Answers to practice questions

The following is a list of suggested material for exam answers, to provide a starting point when planning answers. It is not intended to be exhaustive, and the exam board will reward any other relevant points. Detailed and up-to-date examples are particularly important to achieving the top grades.

Theme 1 UK government and politics

Chapter 1 Democracy and participation

Source-based question

- Civil rights are not increasingly under threat:
  - **'The Human Rights Act … is central to the current system of rights protection… Freedom of Information Act 2000 and Equality Act 2010.'** Several significant parliamentary statutes have been enacted to protect and advance civil liberties. These provide enhanced protection for civil rights — especially the Human Rights Act (AO1, AO2). However, none represents a higher constitutional law so Parliament is still sovereign (AO3).
  - **'Ongoing development of the "common law rights" jurisprudence.'** Acts of Parliament protecting civil rights can be referred to by judges when they make case law. This judge-made case law provides enhanced common law protection for civil rights (AO1, AO2). However, parliamentary statute still takes precedence and without a codified constitution, Parliament is still sovereign and could enact legislation undermining civil rights if it so wished (AO3).
  - **'Human rights values attract substantial support — in particular from civil society groups.'** Civil liberties pressure groups (e.g. Liberty, Human Rights Watch and Amnesty International) campaign on behalf of civil rights. They are essential in a pluralist democracy, ensuring that governments are publicly held accountable for any reduction of civil rights (AO1, AO2). However, although they can provoke debate, their influence is limited, especially if a government has a strong parliamentary majority (AO3).
- Civil rights are increasingly under threat:
  - **'Successive UK governments have introduced legislation that has diluted protections for civil liberties and fundamental rights.'** Several Acts of Parliament, including the Investigatory Powers Act (2016) and Police, Crime, Sentencing and Courts Act (2022), have impacted civil liberties. As parliamentary statutes they must be adhered to in the courts as there is no higher constitutional law (AO1, AO2). However, equally, some governments have introduced legislation to extend civil rights, such as the Equality Act (2010) (AO3).
  - **'It is likely that this pattern will continue.'** Since 9/11 governments on both the left and the right have enacted legislation that has impacted civil society to enhance public security (AO1, AO2). Since threats to public security are unlikely to disappear, there will always be a tension between individuals' rights and the need to protect society (AO3).
  - **'Repeal of the HRA and its replacement by a "British Bill of Rights".'** Conservative politicians often criticise the European Convention on Human Rights. The monarch's speech (2022) committed the Johnson government to modifying it and introducing a British Bill of Rights. Important safeguards in the Human Rights Act, such as the right to freedom of expression (Article 10) and freedom of assembly (Article 11), could be reduced (AO1, AO2). However, all the other political parties remain committed to the Human Rights Act, as do some Conservative backbenchers, so there is still

significant support for the Act. This suggests that civil rights are not under threat. Some Conservative politicians would also argue that a British Bill of Rights provides a better way of protecting civil rights (AO3).

Evaluative questions

1

- **Introduction:** Representative democracy is often criticised for being out of touch and insufficiently connected to the UK public. However, it can be extremely responsive to changing public attitudes and its representative strengths have been fortified significantly in recent years.
- The way in which the House of Commons is elected by first-past-the-post means that it does not fairly represent the way in which the UK public voted. The Liberal Democrats as well as emerging/minority parties are discriminated against (AO1, AO2). However, each constituency has an MP who is expected to represent the views of all constituents, ensuring that all UK citizens are equally represented in Parliament (AO3).
- Critics claim that the House of Commons is too middle class and male to be able to represent UK public opinion. The House of Lords is also socially conservative and unaccountable to the public and so unrepresentative (AO1, AO2). However, Westminster has enacted significant progressive social legislation, which suggests that it is not so out of touch with contemporary Britain. In terms of LGBTQ+, MPs are highly representative. The percentage of female and minority ethnic MPs has increased significantly. The House of Lords has a significant number of crossbenchers — their independence from party political restraint enables them to better represent the public (AO3).
- There is a danger that lobbying firms and special interest groups can dominate Westminster discussion, disengaging Parliament from the public (the revolving door argument) (AO1, AO2). However, significant steps have been taken to make the Westminster Parliament more accountable to the British public, with electronic petitions ensuring that Parliament must engage with issues of sufficient public concern. Referendums (direct democracy) have also taken place on major issues of public concern (EU membership, 2016), providing an important mechanism of direct democracy within the representative Westminster model (AO3).
- Since 1997, Westminster has devolved power to the constituent parts of the UK (Scotland, Wales and Northern Ireland), allowing them significantly greater self-determination in their domestic affairs. Power has also been decentralised to elected mayors and metro mayors (AO1, AO2). This suggests that UK citizens are well represented. However, this representation is asymmetric since not all cities and towns have elected mayors and England does not have its own parliament (AO3).
- **Conclusion:** Although there are challenges to the representative nature of UK democracy, it possesses significant strengths that enable it to generally respond to the public in an effective manner. However, there are still ways in which further reform is required to ensure completely fair representation.

2

- **Introduction:** Critics claim that a greater use of direct democracy (referendums, e-petitions, power of recall and consultative exercises) will stimulate greater participation. However, greater use of direct democracy could also lead to democratic overload and undermine the existing strengths of representative democracy.
- More opportunities for direct democracy, such as referendums on issues of national, regional and local concern, could engage the public more with issues that directly concern them. This would encourage greater self-determination, so strengthening UK democracy (AO1, AO2). However, turnout in referendums is often very low so the results can lack legitimacy. This suggests that a greater use of referendums could disrupt representative democracy by producing results based on

a very low turnout. This has been a problem in the Republic of Ireland where there are numerous referendums (AO3).

- By encouraging direct democracy, the public become more engaged with politics and can exert more influence over decision making within a representative democracy. This can be exercised through electronic petitions, power of recall and referendums, making representatives more accountable to the public (AO1, AO2). However, direct democracy challenges the representative role of MPs and other elected politicians. Elected representatives balance conflicting interests and are expected to be well informed. Direct democracy could make MPs subservient to the electorate, so undermining the Burkean concept of trusteeship (AO3).
- The greater use of direct democracy provides greater opportunities for the public to regularly engage in politics. This encourages a more participatory democracy based on enhanced civic responsibility. The greater use of direct democracy would therefore improve representative democracy since its educative role would encourage a more politically informed citizenry (AO1, AO2). However, the public may not be well informed enough to make informed decisions, and direct democracy can encourage a populist response to contentious issues. The greater use of direct democracy might therefore encourage a majoritarian democracy at the expense of liberal democracy (AO3).
- Direct democracy (e-petitions) ensures that politicians are fully aware of issues that the public feel strongly about and so encourages more responsive representative democracy (AO1, AO2). However, politicians are already aware of public opinion through the regular use of opinion polls, so the greater use of direct democracy is not necessary (AO1, AO2).
- **Conclusion:** Although the greater use of direct democracy would enable the public to engage more in the political process, this would undermine rather than enhance the strengths of representative democracy.

3

- **Introduction:** Thinks-tanks lobbyists and pressure groups all aim to put pressure on governments to adopt the policies they favour. They can deploy similar tactics to gain public support, such as high-profile publicity events. However, to say that their tactics are always similar would be an exaggeration.
- Lobbyists, pressure groups and social movements can all organise media-friendly public events to gain publicity. Lobbyists organised a parliamentary pigeon race on behalf of the Raptor Alliance and pressure groups often arrange publicity-generating events such as the Stop the War Coalition marches and the Make Poverty History concerts. Mind works with celebrities to engage understanding of mental health issues (AO1, AO2). However, only some radical pressure groups and social movements such as Extinction Rebellion and Black Lives Matter use direct action to achieve their objectives (AO3).
- Lobbyists focus on achieving insider status so that they can influence government. This involves meeting key decision makers such as politicians and civil servants and being represented on select committees. Pressure groups can also seek to achieve insider status using similar methods (Friends of the Earth, Oxfam or the Confederation of British Industry) (AO1, AO2). Social movements such as Extinction Rebellion and Black Lives Matter are unlikely to use these tactics as they are based on a more grassroots approach to encouraging political change through direct action (AO3).
- Pressure groups and social movements are likely to use electronic petitions to make the government aware of public attitudes (Marcus Rashford e-petition). They can also try to generate positive media coverage in the newspapers and on television through high-profile campaigns such as Justice for Gurkhas (AO1, AO2). Lobbying groups are more likely to focus on achieving insider status by cultivating strong links in government (TaxPayers' Alliance) (AO3).

- Pressure groups can use the courts to try to put a stop to government action. The campaign to stop HS2 tried to use judicial review to stop it. Liberty supported Ed Bridges' case against South Wales Police for storing facial recognition records (AO1, AO2). Lobbyists are less likely to use these tactics as they wish to establish strong links with the government (AO3).
- **Conclusion:** There is some overlap between the methods lobbyists, pressure groups and social movements use. However, outside pressure groups and social movements are likely to deploy very different tactics from lobbyists and pressure groups with insider status.

Chapter 2 Political parties

Source-based question

- Parties strengthen UK democracy:
  - **'MPs would still need to conclude on a prime minister, a government and a policy programme to be implemented.'** Political parties are essential in enabling governments to be formed and policies to be decided upon (AO1, AO2). Without political parties it would be extremely difficult to aggregate so many different individual opinions to establish a government and implement policy (AO3).
  - **'Voters already know before the election about the likely policies a winning party is going to implement.'** By publishing the same political manifesto across the nation, voters have a clear understanding of the policies that each political party would implement in government, (AO1, AO2). If political parties did not exist, then voters would not know what the choice of governments they were electing would be. This would therefore mean that voters would be denied political choice when deciding how to vote.
  - **'Too many individual, competing proposals.'** Without political parties there would be a huge choice of different policy platforms from which to choose (AO1, AO2). This would confuse the electorate by providing too many choices, making it much more difficult to establish coherent choices. Political parties reduce this confusion by providing clear choices from which to select (AO3).
- Parties weaken UK democracy:
  - **'Party patronage.'** Political parties exert significant patronage powers when in government. For example, party leaders influence appointments to the House of Lords and public bodies. Such cronyism can reduce trust in political parties (AO1, AO2). However, patronage could still take place without the existence of political parties. A government of individual politicians could still exert patronage powers (AO3).
  - **'Group discipline.'** By controlling party discipline the whips try to ensure that representatives obey party policy. This reduces the MPs' independence and can make it more difficult for them to represent the interests of their constituents (AO1, AO2). However, there are numerous examples of MPs not obeying the dictates of the whips, suggesting group discipline can be exaggerated (AO3).
    - **'Party finance scandals.'** There have been several scandals involving large donations to political parties from disreputable sources. This has undermined trust in politicians (AO1, AO2). However, this argument can be exaggerated because by exposing such scandals, the media encourages parties not to break the rules. Also, some protection is provided by the Political Parties, Elections and Referendums Act (2000) (AO3).

Evaluative questions

1

- **Introduction:** Since the leadership of David Cameron, the Conservative Party has become much more socially liberal in contrast to the social conservatism of Thatcherism. The Johnson government's big government policies contrasted with the Thatcherite focus on small government. However, in terms of the nation state, law and order, defence and foreign policies there are significant differences.
- Under Boris Johnson and Rishi Sunak there has been a commitment to increase spending on the NHS (funded by an increase in National Insurance contributions) and big government spending projects such as the furlough scheme during lockdown and supporting families with the energy price cap. This has necessitated a significant increase in the tax burden. There had been little emphasis on the NHS by Margaret Thatcher. Current Conservative emphasis on big government spending projects contrasts with the Thatcherite commitment to the free market and rolling back the frontiers of the state. The Conservative Party under Johnson also abandoned austerity (David Cameron/George Osborne), so perhaps it is no longer committed to Thatcherite good housekeeping (AO1, AO2)? However, it could be argued that big government projects/intervention have been imposed on the government because of the Covid-19 pandemic and the war in Ukraine. So, this is not an ideological change from Thatcherism but instead a pragmatic approach to an unforeseen crisis. Thatcher also used high indirect taxes and increased National Insurance to combat inflation — very much as the Conservative government has done today (AO3).
- The Conservative focus on 'levelling up' indicates a commitment to social justice, which was not the case with Thatcherism when the emphasis was on individual success ('there's no such thing as society', Margaret Thatcher, 1987) (AO1, AO2). Levelling up is now a flagship Conservative policy, which is a significant departure from Thatcherism — given the importance to the Conservatives of not losing the 'Red Wall' seats they won in the 2019 general election, this is likely to remain a major area where modern Conservatism has abandoned Thatcherism (AO3).
- However, in terms of law and order, the Conservative Party is highly Thatcherite. Under Thatcher there was a firm authoritarian focus on law and order (consider the ban on flying pickets during the miners' strike 1984–85). This is very similar to today, with former home secretary Priti Patel referring to Margaret Thatcher as her role model. Suella Braverman has been similarly authoritarian. Recent legislation includes the Investigatory Police Act (2016) and the Police, Crime, Sentencing and Courts Act 2022, which increases the state's authority so could be seen as Thatcherite. However, the Conservative Party is much more socially liberal than it was under Thatcher (gay marriage, 2013), when traditional lifestyles were seen as superior to alternative lifestyles (Section 28 prohibiting the 'promotion of homosexuality') (AO3).
- Foreign policy and Europe provide an area of great similarity. Thatcher's focus was on strong national defence and the protection of national sovereignty (Falklands War, 1982 and high defence spending during the Cold War). Increased spending on defence by the Johnson government, the world tour of the battlefleet and AUKUS all indicate a very Thatcherite foreign policy. Brexit is also within a Thatcherite tradition, valuing the independence of the nation state ('No, No, No', Thatcher, 1990) (AO1, AO2). The government's strong stance against Russia following the invasion of Ukraine might also be seen as Thatcherite. The changing balance of world power away from the West and towards more authoritarian powers suggests that this will remain an area in which the Conservative Party is distinctly Thatcherite (AO3).
- **Conclusion:** The modern-day Conservative Party provides an interesting combination of one-nation and Thatcherite impulses — one-nation in terms of socioeconomic policy and considerably more Thatcherite in terms of law and order, foreign policy and defence.

2

- **Introduction:** Under the leadership of Sir Keir Starmer, Labour has adopted a more pragmatic approach to socialism than was the case under Jeremy Corbyn. The Conservative Party has become more centrist in its economic policies, so this has created considerable socioeconomic overlap.

