

GCE



CCEA GCE A2
Exemplifying Examination
Performance

Government and Politics

This is an exemplification of candidates' performance in GCE A2 examinations (Summer 2018) to support the teaching and learning of the Government and Politics specification.



Permission to reproduce all copyright material has been applied for. In some cases, efforts to contact copyright holders may have been unsuccessful and CCEA will be happy to rectify any omissions of acknowledgement in future if notified.

EXEMPLIFYING EXAMINATION PERFORMANCE

GCE Government and Politics

Introduction

These materials illustrate aspects of performance from the 2018 summer A2 examination series of CCEA's revised GCE Specification in 2016.

Students' grade A responses are reproduced verbatim and accompanied by commentaries written by senior examiners. The commentaries draw attention to the strengths of the students' responses and indicate, where appropriate, deficiencies and how improvements could be made.

It is intended that the materials should provide a benchmark of candidate performance and help teachers and students to raise standards.

For further details of our support package, please visit our website at www.ccea.org.uk

Best wishes



Helen Parks

Education Manager, Government & Politics

Email: hparks@ccea.org.uk

Telephone: 028 9026 1200 ext. 2906

GCE: A2 Government and Politics

AGP11: Comparative Government

Grade: A Exemplar

Option A: A Comparative Study of the Government and Politics of the United States of America (USA) and the United Kingdom (UK)

Read the Source below and refer to it in your answers to Questions 2 and 4.

Source

Failures in the 1970s and 1980s to manage the economy, to combat poverty, to provide proper welfare services, and to protect the dollar began to be explained as a failure of the political system. In the 1990s and 2000s, similar failures occurred over health care reform, the budget and gun control. For some, these failures were the outcome of the system of separation of powers: if it did not actually cause governmental failure, it encouraged it. Although presidents do possess powers to overcome obstacles, such as Executive Orders, gridlock is often the result. In such a situation, it is difficult to provide effective government.

Adapted from Singh, R., Governing America: The Politics of a Divided Democracy, Oxford University Press, 2003

Q1 What is meant by the term “pork-barrelling”? Support your answer with a relevant example. [5]

Student’s response

‘Pork-barrelling’ refers to the situations when Presidents and their executives use agreements with congressmen in order to push executive legislation. It has been used many times as a result of the separation of powers. Presidents often struggle to push their legislative agenda, this is further fuelled by a lack of party loyalty which is common in the USA. Obama, for example, gave \$100 million to Republicans in Nebraska for their federal services in order to gain their support for Obamacare. He also gave a further \$100 million to Conedicut State hospital for support in the Senate, also for Obamacare.

Examiner’s comments

With a six mark question it is essential that candidates allocate their time correctly and this script is a good example of a candidate doing exactly this. The length of answer is appropriate to the number of marks available. This was not the case with all candidates attempting both Options in this unit, with some spending far too long on a question and leaving insufficient time for the response to Question 6.

Questions can, of course, be answered in any order.

This was a solid answer with some definition – “Presidents use agreements .. to push.. legislation”- and examples. There is also some explanation of why ‘pork-barrelling’ is so prevalent in the USA. The answer could have been improved with a little more explicit definition, specifically that it involves a deal between the President

and a representative. What the representative gets out of the deal could have been spelled out more fully.

Marks available 5. Marks awarded 4.

Q2 With reference to the Source and any other relevant material you have studied, identify and explain **two** ways in which a President can overcome Congressional opposition.
(Source, Line 7) [10]

Student's response

Presidents can overcome Congressional opposition in a number of ways. The source references use of executive orders which are of course official statements the President can send to federal agencies instructing them on how they should use their resources. For example, Obama sent out on Executive order which prevented the deportation of children of illegal immigrants and the parents of legal children, thus protecting almost 40 thousand undocumented immigrants. This was not up for congressional approval and thus allowed Obama to fuel his efforts of improving immigration laws. Other tools which can be used by Presidents in order to overcome Congressional opposition include Executive agreements which can be made without a super majority in Congress. Such agreements are international and pose as an alternative to treaties. Trump made an Executive Agreement just this past week in the G7 summit, although he swiftly backed out. More successful agreements include the North American Free Trade Agreement signed in 1994 by Mexico, Canada and the USA.

Examiner's comments

This was a brief response but straight to the point. Two ways were clearly identified, including that given in the Source. Some explanation of how Congress is by-passed is given in both cases. Supporting examples are included. The explanation of Executive Agreements could have been developed a little more but, on balance, the response deserved full marks.

Marks available 10. Marks awarded 10.

Q3 Explain why Presidents have much greater freedom over the control of foreign policy than they do over domestic policy. [15]

Student's response

The United States political system is formed on the basis of a separation of powers. Essentially this ensures that the 3 branches of government, (the legislative, the Executive and the Judicial) are all separate, which allows for the implementation of a system of checks and balances whereby each branch of government can restrain the others to ensure that no one branch or one person (i.e. the President) can become too powerful.

The Executive is headed by the President of the United States and essentially consists of a cabinet, Whitehouse staff and the Executive Office of the President (more staff). The legislative branch of government is run by congress making them responsible for all legislation. The President has ways of influencing the legislation produced by congress such as vetoes, for example Bush vetoed a Bill that called for an end to the Iraq War. And pocket vetoes, e.g. Obama pocket vetoed a bill that would have more easily allowed banks to send homes into foreclosure. However, vetoes can be overridden by a two thirds majority in both houses. Four of Bush's 12 vetoes were overridden. Essentially meaning that the President has little influence over congressional legislation.

The President can contribute executive legislation, but it can be difficult with many having to resort to pork-barrelling like Obama, who donated \$300 million in compensation for Hurricane Katrina for his health reforms. And such actions lead to ridiculous projects like the infamous 'bridge to nowhere' in Alaska, a project that received \$220 million before being dropped. Some Presidents even have to resort to the dirty tactics often used by party whips due to the lack of party loyalty. Thus presidential powers in terms of legislation are practically non-existent.

Presidents do have influence in some cases with positive personality and media influence which grant them more respect and arguably more power as a result. For example, people congratulate Johnson on his charisma which supposedly fuelled his civil rights changes. However, for Presidents like the less worshiped Trump don't hold such powers, making his circumstantial and thus weak.

Presidents do of course have powers in terms of nominations, being able to choose their own cabinet members, filling the Supreme Court and other federal officers. However these are all subject to senate approvals and nominations often fail e.g. Trump's nomination of Brett Talley (a young and inexperienced lawyer) for a lifetime position on the federal bench was rejected by a Republican controlled Senate. Even cabinet nominees can be rejected like Obama's Health and Social Services nominee Tom Pasthle, who failed to report \$140,000 in federal taxes. Further limiting the few powers the President does have.

Even Executive Agreements which are not subject to congressional approval can be rejected, as some of Obama's were, by the Supreme Court if they are deemed unconstitutional or beyond the presidents powers.

However, the President can do far more on an international stage. As Commander in Chief the President can mobilise Troops, for up to 60 days without congressional approval. Though only congress can declare war they are often willing to take troops home so quickly and the President can dictate the length of conflict as Obama did in Afghanistan for many years.

Treaties are subject to a two thirds majority approval by Congress, but Executive Agreements aren't and Presidents use them regularly like the Paris Agreement or the North Atlantic Trade Agreement, both of which only required a small majority.

Overall, in conclusion Presidents have more uncontrolled powers as an international world leader this is a domestic figure due to their ability to dictate policy abroad with limited congressional input. The President often also has to act quickly as with attacks and air strikes, such as those recently, which do not have time to go through Congress.

Examiner's comments

The impression gained from reading the first page and a half of this response is that the candidate has misinterpreted the question. The evidence presented demonstrates how the President can overcome Congressional constraints and this was not the issue in this question. What the answer does succeed in doing is to set out some of the potential limits on the President's pursuit of domestic policy objectives, if in a rather complex way. There are reasons given why Presidents have more freedom to pursue foreign policies but these could have been more fully developed and added to. The final sentence contains a vital point that needed to be expanded upon: Congress grants Presidents greater freedom when emergency circumstances dictate.

