

# ● A Level Politics

June 2019 exemplars  
with examiner  
comments





# Contents

- Papers 1 & 2: UK source questions – pp.4–29
  - Paper 1 qu.1 – pp.8–19
  - Paper 2 qu.1 – pp.20–29
- Papers 1 & 2: UK essay questions – pp.30–49
  - Paper 1 qu.2 – pp.32–40
  - Paper 2 qu.2 – pp.41–49
- Papers 1 & 2: Core political ideas – pp.50–59
  - Paper 1 qu.3 – pp.54–59
- Papers 1 & 2: Non-core political ideas – pp.60–83
  - Anarchism – pp.61–64
  - Ecologism – pp.65–68
  - Feminism – pp.69–72
  - Multiculturalism – pp.73–78
  - Nationalism – pp.79–83
- Paper 3A USA: 12-mark questions & essay questions – pp.84–105
  - 12-mark questions – pp.88–96
  - Essay questions – pp. 97–105
- Paper 3B Global: 12-mark questions & essay questions – pp.106–128
  - 12-mark questions – pp.108–119
  - Essay questions – pp. 120–128



# June 2019 series

- The June 2019 A level question papers, mark schemes and examiner reports can be found on the Edexcel website:
  - [A level Politics > Course materials > Exam materials](#)
- ResultsPlus data for the whole cohort is also available:
  - [A level Politics > Course materials > Teaching and learning materials > Guide](#)

# UK Component 1 & 2



## Source questions





# Challenges with sources (1)

- Some did not discuss the source content sufficiently which is not ideal, as the source content needs to be the basis of the answer.
- Students should be more explicit in their use of the source so examiners can be sure that they are basing their answer on the source.
- Better responses cited the source regularly, making effective use of quotes to guide the direction of the discussion.
- At the lower end of the scale were students who did little more than use the source as a comprehension exercise, explaining both sides of the arguments.



## Challenges with sources (2)

- Some students simply agreed with one side in the contested source debate and failed to provide evaluation to reject the opposing view.
- Candidates were unable to offer a clear line of argument throughout, instead just summarising both sides of the argument, and suffered accordingly with their AO3 marks.
- So the key weakness here (and across all 30-mark answers) was a failure to commit to one side and say why that side was the stronger.
- Where candidates did try to contrast arguments from the source, quite often they were unrelated arguments, so the comparison was hard to assess.



# Challenges with sources (3)

- Better responses compared the opposing arguments directly, rather than in separate halves of the essay.
- The best answers were able to consider opposing arguments in conjunction with one another before reaching a judgement as to which was the stronger argument.
- These responses also made evaluative judgements throughout their essay, offering sustained evaluation throughout, so their concluding paragraph flowed from what had been argued throughout, but this was rare.



## 1a. Using the source, evaluate the view that the outcomes of general elections are stable and predictable.

- 1 (a) *The source below considers the factors which deliver success for political parties in general elections. It reflects on whether the outcomes of general elections are predictable or whether the electorate can spring surprises, making the results more volatile.*

Some people claim that success in a general election for a political party depends on stable and predictable forces. Few seats change hands in a general election and voting patterns are predictable and constant. In studies of voting behaviour factors such as an individual's class and family background combined with the area in which they live all merge together to provide a clear indication of the way an individual will vote. On this basis, opinion polls accurately indicate the outcomes of a general election. When many people are asked, they readily identify with both a specific class and endorse the policies of a major political party. The dice is loaded from the start and outcomes of general elections are all too predictable and fixed.

However, many now doubt the idea of predictability and the assumptions on which it is based. Instead of predictability they infer unpredictability and volatility with an inability to forecast accurately the outcome of how the public will vote. In fact in 2015, 111 seats changed hands and in 2017, 70. General elections and success in them is built around capturing ideas and having media support. What the political parties say in new policies and their manifestos matters greatly. Opinion polls, as the general election in 2017 showed, are no longer good indicators of the outcome. If anything, the 2017 general election illustrated the importance of age and education as indicators of how people vote. The media can make and break a political party. Riding the wave of media attacks, a political party must have a good leader who can weather any storm and connect with the masses. This is what Blair and Thatcher did and was the basis of their success. Policies and leaders are the crucial factors and, as such, they are the leading indicators for success at the polls.



# Paper 1 qu.1a exemplar

This Source offers various arguments which argue that the outcomes of general elections are stable and predictable. Social factors such as class and region have an important role, alongside a partisan focus of party loyalty the general policies of a major political party. Nevertheless, more recently the predictability has drifted, and according ~~to~~ to the Source the media, leadership and manifestos have drawn out more instability in the outcome of elections. Therefore, with the ~~high level~~ advancement of social media and voter tendency ~~becoming~~ <sup>more</sup> focused on short-term rational choices, it appears that outcomes of general elections are not stable and predictable.

This **introduction** outlines the views from the sources, identifying key points and then offers a view which answers the question.



# Paper 1 qu.1a exemplar

However, the concept of ~~class~~ social factors dictating how people vote is no longer a convincing concept due to the fact that according to the source that new factors are taking over and finding new ways to influence voting. This is partly to do with the idea that the country is going through a period of partisan dealignment giving way for factor such as "capturing ideas and having media support" as well as "2017 illustrating the importance of age and education." These variable factors which

This **counter-point** shows the student using the source effectively by referencing it to illustrate their point. Also, the student is considering the different opinion of social factors (comparative analysis – AO2). to the view they considered in the first paragraph (*not shown*). Additionally, in the opening sentence they add an AO3 judgement.





# Paper 1 qu.1a exemplar

are stable and predictable. However, a limitation of this argument in the source is the fact that 2015's General Election bore 111 seat changes and 2017 had 70. 111 is nearly one  $\frac{1}{6}$ th of the total seats in the House of Commons. This massive change was mainly due to the Scottish National party acquiring 56 out of 59 seats, stealing a lump sum from Labour. This statistic clearly shows the weakness of the argument that voting patterns are predictable and constant, therefore decreasing the validity of the view at hand. This is given further emphasis by the source stating that 2017 showed that opinion polls are "no longer good indicators"

This **counter-point** shows how, having recognised one side of the argument in their first section (not shown), they critique it with the argument they consider stronger. Their judgement can be seen throughout the paragraph.



# Paper 1 qu.1a exemplar

One of the first arguments when the source suggests that elections are predictable, due to the rare change of seats. This is suggested through 'few seats change hands' indicating that the concept of safe seats is still very prominent within UK politics, and that the electorate are unlikely to change/influence the change of a 'safe' seat. This proves that elections are therefore predictable, as seats such as Jeremy Corbyn's constituency enjoy a predictable stable outcome. However Although there ~~are~~ is evidence to suggest seats rarely change hands, the arguments suggesting change is far more convincing. After the 2017 snap election, it has become

This **opening point** shows a good linking sentence at the end where they begin their evaluation by rejecting the view they have just outlined. In their next paragraph (*not shown*), the student goes on to discuss why elections are actually not predictable any more.





# Paper 1 qu.1a exemplars

Overall, it is evident that general election outcomes are no longer stable and predictable. Whilst the voting demographics of age and region do guarantee some predictability, this is no longer the case with opinion polls and the media, as UK politics grows increasingly more partisan and divisive, & the ~~stability~~ stability and predictability of general election outcomes ~~is~~ lessens.

These **conclusions** all do the job of concluding with the view they have argued throughout the essay.

In conclusion, the view ~~that~~ General Elections are predictable no stable is no longer valid, in past elections it may have held true, but recent years have shown that opinion polls are just guessing at this point, because social factors are not as concrete, so voters may sway from their previous party.

In conclusion, whilst elections can be predicted by the way in which separate demographics vote and by opinion polls. These are only predictions and so can be wrong like in 2017 with Corbyn winning more than expected. Arguably any party could win an election if they "connect with the masses" like "Blair or Thatcher." This shows that elections can be not only this but the influence of swing seats can change the outcome of elections very easily this making elections hard to predict especially when the election is close.



## 1b. Using the source, evaluate the view that proportional representation would improve elections to the Commons.

(b) *This source is adapted from a Hansard report of a debate in the House of Commons held in October 2017. More than 100,000 people had signed a petition calling for the introduction of proportional representation for elections to the Westminster parliament. Here are extracts from the speeches made by Steve Double MP (Conservative Party) and Caroline Lucas MP (Green Party).*

### **Steve Double MP**

Proportional representation will damage democracy by putting more power into the hands of parties. First-past-the-post (FPTP) invariably delivers strong and stable government. Votes are not wasted for we have seen turnout increase in recent times. It is clear and easy to understand. In addition it prevents extremist parties from gaining seats. There is a direct link between the MP and their constituency. The FPTP system enables us to exchange our strongly, passionately held views in the House of Commons. My party is committed to FPTP as the best system for this country.

### **Caroline Lucas MP**

FPTP is damaging the legitimacy of our system of governance. A winner-takes-all approach to elections promotes adversarial politics. It encourages each of the major parties to seek to defeat their opposition completely, negating the need for post-election cooperation. Policy is likely to change dramatically when governments change. Countries with proportional representation (PR) systems outperform those with FPTP systems; PR would be likely to encourage more people to vote. It is very hard to persuade people to vote when they live in so-called 'safe seats'. We would also improve the chances of electing a parliament that better reflects modern Britain.

(Sourced from: Crown Copyright)



# Paper 1 qu.1b exemplar

First past the post is a simple plurality electoral system, which possesses some benefits which the source acknowledges. However, it must be noted that the wider implications of a 'winner takes all' system, clearly indicate that proportional representation would improve elections<sup>to</sup> in the House of Commons.

Here the **introduction** has served its purpose. They have referenced the source, given context to the question and expressed a judgement.