However, there are still considerable ideological differences in terms of education and law and order.

- Both Labour and the Conservatives have adopted a pragmatic, non-ideological approach to the economy. Labour supports nationalisation only when there is a strong case for it and the Conservatives have intervened within the economy (furlough scheme during lockdown) when it has been necessary. The Conservatives have had to increase corporation tax and National Insurance contributions to maintain public services in defiance of small government Thatcherism, which takes them close to Labour (AO1, AO2). However, the Conservatives are still committed to lowering taxes and it could be argued have only had to adopt large spending programmes (in defiance of austerity) because of the impact of the Covid-19 pandemic (AO3).
- All the main political parties are committed to funding the NHS. Under recent prime ministers, the Conservatives have emphasised their commitment to the NHS, taking them closer to the Labour and Liberal Democrat parties. All the main parties emphasise the importance of social justice (levelling up) (AO1, AO2). However, only the Liberal Democrats are prepared to increase income tax to pay for the NHS. There are also considerable differences over education, with Labour more ideologically in favour of state education and free further education than the Conservatives: Labour would remove charitable status of independent schools and abolish tuition and top-up fees (AO3).
- However, there are significant similarities in foreign policy. All the main parties are fully committed to maintaining the UK's national interests through the nuclear deterrent, membership of NATO and AUKUS. All parties now accept that Brexit cannot be reversed — including the pro-European Liberal Democrats (AO1, AO2). The Russian invasion of Ukraine and China's growing economic and geo-strategic outreach suggest that foreign policy will remain an area of consensus given challenges to national sovereignty (AO3).
- Law and order is an area of significant difference. The Conservatives are Thatcherite in their commitment to authoritarian law and order policies (Police, Crime, Sentencing and Courts Act (2022)). Significantly, they are in favour of modifying the Human Rights Act and introducing a British Bill of Rights. The Labour and Liberal Democrat parties are fully committed to the Human Rights Act as a vital safeguard of civil liberties and oppose more authoritarian policing powers. There is greater focus, therefore, on protecting individual civil liberties against the state (AO1, AO2). However, although authoritarian in terms of law and order, the Conservatives have become much more socially liberal, accepting alternative lifestyles, so there is a consensus in terms of alternative lifestyles (AO3).
- **Conclusion:** There is a growing economic, social and foreign policy consensus among the main parties. Therefore, politics has become non-ideological in many key areas, with all parties accepting the need for government intervention in the economy and strong national defence. However, fundamental differences over education and law and order suggest there are still important areas of difference, so politics is not completely consensus based.

3

- **Introduction:** Popular party leaders (Tony Blair, 1997) can create huge enthusiasm among the electorate, contributing to the success of the party. However, other factors such as the perceived competence of the government can determine the political fortunes of political parties, indicating that a positive media image is not always essential to success (Edward Heath, 1970).
- Tony Blair's dominance in the 1997 and 2001 general elections was helped by his very positive media image (cultivated by Alastair Campbell), which contrasted with less inspiring Conservative leaders (John Major in 1997 and William Hague in 2001) (AO1, AO2). However, we should beware of taking this argument too far. In 1997, other factors contributed to Blair's victory — the coherent ideological appeal of New Labour and the perceived incompetence, European divisions and scandals of the Major government (1992–97) (AO3).

- A positive image is not always necessary for party political success. In the 1966 and 1970 general elections, Edward Heath was not telegenic. However, he surprisingly won in 1970 because the public no longer trusted Harold Wilson thanks to his 'pound in your pocket' speech (1967) on devaluation. Possibly, too, Enoch Powell's popularity helped to determine the result of the 1970 general election, since he was more popular among Conservative voters in lower social categories than the Conservative leader, Edward Heath. Margaret Thatcher was also less popular than James Callaghan in the 1979 general election, but the Conservatives still won because the Labour government was so discredited by the Winter of Discontent and the Conservative manifesto commitment to 'the right to buy' council houses was so popular (AO1, AO2). However, changing perceptions of leadership can still be important in determining political fortunes: Callaghan lost support because of the 'Crisis? What crisis?' headline and Wilson's good relationship with the media was ruined by his devaluation speech (AO3).
- The way in which Tony Blair's media image slumped because of the Iraq War (and the subsequent suicide of weapons inspector David Kelly) was significant in leading to a dramatic reduction in support for Labour, even though the economy was still strong. Gordon Brown struggled as prime minister because of negative press coverage for most of his premiership on his handling of the global economic crisis. Press hostility contributed to Neil Kinnock's inability to be an effective leader of the Labour opposition and his defeat in two general elections (1987, 1992) (AO1, AO2). However, an uninspiring leader can still achieve political success if their policy commitments are popular. In 1945, Labour won a landslide despite Clement Attlee's lack of charisma because the party's manifesto commitment to the NHS was so popular. In 2017, Jeremy Corbyn had a very poor media profile in the press ('Chuck Britain in the Cor-bin': *The Sun*) but increased Labour's vote share by 9.6% because of policy commitment to a second EU referendum and abolishing tuition and top-up fees (AO3).
- Ruth Davidson's media popularity in Scotland was greater than that of her successor, Douglas Ross, which helps to explain declining Conservative fortunes in Scotland. Nigel Farage's high-profile media coverage was vital to UKIP success. Jeremy Thorpe in February 1974 was a charismatic leader and this helped win the Liberals a surprise 19.6% of the popular vote. The decline in Nick Clegg's popularity, 2010–15, contributed to the decline in support for the Liberal Democrats (AO1, AO2). However, media image can be exaggerated, suggesting the public vote on other issues such as the manifesto and governing competence. Harold Wilson had a much more favourable media image than his predecessor Hugh Gaitskell, but support for Labour increased only 0.2% between the 1959 and 1964 general elections. Boris Johnson was much more media savvy than Theresa May, but Conservative support increased by only 1.2% from 2017 to 2019. Jo Swinson made very little impression as Liberal Democrat leader, but Liberal Democrats still increased the vote share by 4.2% in the 2019 general election (AO3).
- **Conclusion:** A positive media image can contribute to the success of a political party, but it is not the exclusive factor in determining the fortunes of political parties.

Chapter 3 Electoral systems

Source-based question

- FPTP delivers an effective electoral outcome:
  - The use of a more proportional system would 'weaken the direct constituency link' between elected MPs and their constituents (AO1). This is effective because it means that MPs represent small geographic areas and can understand the needs and demands of that population, allowing for effective representation (AO2).

- The system is 'well established and understood by voters' (AO1), which should encourage a higher turnout from the electorate, meaning the government that is formed has a more secure mandate and is able to carry out its manifesto with relative ease (AO2).
- Using FPTP usually results in a government with 'a working majority in Parliament' (AO1), meaning that not only can the government govern effectively and pass legislation relatively simply, it is also more easy to hold to account as it is clear who is responsible for governing (AO2).

- FPTP does not deliver an effective electoral outcome:
  - The government made a 'commitment to respect the will of the British people' in the AV referendum (AO1). However, as FPTP usually delivers the government a large majority it is able to act almost as an 'elective dictatorship' and do as it pleases with little effective scrutiny until the next election (AO2)
  - The use of a proportional system 'provides a clear link between constituents and their representatives in Parliament' (AO1) but many of the elected MPs are elected by a minority of a constituency, leaving many voters feeling as if they have wasted their vote and are disenfranchised (AO2).
  - FPTP is 'is well established and understood by voters', which means many voters know they can resort to tactical voting (AO1). This means that the government elected may not be the one that most people want, but rather the 'least bad' option (AO2).

Evaluative questions

1

- Referendums are most effective at increasing political participation:
  - Referendums better educate the public on a specific issue (AO1), which results in greater understanding of the personal and political impact of an issue, encouraging people to turn out and vote (AO2).
  - Referendums are single-issue votes, which are more suited to an era of voter dealignment (AO1) as they allow people to focus on the issues that matter to them and take direct action to impact the outcome (AO2).
  - The electoral cycle is relatively lengthy in the UK at 5 years (AO1) and referendums allow the public to shape government policy or cast judgement on the government between general elections (AO2).
- Other factors are more effective at increasing political participation:
  - Reforming the electoral system for general elections would allow third parties to be more competitive (AO1) and this would mean the public had greater choice in an election and more certainty that their vote would count, encouraging participation (AO2).
  - The UK Parliament could be reformed to make the House of Lords elected (AO1) and this would make Parliament more representative and more fitting with both liberal and representative democracies, encouraging participation (AO2).
  - The power of the prime minister could be reduced by removing their right to call an election at a time of their choosing (AO1), which would make the UK less of an 'elective dictatorship' and encourage people to participate (AO2).

2

- Proportional systems are a good alternative to FPTP:

- The use of AMS in Scotland has shown that a proportional system can produce a majority government (AO1). This means that the government can still be strong and stable, capable of passing its legislative agenda while being more representative (AO2).
- The increased success of third parties seen in proportional systems mirrors the growing success of third parties in FPTP (AO1). This suggests the public want to vote for third parties but may be dissuaded from doing so due to the use of FPTP (AO1).
- Turnout in the devolved assemblies where proportional systems have been used is relatively high (AO1), suggesting that the use of proportional systems does not dissuade people from voting and may actually increase turnout (AO2).

- Proportional systems are not a good alternative to FPTP:
  - Proportional systems are more likely to return a coalition or minority government (AO1), making it far more difficult for a government to pass the legislative agenda that it campaigned on and potentially undermining its mandate (AO2).
  - Proportional systems often have larger constituencies or multi-member constituencies (AO1) and this can reduce the contact of a local MP with the people that they represent, thereby reducing the effectiveness of representation for the electorate (AO2).
  - Proportional systems are often more complex than FPTP, requiring multiple votes or choices (AO1), and this has the potential to increase wasted votes or reduce voter turnout due to a lack of understanding, which could undermine the legitimacy of the election result (AO2).

3

- Legitimacy for the party's manifesto is the most significant benefit of FPTP:
  - FPTP allows a government to win a clear majority of seats in an election (AO1) and this gives it a clear mandate — the right to govern — to carry out the policies on which it has campaigned as the public have given their consent to that manifesto (AO2).
  - The threat that third parties can pose in FPTP can lead to a government altering its manifesto to ensure it does not lose support (AO1), resulting in a manifesto of the most broadly accepted policies from the public (AO2).
  - The two-party nature of FPTP means that the main two parties often propose opposing manifestos (AO1), giving the public a relatively clear choice between parties and clear support for the political direction advanced by the winning party (AO2).
- Legitimacy for the party's manifesto is not the most significant benefit of FPTP:
  - For the government, one of the clearest benefits of FPTP is the likelihood that this will have won a large majority of the seats (AO1) and this will allow the government to carry out its manifesto with relatively little opposition, even if it did not win a majority of the national vote (AO2).
  - The two-party nature of FPTP means that each party retains a large amount of control over individual MPs, deciding who will stand in a constituency and supporting them in doing so (AO1), and this means that party discipline can be maintained in Parliament, allowing the government to pass its legislative agenda (AO2).
  - For the two main parties in the UK, the winner-takes-all nature of FPTP means they are likely to face relatively little challenge from third parties (AO1), meaning they are able to co-opt third parties' most successful policies while only having to focus on one other party as their main competition (AO2).

Chapter 4 Voting behaviour and the media

Source-based question

- Positive role:
  - **'News consumption shifted online, but the growth in digital social media has enabled people to originate, find and share information.'** The growth in digital social media encourages widespread engagement with the news and can fuel support for grassroots activism through websites like 38 Degrees and social movements like Black Lives Matter and Marcus Rashford's campaign for free school meals (AO1, AO2). However, social media can also encourage negative echo chambers, reinforcing rather than debating political opinions (AO3).
  - **'Non-partisan broadcast news media have maintained far more reach and regular use than print newspapers.'** The BBC and other broadcast television sites are monitored by Ofcom and so are expected to provide impartial news reporting so that the public have access to unpartisan news reports. This is important in upholding the values of a liberal democracy, in contrast to authoritarian states where the media is under the control of the government, thus limiting the information the public receive (AO1, AO2). However, new television broadcasters such as GB News and Talk TV have demonstrated significant political bias in defiance of claims that television broadcasting is effectively regulated to be impartial (AO3).
  - **'All broadcasters operate under political neutrality rules that apply with special force during election campaigns.'** This is the case during general election campaigns and so this is very important in ensuring that one party is not able to dominate election campaigns, thus giving the public a free choice (AO1, AO2). However, public attitudes develop between general elections and the evidence suggests that there is a growing right-wing bias in certain news channels (AO3).
- Negative role:
  - **'Most of the press always back the Conservative Party.'** Large-circulation newspapers such as *The Sun* and the *Daily Mail* have a right-wing bias and so support the Conservative Party. This means that the press can set the political weather in favour of the Conservative Party, giving them a significant political and electoral advantage (AO1, AO2). However, we should not take this argument too far, as the 'right-wing press' can be critical of Conservative governments. This occurred during the John Major government (1992–97), and Theresa May (Brexit) and Boris Johnson (Covid-19 restrictions) were regularly criticised in the right-wing press. Once the *Mirror* and the *Guardian* broke the 'party gate' scandal, all the press covered and investigated it so holding Johnson accountable for his actions. (AO3).
  - **'Far fewer papers normally back Labour, and the Liberal Democrats receive only episodic support from smaller papers.'** Most newspapers do support the Conservative Party, so creating a media bias against the other political parties (AO1, AO2). However, this argument can be exaggerated. *The Mirror* regularly supports Labour, and *The Guardian* is left leaning. *The Times* has also supported the Liberal Democrats and the *Mail on Sunday* is less right wing than the *Daily Mail*. The influence of newspapers has also significantly declined, with fewer people reading newspapers today. Online, the right-wing press is less dominant, with *The Guardian* having a large readership, although the popularity of *Mail Online* is still enormous (AO3).
  - **'A number of hyper-partisan low-cost start-ups.'** The internet enables partisan news feeds to be set up. The way in which algorithms select news stories means that prejudiced news channels (such as Breitbart) can 'feed' the public only the news stories they want, so reinforcing prejudice rather than opening minds (AO1, AO2). However, the BBC (impartial) is still the dominant news channel being accessed on social media, which suggests that the internet can also provide the public with access to impartial news, ensuring a constant stream of objective information and so encouraging informed political debate (AO3).