The candidate should have given more time to reading and thinking about their answer before beginning to write.

Marks available 15. Marks awarded 12.

Q4 With reference to the Source and any other relevant material you have studied, assess the view that the operation of the US political system prevents effective government. [30]

Student's response

The US government systems were designed to ensure that no one branch become too powerful. This means that all branches operate separately and there can be clashes between them.

Firstly, each branch can be controlled by a different party. In the United States, there is what many view as a two-way system where Democrats, who are more left wing and liberal, are in constant battle with Republicans who are right wing and conservative. In many cases the branches can be controlled by different parties. For example, under President Obama, during his second term, he faced a Republican congress meaning that the Executive and the legislator were controlled by different parties. This led to many conflicts including issues filling seats on the judiciary, issues passing laws and major issues implementing Obama's liberal policies.

The source discusses failures to address controversial issues such as the economy, poverty, welfare services and so on; such issues have remained relevant to this day. Only in January 2018, Congress faced a two-day government shut-down due to gridlocks over budget bills and especially over the US/Mexico border-wall which is a major factor of President Trumps campaign rallies. These are of course big issues which need addressing and cannot be left to suffer. Other gridlocks of extreme importance include the Homeland Security Funding which was coming to an end in 2015 and needed passed through Congress, however major disagreements led to the bill almost wholly failing to pass. After extreme diccsoions, eventually a budget was passed, though it almost came to a shut-down of the Homeland Security Department, which would have made the US extremely vulnerable. Thus a separation of powers often puts the US at risk, and extends legislating time which is certainly not an ideal situation, nor can it be called effective.

The US judiciary has often operated without full seats as the Senate continually fails to pass nominees they dislike such as John Mateer, a Trump nominee rejected by a Republican Senate. During Obama's final term he also struggled to pass nominees as the Republican congress felt that his suggestions were too liberal. This is not ideal however, as the US senate is stalling on filling another essential branch of government. Without all seats filled, the bench risks facing controversial disagreements which may take months to overcome when no deciding vote is available making this a factor in ineffective government.

The US system also causes issues in terms of dealing with majority controversial issues due to a state by state views. Congressmen and women often show more

loyalty to their states and their constituents than their party, which surely is a positive thing, however, the US has such vast views it can cause major disputes. For example, current gun disputes, which are fuelled by the growing number of high school shootings are heavily criticised. Much of the population are demanding reforms and many anti-gun groups have staged marches and protests. However, due to the nature of the US system many politicians are connected with groups such as ALEC and more specifically the NRA (National Rifle Association) which makes him a stakeholder in the pro-gun campaign and forces them to prevent national gun reforms and instead insist that each state should make their own laws. The influence of culture and PGs (Pressure Groups) in the US is so embedded in their political system it is hard to avoid and causes a serious level of effectiveness in dealing with issues pushed by citizens.

The US system is not all bad, however. There are elements of a system of separation which are arguably more democratic than other systems in the western world. For example, the President's ability to veto has ensured that Congress are remaining alert and aware of the actions they are taking for example, when Bush vetoed a defence bill which would have forced the Iraq government to cope with major legal costs in relation to the Saddam Hussein era, and may have caused international friction.

The judicial ability to assess Presidential actions and review whether or not these are within his constitutional remit has prevented Presidents like Obama from essentially producing their own reforms. I am of course referencing his use of an executive order to prevent deportation which was deemed unconstitutional.

Furthermore, the US judiciary system has often taken questionable views on the actions of African Americans and only last week President Trump granted clemency to a grandmother who was sentenced for life due to a first time, no violent drug crime. This woman was locked up a few decades ago during the 'War on Crime' and legal changes taking place from the 60s to the 90s which led to thousands of Americans receiving harsh sentences for little crimes.

In recent years, the US system has taken massive strides and many younger politicians can bring new life. The Obama administration was eventually able to secure liberal policies despite struggles with a Republican Congress such as national equal marriage legislation and the long desired healthcare reforms. All of these elements suggest that, though the American system is not the world's most effective, and does have periods of ineffective governance, they are good at achieving overall. Though it does appear that many of the factors which make the system ineffective are also those which ensure democracy.

Examiner's comments

Beginning with the separation of powers was an effective opening to this essay answer, although actually using the term would have helped. The candidate clearly presents explanations of why the US system often leads to gridlock, with supporting examples. There are solid points about how different parties can control the White House and Congress, about localism and about the power of organised interests that are relevant to the question. However, not all content is tied to the question. For example, the material on the judiciary is potentially relevant but the candidate needed to work harder to tie it into the issue of effective government.

This question requires balance and this answer does contain some but this could be further developed. The argument that the US system is intended to prevent the concentration and arbitrary use of power could have been made more effectively than the simple statement that the system is "more democratic."

So, this response had some specific and relevant material but also some more general content. Balance could have been developed further.

Marks available 30. Marks awarded 22.

Section B: A Comparative Study of the Government and Politics of the USA and UK

- Q5** Identify and explain **two** differences between the powers of Public Bill Committees in the House of Commons and Standing Committees in the House of Representatives. [10]

Student's response

The powers of committees differ between the US and the UK political systems. Firstly, UK Public Bill Committee (PBC) which operate during the committee stage of the legislative process do not have the power to kill bills, they instead can only review the principles which have been laid out and suggest minor changes. In the US House of Representatives, standing committees can kill bills as was done with Clinton health care reforms.

Furthermore, standing committees often change bills beyond recognition from their initial form as they operate before the second reading meaning that their extreme suggestions are often adopted. While in the UK, PBCs have no compriable power, they simple suggest amendments. For example, in the US House of Representatives, the committee is currently reviewing the 'Pay our Military' bill and have the potential to completely rearrange the amends proposed and implementation dates. While PBCs offer deal with government legislations so have less requirement to make major edits. For example, controversial legislation like the poll tax was just forced through.

Examiner's comments

In contrast to the candidate's response to Question 2, this answer lacked clarity. There was considerable overlap between the two points made: the ability to "kill a bill" and "to change a bill beyond recognition" were accepted as two differences. However, the explanations of these two points were very similar. It would have benefitted the answer if another difference had been given: permanency, expertise, power of subpoena.

Marks available 10. Marks awarded 4.

Q6a Assess the view that Members of Congress are concerned with local issues while MPs and Lords focus on national issues. [30]

QUESTION NOT EXEMPLIFIED BY EXAMINER

Q6b “There are more differences today between the powers of British Prime Ministers and US Presidents.” Assess the validity of this statement. [30]

Student’s response

The Powers of the US President and the UK Prime Minister can appear very different. Some argue however, that the gap is closing. While others say the opposite. The US presidential powers are laid out in a codified constitution giving him/her executive powers. The PM, powers are slightly more obscure.

Firstly, the UK PM is head of government and runs the UK cabinet, making them first among equals (primus inter pares) while the US President is head of government, also having a cabinet, and head of state making him simply first. It should be noted, however, that due to royal patronage, the UK PM often has to taken on head of state roles such as attending events and meeting foreign diplomats.

Looking further into the idea of cabinet government we can assess some powers of these leaders. The purpose of the cabinet in the UK is to legislate and deal with numerous issues at home and abroad. The UK PM gains their position as head of the cabinet through heading their party and they are free to choose any members from within their party they wish. Although some note that big names often ‘pick themselves’ for example Thatcher had to put Heseltine in her cabinet due to his support within the cabinet. Similarly, Theresa May is stuck with Boris in her cabinet, despite his rude comments about Brexit. The President on-the-other-hand must receive senate approval of all cabinet members. Bush received rejections for some of his cabinet nominees as did Obama with his nomination of Tom Dashle. Trump’s nominations for one particular cabinet post even withdrew for fear of rejection. Essentially, in terms of selecting his/her cabinet, the British PM is far less restricted and thus, in this area more powerful.

