combat the patriarchal, male dominated economy, such as the narrowing of the gender pay gap, <sup>and</sup> a higher access to education for women as well as education about the oppression of women to give men a realisation of their masculine privilege in order to enact <sup>legislative</sup> change in a male dominated state. Gilman also pondered more socialist feminist <sup>reformations</sup> ~~ideas~~ such as the redistribution of wealth to create an equality of opportunity for women and give men a chance to ~~rise~~ <sup>improve</sup> raise their position in their professional sector. ~~However~~, Post modern feminists such as Bell hooks believed that liberal feminists won't achieve change <sup>for women</sup> through social reform or may fail to address their ~~for~~ primary focus on white middle-class women rather than women of all minorities. Radical ~~socialist~~ feminists such as Kate Millet also agreed that

economic liberty for women could not efficiently be solved through legal reform due to there being this patriarchal nature running through, not just ~~private~~ public spheres, but private spheres. However, both liberal and post modern feminists agree that class is a defining factor in the oppression of women,

despite their different responses to this view. Social feminists like Rauberhan ~~also agreeing~~ <sup>agreeing with liberal</sup> that feminism <sup>opposed</sup> that the economy is vastly dominated by men and is the belief that a woman's human nature prevents her from ~~one of the explanations why women tend to have the~~ working as efficiently. ~~inferior~~ <sup>"inferior"</sup> as men is ~~used~~ <sup>used</sup> as an inferior role in the ~~workplace and domestically~~ <sup>workplace and domestically</sup>.

primary cause as to why women tend to have the inferior, and junior roles rather than the senior roles in the workplace, and this belief needs to be combated. Therefore liberal feminists and post-modern and socialist-feminists disagree on ~~how~~ <sup>how</sup> to respond to the patriarchal nature of economy and how to deal with it as liberal feminists believe in legal reform whereas the other feminists believe patriarchy runs in both public AND private spheres, and so must be battled through revolutionary change, and for Bell Hooks, the recognition of all women in the minorities and their different struggles.

patriarchal

In conclusion, feminists <sup>disagree</sup> ~~agree~~ more than agree on the economy as Socialist feminists such as Sheila Rowbottom deeply stressed that the <sup>structure of</sup> economy was the root cause of female oppression and so must be combated through ~~economic~~ <sup>social</sup> revolution and the overthrowing of capitalism, whereas Radical feminism such as Kate Millet, criticised this Socialist feminist <sup>primary</sup> ~~strong~~ focus on economy, and stressed that social and deep-rooted-physiological factors that showed ~~the~~ ingrained patriarchal views were more important to address and so advocated for a <sup>complete</sup> cultural revolution. Furthermore, liberal feminists such as Gilman believed that in order for women to achieve equality of opportunity in the workplace there must ~~be~~ be ~~social~~ legal reform, <sup>whereas</sup> ~~however~~ Bell hooks (post-modern) and Rauberhan (socialist) stressed that legal reform wouldn't be enough as ~~there is~~ patriarchy exists not just in public but private spheres



This response remains focussed on the level of agreement and disagreement within feminism over the economy, comparing all the main strands and deploying thinkers effectively. There is some excellent comparative analysis and some logical and substantiated judgements.

## Question 5 (b)

This was the less popular of the two questions but in general it was done well by candidates, who really tried to engage with the debate around this core principle of feminism.

Stronger answers had a clear direction from the start, and that argument was pursued throughout. In the introduction, it was also noticeable that stronger answers had a clear definition of the personal is the political which was then used to give a clear structure to the debate. The very best answers were able to have a clear focus on extent from the introduction, through the paragraphs to the conclusion.

Stronger answers had a clear sense of what the personal is political means. This provided the structure for the essay. Candidates were able to use this definition to build the structure of their essay and look at the issues in relation to public and the private sphere. Candidates were able to explore how the personal is political works as a critique of existing society, what action was needed and what type of world needed to be built. Stronger answers were able to utilise all four strands in their answers and support the debate by highlighting the critical contributions from the key thinkers from the specification.