Evaluative questions

1

- **Introduction:** General election campaigns can be very important in determining the outcome of a general election (2019). However, there is a strong case to argue that the electorate have often made up their minds before the campaign begins.
- In 1997 the Labour Party campaign (angel taxi driver party political broadcast) was much more effective than the Conservative Party campaign (demon eyes New Labour New Danger party political broadcast) (AO1, AO2). However, despite contrasting campaigns the opinion polls hardly changed during the general election, suggesting that events such as Black Wednesday (1992) had already fatally damaged the Major government's chance of re-election (AO3).
- However, campaigns can be significant. In 2019 the Labour Party campaign was dogged by allegations of anti-Semitism within the party leadership and the Conservative campaign effectively responded to the mood of the electorate with its upbeat 'Get Brexit Done' campaign (AO1, AO2). However, although the Johnson campaign was much more effective than the May campaign in 2017, Conservative support increased by only 1.2%, which suggests that the importance of the campaign can be exaggerated (AO3).
- In 1970, the presidentialism of Harold Wilson's campaign repelled many voters, so contributing to the surprise victory of Edward Heath. The 1992 general election provides the best example of a campaign determining the result of a general election. Before the general election, Labour was comfortably ahead in the polls and the economy was in recession. However, Major's soap box and Neil Kinnock's Sheffield Rally speech helped to change attitudes in the last stages of the campaign (AO1, AO2). But this is not always the case. The Labour Party campaign in 1987 was more media-friendly than the Conservatives' and yet Margaret Thatcher won a third general election victory (102 seats) because of the perceived strength of her leadership over Kinnock's (AO3).
- The competence of the government was the key factor in determining the result of the 1979 general election because the Callaghan government was held responsible by the electorate for the 'Winter of Discontent', so contributing to the victory of the Conservatives under Margaret Thatcher (AO1, AO2). However, campaigns can focus on perceived government competence or incompetence, suggesting that a general election can be determined by a combination of both factors. In 1979, the Conservative campaign effectively concentrated on Labour's record in government ('Labour isn't working') and in 2010 the Liberal Democrats and Conservatives effectively campaigned on claims that Labour had allowed the national debt to spiral out of control. In contrast, in 1959 Harold Macmillan won re-election on his record of economic prosperity, 'Life's better under the Conservatives. Don't let Labour ruin it' (AO3).
- **Conclusion:** Both political party campaigns and government competence can be very important in determining the result of a general election and we should beware of making a false distinction between them because a campaign will often focus on the record of a government.

2

- **Introduction:** Newspapers have generally been seen as highly important in setting the 'political weather', so significantly impacting how public opinion develops during general elections. However, the impact of television has been significant in determining political attitudes since the 1960s and is still significantly more important than social media.
- Newspapers claim to be important in influencing how the public vote in general elections. In 1992, *The Sun* switched to supporting the Conservative Party and it later claimed, 'It's The Sun Wot Won It'. This is difficult to prove since it may have been reflecting the way that public opinion had changed rather than leading it (AO1, AO2). The way in which the Sheffield Rally and John Major's soap box were reported on the television in the last days of the campaign may then have been more significant in determining attitudes than the press. The massive decline in newspaper sales in

recent years has also challenged claims the press can help determine the result of a general election, although online newspaper influence is still very strong and newspaper headlines are carried by broadcasters like the BBC (AO3).

- The limited influence of the press in impacting the result of a general election is well demonstrated by the 2017 general election in which Jeremy Corbyn suffered from relentless criticism in most of the tabloid press and yet Labour still increased its vote share by 9.6% (AO1, AO2). Critics have thus suggested that this demonstrates the growing importance of social media over newspapers since in the 2017 general election Labour had a massive lead over the Conservatives in terms of social media use. However, in 2019, although Labour remained dominant on social media, the Conservatives won a 90-seat majority, which suggests that this argument is overstated. Social media is unlikely, too, to break stories — unlike newspapers — and algorithms ensure that users are likely to have existing views reinforced rather than challenged (AO3).
- Relentlessly hostile press coverage can set the political weather firmly against a political party. In 2010, negative press coverage of Gordon Brown's handling of the economic crisis (huge increase in the national debt) made it very difficult for Brown to gain control of the political initiative (AO1, AO2). However, Brown's television performances were also dire, culminating in the disastrous Gillian Duffy 'bigoted woman' exchange, which was then reported extensively on television. In 2019, Jeremy Corbyn's failure to quell allegations of anti-Semitism (Andrew Neil interview) undermined his campaign from the beginning (AO3).
- Television has also played a vital role in determining political attitudes. As far back as the 1960s Harold Wilson's 'pound in your pocket' speech (1967) dramatically undermined public trust in Wilson, which contributed to his general election defeat in 1970 (AO1, AO2). However, newspaper headlines can be crucial in influencing how a campaign develops. In the 1979 general election *The Sun*'s 'Crisis? What Crisis?' so set the tone of the campaign against the prime minister, James Callaghan, that it was used in a Conservative party-political broadcast. In 2017, even right-wing newspapers carried the headline 'dementia tax', making it impossible for Theresa May to gain momentum in her campaign — this was made even more difficult because of her poor television performances (the 'Maybot') (AO3).
- **Conclusion:** Both newspapers and television can play an important role in setting the agenda in a general election. Television is generally thought to be most significant as it reaches more of the public and newspapers can misjudge the mood of the nation (Corbyn, 2017). The influence of social media, though, is less than some critics expected since the way algorithms create echo chambers means it generally reinforces rather than creates public opinion.

3

- **Introduction:** Traditionally, class has been seen as the key factor in determining how the public vote. There is still some truth in this argument. However, age is becoming an increasingly strong indicator of voting intentions as partisan and class dealignment take place. In the 2019 general election, 62% of 18–24-year-olds voted Labour, while 64% voted Conservative above the age of 65.
- General elections have traditionally been determined by class voting. In the 1950s and 1960s Labour had a monopoly of the working-class vote across the UK and the Conservatives had a similar dominance among the middle class (AO1, AO2). However, class voting began to break down as early as the 1970 general election, with the Conservatives winning support among the working class because of the influence of Enoch Powell. Margaret Thatcher also won significant support among the aspirational working class (C2) and the Conservative Party's association with Brexit led to it winning many 'Red Wall' seats in the 2017 and 2019 general elections (AO3).
- In contrast, in recent general elections (2017, 2019) young people have increasingly voted Labour (environmental policies, social justice, free higher education). Older voters, though, have been more likely to support the Conservative Party because of its policies on law and order, Brexit and commitment to lower taxes (AO1, AO2). However, we should not completely discount the

importance of class, since Labour is still dominant in many industrial working-class areas such as South Wales as well as in cities with an industrial heritage like Birmingham, Manchester and Liverpool (AO3).

- Greater support for EU membership among young people has also discouraged them from supporting the Conservative Party because it is so strongly connected now with Brexit. Consequently, this has increased support for Labour among young people as a perceived more pro-European party. The tough stance of the Conservatives on policing has further alienated it from young people, who are more likely to protest than older people (AO1, AO2). However, there is still very little support for Labour in the prosperous South East or South West of England where the Conservatives are still dominant, which suggests that class is still influential in determining how the public vote (AO3).
- Although young people are more likely to vote Labour than Conservative, young females are more likely to vote Labour than young males (AO1, AO2). However, in both categories Labour has secured an increasingly commanding lead over the Conservatives in recent general elections, suggesting that age is becoming more important (AO1, AO2). Despite this, class is still significant since in 2019 Labour still held most seats in industrial working-class areas. This has not been the case in Scotland though, where young people are much more likely to be pro-independence, whatever their class, and so have voted SNP rather than for the unionist parties. In Scotland, therefore, age rather than class is the defining factor in how people vote (AO3).
- **Conclusion:** Age has become more important in determining voting behaviour as traditional class allegiances break down. However, class can still influence voting behaviour (apart from in Scotland) and although its influence has declined as age has become more important, it is still significant.

Chapter 5 The constitution

Source-based question

- Useful and legitimate:
  - **'Lords defeats since 2010 have frequently been on significant pieces of legislation.'** The Lords have often opposed legislation on sensitive issues such as terrorist legislation, the removal of tax credits and Brexit, which demonstrates that they play a useful role (AO1, AO2). However, the House of Commons does not have to accept Lords' amendments, so this power is limited (AO3).
  - **'Better policy making.'** Although the House of Lords is unelected, it could be argued that its legitimacy comes from its expertise. House of Lords committees have a wealth of experience and Lords' amendments to legislation and even defeats of legislation can force the government to rethink — Brown and the 42-day terror bill (2008) (AO1, AO2). Critics claim, though, that legitimacy has to derive from a democratic mandate in a properly functioning liberal democracy (AO3).
  - **'Heavily whipped MPs in the Commons.'** Since the House of Lords is unelected and there are a significant number of crossbenchers in the chamber, this makes it significantly more independent-thinking than the House of Commons (AO1, AO2). However, the unrepresentative nature of the House of Lords — there are no SNP peers and only two Green peers — invalidates its legitimacy (AO3).
- Not useful and legitimate:
  - **'An almost all-appointed upper chamber.'** The way in which life peers are appointed through political patronage and so are not accountable to the electorate in general elections is controversial. There have been several high-profile appointments, which have led to accusations of

cronyism (AO1, AO2). However, most appointments are non-contentious and are based on merit and expertise (AO3).

- **'Generally followed a convention acknowledging the "primacy" of the Commons.'** Since the House of Lords follows the Salisbury Convention and will not oppose legislation that has been in the monarch's speech, this makes the Lords an ineffective chamber since it has such little power (AO1, AO2). However, the Salisbury Convention does not operate if there is a coalition. It is also entirely appropriate that the Lords accepts the democratic primacy of the House of Commons. This also does not undermine its helpful work of scrutiny (AO3).
- **'Major party donors can still effectively "buy" peerages.'** There have been several cases when it has been alleged that major donors to political parties have become peers: under Tony Blair there was the cash for peerages scandal and under Boris Johnson the appointment of the leading Tory party donor, Peter Cruddas, was controversial (AO1, AO2). However, although these cases are highlighted by the media, they are relatively rare. Also, House of Lords Appointments Commission (HOLAC) criticism of such appointments discourages these sorts of appointments because of the likely unfavourable publicity (AO3).

Evaluative questions

1

- Since England is the only part of the UK without its own elected legislature and government, this makes the UK constitution asymmetrical. However, an English parliament, although logical, would likely create more problems than it would resolve.
- Devolution to Scotland and Wales has been so popular that subsequent parliamentary acts have increased the devolved powers they have. This suggests it is unfair that England does not have the same control over its domestic affairs (AO1, AO2). However, there were significant demands for devolution in Scotland in 1997 and (although less in Wales) there was still significant nationalist feeling legitimising Welsh self-determination. Since there has been no such equivalent English nationalism, there is no case for an English parliament (AO3).
- Northern Ireland has its own assembly at Stormont, which further highlights the incongruity of the existing distribution of legislative and executive powers (AO1, AO2). However, Northern Ireland is a special case. It had its own parliament as part of the constitutional settlement which granted Ireland independence (1921) and since the Good Friday Agreement (1998) power sharing has been an essential part of the peace process (AO3).
- The convention of English Votes for English Laws is no longer operational at Westminster, which once again raises the West Lothian issue whereby MPs sitting at Westminster can vote on English domestic legislation although their devolved assemblies legislate on their domestic legislation (AO1, AO2). However, if an English parliament was established, this would likely encourage the further break-up of the UK by emphasising national differences (AO3).
- The current settlement has created an asymmetrical UK in which England is under-represented. This does suggest that further reform is logical (AO1, AO2). However, England already has several elected mayors and metro mayors so there is already another layer of self-determination within England. Also, the lack of enthusiasm for an English parliament suggests that this would be an unnecessary reform. Might also extreme nationalist parties gain representation in an English parliament, especially if it was elected by proportional representation (AO3)?
- Although the existing settlement is unusual, the introduction of an English parliament would likely be destabilising. Since there is little enthusiasm for it, it is therefore a reform best left untouched.

2

- The UK is unusual in not having a codified constitution. Given recent constitutional crises such as Brexit and UK Acts of Parliament which, it has been claimed, challenge civil liberties, there are growing arguments in favour of the codification of the UK constitution.
- Debates over the legality of a second Scottish independence referendum demonstrate that the location of sovereignty has become very contentious. Therefore, there is now a strong case for a codified constitution to determine the exact location of sovereignty in the UK (AO1, AO2). However, the flexible nature of the UK constitution has enabled a developing relationship between the constituent parts of the UK that would not have been possible if a codified constitution firmly laid down the exact location of sovereignty (AO3).
- The legal status of referendums and the extent of the royal prerogative further highlight lack of clarity in the UK constitution, which suggests the need for codification (AO1, AO2). However, the Supreme Court (Gina Miller (1) and Gina Miller (2)) has successfully determined where sovereignty lies, suggesting codification is unnecessary (AO3).
- The way in which civil liberties have been challenged by recent Acts of Parliament such as the Investigatory Powers Act (2016) and the Police, Crime, Sentencing and Courts Act (2022) suggests that a higher constitutional law is needed to protect civil liberties (AO1, AO2). However, Parliament has also enacted significant legislation, such as the Human Rights Act (1998) and the Equality Act (2010), which have provided judges with sufficient safeguards to protect civil liberties (AO3).
- The UK constitution has undermined dramatic reform since 1997. However, the constitution has never been codified, which puts the UK out of step with almost all other nation states (AO1, AO2). However, the evolutionary development of the UK constitution (Burke and Oakeshott) and lack of popular enthusiasm for a codified constitution indicate that this is not a necessary reform. It would also be contentious what the balance between economic, social and political rights would be (AO3).
- Although a codified constitution would provide clarity, the existing UK constitution has been successful in dealing with recent constitutional problems, which suggests that reform is not necessary.