Legislating power is a major factor within the UK system. The British PM and their cabinet sit in parliament and held responsibility for the majority of legislation which succeeds in Parliament. About 80% of all successful legislation is produced directly by the cabinet government. Scrutiny of UK legislation is limited due to strong party ties which almost guarantee that government legislation will be successful. In the United States, however legislating power is not an official power of the President and thus he often struggles to do this forcing presidents to resort to tools like pork-barrelling, such as the \$100 million donation to the Connedicut State hospital to

ensure that Obamacare was successful. Or other factors such as executing extreme whip power, even resorting to blackmail. Executive legislation in the US has a very low rate of success. In a similar sense, many Presidents have referred to the power of persuasion with President Truman stating 'I sit her all day trying to persuade people to do things they ought to have the sense to do without my persuading them. That is all the powers of the President amount to'. This rather dull statement does, however, highlight the President's reliance on Congress in order to get what he wants making the PM appear once again more powerful, at least in terms of legislating and making national change

Media influence, which is arguably reduced to the power of persuasion, is a major factor of power in the modern world. The President is often very present in media and it says a lot about his position. Through use of charisma, which is able to reach national importance through media, Presidents have exercised massive influence and power. President Obama, for example used media to boost his marriage equality campaign which was successful on a national level. Furthermore, President Johnson was often noted as being an extremely charismatic President. He was also able to pull at America's heart strings and produce and pass civil rights reforms as well as many other pieces of legislation based on the idea of 'continuing Kennedy's legacy'. In a similar fashion, PMs such as Blair were accused of becoming more Presidential in their way of managing things. For example Blair massively expanded the use of media in the UK, using it to announce new policies and political statements such as the Millenial Dome which was announced on TV. A lot can be said in terms of how the government treat the media and to what level they are held. For example, Trump prevented the BBC, CNN and the Guardian from initial Press briefings due to his proclamation of 'Fake news'. Ultimately, however, it is the US President who must benefit from the use of media in this way.

Schlesinger addressed the idea of what he referred to as an imperial presidency'. He believed in 2 elements 'that the presidency was too powerful and was growing and could not be contained. Some have suggested that through Obama's 'stonewalling' of Congress and constant asseing of ways in which he an avoid congressional approval he became 'one of the most powerful presidents of all time'. This could perhaps be seen in his actions with Executive orders and his public influence. Similarly, the Presidential PM power is supposedly very clear, but since Blair, it is evidently not. Blair used many powers in face ways, but we can see May struggling to keep grip of her cabinet, she certainly isn't strong on her Brexit standings, continually submitting to other countries and their demands. In terms of PM power, it appears to be dependent on circumstances. It has of course been compared to that of an elastic band, stretching and reducing depending on the one with the title, but arguably so is presidential power.

We have seen both strong and weak Presidents as well Prime Ministers and this has impacted on their powers. For example, President Jimmy Carter, was commonly viewed as a weak president. Political journalist Stringer notes how he regularly changed his policies to keep up-to-date with public opinions, but his congress felt

that he was inconsistent and were reluctant to accept his legislation and suggestion for change. Blair was a strong PM, taking control, even preventing Diane Abbott from sitting on a committee due to her criticism of govt. policy. However, Theresa May is relevant to ruffle anyone's feathers due to her weak position. She is even unwilling to assess the upset in Northern Ireland over abortion legislation, so as not to annoy the DUP, who are keeping in power, only just. This further suggests that power is indeed circumstantial and it is hard to just assess who has more.

Notably, especially now, on a world stage the USA is more desirable for trade, make Executive Agreements with them more desirable and thus more valuable. Trump has been making and editing and rejecting agreements left, right and centre while May is crawling through Brexit talks and returning with many wounds. Ultimately, though the PM can sometimes appear more presidential, there is always a Cabinet to reel them in. Thatcher was even taken down by her own cabinet, as some suggest May is at risk of. While across the water, very few people seem to be reeling Donald Trump, though it is needed, thus proving that although there aren't many differences between the US President and the UK Prime Minister, there are some very, very crucial ones. Prime Ministers risk losing it all in a vote of no confidence, like Callahan, while only Nixon came close enough to impeachment to compare. So there is no doubt that the Prime Minister is not yet Presidential, and the differences as a world style has grown.

Examiner's comments

This was a strong answer that displayed considerable relevant knowledge and understanding of the powers of the President and Prime Ministers. Many of the areas that feature in the debate about this issue are present and the candidate does make some good comparative points: selection of cabinet, control over legislation, use of the media. The reference to Schlesinger's "Imperial Presidency" argument is relevant but when there is an attempt to compare this with the power of the PM, things become unclear. There is much relevant content such as Blair's use of powers, May struggling to control her Cabinet, the significance of circumstances and the "elastic band" concept. However, this needed to be more clearly expressed to meet the requirement of "thorough and clear analysis."

In places the response becomes descriptive rather than comparative and analytical. For example, the section on Obama and Johnson and their use of the media and that on Carter and May could have been relevant, but this required more work to make this so. A comprehensive comparison of powers would have included other possible areas: the significance of the EXOP and the PM's Office. However, this was not a requirement of achieving a Level 5 response.

Marks available 30. Marks awarded 24.

Option B: A Comparative Study of the Government and Politics of the Republic of Ireland and the United Kingdom (UK)

Section A: The Government and Politics of the Republic of Ireland

Read the Source below and refer to it in your answers to Questions 2 and 4.

Source

A growing number of Fine Gael TDs believe Enda Kenny should stand down as party leader. Some backbench TDs are considering whether they will table motions on his leadership as early as next week. "This level of political instability cannot go on given we are a minority government," said a Fine Gael TD.

Mr Kenny last week saw his authority challenged when Independent Alliance Ministers voted in favour of a Bill on fatal foetal abnormalities despite Fine Gael opposing the legislation. In spite of this open opposition, Mr Kenny was powerless to take any action against the rebel ministers.

Adapted from The Irish Times, 10 July 2016

Q1 What is meant by the term "judicial review"? Support your answer with a relevant example. [5]

Student's response

Judicial review is the cut of supreme high court judges, usually 5 judges, wherein decision is made wether a proposed bin or law is repusnant to the Irish Constitution. Two rules apply with judicial review, one being that once a decision is made, it can never be took back and also they hypothetical role, wherin a result can be decided on what a proposed bills results may be: An example of concrete review is the 'X case', wherein an underage pregnant female wished to avail of abortion but after judicial review, decided this was repugnant to the constitution, and was not allowed to so to England for an abortion.

Examiner's comments

This was a solid response with considerable content in terms of a definition and an example. The explanation could have been further developed by the inclusion of what the consequences are when a decision is made that challenges executive policy. The response could also have included the point that Judicial Review is a way in which ordinary citizens or organisations can seek redress when they believe the executive has acted unfairly.

Marks available 5. Marks awarded 4.

Q2 With reference to the Source and any other relevant material you have studied, identify and explain **two** limitations on the Taoiseach's control over cabinet. (Source, Lines 7/8) [10]

Student's response

One limitation of the Taoiseach is as mentioned in source in the Condition where of Irish governments, mainly as a result of the PRSTV voting system wherein many independents and smaller parts members gain 2nd 3rd preference votes. This is a result members them powerful in some respects as the nature of minority governments ensure that the governing party must rely on support. For example, Fine Gael currently rely on Fianna Fieil in a considence and supply nature, and in the past Fianna Fail were entered into coalition with The Green Party (Ahern coalition)

Secondly, the Taoiseach is limited through the Constitution itself, wherein it states that a Taoiseach may only appoint 15 ministers, and mimisters must be approved by both the Dail and the Seinad. This especially limits the Taoiseach in times of change, for example many have advocated for a Brexit ministerial position to be created, but with ministericy posiherg at their limit Veradka may be forced to obsorb the role himself, strengthening him further, or create a junior ministerial position, evidently, in this respect the Taoiseach is limited in his control over cabinet.

Examiner's comments

The Source that accompanied this question referred to the Taoiseach's limited power to discipline or sack ministers. The response did include this point but it was not as fully developed as it could have been. The material on the electoral system and coalition governments is certainly relevant but, again, this could have been developed further. This first point was awarded 3 marks.

The second point is more fully developed and supported with a relevant and well-explained example. 5 marks were awarded.

Marks available 10. Marks awarded 8.