Weaker answers tended to position the views of the different strands side by side, rather than comparatively analysing them to build up judgements on the extent of agreement or disagreement. There was also a noticeable tendency to not include post-modern feminism despite its important contribution to this debate or not to have a clear definition of the personal is political leading to answers wandering away from the question. Weaker answers also tended to simply name thinkers as part of a strand, rather than really using the key ideas of the thinkers to support the debate between the strands.

Post-modern feminism and bell hooks caused some confusion here. Post-modern feminism through the view of bell hooks was about more than ending male chauvinism or ensuring all women had equal rights; it was about eradicating the ideology of domination that permeates all western culture in terms of sex, race, and class. In this sense it was a revolutionary approach to tackling this dominator culture in all aspects of life.

This is a Level 5 response.

The feminist view that the personal is political is something that can be disagreed about through the different strands. Radical feminists believe that the private sphere of life and public sphere should be merged together as they both reproduce patriarchy equally. However, between the strands of Radical, <sup>and</sup> socialist they do believe that the personal is political hence showing some agreement within the strands on this phrase. Overall, there is somewhat more disagreement than agreement in feminism over the personal being political.

Firstly, one area of agreement on the personal being political is between radical feminists and socialist feminists. Kate Millet argues that the patriarchal system of male dominance is embedded within the family alongside society, and that whatever happens in the home

is also something that is political, for example, women are subjected to domestic violence and separate gender roles within the private sphere which ensure male dominance, this should be a matter of the political system too, by implementing laws that empower women away from male dominance and that things within the home are not supposed to just be personal, but should be brought to light in the public sphere. This is a common agreement with ~~liberal~~ <sup>socialist</sup> feminists<sup>1</sup> such as Rowbotham who also believe that the male dominant exploitation that women face in the home due to capitalism's alienation is not only 'personal' and is consequently political as well. Whilst, socialist feminists are more focussed on capitalism and its role in the public sphere contributing to female exploitation, the fundamental principles of their view on the 'personal is political' align with those of ~~the~~ radical feminists, hence showing a degree of agreement between feminism over this issue between these strands.

Alternatively, whilst socialist and radical feminists agree with each other regarding the personal is political to some extent, they have a degree of disagreement with Liberal feminists. The principles of liberal feminism is mostly underpinned by changes that can be made in the public sphere to empower

women, they highly neglect the private sphere and would rather keep it separate from the public sphere. This may be in part of their belief on freedom and gradualist change to the system; they believe that through legislation in the public political sphere, such as Sex Discrimination Act, Equal Pay Act, women have become more liberated in the public and political sphere. Thinkers such as Wollstonecraft would also argue that political representation in the public sphere is far more important than the private sphere. Moreover, this can show the disagreement in views on the personal being political as radical feminists would argue that the liberation in the political sphere is not enough and the underlying cause of systematic patriarchy is neglected by liberal feminists and how the patriarchy needs to be abolished starting from the personal/private sphere in order to have significant impact on women's rights. Overall, this can show that between some strands there is a significant amount of disagreement over this issue as they have different principles on the two spheres of society.

<sup>Intersectional / black</sup>

~~But~~ ~~Postmodern~~ feminists would argue that the personal is political but regarding different types of inequality within society and would somewhat

agree with liberal feminists that ~~what~~ what women do in the private sphere should be decided by them but disagree with the liberal feminist argument that all women will have equal opportunity through the political system. Some women ~~are~~ experience different dimensions of inequality between the public and private sphere and for there to be full equality, those need to be addressed first, such as race and class, <sup>as bell hooks said</sup> therefore to some extent having the agreement that the personal is political as there should be radical changes within the system to allow all types of women to be liberated from a patriarchal system. This can show some agreement between feminism about the personal being political but the principles underpinning different strands create more disagreement.