# Paper 1 qu.1b exemplar

Our current ~~eg~~ electoral system for Westminster elections is First Past The Post (FPTP), a simple plurality system. This essay will ~~not~~ use the given source to evaluate the arguments for changing to a proportional <sup>(PR)</sup> voting system such as STV (which is used in for elections into the Northern Irish devolved government). It will evaluate the benefits to proportional systems, such as greater power to parties, greater legitimacy in the results and encouraged participation. It will contrast the benefits against the best benefits of FPTP, such as creating strong and stable governments, preventing extremism, and increasing participation. It will conclude that PR <sup>FPTP has flaws however suggest</sup> should not be implemented as it would not ensure strong governance, which could hinder the participation of elections.

In this **introduction**, the student has done the same, but at considerably more length. There is a debate as to whether this was the most efficient use of the time given that the previous examples fulfilled the same purpose in a much shorter amount of space and time.





# Paper 1 qu.1b exemplar

Proponents also contend that the issue of wasted votes is not such ~~an~~ a significant issue to this day. Steve Double MP mentions how turnout has been increasing in recent ~~year~~ times. This argument maintains an extent of weight, as from the lows of 59% in 2001, turnout has been slowly recovering as it reached ~~76%~~ 67% in 2017. As such, low turnout is not necessarily an inherent flaw of first past the post. Perhaps it ~~is~~ reflects a longer term decline in trust for political institutions, fuelled by recent scandals. If this is the case, the introduction of a proportional

In this **opening point**, the student is discussing the issue of turnout, referencing the source directly.

Here the student is developing the argument by exploring the point in more depth (logical reasoning – AO2).



# Paper 1 qu.1b exemplar

However, this argument must be rejected as it is  
true that first past the post is a key causation of  
depressed turnout, not other factors such as a  
lack of trust. Caroline Lucas states that proportioned  
representation would 'encourage more people to vote'  
which would thus increase turnout. This is because  
the issue of safe seats and tactical voting would  
be addressed. For example, the additional member  
system provides voters with greater choice by  
electing a constituency MP and a regional party  
representatives. Therefore, under first past the post,  
Conservative voters living in North East London or Hull  
face a lack of voter choice, meaning that turnout  
is low. However if AMS was implemented, these  
Tory voters would have a greater tendency to vote,

In their **counter-point**, the same student is considering the alternative view to the view expressed in the opening point in depth (AO2), as well as expressing a view (AO3) at the beginning.



# Paper 1 qu.1b exemplar

Second, it could be argued that proportional representation would improve elections in the House of Commons because it would make Parliament more representative. Lucas argues that, 'We would also improve chances of electing a parliament that better reflects modern Britain.' This argument is evidenced by the fact that FPTP creates wasted votes, which means that the make-up of the House of Commons does not really represent how people voted. There are many wasted votes in the UK because of FPTP, as seen in 2015, when 74% of votes were wasted because they were for one of the losing parties. PR is much more representative, for example it is used to elect the Northern Ireland Assembly where Sinn Fein won 24% of the vote and a corresponding 28 out of 106 seats. Therefore proportional representation would be more representative of the UK and could arguably be used to improve elections to the House of Commons. However, this argument is not wholly convincing as FPTP is not totally unrepresentative, as Double argues, 'There is a direct link between the MP and their constituency.' Fundamentally, under FPTP there are single-member constituencies with MPs who listen to their constituent's concerns through surgeries and telephone and email correspondence and voice these concerns in Parliament. Because proportional representation is not based on constituency voting, there would not be individuals in the House of Commons who would directly represent the people's views in Parliament. Therefore, proportional representation should not be used for elections in the House of Commons because FPTP provides effective representation.

In this **point and counter-point**, the student is discussing how representative each system is.

Again, they are using examples to explore in depth the point they are making.

Here they are refuting the above point by suggesting that representation is not just about numbers, but about making a connection and supporting one's constituents. They also begin and end their counter-point with their view



# 1a. Using the source, evaluate the view that devolution is in danger of undermining the unity of the UK.

- 1 (a) *This source has been adapted from the House of Lords Select Committee on the Constitution report entitled 'The Union and devolution', published in 2016. This report considered the effect of devolution on the United Kingdom and the Union.*

England, Northern Ireland, Scotland and Wales are stronger united than apart. Yet today, the Union is threatened by continuing demands for independence and also the tensions and inequalities created as policies diverge between devolved bodies – over health, education or tax, for example.

Power has been devolved in an uneven way: a power-sharing executive, a national assembly or parliament, a combined authority, or English Votes for English Laws. The cumulative impact of devolution on the unity of the United Kingdom has not been properly considered. The benefits of unity and the Union have been taken for granted. A coherent vision for the shape and structure of the United Kingdom is required, without which there cannot be constitutional stability.

On the other hand, devolution has been achieved without undermining our unitary state and without the need for federalism or codification of our constitution. The four nations are 'stronger together', in a relationship of clear mutual respect. Although nationalism remains strong in the devolved nations, devolution has satisfied some demands for self-government, avoiding a break-up of the union. Policy divergences reflect local democracy and identities, while maintaining the integrity of the United Kingdom.

(Source: adapted from <https://publications.parliament.uk/pa/ld201516/ldselect/ldconst/149/149.pdf>)





# Paper 2 qu.1a exemplar

In the source, the view can be taken that devolution has been successful and enhanced UK democracy through bringing government closer to the people, calming demands for independence and for decentralising power within the UK's uncoded, unitary constitution. However, the source also presents the view that devolution poses a threat to the unity of the UK due to unequal representation, fuelling demands for independence and nationalism, and undermining UK democracy through challenging parliamentary sovereignty. Overall, the strongest view in the source is that devolution is in danger of undermining the unity of the UK.

Here the student has written an **introduction** by referencing the source and summarising both sides of it, but concluding that one side is stronger.



# Paper 2 qu.1a exemplar

example, Scotland has received the most devolution as it demanded it more, Wales however, has a smaller population, smaller economy and relies more on Westminster. Only in 2019 has the Welsh Act given them ~~their~~ their own Parliament suggesting that Asymmetrical devolution may be beneficial. Giving away power at a slower pace to each nation who get an appropriate time. That is in this case, the argument against it is again stronger of devolution clearly helps nations to satisfy demands of each nation, thus creating more respect and the desire to break up the union is incredibly low.

This **interim judgement** comes after both sides have been considered and addressed. The student is using an interim judgement to clarify their view. This is another effective way of addressing AO3 throughout the essay.



# Paper 2 qu.1a exemplar

The source states that 'policy divergences reflect local democracy and identities'. This idea is accurate because policy divergences only exist because the electorate has voted for members of devolved bodies such as the Welsh Assembly, giving them the legitimacy to enact ~~laws and~~ policies that reflect their views. However, the stronger source argument is that ~~policy~~ 'inequalities' are 'created as policies diverge between devolved bodies'. This argument is highly accurate as in Wales the Welsh Assembly has allowed all citizens under the age of 25 to receive free prescriptions while in the UK prescriptions are only free when a citizen is in full-time education or has a valid ~~exem~~ exemption form. This is a clear example of how devolution is undermining the unity of

Here, in a **point and counter-point**, the student is using the source to consider both sides while still identifying which one is the stronger one in their opinion.



# Paper 2 qu.1a exemplar

From the source, the strongest argument to suggest the  
break up of the UK into a more federal system is the demand  
for more power. The source states - "the union is threatened  
by continuing demands for independence . . . created policies  
diverged between devolved bodies." For example, After the initial  
Scotland Act of 1997/8 where there was an overwhelming  
amount of support and high turnout by the Scottish electorate  
to have devolution, Westminster gave them both legislative  
and administrative power over health care, public transport  
and education. For example, the abolishment of tuition fees.  
However, this completely undermines the opposing side that it  
"shows a relationship of clear mutual respect" as after the Scottish

Here, in their **opening point**, the student is using the source effectively by referencing it and then by exploring the point raised in more detail by bringing in own knowledge, showing good AO1 skills.

The student continues towards the end of the section to reject an opposing argument as being weaker, showing good AO3 skills.





## 1b. Using the source, evaluate the view that Prime Ministers have too much power.

(b) *This source is adapted from the House of Commons Political and Constitutional Reform Committee report entitled the 'Role and powers of the Prime Minister' published in 2014. This examines whether there is adequate public understanding and clarity about the Prime Minister's role and powers, and whether the checks and balances on those powers are sufficient.*

Prime Ministers have significant powers of patronage such as appointing ministers. They set the Cabinet agenda and are able to control the Cabinet - including deciding who chairs the most important Cabinet committees. If a Prime Minister is an electoral asset, they are fairly secure in office and, as long as they have the support of their closest allies in Cabinet and a large Commons majority, they face very few limits to their power.

However, Prime Ministers cannot appoint whoever they want to Cabinet. They must reflect the balance of party opinion and appoint the 'big beasts', as it's better to have them 'inside the tent rather than outside'. Theresa May had to retain a balance of 'Brexiters' and 'Remainers' in her Cabinet, reflecting Conservative Party divisions.

Prime Ministers can be brought down by their party. Tony Blair was arguably forced to resign. Margaret Thatcher resigned after losing the support of her Cabinet, when her 'Poll Tax' was rejected by the public. Prime Ministers with small majorities, or no majority, cannot take Parliament for granted. Theresa May avoided votes in Parliament which she expected to lose and the Commons prevented Cameron from going to war over Syria.

