



# **Examiners' Report June 2024**

**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 2024

Publications Code 9PL0\_X02\_2406\_ER

All the material in this publication is copyright

© Pearson Education Ltd 2024

## **Introduction**

This was the fourth full series since the introduction of the new Politics specification, and it was very pleasing to see so many candidates fully engaging with the big political debates.

The paper was a challenge for candidates, allowing them to select and deploy political information, develop analysis, and build substantive judgements. It is worth highlighting the number of candidates who developed fully a clear line of argument, used contemporary evidence, and was able to place that evidence in context.

## **Source Questions**

In the source questions, it was pleasing to see candidates engaging with the political information in the source to develop an argument in relation to the question set. Effective structures were used to pair-up the arguments to develop comparative analysis and work towards substantiated judgements.

## **Essay Questions**

Essay questions were generally well-structured, engaged with the question, used good political vocabulary, and looked to develop a sense of debate. Whilst it was good to see clear lines of argument emerging, there is still a need to develop judgements that are more effectively substantiated by the evidence presented and the analysis that was developed. The line of argument needs to go beyond only being stated to being developed effectively, so as to convince the reader.

## **Non-core political ideas**

It was pleasing to see that the non-core political questions were answered well, overall, and there was a stronger use of key political terminology. Writing in the language of the political idea allows the candidates to write with greater depth and perception whilst also making it possible to write shorter, more hard-hitting responses.

Most candidates did look to develop the comparative analysis around the differences and similarities between strands, supported by key thinkers, to reach judgements. In those judgements there is still a need to focus on the question stem and provide a clear answer to "extent".

Timing across the paper was an issue again this year, and the answers on non-core political ideas were typically the responses that were either very short or incomplete.

## Question 1 (a)

This question was the less popular of the two source questions, with a wide range of answers on display.

Candidates were able to engage with the political information in the source, using the key arguments from the source to build the skeleton for their essay. Performance was more varied in terms of developing the debate from the political information in the source and selecting topical evidence to help generate effective analysis and judgements.

Engagement with the question was crucial to reaching the higher-level mark bands. Stronger answers were able to select the political information effectively from the source and pair-up the arguments from it to develop a high-level debate with a clear line of argument regarding election of the House of Lords.

This debate was supported by well-selected evidence, that was often very topical. For instance, candidates looked at the role of the Lords in scrutinising the Safety of Rwanda Bill, the appointments made to the Lords by Boris Johnson, or the impact of Peers such as Lord Dubs or Baroness Lawrence. The strongest answers had a clear line of argument, where that argument was developed throughout the essay. Introductions were short and pithy, setting up the debate and direction of travel, whilst conclusions were logical, clear and offered a natural end to the answer, rather than only a recap of the essay.

Structure was very important here. Answers that did not pair up naturally-competing viewpoints found it difficult to develop their analysis thoroughly, to reach logical judgments. Answers that did not use the political information in the source effectively to set up the debate – or did use the source but did not develop the arguments within it – found it difficult to build effective Assessment Objective (AO)02 and A03. Answers that used historical evidence or hardly any evidence also had difficulty engaging with the question.

In terms of developing A03, many candidates did have a clear line of argument in the introduction and did build in mini-conclusions at the end of the comparative analysis of a pair of arguments building to the conclusion. Often, these judgements still felt more stated than developed, and where judgements or conclusions were either unexpected or unconvincing, the A03 was weaker.

This is a Level 5/Level boundary script.

~~Some may argue~~ The House of Lords serves as an important revising chamber in Parliament. However some argue that it has no legitimacy to do its job as they're entirely unelected. Criticisms from proponents of an elected House of Lords include the fact that huge donors and well-connected individuals, the lack of mandate and abuse of patronage. However whilst these arguments are valid to an extent, they are limited as an elected House of Lords would cause a legitimacy clash, as well as the fact that the current arrangement allows for independence and the ability ~~expressions~~ to successfully challenge government legislation.

Some may argue that there should be an elected House of Lords to combat the problem of the amount of wealthy individuals and donors who are present as peers in the House of Lords. The source says that the House is 'stuffed full of party donors, lobbyists and wealthy, well connected individuals'. This highlights the argument that due to peers who are not fit to serve, the quality and ability to challenge and amend legislation is greatly hindered. The House of Lords should have peers appointed on experience and relevant expertise instead of the size of a donation to a party. The failure to challenge and

amend legislation can be seen by the government not taking amendments seriously, with Sunak's government rejecting amendments to the Rwanda bill in 2024. Therefore some conclude that having an elected House of Lords solves this and would make them more powerful by giving the choice to the electorate and providing a legitimate mandate. However this argument is limited as the House of Lords can already be seen to successfully challenge the government.

The more convincing argument is that the House of Lords doesn't need to be elected for better functionality as it already performs its scrutiny function well. The source states that the House of Lords 'performs an essential role as a revising chamber, providing detailed scrutiny of legislation'. Their ability to successfully challenge and scrutinise legislation can be seen when they had defeated and scrutinised Brexit legislation 10s of times over by 2018. The source also states that 'an elected Lords could result in 'weakening its ability to check the government', potentially causing it to function worse. This could be due to the fact that government majorities would likely be reflected in the Lords if it were to run on a First-past-the-Post system as voters would likely vote for the same party twice. Therefore the more convincing argument is that the Lords performs its functions well and an elected Lords could actually worsen its scrutinising function, as peers from the same political party

can be whipped and would most likely be less inclined to scrutinise as heavily.

Some may also argue that the House of Lords should be elected to provide a mandate for them. The source states that 'The House lacks the democratic mandate to do its job effectively' which refers to the fact that peers are unelected and the electorate has no say over who gets in. Many argue that this is completely undemocratic and results in unelected officials standing in the way of what the public wants. For example, across the many times the House of Lords has amended or made the government change Brexit related legislation, the public was angry at how the Lords were getting so deeply involved and how much influence these unelected peers exerted. Especially on a matter like Brexit where a referendum clearly showed the will of the electorate, some argue that the House of Lords has no right to stand in the way due to lack of a democratic mandate.

However this argument is weakened by the fact a democratic mandate would cause a clash between the Lords and Commons.

The more convincing argument is that the Lords should remain unelected in order to prevent a legitimacy clash. The source states that 'a clash could develop between the Commons and an elected Lords'. If the Lords was to be elected on the same system as the House of Commons, ~~it~~ it would not be clear who had higher legitimacy and the Lords

would no longer bow to the Commons. As both would have an equal mandate, bills going through a 'ping-pong stage' in Parliament such as the Rwanda bill recently, would potentially become stuck, as the House of Commons could not so easily reject amendments by the Lords, like they did with the Rwanda bill, if the amendments now had much stronger legitimacy. Therefore it is concluded that in order to avoid a clash between chambers over legitimacy, the House of Lords should remain unelected.

Some may also argue for an elected House of Lords due to the abuse of appointments that can occur, and the outdated system in place. The source states that 'Appointments have been increasingly numerous and inappropriate' and also that 'hereditary peers and religious representatives is not suitable in a modern democracy'. The Lords Spiritual and around 90 hereditary peers sit in the House of Lords and are still paid for despite calls from the public that this is a very outdated system. There are also public criticisms over appointments. Boris Johnson appointed Evgeny Lebedev as a peer despite his shady links and ~~despite~~ arguably only due to the fact that he is a massive Conservative donor. When Prime Ministers come to the end of their premiership they can make resignation honours appointments. Despite MI5 intelligence on Lebedev and advice against appointing him, Johnson appointed him anyway, causing concerns over why there should be so many inappropriate

appointments. While some argue that the Lords should then therefore be elected, this argument is limited as having an elected Lords would defeat its revising function, and that commissions can advise against appointments.

The more convincing argument is that the Lords should remain unelected so as to maintain an effective revising function, and that the House of Lords Appointments Commission can produce advice against nominations and can recommend crossbench peers. The source states that "an appointed House of Lords allows for 'a greater amount of time for members can dedicate to legislative scrutiny'. If the Lords were to become elected, peers would focus energy and time into being popular and pleasing the electorate. This would likely not result in a chamber full of experienced peers with knowledge and expertise in their subject area, defeating its purpose as a knowledgeable revising chamber. Additionally the House of Lords Appointments Commission can and has stopped nominations such as the ones from Tony Blair later on in his premiership. Despite things such as the 'cash-for-honours' scandal in around 2007, an elected House of Lords would not successfully fix it, it would instead create this new problem of ineffective scrutiny. Therefore the House of Lords should stay unelected.

Whilst some argue for an elected House of Lords due to its lack of a mandate, abuse of patronage by the Prime Minister in appointments or its shortcomings in scrutiny,

an unelected Lords would create more problems such as an ineffective ~~sen~~ revising chamber as peers would just try to appeal to the public <sup>and a</sup> clash over legitimacy. It also would not fully fix the current issues and therefore the House of Lords should be unelected.



**ResultsPlus**  
Examiner Comments

This answer focusses on the question, with a clear line of argument developed throughout.

It selects and deploys the key political information from the source to establish the debate, before building the analysis to reach supported conclusions.

There is some well-selected evidence, but the deployment of more contemporary evidence could be used to enhance the debate.

Level 5

Total: 25 marks



**ResultsPlus**  
Examiner Tip

Reaching judgements throughout the essay is important when you consider that A03 is worth one-third of the marks. They cannot only be left to the conclusion

## Question 1 (b)

This was the more popular of the two questions and was, in general, very well-answered. There was quite a wide range of approaches to the question, with some candidates showing breadth and others more depth. Both were effective, although there were some candidates who only focussed on devolution, and this limited the development of an effective answer to the question. There was a real attempt to engage with the question of whether or not constitutional reform since 1997 had been a success, and some clear lines of argument were developed.

Stronger answers were able effectively to pair up arguments from the source to create a high-level debate about the success of constitutional reform. This allowed candidates to show perceptive comparative analysis of the political information in the source. The analysis was often supported by well-selected evidence, including some excellent contemporary examples such as:

- the Government's use of Section 25 with the Scottish Gender Recognition Bill
- the electoral success or otherwise of various nationalist parties
- recent policy initiatives by the London Mayor and Metro Mayors such as Andy Burnham
- the Supreme Court ruling on the Rwanda policy
- subsequent passing of the Safety of Rwanda Act

Stronger answers also had a very effective structure. There was an introduction that established the debate and a clear line of argument for the answer. Many argued strongly for their views on whether constitutional reform had been a success, whilst effectively analysing both sides of the argument. The structure used well-paired arguments to reach supported judgements before reaching strong conclusions. Those conclusions were often short, hard-hitting and felt part of a well-argued answer, rather than simply an add-on.

It was pleasing to see some excellent understanding of the Supreme Court – and the extent to which declarations of incompatibility are impactful as are rulings on the actions/policies of the Executive branch. More modern rulings by the Supreme Court, like the Miller cases, the Keidan case and the Rwanda Policy, were utilised to good effect. However, there was often some confusion about whether certain Supreme Court rulings were challenging the actions of the Executive or legislative branch. There was certainly confusion around the Rwanda ruling and whether it was about the action/policy of the Executive branch or an Act of Parliament.

Some structures were less effective. They concentrated only on devolution, or did not pair-up the arguments from the source effectively, or attempted to write a pre-planned response rather than using the political information in the source. One such example would be candidates trying to 'shoehorn in' other constitutional reforms, like House of Lords reform or the Fixed-Term Parliament Act or lack of constitutional reform eg First-Past-the-Post, to develop a debate about success.

A03 was demonstrated throughout many answers. Once a pair of 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 interim judgements or the conclusion were a surprise to the reader, it was the case that the A03 had not been developed well.

This is a Level 5 answer.

Chosen question number: Question 1(a)  Question 1(b)

There has been significant constitutional reform since 1997 on issues regarding the judiciary, devolution and Human Rights. While the reforms have had significant limitations, they have overall been a success in improving democracy in the UK.

One area where there has been successful reform is in devolution providing a 'decentralisation' of power and greater democracy. Since 1997, we have seen the creation of a Scottish Parliament in 1998, a Northern Irish Assembly in the Belfast Agreement and a Welsh Assembly. These have been successful in leading to the rise of new parties and legislation which is suited to the needs of the people in devolved regions. For example, in Scotland, the Scottish parliament has introduced far devolved legislation such as the prohibition of tuition fees, prescription charges as well as a unified police force and minimum alcohol pricing. The reforms after 2016 further allowed for control regarding taxation, leading to a 48% tax budget on income tax. This has further been

the case in Wales with education reform though the Foundation Phase of 2008 as well as such in Northern Ireland. This has been successful in achieving 'subsidiarity' which is how local control leads to better policy and government. Therefore, the decentralisation of power through devolution has been successful in improving political democracy and creating suited legislation for the regions. However, there are limitations to devolution as it can be seen as 'unequal' and 'impartial' as stated by the Smees as well as providing no 'voice' for England. This is evident due to the ~~inequalities~~ ~~in power~~ and inequalities in power and policy in the devolved regions creating an uneven constitution. For example, Scottish parliament has greater powers of legislation such as though fiscal policy controls compared to Westminster. Furthermore, as the Smees states, Brexit has 'weakened' devolution as Northern Ireland remains a part of the EU compared to the rest of the UK due to the Belfast Agreement on <sup>no</sup> borders, creating inequality. England despite rising Mayor Mayor in 2017 has received little voice as these regions have little and unequal powers amongst themselves compared to the

devolved regions, calling ~~for~~ Andy Burnham to call for 'Deep Devolution'. This shows how devolution may be less successful as it has created conflict and weaknesses in the UK due to the vast inequality and differences in its distribution. Despite this issue, devolution has still improved strongly due to decentralising power so therefore has been a success overall since 1997.