3

- Recent Acts of Parliament that have impacted civil liberties (Investigatory Powers Act, 2016) have led to further demands for an entrenched bill of rights. However, there are several ways in which UK civil liberties are protected, which suggests that a codified bill of rights may not be necessary.
- Since the terrorist attacks on the USA in 2001 Labour and Conservative governments have introduced legislation impacting civil liberties. These include limits on public protest (Serious Organised Crime and Police Act, 2005; Police, Crime, Sentencing and Courts Act, 2022). This suggests civil liberties need to be protected by a higher constitutional law (AO1, AO2). However, the media and protest groups can successfully alert the public to a potential reduction in their civil liberties (pluralist liberal democracy). This reduces the likelihood that governments will undermine civil liberties. For example, ID cards were so unpopular that the legislation introducing them was repealed by the coalition government (AO3).
- Since Parliament is sovereign, it can enact any legislation for which it has a parliamentary majority. This could potentially challenge civil liberties since no Parliament can bind its successor (AO1, AO2). However, MPs may refuse to enact legislation challenging civil liberties — Blair failed to enact legislation increasing to 90 days the time terrorist suspects could be held without trial (2005) (AO3).
- Parliamentary sovereignty means that the Human Rights Act is not a higher law and so it can be modified or even repealed. If a new statute is in defiance of the Act, the judiciary can only issue a formal statement of incompatibility because no Parliament may bind its successor (AO1, AO2). However, the Human Rights Act puts significant restraints on government (*Abu Qatada, HJ and HT* v *Home Office*) and has been used by judges to advance civil liberties in judge-made law (*R* v *Jogee*, *P* v *Cheshire Council*), thus protecting and advancing civil liberties (AO3).

- Although an entrenched bill of rights would determine positive rights, the issue of which rights to include (economic, political, social?) would be highly controversial. Several Acts of Parliament already protect UK citizens' civil liberties (Equality Act, 2010). There are therefore already several statutory safeguards. Because MPs are accountable to the electorate in regular general elections, it is also unlikely that seriously repressive legislation would be enacted as the public would oppose a government that did this (AO1, AO2, AO3).
- There is the potential for civil liberties to be challenged by Parliament because it is sovereign. However, the UK is a liberal democracy governed by the rule of law and this makes a serious assault on UK civil liberties practically unlikely.

Chapter 6 Parliament

Source-based question

- Limited impact:
  - **'Even a government with a small parliamentary majority will be able to set the parliamentary agenda in the way that it wants.'** The government will always be able to control the parliamentary agenda and the time given to debating legislation. This therefore gives it significant power to establish the political agenda in the way it wants (AO1, AO2). However, government cannot stop legislation being debated in the House of Commons and there are several mechanisms opposition parties can use to hold the government accountable (emergency debates and urgent questions) (AO3).
  - **'Their impact on public bill committees is also limited because of the government's inbuilt majority.'** Public bill committees are whipped and only have limited time set aside for them. The government's inbuilt majority on them also means that the opposition parties' amendments are unlikely to be passed (AO1, AO2). However, amendments can be made to legislation if they provide non-contentious ways of improving it (AO3).
  - **'A large majority.'** If a government has a large parliamentary majority this can make it difficult for the opposition to oppose government policy since they do not have sufficient numbers (Blair, 1997, 179-seat majority) (AO1, AO2). However, even a government with a large majority can be vulnerable if there are divisions within the parliamentary party. In 2021–22 Boris Johnson's authority as prime minister was fatally damaged by combined opposition and Conservative criticisms of his illegal activities during lockdown (AO3).
- Significant impact:
  - **'A good opposition front bench spokesman.'** An effective opposition front bench can be very effective in holding the government accountable for its actions. The Blair opposition, 1994–97, provides a good example of this (AO1, AO2). However, equally, a weak opposition front bench can enable a government to avoid serious scrutiny. As prime minister, Blair benefited from a relatively weak Conservative front bench. Jeremy Corbyn's front bench team missed opportunities to effectively challenge the minority May government, 2017–19 (AO3).
  - **'Prime Minister's Question Time.'** An effective leader of the opposition can use PMQT to undermine the government and make the opposition party look like a 'government in waiting'. Tony Blair did this as Labour Party leader against John Major from 1994–97 ('weak, weak, weak') and David Cameron used PMQT to undermine Gordon Brown (AO1, AO2). But the effectiveness of PMQT depends on who the prime minister and leader of the opposition are. Neil Kinnock and Jeremy Corbyn were relatively unsuccessful at the dispatch box, and Boris Johnson generally was

able to divert criticism at PMQT until the 'party gate' scandal when Sir Keir Starmer's forensic examining at PMQT was more successful (AO3).

- **'Parliamentary arithmetic is also important.'** If the government has a small parliamentary majority this can dramatically increase the influence of opposition parties since they have greater opportunities to stop legislation. The Labour opposition to John Major, 1992–97, was strong because Major had a declining majority and a government that was divided over Europe (AO1, AO2). However, even a government with a significant majority can be challenged by an effective opposition: Macmillan's government was discredited by 'events, dear boy, events' (1962–63), which Harold Wilson took advantage of even though Macmillan still had a sizeable parliamentary majority. Gordon Brown had a significant majority (2007–10) but was still challenged by an effective Labour and Liberal Democrat opposition (the government even lost an opposition day motion on Gurkha residency rights) (AO3).

Evaluative questions

1

- Although there have been significant criticisms of Parliament's representative functions, it still possesses significant strengths that make Parliament better at representing the British people than legislating.
- The way in which the House of Commons is elected by first-past-the-post means that it does not fairly represent the way in which the public voted in a general election. Consequently, voters for smaller political parties without sufficient depth of support are under-represented (AO1, AO2). However, MPs represent their constituents, whoever they voted for, ensuring that people across the UK are equally represented. The unresolved West Lothian issue might therefore suggest that the way in which Parliament legislates is a more pressing concern (AO3).
- Although the House of Commons has been criticised for having an elitist membership, it has become much more socially inclusive in recent years. This suggests that its representative function has improved because it more exactly represents contemporary British society. Lobbying scandals are a problem, but media exposure of them and the House of Commons Committee on Standards makes them less of a challenge, ensuring better representation for constituents (AO1, AO2). The legislative function of Parliament is still limited, however, because of the strong influence the executive has over the parliamentary timetable, making Private Members' Bills very difficult to enact (AO3).
- The representative function of the House of Commons has improved because of the introduction of e-petitions, which give the public a more effective way of gaining redress of grievance (Marcus Rashford e-petition on free school meals) (AO1, AO2). However, e-petitions do not lead to legislation being enacted, which suggests that the executive retains too much influence over the legislative agenda (AO3).
- MPs can be very effective in raising issues of concern to their constituents in Parliament. This can be done in prime ministerial and ministerial questions and through adjournment debates. MPs also hold regular surgeries that their constituents attend, which demonstrates the strengths of single-member constituencies (first-past-the-post) (AO1, AO2). In contrast, the effectiveness of House of Commons legislation is undermined because of the authority of the whips who generally require MPs to vote in a certain way and the way in which public bill committees always have a government majority and are whipped, making opposition amendments difficult to pass (AO3).
- Although House of Commons representation has been criticised, it still has considerable strengths. In terms of legislation, the continued dominance of the executive and the ongoing West Lothian issue suggest that reform is more urgent here.

2

- Although the House of Lords has limited powers because it lacks a democratic mandate, this does not mean that it is an ineffective chamber. Instead, it has a valuable parliamentary role.
- The House of Lords' limited legislative influence means that it cannot veto legislation. This is because the House of Commons is the primary elected chamber (AO1, AO2). However, this does not mean that the House of Lords is ineffective because it can still improve legislation with well-thought-through amendments. These can be accepted by the House of Commons in parliamentary ping-pong, which suggests that it possesses an important scrutinising function (AO3).
- Since the House of Commons has democratic primacy, it can override legislative defeats in the House of Lords, as the Johnson government did to its defeats over EU withdrawal (AO1, AO2). However, significant government defeats in the House of Lords, such as the Brown government's attempt to increase to 42 days detention without charge for terrorist suspects and the Cameron government's abolition of tax credits, led to major rethinks of government policy. This suggests that the House of Lords has a significant legislative function despite its limitations (AO3).
- House of Lords committees provide informed advice to the government, such as the Committee on National Security Strategy. Some of them are joint with the House of Commons (draft Online Safety Bill), thus providing a strengthened expert membership. The scrutiny offered by the House of the Lords Committee on Statutory Instruments (secondary legislation) is especially important as these are being used more often by the government as a way of bypassing the House of Commons (AO1, AO2). Although the expertise of House of Lords committees means that their recommendations can be taken very seriously by government (AO3).
- The Salisbury Convention means that the House of Lords will not attempt to wreck legislation that has been proposed in the monarch's speech. This limits its authority (AO1, AO2). However, this is not the case if there is a coalition since the government cannot claim a clear democratic mandate. Therefore, this limit on the power of the House of Lords is not always operational (AO3).
- The influence of the House of Lords is certainly limited but it still possesses an important scrutinising and legislative role, which supports the House of Commons, giving it an effective parliamentary function.

3

- Although a government with a small parliamentary (or non-existent) parliamentary majority will be especially vulnerable, this is not the only criterion for effective parliamentary scrutiny of the executive.
- When a government has a small parliamentary or non-existent parliamentary majority it is more vulnerable to its legislative programme being defeated in the House of Commons: Theresa May's three defeats on her Brexit withdrawal agreement 2019 (AO1, AO2). However, even a government with a strong parliamentary majority can be defeated by a combination of governing party rebels and the opposition: Margaret Thatcher and the second reading of the Shops Bill (1986) and Tony Blair's defeat over his attempt to detain terrorist suspects without charge for 90 days (2005) (AO3).
- There are several mechanisms whereby the House of Commons can hold the government accountable. These include Prime Minister's Question Time, ministerial questions, adjournment debates, emergency debates and urgent questions (AO1, AO2). To be effective, these do not depend on the size of the government's majority. Even a government with a large parliamentary majority can be held accountable through these mechanisms (AO3).
- The most effective way in which a government can be held accountable for its policies is through a vote of confidence. The Callaghan government lost a vote of confidence in 1979 and so was forced to call an immediate general election (AO1, AO2). In these circumstances the size of a parliamentary majority is significant since a government with a parliamentary majority (Callaghan was leading a minority administration) is unlikely to lose a vote of confidence (AO3).

- Select committees provide an important way in which government departments can be held accountable for their policies and administration. The Home Affairs Select Committee's interrogation of Amber Rudd, for example, helped lead to her resignation over the Windrush scandal (AO1, AO2). Since departmental select committees are non-partisan, the size of the government's majority is irrelevant to whether they are successful or not (AO3).
- In certain circumstances, such as a vote of confidence, a small or non-existent parliamentary majority will make it easier for the House of Commons to hold the executive accountable, but there are many other ways in which the House of Commons can do this that have nothing to do with the size of the government's parliamentary majority.

Chapter 7 Prime minister and the executive

Source-based question

- Declining importance:
  - **'Powerful prime ministers are largely ignoring cabinet government.'** There is considerable evidence to suggest that powerful prime ministers with their own sources of advice have not consulted cabinet on important decisions. This can be seen with prime ministers such as Tony Blair (interest-raising powers to the Bank of England and the Millennium Dome) (AO1, AO2). However, cabinet remains very important and even powerful prime ministers have understood the importance of using its expertise to discuss the consequences of important legislation or events. Boris Johnson consulted with cabinet on key issues such as continuing lockdown restrictions and the Russian invasion of Ukraine (AO3).
  - **'Preferred to make important decisions within a small group of trusted advisers.'** Prime ministers have often had close advisers — Harold Wilson's 'kitchen cabinet' and the 'chumocracy' of David Cameron (AO1, AO2). Liz Truss and her chancellor of the exchequer Kwasi Kwarteng worked closely together on their mini budget in 2022 rather than debating it in cabinet. This does not mean, however, that the cabinet is not important in legitimising policies that may have been developed elsewhere (AO3).
  - **'"Sofa government" approach to decision making.'** Tony Blair liked to make policy through bilateral discussions with ministers. This is referred to as 'sofa government' (AO1, AO2). However, the considerable drawbacks to this way of making policy were demonstrated by the Iraq War (Chilcot Report), suggesting that this style of government is unlikely to provide a template for the future (AO3).
- Not declining importance:
  - **'Wilson may have wanted to dominate cabinet but did not always succeed.'** Powerful prime ministers can exert a dominant force over the cabinet as Wilson and Margaret Thatcher did (Westland crisis, 1986). This suggests the cabinet's potential lack of influence (AO1, AO2). However, the cabinet has considerable power to resist a prime minister, as Harold Wilson discovered when 'big bests' blocked the White Paper 'In Place of Strife' (AO3).
  - **'Controversial government policies.'** Prime ministers understand the importance of maintaining party discipline and loyalty and it is therefore important that the cabinet endorses controversial policies (AO1, AO2). Although Margaret Thatcher is often seen as having dominated cabinet, she understood the importance of it thoroughly, debating controversial economic policies to avoid damaging resignations (AO3).
  - **'Margaret Thatcher only lost power when she felt herself greater than cabinet.'** Powerful prime ministers can become so dominant over cabinet that they can lose sight of its importance. Towards

the end of her time in office Margaret Thatcher did this (Europe and the poll tax), as did Tony Blair throughout his time as prime minister (AO1, AO2). However, when Thatcher required its support in 1990, most of the cabinet withheld it, suggesting that its support is vital to a prime minister and so its influence is not declining (AO3).

Evaluative questions

1

- Prime ministers have several important ways of 'setting the political weather' (chairing cabinet, media attention, setting policy) but circumstances mean that they cannot always control the decisions made by their government.
- Tony Blair was a charismatic prime minister with a very clear political ideology. This made him a dominant force in British politics (Millennium Dome, interest-raising powers to the Bank of England) (AO1, AO2). Gordon Brown remained dominant in economic policy and towards the end of his time in power his MPs proved increasingly uncooperative — defeat of the 90-day terrorist legislation (2005). Liz Truss attempted to dramatically change government economic policy. However, she was unsuccessful because of her lack of media presence, loss of support in the press and disapproval of her economic policies by the influential International Monetary Fund (IMF) (AO3).
- Prime ministers can utilise their strong media presence to dominate political decision making. Thatcher, Blair and Johnson were able to do this (AO1, AO2). However, even powerful prime ministers can have their authority challenged by forces beyond their control. In 1986 Conservative backbenchers defeated the second reading of the Shops Bill (1986). Boris Johnson's attempt to prorogue Parliament in 2019 was declared illegal by the Supreme Court so Parliament was recalled (AO3).
- Prime ministers with small parliamentary majorities or prime ministers of minority governments or coalitions have significant restraints put on what they can do. For example, David Cameron was unable to introduce certain policies because they were against the Coalition Agreement and Theresa May's authority was reduced when she became a minority prime minister with a divided Conservative Party (AO1, AO2). However, even minority prime ministers can prove remarkably powerful, as demonstrated by James Callaghan challenging the postwar consensus with his Blackpool speech (1976) (AO3).
- Prime ministers with a large parliamentary majority and positive media support can be very dominant (Harold Wilson 1964–66, Tony Blair 1997–2003). Their authority is also weakened if there is a weak parliamentary opposition (AO1, AO2). However, 'events, dear boy, events' means that circumstances can undermine a prime minister's dominant influence. Initially, Gordon Brown and Theresa May were dominant prime ministers, but the economic crisis (2008) and the 2017 general election significantly undermined the ability of both to dominate politics, making them more managers than leaders (AO3).
- Despite the significant power that prime ministers have to shape events, they are also shaped by events, suggesting that their ability to control decisions made by government depends on circumstances often beyond their control.