(Source: adapted from <https://publications.parliament.uk/pa/cm201415/cmselect/cmpolcon/351/351.pdf>)



# Paper 2 qu.1b exemplar

It could be argued that one of the most significant powers given to the Prime Minister is their electoral majority. The text states that with a "large Commons majority, they face few limits to their power". Therefore suggesting that the PM is too powerful. This was heavily evidenced by Tony Blair's large majority of 179 seats which meant that he didn't lose a vote in 8 years. This is highly significant as this allowed him to pass very controversial legislation such as suspending the Human Rights Act after 9/11. It is arguable that this made him too powerful as a PM with a smaller majority would not be able to succeed in this breach of human rights. This showing that he faced almost no limits as stated in the text. Also, due to his electoral success, he was an "electoral asset" meaning that he also had public support behind him. This meant that

In their **opening point** the student is taking points from the source and using their own knowledge to add explanation. By exploring the points raised in the source in this detail they are scoring highly in AO1 and AO2 marks.

It's also worth noting that students can reference the source without directly quoting it.



# Paper 2 qu.1b exemplar

However, this argument can be easily challenged. This is because not every Prime Minister can get this large majority. The text states that "Prime Ministers with small majorities or no majority cannot take parliament for granted". This suggests that parliament provides a significant check on their power. ~~Thus~~ hence suggesting that Prime Ministers do not have too much power. "Teresa May often avoided votes in parliament which she expected to lose" showing that parliament is such a significant check on the PM and thus limitation to ~~the~~ their power. Moreover, David Cameron was prevented by the commons from going to war in Syria showing another PM's inability to get through parliament. Also, despite Tony Blair's large majority he still faced limitations

In the **counter-point** of their answer, the same student goes on to challenge their point by using counter-points raised in the source.

Here we see the student addressing the points from the source directly and adding some of their own analysis.





# Paper 2 qu.1b exemplar

"As well as Thatcher 'resigning after losing the support of her Cabinet', Blair also faced limitations to his power as ~~he was~~ he was 'arguably forced ~~not~~ to resign' due to pressure from his Chancellor, Brown. Ultimately, like Blair who neglected his Cabinet and used special advisers and 'sofa politics' (rendering Cabinet a 'rubber stamp' for decisions made elsewhere); and Thatcher whose hostility and dominance alienated her executive, ultimately over-powerful PMs cannot last. Therefore the PM does not have too much power, because although they are not limited by the Constitution, they are perhaps limited by constitutional reality.

This is the final part of a **counter-paragraph** arguing against a point made prior to this.

Here the student is *arguing the case* for their side rather than just stating two different sides to an argument. They conclude their paragraph with their judgement.





# Paper 2 qu.1b exemplar

Ultimately, if we are to take the current government's ~~the~~ requirement for 'confidence and supply' agreement with the DUP in order to have a majority, ~~and the fact that~~ as an indicator, our current PM certainly does not possess too much power. When combining this with the consideration that even leaders with huge majorities ultimately overexercise power to their own demise, it seems that the nature of UK politics ultimately restricts the PM's power, even without a codified constitution, to ensure it. Therefore, overall, it should not be concluded that PMs in the UK have too much power.

This **conclusion** sums up the discussion had throughout the essay and concludes that PM's do not have too much power. It is important to note that this student argued this throughout the response as well as confirming this in their conclusion.

# UK Component 1 & 2



## Essay questions



# Challenges with essays

- Since marks for the AOs are equal, it was as important for candidates to reach a reasoned conclusion (AO3) as it was to analyse (AO2) and provide facts (AO1).
- Some responses were largely narrative – or often seen as ‘story telling’ and full of AO1 – but underperformance on the essays was again linked to ineffective means of hitting all the AOs.
- Weaker essays were not well-planned or thought through – and the candidates changed their views and opinions regularly in the response.
- So, as with the sources, the key weakness was not committing to one side and say why that side was the stronger.



# Paper 1 qu.2a

**2a. Evaluate the view that think-tanks, lobbyists and pressure groups have little impact on government decisions.**



# Paper 1 qu.2a exemplar

Some political analysts have suggested that think-tanks, lobbyists and pressure groups have <sup>a lot of</sup> ~~little~~ impact on government decisions. This is because they come up with political solutions, they can have inside information and they can influence legislation in some cases. The alternative view is much more ~~convincing~~ convincing, as the government has no legal obligation to listen to them, the government can strike them down, and they only really influence government if they are working from the inside. Overall, think-tanks, lobbyists and pressure groups do not have much impact on government decisions.

This **introduction** outlines both sides of the debate before outlining the view that the essay will take.



# Paper 1 qu.2a exemplar

On the contrary Think Tanks suffer from the same problems and flaws that ~~pressure~~ pressure groups and lobbyists have. Their roles are only advisory, seen most pertinently in the Fabian Society as their Socialist principles were applied to the Capitalist world of politics, as the Blair government simply modified their beliefs rather than ~~extract~~ extracting them word for word. This would lead to the suggestion that Think Tanks do not have much impact on government legislation as they are unable to enforce their wills, unlike other institutions that can affect the executive like the House of Lords.

To conclude this point it can be seen that despite not being able to enforce their ideologies on a government, Think Tanks like the Adam Smith Institute are certainly influential as they often provide the foundational beliefs that underpin a government's economic or legislative strategy.

This **counter-point** is looking at think-tanks and is suggesting that they aren't able to influence government. Their AO3 came in the form of interim judgements.

This student wrote three separate sections, each one considering the effectiveness of each type of group. They included an interim judgement at the end of each section.





# Paper 1 qu.2a exemplar

Individual pressure ~~or~~, or behind-the-scenes, lobbying of government, ~~often~~ is often more reliable than public campaigns. Although lobbying is difficult to measure in impact - few government officials would be willing to admit that they were influenced by professional lobbyists - £10 billion is spent on it annually, so there must be some impact on government policy to make it such a lucrative field. ~~The~~ ~~important number seen to~~ Furthermore, think-tanks can influence important figures ideologically, ~~in~~ sometimes even before they enter influential positions, which then has a long term but less dramatic impact on government decisions. Thatcher, for example, ~~was~~ only gradually became committed to some of her key ideas like supply side economics ~~after~~ due to her time with <sup>right-wing</sup> think-tanks like the Adam Smith Institute - ~~the~~

This response was not typical, but it was very effective.

The student took a different theme in each section (here it's the method of behind the scenes/personal pressure) and discussed all three groups – balancing the effectiveness of each and also comparing them.



# Paper 1 qu.2b

**2b. Evaluate the view that the only political parties that matter in our political system are the Labour and Conservative parties.**





# Paper 1 qu.2b exemplar

There is an argument to make that FPTP has insured that the two major parties 'matter' the most in that they dominate the parliamentary seat share.

In both the 1979 and 1997 elections, FPTP produced a significant landslide majority whereby the Conservatives (prior) and Labour (latter) achieved huge power over the parliamentary, social and economic agenda of the country. It can be said in this way that the Labour and Conservatives are the parties that matter the most because they are the ones who secure the largest majority and hence can pass the most legislation that affects the country. However, it has to

Here, in their **opening point**, the student is discussing the role of FPTP in whether minor parties matter.

Here the student is developing the issue (logical reasoning – AO2) and relating it back to the question.



# Paper 1 qu.2b exemplar

effects the country. However, it has to be argued that these two parties no longer matter the most in that FPTP no longer efficiently produces a large majority and so ~~open~~ paving the way for more minor parties to matter more. In both 2010 and 2017, the electoral system produced minority governments whereby in 2010, the lib dems formed a coalition which elevated their power and in minor parties to matter more. In both 2010 and 2017, the electoral system produced minority governments whereby in 2010, the lib dems formed a coalition which elevated their power and in 2017 where the conservatives had to form a deal with the 10 members of the DUP in order to <sup>have any</sup> ~~hope~~ of passing legislation through parliament, which again took power away from the ~~conservative~~ party and gave it to a minority one. In

Here the same student is critiquing the same issue in their **counter-point** by discussing why FPTP does not help the main parties.

They are using examples, not just to exemplify (AO1), but also to explore in more depth the point they are making (AO2). They are making their examples work hard to help them critique the previous paragraph.



# Paper 1 qu.2b exemplar

Second, it could be argued that the only parties that matter in our political system are the Labour and Conservative parties because they have ultimate legislative influence. By always being in control of government, which is in control of the legislative agenda in Parliament, they have ultimate influence over the legislation that comes into place. Therefore, they are the only parties that matter because they are the the only parties that have affected British policy. Furthermore, they are always more likely to win elections than smaller parties because the UK general elections use the First-past-the-post electoral system, which favours the main two parties as they win a 'winners bonus'. The Conservatives and Labour have localised support, so will win more seats and will therefore have overall electoral success.

Above, the student is outlining one side of the argument in their **opening point** (only part of the paragraph is shown here)

They follow it with a **counter-point**, where they are not only giving the opposing view (AO2), but explaining why they think it is the stronger view (AO3). Notice also the excellent use of examples which develop the points they make very effectively.

parties that matter in our political system. However, this argument is less convincing than the argument that the Conservatives and Labour are not the only parties that matter, as smaller parties have an increasing influence over the legislative agenda without needing to be in government. For instance, in 2014, the growth of the Scottish Nationalist Party in Scotland showed that there was a public desire for Scottish independence, which led David Cameron to call a referendum on whether Scotland should remain part of the UK. This shows the SNP influencing government decisions. Similarly, the popularity of UKIP in the 2015 general election led Cameron to call the 2016 EU referendum on Britain's continued membership of the EU. Finally, the government are now in coalition with the Democratic Unionist Party, relying on the DUP to side with them in any votes. However, the DUP voted against Theresa May's Brexit deal because they disagreed over the Northern Ireland backstop, blocking the deal, leading to Parliamentary gridlock and the eventual resignation of Theresa May. It is evident that other parties are now increasingly able to influence the government's legislative agenda, showing that without being in government, they still have considerable influence over UK politics and that the Conservatives and Labour are not the only parties that matter.