Another important reform which has been successful since 1997 is the Human Rights Act of 2008 (HRA) as it ~~offers~~ offers 'protection' of rights and 'checks' on government. The HRA places the ~~EU~~ European Convention of Human Rights into the UK constitution and is quasi-entrenched. This allows the Supreme Court and ECHR to make recommendations on government policy, despite its power. An example could be the Mental Health Act of 2007 which was referred over to the ECHR, concerns over involuntary detention. It also provides a basis for the courts to check government policy that breaks human rights such as in ~~HT~~ <sup>HJ</sup> and HJ vs Home Secretary 2020 stopping the deportation of two homosexuals over concerns about their treatment. Overall, this has been largely successful as it has protected democracy ~~High~~ ~~all~~.

ensuring the rights of citizens of the UK and has been able to check government policy several times to do so. However, the HRA has large limitations which may mean it would have to not ensure collective safety by ~~protecting~~ protecting the rights of terrorists. This is a problem as the ECHR covers the rights to all people meaning the pragmatic headline policy such as deportations often cannot be achieved. This was legally an issue with the Abu Qatada case of 2012 where due to section 2's protection from torture, he could not be directly extradited to Jordan from the UK. ~~This is a problem as an example~~ This is followed ~~by~~ by the Belmarsh Case of 2004 calling for the release of terror suspects. This can legally be considered a failure as it may be seen to infringe on one's collective rights to safety if criminals cannot be properly detained, ~~however~~ so could it be argued to be a failure. However, these examples are legally exceptions and are rare cases. The HRA has protected more people than it has endangered and has legally improved the institution, for these reasons it ~~is~~ must be considered a success.

~~The~~ As well as this, it could be argued that judicial

reform since 1997 has been successful by creating effective checks and balances in the ~~constitution~~ Constitution. The Constitutional Reform Act of 2005 created an independent judiciary and Supreme Court in 2009. This can be seen as successful in checking the government on cases such as rights as well as through judicial review. Examples could be *AM v Secretary of State* ~~2005~~ which prevented the ~~the~~ illegal deportation of a man. There are also landmark cases such as *R vs Lord Chancellor* 2017 which outlawed tribunal fees due to discriminate against the poor. It can be argued that judicial reform on this front has been largely successful as it checks the power of government and ~~the~~ helps prevent an over-mighty executive, which protects the notions of parliament as well as ~~the~~ representative democracy. The independent court is not afraid to check the other branches, ~~and~~ <sup>meaning</sup> this separation of power has been an example of successful reform since 1997. However, there ~~has~~ have been significant issues regarding the Supreme Court ~~and~~ <sup>its</sup> 'one-way' judicial review and being 'too political' which would not be successful as it would erode its legitimacy and be insufficient. There were arguments that the judicial review through the Miller Cases of 2017 and 2019 checking Brexit on hold and checking Johnson's prorogament

of parliament) ~~and~~ were done to delay  
Brexit and other legal principles. This is supported  
as the Justice Secretary of 2019, Liz Truss, refused  
to defend them. This is further supported by the  
Judicial Review Act of ~~2019~~ 2022 which limited  
the cases for which there could be a judicial  
review, stating ~~that~~ the argument that ~~may~~ may see  
it as overreached and too political. While there  
have been arguments, it must be considered that this  
is speculative and not fact-based, the Supreme Court  
has been more successful than not as it checks government  
and ensures democracy. It must be considered that its  
limitations are only speculative.

To conclude, while constitutional reforms since 1997 have  
had limitations, they have been overall successful  
as they have ensured a protection of rights  
and democracy. While there have been significant  
problems with some reforms such as devolution, ~~with~~  
their benefits outweigh their disadvantages. The  
reforms have not been perfect but have  
certainly improved the constitution, ~~and~~ ~~the~~ ~~part~~  
Their protection of democracy means that reforms since  
1997 have been successful.



There is:

- a clear line of argument developed throughout the answer
- perceptive analysis, well-selected evidence and supported judgements
- utilisation of the political information from the source to generate the debate

There is a good use of political vocabulary here.

The evidence that is selected includes a number of contemporary examples.

Level 5

Total: 28 marks



If the examiner can write the conclusion from reading the rest of the essay, and it matches the conclusion, then that shows generally that a clear line of arguments has been maintained throughout

This is a Level 5 answer.

Chosen question number: **Question 1(a)**  **Question 1(b)**

Constitutional reform since 1997 has aimed to enhance democracy including pluralism, the separation of powers and rights protection. ~~Reforms~~ Reforms have therefore been introduced over areas such as devolution, human rights and the judiciary. However due to some reforms failing their main objectives and the undermining of reforms and strengthening of the executive, in recent years, it must fundamentally be disagreed that constitutional reform since 1997 has been a success.

To a ~~part~~ partial extent it can be agreed that in terms of devolution, constitutional reforms have been a success. This is clear as the source states it has delivered 'the decentralisation of power and greater democracy'. This is evident in Scotland whereby successive 'Government of Scotland Acts' have granted Scottish parliament both financial and legislative powers such as controlling the rate of income tax and abolishing tuition fees demonstrating how devolution has successfully introduced pluralism, bringing decision making to the people. This is also demonstrated by the quasi-federal nature of devolution as the 2016 and 2017 ~~states~~ Scotland and Wales Act states devolution cannot be removed without a referendum. This demonstrates ~~the extent~~ a trend in the extension of devolved powers and the long term impact of this reform, it is therefore a success. However, it can be fundamentally argued that devolution has not been a successful reform as the source states it has 'failed' and is

'unequal and unfair'. This is demonstrated by the ~~very~~ asymmetrical nature of devolution. In 1998 Scotland was granted legislative and financial powers whereas Wales was only granted administrative powers demonstrating an uneven distribution of power. Additionally in England, devolved powers are limited (there are only mayors for major cities such as London and <sup>metros</sup> are abandoned) ~~the~~ further demonstrating the unequal nature of devolution making it unfair. This is a fundamentally strong argument as ~~opened~~ in recent years ~~Westminster~~ Westminster has undermined the powers of devolved bodies. The Northern Ireland Assembly has been closed 3 times since its opening returning power to Westminster (most recently from 2022-2024) and Scottish parliament have had conflicts with Westminster, ~~one~~ both when they used Article 35 to veto gender recognition reform legislation <sup>(2022)</sup> and when the Supreme Court in 2022 ruled that any region can grant a second ~~refer~~ independence referendum, <sup>demonstrating</sup> ~~that~~ ~~is~~ the fundamental failure of devolution due to the ~~conflict~~ and instability between devolved bodies and Westminster will ~~desires~~ desires for independence.

To a partial extent it can be argued that in terms of rights reform, constitutional reforms since 1997 have been successful. The source states that 'the Human Rights <sup>(HRA)</sup> act' 'developed awareness and protection of rights'. This is clear as the HRA has transferred the ECHR into UK law allowing clarity on rights and ensuring they are not infringed on. ~~For~~ As a result, government legislation can be held to account based on the HRA. For example, in 2023

The Supreme court declared the government's Rwanda legislation incompatible with the HRA demonstrating how this reform has helped raise awareness on human rights, and hold the government to account for infringing upon them. However, this is a fundamentally weak argument as despite this, the Rwanda bill passed parliament and became law demonstrating the failure of the HRA to protect rights as parliament remains sovereign. Alternatively it can be argued that rights reform since 1997 has been unsuccessful as the source states 'the HRA has remained controversial' and 'reform is needed'. This was seen as ~~the~~ in 2020 <sup>supreme</sup> a ~~se~~ case involving the deportation of a Zimbabwean citizen <sup>and suspected terrorist</sup> argued his tribunal should be heard demonstrating how the HRA protects the rights of terrorists rather than legitimate freedoms of the public. This is a strong argument as in the 2019 conservative manifesto (which was elected on an 80 seat majority) included a commitment to replace the HRA with a British bill of rights. <sup>\*</sup> Fundamentally it must be argued that 'constitutional reform since 1997 ~~is~~ has been unsuccessful at protecting rights as further reforms needed.

To a ~~fundamental~~ partial extent, in terms of judicial reform, it can be argued that constitutional reform since 1997 has been successful as the source states it has created a 'separation of powers' and more 'checks and balances'. This is clear as the constitutional reform act (2005) meant the ~~the~~ highest court of law was separate to the House of Lords and judges

were appointed by ~~the~~ an independent commission demonstrating a separation of powers and ability to hold the government to account. The Supreme Court <sup>(SC)</sup> now has the power of judicial review and can declare government actions ultra vires. For example in ~~the~~ PM v. Chelmsford Advocate v. General for Scotland (2019), Boris Johnson's prorogation of parliament was ruled unlawful demonstrating how the SC ~~can~~ is a successful reform as the government can be effectively held to account by a separate branch of government. However it can be alternatively argued that judicial reforms have not been a success as the source states that the SC has 'become too political' and 'judicial review is being over used'. This is demonstrated through trends of judicial activism ~~the~~ under Lady Hale (the number of judicial review cases peaked in 2019). This is ~~clearly~~ demonstrated by the case Miller v. Secretary of State for Exiting the EU whereby it was ruled that parliament must pass a law before leaving the EU. However this attracted media criticism as ~~the~~ <sup>the daily</sup> Mail wrote 'what's unlawful about denying 17.4 million people Brexit'. <sup>2</sup> This demonstrates the failure of judicial reform as the SC is an unelected and unaccountable body who have undermined the will of the people. This is a fundamentally strong argument due to the lack of social representation <sup>ation</sup> in the SC, ~~which is~~ <sup>its members</sup> ~~made~~ white, old and Oxbridge educated. Fundamentally, it must therefore be agreed that judicial constitutional reforms have been unsuccessful.

To conclude, it must be fundamentally disagreed that constit-

ional reforms since 1997 have been successful as <sup>the HRA</sup> ~~rights~~ reform has been effective at protecting legitimate rights, devolution has been asymmetrical and the constitutional reform act has granted illegitimate power to unelected and unaccountable judges.

\* Additionally recent government legislation has demonstrated a trend in the weakening of rights protection, this involves the Police, courts and sentencing act (2022) limiting the right to protest, and the introduction of voter ID (2021) limiting the right to vote demonstrating how constitutional reform since 1997 has not been successful in enhancing rights protection, many have increasingly come under threat in recent years -

\* Additionally often SC decisions receive criticism from elected officials - following ~~the~~ Johnson's prorogation of parliament ruling, Rees may ~~be~~ <sup>be</sup> it as a 'constitutional coup'



This answer is focussed on the question, and utilises the political information in the source effectively to generate the political debate.

Much of the evidence selected is contemporary and adds to the richness of the debate. The essay structure works well.

The arguments from the source are paired up, with supporting evidence brought in to generate some perceptive analysis leading to substantiated judgements.

There is a clear line of argument developed throughout and the answer delivers on breadth and depth.

The devolution section is effective, going beyond purely one devolved area.

One area to work on is greater accuracy in the example of the Supreme Court ruling on the Rwanda policy.

Level 5

Total: 28 marks



Pairing-up the key arguments from the source provides the skeleton for an effective essay

Develop those arguments, using judiciously selected evidence

Use focussed analysis to reach supported judgements: this is the best way to approach the source-based questions

## Question 2 (a)

This was the more-popular of the two questions and a wide range of different approaches was adopted. Most candidates had a very clear understanding of what was meant by sovereignty and could offer a sharp definition of it, as a starting point from which to build their answer.

Stronger answers were laser-focussed on the question and able to develop a strong line of argument.

Popular areas to cover were the:

- elective dictatorship
- referenda
- devolution
- the EU and the Human Rights Act in conjunction with the Courts.

The better introductions offered an accurate definition of sovereignty, put the debate into context and offered a clear direction of travel. The best answers engaged fully with the debate, selecting some excellent, contemporary evidence to illustrate the arguments to underpin their analysis and evaluation. It was also very pleasing to see such a strong use of political vocabulary, including so much of the key terminology in the specification.

The synoptic element, part of A01, was, in general, handled very well. There were strong links back to democracy and participation in the discussion of:

- referenda and devolution
- the role of political parties in devolution,
- the role of FPTP and party discipline in the elective dictatorship
- rights in discussion of the Supreme Court and the Human Rights Act

Some answers had difficulty defining sovereignty and linking sovereignty effectively to Parliament, and this made it difficult to build an effective essay. There was some confusion, with answers confusing the Executive branch with Parliament or discussing the limitations imposed on the Commons by the Lords.

In terms of Europe, there was some confusion of the differences between the European Court of Justice and the European Court of Human Rights. There was also a tendency to be very historical in debates around the EU, although references to Northern Ireland and the ongoing impact of the EU Single Market often elicited excellent responses.

Lastly, a common area for confusion was the role of the Supreme Court and the Human Rights Act. The question concerned the sovereignty of Parliament, therefore it was important to focus on declarations of incompatibility rather than the judicial review of the actions/policies of the Executive branch. It was also the case that court rulings — sometimes used as examples to show that parliament had lost sovereignty to the Courts, such as the Miller rulings — are, in fact, rulings that upheld parliamentary sovereignty.

Finally, often the A03 judgements made throughout the essay, or in the conclusion, were merely stated rather than supported by the preceding debate, or were somewhat of a surprise, given the direction in which the essay had been going.

This is a Level 5 answer.

Chosen question number: Question 2(a)  Question 2(b)

Parliamentary sovereignty refers to the ability of parliament to make, unmake or amend any law as it is not bound by its predecessors and cannot bind its successors. As such, it is one of the pillars of the UK Constitution. However in recent years as a result of Devolution, the HRA and the overwhelming executive it can be argued that parliament ~~has~~ no longer exercises most of its power for which despite having legal sovereignty it can be argued that Political sovereignty lies mostly with the executive who gains its mandate from the people.