In conclusion, ~~most~~ <sup>some</sup> feminist strands believe that the personal is political such as radical and socialist feminists however, ultimately, there is more disagreement between feminism as a whole; as discussed, the principles of these strands greatly differ in some instances so therefore, it is those differences that create this disagreement to some extent.



This answer has a very clear sense of what the core principle of the personal is political means, which allows for the development of some effective analysis and evaluation. There is clear question focus and comparative analysis between all the main strands within feminism.



At least two key thinkers from the specification must be used in answers. Other thinkers from beyond the specification can be used in addition but not as a substitute for the two key thinkers from the specification.

## Question 6 (a)

This was the more popular of the two choices on multiculturalism and was generally answered well with students really engaging with the debate.

Stronger answers had a clear direction from the start, and that argument was pursued throughout. The very best answers were able to have a clear focus on extent from the introduction, through the paragraphs to the conclusion.

Stronger answers tended to build the structure around a variety of different themes such as diversity, tolerance, opposition to assimilation and support for minority rights and cultural recognition. Within these themes, candidates were able to draw out the areas of agreement and disagreement between liberal, pluralist, and cosmopolitan multiculturalists, supported by the well selected use of the ideas of the key thinkers. It is also worth noting that there is no cosmopolitan multiculturalist in the specification, although some answers did use Jeremy Waldron here as an additional thinker.

Weaker answers tended to position the views of the different strands side by side, rather than comparatively analysing them to build up judgements on the extent of agreement or disagreement. Weaker answers also tended to simply name thinkers as part of a strand, rather than really using the key ideas of the thinkers to support the debate between the strands.

One area of confusion that did arise was in liberal multiculturalism, which was often mistaken for liberalism. Liberal multiculturalism argues that liberal idea of the neutral state is not supportable in practice; it can grant freedom of speech but as soon as it specifies the language for official documents or to be used in schools, it is no longer neutral. Therefore, group differentiated rights can be supported based on the principle of justice as well as the principle of autonomy.

This is a Level 5 response.

Overall, <sup>to a greater extent</sup> there is more disagreement than agreement within Multiculturalism. The three main areas of disagreement lies within diversity, minority rights and the importance of culture. The most disagreement lies between pluralist and liberal multiculturalism and this is due to their fundamental disagreements on the emphasis that should be place on culture and cultural gaps which underpins disagreement in all three areas. Thus to a greater extent there is more disagreement than agreement.

All forms of Multiculturalism agree that there should be some level of diversity within society alongside some level of unity in society. The liberal <sup>with asymmetry</sup> ~~Fasih Aladeed~~ bases his conception of minority rights on allowing there to be some level of ~~dist~~ distinctiveness <sup>of culture in</sup> in ~~total~~ society & for instance the self legislating Nunavut territory in Canada ~~is~~ bridge about cultural distinctiveness. Similarly, the pluralist Binhu Parekh advocates for a 'community of communities' in which cultural dialogue and exchange is celebrated. Cosmopolitans also are in

fan of diversity with Jeremy Waldron opposing Marcus Garvey's notion of cultural isolation and Pan-Africanism. However, ~~the~~ multiculturalists disagree on the extent to which diversity should go and the role of a 'national story' in diversity. Liberal multiculturalists advocate for a 'shallow diversity' in which diversity is constrained by the acceptance of some values as absolute and universal. However pluralists advocate for deep diversity which does not view any value as absolute. Poremba echoes this sentiment by arguing that culture must 'guard against the ~~at~~ obvious temptation to absolutize itself' and Isaiah Berlin ~~is~~ advocates for value pluralism which goes beyond shallow diversity by arguing that liberals cannot know which set of values are the correct one. Cosmopolitans will also oppose pluralists by ~~not~~ viewing diversity merely as a transitional stage and internally pluralists are divided in their support for deep diversity but ~~are~~ ~~the~~ ~~of~~ particularists would view diversity as a threat to their own culture. Thus in terms of the level of diversity, there is significant disagreement within multiculturalism.