Q3 Explain why there are so many independent TDs in Dáil Éireann. [15]

Student's response

Independent TD, such as Mick Wallace and Clare Daley are prominent features in the Dáil. One reason this is the case is the proportional representation single transferable voting system. In many constituencies there are 3, 4 and sometimes 5 seats to be won through a system of preferential voting. This results in many independent TDs receiving second, third and fourth level votes.

Constituents prefer to give their vote to the often more vocal and active independents that give their vote to their party's opposition. This results in a minority line of independents in the Dáil not backed by party loyalty.

Furthermore, independents tend to be more vocal in the Dáil and the better scrutineers of the government, as they are not bound by a whip system or party loyalty. This allows independents such as Claire Daley to appeal to voters by advocating contentious issues such as women's rights, and others such as Mick Wallace has directly called out state agency NAMA on 'Dodgy dealings' on Project Eagle (Northern Irish loans). Evidently, independent ability to speak out about such things and their high attendance in the Dáil make them popular at constituency level and explain why there are so many in the Dáil.

Lastly, the culture of localism and brokerage means that belonging to a party is less important and that through effective constituency work acting as welfare officer, public representative among other roles ensures that independents are on equal footing with other TDs at constituency level. This can be seen through studies showing TDs, like Mick Wallace's involvement as an intermediary between institutions vastly speeds up processes like receiving medical cards. This also explains why independents are prevalent in the Dáil.

Examiner's comments

This answer contains three reasons why there are so many independent TDs in the Dáil. The best of these is the third as it is clearly explained how the culture of localism in Ireland contributes to the survival of energetic independents. The first reason identified, the STV electoral system and how it allows voters to give later preferences to independents, is also relevant and well explained. The second reason given in the answer is more about the positive consequences of the large number of independents rather than the causes: they can support contentious issues or expose political malpractice. However, the consequences of having a large number of independents was not the issue.

Marks available 15. Marks awarded 12.

Q4 With reference to the Source and any other relevant information you have studied, assess the view that a Taoiseach today is little more than the “Chair” of the Cabinet. [30]

Student's response

In recent years it has been claimed that the Taoiseach is little more than a chair of his cabinet. Proponents would argue that because of the coalition nature of Irish govt, Taoisachs are resigned to little more than chairs. The addition of big beasts and even the Constitution itself will factor in to this widely held view. However, opponents argue that the Taoiseach is still 'leader' and as head of state has powers to make quick decisions and exercise his control over cabinet through hiring and firing.

Proponents argue that since the constitution came in effect in 1937, the Taoiseach is constitutionally limited to a 'chair' role by the limits it has on the Taoiseach power. Constitutionally, the Taoiseach may only have 15 ministers regardless of need, and also the limit that he/she may only select one senad member, something that hasn't been seen since Senator Dooge was appointed a ministerial position. This reinforces the belief that the Toaiseach is simply a Chair and doesn't in fact have much control of his cabinet.

However many refute this saying the constitution itself is what empowers the Taoiseach and that his powers to hire and fire prove him to be not simply a 'Chair'. An example of this ability is awarding junior ministerial position for past loyalty e.g. T.D. Bruton This proves that a Taoiseach is not simply a chair and has powers to enable him to simply take control – of the cabinet, and reward loyalty.

Another reason Why many argue that the Taoiseach is simply a 'Chair' is down to the coalition nature of Irish govts as they are usually minority govts as was the case with Aherns Fianna Fail government and Kenny's independent coalition. Minority govt means that coalitions need to be formed to ensure the govt can legislate and pass its programme for govt.

However, this limits the degree of control the Taoiseach may have over his cabinet as concessions must be made with coalition parties in terms of ministerial rates. This was the case in the Fianna Fail coalition with the Greens which allowed the Greens to have some say in the legislative process. For example, The Bill to ban stag hunting was largely as a result of this coalition with the Greens and Proves that coalition govt can ultimately show the Taoiseach as nothing more than a chair. This is compounded by Kenny's Independent alliance voting against him as mentioned in Source 1, further reinforcing the claim.

However, others refute this entirely stating that all legislation still must abide by the programme for govt, a document sometimes 30,000 words long and historically,

cabinet govt have an extremely high success rate of achieving (80%). This has led many commentators such as Fintan O'Toole to suggest that often coalition partner are guilty of 'the tail wagging the dog'. Therefore this contention refutes the claim that the Taoiseach is simply a chair.

Furthermore, many contend that the addition of Big Beasts further resign the Taoiseach to the role of Chair. An example of this was Aherns addition to Reynolds cabinet to silence any possible friction coming from his rival from the back benches. The addition of strong opposition within a Taoiseachs party means that he is insult limited in his control of his cabinet, and with only 15 posts available the addition of opposition reflects a major aspect as to why Taoiseachs are simply chairs.

However, many would argue that the inclusion of Big Beasts is an exhibition of a Taoiseachs control over cabinet as he is using his position to effectively silence opposition under the promise of collective ministerial responsibility. This was the case following Leo Varadkar winning the leadership battle in Fine Gael, and accordingly gave his second place rival and and opposition a ministerial role. This shows that th some respects the Taoiseach is in firm control of his cabinet.

Lastly, many argue that the relatively small number of TDs in Ireland (156 TDs) and the reputation of TDs to be 'Generalists' not 'specialists' (Alan Shatter) claim that Taoiseachs are limited by talent. This can lead to what many people describe as 'unfit' TDs being appointed as ministers and sometimes even Taoiseachs themselves (Kenny was dubbed the 'Accidental Taoiseach' due to his lack of a financial background). This lack of talent inevitably does restrict a Taoiseach control of cabinet and leads many to suggest the Taoiseach is simply a chair.

However, opponents claim it comes down to the personality of the Taoiseach in question. For example, Fitzgeralds notorious long meeting spending valuable time talking about unimportant topics proved him to be a Chair, similar to Kennys reputation for leaving legislation to ministers. This is in contrast to Taoiseachs like Veradker who have been deemed 'Chair' like, making quick decisions regarding hurricane Ophelia and his minority government's gritty involvement in legislation. These contrasts show the impact of a Taoiseachs personality on whatever he is seen as a chair.

In conclusion, although oppenents rightly claim that aspects like personality effect wether a Taoiseach is little more then a Chair, it is understandably true that because of coalition nature of govt and lack of expertise, the Taoiseach is largely limited to being a Chair.

Examiner's comments

This response contains significant relevant material and it appears the candidate has some understanding of the “Chairman or Chief” issue but this needed to be made more explicit. This should ideally have come at the beginning of the answer where it could have provided context for what followed. The answer does clearly present arguments for both sides, including the prevalence of coalition governments, therefore meeting the requirement for using the Source. However, more could have been made of Kenny’s difficulties through greater use of the Source. The answer does deal very well with the issue of “Big Beasts”, presenting two different interpretations of their inclusion in cabinet, with supporting evidence. The point about the personality of the Taoiseach was also well made but would have benefitted from more supporting evidence.

So, some very good material and evidence but the answer would have been better with an explicit explanation of the “Chair/Chief” concept, with greater use of the Source and with more supporting evidence.

Marks available 30. Marks awarded 23.

Section B: A Comparative Study of the Government and Politics of the Republic of Ireland and the UK

Q5 Identify and explain one similarity and one difference between Question Time in the Dáil and in the Commons. [10]

Student's response

In both the Dail and the Commons question time follows the same model (e.g. Westminster model) this means questions must be tested in advance and that supplementary unbaised questions are allowed: For example, despite having a question on Brexit tabled to Mr Javeed David, he was 'torn apart' in the supplementary questions similar to Francis Fitzgerald in the Dáil, who was torn apart in Question Time over allegations she misled the Dáil.

However one difference in the system is the culture of avoidance that exists in the Dáil. There is evident when Enda Kenny avoided Mick Wallaces question by answering him in Irish embarassing and avoiding a full answer in the process, also when asking a question of Enda Kenny, TD Mary-Lou McDonald launched into a personal attack on the Taoiseach. This is in stark contrast to the House of Commons question time were standing orders are adhered to and many past mavericks such as Dennis Skinner have often been asked to leave.