2

- There have been several recent occasions when ministers have not resigned (Gavin Williamson, education secretary, 2020). This suggests that the principle of individual ministerial responsibility has been challenged. There have been fewer challenges to collective ministerial responsibility, although in specific circumstances it has not operated.
- There are several examples of ministers not taking responsibility for administrative and policy failings within their departments. Gavin Williamson failed to resign over A-level results in 2020. In

the mid-1990s Michael Howard shifted responsibility to the civil service for prison breakouts. This suggests that individual ministerial responsibility is being challenged (AO1, AO2). However, the media is important in exposing departmental failings and can use its influence to get a minister to take responsibility and resign (Amber Rudd and the Windrush scandal, 2018) (AO3).

- The ministerial code makes clear the circumstances under which a minister ought not to resign. This suggests that there are clearly defined circumstances in which a resignation will be expected by the prime minister (AO1, AO2). However, the prime ministership of Boris Johnson showed this principle being ignored — Priti Patel did not resign over allegations of bullying. This suggests that under the Johnson government individual ministerial responsibility was being challenged but that this is not necessarily part of a long-term trend (AO3).
- When ministers have been involved in a scandal that the press have covered in sensational detail, it has proved very difficult for them to keep their jobs. This was the case for Matt Hancock (2021) in the same way as for Cecil Parkinson (1983) and John Profumo (1963) (AO1, AO2). This suggests that when scandal is involved, the media (and the public's appetite for sensational news stories) is very effective in ensuring individual ministerial responsibility is upheld (AO3).
- Collective ministerial responsibility does not operate in specific circumstances such as when there is a major constitutional issue on which ministers are allowed to campaign on different sides (EEC 1975 and EU 2016 referendums). Also, it is more difficult to uphold during a coalition than when there is a majority government — consider Vince Cable's criticisms of austerity when he was business secretary. Some critics felt the Theresa May government should have resigned over the massive loss (230 votes) of its flagship Brexit policy (2019) (AO1, AO2). However, these circumstances are unusual and in normal circumstances collective ministerial responsibility applies (AO3).
- Boris Johnson was publicly critical of Theresa May's Brexit policy and Tony Benn publicly condemned Harold Wilson's government naval exercises with South Africa, but neither resigned from government. This suggests that collective ministerial responsibility does not always operate — John Major also suffered from cabinet leaks against him ('the bastards') (AO1, AO2). However, these examples were of relatively weak prime ministers who found it difficult to assert authority. In normal circumstances collective responsibility can be maintained by strong prime ministers. NB: both David Davis and (AO3) Boris Johnson *did* eventually resign from May's government over their opposition to the Chequers Agreement (2018) (AO3).
- This suggests that although challenged, both principles are still operating, although much depends on the personality of the prime minister and the strength of their hold over government to determine how effective these conventions are.

3

- The rise of modern communications and 48-hour news has granted increased opportunities for the presidentialism of UK politics. However, it would be rash to argue that there has been a steady rise in presidentialism since this is dependent on certain circumstances.
- Tony Blair was highly presidential, with frequent use of the personal pronoun and a significant increase in the size and influence of the prime minister's office. Boris Johnson also shared similar presidential characteristics (AO1, AO2). However, none of Gordon Brown, Theresa May or Liz Truss were capable of being a presidential leader, which makes this argument less convincing. Rishi Sunak's approach to politics is more measured and consensual than presidential. (AO3).
- The rise of 48-hour news and social media means that there is a constant spotlight on the prime minister, and this gives them the opportunity to be presidential. The introduction of leaders' debates in general elections since 2010 has further shown the growing presidentialism of UK politics (AO1, AO2). However, not all party leaders have engaged in the 'presidential debates' (Theresa May, 2017). We can also see intense media interest in prime ministers, with Harold Wilson

in the 1960s and even Gladstone and Disraeli in the nineteenth century. This suggests that media focus on the prime minister is not new (AO3).

- During crises such as the Iraq War and the Covid-19 pandemic prime ministers directly addressed the nation in a presidential fashion (AO1, AO2). However, such circumstances are unusual, which suggests that there has not been a steady rise in presidentialism (AO3).
- Strong prime ministers with large majorities and a personal mandate for their policies (Blair 1997 and Johnson 2019) can act in a highly presidential fashion. 'Levelling up', for example, is closely connected with Boris Johnson himself (AO1, AO2). However, the personal prestige of leaders (spatial leadership thesis) depends upon specific political circumstances. David Cameron, for example, lacked the same sort of personal mandate in 2010 and 2015 and so was unable to be presidential in the same way. This therefore does not suggest a steady rise in presidentialism (AO3).
- Although certain prime ministers have acted in a presidential fashion since 1997, this has been due to their character, popularity and personal mandate from the public rather than this representing a developing trend in UK politics.

Chapter 8 Relations between branches

Source-based question

- Limited and ineffective:
  - **'"Whipped" partisan lines.'** The whips wield significant influence in the House of Commons, encouraging backbenchers to vote according to the party line, so insufficiently scrutinising legislation. This can reduce genuine scrutiny as MPs vote the way they are required to (AO1, AO2). However, this criticism is over-stated since MPs have frequently rebelled over legislation — Conservative MPs, for example, rebelled over extending lockdown legislation (AO3).
  - **'Ritualistic, point-scoring and unproductive in terms of achieving policy improvements.'** This is a valid criticism of the work of Public Bill Committees since they are whipped and the government will always have a majority (AO1, AO2). However, there are examples of opposition amendments being accepted if they are non-controversial ways of improving legislation (AO3).
  - **'The amount of secondary legislation is growing.'** Increasingly, governments have introduced significant changes to the law through statutory instruments (secondary legislation) because these require much less parliamentary scrutiny. Boris Johnson especially used statutory instruments with lockdown legislation during the pandemic (AO1, AO2). This has become such a major way in which the scrutinising influence of Parliament has been challenged that even the speaker Sir Lindsay Hoyle has been critical (AO3).
- Not limited or ineffective:
  - **'Prime Minister's Question Time.'** This is a regular and highly effective way in which the prime minister and the record of the government are scrutinised. Tony Blair used it very effectively against John Major and David Cameron against Gordon Brown. Sir Keir Starmer also used it against Boris Johnson with some success during the 'party gate' allegations (AO1, AO2). However, its theatrical nature can undermine its effectiveness as a genuinely forensic form of scrutiny (AO3).
  - **'The post hoc scrutiny of policy implementation via select committees.'** Since 1979 select committees have become increasingly effective as they are elected (AO1, AO2). However, select committees have no binding power and often depend on media support if they are going to force a change in policy (the Home Affairs Select Committee, Amber Rudd and the Windrush scandal, 2018) (AO3).

- **'The Liaison Committee … a useful if modest innovation.'** Prime ministers are regularly interrogated by the Liaison Committee, which represents the chairs of all the select committees. Its less confrontational nature makes this a more effective form of forensic scrutiny than Prime Minister's Question Time (PMQT), as the interrogation of Boris Johnson the day before he resigned illustrates (AO1, AO2). However, its lack of media attention has potentially undermined its effectiveness and Johnson ducked attending it on several occasions, which would not be possible with PMQT (AO3).

Evaluative questions

1

- Constitutional experts (A.V. Dicey, Walter Bagehot) traditionally have emphasised the sovereignty of the Westminster Parliament. However, despite Brexit restoring sovereignty to Westminster, there are growing ways in which parliamentary sovereignty is being challenged.
- The UK constitution has traditionally been viewed as unitary because although the Westminster Parliament can devolve power to other legislative bodies, it can reclaim those powers (AO1, AO2). This remains the case with the Stormont Assembly in Northern Ireland. However, this is no longer the case with the parliaments of Wales and Scotland, which can only be abolished on the back of a referendum in those countries. This suggests that Westminster's sovereignty has been challenged in this context (AO3).
- The Supreme Court has challenged the legality of the UK government's actions in both the Gina Miller cases (2017 exiting the EU and 2019 the prorogation of Parliament). In Gina Miller (1), the Supreme Court established the extent of the royal prerogative and in Gina Miller (2) it again determined the limits on what the executive could do. On both occasions the Supreme Court acted as an arbiter between the executive and Parliament over where sovereignty should lie (AO1, AO2). Thus, although Parliament retains legislative sovereignty, it could be claimed that the Supreme Court possesses judicial sovereignty in determining whether the other branches of government have acted according to the rule of law (AO3).
- It has also been claimed that the Human Rights Act has challenged parliamentary sovereignty because of the extent to which it has been used to determine case law: this has provided it with quasi-sovereign powers (AO1, AO2). However, the Human Rights Act can be modified or repealed by Parliament so does not represent a higher law that Parliament must obey. Parliament can even enact legislation in defiance of the Human Rights Act and the judiciary would have to accept the new law, although noting the conflict with a formal statement of incompatibility (AO3).
- The increased use of referendums between 1997 and 2016 contrasted the people's popular sovereignty against the legislative authority of Westminster. Legally Parliament retains *de jure* sovereignty (AO1, AO2). However, in practice (de facto) it would be almost impossible for Parliament to ignore the will of the public expressed in a referendum (EU 2016), suggesting that practically the sovereignty of the Westminster Parliament has been challenged (AO3).
- The increased use of secondary legislation (statutory instruments) by the government represents a way in which the executive can avoid parliamentary scrutiny, so challenging Parliament's sovereign authority (AO1, AO2). This is a powerful way in which the executive can achieve its own sovereign authority, although it could be argued that since Parliament initially passed the primary legislation being amended by statutory instrument, Parliament retains sovereignty (AO3).
- Westminster claims of sovereign authority are thus being challenged from several directions (political, legal, executive and judicial), suggesting that the authority of the Westminster Parliament is being significantly challenged.

2

- Although the UK Supreme Court has been criticised for its recent involvement in politics, its importance in upholding the rule of law and determining the location of sovereignty in the UK means that its role in government is indispensable.
- Critics of the Supreme Court's political involvement claim that it can interfere in cases that Parliament and the executive should determine. By becoming involved in political controversies such as Brexit and the prorogation of Parliament by Boris Johnson (2019), it overstepped the separation of powers (AO1, AO2). However, it is the duty of the Supreme Court to determine the location of sovereignty and the meaning of the rule of law, so these interventions were justified (AO3).
- The Supreme Court ensures that the government acts in accordance with the Human Rights Act. It has often done this with reference to the Home Office and potential challenges to civil liberties (*Belmarsh* 2004 and *HJ and HT* v *Home Secretary*, 2010) (AO1, AO2). Although controversial, this is an appropriate use of the Human Rights Act by the Supreme Court since the executive must be bound by the rule of law (*Entick* v *Carrington*, 1765) (AO3).
- The Supreme Court can issue a formal statement of incompatibility if a parliamentary statute conflicts with the Human Rights Act. This might be seen as interfering with Parliament's legislative role (AO1, AO2). However, the formal statement of incompatibility could not be used to quash the legislation since no parliament may bind its successor, which suggests that the Supreme Court has not exceeded its authority (AO3).
- Critics claim that the Supreme Court has used the Human Rights Act to extensively develop judge-made case law. By doing this it has effectively interfered with Parliament's legislative role (AO1, AO2). However, the judiciary has always interpreted the meaning of statute law when making case law, so when the Supreme Court has done this with the Human Rights Act, this is within an existing common law tradition and so not an unconstitutional innovation (AO3).
- Although politicians and the press have recently claimed that the Supreme Court has interfered in the legislative and executive process, this is not a convincing argument and may well have been motivated more by partisan resentment at unfavourable judgments than by constitutional realities.

3

- Although the European Union has encouraged dramatic economic growth due to free trade and the free movement of people, its political success has not always been as great. To say, though, that it is a political failure would be going too far.
- The EU's commitment to the four freedoms has encouraged a dramatic growth in the size of the EU's economy ($17.1 trillion, 2020) (AO1, AO2). However, the single European currency has been less obviously a success for all members: the European sovereign debt crisis that impacted very badly on less developed European countries such as Greece (AO3).
- Although the European economy has grown significantly, this has not always brought further political integration. The free movement of people has been economically advantageous (AO1, AO2). However, it has also encouraged resentment and hostility in Western European countries, leading to a rise in populist parties and discouraging further integration. Brexit may be a consequence of this. However, the EU has still massively expanded (27 members, 2022), suggesting it is not a political failure (AO3).
- The political success of the EU has been weakened by the ongoing commitment of member states to their sovereign identity during the migrant and Covid-19 crises (AO1, AO2). However, this does not mean that the EU is a political failure. The European project has always been a balancing act between national self-interest and wider European goals and so this tension is unavoidable. The successful implementation of the Maastricht (1993) and Lisbon (2009) treaties does not suggest that it is a political failure. The EU's response to Covid-19 also became increasingly strong (AO3).

- The EU has been criticised for not having developed a coherent foreign and defence strategy, ensuring that its global influence is limited (AO1, AO2). However, the EU has reacted strongly to the Russian invasion of Ukraine and is a world leader in its response to climate change, which suggests that it is certainly not a political failure (AO3).
- This suggests that the EU has had considerable economic and political successes. However, it still faces significant economic and political problems, which suggests that neither has it been an unqualified success.