All multiculturalists would advocate for the rights of the individual to practice their cultural customs and beliefs. Will Oxtoby argues that certain minority rights are compatible with 'liberal democratic individuals' and other liberals may similarly agree that certain rights such as

Some minority rights are a guarantee of personal autonomy. Pluralist Multiculturalists would also be in favour of minority rights to ~~ensure that we can maintain~~ prevent the marginalisation of minority groups, ~~with~~ and Cosmopolitans similarly would seek to protect different cultures ~~with~~ minority rights. However, the extent to which we should extend to minority rights should be extended and their importance in an area of <sup>significant</sup> disagreement. Whilst liberal Multiculturalists would argue that the rights of the individual take precedence over the rights of cultural groups ~~that~~ pluralist multiculturalist I would be less inclined to agree. Whilst ~~from~~ Will Kymlicka argues that minority rights are the only way to ensure full and equal participation other liberals argue that it prevents integration into society and ~~disadvantages~~ ~~to~~ does not account for the tension between the individual and the collective's rights. However, other Multiculturalists such as J. Charles Taylor would disagree and argue that individual self respect is tied to cultural membership and so minority rights must be extended. Conservative critics <sup>comment on</sup> ~~found~~ this conflict and argue that minority rights threaten long established traditions. Cosmopolitan multiculturalists would not want to include a right against offense (which pluralists would) as seen by Waldron's praise of Salman Rushdie's controversial 'Satanic Verses'. Thus, there is significant disagreement on the extent of minority rights and their importance.

All multiculturalists agree that some level of ~~the~~ recognition should be given to all cultures. Whilst Liberal Multiculturalists do advocate for a ~~both~~ strong national identity and patriotism they do recognise that different cultures are of importance. This is consistent with pluralist and cosmopolitans who advocate for some level of recognition as seen in Charles Taylor's 'Politics of Recognition'. However they do disagree on the importance of culture. Liberal, as seen in French Laicite, view culture as a private matter but that it is unimportant as long as civic nationalism is there. But Charles Taylor sees recognition as a 'vital need' with no recognition leading to a crippling self hatred and Parekh saying it makes immigrants feel threatened and besieged. Parekh views culture as the dialectic of human nature placing great emphasis on recognition and distinctiveness. But cosmopolitan like Waldron aim at a 'melting pot society' and want only a 'single <sup>single</sup> cultural community'. But particularists see cultural distinctiveness as a form of political resistance and aware approach says that 'cultures are not important in themselves but because people matter and cultures important'. <sup>Thus people's</sup> <sup>not disagreements</sup> <sup>than agreements</sup>

There is greater disagreement than agreement in multiculturalism especially between liberals and pluralists. They disagree on minority rights expansion, importance

*the answer.*



There is a clear line of argument and real sense of debate here. All the main strands of multiculturalism are covered, with the main ideas of key thinkers used well to bring the debate to life. It is good to see an excellent use of the key terminology of the specification which helps to build a clear and focussed answer.

## Question 6 (b)

This question was the less popular of the two questions and was also less well answered in general. The question focussed on tolerance, part of the key terminology of the specification. A clear grasp of what this concept means, its limits and why it is so important to multiculturalism were key to the answer.

Stronger answers had a clear direction from the start, and that argument was pursued throughout. The very best answers were able to have a clear focus on extent from the introduction, through the paragraphs to the conclusion.

Stronger answers tended to focus on the debates around tolerance, its limits, its relationship to diversity and its relationship to integration. Stronger answers were able to draw out the areas of agreement and disagreement between liberal, pluralist, and cosmopolitan multiculturalists as well as the contrasting views of the conservative criticism of multiculturalism, supported by the well selected use of the ideas of the key thinkers.