# Paper 1 qu.2b exemplar

Overall, the source's argument that ~~the~~ general election results are ~~not~~ unpredictable and volatile is more convincing. In recent years, ~~class~~ ~~and~~ factors such as wars, ~~later~~ opinion polls and the dominance of the two main parties have been eclipsed in relevance, by the changeable circumstances ~~involvement~~ of election campaigns, leaders and the media. Therefore, the source's argument against general elections being predictable and stable is more convincing.

To conclude, it is clear to see that the only parties that matter in our political system are indeed Labour and the Conservatives. ~~as they have~~ ~~represent~~ It could be argued that in recent years smaller parties have gained a greater following as a result of devolution, and inability of Labour and Conservatives to attract voters, with nationalist parties' recent progress in the House of Commons. However, this gained significance still cannot compete with the significance of Labour and the Conservatives who are favoured by the electoral system, with a long standing history of electoral success and recent rebranding of policy that provides greater choice.

The role of the **conclusion** is to tie the essay together and reiterate, briefly, what has come before it. Both these conclusions summarise their essay while reaffirming their clear judgement.



# Paper 2 qu.2a

**2a. Evaluate the view that membership of the EU undermined parliamentary sovereignty.**





# Paper 2 qu.2a exemplar

The UK has always had an unique relationship with the EU, and ~~the~~ has been called the 'awkward partner'. Questions over sovereignty and 'take back control', ~~given~~ coupled with this 'awkward partnership' cumulated in the Brexit Referendum of 2016, in which the UK voted to leave the EU by 2:1. The ~~given~~ issue of sovereignty is complex. Sovereignty is the possession of ~~own~~ complete authority and power, and in the UK, parliament is said to be sovereign. Whilst there are ~~the~~ aspects of the EU <sup>where it</sup> ~~that~~ can be argued that parliamentary sovereignty is undermined, on the whole, it was not.

This **introduction** is an excellent example of providing context, defining only the relevant terms and, albeit with some qualification, answering the question by rejecting the assertion.



# Paper 2 qu.2a exemplar

First, it could be argued that the EU has undermined Parliamentary sovereignty because it has taken some UK legislative power. All EU law is supreme over UK law, and the UK accepted this by agreeing to the European Communities Act of 1972. Therefore any UK law that contravenes with EU law must be amended so that it is in line with EU policies. The EU has a series of common policies that must be obeyed by all member states, such as the Common Agricultural Policy and the Common Fisheries policy, which have limited Parliament's ability to legislate on issues regarding fishing and agriculture, showing that it has limited Parliamentary sovereignty. However, there are a number of ways that Parliament's sovereignty has not been affected by the EU. Firstly, Parliament retains power over tax, law and order, social policy, healthcare policy and education policy, showing that their ability to legislate has not been limited. Further, Parliamentary sovereignty has not been undermined because, despite the EU's common Foreign policy, the UK retains control of its own foreign policy and can spilt from the EU on this issue. This was seen when the UK joined the US led military invasion of Iraq in 2003, unlike the other EU states. Parliament retains control of the UK's economy, especially as the UK are not part of the Eurozone, proving that, despite claims that Parliament's ability to affect legislation has been limited, it has not actually been limited and Parliament remains sovereign.

This student is showing excellent detailed knowledge and presents both views in their section. However, despite a brief evaluative sentence starter at the bottom, they have not argued the case particularly effectively of the side they believe to be stronger. While AO3 is evident, it is not at as high a level as the AO1. Students need to concentrate on meeting all three AOs to score highly in essays.



# Paper 2 qu.2a exemplar

However, once more, criticisms of the  
EU's social policies as supranational  
over-extensions are entirely unfounded. In  
fact, John Major's Conservative government  
attempted to "conserve" British values  
by obtaining an opt-out from the  
Schengen Agreement (paper ①); and  
moreover, sovereignty is pooled, not  
surrendered as the UK benefits from a  
sharing of power by all 28 member  
states.

Therefore, the EU's social policies  
highlight the paradox that although the  
UK has been criticised for ceding power  
to Brussels, in doing so, sovereignty has  
not been challenged, but indeed enhanced.

The student, in  
this **counter-  
point**, is  
disagreeing with  
the point made  
above (*not  
shown*) and then,  
in an interim  
judgement,  
reasserting their  
views.



## Paper 2 qu.2b

**2b. Evaluate the view that although the House of Lords has less power than the House of Commons, in practice it exerts more influence on government decisions.**



# Paper 2 qu.2b exemplar

The House of Lords and House of Commons form part of Parliament. They have many functions, and ~~as for~~ one being passing legislation, and the other being scrutinising the Government. Some might argue that the Lords has more influence on government decisions for many reasons for example, their lack of party unity, their better scrutiny and their influential role in passing legislation. This essay will argue the view that the House of Lords does not exert more influence on government decisions.

An example of an **introduction** which outlines the two sides of the debate and then presents a clear line of argument.





# Paper 2 qu.2b exemplar

Some may argue that the Lords has more power than the House of Commons in terms of legislating. This is due to the fusion of powers model, which weakens the Commons grip on the executive. First past the post tends to deliver strong majorities due to the two party system it promotes. As such, governments may find it easier to pass bills through the Commons, with the aid of disciplinary tools like Whipping to do so. For example, Blair's 179 majority meant he was undefeated in the Commons for two terms.

Above, the student is outlining one side of the argument in their **opening point**.

(only part of the paragraph is shown)

Then, in the following **counter-point**, they are not only giving the opposing view (AO2), but explaining why they think it is the stronger view (AO3).

(only part of the paragraph is shown here)

However this argument must be rejected as the Lords legislative power is constrained by statutes and conventions. The Salisbury convention means it is likely to defer opposition if the proposed bill was part of an elected manifesto. Likewise, although the Lords recommended 14 amendments to the EU notification withdrawal bill, the Commons overturned this. Blair used the parliament act 3 times to avoid amendments from the Lords. As such, the Commons has become increasingly powerful, especially in recent times due to minority governments. Not only was the Commons able to defeat the withdrawal agreement 3 times, but it asserted its legislative influence over the government when it took control of the Brexit process through indicative votes, although no options satisfied a majority.



# Paper 2 qu.2b exemplar

The latter argument is most significant in demonstrating  
that the HOC does not exert more influence  
over government due to its limits on policy  
making, due to its unelected status. ~~Re~~ Reform  
to an elected chamber could change this.

This snippet from a paragraph shows the option of an **interim judgement** to express AO3. The student has discussed both arguments and now in an additional paragraph has assessed which one is most valid.



# Paper 2 qu.2b exemplar

Firstly, the House of Lords can be seen to be more influential on government decisions because, there is less of a problem of party unity in the Lords affecting passing bills and making ~~dec~~ decisions. For example, there are over 100 crossbenchers in the Lords who act independently from their parties and there is also less of a whip influence. Contrastingly, in the Commons, due to the voting system of first past the post Prime Ministers tend to gain a large majority in the House. However, in reality, the above statement must be rejected and the Lords do have much less of an influence over the Prime Minister. This is because due to the Lords ~~lack of~~ not being elected, they expect that the government has a mandate and are therefore often sceptical to go against this. This is because, if they had a large <sup>imminent</sup> majority it would ultimately undermine representative democracy, as they had ~~not~~ been elected. This is evident because of the phrase

Here are two examples of making synoptic links in a Component 2 essay.

# Component 1



**Core ideas questions**



# AOs in 24-mark ideas questions

- 24-mark ideas questions have a different stem, 'To what extent do ...'
- This will usually be followed by asking students to compare the way the strands within that ideology agree and differ over the topic raised, e.g. the state.
- As such the nature of the comparison (AO2) and judgement reached (AO3) are different.
- Comparisons (AO2) will need to be made about areas of agreement within the strands over the topic, as well as areas of disagreement.





# AOs in 24-mark ideas questions

- Due to the question stem, the judgement (AO3) required is not simply on whether there are similarities or differences, but **whether there are more similarities than differences** (or vice versa).
- Ideas answers need an introduction and conclusion as this is where the AO3 judgements will be included.
- Moreover, the AO3 judgment should be made in the paragraphs linked to the AO2 comparisons made.



# Question 3 general points

- As Question 3 has a different stem, the nature of comparative analysis and evaluation is different than on Questions 1 and 2.
- For ideas questions, students need to evaluate whether the similarities were greater than the differences within the named ideology over the issue raised.
- Most students were unable to come to a sustained judgement like this as too many students were not comparing strands within their answer. Centres need to focus on this going forward.
- Very few candidates were caught by the 'thinkers cap', and almost all of those who were had an otherwise weaker answer so were not significantly affected by it.



# Core ideas questions

**3a. To what extent do socialists have conflicting views over how the economy should operate?**

**3b. To what extent are conservatives united in their view of society?**



# Paper 1 qu.3 exemplars

To Some extent, Conservatives are United in the view of Society With their Core belief of Strong law and order ensuring that they maintain a Capitalist Society With elements of pragmatism. However, there is a Clear divide between traditional Conservatism, One Nation and Neo-Liberal. With all of them desiring different societies, Hobbes and Burke saw humans as selfish Who ~~cannot~~ think rationally alone in Society, One Nation believe in a paternalistic Society And Neo-Liberalism promoted Individualism.

This essay will evaluate the agreement and disagreement between Marxist, ~~Ear~~ and Early Social Democrats and Late Social Democrats and Third Way Socialists on their views of the economy. It will conclude that there ~~is~~ are clear conflicting views over the types of economies that should operate due to the shift in the Socialist movement and its differing views of problems in society.

This **introduction** addresses the issue of divides, but does not come to a judgement about which is greater.

This **introduction** recognises disagreements only, but not whether they are greater than agreement.