Theme 2 Political ideas

Chapter 9 Liberalism

1

- **Introduction:** Liberals can agree on the desirability of capitalism, the free market and the importance of private property but disagree about the role of the state in the economy.
- Classical and modern liberals are all influenced by the idea that the state should respect the natural right to private property as described by Locke. However, modern liberalism favours progressive taxation (positive freedom), which classical liberalism would argue is an infringement upon the individual's natural rights. Robert Nozick argued that taxation by the state amounted to theft.
- Classical and modern liberals are enthusiastic supporters of the free-market ideas of Adam Smith for being the best route for prosperity. However, while modern liberals support the free market, they have deviated from Smith's ideas by supporting Keynesian economics, which argues for state intervention, rather than Smith's laissez-faire economics.
- Classical and modern liberals can broadly accept that capitalism will lead to unequal outcomes for individuals within the economy. However, the two branches of liberalism differ on how much inequality they will tolerate. Classical liberals are laissez-faire and leave outcomes to the market, modern liberals such as Rawls argue that the state must intervene so that individuals cannot disproportionately prosper at the expense of others.
- Classical liberals argue that state-managed welfare provisions favoured by modern liberals like Rawls are an economical as well as a societal interference and erode egotistical individualism and lead to a dependency culture. Furthermore, welfare spending is expensive and can lead to the state building up potentially unmanageable levels of debt that risk bankrupting countries.
- **Conclusion:** There is agreement on the importance of private property and capitalism. However, there is a real difference on the role of the state in the management of the economy. It is for this reason that the differences outweigh the similarities.

2

- **Introduction:** While both strands of liberalism can agree on the broad arrangements for the state, there is considerable disagreement on the extent to which they believe the state should involve itself in society and economy.
- Classical and modern liberals agree with Locke that individualism needs to be protected and encouraged and that there should be a toleration of different values, beliefs and versions of what constitutes the ideal life. This has influenced the support of liberals for constitutionalism and the protection of human rights in such documents as the US Bill of Rights.
- Classical liberalism (Wollstonecraft and Mill) and modern liberalism (Friedan) have both argued that women are as rational as men, calling for the state to support enfranchisement and equality of opportunity in the public sphere of society.

- Classical liberals' view of egotistical individualism in relation to human nature argues that individuals have a rational sense of self-interest and self-reliance. This corresponds to classical liberals' attitude to the state — preferring a small state and negative freedom.
- Modern liberals believe in developmental individualism in relation to human nature and that for the individual to reach their full potential, they need to be assisted by the state. This corresponds to modern liberals' attitude to the state — preferring an enabling state.
- **Conclusion:** Liberalism's attitude to human nature leads to some common conclusions about the role of the state. Conversely, the different attitudes to human nature between classical and modern liberalism lead to differing conclusions on the role of the state.

3

- **Introduction:** Liberalism is united on many aspects of human nature, state, society and the economy, however there are also notable divides.
- Liberalism is united in believing that human society predates the state and that the state should leave individuals free to flourish. However, classical liberals largely view society as atomistic, while modern liberals perceive society as more organic, which is a significant difference.
- Liberalism is united in its support of Locke's ideas of constitutionalism and the importance of individualism. There is agreement around Mill's ideas of toleration of different values, beliefs and versions of what constitutes an ideal life. However, liberals disagree on what constitutes the common good. Classical liberal Locke argued for formal equality, while Rawls argued for social justice that formal equality is not enough and the state must intervene and offer equality of opportunity. This is a significant difference.
- Liberalism is united in the belief that the state should support the rule of law and that there should be a formal entrenchment of human rights within higher law, such as the US Bill of Rights. However, classical liberals such as Locke and Mill in his early writings argue that the state should be restricted to maintaining the rule of law, while modern liberals such as Rawls argue for an enabling state to facilitate a welfare state. This is a significant difference.
- Classical and modern liberals are both supporters of capitalism and admire the free-trade economic ideas of Adam Smith as being the best route to wealth and prosperity for individuals and nation states. However, while classical liberals argue that the state should support laissez-faire economics with minimal government, modern liberals have deviated from these ideas and support Keynesian economics, where the state intervenes directly to stimulate the economy.
- **Conclusion:** Liberalism is most united on the importance of constitutionalism and individual rights. The biggest divergence is on the role of the state in society and the economy.

4

- **Introduction:** Liberals are united on many aspects of individualism. However, there are also notable divisions.
- Liberals are united in their optimistic view of human nature and viewing individuals as naturally rational, moral and wishing to pursue the good life. The ideas of Mill, Wollstonecraft, Friedan and Rawls have led to a consensus that all individuals have an equal worth in society. Modern liberals have taken these ideas into areas that classical liberals such as Mill never imagined in their championing of LGBTQ+ rights.
- Liberals agree that individualism needs to be protected and encouraged and that there should be a toleration of different values, beliefs and version of what constitutes the ideal life. However, classical liberals like Mill argue that individuals need negative freedom to be truly free, while Rawls argues that individuals need positive freedom to be truly free.
- Liberals are united in their concerns about popular democracy conflicting with individual rights. Mill conceptualised this concern with his tyranny of the majority. However, liberals differ on how best to deal with the conflict between popular democracy and individual rights. Classical liberals prefer

representative democracy, which allows filters to control the 'tyranny of the majority' while funding a welfare state.

- **Conclusion:** While liberals can agree on their broad agreements of individualism, there are significant differences in what constitutes freedom.

Chapter 10 Conservatism

1

- **Introduction:** Conservatives have an ambivalent attitude to paternalism. While acknowledging that the state should intervene to assist individuals, there remains a debate, particularly among one-nation and neo-conservatives, about the extent of state intervention. Neo-liberals oppose state-sponsored paternalism.
- Conservatism in almost all of its incarnations (apart from neo-liberalism) has supported the concept of paternalism. Paternalism is linked to the ideas of noblesse oblige and the organic conservatives. Burke argued that elites have a duty of care to the rest of the population and if they abdicate this responsibility it can lead to revolution, as in the USA and France. Traditional, one-nation and neo-conservatism have all been influenced by the practical need to be paternalistic, i.e. societal stability. A good recent example would be the action of one-nation government in the UK and neo-conservative-influenced government in the UK's paternalistic response to the Covid-19 pandemic.
- Organic conservatives differ in the nature of paternalism: traditional conservative paternalism is based on the tradition of noblesse oblige. Early one-nation conservatism sees a limited role for the state; later one-nation conservatism sees a larger role in maintaining a welfare state. Neo-conservatives favour a less generous welfare state than later one-nation conservatives.
- In the modern era there is a considerable difference in the size and role of the state between later one-nation conservatives and neo-conservatives. Both see themselves as being paternalist, but neo-conservatives fear creating a dependency culture.
- Neo-liberals view society as atomistic, which puts them at odds with all other organic conservatives. Rand and Nozick focus on a minimal state and individualism and argue that paternalism means that the freedom of the individual is often sacrificed when people are taxed to pay for a welfare state. Like neo-conservatives, Rand argues that such state intervention weakens an individual's development, making it more likely that they will be reliant on the state. Neo-liberals are happy for private individuals to engage in voluntarism, just as long as they are not compelled to do so by the state.
- **Conclusion:** Within conservatism, traditional, one-nation and neo-conservatives all agree on the importance of state-sponsored paternalism, but they disagree on the exact role of the state. Neo-liberals are against state-sponsored paternalism, although are happy for private individuals to behave paternally as long as they are not compelled to do so.

2

- **Introduction:** Traditional conservatism and early one-nation conservatism have much in common but later one-nation conservatism differs considerably.
- Traditional conservatism and early one-nation conservatism were both influenced by the ideas of Burke, who was sceptical about the rational ability of humans and argued that any state intervention should be influenced by cautious empiricism. Later one-nation conservatives are influenced by modern liberalism and rationalistic ideas. Successive one-nation prime ministers from Macmillan to Johnson have adopted rationalistic policies such as Keynesian economics.
- Traditional conservatives were originally influenced by Hobbes, who favoured absolute monarchy. Later traditional conservatives agreed with Burke, who favoured parliamentary government elected by elites. Early one-nation conservatives disagreed, with Disraeli favouring a wider electorate with

the 1867 Reform Act. Modern one-nation conservatives favour universal suffrage, something Burke opposed.

- Traditional conservatives such as Burke favour upholding public morality and authoritarian law and order. Hobbes, Burke and Oakeshott all believe in the importance of religion to help bind society. Modern one-nation conservatism is far more secular than traditional conservatism and more inclusive on same-sex relationships and marriage and LGBTQ+ issues.
- Traditional conservatism influenced by Burke supports the idea of the free market, the ideas of Adam Smith and limited state interference in the economy. Modern one-nation conservatism differs dramatically as it is influenced by modern liberalism. One-nation prime ministers from Macmillan to Johnson have been influenced by Keynesian economics. Likewise, traditional conservatives did not support financing a welfare state, while one-nation conservatives do.
- **Conclusion:** While there are some similarities between traditional conservatism and the early one-nation conservatism of Disraeli, there are considerable differences between traditional conservativism and later one-nation conservatism over the role of the state in relation to the economy.

3

- **Introduction:** Most branches of conservativism (traditional, one-nation conservative and neo-conservative), with the exception of neo-liberalism, argue that human nature is imperfect.
- Hobbes argued that human imperfection is innate, which influences all conservative thinking (apart from that of neo-liberals). Humans and therefore human nature are intellectually imperfect, leading Burke and Oakeshott to favour the status quo over change. If society must change it should be guided by cautious empiricism (Burke). Neo-liberals have a positive view of human nature, arguing that individuals are capable of rational thought (Rand and Nozick).
- Human nature is communal and people crave the community and structure of an organic society (Burke). Humans are unequal, so a ruling class is needed to rule society for the benefit of all (Hobbes, Burke, Oakeshott). Neo-liberals view human nature as individualistic and therefore prefer an atomistic society.
- Most branches of conservatism (neoliberalism apart) argue that human imperfection can lead to disaster if the state puts faith in abstract ideas over pragmatism (Burke and Oakeshott). Neo-liberals are far more positive on rationalism, preferring scientific method over pragmatism.
- Neo-liberals believe that a welfare state inhibits an individual's capacities to be self-reliant and creates a dependency culture that distorts human nature (Rand and Nozick), while most conservatives argue for some kind of welfare state to assist the vulnerable. Neo-liberals reject the morality inherent within traditional conservatism's view of human nature as it infringes individual freedom (Rand and Nozick).
- **Conclusion:** Conservatives agree more on human nature than they disagree. Neo-liberalism's interpretation of human nature is a schism within conservatism and remains the minority viewpoint.

4

- **Introduction:** The different branches of conservative thought are mostly in favour of the free market and property ownership. However, there are numerous disagreements among conservatives concerning the role of the state in relation to managing the economy.
- Traditional conservatives are ambivalent about capitalism and the role of the state in the economy. Some favoured protectionism to preserve the interests of the elite and the nation state. Edmund Burke influenced traditional conservativism and one-nation conservativism by his support for the free market and the ideas of Adam Smith.
- Burke's idea of 'changing to conserve' influenced early one-nation conservatism and saw Disraeli arguing for extremely modest state intervention to regulate the economy. This differs considerably

from modern one-nation conservatives who have favoured a far more interventionist policy with Keynesian economics.

- Neo-conservatives were opposed to the level of state intervention proposed by one-nation conservatives. Margaret Thatcher was against the mixed economy supported by one-nation conservatives at the time and proposed wide-scale privatisation of national utilities. Neo-conservatives also want to reduce the size of the welfare state. Neo-conservatives argue that there should be some kind of welfare state, which puts them in conflict with small-state neo-liberals.
- Neo-liberals such as Rand and Nozick are committed to a small-state, free-market model and oppose interventionary state management such as Keynesian economics. This brings them into conflict with one-nation conservatives. However, it also sees them differ from neo-conservatives. Neo-conservatives value organic society above all else and this will see them abandon free-market economics for Keynesian economics in times of crisis.
- **Conclusion:** Conservatives are broadly united in supporting the free market and property rights. The biggest difference is between the one-nation conservatives and neo-liberals on managing the economy and the size of the state. Neo-conservatives, while sympathetic to neo-liberal ideas, maintain there must be a welfare state and will adopt Keynesian economic policies in times of crisis (AO3).

Chapter 11 Socialism

1

- **Introduction:** Different branches of socialism favour different aspects of equality. Equality is therefore a multifaceted concept, including foundational equality, absolute equality, equality of outcome, equality of welfare and equality of opportunity.
- All socialists agree on foundational equality (AO1), which is the belief that all individuals are born equal and are entitled to the same political and legal rights. Although all branches of socialism are committed to different types of equality, they are riven with disagreement about the efficacy of which equality is best for society (AO2, AO3).
- Revolutionary socialists like Marx and Engels and Luxemburg advocate absolute equality so that everyone receives the same rewards within society (AO1). Social democracy and the third way reject revolutionary socialism's (Marx and Engels and Luxemburg) belief in absolute equality as impractical (AO2, AO3).
- Revolutionary socialists Marx and Engels and Luxemburg and democratic socialist Webb argued for an equality of outcome whereby rewards were based on an individual's contribution (AO1). Social democracy (Crosland) and the third way (Giddens) believed in reducing inequality of outcome but were never as committed to it as revolutionary socialists because they did not reject capitalism, which by its very nature creates unequal outcomes (AO2, AO3).
- There is disagreement between social democrats and the third way. Social democrats (Crosland) favour equality of welfare (via a welfare state). The third way (Giddens) prefer a less generous equality of welfare, with 'means-tested benefits' (AO2). Revolutionary socialists reject equality of opportunity, which is strongly supported by social democrats and the third way, declaring it futile, as it does not address the inherent inequalities of capitalism (AO2, AO3).
- **Conclusion:** All branches of socialism are broadly committed to equality (AO3). However, there are irreconcilable differences over what constitutes the nature of this equality (AO3). Overall, disagreement outweighs agreement (AO3).