Weaker answers tended to position the views of the different strands side by side, rather than comparatively analysing them to build up judgements on the extent of agreement or disagreement. Weaker answers also tended to simply name thinkers as part of a strand, rather than really using the key ideas of the thinkers to support the debate between the strands. It was noticeable that some answers talked more generally about multiculturalism without really focussing on the question or using the key terminology from the specification.

This is a Level 4 response.

Question 7(a) ✕

Question 7(b) ✕

Multiculturalists overall do agree on tolerance as all believe in some form of diversity as well as wanting positive discrimination for minority cultures. Positive discrimination would provide tolerance as it shows minority cultures that they are accepted and important and all strands want to protect them. There are some disagreements on how much society should tolerate ~~them~~ minority cultures, but ultimately they do agree.

All 3 strands in multiculturalism (MCSM) advocate for positive discrimination, as this will protect and promote minority rights. For example the liberal strand believe that cultures should be given ~~the~~ ~~positive~~ positive discrimination through 'group differentiated rights'. This was advocated for by Kymlicka as although the state in theory should be neutral ~~we must~~ they will always bias the majority culture and make minority cultures feel like second class citizens. Which Kymlicka argued was wrong and ~~there~~ minorities differences in culture should not be sidelined and ~~so~~ the state must tolerate these differences. This is agreed by Narekh who wants legalise

pluralism, where there are multiple legal systems in society which allows cultures to experience 'there full culture, as diversity is unity'. This shows how both strands tolerate minority cultures through their use of positive discrimination towards them. Liberal and pluralists also agree that ~~both~~ Pluralist Multiculturalists (MCS) agree that culture is embedded and so ~~other cultures are not~~ ~~and~~ you can't change the culture that has been given to you. Cultural embeddedness was advocated by Parekh and Berlin's ideas on value pluralism, where multiple cultures should be allowed in society show ~~that~~ how the strand Pluralists ~~are~~ encourage tolerance of cultures. This is also agreed by the liberal strand who although adhere choice believe that your culture is due to inheritance and is granted by your community. Meaning you can't change your culture and so therefore all cultures must be tolerated, as seen by Taylor's emphasis on the politics of recognition which advocates that each culture must be recognised and tolerated otherwise will lead to politics of hate like the 2007 Bradford riots. Therefore this shows that our culturally embedded nature means tolerance towards cultures must be accepted.

However there are some disagreements between the MCS strands and this is over the way society should be. As the pluralist strand advocate for deep diversity which is a full tolerance of the whole culture and every law must be allowed even ones such as FGM. Although Parekh did acknowledge

That this was radical for a modern state it was needed. However the Liberal strand differ on their tolerance of culture in society as they place an emphasis on shallow diversity which is ~~not~~ tolerating the culture but only to a certain extent and oppressive laws such as forced marriage should not be allowed in society. This shows a difference on how far the 2 strands tolerate each culture and to what extent they should be allowed in society. There is also another disagreement over tolerance in the strands which is cosmopolitan, as cosmopolitan thinker Jeremy Waldron advocates for cosmopolitan integration which can be argued disregards tolerance to each culture. As cosmopolitan integration allows cultures to pick and mix different elements from every culture so doesn't allow the culture to protect its values, ~~the~~ which therefore shows that cosmopolitan ~~disregards~~ the idea of tolerance towards culture due to their pick & mix culture. This shows how the strands disagree on their tolerance to what extent culture should be allowed in society.

However overall, all strands do ultimately want to tolerate each culture and this is shown ~~in~~ on all 3 agreements and the positive discrimination of culture, which then allows cultures to have their own rights which protect their minority background and ensure that they are accepted into society. As well as the Liberal and pluralist strand agree that culture is ultimately embedded so can't be changed, ~~or~~ and so therefore cannot subscribe to the majority culture and so each separate

Culture must be tolerated in society



**ResultsPlus**  
Examiner Comments

This response clearly tries to answer the question, and scores consistently across all the AOs. It has a very strong use of key terminology from the specification. This is a good example of how to use thinkers – by using the key contributions of thinkers to the ideas of the main strands within the political idea.