# Paper 1 qu.3 exemplar

Although it can be argued there are significant areas of agreement within conservatism <sup>our society</sup> such as that between ~~one~~ traditional conservatives and one nation conservatives as well as some elements of neo conservatism. However, it has to be argued that the disagreement between traditional and one nation conservatives over the existence of society is so great that ultimately it outweighs the areas of agreement. In this way, these two camps ~~conservatives~~ are not united in their view of society.

This introduction addresses agreement and disagreement, and gives a clear judgement as to which one is greater.





# Paper 1 qu.3 exemplar

It can be argued that social democrats and the third way have compatible, not conflicting, views of the economy's operation. This is because they both view the state as an instrument to tame capitalism. Anthony Crosland stated that capitalism was a dependable creator of wealth, however its outcomes should be managed. In accordance, he advocated for peaceful constitutional means to deliver optimal economic outcomes. Similarities can be drawn with the third way, as they also seek to embrace the market, viewing it as a means to help those socially excluded. Hence, both these forms agree that the state and the market should operate together, be it through private finance

In order to address all the AOs, the best structure for Ideas essays is a themed approach, that is, looking at more than one strand within a paragraph.

This enables students to address all three AOs effectively.

Here the student is looking at similarities between social democrats and the Third Way.

(The student then goes on to contrast this with differences between them in the next paragraph, and then differences between them and Revolutionary Socialists in the final one.)



# Paper 1 qu.3 exemplar

However, there are more areas of disagreement than ~~agreement within conservatism~~ and indeed between the the former mentioned strands of conservatism. Whilst traditional conservatives such as Hobbes but mainly Burke argue that hard paternalism is the way to actualise paternalism in society, one nation conservatives view ~~soft paternalism~~ as the solution. Traditional conservatives in this way believe that the concept of 'noblesse oblige' and the upper classes ruling and advising the poor on economic matters <sup>(epistocracy)</sup> is enough to retain a functioning and successful society as perpetuated by Burke. One Nation conservatives such as Oakshott and indeed Disraeli realised that soft paternalism whereby the extent to which the rich helped the poor

Here a student is addressing their previous paragraph and critiquing it by arguing that the agreements within Conservatism they identified are not as significant as the disagreements outlined here.

They are identifying that although (*in the previous paragraph*) both one-nation and traditional conservatives support paternalism, in fact they define it in different ways.

(The student goes on in their final paragraph to argue that there are even greater differences between the New Right and these two strands.)



# Paper 1 qu.3 exemplars

Realists have conflicting views on how the economy should operate. The first arises from disagreement over the state's role and the provision of welfare between the third way and social democrats. More fundamentally, the revolutionary social vision of a classless economy based on cooperation and common ownership, is in complete contradiction

In conclusion, it has to be said that although there are some areas of agreement such as those between traditional and modern conservative thinkers on organicism and pragmatism, the areas of disagreement in terms of whether society even exists are so great that we have to conclude that there is limited unity on the subject at all.

As in 30-mark essays, the role of the **conclusion** is to tie everything together and confirm the judgement made throughout the essay. The top conclusion does not really do this; instead it outlines differences between them.

The second conclusion focuses more on the extent of disagreement versus agreement, and comes to a judgement ... just!

# Component 2



**Non-core ideas questions**



# Anarchism questions

**3a. To what extent does anarchism have a coherent view on the economy?**

**3b. To what extent is an anarchist society a realistic goal?**





# Paper 2 qu.3 exemplar

Individualist and collectivist anarchists may share a mutual distaste towards the economic systems embraced around the world. However, not only do they disagree over the purpose ~~for~~ over this, but they fundamentally disagree over how a stateless economy would function.

Here, in their **introduction**, the student is clearly identifying that there are more disagreements than similarities in anarchist views of the economy.



# Paper 2 qu.3 exemplar

Anarchism can be considered coherent to an extent over ~~the~~ the economy, due to a common rejection of state intervention. Anarchists turn to experiments in the USSR with state socialism, but also mixed economies that maintain a degree of state intervention. For all anarchists, economic freedom can only be achieved by the rejection of the state. This is because the state is a threat to fundamental economic principles of liberty and freedom. Emma Goldman ~~make~~ for example criticised the coercive nature of the state, explaining how it has the ability to deprive people from their property. An optimal economy

Here the student is identifying areas of similarity in their first paragraph before going on in later paragraphs to argue that the differences are more fundamental. It is essential that students do not forget to address both sides.

Also, note the highly effective use of a key thinker, Emma Goldman.



# Paper 2 qu.3 exemplar

Overall it is evident that anarchism is not coherent in terms of the economy. It is true to concede that all anarchists reject state intervention, however it must be acknowledged that this is due to different reasons. This is because of contrasting definitions of economic freedom. It must also be noted that the perceived function of a stateless economy is in contradiction. Whilst anarcho capitalists embrace free markets, collectivists seek to fulfil a cooperative, sociable network for mutual exchange.

...and then finally **concluding** that despite, some similarities, fundamentally anarchists disagree more than they agree.



# Ecologism questions

**4a. To what extent do ecologists have concerns over economic growth?**

**4b. To what extent do ecologists argue that radical change in society is necessary?**



# Paper 2 qu.4 exemplar

There is little agreement on ~~whether~~ society among ecologists. Although there is general consensus on the current problems preventing protection of the environment, ~~there~~ the conflict on suitable solutions - whether the overthrow of capitalism or ~~repeal~~ abolishing the state - prevents ecologists from creating a coherent view on what an ideal ecologist society would look like.

This introduction outlines the argument that the student will follow ... that, despite general agreement, the disagreement is more fundamental.

... and this **conclusion** ties the essay together.

In conclusion, there is little agreement on whether society requires a radical transformation, nor what this transformation would be. Until there is consensus on whether capitalism and the state should be reformed or abolished, it must be concluded that ecologists have failed to create a coherent view of an ecologist society or present a single solution for the environmental crisis.





# Paper 2 qu.4 exemplar

Firstly, ecologists are generally concerned about economic growth because of its links to capitalism, but shallow ecologists are more willing to ~~adapt~~ reform the capitalist system whereas deep ecologists want to overthrow it completely. Ecologists are generally wary of capitalism because of its insatiable desire for economic growth, which may lead to them exploiting the earth's natural resources for the sake of consumerism, and their thirst for profits resulting in capitalists putting economic growth before protecting the environment.

The beginning of this paragraph identifies agreement and disagreement...

it then goes on to explain the general view of ecologists...

before continuing with an analysis of divisions.

This shows he was concerned about economic growth due to its destructive nature to the precious natural world and humans' relationship with it. Overall, ecologists show some concern about economic growth, but shallow ecologists desire greater government control of it to protect nature for future generations, whereas deep ecologists completely reject economic growth for its destruction of the natural world which has intrinsic value in itself, not just for future generations.



# Paper 2 qu.4 exemplar

The first, most fundamental division appears in the ecologists' belief on the change needed in human attitude in order to reform society. Both shallow and deep ecologists are in agreement that traditional anthropocentric views are flawed as it encourages selfish behaviour, giving mankind excessive dominion over nature. Instead shallow ecologists argue that the moral community needs to be extended in order to achieve a state of enlightened anthropocentrism. This is aligned with their core belief of intergenerational equity which argues for the preservation of society so that future generations do not suffer from depletion and other shortages of natural resources. This requires moderate change whereby there is a growth in environmental awareness. In comparison, deep ecologists completely reject this view as it still places humans at the centre, encouraging selfish dominion thus would

The student starts by outlining that this is the most fundamental division.... It then goes on to suggest agreement between two ecologists... but then continues to suggest that the agreement is superficial and in fact there is clear and fundamental disagreement.



# Feminism questions

**5a. To what extent do feminists agree on human nature?**

**5b. To what extent do feminists disagree about the nature of the society they wish to create?**



# Feminism questions: general points

- It seemed as well that a significant minority of candidates were unable to develop the views of the key thinkers either in detail or, at times, accurately. This suggests some centres are focusing too much on non-key thinkers such as Mary Wollstonecraft, Betty Friedan and Shulamith Firestone.
- Of the strands of feminism, radical feminism seems to be least well understood. Many candidates ascribed the views of difference or separatist feminists to all radical feminists, when they represent a small minority of feminists overall. 'Political lesbianism' was often misunderstood and exaggerated.
- The key area for candidates to practise is comparing and contrasting the views of different feminists, so that answers explicitly consider the degree of difference between their positions.
- Weaker answers also lacked a clear structure and comparison and AO3.



# Paper 2 qu.5 exemplar

It can be argued that all equality feminists agree on the creation of a society where there is gender equality between men and women. Indeed Liberal Feminist Mary Wollstonecraft said "The mind has no gender", implying women <sup>as</sup> are rational and independent as men however are restricted by stereotypes, which Friedman believed created "The problem that had no name" for women: being trapped in domesticity. Hence all feminists agree on the importance of a gender-equal society.

Here the student is showing areas of agreement within the different strands of feminism in their first paragraph where they are focusing on 'equality feminists'. Please note, however, that the two feminists quoted are **not** among the five named Key Thinkers in the specification.





# Paper 2 qu.5 exemplar

However, There is disagreement in Feminism  
over the spheres in which equality should  
be provided as well as the type of equality.  
Liberal Feminists only believe women are  
oppressed in the public sphere so that is where  
gender equality must be implemented. However  
Socialist and Radical Feminists subscribe to  
Hanish's 'personal is political'. • Indeed  
Rowbotham believed women are oppressed  
in both spheres as the economy affects  
the private sphere. Therefore both radical  
and socialist feminists advocate <sup>gender</sup> equality  
in both spheres. Yet greater contrast

In the next paragraph, they are identifying disagreements as well as some agreement within the strands.