The introduction of Devolution since the Blair years has led many to question the sovereignty of Parliament. This is because much power has been given to the Scottish and Welsh Parliament, along with the N.I. and ~~England~~ London Assemblies, especially after the Scotland Act 2016 which devolved further powers to Scotland to rule over taxes and drug regulations while all

of the devolved bodies besides the London Assembly use a different electoral system which has decreased the importance of the two major parties (conservatives and Labour) who often form majorities in Westminster. For example, the SNP has been in government along the Scottish Greens ~~and~~ since 2005 and now rule alone after the end of the coalition which is especially important as they support the independence of Scotland. Thus, devolution can be argued to have weakened parliamentary sovereignty. Especially as the devolved ~~the~~ bodies gained their powers through referendums which had over 70% turnout in Scotland and N.I. for which it can be said that the population was exercising political sovereignty giving power to the devolved bodies and weakening Parliament. However, it is key to mention that the power given to devolved bodies is not entrenched and asymmetric for which Westminster remains the primary law-making body in the UK. This has been especially the case during 2017-2020 when the N.I. Assembly was

suspended and by the Supreme Court ruling of 2022 when it declared ~~the~~ did not have the power to hold an Independence referendum without the consent of Westminster. Thus, highlighting the sovereignty of Parliament. Nevertheless, due to the popular support for the strongest devolved bodies, especially in Scotland such power would be difficult to re-centralise which shows that political sovereignty is no longer exercised by Parliament alone but by citizens and the government of devolved bodies.

Furthermore, it can be argued that despite Brexit, retained E.U. law in particular the codification of the ECHR into the HRA used by the Supreme Court, has undermined Parliamentary sovereignty. This is because after Brexit there are still 4,000 retained EU laws with the HRA being the most powerful as it acts as quasi-entrenched and has allowed the Supreme Court to ~~the~~ issue declaration of incompatibility and has led to an increase in judicial activism which directly threatens the sovereignty of Parliament as a legislature.

This can be exemplified by the use of the HRA in 2004 to hold Parliament accountable on the Belmarsh case as it went against the notion of Habeas Corpus, with suspected terrorists being detained without trial, this has led to further involvement of judges into politics which has been seen as a rise of judicial activism while many conservatives attacked Lady Hale on her rulings on cases such as the Prorogation case. However, after Brexit the European Court of Justice no longer has jurisdiction in the UK and retained laws can be derogated by a Parliament Act ~~if~~ and there's been debates over introducing a new Bill of Rights. Furthermore, this leaves the S.C. as the highest court in the UK which gained its powers from Parliament and only upholds the rule of law based on Act passed while ruling such as Johnson acting ultra vires can be seen as the judiciary protecting the sovereignty of Parliament. Thus, despite their ~~increasing~~ powers and use of retained EU law, it can be argued that judicial neutrality and rulings uphold the argument that Parliament retains at least ~~at least~~

## legal sovereignty

Moreover, it can be argued that sovereignty does not lie in Parliament alone due to the overwhelming executive which often exercises a majority leading to them having political sovereignty. This is because, with landslide election winning, such as under Tony Blair and Boris Johnson in 2019, the executive has been able to 'form elective dictatorships while the use of secondary legislation and support for their party manifestos has further decrease the inability of Parliament to hold the government to account and exercise its sovereignty in particular due to the unelected nature of the Lords which undermines democracy. However, the executive is in Parliament's and gains its mandate from having a majority in the House of Commons for which under coalition governments such as in 2010 and 2017 Parliament has been able to exercise its roles better and as argued in the "transformative model" Parliament is able to predict the different moves

and actions of the executive to prepare a reaction and make use of public bill and select committees ~~not~~ to scrutinise the government and legislation while the Lords Reform of 1999 led to the specialisation of the upper chamber allowing them to be more decisive when scrutinising ~~part~~ the executive. Nevertheless, committees remain whipped despite the Wright Reforms with PMs like Johnson often not attending the Liaison Committee. Moreover, it can be argued that laws are not passed by Parliament but rather passed through it as the executive has political sovereignty which allows them to set the legislative agenda with only 10% of Private members bills being successful and the lords ~~being~~ having ~~more~~ less power due to the 1911 and 1949 Parliament Acts.

Overall, it can be argued that while Parliament retains legal sovereignty aided by the Supreme Court rulings, sovereignty does not lie in Parliament alone especially due to the use of Referendums by the executive and manifestos in campaigns to gain political sovereignty through the will of the people. (Total for Question 2 = 30 marks)



The introduction here is focussed, clear and sets up the debate and line of argument very effectively.

The answer has an effective structure that allows for the development of a real debate. There is good comparative analysis allowing the candidate to reach substantiated judgements.

There are clear synoptic links generated throughout the answer.

One area for development might be the selection and deployment of more contemporary evidence to support the arguments given.

Level 5

Total: 26 marks



In a question based around key terminology like this one, it is a good idea to define the term in your introduction to lay the foundations for your answer

## Question 2 (b)

This question was the less-popular of the two and saw a great range of approaches and marks. The key to the question was to focus on whether or not the government's control of the Commons had weakened in recent years.

Question focus was key, here. Stronger answers were able to focus on "control" and "recent years".

They looked at a range of issues, for example whether or not :

- backbenchers had become more rebellious
- party discipline had weakened
- the nature of recent election results and campaigns had changed the balance of power
- reforms of the Commons had changed the relationship between the Government and Commons
- the powers of the Prime Minister (PM) and the Government had grown or been used in different ways

Where candidates could show that either the control had changed to become weaker or stronger, or had stayed the same over time, they were able to access the higher levels in the mark scheme.

The very best answers:

- had a clear line of argument
- deployed much contemporary evidence
- were able to contextualise that evidence by cross-referencing it back to more historical examples. For instance, could recent governments be seen to have either more or less control than Thatcher or Blair and why.

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

Weaker answers tended to use different PMs across time as their different paragraphs, giving much evidence but rarely developing any depth to their argument. The focus tended to be on the size of the majority in the Commons only, which limited the breadth of their answers. There was also a tendency to get sidelined into other debates.

These included:

- control between the PM and cabinet
- the success or otherwise of conventions of ministerial responsibility
- bringing in other checks on the Government such as the Lords, the Courts, the devolved bodies or the media

It is vital that candidates answer the question that is set rather than writing a pre-planned generic essay.

This is a Level 4/Level 5 boundary script.

The government in the House of Commons ~~has~~ is made up of the Prime Minister and their cabinet, and their role is to put forward and enact the policies included in their department manifestos and manage the various departments that help the country to operate. Typically the executive is effective in their role but over recent years, a variety of issues have meant that they have lost some authority, thus this essay will argue that the government's control of the House of Commons has weakened in recent years.

It can be argued that the government has significant control of the House of Commons because they have the most control of time. Standing Order 14 states that the government has priority of time in the Commons every day of the year with the exception of 35 days for ~~be~~ the Backbench Business Committee and the several days for the opposition to take control. This means that government bills usually get the most debating time since the government gets to set the political agenda.

However, a stronger argument is that this order does not always apply and thus the government loses some control. For example, ~~the~~ during Brexit the Commons passed a significant majority on a vote to temporarily suspend Standing Order 14 in order to allow for their to be sufficient debate time and scrutiny of various aspects of Brexit. This

shows how it is possible for the government to lose some of its control. ~~and~~ Furthermore the Wright Committee reforms which created the Backbench Business Committee, imposed by the Conservative government in 2016, further shows some loss of authority to allow for their time to be taken away from them.

Overall it can be concluded that the mere fact that the government ~~was~~ had its control of time superseded by a Commons vote signifies that their control has weakened, although this can be put down to the fact that Brexit dominated the agenda of every ~~government~~ <sup>party</sup>, not just the government.

It could be argued that the government's control has not weakened in the Commons because the government still has control of the whip, meaning they still have control of the backbenchers that sit in the Commons. The whips are used to ensure that the party members vote with the party and don't dissent. Their power comes from the fact that they are often seen as a way to achieve promotion via loyalty, for example Stephen Crabb was promoted in 2016. The whips also played a significant role in passing the EU (Further Relationship) Bill, which passed by 362 votes to 60, in which both Labour and Conservative ~~MPs~~ <sup>MPs</sup> voted, showing how effective the whips were in ensuring Conservative MPs voted with the party, but also that the government clearly had some influence over the other parties in the Commons. Furthermore, it is possible to have the whip removed which ~~was~~ PM Boris Johnson did to 21 MPs in 2021, who voted against his no deal Brexit proposal, proving government authority. However, it can be more strongly argued that the government is losing control of the Commons namely their backbenchers. In Theresa May's

premiership she ~~lost 33~~ faced 33 defeats, the record number of government defeats due to rebellious backbench MPs but also significant opposition from the rest of the party parties in the Commons who did not agree with her Brexit plans. This alone shows a huge loss of control. Furthermore Rishi Sunak also faced threat of a rebellion of up to 40 Conservative MPs in the passing of his Rwanda Bill, showing ~~was~~ a threat to his government's control, but also he has also faced a lot of disapproval from the opposition for this bill in debates.

Overall it can clearly be argued that in times of controversial bills, such as Brexit and Rwanda policy, the government has often found it hard to retain their authority over the commons, and thus their control has weakened.

It can be argued that in times of majority government, the government does not experience a loss of control. Due to Boris Johnson's seemingly charismatic personality and popularity with the public, he was able to garner lots of support. His reputation as a big beast, former position as Mayor of London and ~~and~~ regular appearances on 'Have I Got News For You' lead to him being an electoral asset, and many people voting on valence, ~~but~~ meaning they voted for his party because of their support of him. The result of this was a majority of 80 which allowed his government to pass legislation on Brexit rather quickly and efficiently with little opposition. He was also able to pass his social care reforms rather simply even with some disapproval, due to his majority. This can be argued to be a benefit of first-past-the-post as a voting system. However, a stronger argument is that in recent years, FPTP

has failed to produce a decisive majority government, and has thus led to the government's control of the House of Commons weakening. In the last 4 general elections only one ended in a majority, 2019 under Boris Johnson. In 2017, Prime Minister Theresa May lost the majority that she inherited from David Cameron and was left with a minority. This meant she had to sign a 'supply and demand' agreement with the DUP, meaning that they would have to vote with her government in certain areas and she would be forced to agree to some of their requests and policies. This undoubtedly is evidence of a weak government who then weren't able to pass Brexit legislation due to so much opposition within the Commons. May ~~was~~ ~~in fact~~ then did avoid many votes she knew she'd lose. ~~To conclude~~ Overall it can be argued that since the recent governments have had little to no majority, it has led to them having weakened control over the Commons.

To conclude it can be judged that the ~~How~~ government's control has weakened in recent years largely due to not only party divide but also a loss of authority when it has come to large scale issues, such as Brexit and the Rwanda policy, but it can also be said that the electoral system is also playing a large role. Furthermore, increased professionalism and independence of backbenchers has also led to loss of control.



This essay has a clear structure and looks to engage with both "weakened" and in "recent years".

There is a clear line of argument pursued, with some strong use of political vocabulary and well-selected evidence. The answer has clear synoptic links developed throughout.

A03 judgements are argued throughout the answer.

An area for development would to use well-selected evidence to build on the debate around the control of the parliamentary timetable.

Overall, the response reaches the higher level.

Level 5

Total: 25 marks



It is important to plan essays

Know what you want to argue before you start writing in order to ensure there is a clear line of argument throughout

### Question 3 (a)

This was the less-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 the core idea and principle that 'anarchy is order', supported by using well-selected key thinkers from the specification. It was pleasing to see all the different thinkers being well-utilised.

Stronger answers were able to define what is meant by 'anarchy is order' and how it emerges from the anarchist views on human nature. Stronger answers had a clear line of argument from the start, and that argument was pursued throughout. Paragraphs were built around the anarchist critique of the existing state. They showed how it leads to disorder, the nature of the stateless society and how it leads to a natural and spontaneous order, and how to get from the existing state to the stateless society where anarchy is order.

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 support 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 idea that 'anarchy is order' or focus on the positions held by the thinkers, rather than focussing on comparative analysis to highlight agreements and disagreements between the strands. There was, perhaps, a much greater tendency to leave judgements to the conclusion rather than building them into the essay, making it harder to develop a clear line of argument.

One area that did seem to cause confusion was how the different strands proposed getting from the existing state to the stateless society where anarchy is order. The difference between revolution – an attempt to transform social, economic, and political relations — versus insurrection, which is the transformation of the self, leads us no longer to let ourselves be arranged but to arrange ourselves and sets no glittering hopes on institutions.

This is a Level 5 answer.

To what extent are anarchists united over the idea that anarchy is order?

Indicate which question you are answering by marking a cross in the box . If you change your mind, put a line through the box  and then indicate your new question with a cross .

Chosen question number:      Question 3(a)       Question 3(b)   
   Question 4(a)       Question 4(b)   
   Question 5(a)       Question 5(b)   
   Question 6(a)       Question 6(b)   
   Question 7(a)       Question 7(b)

The idea that anarchy is order is a core principle of the anarchist ideology. Therefore, consensus or division on this subject is critical for other areas of the ideology, particularly society and the idea of utopia. I will investigate where collectivist anarchists and individualist anarchists are united over the idea that anarchy is order through three distinct themes: 1) human nature 2) state 3) economy.