## Question 7 (a)

This was the less popular of the two questions on nationalism, but in general was answered well with candidates engaging with this debate around society.

Stronger answers had a clear direction from the start, and that argument was pursued throughout. The very best answers were able to have a clear focus on extent from the introduction, through the paragraphs to the conclusion.

Stronger answers tended to build their answers around what unites all nationalists in their view of society, before looking at areas of agreement and disagreement between strands. Stronger answers tended to pair up liberal nationalism with anti/post colonialism against the ideas of conservative nationalism and expansionist nationalism. Better answers were able to effectively deploy the key terminology of the specification to build effective debates between the strands and support this debate by utilising the critical ideas of the key thinkers from the specification.

Weaker answers tended to position the views of the different strands side by side, rather than comparatively analysing them to build up judgements on the extent of agreement or disagreement or to drift away from the focus on society. Weaker answers also tended to simply name thinkers as part of a strand, rather than really using the key ideas of the thinkers to support the debate between the strands. There was also a tendency to not include all the strands in the debate, limiting the ability to develop the breadth of argument and draw out comparative analysis to build clear conclusions.

This is a Level 5 answer.

Question 7(a) ✘

Question 7(b) ✘

Nationalism focuses on the idea of the nation and how society should be conducted within that nation and globally. It could be argued that nationalism is united in its views on society as all strands advocate for societies made up of individuals with common characteristics or interests. However, it is clear that as a result of the differing views regarding inclusivity, nationalism is divided in its views on society.

It could be argued that nationalism is united in its views on society as all strands advocate for societies to be based on a collective characteristic or interest of the people. This can be seen in the liberal <sup>nationalist ideas</sup> ~~ideas~~ of Jean-Jacques Rousseau who was overt in his belief that a nation must <sup>be constructed</sup> ~~be constructed~~ around the general will of society and a collective social contract between the population and the state. This is seen in his idea that, 'obedience to the general will enhances freedom'. This shows that he advocates for a society consisting of a people with a common will and interests. In addition, conservative ~~the~~ nationalists such as Johann Gottfried von Herder advocate for a society based on shared past experiences and culture. Culturalism is an

important conservative nationalist principle. As well as this expansionist nationalists desire society to be made up of a single race and national identity. Also post-colonial nationalists such as Marcus Garvey advocate for pan-Africanism which is ~~the~~ a society and nation constructed of Black people spanning across nations and nation states. This can be seen in him saying, 'Africa for the Africans ... at home and abroad!' This shows a necessity of African heritage to be a part of the society which is in line with other strands' ideas of common characteristics. Overall, there are some similarities in nationalist ideas about the state but they are very limited.

However, a much stronger argument is that nationalists are divided in their views on society as they vastly differ on ideas of inclusivity and globalisation. This can be seen in the ideas of liberal and post-colonial nationalist strongly disagreeing with conservative and expansionist ideas. Liberal nationalists advocate for an inclusive society based on a national spirit and patriotism rather than common characteristics. This can be seen in the ideas of Giuseppe Mazzini who called for inclusivity and national pride as seen in him saying, 'A country is not a mere territory... but rather a sentiment of love, a sense of fellowship which binds together the sons of that territory.' This shows a <sup>romantic idealism</sup> desire for 'love' and an inclusive society reliant on national spirit. In addition he advocated for internationalism and a cooperative global society ~~to~~ made up of self-determining nations which all have the same power and sovereignty. ~~post-~~