The most important thing in the structure of Ideas essays is to ensure that all paragraphs contain comparisons of at least two strands.



# Multiculturalism questions

**6a. To what extent are conservative criticisms of multiculturalism justified?**

**6b. To what extent do multiculturalists disagree over the role of the state?**



# Paper 2 qu.6 exemplar

While to a certain degree it does appear that in some respects, such as economic management, multiculturalist and conservative ideas could coexist, in a general sense the fundamental beliefs underpinning multiculturalist thought, in relation to human nature and society, can be justifiably criticised from a conservative standpoint because in this regard there are fundamental obverses.

This **introduction** highlights the argument the student will continue throughout their essay.



# Paper 2 qu.6 exemplar

Multiculturalist thinkers which come from a liberal standing, such as Will Kymlicka, may certainly disagree that conservative criticisms of multiculturalism are justified. Whereas thinkers like Charles Taylor saw cultural identity as an end within itself, Kymlicka perceived the concept to be a vehicle to advancing individualism, a theme very in tune

In this paragraph, the student is comparing different opinions of conservative criticisms.



# Paper 2 qu.6 exemplar

Multiculturalists ~~all disagree over the role of~~  
all agree that the state should be tolerant  
and promote diversity. However, the extent  
to which multiculturalists agree on this differ  
very much with liberal multiculturalists wanting a  
civic unity and ~~neutral~~ culturally neutral state,  
Pluralist multiculturalists wanting the state to accept  
diversity and be tolerant of differences and  
cosmopolitan multiculturalists wanting a culturally  
mixed state to form a monoculture state. Therefore,  
Multiculturalists generally disagree over the  
role of the state.

Liberal multiculturalists believe that the state  
should be focused on individuality, civic  
unity, tolerant, democratic and culturally  
neutral. Whilst they share the view with  
other multiculturalists that diversity should be  
practised, the difference is, is that liberals  
believe it should be practised at home in

The student **introduces** the argument they will be following in their essay...

Their first point begins with Liberal multiculturalism but, in the same paragraph (*not fully shown*), they bring in disagreements with other strands, hence raising their AO2 marks.





# Paper 2 qu.6 exemplar

The first way in which multiculturalists disagree ~~on~~ over the role of the state is how best integration is achieved. Pluralist multiculturalists believe in deep integration. Parekh believes that all humans are culturally embedded from a historical stance and that the state should encourage support for these cultures, ~~this~~ By using the idea of pluralists wanting the state to encourage integration, This does not share the same idea that Kymlicka had, where the state needs to find specific ways in which integration works for all.

Here the student is picking a theme and then addressing how different strands of multiculturalism disagree over it.



# Paper 2 qu.6 exemplar

overall, ~~the~~ the 3 different branches of multiculturalists want different things. These can include how the state encourages intergration or how to encourage diversity. The key thinkers also don't always align to a branch and so therefore can differ on opinions on how best to use the state. This shows that multiculturalist mainly disagree on the role of the state.

...and then **concluding** by asserting that multiculturalists disagree over the state.



# Nationalism questions

**7a. To what extent is nationalism regressive?**

**7b. To what extent does nationalism divide rather than unite societies?**



# Paper 2 qu.7 exemplars

**1** Nationalism, as a whole isn't all regressive. Regressive means the wanting for a nation-state to revert to a traditional self, with selective views to society. In order the most regressive to <sup>Progressive</sup> least regressive forms of nationalism is Expansionist nationalism, Conservative nationalism, Post/anti-imperialist colonialist nationalism and liberal nationalism.

**2** The principal conflict ~~between~~ when arguing whether nationalism unites or divides societies is between the ideas of liberal and civic nationalists who favour co-operation, and expansionist, more right-wing conservative nationalists. This essay will argue that it divides societies to a greater extent.

Nationalism is a psycho-political construct and 'chameleon' ideology in that it can be applied to fit within the constraints of other ideologies. This essay will argue that nationalism is a regressive ideology, especially in areas such as the state and society. This is best illustrated by ultra-conservative thinkers like Maurras and fascist thinkers like Adolf Hitler.

**3** Here are three **introductions**. The first one defines some terms and outlines, in order the most to least regressive. It does not outline the view the essay will be taking. The second and third ones outline the view they plan to argue, which is a key component for AO3 marks.



# Paper 2 qu.7 exemplar

While there are some nationalist thinkers who are progressive in terms of the state, they are in a minority. Liberal nationalists like Jean Jacques Rousseau argue in 'The Social Contract' that the state should enable self-fulfilment and should be based off a collective will to achieve freedom. <sup>In this sense</sup> ~~A supporter of this~~ liberal nationalists are progressive because they reject the old monarchical version of the state in favour of enabling freedoms. However, regressive nationalist thinkers are much more prominent; seen within conservative nationalists and fascist nationalists. Maurras (an ultra-conservative thinker) was chauvinist in his

Here the student is reinforcing the view that nationalism isn't progressive by comparing the different strands in the same paragraph.

**Please note,** however, that students, ideally, should be encouraged to lead with the strands first and then exemplify with the thinkers, rather than the other way round.





# Paper 2 qu.7 exemplar

stage as well as within the nation.  
~~Further~~ In contrast, however, conservative nationalists would not encourage such easy co-operation across borders and therefore can be said to limit this, encouraging instead divisions. Conservative-leaning thinker Giuseppe Mazzini ~~was~~ rejected individualism rationally and advocated a spiritual aspect to the nation-state. This corroborates the idea that conservative nationalists believe someone cannot instantly join a society and become part of that nation, therefore perpetuating divisions and not encouraging coherence.

Having outlined earlier in the paragraph why nationalism is a unifying force, here the student is challenging this idea by critiquing those points identifying the divisive elements within nationalism.



# Paper 2 qu.7 exemplars

All these factors, when taken into account more show the division between types of nationalists on whether to divide society aggressively or not. Nevertheless, nationalism, even from a liberal view, still looks at societies from the concept of state borders so divide societies more.

The first **conclusion** seeks to express a point of view, mainly that it does divide society.

The second summarises the views of the different nationalism strands, but doesn't answer the question by coming to a view about whether they are regressive overall.

To conclude, nationalism is too broad an ideology to express as regressive or not it depends on the strand. Conservative and expansionist nationalists are inherently regressive due to their traditional views of national membership as opposed to the more progressive ideas of liberal and anti-colonial nationalists. In ways

# Component 3A (USA)

**12-mark comparative  
and 30-mark essay  
questions**





# AOs in Component 3

## 12-mark questions

- 12-mark comparative questions on 3a (USA) and 3b (Global) require AO1 and AO2 only.
- This means that students simply have to introduce AO1 that is relevant to the question and then compare this AO2 to find similarities, difference etc, depending on the wording of the question.



# AOs in Component 3

## 12-mark questions

- The best way to do this is to take a theme and address the comparison within the paragraph.
- As there is no AO3, there is no requirement to reach a verdict or judgement.
- These questions also do not need introductions or conclusions.





# USA Q1 and Q2: 12-mark comparative questions

- The most effective approaches to these questions were to identify clear differences/similarities etc, with explicit points made between the US and UK with exemplification.
- Some candidates addressed questions with no direct comparisons, but this was only a small minority of candidates. These gained limited AO2 marks.
- Some wasted time including similarities, when differences were asked for (or vice versa), and gained no credit. Candidates should be reminded to answer the question as set, as this was a common error in all the 12-mark comparative questions.
- Stronger responses referred back to the wording of the question in each paragraph, rather than drifting into general descriptions.



# Paper 3A qu.1a

**1a. Examine how interest groups in the USA are more effective at protecting civil rights than pressure groups in the UK.**



# Paper 3A qu.1a exemplar

One way in which interest groups in the USA are more effective at  
protecting civil rights than pressure groups in the UK is because of  
their different access points. Due to America having three  
completely separate branches, if ~~an~~ an interest group approaches  
the executive with a civil rights concern and it is rejected,  
they are able to go to an opposing party in congress  
where their concerns may be listened to. In comparison,  
due to parliament in the UK being sovereign and the three  
branches being linked, it is far more difficult for a  
pressure group to be successful. For example, if the government  
does not like a certain pressure group who is advocating  
the rights of abortion for example, ~~there~~ there is no other  
access points for the pressure group to gain influence.

This is the opening paragraph of the answer; no introduction was needed. Here the student is comparing US and UK pressure groups in each paragraph. They are explaining only why US pressure groups are more effective, as the question asks.



# Paper 3A qu.1a exemplar

secondly, interest groups in the USA are more effective at protecting civil rights than those in the UK because there are far more 'access points' in government, through which pressure groups can lobby representatives to uphold or advance civil rights. In the UK, the fusion of powers means that the executive branch holds considerable power over the legislative branch through 'carrots and sticks'. Thus, pressure groups tend to focus their efforts solely on the executive branch, reducing the channels through which pressure groups can lobby for rights protection. By contrast, in the USA, there are numerous access points, due to the separation of powers (meaning pressure groups can lobby both the executive and the legislative branches), and federalism, which means pressure groups can lobby both at a state and federal government level. This has been particularly crucial for pressure groups focussed on women's rights in abortion, such as NARAL, who are able to lobby against the chipping away of abortion rights at a state level.

Again, here the student is identifying an issue, access points again, and examining how this affects pressure groups in the UK differently to the US.

Notice also that the student is referencing rights throughout the answer.



# Paper 3A qu.1b

**1b. Examine how devolution in the UK differs from federalism in the USA.**





# Paper 3A qu.1b exemplar

One way in which devolution differs can be seen from how entrenched it is. In the US, federalism is entrenched under the 10<sup>th</sup> amendment. This means that all powers not given to Congress are reserved for the states, for example education policy. As such, states rights are protected in the sovereign constitution. However in the UK, devolved bodies ~~are~~ rely on parliament for its existence. Due to the doctrine of parliamentary sovereignty, parliament maintains the right to dissolve the bodies, although this may be politically difficult. As such, the extent to which this devolved power is entrenched is different. A rigorous amendment process required shows this.