Examiner's comments

As required, there are two points clearly presented in this response. The first is a similarity that is well developed with supporting evidence. The second is less well explained. It is not clear whether the difference is the "culture of avoidance" or "personal attacks", both of which are included at this point. The candidate suggests that both are a feature of Question Time in the Dáil but not at Westminster, which is a questionable assertion.

Marks available 10. Marks awarded 7.

Q6a Assess the view that there is a strong case for keeping the Lords but not for retaining the Seanad. [30]

QUESTION NOT EXEMPLIFIED BY EXAMINER

Q6b "Parliament is much better at scrutinising the Executive than the Oireachtas." Assess the validity of this statement. [30]

Student's response

Many commentators such as Alan Shatter claim that today 'scrutiny in the Dáil is dead' and that in contrast, parliament offers a much better scrutiny role of the Executive. Proponents argue that the absence of localism and superior committee systems ensure that MPs provide a higher standard of scrutiny but opponents argue that the historic reputation Executive dominance of the Commons and the advent of political careerism in place of localism means that some disagree and contend both are equally good.

Proponents argue that due to the absence of localism in British politics, MPs have more time to perform adequate scrutiny of the executive. Studies show that MPs time spent 54% of their time in Parliament rather than their Irish counterparts lean towards constituency issues. Backbench MPs therefore have more opportunities to weigh in on debates, for example, The Commons heard multiple viewpoints of backbench MPs during Brexit debates. This is in sharp contrast to TDs in the Dáil who often contribute to a debate to 'show face' and then leave after. An example of this is when Fianna Fail leader Michael Martin joined a debate on repealing the 8th amendment, and after contributing soon left. This also highlights the issue of attendance in the Dáil in comparison to the Commons which is generally well attended. This somewhat shows that the commons is better equipped to provide a higher quality of scrutiny.

However, opponents argue that this lack of localism gives way for a higher degree of political careerism as reelection is largely based on your party in the commons due to the bi-partisan nature. This is something many TDs do not have time for as reelection is surely based on effects for constituents. Examples of careerism reducing the effectiveness of Parliaments ability to scrutinise is in Thatchers strong govt, she backed MP Carisle in favour of 'yes men to enable her already strong majority to effortlessly pass legislation. This leads many to argue that the Oireachtas is just as good in its role of scrutiny.

Moreover, careerism leads on to the aspect of further executive dominance of Parliament. With Blairs 160 strong majority, he was able to act as he pleased with little consultation with parliament and even at times, his Cabinet This is apparent in the case of the Iraq war, were despite opposition from parliament Britain still got

involved. Also, with Thatcher, an Iron will often made her known as the Iron Lady, and the concept of Thatcherism was soon born.

However, proponents would argue that although both govts were excessively powerful, it was Parliament itself that brought both them down.

In this respect, it is argued by opponents that due to the coalition nature of the Irish govts that the Oireachtas can perform some level of scrutiny and will not be resigned to a rubber stamp in the case of some strong British govts of past.

Proponents argue that a superior committee system in the UK makes it more successfully at scrutinising than its Irish counterparts. Since the Wright reforms in 2010, the addition of the Back Bench Business Committee and committee members now being chosen by secret ballot, absence of the whip system improves the legitimacy of British committees, and makes them more effective scrutinisers than their Irish counterparts. This is evident as the BBBC was the first committee to bring up the Brexit debate, which eventually led to a referendum.

This is in contrast to the Irish Committee system that has government majorities and no powers to summon people and papers the shortcoming are evident in the water committee, wherein such an important issue was plagued with absenteeism and a lack of discussion. Additionally, the refusal of Permanent TSB to show for a committee meeting over alleged 'Dodgy dealing' concerning Project Eagle further highlights inefficiency in the Irish Committee system.

In conclusion, although the Oireachtas does perform some level of scrutiny, it is evident because as the absence of localism as a superior committee system a Parliament scrutinise better.

Examiner's comments

There was a very impressive introduction to this answer, with the issue being clearly established and a number of substantive areas identified. The candidate correctly discussed the significance of localism in Ireland but the discussion could have been more balanced rather than implying it does not matter at all in the UK. The point about careerism in British politics is balanced but the explanation becomes confused and finishes with the implied conclusion that careerism is not something that affects TDs. There was also a lack of clarity in the discussion of the significance of the government's majority in the UK. The point about coalition government is relevant but could have been developed further. However, the discussion of committees in the two systems is clear and relevant.

The response begins and ends well. In the middle there is some confused and underdeveloped content.

Marks available 30. Marks awarded 22.

GCE: A2 Government and Politics

**AGP21: Political Power and
Political Ideas**

Grade: A Exemplar

Option A: Political Power

Answer **all five** questions, the **three** in Section A and the **two** in Section B

Section A: The factors involved in the exercise of political power

Read the Source below and refer to it in your answers to Questions 2 and 3.

Source

All states claim a monopoly on the legitimate use of coercive power within their society. In democracies there is limited use of coercion, in the form of the police and prisons, to preserve public order. In authoritarian systems, coercive power is used widely and routinely to keep the citizens obedient but this is expensive. Authoritarian systems will spend a significant part of their budget on coercion because, in the absence of legitimate authority, they have no choice but to use force and fear to subdue the population. However, critics of liberal democracies argue that in democratic systems, ideological control is used to deceive and dupe the masses.

- Q1** What is meant by the term “ideological control”? (Source, Line 7.) Support your answer with a relevant example. [5]

Student's response

The term ideological control leaves you as slaves or organisations use of influencing the masses beliefs on a subject to comply with the state/organisations views for example Marx referred to religion as the opium of the masses using a religions rules to comply with the bourgeonsis control. This use of influence is seen as a way to control the people with mass ideological beliefs.

Examiner's comments

There is relevant explanation of the concept of ideological control in this response but it could have been further developed. For example, reference could have been made to the mechanisms most commonly used by states to spread official ideology: the mass media and education. The reference to religion was appropriate but would have been enhanced by identification of a particular state that uses religion in this way.

Marks available 5. Marks awarded 4.

Q2 With reference to the Source and any other relevant material you have studied, explain **two** limitations of the use of coercive power. [10]

Student's response

The use of coercion can be met with relative acceptance by the people if kept in a limited amount however it does have limitations if used excessively for a state to maintain power.

One reason why coercive power is a limitation to a States control is because of the resources needed to keep mass coercion on a states citizens. Coercion is expensive and military funding can be draining to a state leading to economic issues for example North Korea faces massive amounts of starvation and economic problems such as its expense on a nuclear program leading to Pyongyang Hotel development being stopped twice and is still not completed. This shows how a states use of coercion can drain its economy and bring more issues to a state if it relies on coercion to keep control like North Korea with the Kim family which shows how a states use or coercion can be a limitation.

Another reason that a state use of coercion is a limitation is that some states use on coercion on its own citizens can be counter-productive if it relies on this to keep control. One issue is rebellion to the state when met with coercion can lead to more rebellion for example the executions of the 1916 Easter Rising leaders bred more hatred to the British Government and led to be war of independence, previously Irish citizens didn't care much for rebellions until after the executions. This show how coercion can be counter-productive and lead to resentment to the enforcers of it showing how a states use of coercion can be seen as a limitation to a coercive state.

Examiner's comments

Much of what was required by the question is present in this response. Two limitations are clearly identified. The Source is used for the first and supporting examples are included. The first limitation could have been expanded to include the point that expenditure on coercive control affects spending on other, more legitimising, forms of state activity. The Pyongyang Hotel reference does not achieve this. The second limitation, the counter-productive nature of coercion is also valid but some further analysis of why this is so would have enhanced the response.

Marks available 10. Marks awarded 8.

- Q3** Using material from the Source and any other relevant material you have studied, explain why democracies involve only the “limited use of coercion”. (Source, Line 2.) [20]

Student's response

The use of coercion was stated by Weber as all societies use coercion, However the states that use only coercion are doomed to fail. Coercion can be used by a number of ways to keep control or order to a state which is why democracies use coercion in limited amounts to keep control without abusing the people influencing the states stability.