Colonial nationalists also have similar inclusive ideas as their proposed nation under Garvey spans across nations. On the other hand, conservative nationalists advocate for a society created around common characteristics like language, culture, folklore, tradition and shared past experience. This is much more exclusive and reflected in Johann Gottfried von Herder's idea that, ~~the~~ Countries are wonderfully separated nationalities not only by woods and mountains, seas and deserts, rivers and climates but more particularly by ~~the~~ language, <sup>inclinations</sup> ~~character~~ and characters. This shows that he believed that ~~societies~~ <sup>societies</sup> should be constructed of populations that share personal characteristics, a 'volk' which is patriotic and self-determining. On the ~~the~~ most exclusive end of the spectrum is expansionist nationalists who advocate for a society consisting of a homogenous population that is superior to other societies and nations and should therefore dominate those societies through ~~militarism~~ militarism and imperialism. This can be seen in the ideas of Charles Maurras who despised a repressive France ~~the~~ following the revolution ~~and~~ and wanted to return to the colonial empire and monarchy of France. These expansionist ideas are reflected in Hitler's Nazi regime, Mussolini's fascist Italy and the British colonial history. Conservative nationalist exclusivity is reflected in Rishi Sunak and Suella Braverman's Illegal Migration Bill and strict stance on immigration. Overall, the ideas in nationalism surrounding the exclusivity of a society means that nationalism is more ~~dived~~ <sup>concerned</sup> in its view on society.

In conclusion, ~~nationalism~~ all nationalists call for a strongly patriotic and proud society with similar common interest within the population. However, the extremely contradictory views on the inclusivity and make up of both individual national societies and international society means that it is clear nationalism is divided on society. Liberal and post-colonial nationalist are more inclusive and reject colonialism and ~~imperialism~~ <sup>hegemony</sup> of nations, whereas conservative and expansionist nationalist are very exclusive and dispossing of ~~them~~ <sup>others</sup> and immigration. As a whole the idea and views of ~~the~~ society and how it should be constructed divides nationalist to a great extent.



**ResultsPlus**  
Examiner Comments

This is a sharp and focussed answer that has an excellent grasp of the terminology and ideas of nationalism. There is perceptive comparative analysis building to effective arguments and judgements. The whole range of different strands are utilised to develop both breadth and depth. The essay has a strong introduction and conclusion, with an effective structure.



**ResultsPlus**  
Examiner Tip

Introductions and conclusions are very important to a good essay; they do not need to be long but do need to be punchy, focussed on the question and clear.

## Question 7 (b)

This was the more popular of the two questions on nationalism, and generally candidates engaged well with the debate around whether nationalism is progressive. Candidates generally had a good grasp on the terms progressive and regressive.

Stronger answers had a clear direction from the start, and that argument was pursued throughout. The very best answers were able to have a clear focus on extent from the introduction, through the paragraphs to the conclusion.

Stronger answers tended to group liberal nationalism and anti/post colonialism together exploring the extent to which they were progressive, and then grouped conservative nationalism and expansionist nationalism together to explore the extent to which they were regressive whilst comparing the differences between and within the two blocs. This led to some very interesting debates supported by carefully selected ideas from the key thinkers.

Weaker answers tended to position the views of the different strands side by side, rather than comparatively analysing them to build up judgements on the extent of agreement or disagreement. Weaker answers also tended to simply name thinkers as part of a strand, rather than really using the key ideas of the thinkers to support the debate between the strands. There was also a tendency to not include all the strands in the debate, limiting the ability to develop the breadth of argument and draw out comparative analysis to build clear conclusions.

This is a Level 4 answer.

Question 7(a) ☒

Question 7(b) ☒

Nationalism as a whole is mostly divided on whether it can be labelled as regressive or progressive, for instance liberal and anti-post colonial nationalists can be seen as progressive in their views on human nature and their idea of nationhood, whereas conservative and Chauvinistic nationalists can be seen as more regressive than progressive in their approach. Ultimately, it can be seen that nationalism on the whole, is more regressive than progressive.