This essay will conclude that there are obvious differences between anarchists in their attitude to 'anarchy is order', particularly in their view of human nature and the ideal future society. However, there is important overarching consensus on the basic features of the principle that of 'anarchy is order'. Anarchists are, at a base level, united.

Firstly, there is some evidence that collectivist anarchists and individualist anarchists are united over the idea that anarchy is order with respect to human nature. Indeed, all anarchists agree that social order occurs naturally and spontaneously, emerging from our human nature. Anarchists believe that order was the natural state of humanity.

in pre-history. This is due to the fact that anarchism is an optimistic ideology with a strong belief in the inherent rationality of humans. By extension, humans have the natural ability to organise themselves. For example, in Kropotkin's scientific analysis of human nature, he noted how humans, like all animals, naturally organised themselves in the state of nature to increase their chances of survival. On the other <sup>hand</sup> there is some disagreement between collectivists and individualists over why humans have a natural propensity to order themselves. Individualist anarchists argue that this stems from the inherent rationality of the self-interested egoist. It is in our own interests to organise ourselves. Stone's belief in the power of the individual is highlighted by his idea that the rational and self-interested individual is the core of the moral universe. But, collectivist anarchists argue that order stems from humans' inherent sociability, altruism and cooperative nature. Bakunin ~~is~~ had a strong belief in the sociability of humans. Our natural ability to form groups and work effectively together is at the heart of anarchy is order. In judgement, we see how there is considerable difference between individualists and collectivists over what specific aspects of human nature anarchy is order derives from. However, we cannot neglect the fact that there is consensus that societal order comes from our human nature. With regard to human nature, anarchists are united over the idea that anarchy is order.

Secondly, there is some evidence that collectivist anarchists and individualist anarchists are united over the idea that anarchy is order with regard to the state. Indeed, a core value of anarchism is the rejection of the state. All anarchists believe the state is immoral because it rules through physical force and coercion. Proudhon famously advocated peaceful overthrow of the state. However, one of the key reasons behind rejection of the state, all anarchists agree, is anarchy is order. As well as being fundamentally anti and corrupting, the state is unnecessary. Social order, as discussed, occurs naturally - anarchy is order. Therefore, we do not need the state to enforce social order - it is unnecessary. Emma Goldman summarised this in her attitude towards the state, saying that the state was both 'corrupting and futile'.

On the other hand, anarchists disagree how a stateless society will actually look once the state has been rejected. Individualist anarchists envisage a society where rational, autonomous, self-interested and competitive individuals manage their own affairs, separated from any collective bodies. For example, Shover asserted that the future society will be a union of equals. But, collectivist anarchists envisage a society where naturally altruistic and cooperative individuals will voluntarily come together in groups to work together for collective gain. Kropotkin, Proudhon's Kropotkin's Mutualism advocated small communes working together on a basis of mutual aid through common ownership of the means of production. In judgement, we see again that there is significant difference

between how anarchists perceive the real-world consequences of 'anarchy is order' in the stateless society. But, there is no doubt over anarchist consensus that the principle of anarchy is order provides a core reason why the stateless society should exist at all. Thus, on the state, anarchists are united over the principle of anarchy is order.

Finally, there is some evidence to suggest that collectivist anarchists and individualist anarchists are united over the idea that anarchy is order with regard to the economy. Indeed, all anarchists, like their view of society, believe that an economic order occurs naturally, deriving from our rational self-interest. However, far more strong is the belief that capitalism undermines social order, providing another reason why the stateless society should be replaced. Indeed, there is consensus among ~~the~~ collectivist and individualist anarchists that capitalism runs counter to our human nature. This agitates the masses, creating social desquiescence. This is often used as a reason for the rejection of the state as many anarchists view the state as the 'vessel of capitalism' (Bakunin). ~~On the other~~ On the other hand, there is some disagreement between anarchists over why capitalism is at the root of social disorder, and the opposite of anarchy is order. Individualist anarchists assert that capitalism inhibits the freedom of individuals, particularly with regard to the exploitation of the working classes. Collectivist

anarchists believe that capitalism is fundamentally contradictory to our human nature as social beings. It pits us against each other. Kropotkin rejected this 'darwinian struggle' and 'survival of the fittest' economy. Therefore, Kropotkin advocated the overthrow of private property and capitalism. In judgement, we see that there is disagreement over why capitalism underpins social disorder. But, again, we see fundamental agreement that capitalism is bad for societal order, and must be ~~replaced~~ replaced to achieve anarchy is order. Thus, with regard to ~~anarchy is order~~ <sup>the economy</sup>, anarchists are united over the principle of anarchy is order.

In conclusion, collectivist anarchists and individualist anarchists are united over the principle of anarchy is order. The argument against this statement is strong. Indeed, we see certain disagreement as to exactly why anarchy is order and what the consequences of it are in society. But, the fundamental consensus over anarchy is order on a base level - the inherent ordered nature of the stateless society, the need to overthrow the state and capitalism to achieve anarchy is order - is undeniable. At least on the fundamental level, collectivist anarchists ~~are~~ and individualist anarchists are united over the principle of anarchy is order.



This answer shows:

- a high level of engagement with the question
- an excellent grasp of the political vocabulary of anarchism
- a focus on extent
- a clear structure
- a line of argument that is developed throughout

Level 5

Total: 24 marks



Use the key contributions of political thinkers to anarchism in support of the strands to deepen the analysis in your essays

### Question 3 (b)

This was the more-popular of the two questions and was very 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 the core idea and principle of liberty, supported by using well-selected key thinkers from the specification. There was a very pleasing use of the political terminology and vocabulary of anarchism allowing candidates to write shorter, more focussed and effective answers.

Stronger answers were able to define what liberty means to different strands of anarchism, how it is crucial to human nature and how it is not compatible with any form of political authority in society, the economy or in the form of the state. Paragraphs were built around the critique of the existing state and how it impacts on liberty, the importance of liberty to human nature and how liberty is incompatible with hierarchy and authority in the economy or 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 support 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 core principle of liberty. Alternatively, they focussed on the positions held by the thinkers rather than focussing on comparative analysis to highlight agreements and disagreements between the strands. There was perhaps a much greater tendency to leave judgements to the conclusion rather than building them into the essay, making it harder to develop a clear line of argument.

One area that needs more focus going forward is the attitudes of egoism and anarcho-capitalism, within individualist anarchism, in terms of liberty’s relationship to capitalism and private property.

This is a Level 5 answer.

The paragraph on economic liberty is an excellent example of a paragraph focussed on the demands of the question. Also, it highlights that anarcho-capitalism is an outlier within anarchism when it comes to freedom and capitalism.

Chosen question number:      Question 3(a)       Question 3(b)   
   Question 4(a)       Question 4(b)   
   Question 5(a)       Question 5(b)   
   Question 6(a)       Question 6(b)   
   Question 7(a)       Question 7(b)

Anarchist thinkers all agree on the need for liberty from the state as well as ~~the~~ economic freedom. However, there is large disagreement ~~by~~ between individualist anarchists ~~and~~ (egoists and anarcho-capitalists) and collective anarchists (mutualists, anarcho-communists and anarcho-syndicalists) over how much ~~the~~ freedom the individual should have from the collective. Therefore, this essay will argue that ~~All the~~ anarchists disagree ~~on~~ to a superficial extent over liberty.

All anarchists agree that the state is oppressive, coercive and controlling and therefore limits liberty. As a result of their shared belief that the state ~~is a~~ ~~●~~ limits liberty, they all agree that it should be abolished. Collectivist anarchists argue that the state suppresses the freedom of

humans to explore their 'true' human nature of being sociable and cooperative, and individualists argue that the state again limits individuals' ability to achieve their rational and autonomous human nature. Anarcho-syndicalist Bakunin summarised the anarchist view of the state suppressing liberty well when he described it as a "vast slaughterhouse" that illegitimately limits individuals ability to be free. Goldman agreed when she stated that it uses the vote as a 'smokescreen' to make individuals think they are decision-makers, when in fact they were not free to make their own decisions and were instead being forced into conformism by the ruling elite, using the state. This shows their agreement on the state limiting liberty.

All anarchists also argue on the importance of economic freedom for individuals. They rejected state intervention as limiting freedom and most anarchists agree that capitalism is a promoter of inequality which limits

personal freedom to make decisions. <sup>Most</sup> Collectivists argue that property should be under collective ownership with individuals free to use their produce as they wish. <sup>Most</sup> Individualists agree that capitalism limits individual liberty, with egoists arguing it is exploitative and oppressive, such as Stirner who described it as a "machine-like labour (that) amounts to a similar thing to slavery", limiting freedom. Anarcho-capitalists are the only strand to reject the <sup>idea of the</sup> oppressive nature of capitalism, arguing for a completely free market capitalist system where individuals are free to enter it to contracts as they please. Therefore, whilst all anarchists agree on the concept of economic freedom, there is slight disagreement ~~over the~~ in individualism over the role of capitalism relating to freedom.

However there is ~~substantial~~ slight disagreement between collectivists and individualists over whether the collective or individual is more important. ~~Collectivist~~ Collectivists argue that the collective is <sup>most</sup> important but that the individual should still be free within

that. Anarcho-syndicalists argue that individuals should form associations with people in similar jobs, but should exchange freely and in a mutually beneficial way. Anarcho-communists <sup>highly</sup> disagree, stating that the collective is of superior importance, with Kropotkin arguing that "all things are for all men since all men have need of them" therefore agreeing to slightly limit individual liberty in favour of the collective. Mutualists are seen as the link between collectivists and individualists over freedom, with Proudhon stating that whilst individuals should be free to be selfish they are also "an integral part of the collective." Individualists such as egoists fundamentally disagree, stating that the freedom of the individual is of most importance, with Stiner summing up the view by saying "I am everything to myself and I do everything in my own account". Therefore, there is a difference over the level of freedom of the individual with regards to the collective.

In conclusion, anarchists disagree to a superficial extent as, whilst there is some disagreement over the level of ~~of~~ freedom of the individual, they all fundamentally agree on the importance of freedom from the state and economic freedom.



**ResultsPlus**  
Examiner Comments

This answer has a strong focus on liberty, and sets out a clear structure and a line of argument in the introduction.

Thinkers are integrated effectively into the answer, and the focus remains on the agreements and disagreements between collectivist and individualist anarchism.

The use of anarchist political terminology is very accurate here.

The A03 focus on extent could perhaps be slightly stronger in terms of having a clear line of argument that is argued convincingly throughout.

Level 5

Total: 21 marks

This is a top of Level 5 answer.

Chosen question number:      Question 3(a)       Question 3(b)   
    Question 4(a)       Question 4(b)   
    Question 5(a)       Question 5(b)   
    Question 6(a)       Question 6(b)   
    Question 7(a)       Question 7(b)

Liberty is a principle ~~not~~ that can be said to be much respected by both collectivist and ~~not~~ individual anarchists. Whilst the two branches value it, it can be argued that the two disagree on what liberty looks like and how it is to be achieved. Therefore, anarchists disagree to a greater extent on liberty.

Anti-statism is a fundamental principle of anarchism and so all anarchists can be said to agree that the abolition of the state is necessary to achieve liberty. Both ~~collectivist~~ strands agree that the state is corrupting and so causes one to lose sense of their true nature. Goldman described the state as a 'cold monster', ~~which~~ <sup>is</sup> the anarchist belief that those subject to ~~its~~ hierarchical authority are brutalised by a state that resolves conflict through violence, not reason. Individualist anarchists in particular criticise the state for inhibiting individuality, submitting the individual to the general will and thus limiting one's freedom to be autonomous.

Collectivists criticise the state's defence of ~~the~~ inequality as a tool used by the wealthy to protect their ~~own~~ <sup>to experience liberty</sup> privilege, their ~~handcuffs~~ <sup>obstructing the ability of the</sup> ~~most of~~ <sup>society</sup> ~~to~~ <sup>As a</sup> ~~corrupting~~ 'commanding' state, anarchists believe it forces one to suspend their use of reason and so is a major obstacle to ~~personal~~ <sup>exercising individual</sup> liberty. However, disagreements are evident in how best to replace ~~the~~ <sup>the</sup> state in the pursuit of liberty. Individualist anarchists and mutualists support non-violent protests and the overthrow of the state in an evolutionary process.

## Individualists

They oppose revolutionary strategy as it involves the forcible taking of property, which they believe is an authoritarian act that infringes on one's autonomy. On the other hand, anarcho-communists and anarcho-syndicalists don't believe in passive forms of protest and peaceful means. It is believed that this is ineffective as the state will always use its power to prevent change, whilst methods like elections only serve to support the state structure. Therefore, this evident inconsistency ~~is~~ within anarchism on strategies to overthrow the state highlights the ~~disagreement~~ fact that anarchists disagree on how to achieve liberty.

Collectivists and Individualists disagree on their definition of liberty. Individualist anarchists believe liberty is the freedom to explore one's individuality and freedom from both the state and social restrictions. This is founded upon their support for negative freedom, removing all external constraints on the individual, providing one with the opportunity to fully realize their potential. On the other hand, collectivists place social solidarity first and ~~to~~ emphasise the importance of equality to achieve liberty. Bakunin stated that 'social solidarity is the first human law, freedom is the second.' Anarcho-syndicalists in particular attach value to <sup>occupational</sup> social solidarity as they believe one's association with trade unions means they credit work or creativity as ~~the~~ ~~two~~ central elements of the human condition. As a result, clear contradictions can be seen in how the strands define liberty - highlighting their disagreements. However it can be said that despite ~~these~~ these differences in perception, both strands recognise equality to be a prerequisite of liberty. Without ~~liberty~~ equality, some become entitled to ~~freedom~~ freedom whilst others are not. Bakunin stated that 'liberty without equality is privilege and injustice.' Additionally, individualists and collectivists ~~agree~~ recognise that ~~liberty~~

The individual can't exist outside of society, irrespective of ~~their~~ their varying definitions of liberty. Anarchists accept that everyone needs others to develop and so whilst ~~liberty~~ individualist anarchists value liberty in its development of the individual, <sup>they</sup> accept the ~~need~~ for role society plays in ~~the~~ progressing one's potential. Yet, the disagreements between the strands can be said to outweigh this as ~~an~~ egoists in particular believe one has to reject the values imposed on it by society - achieving liberty through voluntary agreements that is a what Stirner calls a 'union of egoists' to fulfil their ego and further their own interests. ~~Like~~ Kropotkin's theory of mutual aid directly contradicts this with its support for the avoidance of competition to secure the everyone's survival. Therefore it can be argued that collectivist and individualist anarchists disagree on their definition of liberty.