Democracies use a limited use of coercion because of the damaging effects extreme reliance of coercion creates and so bodies such as police, judiciary and laws are set up to keep order but not to cause an abuse on rights and used illegitimately for example the police ombudsmen in Northern Ireland is set as a check on the police's use of coercion to ensure they are not infringing citizens rights or acting like a maverick force. This is used to show legitimate uses by policing to ensure not only that a democratic state is kept in order but also to ensure the people get protecting from other peoples lawlessness thus so me people accept misuse of coercion as a legitimate use of the states authority. This is one of the lessons liberal democracies only involve in use of limited coercion as it legitimises the state.

Another reason liberal democracies only involved with a limited use of coercion is to keep stability as many states may solely rely on coercion alone face the possibility to collapse for example President Assad of Syria used extreme coercive measures to stop political opponents by sending the military on the streets of Syria to scare citizens and prevent more opposition in turn this led to more rebel recruitment and a bloody civil war since 2011 leading to 400,000 deaths. This shows how a states use of extreme coercive measures lead to an instable state and so liberal democracies only rely on this use when it's needed and in small quantities to keep order but also not cause a threat to the states stability for example Eisenhowers deployment of the national guard in Little Rock , Arkansas as use being hold the desegregated schooling law and didn't cause rebellion as his use of the guards was used in a deterrent rather than threatening manner keeping the US stable. This shows the difference between authoritarian use of coercion and liberal democracies which is why liberal democracies only involve limited use of coercion as it keeps the states stability strong.

Another reason for using liberal democracies only involve limited uses of coercion is to keep an authority check over the state as states that solely use coercion when needed to ensure authority like liberal democracies often lead to the citizens and other states complying for example the founding fathers expressed the use of a strong defence force as to protect itself from colonial powers overpowering the state. This was met with encouragement by the people as they saw the states authority

and use or coercion as fall and so this use of coercion still limited to times of crises in many liberal democracies limit their use of coercion as its seen as the legitimate use of the states authority.

Unlike the other systems used under authoritarian rule such as North Korea who have spent over 50 years into military defence of the state which was not met with the peoples acceptance as this led to poverty, economic issues, starvation. This shows how other states use of coercion on a larger level to ensure authority is not met with consent and is the reason why many liberal democracies do not use this amount of coercion, and involve only a limited amount.

Liberal democracies only involve with the limited use of coercion as it is seen as counter productive to use extreme levels to keep order to a state for example the Arab Spring begun because of the economic policy failure in states like Tunisia and Egypt at the extreme use of coercion to cope with this led to a global supply of collapsing coercive states.

Examiner's comments

In contrast to many other answers that simply described the use of coercion by authoritarian states, this response attempted to directly address the question and was credited for doing so. The response contains some very good material on coercion causing instability and being expensive.

The point given in the Source that states with legitimacy do not need to use a high degree of coercion could have been further developed in the response as it is obviously a crucial factor. The second paragraph includes the valid argument that there are mechanisms in liberal democracies to present the excessive use of coercion but this was presented in a confused way. There was also some confusion in the presentation of other arguments: "to keep an authority check over the state." The Level 4 descriptor in the Mark Scheme refers to "clear and full analysis" and, in places, this answer falls short of that.

The use of authoritarian states as examples was acceptable as long as this led to a point being made about liberal democracies.

Marks available 20. Marks awarded 15.

Section B: Theories of Power

Q4 What is meant by the term “circulation of elites”? [5]

Student's response

The term circulation of elites is a term created by Michel's belief that the elite will always rise to the top now no matter which system when one elite falls another replaces it for example his research into Germany saw what the one's with the best traits/abilities always rose to the powerful positions. Such as Adolf Hitler with charismatic language rose to become fuhrer and dictator of the previous liberal democracy.

Examiner's comments

“Circulation of Elites” was partly explained in this answer: “when one elite falls another replaces it.” However, a Level 3 response required a more developed explanation of the concept. Michels' work could have been used to support the explanation but this was not the case. This was also the case with the example referring to Hitler. So not a basic explanation but one that needed more in the way of relevant content.

Marks available 5. Marks awarded 3.

Q5a Evaluate the view that wealth is the basis of political power in all political systems. [35]

Student's response

The view that wealth is the basis of power in all political systems is an idea created by Marxists who saw a key divide in societies specifically capitalist. This was the controllers of the means of production and the wealthy (Bourgeois) and the workers of factories and and the low class (Proletariat)

Marx and Engels were the first to see the idea of a class divide by the idea of wealth and saw that 'those who make me gold make the rules' spreading the idea that wealth as the basis of power and that the Bourgeois used this power to keep the Proletariat down and prevent them from gaining power for example Tsarist Russia is a key example of aristocratic rule with those in high society and wealthy backgrounds running the state and abusing the lower class. One of the key fixes to this issue was the idea of a class based revolution and he removed capitalism.

Gramsci also saw the idea that wealth is the basis of power in all political systems but instead saw the idea of hegemony. He saw democracy as a sham and that the Bourgeois' used things like media and propaganda as a way to stop the proletariat from seeing a difference in the classes are that they are being looked out for examples of this hegemony in democracies is in British with Murdoch using sky and the times to get right wing views and keep the working class from overthrowing the government. This shows why many politicians get in close with people like Rupert Murdoch to keep the status quo and create a 'false class consciousness' to the masses showing how wealth is the basis of power even in liberal democracies.

Milliband is different from other theorists as he sought after research into positional Eastern European states which claimed to already be communist and also Democratic states in the west. He saw a direct link between the wealthy and those who are in government and claimed that he set up of conservative parties and one party states allows for the wealthy to create a smokescreen over the working class for example Cameron's government had millionaires in his cabinet and Eastern European states like Poland faces heavy corruption from wealthy comrades of Stalin while he people suffered emense poverty. Thus showing Millibands idea of the wealthy directly ruling the state in both 'communist' and democratic states proving he idea of wealth being the basis is of power.

Although Marxists believe that wealth is the basis of power in all political systems there are other theories that undermine his accusation and suppose others ideas on how political systems run and the basis of power.

Pluralists disagree with this claim of wealth being the basis of power in all political systems as pluralists state that liberal democracies rely on the idea of the people having powers based on pluralists statement 'power is here and everywhere'. Pluralists point out the power of groups led by the people being the basis of power such as Hewitt who studied in Britain on 24 issues and saw that the main basis to the decisions made on these issues matched those of certain interest groups. This shows how liberal democracies such as Britian wealth is not the basis of power and that it could be shown to pressure groups such as Greenpeace who influence the government to vote in their interests as pluralist suggest power is held under Polyarchy rule of the many.

Elitists agree with Marxists idea that political systems are ruled by a minority However they do not see wealth as the basis of power as classic elitists such as Pareto and Mosca see power as ruled by the superiors and that the few who do to rule are there because they have better traits and skills than the masses such as Pareto's 'lions' and who rule through force and of 'foxes' who rule by charisma and cunning. Elitists also see elite rule as invimble unlike Marxists and do not see a class based revolution as possible. Power elitists however do not see elite rule or oligarchy as inevitable however theorists like Mill's also don't see wealth as a basis of power but instead see institutions such as 50's Amercia's military, Government and business as the basis of power and the idea of inter changeable elitists.

Feminists like Marxists and elitists see see a group who dominate Powers at political systems flawed they do not see wealth as the basis of power but instead may see the idea of politically as the basis of power. Feminists see man as the Rulers of all political systems and express the idea of keeping women down to be exploited by unequal pay, low level jobs and domestic work in the family. Theorists such as Greer a radical feminists sees the idea of the family and work as the oppressor of women set upon as a patriarchal system for to prevent women from gaining powers for example in 2010 there also was only 1 woman in the British cabinet (Theresa May) and also in 2014 it was suggested that the pay gap makes women work 2 months a year for free compared to men. This shows how the feminists see aspects in society and claim that the true basis of powers is patriarchy and not wealth.

Overall in some societies wealth can be seen as a basis of power such as monarchies like imperialist Russia However through their decline through 300 years and the legitimisation of democratic principles like the House of Commons having more power than the House of Lords it is unlikely for Marxists to be correct on the idea that wealth is the basis of power in all political systems.