Here the student is addressing a difference in each paragraph.

They are addressing both the US Congress and then comparing it to the UK Parliament and explaining the differences only!

By using phrases like however, whereas, unlike etc, students can maximise their comparative analysis.

It's worth noting that the student began their response like this with no introduction. This approach is to be encouraged.



# Paper 3A qu.1b exemplar

Another difference between UK devolution and US federalism is where in which sovereignty lies. In the UK, Parliament is sovereign and remains the supreme law making body whereby no other body can overrule it. Devolution does not involve the distribution of sovereignty to regional bodies of Scotland, Wales and Northern Ireland, but ~~the~~ <sup>Parliament</sup> grants them powers such as the power to implement their own healthcare, education and policing systems. Due to Parliamentary Sovereignty, Parliament retains the ability to ~~remove~~ revoke these powers granted to the regional bodies and can strike down any laws made by them, meaning that devolution is not protected and Parliamentary Sovereignty can override these powers and even take them back. However, this differs in the USA as federalism involves the distribution of sovereignty from the federal government to each of the states. The federal government does not have the ability to remove sovereignty from the states meaning that each state can create and abide by its own laws.

Here the student is discussing the issue of sovereignty within devolution and federalism, which they refer to in the opening line of their paragraph.

The student is being highly comparative in analysing the differences in the two systems (*only part of the answer is shown here*).



# Paper 3A qu.2

**2. Analyse the different legislative powers of the UK Parliament and the US Congress.**



# Paper 3A qu.2 exemplar

One way in which the legislative process differs can be acknowledged when assessing the fusion of powers. In the UK, the executive and legislature are fused, meaning the government is able to sit in the Commons. This means that in the UK, the legislative ~~process~~ powers are weak since they are determined by the government's agenda. This can be analysed using the structural theory since the constitution sets out the framework for different branches. This differs as in the US, a strict separation of powers means that the legislative powers are enhanced. The speaker such as Pelosi may develop their own set of priorities, which contrasts with the president. This will be particularly the case under a nationalised mid term.

Another way the legislative powers differ can be seen when assessing powers of patronage. The US

The key to AOs in this question is to answer the question first and then apply the comparative theory.

Like Question 1, to maximise AOs it's best to take a themed approach and address the US and UK within each paragraph.

Again, no introduction or conclusion is needed, as there is no AO3 and no need to address the extent of differences/similarities; remember to answer only what the question asks.



# Paper 3A qu.2 exemplar

In the UK, Parliament has absolute authority through the concept of Parliamentary sovereignty. It has the final say on all laws, including those struck down by the courts through Remedial Orders like the Terrorist Asset Freezing Act that overruled *Ahmed and Others v UK*. This is in complete contrast to the US where the constitution gives certain areas that Congress can legislate on, some that the States can and some the SCOTUS has jurisdiction over. One

In this example, the student is clearly distinguishing between the sovereignty of the UK Parliament and the lack of it in the US Congress.





# Paper 3A qu.3a

**3a. Evaluate the view that US foreign policy is dominated as much by Congress as by the presidency.**



# Paper 3A qu.3a exemplar

In order to analyse the extent to which foreign policy is dominated by the president or congress, one must consider constitutional war powers, powers over international relations, and the overall political mandate that each branch maintains over foreign policy. By assessing these factors, it must be acknowledged that in fact the president dominates foreign policy.

Here the **introduction** has fulfilled the requirements of an introduction. They have given context to the question, addressed both sides and expressed a judgement.



# Paper 3A qu.3a exemplar

However, this argument is not convincing as the President's constitutional powers give him much more control over foreign policy than Congress. Congress' power to declare war is insignificant compared to the President's power as Commander in Chief because this power is rarely used. Indeed, war was last declared in 1942, yet it is undeniable that the US has been at war since then because of the US President's ability to commit troops to foreign action, as seen in Iraq in 2003 and in the Cold War of the 1950s. Furthermore, the power of the purse has not helped Congress prevent the President from taking action, as they have never actually withdrawn funding for military action, despite threats. Therefore, it is clear that the President dominates foreign policy more than Congress as Congress' constitutional powers to affect foreign policy are much weaker than the President's.

Here, in their **counter-point**, the student is arguing against a previous paragraph. The evaluation (AO3) is woven throughout the paragraph.



# Paper 3A qu.3b

**3b. Evaluate the view that the effective working of the US Constitution depends more on interest groups than the Supreme Court.**



# Paper 3A qu.3b exemplar

bear arms. However, this is not wholly convincing in light of the fact that there has been some gun control legislation successfully passed through Congress, showing that interest groups have not stopped Constitutional rights from being infringed by the government. Clinton's Brady Act created back-ground checks for people buying hand-guns and the NRA did not stop this from passing through Congress, showing that interests groups are limited in their ability to protect rights. In contrast, the Supreme Court have effectively protected the constitutional right to bear arms, ensuring that the Constitution still functions effectively. In the case *Printz v. US*, 1997, they ruled the Brady Act unconstitutional and were able to prevent gun control where the NRA didn't. Furthermore, in *DC v. Heller*, 2008, they ruled a Washington D.C. ban on handguns and a requirement that shot guns and rifles must be kept unloaded as unconstitutional, ensuring that the constitution still functioned as the right to bear arms was protected. Furthermore, in *McDonald v. City of Chicago*, 2010, the right to bear arms was also protected and they declared Chicago's attempts to introduce gun control unconstitutional. Therefore, it is clear that the right to bear arms has been better protected by the Supreme Court than interest groups, showing that the Supreme court are more important in ensuring the effective working of the US constitution.

Here, in a **counter-point**, the student is arguing against a previous paragraph and coming to a view at the beginning and end of the paragraph.

This means that it includes elements of all three Assessment Objectives.





# Paper 3A qu.3b exemplar

The more convincing argument is that the SC ensures  
this more effectively through Judicial Review and  
setting Judicial Precedent. The courts protect Human  
Rights through court cases such as Engel v ~~Vitale~~<sup>Vitale</sup> and  
more recently Masterpiece Cakeshop v Colorado. In this case  
in 2017 the SC ensured protection of the 1st amendment  
rights of expression, as owners of Masterpiece Cakeshop were  
not forced to bake a homosexual couple's wedding cake.  
Therefore, it is evident that through protection of human  
rights through direct power, the SC upholds constitutional  
effectiveness <sup>to</sup> a better extent than interest groups as  
they wield direct influence.

Again here the student, in their **counter-point**, is making it clear that they believe this is the stronger argument and exemplifying their argument well. The paragraph ends, as it begins, with their view (AO3).



# Paper 3A qu.3c

**3c. Evaluate the view that the procedures for electing US presidents and members of Congress are not fit for purpose.**



# Paper 3A qu.3c exemplar

However this argument must be rejected as by diluting direct democracy, the electoral college favours a stable constitutional republic. The founding fathers acknowledged the importance of protecting state identity, and the system does exactly this. Had it not been for the Electoral College, large states such as California would have been able to single handedly swing the election result for Clinton, which neglects the principle of federalism. States such as Iowa, who have 4 electoral college votes, would be overlooked in campaigns. In addition, although it fails to guarantee a popular vote ~~by~~ majority, the system ensures a strong winner. The winner takes all system means that ~~presiden~~ candidates seek

In this **counter-point**, the student is addressing procedures for electing a president.

Notice how the student is arguing the case for their view, rather than just presenting an alternative view.



# Paper 3A qu.3c exemplar

Some may also argue that the procedure of electing members of Congress is not fit for purpose. The system causes a representative deficit, as evident from incumbency reelection rates reaching 97% in 2016. This is due to the presence of safe seats. This is worsened by gerrymandering, which is when state legislatures redraw ~~the~~ district boundaries at the expense of the opposition. The founding fathers never intended a two party system to arise, and this first past the post, winner takes all system promotes exactly this. Gerrymandering effectively means that representatives choose their voters, not the other way round. ~~the~~ Republican voters in New York for example may feel isolated by the system, which only further exacerbates a sense of disillusionment towards the political system.

Here, in an **opening point**, the student is addressing the issue of Congressional elections.

# Component 3B (Global)

**12-mark comparative  
and 30-mark essay  
questions**





# General comments

- The key to success in responding to the longer questions set is to recognise that the performance level of an essay is decided by all three of the Assessment Objectives.
- A large proportion of candidates score well in AO1 by providing detailed and developed knowledge and understanding, but they failed to attain the marks that are available from AO2 and AO3.
- The intellectual skills required to perform at the highest level in AO2 revolve around the ability to provide an analysis with logical reasoning, and by drawing on similarities and differences.
- With AO3 the evaluation will, at the highest level, be based on fully effective judgements, which are consistently substantiated and lead to fully focused and justified conclusions.





# Paper 3B qu.1a

**1a. Examine the criticisms that have been made of the World Trade Organisation and the G7/8.**



# Paper 3B qu.1a exemplar

One criticism that can be made is that both organisations promote neo-liberal values which leads to the exploitation of developing countries. Both organisations advocate free trade: the WTO<sup>(1995)</sup> regulate world trade to be through open borders and the G7<sup>(1975)</sup> are all Global North, highly developing, wealthy economies that advocate economic free trade, which liberals like Keohane argue maintains peace. Yet free trade leads to developing economies fighting unfair competition, and can be taken advantage of by developed economies, through dumping for example. Indeed ~~Greece~~ has indeed such exploitation lead to Wallerstein's dependency theory, with developing economies relying on demand by developed economies, e.g. Zambia's interest rate falling 4.6% when China lowered its demand for Zambian steel. Hence due to the neoliberal values promoted by the G7 and WTO, this can lock developing economies into a proto-industrialised stage of production, which can widen the inequality between developed and developing economies, promoting

Here the student is addressing criticisms of both organisations.