2

- **Introduction:** The third way is a revised version of social democracy. There is therefore both common ground and differences between the two branches of socialism in how they view human nature, the role of the state in governing society, and the economy.
- Human nature. Both social democracy and the third way agree that humans naturally have a strong sense of social justice and object to gross inequalities of wealth (AO1, AO2). However, Giddens believed that human nature was more nuanced than Crosland, arguing that the communal sense of community was balanced by a desire for individual advancement (AO2, AO3).
- The role of the state. Both social democracy and the third way reject the revolutionary socialist ideas of Marx/Engels (with the withering away of the state) as well as the democratic socialism of Webb (gradualism) (AO1, AO2, AO3). Both favour the state managing the economy through progressive taxation and promotion of a welfare state and equality of opportunity. Giddens (the third way) favoured the free market far more than Crosland (social democracy) who preferred state management of the economy. Giddens favours the state being more 'hand up' rather than Crosland's 'handout' state (AO1, AO2, AO3).
- Society. Both social democracy and the third way argue that societal class division can be healed (AO1, AO2, AO3). Both agree that the state can be used to remodel this (social democracy — comprehensive schools, third way — more young people attending university). Social democracy focuses on social justice, the third way more on social inclusion. For example, while Crosland argues that the state should fund all welfare, the third way favours individual responsibility and a means-tested welfare state (e.g. introduction of university fees) (AO1, AO2, AO3).
- Economy. Social democracy and the third way reject both the revolutionary socialism and the democratic socialism vision of economic management (AO1, AO2, AO3). However, while social democracy favours Keynesian economics, the third way is more positive on the free market and entrepreneurship. While both argue for 'progressive taxation', social democracy champions far higher levels of tax than the third way (AO1, AO2, AO3).
- **Conclusion:** Social democracy and the third way are both opposed to revolutionary socialism. Social democracy and the third way both support a proactive state intervening for social justice and equality of opportunity. However, the third way is a 'renewal' of social democracy and is different — it favours means testing social inclusion over social justice. Likewise, it prefers the free market and lower taxation to social democracy's Keynesian economics and higher taxation (AO3).

3

- **Introduction:** Socialists share a common concern about the effects of unfettered capitalism. However, they disagree considerably on how best to manage the economy.
- All forms of socialism are critical of the negative effects of capitalism. All forms of socialism are, to differing degrees, critical of the wasteful competition inherent within capitalism and emphasise the need for cooperation. Revolutionary socialists think capitalism is beyond reform. Evolutionary socialists think capitalism can be reformed but disagree on how to reform it (AO1, AO2, AO3).
- Evolutionary socialists all agree that capitalism can be reformed of its most exploitative tendencies. The third way argues for far less equality of outcome than either social democracy or democratic socialism (AO1, AO2, AO3).
- Revolutionary socialists such as Marx and Engels think only mature economies can experience revolution, while Luxemburg argues that less mature economies are also capable of successful communist revolutions (AO1, AO2, AO3).
- All forms of socialism are committed to an economy that creates a fairer society. Socialists disagree on the role of the state in organising the economy. Revolutionary socialists think the state will wither away, while evolutionary socialists disagree on how active the state must be in managing the economy (AO1, AO2, AO3).

- All forms of socialism envisage equality of opportunity within society. Evolutionary socialists disagree on how to manage the economy. Webb (democratic socialism) favours nationalisation; Crosland (social democracy) a mixed economy; and Giddens (third way) prefers a neo-liberal free market.
- **Conclusion:** While there is broad agreement on the negative consequences of capitalism, there are significant differences in views on how best the economy and capitalism should be managed across the different branches of socialism.

4

- **Introduction:** Socialist thinkers are broadly positive on common humanity and the belief that human nature is malleable. Socialists differ in how capitalism affects common humanity and the extent to which human nature is collective/individualistic.
- Most socialist thinkers have an optimistic view of human nature, believing that individuals possess a common humanity and gravitate towards cooperation and sociability. Webb is the least optimistic key thinker on human nature, arguing that the working class lacked the rational and intellectual sophistication to take control of industry themselves, and therefore required guidance by an intellectually superior and paternal middle class (AO1, AO2, AO3).
- Socialists believe that human nature is malleable, like plasticine, and is moulded for good or for bad by social circumstances. Socialists argue that unreformed capitalism has had a negative effect upon human nature as it indoctrinates selfish, individualistic and greedy behaviour (AO1, AO2, AO3).
- Different branches of socialism disagree about the exact effect of capitalism. Revolutionary socialists are the most negative, evolutionary socialists are more positive. Marx and Engels argued that capitalism corrupts human nature, Crosland argued that capitalism was not as corrosive on human nature as Marx/Engels believed (AO1, AO2, AO3).
- Socialists believe that humans are rationally capable of creating new forms of society and economy that can create 'socialism'. Socialists differ in how they view common humanity. Revolutionary socialists and democratic socialists have a more collective view of human nature, evolutionary socialists have a mix of collective and individualistic views of common humanity (AO1, AO2, AO3).
- **Conclusion:** Socialists can broadly agree on the positive nature of common humanity. However, there are numerous differences among all branches of socialism on the notion of common humanity.

Chapter 12 Anarchism

1

- **Introduction:** The majority of anarchists view an anarchist society as one that will be stateless. Although collectivist anarchists broadly agree on a vision of society, individualist anarchism virtually denies that society should exist at all.
- All branches of anarchism agree that the state is not needed for the creation of an anarchist society, be it collective or individualistic. The one exception is Proudhon, who envisages a role for the state (albeit a 'shell of a state') in the organisation of a new anarchist society.
- Collectivist anarchists are in broad agreement about the nature of an anarchist society. Kropotkin argues for voluntary communities that are self-governing, Bakunin's ideal society is similar but federal in nature, Proudhon's mutualism and Kropotkin's anarcho-communism are very similar. Differences are smaller between these different versions of collective communities.
- Individualist anarchists such as Stirner argue that there is no such thing as society in the conventional understanding of the word, while all collectivist anarchists propose similar versions of society. Stirner views each individual as having their own autonomy.

- **Conclusion:** Collectivist anarchists broadly agree on the kind of organic cooperative anarchist society they envisage, although there are subtle differences. Individualist anarchism essentially rejects society as most would understand it and therefore envisages existence in atomistic terms.

2

- **Introduction:** As a set of political ideas, many anarchists have a positive view of human nature. However, a number of anarchist thinkers argue that human nature is neither self-interested nor neutral.
- All anarchists argue that human nature is malleable and we behave as a product of the society in which we grow up. The state has a particular power to corrupt individuals, which has a corrosive effect on human nature.
- Anarchists broadly agree that human nature is naturally 'good', in that humans are naturally sociable and rational. However, there is some disagreement. Collectivist socialists view human nature as being naturally communal while individualistic anarchism views human nature as more egotistical. Proudhon is the most negative on human nature as he acknowledges the selfishness of man.
- Collective anarchists such as Kropotkin argue that humans are predisposed to altruism and cooperative social groups. Individualist anarchists such as Stirner view humans as being intensely competitive and motivated by self-interest.
- **Conclusion:** While broadly agreeing on the corrosive effect the state has on human nature, the biggest disagreement within anarchism is a fundamental one, namely that humans' natural state is either collective or individualistic.

3

- **Introduction:** Anarchists can agree that the state should be abolished so that it no longer controls the management of the economy, but there are significant differences in how the economy should be organised.
- Collective anarchists view the organisation of the economy in communal terms, while individualistic anarchism perceives the economy as being based on competition between individuals.
- Within collective anarchism, anarcho-communism and mutualism are the most similar as they focus on mutual cooperation and strongly resemble the economic communism of Marx and Engels. Anarcho-syndicalism differs in that the syndicates would become the owners of their own particular means of production. Each syndicate would engage in a mutually beneficial exchange of goods and services.
- Within individualist anarchism there are also significant differences between the two branches. While both would be unregulated and based on competition, Stirner's vision is more individualistic as he argues that individuals would be free to maximise their own advantages, leaving him open to criticism that society and economy could become lawless. Anarcho-capitalism has more checks on the individual with the rule of law and being maintained by a private sector.
- **Conclusion:** The two main branches of anarchism have fundamental divisions in how the economy should be managed in an anarchist society. Collective anarchism is the most similar within its different strands, while individualist anarchism is the most different within its two strands.

4

- **Introduction:** Anarchism has two distinct branches, collective and individualist, but these share common characteristics, although whether this is enough to make anarchism a united movement is debatable.
- All anarchism is anti-state and anti-clerical, opposing hierarchy and religion. All forms of anarchism expect that there will need to be a revolution, although there are differences over whether it will be peaceful or violent. The majority of anarchists expect there to be violence. However, collective and individualistic anarchism have very different visions of what society would look like.

- Collective anarchism broadly agrees on how society should be organised, but there are subtle differences between the branches. Anarcho-communism (Kropotkin) advocates small-scale communities based on voluntary small-scale social communities, while Proudhon argues for a limited role for the state ('shell of a state') to organise a new anarchist society.
- The individualist anarchists of Stirner's egoism and anarcho-capitalism are significantly different. While Stirner rejects conventional capitalism, anarcho-capitalism is heavily influenced by the ideas of classical and neo-liberalism.
- **Conclusion:** While the majority of anarchist thinkers believe that violence and revolution will be needed to bring about a new society, it would be incorrect to say the political idea is united. Collective and individualist anarchism are profoundly different (AO3).

Chapter 13 Ecologism

1

- **Introduction:** While ecologists can agree there needs to be a development of environmental ethics, shallow green and dark green ecologists disagree over how this might be developed.
- Shallow green ecologists focus on animal liberation from an anthropocentric sense and are concerned with individual species. Dark green ecologists disagree with this approach and argue for animal liberation that focuses on whole ecosystems. Peter Singer, for example, argues that animals should receive the same rights as humans. While there is broad agreement that there needs to be a change of environmental ethics, there is considerable disagreement over the extent of this change between the two branches of ecologism. Light green ecologists argue for environmental ethics that involves enlightened stewardship of the planet, which is anthropocentric; dark green ecologists are more holistic and see all species coexisting with biocentric equality.
- Shallow green ecologists focus on managerialism to readjust social and economic needs to preserve the environment, which is an anthropocentric approach. Dark green ecologists disagree, arguing that it does not go far enough. Schumacher argues for post-materialism and ecocentric solutions that focus on decentralised communities and bioregions. While there is broad agreement that there needs to be a change from the current status quo, dark green ecologists are far more radical than shallow green ecologists.
- Shallow green ecologists focus on green capitalism to change environmental behaviour via green consumerism, the taxation of air emissions and tax breaks for renewables to change environmental behaviour. Dark green ecologists view capitalism as futile, with eco-socialists and eco-anarchists both arguing that private property should be abolished and replaced with common ownership.
- **Conclusion:** While ecologists agree that there must be a development of environmental ethics, there are significant differences between shallow green ecologists who wish for environmental ethics that are essentially anthropocentric in nature and dark green ecologists who argue for more ecocentric ethics.

2

- **Introduction:** While ecologists can agree there needs to be a development of existing social structures, there is considerable disagreement between shallow and dark green ecologists.
- Ecologists agree that societal structures must change; however, there is considerable difference in what these changes must be. Shallow green ecologists argue that societal structures must become better stewards to protect the environment. Deep green ecologists reject the conventional ethics of society and argue for a complete break from the mechanistic world view.
- Ecologists can agree very broadly on holism. Shallow green ecologists accept a limited concept of holism influenced by the ideas of Carson. Dark green ecologists are more influenced by

Schumacher, who argued for a complete restructuring of society via bioregions, while shallow green ecologists argue more for reform.

- Ecologists can agree that social structures within the economic workings of society will change, but there is considerable difference over what these changes will be. Shallow green ecologists argue for managerialism and sustainable development, while deep greens ecologists are influenced by Schumacher and Bookchin, who argue for localism and limits to growth.
- **Conclusion:** While ecologists agree that social structures must change, dark green ecologists are considerably more radical than the reformist shallow green ecologists in their ideas for change.

3

- **Introduction:** Ecologism is divided on the modern industrial economy. While shallow green ecologists argue that it can be reformed, deep green ecologists argue that it cannot.
- Shallow green ecologists argue that the modern industrial economy can coexist with the environment. Deep green ecologists argue that it cannot and that there must be radical change. Deep green ecologists and social ecologists such as eco-anarchists and eco-socialists go as far as arguing that capitalism must be destroyed via revolution to ensure environmental protection, and that an economy modelled on communism should replace it.
- Shallow green ecologists argue that green capitalism can change environmental behaviour. Deep green ecologists disagree that the modern industrial economy is unsustainable. Schumacher and Bookchin argue that the economy must be remodelled around localism.
- Shallow green ecologists argue for managerialism from supranational bodies to achieve sustainability. Deep green ecologists argue that managerialism and conservation continue to fail and that there must be radical change, such as localism.
- **Conclusion:** There is a considerable divide between shallow green and dark green ecologism on the compatibility of ecologism with the modern industrial economy. Shallow greens argue that there is compatibility and propose reform, while dark greens and social ecologists dismiss the idea and argue for incompatibility and radical change as a solution.

4

- **Introduction:** The strands of ecologism share little agreement that the state can play a role in preserving the environment.
- Shallow green ecologists argue for weak sustainability where the state intervenes at national and international levels to regulate environmental problems. Deep green ecologists like Schumacher argue that the state should be decentralised to facilitate localism.
- Shallow green ecologists argue for the state to facilitate green capitalism and incentivising good environmental behaviour such as Nestlé's zero deforestation policy. Deep green ecologists dismiss such behaviour as ineffective and say that the state is the problem and should either decentralise (Schumacher) or be abolished.
- Shallow green ecologists retain the post-Enlightenment mechanistic world view that nature can be understood, fixed and replaced as if nature were a machine. Shallow ecologists argue that the state should favour technological solutions to the climate problems. Deep green ecologists argue that the mechanistic world view is part of the problem and that state and society need to be radically reorganised so that they become ecocentric.
- **Conclusion:** Ecologists can only really agree on the limitations of the state, with the majority of ecologists (deep green and social ecologists) wishing to either radically restructure it or abolish it. Shallow green ecologists differ dramatically and argue for a positive role for the state in preserving the economy.

Chapter 14 Feminism

1

- **Introduction:** There is broad agreement on aspects of sex and gender within feminism; however, there are distinct differences.
- The vast majority of feminists agree that sex is a biological fact, while a minority of feminists, chiefly transfeminists, argue that sex is socially constructed. Equality feminists argue that sex is a biological fact but believe the gender differences are socially constructed. Difference feminists believe in essentialism, which argues that biological differences between men and women lead to distinct differences in their natures.
- Liberal feminists are primarily concerned with dealing with gender equality within the public sphere. Radical feminists are concerned with gender inequality within both the public and the private spheres. Postmodern feminists like bell hooks argue that the causes of gender inequality are not based on gender alone.
- Socialist feminism and postmodern feminism argue for a much more complicated understanding of gender than liberal and radical feminism, which offer more generic explanations of gender and how it affects women.
- **Conclusion:** While there is a consensus among feminists that sex is a biological fact, equality feminists and difference feminists disagree about the effect biological differences have on gender roles. There is broad agreement among feminists about gender roles being important in the public sphere of society, while radical/postmodern feminists argue that the state must address gender roles in the private sphere.