Firstly, in terms of the state, liberal nationalists are very progressive in their view, they encourage co-operation and emphasise general will, as suggested by Jean Jacques Rousseau which is the idea that everyone within a nation should be working towards the common good of the nation which infers progressivism as liberal nationalists will often emphasise working with global organisations such as the U.N or Nato to unify around a common good. Whereas on the

Other hand Chauvanistic nationalists such as Charles Maurras, are very regressive in their view of the nation state. Maurras emphasises militarism over cooperation and the superiority of his nation of France to others. He looks back on France's 'golden days' during the past, which is regressive in its approach, unlike liberal nationalists. Conservative nationalists to an extent share this emotional and exclusive perspective on the nation-state, they believe in a 'volksgeist' or folk spirit as suggested by Herder which has developed over many years making nationhood exclusive. Therefore, nationalism as a whole is more regressive than progressive.

↳

Furthermore, the approach to both society and the state by anti-post colonial nationalists can be seen as progressive overall. For example, key thinker Marcus Garvey suggests that in a post-colonial nation, African nations will be able to gain economic and self-deterministic independence, which will help them progress as a society. Garvey also argues that racial separatism can be used as a method to progress, as it would end the exploitation faced by African nations and allow black ~~people to go~~ communities to gain sufficient independence from the global effects.

and markets created by colonialism. However, it can be argued that racial separatism is more regressive rather than progressive as it looks back to the origins of a nation before globalisation and free movement. Chauvinistic nationalists such as Charles Maurras also emphasise this idea of both racial separatism and nativism, which again harks back to a time in history where militaristic values and superiority of ones nation was important, which can be seen in history within Nazi Germany for example. Therefore on the whole nationalism is more regressive than progressive.

In addition, liberal nationalists are more inclusive and positive in their approach to human nature the believe that humans will work together and co-operate for the common good, as suggested by Rousseau and they often favour internationalism, looking forward to future relationships with other nations both economically and politically and would therefore support organisations such as the U.N which are more harmonious and co-operative in approach. Emphasising civic nationalism - the idea that a nation is based on the general consensus,

tolerance and goodwill of the people. Whereas, conservative nationalists such as Herder are more exclusive and pessimistic in their view of human nature. Emphasising that the nation is built around a folk spirit or *Volksgeist* that has developed over time and cannot be replaced or taken on as a shared value if you are not from that nation. This suggests that nationalism is actually more regressive in its approach to human nature, than progressive.

In conclusion, on the balance, nationalism can be seen as more regressive than progressive, as strands such as chauvinistic and conservative often look back to the past to define their idea of a nation. Whereas liberal nationalists can be seen as more of an outlier as they are more progressive and tolerant in their approach. But overall the stronger argument is that nationalism on the whole is more regressive than progressive.



This essay has an impressive structure that really allows it to meet the demands of the question. All the main strands are covered, with the ideas of key thinkers selected well to support the debate.



Essay structure is really important to really tackle the debate head on within the time limit.

## Paper Summary

Candidates are given the following advice:

- Timing is crucial; it is important that candidates leave themselves enough time to do justice to the non-core ideas section.
- Planning remains vital in source-based essays; the better answers were clearly able to pair up arguments from the source and use them to generate a real sense of debate throughout.
- The careful selection of relevant evidence, in particular contemporary evidence is vital to building effective analysis and substantiated judgements in all questions on UK Government.
- The importance of writing short, punchy introductions and conclusions to really frame the essay.
- In essay questions, the importance of remaining focussed on the words of the question and planning answers so that they don't drift from the question.
- The importance of building effective evaluation throughout essays; this relies on arguing to a conclusion rather than merely stating a conclusion.
- In non-core ideas, it is vital to focus on areas of agreement and disagreement, and really build up a sense of the "extent" of those agreements and disagreements.
- All the strands should be utilised in non-core ideas answers and it is better to support the debate with the key contributions of the thinkers rather than simply stating that a thinker is from one strand or another.

## Grade boundaries

Grade boundaries for this, and all other papers, can be found on the website on this link:

<https://qualifications.pearson.com/en/support/support-topics/results-certification/grade-boundaries.html>