Again, the student began their response like this, with no introduction.

Here the student is exploring the criticisms in more depth.



# Paper 3B qu.1a exemplar

Both the World Trade Organisation and G7/8 have  
been criticized for being based in western ~~imperialism~~ imperialism  
especially the USA. The World Trade Organisation is  
based in neo-liberal ideas and the spread of capitalism  
to allow for a global market and system of trade. This  
can be seen to undermine other economic systems and  
allow developed countries to continue to dominate. Similarly  
the G7/8 was created as the 7 main economic powers  
in the world at the time and was there to allow the  
development of their economic policies to enhance trade relations.  
This ~~excludes~~ excludes developing countries through western  
imperialism and allows the USA to continue to dominate.

Again over the next two pages, this student is identifying criticisms of both institutions



# Paper 3B qu.1a exemplar

Also both institutions have been criticized in their failings to  
address contemporary global issues. The G7/8 was only  
created to deal with economic governance between the 7  
states. It hasn't subsequently adapted to include policies  
on climate change which has received high criticism ~~esp~~  
especially from pressure groups like Friends of the Earth.  
Similarly the World Trade Organization primarily deals with  
~~trade~~ states and trade disputes. It has been criticized  
for failing to address the poverty enhanced through the divide  
between developed states and developing states demonstrated in

By applying a criticism which applies to both institutions, students will maximise their chances of scoring highly for AO2.



# Paper 3B qu.1b

**1b. Examine the factors that have led to China and India being described as ‘emerging powers’.**



# Paper 3B qu.1b exemplar

In addition, China and India are both becoming far more powerful culturally than ever before. China's ~~an~~ increasing population has made Mandarin-Chinese one of the world's most widely spoken language, and the increasing popularity of Chinese brands like Huawei and social media networks like Weibo has bolstered this power. ~~Within China~~ With regards to India, media has again confirmed their status as an emerging power; the spread of Bollywood cinema has made actresses such as Aishwarya Rai globally recognisable and given Indian media a much wider audience and sphere of influence.

As with all 12-mark questions, the comparative aspect requires students to make links and connections between two elements asked. Here it is India and China. The student here is effectively comparing India with China.





# Paper 3B qu.1b exemplar

Both China and India have been labelled as 'emerging powers' in recent years. The first reason for this is their economies. Both are BRICS economies and so play a significant role in global economics due to this factor. China especially accounts, in 2019, for around 20% of the world GDP and so have had a dramatic economic growth since the 1980's with an average of 9% a year economic growth. This proves how the two are 'emerging powers' as their economies are growing, and fast, and so are emerging as competitors to the US. Some commentators have argued China will overtake the US on GDP by as early as 2020, others forecast this to be later in the century but the consensus is that one day China will overtake the US. Both of these emerging powers economic power's influence is due to them having the two highest population sizes worldwide which allows for significant manpower in economics.

While this is a good answer, it is typical of a lot of answers which focused primarily on examples of China when answering about both countries. Ideally, both countries will be referenced effectively.



# Paper 3B qu.1b exemplar

The first factor in these states is their economic growth. Both States have become major economies since the start of the 21<sup>st</sup> century. Since ~~2008~~ 2009, China has been the world's largest export, and according to the IMF it had a GDP of \$13 trillion in 2018, making it the world's second largest economy, or third largest if the EU is included. India has similarly had an economic boom, with TNCs exploiting weak labour laws to establish manufacturing bases throughout India and China. India ~~to the~~ has also benefited from many call centres with international outreach being based there. Both countries have massive populations of over 1 billion, and emerging middle classes, which is beginning to make them attractive countries.

The student is effectively comparing factors pertinent to both India with China which have led to them being described as emerging powers.



# Paper 3B qu.2

**2. Analyse how realists and liberals explain the likelihood of war and conflict.**



# Paper 3B qu.2 exemplar

Unlike realists, liberals believe that  
war and conflict is a failure of reason  
and should be avoided at all costs. Liberals  
believe that states should act with the idea  
of peace in their minds and mutual respect.  
Unlike realists, liberals see human nature  
as progressive rather than fixed, and so  
states expect that, always using reason,  
debate and compromise in disagreements  
rather than coercion or force.

The Q2 12-mark question requires students to make links and connections between liberal and realist perspectives.



# Paper 3B qu.2 exemplar

The likelihood of conflict is a crucial aspect of international relations theory, and is disagreed upon by realists and liberals, firstly due to their opposing views of human nature. Realists ~~first~~ such as Morgenthau follow a conservative view of human nature, in which humans are selfish and seek to maximise their power relative to others, as described by Hobbes. This need to gain power therefore leads itself to the realist view that conflict is inevitable due to the fact that all states are power maximisers, and so will collide with each other, as in Dalton's 'Billiard Ball' model. Liberals, however, subscribe to a different view of human nature, as in liberalism, wherein man is rational and capable of altruism. Liberals argue that this rationality will mean that ~~states~~ conflict between states will be a last resort, as, ~~the~~ ~~rationality~~ ~~of~~ ~~states~~ ~~means that~~ do not desire conflict, and so will seek to resolve disagreements using other means.

Here the student is contrasting the two different perspectives of realists and liberals by looking at their view of human nature and linking it to their view on the likelihood of war.



# Paper 3B qu.2 exemplar

the behaviour of nation-states

the extent to which this leads to war and conflict. According

to realists, states are self-interest humans are selfish and

they naturally pursue their self interest above the needs of others.

As Hobbes highlights, this leads to a tendency towards conflict

as conflicting interests leads to tension. Thus, states behave

in a similar manner. ~~For instance~~ This view can be exemplified by

the USA's invasion into Iraq with unjustified claims there were weapons

of mass destruction, thus it is observed as selfish pursuit by the USA which

initiated war and conflict. However, the liberal view differs

because liberals believe humans are inherently altruistic. As rational

beings, they understand that cooperation is more beneficial. Thus, nation-states

co-operate as they recognise in joining intergovernmental organisations (IGOs).

As Wilson highlights, the cooperation of democratic nation-states leads to a

lower threat of war because their rationality allows them to

recognise that the consequences of war outweigh the benefits of war.

This answer is again effectively comparing the two views of realists and liberals to explain the likelihood of war.





# Paper 3B qu.3a

**3a. Evaluate the extent to which globalisation has made the world unipolar rather than multipolar.**



# Paper 3B qu.3a exemplar

Cultural globalisation is the spread of Westernisation, thus flattening other ~~cultural~~ cultures and making the world more uniform. It can be argued that the spread of cultural globalisation has made the world more unipolar, for example, Ben Barber's 'McWorld' refers to how the USA has homogenised the globe and has spread their liberal ideologies - both social, ~~social~~ and economic. For example, consumerism and materialism are the key factors of capitalism, ~~spread~~ which have spread thanks to TNC's and foreign investment as well as the Bretton Woods institutions (WTO, WB, IMF) imposing free trade, no tariff rules on developing nations.

Here the student is discussing cultural arguments and explaining what they are and how they can dominate.



# Paper 3B qu.3a exemplar

Through the advancement of technology, people across the globe are enjoying the same luxuries the USA have, e.g. drinking coca-cola, wearing Nike, watching American sitcoms and listening to American music. It is clear that the USA, after the fall of the USSR, has successfully sold the 'American dream' to the rest of the world and remained the greatest power of soft power.

The student is continuing here, concluding that globalisation has enhanced unipolarity.



# Paper 3B qu.3b

**3b. Evaluate the extent to which human rights are more effectively protected by humanitarian intervention than by international courts and tribunals.**



# Paper 3B qu.3b exemplar

For example, the ~~mission~~ intervention in ~~ty~~ Libya issued by the UN was seen as a success as it stopped Gaddafi from slaughtering thousands of people. This was done on the principle of 'responsibility to protect' as liberals feel a duty to protect human rights (natural rights) which are the basic core ideal ~~of~~ liberalism stemming from John Locke's views on human nature. Although this ~~was~~ was viewed as

Here the student is considering the view that intervention can be effective in their **opening point**...



# Paper 3B qu.3b exemplar

naïve. Although this ~~case~~ was viewed as a success at the time, the intervention was only successful for a short time. Since 2017, there are two rival governments, 8 parliaments and 400,000 people are internally displaced. Furthermore, it is seen as a breeding ground for terrorism suggesting that humanitarian intervention is not all that effective. Since the 1990's there have

...before arguing in their **counter-point** that, in fact, humanitarian intervention is not effective.





# Paper 3B qu.3c

**3c. Evaluate the extent to which regional bodies are effectively able to challenge individual states for influence in global politics.**



# Paper 3B qu.3c exemplar

This essay will evaluate three regional bodies, & the EU, NATO and the ECHR, ~~impact~~ as challengers to state sovereignty (both political and economic). It will conclude that regional bodies pose a greater challenge to developing states (who ~~do~~ require greater dependence) that developed states, who can be more greatly independent and even challenge the dominance of the regional bodies. ~~Yet it will~~

This **introduction** clearly outlines what it will address and identifies a view which it carries out through the essay.



# Paper 3B qu.3c exemplar

However, given that only 4 NATO members pay the full 2%, this suggests members do not feel challenged. Indeed Trump's threat to leave NATO as well as not abide by Article 5 demonstrates the US's nationalist independence against regional to which it is apart. This is because it is the largest ~~g~~ funding state of ~~na~~ NATO and hence, it can be argued, can actually challenged NATO as a regional body.

Here the essay is arguing that NATO has not challenged individual states.