Anarchists also disagree on how liberty looks like economically. Anarcho-capitalists have unrivalled faith in the free, free market capitalism and its ability to cater to everyone's needs as a self-regulating system. The absence of government intervention ~~entirely~~ embodies economic liberty as the market is left to operate according to the will of the people. On the other hand, ~~as~~ within the individualist strand itself there are disagreements. Egoists reject capitalism as it is believed anyone who works for another is subject to exploitation, and as the individual is the centre of the moral universe, any work one performs must be fulfilling. Further disagreements can be seen as ~~anarchist~~ anarcho-communists reject the anarcho-capitalist support for capitalism as ~~it is believed~~ it is believed that liberty under capitalism is illegitimate since it only allows the 'wage slave' to choose.

its boss. However, agreements on economic liberty can be seen between mutualists and individualists in their defence of private property. Individualists believe in the primacy of the individual over the collective and so ~~worries~~ fear the abolition of private property, risking giving the collective power over the individual. Proudhon was similarly critical of collectivism devaluing the individual and so on these grounds, mutualists defend small scale property ownership based on possession to ensure the individual is economically independent. Further agreement can be seen in amongst all anarchists in their rejection of state intervention in the economy. Anarcho-capitalists particularly criticise the use of state intervention as it creates monopolies that restrict choice and thus restrains one's freedom. In spite of this, ~~the disagreement~~ these similarities are insufficient against the overwhelming disagreements in how the strands envision economic liberty. Anarcho-communists and anarcho-socialists oppose private property in favour of common ownership which is believed to nurture the altruistic elements of human nature as opposed to private ownership which breeds envy. Even as mutualists defend small-scale property ownership, ~~disagree~~ they disagree with individualists as they accept the inequality perpetrated by large scale property ownership. Seeing as collectivist and individualist anarchists appear to differ significantly on the manifestation of liberty in the economy, it can therefore be argued that anarchists disagree on liberty.

To conclude, within anarchism it is clear that liberty is valued ~~as~~ in its ability to satisfy ~~the interests of~~ personal interests (as argued by individualists) and to further equality in society. Yet, evident contradictions can be seen among the strands on how best to achieve liberty, as well as the different ways this freedom can manifest in the economy. It can therefore be said that ~~the~~

*...anarchists disagree to a greater extent on the topic of liberty.*



**ResultsPlus**  
Examiner Comments

There is a strong line of argument developed here, with a very clear focus on liberty. The answer covers "extent", uses some excellent political vocabulary and has integrated thinkers.

Total: 24 marks



**ResultsPlus**  
Examiner Tip

It is important to have balance in your answer; this means that both agreements and disagreements must be covered in the debate.

## Question 4 (a)

Ecologism remains one of the non-core political ideas that is less popular. However, generally candidates engaged well with the questions regarding whether or not there is disagreement within ecologism.

There was a wide range of different themes developed, all strands were generally covered, key thinkers were well-deployed and, perhaps most pleasingly, there was a stronger use of the key vocabulary and terminology of ecologism. This meant that candidates in general could demonstrate more knowledge, analysis and evaluation in shorter, more focussed and effective answers.

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.

Some stronger answers built their essays around either areas of agreement, then areas of disagreement.

Alternatively, others used themes, for example:

- the state
- the economy
- attitudes to anthropocentrism
- views on sustainability
- whether or not a radical or reformist approach was required

They used a different theme for each paragraph and explored unity and division within each theme.

Many answers used the ideas of the critique of the existing world, a vision of a more ecologically sound future, and how to get from the existing world to an ecological world, effectively to seek areas of fundamental agreement and disagreement within ecologism. A full range of key thinkers was used, with some answers also going further than covering the main strands to explore in greater depth the different sub-strands within social ecology.

Weaker answers tended to position the views of the different strands side-by-side or only focus on the thinkers, not the strands. Alternatively, they discussed environmental policy rather than analysing comparatively the views of the different strands, to build up judgements on the extent of agreement or disagreement.

Where candidates did not have familiarity with the vocabulary/terminology of ecologism, answers tended to become more descriptive and less analytical.

This is a Level 5 answer.

Chosen question number:    Question 3(a)                       Question 3(b)   
   Question 4(a)                       Question 4(b)   
   Question 5(a)                       Question 5(b)   
   Question 6(a)                       Question 6(b)   
   Question 7(a)                       Question 7(b)

~~Ecologism is the idea that the environment~~  
Ecologists argue that the environment is important. They agree that anthropocentrism (human-centred approach) is a major contribution to the destruction of the earth, they however disagree about ~~way they opp~~ what to replace it with. They do all also agree ~~with~~ that society should be more sustainable but disagree ~~way~~ on the aims of getting ~~there~~ there. This essay will therefore argue ~~discuss~~ <sup>that</sup> the extent to which ecologism is in more ~~of~~ agreement than disagreement is limited.

All ecologists agree that anthropocentrism is bad and a major contributor to the destruction of the earth. Anthropocentrism is what we have in the current world; viewing nature as having instrumental value that humans can exploit as they are the masters of nature (above and outside of it). ~~Shatter~~ All ecologists agree that we

Should take lessons in the science of 'Ecology'. In contrast to anthropocentrism, which has a mechanistic world view (seeing the nature as a machine) which is reductionist in its approach (the study of independent component parts), Ecology is holistic, studying nature as a whole which ~~is~~ is not independent parts living in isolation from each other; this is because the science of Ecology is the study of plants and animals living in their natural habitats and ecosystems. Therefore, we can conclude here that this is a clear agreement between ecologists as they all agree that they oppose anthropocentrism and that we should all learn lessons from the science of Ecology in order to save the environment from the destruction ~~that~~ anthropocentrism is causing.

However, ecologists disagree on the replacement of anthropocentrism as they disagree ~~for~~ on the reasons why they oppose anthropocentrism. Shallow / Light Green (LG) ecologists such as Rachel Carson argue for 'Enlightened Anthropocentrism'. This is where ~~active~~ humans are the stewards and

care-takers of nature, but are still above it, also believe that nature does have instrumental value. Deep / Dark Green (DG) ecologists such as Leopold reject both anthropocentrism and 'Enlightened Anthropocentrism' proposed by LGs as it is still human centred. DGs reject any form of human-centred approach so instead propose 'Eco-centrism' as the only viable option. This puts nature at the centre of the matter and disregards humans completely. This is because DGs think that nature has ~~extrinsic~~ intrinsic (internal) value (value in its own right) - Leopold (Land Ethic). Social Ecologists (SE) reject anthropocentrism, Enlightened Anthropocentrism and ~~to~~ Eco-centrism as they are all forms of hierarchy and systems of domination. SE Murray Bookchin went as far to say that eco-centrism was "eco-la-la ~~that is~~ ~~misanthropic~~ nonsense that is misanthropic" (negative about humans). Their idea is that humans are merely part of nature, not above or below. Therefore, we can conclude here that this shows a fundamental disagreement between ecologists as they

cannot agree on what to replace it with.

Ecologists also disagree on sustainability. Although they all wish for a more sustainable society, their means of achieving that goal are very different. LG's propose 'weak sustainability'. This involves; slower and smarter ~~gro~~ economic growth, 'green consumerism' and 'green capitalism' (producing and buying green products). LG thinker Rachel Carson also adds the idea of 'intergenerational equity' to the issue of sustainability. This means that the current generation must not compromise the ability of future generations to meet their needs - The sustainability model must ~~fall in the~~ fit in with the idea of 'Limits to Growth' (Club of Rome). Carson said "if man wages war on nature, he is ~~the~~ inevitably waging war on himself", nature must be protected in order to sustain human life. Both DGs and SE reject the LG proposal of weak sustainability as not radical enough, as they claim ecologism is not compatible with capitalism, green or not (EF Schumacher - "there is more to life than GDP" - DG thinker).

DGs propose, instead, a more radical proposal of 'Strong sustainability'. This involves the West going through a period of de-growth, followed by a steady state economy ~~to growth~~ (zero growth), the ~~abolition~~ <sup>abolition</sup> of capitalism as industrialism is another major contributor to the destruction of the earth. The abolition of capitalism would then lead to a post-consumerist ~~and~~ and anti-materialist society, in other words - people would no longer base their happiness off their want or their possession of material goods (e.g. clothes). SE does largely agree with DG's proposal for strong sustainability as it is much more radical in its aims and methods. Therefore, we can conclude here that this shows a clear and fundamental disagreement among ecologists as although they agree they all want a more sustainable society, they differ in their methods.

In conclusion, on the balance of evidence, ecologists are fundamentally more ~~at~~ in disagreement than agreement. They cannot and never will agree on what to replace anthropocentrism with nor how to achieve a sustainable society.



This essay:

- is focussed on the question
- has a clear line of argument that is followed throughout
- covers all the strands
- attempts to engage with the concept of "extent"

The introduction provides a clear direction for the debate and that is followed throughout the answer.

The level of key terminology and political vocabulary from ecologism is very high throughout.

Level 5

Total: 22 marks



Knowing key political terminology and the vocabulary of ecologism allows candidates to write with a sense of accuracy, focus and control

This is a Level 5 answer.

Chosen question number:

Question 3(a)

Question 3(b)

Question 4(a)

Question 4(b)

Question 5(a)

Question 5(b)

Question 6(a)

Question 6(b)

Question 7(a)

Question 7(b)

There is both significant agreement and disagreement within ecologism. Overall, when one considers all areas of ecologist thought and the varying opinions on different issues, it is clear that there is fundamental disagreement within ecologism on most issues and that there is more disagreement than agreement within ecologism.

Firstly, there are certain issues that all ecologists do agree on. They all agree that the current world economic system is flawed and responsible for environmental issues, that exponential growth constitutes a large part of this problem and that capitalism ~~is~~ in its current form is unsustainable. They also, to varying degrees, reject anthropocentrism, the view that humans are the masters of nature and that nature only possesses instrumental value. ~~They also~~ However, there is stark disagreement

blunders them over the preferable alternatives to these issues. Light Greens do not entirely reject capitalism, they believe in green consumerism, wherein consumers only consume green products, forcing companies to go green, they believe that environmental issues can still be resolved under capitalism. They also believe in enlightened anthropocentrism, that humanity is the steward of nature, above it but not outside of it and that it must protect it, Rachel Carson stated 'man's war ~~with~~<sup>against</sup> nature is inevitably a war against himself.' Dark Greens and Social Ecologists reject the view that capitalism will allow solutions to environmental problems and they both believe that capitalism must be destroyed. Murray Bookchin, an eco-anarchist stated that 'asking capitalism to stop growing is like asking a human to stop breathing,' displaying clear opposition to capitalism. Whilst these ecologists agree on these core principles, they radically disagree on how these problems ought to be dealt with.

A further point of disagreement amongst ecologists is the manner in which they believe the world should function in order to solve these key issues.

Light Greens believe in intergenerational equity, the view that the moral community must be extended to those yet to be born, whereas Dark Greens believe in the Land Ethic, in accordance with the ideas of Aldo Leopold, the view that the moral community must be extended to all natural resources such as the land, air and water. Light Greens also believe in enlightened anthropocentrism where man is the steward of nature, whereas ~~Dark~~ Dark Greens believe in ecocentrism, wherein man is just 'a plain citizen of nature'; they also emphasise that nature has intrinsic value in its own right. Social Ecologists disagree with anthropocentrism as they are opposed to humanity's domination of nature, and ecocentrism as they view it as inhumanistic and denying the uniqueness of humans. They also reject the Dark Green view that all biological life is morally equal, believing that viruses for example should not be considered in this way. This displays stark differences within ecologism.

~~Dark Greens~~

Social Ecologists believe that humanity's present domination of nature reflects the

domination of humans over humans. However, they disagree over the nature of this domination, and the way it relates to the environment. Carolyn Merchant, an Eco-feminist stresses the presentation of nature as being female and as such, the exploitation of nature is an extension of the exploitation of women in society. Eco-socialists stress exploitation of the working class under capitalism as the underlying cause of humanity's exploitation of nature. Finally, eco-anarchists such as Murray Bookchin, emphasise that society is full of hierarchy and this is reflected in the exploitation of nature. Therefore, they believe that in order to end the exploitation of nature, the patriarchy must be ended, capitalism must be ended, and all forms of hierarchy must be ended, respectively. This displays fundamental disagreement within not just ecologism but social ecology itself.

In conclusion, whilst all ecologists agree on certain principles, ~~and~~ it is clear that they radically disagree over how they should be implemented, displaying that there is fundamentally more disagreement

*Have agreement within ecologism.*



**ResultsPlus**  
Examiner Comments

There is a clear line of argument here, with an attempt at measuring "extent". The answer looks at the differences between the strands and also the differences within social ecology.