Examiner's comments

There was a fair degree of Marxist Theory in this response although additional content would have enhanced the answer, specifically, Marx's own view of the capitalist state being a committee for managing the affairs of the bourgeoisie. The answer also contains relevant evidence but, as with the response to Question 3, there is some confusion in the presentation. This is especially so in the paragraph on Miliband although the final sentence does provide some clarity about the point being made.

As pointed out in Chief Examiner's Reports, a limitation of 'Theories' responses under the Legacy Specification was the evaluation of the theory under examination. Many candidates sought to critique a theory simply by describing other theories. This response illustrates this point in the account of Pluralist Theory. There is little attempt to explain how Pluralists would challenge the view that wealth is always the basis of political power. The section on Elite Theory is more directly evaluative. The account of Feminist Theory would have benefitted from some recognition of the variants within Feminism. So, the requirement of the Mark Scheme for "clear and full..evaluation of..arguments" was only partly met.

Marks available 35. Marks awarded 26.

Q5b "Liberal democracy is not perfect but it is the best political system there is."
Evaluate this view. [35]

QUESTION NOT EXEMPLIFIED BY EXAMINER

Option B: Political Ideas

Answer **all five** questions, the **three** in Section A and the **two** in Section B

Section A: Texts

Read the Source below and refer to it in your answers to Questions 2 and 3.

Source

The various interests and conditions of life within the ranks of the proletariat are more and more equalised, in proportion as machinery obliterates all distinctions of labour, and nearly everywhere reduces wages to the same low level.

The proletariat alone is a really revolutionary class. The other classes decay and finally disappear in the face of Modern Industry; the proletariat is its special and essential product.

In depicting the most general phases of the development of the proletariat, we traced the more or less veiled civil war, raging within existing society, up to the point where that war breaks out into open revolution, and where the violent overthrow of the bourgeoisie lays the foundation for the sway of the proletariat.

Adapted from: Marx and Engels, The Communist Manifesto, 1848

Q1 What did Marx and Engels mean by the “conditions of life within the ranks of the proletariat are more and more equalised”? (Source, Lines 1, 2.) [5]

Student's response

Within the source when Marx states that the conditions of the proletariat are becoming 'more and more equalised', Marx is referring to his belief that under capitalism, the proletariat are continuously becoming increasingly appressed by the bourgeois. This is a result of the bourgeois desire to maximise their own personal wealth, which is a by-product of the capitalist economic system, which corrupts man to pursue the continued increase of their wealth.

In order to achieve this, the bourgeoisie through mechanisation, divide labour and made proletarian work is increasingly simplistic which alienates the working class, and takes away the fruits of their labour. In contemporary society, this has been displayed by the conservative party giving public sector jobs a 6% pay rise over the last 5 years, which is essentially a pay cut when aligned with inflation. As a result the proletarian becoming increasingly equqlised, as they all suffer a similar plight.

Examiner's comments

A feature of a significant number of answers to this question was general statements about the exploitation and conditions of life of the proletariat becoming worse. This answer has more than this by way of explanation, specifically the references to "mechanisation" and "work increasingly simplistic." However, the points that Marx and Engels were making in the statement in the question, the disappearance of divisions within the proletariat and the consequences of this for revolution were only partly developed.

Marks available 5. Marks awarded 3.

Q2 With reference to the Source and any other relevant material you have studied, explain the Communist Manifesto's argument that a proletarian revolution was inevitable. [10]

Student's response

In the Communist Manifesto, Marx and Engels state that the overthrow of capitalism by the proletariat inevitable, as the proletariat are a 'really revolutionary class'. Marx argues that at the dawn of capitalism, the norms and values of the people have been altered to be increasingly individualistic, oppressive and self-serving. He displays this in the manifesto as he states that the bourgeoisie are 'drowned in the icy waters of egotistical calculation', as a result of this extreme individualism promoted by capitalism, Marx argues that the four bourgeoisie will continuously strive to increase their surplus value.

In order to achieve this, Marx states that through technological advancement, 'machinery obliterates all distinctions of labour'. As a result of this continuous despoiling of the working class, they will become increasingly impoverished as 'everywhere reduces wages to the same level'.

After this, Marx argues that the proletariat will begin to reject the capitalistic ideas they have been socialised from birth to conform to, and as a result will gain class consciousness and become a 'really revolutionary class'.

Finally, Marx believes that when the plight and oppression suffered under capitalism reaches its most intense point, the workers will pursue the 'violent overthrow of the bourgeoisie' and Marx prediction of a varying class revolution will occur.

An example of this throughout history would be establishment of communist states in Cuba, Vietnam and Russia, however, these were not entirely similar to the workers revolution Marx predicted.

Examiner's comments

As required by the question, this response contains a good combination of material from the Source and the candidate's own knowledge. The answer correctly seeks to explain the argument that a proletarian revolution is inevitable because of the nature of capitalism. There is some very good material on, for example, the growth of revolutionary consciousness among the working class. Some more detail on Marx's analysis would have made the answer even stronger: the crises of overproduction and the boom/slump instability of capitalism that would in the end lead the working class to revolt. The answer finishes with some examples which the candidate acknowledges do not fit the model of a workers' revolution so their purpose is undermined.

Marks available 10. Marks awarded 8.

Q3 Using material from the Source and any other relevant material you have studied, explain how the idea of an inevitable proletarian revolution has been criticised. [20]

Student's response

Whilst Marx views the proletariat as a 'really revolutionary class' and believes the 'violent overthrow of the bourgeoisie' to be inevitable, this belief is rejected by various other ideologies. This view point is also criticised by many other individuals within socialist thought, who believe that the revolution and unnecessary and also by those who believe that capitalism and socialism are not mutually exclusive.

Anglo-Irish Conservative Edmund Burke would criticise the Marxist idea of the 'violent overthrow of the bourgeoisie' as abhorrent. Within reflections, Burke speaks of the organic nature of our society, which has developed over hundreds of years to meet the needs of humanity. As a result of this, Burke believes that the status quo of our society should be maintained, as it has worked from past generations and as a result should be preserved for future generations. Similarly, he would view the ideas of socialism as being a simple ideological construction, which has not been tried and test and should hence not replace our existing society structure. This is due to the modern state having 'all things illustrious in rank' Whilst the idea of socialism is merely just a radical solution to something which doesn't need fixing. An example of a conservative maintaining the organic nature of society is the British Conservative party, who socialist ideals such as free healthcare and pensions for workers in the 1940's, in order to maintain the status quo of British Society. This shows that Conservatives criticise the Marxist idea that a proletarian revolution is inevitable, as it is not grounded in empiricism.

Additionally, within the socialist school of thought, Democratic Socialists such as Benn criticise the idea of a proletarian revolution, as it will inevitable lead to instability. Democratic socialists such as Corbyn and Sanders in the modern era see the revolution as futile, as it will not win over the hearts and minds of the wider electonate, who are currently in a state of 'false class conscious' – Marx and do not support socialism.

In order to gain popular support, they believe in the 'road to gradualism'. this essentially means that through democratic methods they will slavly convince those in a state of false class consciousness to endorse their party. They then believe that after they enter government the benefits of socialism will so easily win over the people that they will no longer elect bourgeois parties. As a result they believe the longevity of socialism will be retained, as if the revolution occurs, the opponents of socialism will likely attempt to oppose the revolution after the voruers have seized power. An example of a successful democratic socialist is ex Venezuela President Hugo Chavez, who gained power in the late 90's and maintained his position up until his death in 2012, showing the longevity of democratic socialism. This clearly shows that democratic socialists criticise Marx's idea of an inevitable proletarian revolution,

as it is an ineffective road to the 'end of history' – Marx as it will eventually lead to instability.

Finally, liberals such as Mill also criticise the idea of an inevitable proletarian revolution, as they believe that free market capitalism is a route to freedom for all. Mill believes that in his notion of liberal society, there is an equality of opportunity in which all have an equal opportunity to succeed. As a result. He believes that the revolution is futile and unjust, as under socialism there is no true justice on meritocracy as a result of equality of outcome.