Key thinkers are deployed effectively and integrated into the answer. There is a good use of the political vocabulary of ecologism, which creates a real sense of sharpness in the selection of information and the depth of the analysis.

Level 5

Total: 21 marks



**ResultsPlus**  
Examiner Tip

It is important to have balance, covering both disagreement and agreement to help justify your view of "extent"

## Question 4 (b)

Candidates generally engaged well with the debate on how united ecologism is, in its view of the economy.

It was pleasing to see candidates showing how there is unity in their analysis of the existing economic order, and their desire for a sustainable economy, whilst highlighting the division over what that sustainable economy looks like and how to achieve it.

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 areas of unity then areas of division.

Alternatively, they used themes, such as:

- capitalism
- industrialism
- consumerism and materialism
- sustainability

They used a different theme for each paragraph, and explored unity and division within each theme.

Stronger answers generally saw a clear level of unity between deep greens and social ecology in opposition to the existing economy, and the need for a rejection of capitalism, industrialism, consumerism and materialism to create an ecological economy. This was set against the more reformist approach of shallow greens to work within capitalism, through either green capitalism and consumerism, or a more managerialist state.

Weaker answers tended to position the views of the different strands side-by-side, only focus on thinkers, not strands, or were diverted into a debate about green policies, rather than analysing comparatively the strands to build up judgements on the extent of unity or disunity.

An area for further work is to ensure candidates have a clear and effective grasp of the key political terminology of ecologism so that they can write shorter, more focussed and analytical answers.

This is a Level 4/Level 5 boundary script.

Chosen question number:      **Question 3(a)**       **Question 3(b)**   
    **Question 4(a)**       **Question 4(b)**   
    **Question 5(a)**       **Question 5(b)**   
    **Question 6(a)**       **Question 6(b)**   
    **Question 7(a)**       **Question 7(b)**

The ~~light~~ Light Green ecologists aim to reform an economic system, while the Deep Greens & Social Ecologists aim to radically transform it. This fundamental divide means that there is very little unity within ecologists over the economy.

Light green ecologists advocate for "green capitalism". They argue that capitalism does not necessarily have to destroy the environment. Like all other ecologists, they oppose the current system of uncontrolled growth as they believe this will ultimately lead to an environmental catastrophe. ~~They believe in enlightened anthropocentrism~~  
 This is derived from enlightened Anthropocentrism, they believe that we must sustainably manage resources as doing otherwise is a risk to humans & humans. Therefore, we must reform capitalism as it turns nature's instrumental value to humans. Deep greens and social ecologists, however, completely oppose capitalism and aim to abolish it completely. For deep greens, capitalism ~~is~~ is completely unethical & because it

means that nature can be used as an exploiter for profit, and instead it doesn't recognize the intrinsic value of nature. Instead, ~~the~~ ~~advocate~~ ~~for~~ ~~a~~ ~~radical~~ ~~system~~ ~~is~~ ~~as~~ ~~Aldo~~ ~~Leopold~~ ~~'s~~ ~~'land~~ ~~ethic'~~ Social ecologists also oppose capitalism for these reasons, but primarily oppose it due to it being a hierarchical system that creates social issues across nations that are striving to balance for human treatment of the environment. Instead, the radical strains advocate for a system of localized products based on human needs, not human wants or human profits as is the case in capitalism.<sup>x1</sup>

The polar opposite views on capitalism of the Deep Green and Light Green compare to the Deep Green of Social Ecology, press that ecologists is ~~founder~~ extremes divided or between those who wish to reform capitalism and those who wish to abolish it.

All ecologists oppose the current system of exponential growth. Light greens advocate for smarter, greener growth through the use of technologies, and believe that economic growth can continue as long as it is "greener". This is referred to as "weak sustainability" and is derived from the ideas of ecologists such as Robert Conner who argue that ~~the~~ ~~preference~~ of sustainable management of a Earth's resources is vital to the survival of mankind. ~~But~~ Deep Green

as Social Ecologists, however, advocate for stress sustainability. This includes a stage of degradation for advanced capitalist countries, followed by a "steady state economy" in which there is no growth as it ~~is~~ would be completely unnecessary if man were to live in accordance with the nature. Deep greens view any economic growth that ~~brings~~ harms the biosphere as completely unethical, due to their ecocentric principle of biocentric equality\*, the idea that all nature, living or not, is deserving of equal rights & protection. Social ecologists, however, believe that ecocentrism is anthropocentric & therefore some economic growth can be permissible if it was for the good of both humans & nature. Overall, there is again a clear division between the strands, as ~~we~~ advocate the Light Greens advocate such sustainability compared to the Deep Greens and social ecologists strands, thus there is again a clear divide between the strands.

Light All ecologists believe that consumption at its current level is problematic. Light greens believe in "green consumerism", that corporations ~~can~~ will become environmentally conscious if consumers only buy green products. Deep greens completely oppose this & see consumerism as a main problem in humanity's mistreatment of nature. This includes the idea that

\*As laid out in Aldo Leopold's land ethic.

Human happiness to be derived from other, more meaningful  
creatures, such as having a positive relationship with nature.  
Social ecologists also oppose consumerism, but  
unlike deep greens, do place the blame on  
human or consumers, social ecologists blame the  
capitalist production & hierarchy for the problem of  
consumerism. ~~It is~~ This is the belief  
that consumerism will no longer be a problem if  
the social issues of hierarchy and dominance are  
eliminated. Their differing views on consumerism agree  
that but there is little unity between the strains.

In conclusion, the ~~most~~ divisions in ecology between the  
radical deep greens & the reformist light greens  
show that ecologists & deep divided ideologies over  
the economy. While light greens generally ~~agree~~ with  
support our current economic system or promote a  
green version of it, the deep greens and  
social ecologists advocate for a complete change in our  
economic system, meaning there is no unity between the  
strains.

\*1 Furthermore, the social ecologist Murray Bookchin  
describes capitalism as a "grow or die" ideology,  
believes it must be done to protect nature.



This answer has a very clear line of argument that is pursued throughout and shows a grasp of the key political terminology of ecologism.

The answer:

- is focussed on the question
- has a strong structure
- attempts to measure extent.

All three strands are covered.

The key thinkers are used here, but are not, perhaps, used to the full extent because they are not fully-integrated in the essay.

Overall, the lower level is best-fit for this response.

Level 4

Total: 19 marks



Integrate your thinkers into the essay

Use their main contributions to ecologism to support your arguments about the unity or division between different strands

## Question 5 (a)

Candidates were generally able to identify agreement and disagreement between the strands and many showed good knowledge and understanding of differing feminist perspectives of reform versus revolution.

Almost all answers included the required two key thinkers, with many going above and beyond to reference other thinkers, such as Friedan or Wollstonecraft, to support their responses. It was pleasing to see a strong grasp of the key terminology and vocabulary of feminism being deployed, making for shorter and more effective answers.

The strongest answers were well-structured, analysing a range of themes and showing deep knowledge of the views of thinkers associated with the four main strands. They drew these out to make meaningful comparisons and informed judgements regarding the extent of unity or division.

The very best answers were explicit about the “extent” of unity, supporting their judgements with perceptive, comparative analysis and well-selected political information. It was pleasing to see more candidates using post-modern feminism, more accurately using the ideas of intersectionality and 'bell-hooks' (female author).

Weaker approaches tended to be more descriptive, only laying out the ideas of the different strands or different thinkers rather than focussing on the extent of unity. This approach sometimes saw a more narrative, historical approach that was very descriptive rather than analytical.

There was a tendency to want simply to label key thinkers by strand rather than focussing on how the ideas of the different thinkers have contributed to the views of feminism as a whole, and the thinking of the different strands. One area for focus is to generate a more rounded understanding of the contributions of Kate Millett to the debates within feminism.

This is a top-level answer.

Chosen question number:

Question 3(a)

Question 3(b)

Question 4(a)

Question 4(b)

Question 5(a)

Question 5(b)

Question 6(a)

Question 6(b)

Question 7(a)

Question 7(b)

Across feminist thought, there is wide consensus that the patriarchal nature of society must be changed. In this aspect there is unity. However, the way in which societal change should come about is nuanced, and the extent to which the patriarchy cuts through society is debated. Feminists are united in their goal to abolish patriarchy from society, though there is debate on how this is best achieved.

All feminists agree that patriarchy is deep-rooted in society and must be removed to secure female emancipation. However, liberal feminists argue that this is best achieved through reform and education, securing legal and political equality to remove patriarchy. For radical feminists, this is not enough. As an institution founded by the patriarchy, the state cannot change society.

in an acceptable way for feminists. Radical feminists view patriarchy as all-pervading, in every aspect of life. Formal equality only relates to the public sphere; work, education, voting. Radical feminists view the personal as political too, with Mullet arguing that sexual relationships reflect undue power dynamics, and lesbian communities can combat the patriarchy in society. Radical feminists also view culture as a source of female oppression, through language, media, and religious institutions that impose gender roles. A counter-cultural society is needed to combat the deep-rooted effects of patriarchy, argue radical feminists. Ultimately, the patriarchy is a shared issue for feminists, but it is far more deep-rooted in radical feminist thought.

Feminists also agree that women have been assigned a subordinate role by men in all aspects of society. For liberal feminists such as Gilman, biological sex differences should not determine a woman's place in society as a "mother" or caregiver. As such, formal rights such as the 2010 Equality Act can uphold a woman's right to equality.

of opportunity. For radical feminists, there are a range of opinions. Socialists such as Rowellmann view the economy as a central part of female oppression in society, as they are reduced to an unpaid workforce in the home, and a reserve army of low-paid labour. Feminists such as Firestone have advocated for androgynous societies whereby sex differences are removed to ensure women are not limited by "accidents of birth", as Mill proposed. Ultimately, feminists agree that women suffer a subordinate societal role, but disagree on the best way to combat this, with liberal feminists preferring legal equality, and radical feminists advocating for the physical removal of sex differences and androgynous, communal child rearing.

Whilst all feminists desire equality in society, post-modern feminists criticize liberal feminists for their narrow focus on middle-class, white women. bell hooks advocates for an intersectional approach, where multiple identities in society achieve equality, not just middle class white ~~and~~ women. hooks argues that black, gay, religious minority, poor women all

experience different forms of inequality in society. As such, post-modern feminists apply a broader scope to the improvement they wish to see in society. It also appears to radical feminists that the patriarchal nature of society has negatively impacted men, by assigning them a false sense of self-superiority. ~~As such~~ Ultimately, post-modern and radical feminists believe the patriarchy affects a wider range of societal members than liberal feminism claims.

Whilst feminism is united in its need to change patriarchy in society, there are many nuances across feminist thought. Liberals seek a reformed society, and argue for legal egalitarian society. Meanwhile, radical feminists expand from the public sphere to the private sphere and emphasise that the personal is political. Furthermore, radical feminists view patriarchy as a legacy of white imperialism that disadvantages other minorities including black people and gay people. As such, combatting the patriarchy requires more revolutionary action. Though feminism is a wide ranging ideology,

With many schools of thought about the best form of society, they are ultimately united by the desire to remove patriarchy from society.



**ResultsPlus**  
Examiner Comments

The introduction outlines the debate very effectively. It introduces a clear line of argument, which then runs throughout.

It demonstrates:

- a good use of political vocabulary,
- how thinkers are integrated into the answer
- that there is balance
- that there is coverage of all the strands

Level 5

Total: 23 marks



**ResultsPlus**  
Examiner Tip

A strong grasp of the key terminology and political vocabulary of feminism helps to bring a sharpness and focus to your answer

## Question 5 (b)

It was pleasing to see candidates engaging with the question, focussing on the meaning of equality.

They drew out different areas such as:

- gender equality
- political equality
- legal equality
- the debate between equality and difference feminism.

Again, here, the ability to deploy the language and terminology of feminism led to shorter, more effective answers.

Candidates who adopted a thematic approach and structured their responses based on themes of the ideology (eg, legal equality, gender equality, patriarchy, the family, political equality) were able to access higher levels in the levels-based mark scheme. These candidates used key thinkers to support their arguments effectively, showing a deeper understanding of the ideology.

Most candidates included successfully at least two key thinkers, which is essential for achieving higher marks. However, it was noted that some candidates identified Wollstonecraft and Friedan incorrectly as key thinkers rather than using them as additional thinkers.

The very best answers were able to integrate key thinkers into their analysis of the strands of feminism rather than merely mentioning them, or labelling them by strand.

Weaker answers were descriptive, focussing on one strand per paragraph without adequate comparison, thereby missing opportunities for higher-level analysis (AO2) and evaluation (AO3).

Some were structured around individual thinkers, which limited their ability to demonstrate the levels of agreement and disagreement within the political idea.

An area on which to focus is how the contributions of key thinkers have contributed to the different strands within feminism.

This is a Level 5 answer.

Introductions do not need to be long, but they need to be effective.

They should establish the debate and lay down a clear line of argument.

Chosen question number:      Question 3(a)       Question 3(b)   
   Question 4(a)       Question 4(b)   
   Question 5(a)       Question 5(b)   
   Question 6(a)       Question 6(b)   
   Question 7(a)       Question 7(b)

Feminism is a movement and ideology that essentially believes in equality and liberation of women. It can be argued that feminists however disagree on how this equality should be achieved; the radical feminists argue for equality via revolution whereas the liberal feminists argue for equality through legal and political framework. I will argue that to a large extent, there is more agreement than disagreement within feminism about equality.