Consequently, classical liberals such as Mill view the revolution as unnecessary, as under industrialised capitalism, all workers have the opportunity to reach the 'height of their faculties' – Mill. A contemporary example of equality of opportunity occurred in New Hampshire in 2015, as the courts struck down the need for colleges to have affirmative action quotas, hence giving all an equal opportunity to enter college.

In conclusion, it is clear that Marx and Engels idea of a 'civil war' between the bourgeoisie and the proletariat resulting in an inevitable revolution, is criticised by many other ideologies and socialist thinkers. This includes conservatives, who believe it undermines the organic analogy, democratic socialists who believe it is ineffective and undermines the longevity of socialism and also classical liberals, who view it as futile as equality of opportunity already exists and hence a revolution is unnecessary.

Examiner's comments

This response is a mixture of directly relevant critical material and content that is much less direct. The material on Burke falls into the former category because it does seek to address the issue of revolution and whether it is necessary or sensible. The section on Mill also has relevance in the argument that capitalism creates equality of opportunity that makes revolution unnecessary. However, the attempt to represent Mill as a defender of industrial capitalism is at odds with the facts. The section on Mill finishes with an example of dubious relevance.

The views of others socialists on the need for a proletarian revolution are certainly relevant to this question. However, the answer to a degree confuses Democratic Socialism and Social Democracy. Democratic Socialists are presented as supporters of the "road to gradualism." The relevance of the Venezuelan example given at the end of this section is not clear. However, credit was given for identifying other strands of Socialism with different views of the need for revolution.

This answer represents a "theories" approach to this question. It would have benefitted the answer if some more empirical evidence of the failure of the revolution had been included. This could include the growing exploitation of the working class, the disappearance of divisions within the proletariat and the ever more acute crises of capitalism. All of these predictions, critics argue, did not happen.

Marks available 20. Marks awarded 13.

Section B: Ideologies

Q4 What is meant by the term “natural rights”? Support your answer with a relevant example. [5]

Student's response

The term natural rights is a liberal concept coined by John Locke. It refers to 3 inalienable rights humans are endowed with at birth, which include life, liberty and property. Locke believes that it is the role of the State to uphold these natural rights and if they do not, these rights are still ingrained within individuals, who are having their rights stripped away by a tyrannical state. An example of natural rights is within the 1776 declaration of independence, as Jefferson directly referenced them when he stated that all Americans have a right to 'life, liberty and the pursuit of happiness'.

Examiner's comments

This was a full marks response because it has Locke, it has a clear definition of natural rights as inalienable and it has examples of such rights. It also gives the Liberal view that states that interfere with natural rights are tyrannical and finishes with an example of the political impact of the concept.

Marks available 5. Marks awarded 5.

Q5a Evaluate the Conservative view that human beings are weak and irrational creatures whose behaviour needs to be controlled. [35]

Student's response

As a whole, the conservative disposition take a negative stance on human nature. Generally speaking, they believe humanity has a potential 'oppressive servitude' – Burke that must be restrained and deterred by the State.

Conservatives also take a benevolent view of inequality and state that whilst many people are weak this is necessary as they fulfil a role in natural society. However, many conservatives such as von Hayen and the New Right believe that human beings are weak and irrational creatures whose behaviour needs to be controlled.

Within his text reflections on the revolution in France, Burke openly states that the behaviour of humanity need to be restrained by the State. This is displayed when he describes the French revolutionaries as 'heinous men and women lost to shame'. Generally speaking, Burke does not view humanity as wholly negative and believes that those of 'wisdom and virtue' are not wholly weak and irrational, as they understand the need to restrain liberty in order to tame the negative human conscious. Yet in spite of this Burke observes the activities of the French revolutions who are taken part in irrational and inhuman violence which must be restrained by the state. A contemporary example of behaviour being restrained occurred in 2016 through the passage of the investigatory powers act in the UK. This legislation is used to undermine personal privacy and as a result make it easier for the police service to re-establish order by arresting irrational individuals. As a result, this legislation will control the behaviour of weak and irrational, as it will deter them from committing crime.

This idea would be criticised by Marx, who believes that criminal activity, by individuals who conservatives label as weak and irrational, is simply a by-product of the criminogenic nature of capitalism. However from this it is clear that Burke believes that many, yet not all humans, are weak and irrational individuals whose behaviour needs to be controlled.

Contrary to this, within the conservative school of thought, Burke would be criticised by Michael J Oakshott. In his writing, Oakshott characterises humans as 'not terrible, but fallible'. This is due to his rejection of human perfection, an idea promoted by socialists and liberals. As a result, Oakshott believes that humanity is capable of making mistakes and is also self-seeking, yet they are not inherently terrible. Due to this, Oakshott is set apart from other conservatives, as whilst he believes that some need controlled, he does not endorse the view point that they are irrational and terrible.

An example of Oakshott's view of human nature occurred during the 2009 MP expenses scandal, as this proved that individuals left uncontrolled are weak and self seeing, yet not necessarily terrible.

Similar to Oakshott, John Stewart Mill would concur with his belief on human nature to an extent as he views humanity as selfish. Yet Mill and other liberals hold an alternative view on humanity, as they view man as rational.

Completely opposed to Oakshott would be von Hayen and the New Right, who view his analysis as being lazy and also influenced by frequent socialist thinking. Whilst von Hayen is a proponent of free market economics, he wholly endorses the idea that human beings are weak and irrational creatures whose behaviour needs to be controlled. This is a result of the welfare state created by Atlee in the 1940's leading to the onset of a dependency culture. Consequently, this led to the dawn of the underclass, who personify the conservative notion of weak and irrational human beings as they are inherently criminal, as due to the poverty brought on by welfare dependency, they use crime to subsist. Contemporarily, this is evident through ONS statistics which found that 1 billion each year is lost in the UK on benefit fraud.

In order to counter this, Modern Conservative parties in the UK reformed welfare in 2012, and have since then continued to cut it. Concurrently, they have also made harsher policing measures, in order to control the behaviour of the weak and irrational underclass. This is exemplified in the highest prison population in Europe of 86,000, this is a method which controls criminals, whilst also deterring future criminals.

Evidentially, it is clear from this that the New Right and von Hayen endorse the idea that humans are weak, irrational and need to be controlled.

Yet, Marx would critique this idea, as he would believe that through continuous deskilling and mechanisation, the underclass have been forced to adopt crime as a survival strategy.

In conclusion, it is clear that not all conservatives endorse the idea that human beings are weak and irrational creatures that need controlled. This is displayed by Burke, who believes that while some humans are in need of control, those with 'wisdom and virtue' do not. Additionally, this is also shown by Oakshott who believes that not all human beings are irrational, but rather fallible. Finally, it is clear that the New Right do support the idea that human beings are weak and irrational characters whose behaviour needs controlled, which could lead one to argue that the current conservative view that humanity is wholly in need of control is a result of the Thatcher and Reagan governments of the 1980's.

Examiner's comments

A significant number of the responses to Question 5a reduced Conservatism to just Burke. The same was also true of some answers to 5b: Liberalism is Mill. Under the Revised Specification, the questions in Section B will be about the ideology as a whole and to only refer to one representative of the ideology is a major limitation. However, this answer did not do this. Burke is present but so are Oakeshott and Hayek and the New Right.

Another positive feature of this answer is that it focuses on the issue of whether Conservatives believe human beings are weak and irrational. The discussions of Burke, Oakeshott and Hayek are all sophisticated and nuanced. There is reference to Modern Conservatism but the views of One Nation Conservatives deserved some more attention, specifically their more paternalistic view of human nature.

There is some evaluation of Conservative ideas from other ideological perspectives but this is underdeveloped. More on how Liberals and Socialists would critique the Conservative view of human beings would have taken this very good answer into Level 5.

Marks available 35. Marks awarded 28.

Q5b Evaluate the Liberal view that the state poses the greatest threat to individual liberty and therefore state power must be strictly limited. [35]

QUESTION NOT EXEMPLIFIED BY EXAMINER



INVESTORS
IN PEOPLE