Firstly, there is a disagreement between difference feminists and equality feminists on equality. Difference feminists essentially use the claim of the biological difference between men and women (sex) to argue that men and women are innately different and instead of fighting for pure equality, women should celebrate the difference given that women are 'naturally' born with a more nurturing and caregiving nature. Equality radical feminist Kate Millet and Simone De Beauvoir

totally disagree with this belief. If Kate Millet argues that the ~~greater~~ argument about second gender is a clear clear patriarchal societal construct and that men and women are both equally able to achieve the same fortunes in life. Therefore, she believes that all feminists should rather support clear equality for both men and women; this shows the clear disagreement.

However, it can rather be argued that nonetheless, all feminists agree that women are unfairly discriminated and oppressed in society. As a result of this, women <sup>want</sup> should fight to free themselves from such 'cultural conditioning' of unrealistic expectations men as domesticity and ~~submissiveness~~ submissiveness to their husbands. Sheila Rowbotham backs this argument by saying that 'men would agree that women are oppressed but not you'. Therefore, to a <sup>small</sup> ~~large~~ extent there is ~~not~~ disagreement between the ~~two~~ ~~difference~~ and equality feminists ~~are~~ - we equality ~~for~~.

Furthermore, feminists disagree we equality should be achieved. Liberal feminists such as Betty Friedan argue that given that men and women are capable of working together, they should <sup>both</sup> come together to remove the patriarchal via the state. Betty Friedan argued in her best seller 'feminine mystique' 1963 that ~~most~~ women are ~~externally~~ 'culturally conditioned' into believing that their lives aim is to be a housewife. She then argues that once all restrictions

in employment are lifted, eventually, women would gain consciousness, start ~~work~~ working more, and the patriarchy would disappear. Radical feminist Kate Millet disagrees ~~or~~ in this. Millet argues that the state itself is patriarchal and therefore ruling in the state would not want to see an extension of women's rights. Therefore, the only way equality can ~~be~~ <sup>be</sup> achieved is by women engaging in lesbian relationships rather than hetero sexual relationships as such relationships breed ~~up~~ oppression and inequality. Therefore, this shows how they disagree on how equality should be achieved.

Having said that, it can be argued that all feminists agree on the damage which the patriarchy has caused. Even socialist feminists such as Sheila Rowbotham argue that capitalism ~~breeds~~ <sup>leads to</sup> patriarchy and causes oppression and therefore, this patriarchy must go. Therefore, although they disagree on how it should go, there is a clear consensus that once patriarchy is removed, equality will be achieved.

Lastly, there is a disagreement ~~or~~ <sup>rather</sup> between non-modern feminists and traditional feminists. Modern feminist bell hooks has argued that in societies today, equality is not only needed in terms of gender but is needed in race and religion. In her book 'Ain't I a woman?' hooks argues that the intersectionality in feminism has been overlooked given that the oppression faced by white women is very different

from the oppression faced by black women - therefore, the equality should be achieved in all spheres. Traditional or older feminists like Sheila Rowbotham disproportionately focused on achieving equality for white-middle class and working class women by liberating them from capitalism. She did not rather focus on equality for all women as opposed to hooks. This then demonstrates the difference in the intended extent of sex equality between traditional and post-modern feminists.

Having said that, it can be argued that feminists agree on the fact that equality for women is not just limited to the public sphere but it includes the private sphere because indeed 'the personal is political'. For example, radical feminist Kate Millet argues that issues like domestic abuse should not be neglected because it is ~~not~~ deemed to be a private issue; she argues that this is still a form of oppression that must be overcome to ensure equality. Traditional socialist feminist Charlotte Gilman ~~argues~~ argues that agrees with this view on the basis that women are ~~oppressed~~ oppressed in the family as they are made to perform free labour; therefore, the traditional family should be abolished and replaced with communal living so that no private oppression is tolerated. Overall, we can then ascertain that there is no more agreement than disagreement within feminism (to a large extent) over how far / deep equality should be achieved.

In conclusion, I believe the points above have gone to show that indeed to a large extent feminists agree we equality to a large extent than they disagree. This is because there is a broad ~~and~~ consensus over the fact that women are clearly oppressed in society and as a result of this, liberation and equality is needed to put an end to this ~~general~~ centuries long oppression. Although difference feminists argue that men and women are biologically different and this difference should be achieved, it is clear that there is a united argument against the patriarchy and the need for its removal; thus this ~~shows~~ shows that there is clearly ~~and~~ more agreement.



**ResultsPlus**  
Examiner Comments

The introduction establishes the framework of the debate and provides a clear line of argument. There is an attempt to engage with "extent".

The agreement and disagreement between all four strands are covered, and the ideas of key thinkers are integrated into the answer. The political terminology used here is good.

An area for development could be through a more nuanced, detailed development of the ideas of radical feminism and Kate Millett.

Level 5

Total: 23 marks

## Question 6 (a)

Multiculturalism is one of the less-popular political ideas. However, it was very pleasing to note how well this question was answered.

Candidates were able to develop a strong line of argument and effective debates around the extent of multiculturalism's unity in its views on society. It was pleasing to see all of the strands being covered and key thinkers being deployed judiciously.

Stronger answers took a thematic approach, looking at the extent of unity and division within multiculturalism over themes such as diversity, tolerance and the extent to which society should recognise, celebrate and support cultural difference. Within this debate, all the main strands were covered, whilst the ideas of the different political thinkers were integrated effectively into the answer. It was very pleasing to see the political vocabulary and key terminology of multiculturalism being used effectively within the debate, showing a very good level of knowledge and understanding.

Weaker answers tended simply to show the ideas of the different strands paragraph-by-paragraph or focus on the debate between thinkers rather than strands. There was also a tendency to use thinkers as an add-on. They were introduced and labelled as belonging to a particular strand rather than integrating their political ideas into the answer, in support of the differing views within multiculturalism.

One area that needs focus is to develop the understanding of how the views of liberal multiculturalism emerge from, but also challenge, the views of liberalism. In particular, how the liberal multiculturalist view of the role of the state and attitudes to celebrating, recognising and supporting diversity within the public sphere, is very different from liberalism.

This is a low Level 5 answer.

Chosen question number:

Question 3(a)

Question 3(b)

Question 4(a)

Question 4(b)

Question 5(a)

Question 5(b)

Question 6(a)

Question 6(b)

Question 7(a)

Question 7(b)

It can be argued that multiculturalism is united on its views about society, as all multiculturalists agree about the importance of recognising minority groups and creating diversity. However, this essay will more convincingly argue that multiculturalism is more united than divided on its views on society because there is disagreement about how far recognition and diversity should be extended.

All multiculturalists agree that recognition for minority groups and allowing diversity should be priorities in society. Firstly, liberal multiculturalists believe in the importance of equal dignity and recognition for minority groups in society, as advocated for by Charles Taylor, and the celebration of diversity in society to inspire creativity and innovation. Similarly, pluralist multiculturalists agree with the importance of recognition as majority cultures should not dominate society (value pluralism) and that diversity is social as it enables cross-cultural dialogue, advocated for by Tariq Modood,

which enables different cultures to learn from each other.

Finally, cosmopolitan multiculturalists also emphasise the importance of diversity to allow individuals to 'pick a mix' their identities through interaction with different cultures. However, multiculturalists disagree about the extent to which recognition and diversity should be extended in society.

Multiculturalists disagree about the extent to which recognition should be extended in society because different multiculturalists hold contrasting views on whether changes to the law to accommodate minority groups are appropriate. Whilst pluralist multiculturalists see special sets of minority rights as vital to recognising and protecting minority cultures, for example with Will Kymlicka advocating for self-government, polyethnic and representation rights, liberal multiculturalists are more hesitant. Although they do believe in some accommodation for minority cultures in the law, they believe that this cannot extend to illiberal practices such as female genital ~~not~~ mutilation. In contrast, pluralists believe that the branding of some cultural practices as illiberal goes against the principle of value pluralism advocated for by Shikha Parekh. Therefore, this shows how multiculturalists disagree about the extent of recognition in society.

As well as this, multiculturalists disagree about the extent to which diversity should be incorporated in society. There is a

distinction between shallow and deep diversity: whilst liberal multiculturalists believe in shallow diversity which is underpinned by a strong national identity (modest), pluralist ~~not~~ multiculturalists advocate for deep diversity ~~to~~ which includes accommodations made in the law to allow cultural practices. On top of this disagreement, cosmopolitan multiculturalism sees diversity as not an end goal, but an aspect in the process of creating a global multicultural community without distinct cultures. This is because they believe that individuals should be able to construct their cultural identity in society and not restricted to following one culture. Therefore, these arguments show how multiculturalists disagree about the extent and purposes of diversity in society.

Overall, the most convincing argument is that multiculturalists are more divided than united in their views on society. Whilst they agree about the most important principles in a multicultural society, recognition and diversity, they disagree about the ~~extent~~ extent to which these should be applied. Therefore, it is stronger to argue that liberal, pluralist and cosmopolitan multiculturalists disagree more than they agree on society and how it should be run.



There is an excellent engagement with the question here, a clear use of the different strands of multiculturalism and the key thinkers are well-integrated into the answer.

The answer has a solid structure, and the use of the political terminology and vocabulary of multiculturalism is very strong. This allows the answer to include much content in a short space.

An area for development would be to generate a stronger sense of A03 throughout the answer.

Level 5

Total: 20 marks



To develop an answer:

- use key terminology from the specification and vocabulary of multiculturalism. This will bring sharpness to an essay
- use the most important contributions of political thinkers to the political idea in an integrated way, rather than simply labelling a thinker with a strand

## Question 6 (b)

This was the least-popular of the two questions on multiculturalism and revolved around one of the big debates. The debate about integration links up with key terms in the specification such as assimilation, individualist integration, pluralist integration and cosmopolitan integration. Answers that were able to define what is meant by these terms and deploy them effectively were able to access the full range of the mark scheme.

Stronger answers took a thematic approach, looking at the extent of agreement and disagreement within multiculturalism over themes such as the different types of integration, assimilation and the ability to balance diversity with unity. Within this debate, all the main strands were covered, whilst the ideas of the different political thinkers were integrated effectively into the answer. It was very pleasing to see the political vocabulary and key terminology of multiculturalism being used effectively within the debate, showing a very good level of knowledge and understanding.

Some of the weaker answers tended only to set out the ideas of the different strands paragraph-by-paragraph. Others focussed on the debate between thinkers rather than strands or were unable accurately to define the different types of integration. There was also a tendency to use thinkers as an add-on. They were introduced and labelled as belonging to a particular strand rather than integrating their political ideas into the answer, in support of the differing views within multiculturalism.

A key area on which to focus is the difference between the different types of integration versus assimilation, and the debate around integration and segregation. The contributions to multiculturalism of Tariq Modood are particularly important here.

This is a very strong Level 4 answer.

- Chosen question number:
- |   |   |
|---|---|
| Question 3(a) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | Question 3(b) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| Question 4(a) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | Question 4(b) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| Question 5(a) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | Question 5(b) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| Question 6(a) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | Question 6(b) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| Question 7(a) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | Question 7(b) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |

The multiculturalist debate focuses on the possibility of unity within diversity and how this is achieved. Generally, multiculturalists broadly agree on the importance of integration for the purposes of upholding ~~a person's~~ dignity and rights in order to create social harmony. However, the strands of multiculturalism take very different views upon identity and the importance of diversity.

This essay will conclude that despite Sinter A ~~Generally, multiculturalists believe that~~ aims behind the objective of integration, the strands are ultimately too different in their view of diversity and ~~identity~~ the significance of cultural identity.

Generally, multiculturalists agree on the importance of rectifying historical colonialism and discriminatory social structures, understanding that there is a parallel between social disadvantage and

cultural differences. Consequently, all strands tend to be united in their support for minority rights, outlined by liberal multiculturalist Will Kymlicka of: self-governmental rights, polyethnic rights, and representative rights. These rights denote forms of positive discrimination of a form of promoting minority cultures and protecting them from marginalisation. In turn, all multiculturalists believe that <sup>as a form</sup> being able to retain their culture is crucial for both their self-identity and dignity. Representative rights seek to ~~reduce~~ <sup>minimise</sup> bias of the dominant majority culture in the economy, and polyethnic rights grant minority groups legal exemptions to protect them from being coerced into giving up core parts of their culture (and hence identity). In turn, it can be said multiculturalists broadly agree that integration should be achieved or through allowing all cultures to uphold <sup>their</sup> dignity ~~and~~ and giving minority cultural protection against the possibility of marginalisation in order to create a more harmonious and cohesive society.

1

However, a point of divergence would be how the different strands respect the notion of identity. Liberal multiculturalists endorse the

notion that the individual is rational and should be autonomous of a culture, placing liberty at the core of its principles. They believe that undermining minority rights is equivalent to undermining their freedom. However, liberal ~~and~~ multiculturalists have a view of 'diversity in points', liberal in public suggests that people should integrate within the framework of a liberal democratic state or secular cities. However, pluralist multiculturalists, such as Joseph, emphasize the cultural embeddedness of individuals, particularly due to the concept of primary socialization - people's identity cannot be separated from their culture. In this sense, ~~platon~~ pluralist disagree with the liberal notion that we can abstract our identity from social contingencies. Cohospitally ~~and~~ multiculturalists take an even more radical view of identity and human nature, contrasting the idea of being culturally embedded. Cohospitally multiculturalists advocate for a long term goal of a global unified cultural identity, supporting the notion of 'mix and match', vastly opposing views of the significance of culture to an individual's identity. Consequently, multiculturalists disagree strongly over methods of integrating

as they hold radically different views on identity, despite cosmopolitan and pluralists being broadly more communitarian and liberals being more individualist.

Lastly, multiculturalists disagree on integration due to their conflicting viewpoints on diversity.

Pluralist multiculturalist Isaiah Berlin highlighted the incommensurability of beliefs that were held ~~in~~ with respect to different metaphysical assumptions - this encouraged a view of deep diversity and value pluralism. Pluralists believe in some form of integration through interactions between cultures, but place emphasis on mutual co-existence as opposed to <sup>the</sup> full integration of cultures. Liberals disagree with this viewpoint, highlighting that diversity is important to the individual's sense of freedom and personal autonomy, but a mutual liberal respect within a secure liberal framework of public institutions can endorse and permit a cohesive and integrated society, despite the contrast between cultures. Cosmopolitan multiculturalists ultimately advocate for extensive interactions to a single unified culture, believing that cultural exchange helps people to develop

morally and spiritually. Conservatives argue that full integration can only be found within nationalistic ideals of multiculturalism, concepts of historical continuity or an overarching cultural and racial identity, and extreme advocate for complete cultural assimilation in society for integration. Therefore, there are a wide set of ideological divisions due to multiculturalism views on diversity, with shallow diversity (liberalism), and deep diversity (protectionism), and complete cultural integration (a paradoxical notion of diversity leading to unity by cohesiveness) all defining its concepts.

In contrast, multiculturalism is grounded in a unified stance on providing minority cultures with minority rights and dignity to counter systematic marginalization of well as the adverse effects of ~~the~~ ~~orientalism~~ orientalism, particularly by the West in controlling the discourse on non-western social and religious identities. The Haves, multiculturalist divisions over integration are particularly prevalent with their disagreement over the nature and superiority of identity as well as diversity.



The introduction is 'punchy', setting out the debate and the line of argument that deals with "extent".

The answer remains focussed on integration, and reference to key thinkers is effective in the answer.

An area for development here might be to discuss the multiculturalist opposition to assimilation being imposed to create unity but without diversity.

Level 4

Total: 19 marks



Define core principles or key terminology from the question in the introduction

## Question 7 (a)

This was the less popular of the two questions on nationalism, but in general was answered well: candidates engaged with this debate around the state. Candidates were able to identify that the most central belief of nationalism is that the nation-state brings together the concept of the nation and the state and that there is widespread disagreement over the role and nature 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 tended to build their answers around what unites all nationalists in their view of the state. They went on to consider areas of disagreement between strands over the right of all nations to statehood, whether or not the state is a realm of freedom and the basis for the state.

Stronger answers also tended to pair up liberal nationalism with anti/post colonialism against the ideas of conservative nationalism and expansionist nationalism. Better answers were able effectively to deploy the key terminology of the specification, building effective debates between the strands and supporting 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. Alternatively, they focussed on the different ideas of the key thinkers rather than comparatively analysing the strands to build up judgements on the extent of agreement or disagreement.

Weaker answers also tended simply to name thinkers as part of a strand rather than using the key ideas of the thinkers to support the debate between the strands. There was also a tendency not to 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.

One area on which to focus would be to develop a more thorough understanding of Mazzini and his concept of nationhood.

This is a Level 5 answer.

- Chosen question number:
- |   |   |
|---|---|
| Question 3(a) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | Question 3(b) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| Question 4(a) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | Question 4(b) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| Question 5(a) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | Question 5(b) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| Question 6(a) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | Question 6(b) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| Question 7(a) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | Question 7(b) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |

Nationalists vary in their views of the state based on their varying views on human nature, leading to varying views on how the nation-state should interact with other nation-states. The core idea of the nation means that a state is always needed to represent it as this is how the nation expresses itself. This essay will be arguing that nationalists do disagree more than they disagree about the state to a large extent.

~~the state~~

Nationalists agree to some extent over ~~the role of~~ their views of the state forming and how this comes from their views on human nature. Liberal, ~~and~~ anti-colonial and post-colonial nationalists all believe that humans are rational and this creates a rational state. ~~All nationalists~~ conservative nationalists also agree that the state is based on social cohesion and will reflect the society in the nation that forms it. All nationalists also agree that human nature directly leads to the formation of the state however they disagree on how this happens. Rousseau and liberal nationalists argue that humans are rational so rationally create a state which represents them and is governed by popular choice - general will. However, conservative nationalists take on a more mystical or

historical view of how human nature leads to the formation of the state. They believe in von Herder's idea of the 'Volksgeist' or national spirit shared by people through common history and culture. This means that the state will also be based on shared history and will value the national spirit and tradition. Furthermore, there is greater disagreement between nationalists over membership of the state. Liberals believe in anti-nationalism and are inclusive to all, and post-colonial nationalists agree to a certain extent over inclusivity, suggesting nationalists agree to a small extent. However, conservative nationalists and expansionist nationalists are more exclusive of state membership. Conservatives believe that you can eventually join the state but must give up multiculturalism to protect the national spirit and expansionist nationalists take this further, such as Maurras who suggested that the original members of the state are the only real ones. This ~~shows~~ demonstrates that there is a significant level of disagreement between nationalists over the state and how it forms or who can become a member. Overall, when considering formation and membership of the state it is clear that there are ~~very~~ <sup>large</sup> extent of disagreement and only a small agreement but not between all strands of nationalism.

Nationalists agree to a certain extent over self-determination of the state and how it should interact with other states. All nationalists believe in self-determination for their nation - the ability of the nation to govern itself, suggesting they all agree on the nature of the state to a certain extent. Rousseau advocated ~~for~~ self-determination

For all states as a liberal and non-ethnic, post-colonial and conservative nationalists all agree with this to varying degrees. This suggests that there is a ~~very~~ small degree of agreement over the state among nationalists. However, there is disagreement over the extent to which nationalists believe in self-determination for the state and how they apply this in relations of the state. Conservative nationalists only believe in self-determination for their state when it doesn't impact their state so they are more isolationist whereas liberal nationalists want unlimited self-determination for all. This means they want an interdependence and global co-operation so the liberal nationalist state will be work with other states whereas a conservative one would not. Boney and other post-colonial nationalists agree with liberals ~~to a certain extent~~ but only want self-determination for post-colonial states to come together and so that they are free from colonialism. Furthermore, there is also a greater level of disagreement from expansionist nationalists who have a more chauvinistic and racist belief in the superiority of the state over other states, and over people within the nation so they advocate for a more totalitarian state. This demonstrates a significant level of disagreement and suggests nationalists mostly disagree over the state, ~~over its government that~~ ~~due to their varying views on human nature and~~ and its relations to other states so they overall disagree more.

In conclusion, nationalists disagree ~~in~~ more than they agree over the state to a large extent as they vary in their views of how the state will form due to varying views on human nature, which therefore impact ~~on~~ the nature of the state and how it ~~interacts~~ interacts

with other nations. There is some level of agreement between liberal and  
anti or both colonial nationalists but they overall all disagree more.



**ResultsPlus**  
Examiner Comments

There is a short but clear introduction, which introduces the debate and sets out the line of argument.

There is clear balance in covering both agreements and disagreements, and an attempt to engage with extent.

All of the strands are covered and key thinkers are integrated into the answer.

There is a strong use of the political terminology of nationalism.

Level 5

Total: 22 marks



**ResultsPlus**  
Examiner Tip

Remember not only to show where there is agreement and disagreement, but focus in on the "extent" of that agreement and disagreement

## Question 7 (b)

This was the more popular of the two questions on nationalism and showed a full range of answers. The key to success often lay in the ability to define the key terms inclusive nationalism and exclusive nationalism, and to be able effectively to deploy the language of nationalism.

Stronger answers focussed on agreement and disagreement between strands and were able to assess the extent of each. In both Nationalism questions, there was a tendency to add a lot of historical detail and narrative, which needed to be focussed on the question or it only added A01, rarely developing A02 and A03.

Under timed conditions, it is more important to focus on the big debates between the strands, supported by thinkers than give a wider discussion of historical examples. It was pleasing to see so many answers using all of the strands and deploying a full range of key thinkers.

Some answers took a thinker-based approach, and compared them, instead of the strands. Others took a strand-by-strand approach, which meant that they had difficulty with A02 and A03.

One area on which to focus is using the key ideas of thinkers in support of the strands rather than simply stating that a thinker belongs to a particular strand.

This answer is on the boundary of Level 4/5.

- Chosen question number:
- |   |   |
|---|---|
| Question 3(a) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | Question 3(b) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| Question 4(a) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | Question 4(b) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| Question 5(a) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | Question 5(b) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| Question 6(a) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | Question 6(b) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| Question 7(a) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | Question 7(b) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |

It is argued that nationalism is broadly inclusive, however this view is deeply wrong as the majority of nationalists are exclusive in the way they define membership of a nation along cultural or even racial lines.

It is the case that nationalism is more exclusive than inclusive in the way some nationalists define membership of a nation as being along cultural lines. Cultural nationalism is championed by conservative nationalists, who believe a nation is built on common customs, history and language. This view is characterised by Johann Gottfried von Herder's belief in the 'Völkgeist', or the 'spirit' of a nation, which is fundamental in uniting its members. Von Herder believed that cultural similarities such as a shared <sup>language</sup> ~~and~~ ~~or~~ and history were what binded together the members of a nation. He believed that each nation had "one national

character of its own". This view is clearly exclusive in the way that membership of a nation is built on the pre-requisite of a shared cultural understanding, it is not therefore easy for simply anyone to join a nation if they do not share in the 'Volksgeist'. This conservative nationalist belief in an exclusionary sense of cultural nationalism is shared to some extent by post-colonial nationalists. Post-colonial nationalists embrace a sense of Black nationalism in the face of historical colonial oppression and is somewhat similarly built on cultural lines. Marcus Garvey for example believed the ultimate goal of post-colonial nationalism was a united African nation, banded together by its common customs and history as a victim of oppression. Garvey's view of 'Africa for the Africans' falls along similar lines of conservative nationalism in the sense that it is built on the understanding of the nation as a cultural bloc. In this way it too is more exclusive than inclusive, as it is difficult for those who do not share in a history of oppression to join the nation.

However, it can also be argued that nationalism

is inclusive as it is not always the case that it is built on cultural lines. Liberal nationalists for example embrace the notion of civic nationalism, whereby members of a nation are bonded together by shared values rather than history or language. This view stems from Jean-Jacques Rousseau's argument of a nation being built on the "general will" of the people. This highlights how this form of liberal nationalism is inclusive as it embraces diversity within society and even multiculturalism within the nation as long as people remain committed to their common values which in the case of Rousseau was a shared value of democracy and the rule of law. It is therefore easy to become a member of the nation as long as one shares ~~the~~ <sup>the</sup> general values of the nation. This view is similarly held <sup>somewhat</sup> ~~by~~ by anti-colonial nationalists, who with their experience of colonial oppression are much more willing to tolerate diversity within society.

Nationalism however has the potential to be much more exclusive. Expansionist nationalists held a chauvinistic belief that their nation is superior in a world of 'survival of the fittest'. For Charles Maurras, his belief in "goddess France"

rejected any inclusive notion of diversity within society. These chauvinistic beliefs were usually accompanied with a passionate militarism, whereby expansion of the nation came at the expense of self-determining independent states. This expansionist belief and ~~was~~ <sup>and</sup> chauvinist belief in one's own superiority as a nationalism often goes in tandem with a belief in racism, the ultimate form of exclusive nationalism. For Maurras, he was extremely critical of Jews and foreigners as "anti-France" forces. This view of the nation as being built on racial characteristics was not only shared by 20th century expansionist nationalists, such as Adolf Hitler's belief in a supreme 'Aryan' race, but is also shared by modern nationalists such as France's Marine Le Pen, who has been critical of "anti-white" immigration to France as a threat to the nation. Racism is the ultimate form of exclusive nationalism as it forbids anyone from joining the nation if they do not share biological characteristics.

Although liberal and anti-colonial nationalists have an inclusive view which accepts societal

diversity and a nation based on shared civic values. This view is held by a minority of nationalists. It is much more accurate to describe nationalists as exclusive, as for many their understanding of the nation is built on shared cultural, or even racial, characteristics. This inherently excludes those who seek to join the nation yet do not share in the history, customs or blood of the nation - a view shared by the majority of nationalists.



**ResultsPlus**  
Examiner Comments

There is a clear question focus here, with a strong line of argument.

The answer deploys good political vocabulary from the nationalism topic and thinkers are integrated effectively into the answer.

The different strands within nationalism are covered and there is a real attempt to investigate where the strands are inclusive or exclusive.

On balance, this response reaches the lower end of the top level.

Level 5

Total: 20 marks



**ResultsPlus**  
Examiner Tip

Before writing, it is important to decide what your line of argument will be

Ensure that it runs as a golden thread throughout the essay

## Paper Summary

### Paper Summary

Based on their performance on this paper, candidates are offered the following advice:

- Timing is crucial: leave enough time to do justice to the non-core ideas section. Essays on non-core political ideas can be shorter and more effective by deploying the key vocabulary and terminology of that political idea
- Planning remains vital in source-based essays; the better answers were able to pair-up arguments from the source and use them to generate a sense of debate and clear line of argument throughout
- Select relevant evidence carefully, in particular contemporary evidence. This is vital to building effective analysis and substantiated judgements in all questions on UK Government. Contemporary evidence can be placed in context by comparing it with historical evidence
- Write short introductions and conclusions to frame the essay
- Be able to define and utilise key political vocabulary, including key terminology from the specification
- In essay questions, focus on answering the question, not reproducing a pre-planned answer
- Build 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 build up a sense of the 'extent' of those agreements and disagreements
- Utilise all of the strands in non-core ideas answers. It is better to support the debate with the key contributions of the thinkers than simply to state that a thinker is from one strand or another
- Candidates need a strong focus on the core principles and ideas of non-core ideas, and the ability to define and use the key terminology from the specification.

## **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>