2

- **Introduction:** There is broad agreement among feminists on the oppression faced by women in society and economy, but there are differences between the various branches on the nature of this oppression and over proposed solutions.
- All feminists agree that women face discrimination in society and economy and that this is a historical problem. However, there is disagreement over how to deal with this problem. Liberal feminists propose reform, radical feminists propose drastic change, socialist feminists propose revolutionary change.
- Most feminists agree that equality within society and economy has been difficult for women because of innate institutionalised cultural disadvantages. Feminists have disagreed on the focus of these disadvantages. Liberal and radical feminism have analysed these problems through a white middle-class generic prism while postmodern feminism has taken a more intersectional approach.
- Equality feminists argue that the labour market is divided because of gender roles, with women being employed in professions that are seen as feminine and men in roles that are seen as masculine. Male-dominated professions tend to be better paid. Difference feminists argue that women are biologically predetermined to favour certain professions.
- **Conclusion:** While there is considerable agreement within equality feminism about the causes of problems for women, there is also considerable difference on the proposed solutions. Difference feminists disagree with the equality feminist argument that women are socially conditioned into certain professions. Difference feminists argue that women's natural feminine disposition draws them to certain professions.

3

- **Introduction:** There is broad agreement in feminism on what patriarchy is; however, there are key differences over methods to nullify its effects.
- Most feminists are equality feminists and use the term 'patriarchy' to define a society that is dominated by men and that oppresses women. Liberal feminists tend to not use the term patriarchy, preferring to describe inequality in society as stemming from discrimination. Postmodern feminists have the most complex definition of patriarchy because of their belief in

intersectionality. However, the majority of feminists can agree that society has been organised throughout human history so that men dominate and women play subordinate roles.

- Most feminists argue that patriarchal gender stereotyping as described by Gilman and de Beauvoir defined patriarchy as a cultural and not a biological phenomenon. Noticeably different in this view are difference feminists, who view biological differences as being important.
- While feminists cannot always agree on the exact definition of patriarchy, there is a consensus that however it is defined by different branches, it should be opposed in the public sector. Post-feminists disagree on this as they argue that most feminist goals have been achieved. Similarly, liberal feminists argue that the state should limit itself to intervening in the public sphere of society, which disagrees with radical and postmodern feminists, who argue that the state must involve itself in the private sphere of society as well as the public sphere.
- **Conclusion:** While there is broad agreement on the existence and definition of patriarchy, there are explicit differences across the branches of feminism. There is also difference in how and in what areas of society feminists should oppose patriarchy.

4

- **Introduction:** While there are broad areas of agreement over how feminists wish to achieve social change, there are also key differences in their approaches.
- Liberal and radical feminists disagree on the areas of society in which to advance social change. Liberal feminists have traditionally focused only on the public sphere of society and equality of opportunity. Radical feminists argue that patriarchy must be challenged in both the public and private spheres.
- Post-feminists such as Camille Paglia argue that most feminists' goals have been achieved and that patriarchy is largely defeated and post-feminists are the least ambitious branch for societal change. Postmodern feminists disagree. Because of intersectionality, they have numerous solutions for societal change, from opposing gender mutilation, to transfeminist rights, opposing cyber-patriarchy and targeting countries with high violence levels against women, to name but a few.
- Difference and cultural feminists disagree with equality feminists about gender being created by society, arguing instead that biological sexual differences influence gender roles. Difference and cultural feminists wish to remodel society so that it acknowledges the importance of femininity. Cultural feminists go one step further by arguing that feminine traits are superior to masculine traits and should be promoted as part of social change.
- **Conclusion:** While there is broad agreement about promoting social change in the public sphere of society, there are numerous differences over the approach to take across the strands of feminism.

Chapter 15 Multiculturalism

1

- **Introduction:** Multiculturalism supporting minority rights can be perceived as both a positive and a negative for society depending on which branch of multiculturalism is discussing it.
- Pluralist multiculturalists such as Parekh argue that minority rights must be preserved to maintain cultures. He argues that cultures can coexist within a 'community of communities'. Liberal multiculturalists are concerned that this can cause division when minority groups do not share liberal values.
- Conservatives cling to customs, rituals and long-standing practices. The cultural diversity of multiculturalism threatens long-standing national identity. Cultural relativism and deep diversity are unacceptable to many conservatives. Therefore, conservatives traditionally argue that minorities must conform to the dominant culture, adopting a process of assimilation. This causes conflict.

- Pluralist multiculturalists argue that some communities need state intervention to protect minority rights and address inequality within society and the economy. Cosmopolitan multiculturalists are opposed to this and argue that attachments to communities should be weak and therefore state interventions are unnecessary.
- **Conclusion:** While pluralist multiculturalists support minority rights, other branches of multiculturalism argue that these can cause division.

2

- **Introduction:** Although multicultural thinkers agree on the importance of society in shaping individuals, there remain disagreement and tensions between liberal, plural and cosmopolitan strands of multicultural thought.
- Multiculturalists are united in seeing themselves as part of society and that society shapes individuals. Kymlicka refers to the 'self-fulfilment' arising from strong cultural identity. However, there is disagreement across liberal, plural and cosmopolitan strands of multicultural thought that is unreconcilable.
- Some multicultural and religious communities are intolerant of alternative belief systems. Pluralist multiculturalists like Parekh argue for 'moral relativism', but this often goes beyond Berlin's moral pluralism that most liberal multiculturalists are comfortable with.
- Pluralist multiculturalists such as Parekh assert that cultures within society do not coexist peacefully. Kymlicka argues that cosmopolitan multiculturalism threatens minority culture and that minority cultures must be culturally embedded, else they wither and die.
- **Conclusion:** While multiculturalists can agree that diverse societies offer benefits for all different cultures and can agree on cultural recognition, there are clear differences between liberal and pluralist multiculturalists. Liberal multiculturalists can extend toleration only so far and are committed to individual rights, while pluralist multiculturalists favour collective rights, which trespass upon liberal multiculturalists' idea of freedom within society. This philosophical disagreement causes considerable tension within multiculturalism.

3

- **Introduction:** Although multiculturalists agree on broad aspects of thought, there is a disagreement stemming from individualist and collectivist differences.
- Multiculturalists see themselves as part of a community rather than as individuals. This is often described as communitarianism. However, liberal and cosmopolitan multiculturalists view human nature and society as more individualist, while pluralist multiculturalists such as Parekh perceive human nature as collective and communal.
- Multiculturalists agree that the existence of a very diverse society helps individuals to understand identity. However, liberal and cosmopolitan multiculturalists favour liberal rights and disagree with pluralist multiculturalism's preference for collective rights, arguing that they are illiberal.
- Multiculturalists broadly agree that within society, members share a number of essential values that suggest commonality within human nature. Liberal multiculturalists such as Taylor argue for shallow diversity that demonstrates the 'politics of recognition'. This causes tension with plural multiculturalism, which advocates deep diversity and the collective interests of whole groups or communities.
- **Conclusion:** Multiculturalism is more divided than united. The areas of agreement are broad and when one examines the detail of the multicultural beliefs, it is clear that there is a definite divide over individual and collective rights.

4

- **Introduction:** Multicultural thinkers all agree that the state plays an important role in maintaining society, but they differ on what this role should be.

- Pluralist multiculturalists argue that some communities need state intervention to protect minority rights and address inequality within society and the economy. Cosmopolitan multiculturalists are opposed to this and argue that attachments to communities should be weak and therefore see state interventions as unnecessary.
- Taylor argues that the state should practise the 'politics of recognition' so that liberal values do not override the identity of minority groups. Pluralist multiculturalists argue that the state must not presuppose that liberal values are superior, but liberal and cosmopolitan multiculturalists are committed to the importance of individual rights and disagree with the idea of deep pluralism and cultural relativism. This causes a deep schism between liberal/cosmopolitan and pluralist multiculturalists.
- Liberal and cosmopolitan multiculturalists differ from plural multiculturalists in arguing that the state should intervene in the public sphere of society only (such as with formal equality and anti-discriminatory laws) and should refrain from interference in the private sphere (involving individuals' native language, customs, religion and culture).
- **Conclusion:** Liberal and cosmopolitan multiculturalists prefer the state to play a role in the public sphere of society only and to uphold liberal values. Pluralist multiculturalists disagree that the state should hold liberal values as superior and argue that it should intervene in both the public and private spheres of society.

Chapter 16 Nationalism

1

- **Introduction:** Nationalism is based on a form of consciousness whereby individuals identify with a nation based on an identity distinct from that of other nations. It is possible to argue that nationalism contains both positive and negative perceptions of human nature.
- Liberal and anti/postcolonial nationalists have a progressive view of human nature. Government is based on the consent of the people, which psychologically is a rational interpretation. However, conservative and expansionist nationalists have a pessimistic and emotional view of human nature. Similarly, the racism inherent in expansionist nationalism is not rational.
- Liberal nationalist and anti/postcolonialists' vision of nation is inclusive with a positive view of human nature. Rousseau argued individuals can live and work together in harmony with shared values to form a nation. Expansionist nationalism is based on chauvinism and the feeling of superiority that some nations have over others. This exaggerated form of nationalism is exclusive and associated with the ideas of Maurras.
- Liberal nationalists' positive view of human nature makes them believe nations can work and cooperate with each other supranationally via institutions such as the EU or NATO. Anti/postcolonialists such as Garvey believed in pan-Africanism. Expansionist nationalism is based on both imperialism and racial conquest whereby the interests of one nation justify it dominating others. Militarism and conquest are used to create a sense of national unity.
- **Conclusion:** Nationalism can agree on human nature in only the most general sense, in that individuals can identify a national consciousness. However, there are serious divisions on human nature within the different branches between liberal and expansionist versions of nationalism.

2

- **Introduction:** Expansionist nationalism is supported by the idea that one racial/ethnic group is superior to others, while liberal nationalism favours equality between nations and does not espouse expansionism.
- Expansionist nationalism of imperialism saw European countries believing they brought a superior civilisation to 'inferior races'. Liberal nationalism has always opposed such expansionist tendencies.

- Exponents of nativism in the USA have traditionally seen white Anglo-Saxon Protestants as having superiority over racial/ethnic groups they see as inferior, such as Native Americans, African Africans and Mexicans. Liberal nationalism has always opposed such expansionist tendencies.
- Regressive nationalism with ideas of racial purity influenced Nazism and South Africa's apartheid regime contributed to expansionist policies. Liberal nationalism focused instead on supranationalism and cooperation between nations as espoused by Mazzini.
- **Conclusion:** Regressive and expansionist nationalists are the most in favour of expansionist policies while liberal nationalism resists such ideas, arguing instead for cooperation between nations.

3

- **Introduction:** While liberal nationalism is most associated with progressive ideas of tolerance and reform, other branches of nationalism are significantly less progressive.
- Liberal nationalism proposes liberal democracy in new nations and argues for the freedom of the individual being synonymous with the freedom of the nation. These are progressive attitudes. Expansionist nationalists argue that their nation state's historic destiny transcends democracy and individual rights. Postcolonial nationalism is also more concerned with nation building than with democracy. These are not progressive values.
- Liberal nationalism respects the sovereignty and traditions of other legitimate states. However, expansionist nationalists do not respect the sovereignty of other nation states. Conservative nationalists seek to preserve and spread their national values to other people. Only liberal nationalists can describe themselves as progressive.
- **Conclusion:** Liberal nationalism thinks that nationalism should serve the state. Liberal, progressive values are therefore more important than the nation state. However, expansionist nationalism and postcolonialism put the nation above the state and liberal values. Only liberal nationalists can describe themselves as progressive.

4

- **Introduction:** While nationalist thinkers can agree on the importance of the state in organising the nation state, they differ dramatically in terms of the role the state will play in relation to other states.
- Nationalists argue that the state and society should be constructed around people identifying as a cohesive group, with shared race, language, history or values. However, expansionist nationalism favoured by Maurras argues that some nation states are superior to others and society should be based on shared ethnicity. Liberal nationalists would disagree with such expansionist ideas.
- Statehood is the key objective for nationalists. As Mazzini argued, the nation should be self-governing and able to define itself. Nationalists such as Garvey share a common theme for their own state and society as an expression of self-determination. Nationalists differ in their approach to the state. Liberal nationalists influenced by the ideas of Rousseau take a rationalist approach (civic nationalism) while others, such as Herder, believe in a state on a more spiritual and emotional basis, arguing that the role of the state is to preserve the nation and its culture.
- Liberal and anti/postcolonial nationalism argue that there will be stability within the society of a nation state when the state respects the boundaries of other nations. Expansionist nationalism is exclusive and believes in racial superiority. This can lead to the use of oppressive force and power with nation states viewed as inferior.
- **Conclusion:** While nationalism can agree on the importance of principles of state in society, there is significant disagreement in the principles held by liberal and anti/postcolonial nationalists and expansionist nationalists.

Theme 3 Global politics

Chapter 17 Comparative theory

1

A good answer should include the following points:

- According to liberals, human beings are rational and cooperative (John Locke) and they can therefore establish institutions of regional and global governance which allow them to cooperate and so reduce the chance of conflict. In contrast, realists believe that human beings are prone to conflict (Thomas Hobbes) and so the best way of avoiding conflict is to deter aggression through strength. (AO1, AO2)
- Liberals believe that the most effective way of securing peace is through encouraging complex interdependence (Joseph Nye and Robert Keohane), since this creates so many connections between nation states that war becomes irrational. Realists respond that alliances and military power such as NATO provide real security in an anarchic world. (AO1, AO2)
- Liberals argue that peace is encouraged by the spread of democracy, the rule of law and free trade since this expands zones of peace at the expense of zones of conflict. Realists believe that, since all states are power maximisers, the encouragement of liberal values are irrelevant and the only sure way of ensuring lasting peace and stability is to respect Westphalian principles of state sovereignty by not seeking to expand your values into independent nation states. (AO1, AO2)

2

- A good answer should include the following points:
  - Realists view the nation state as the main player in global politics and its primary purpose is protecting its citizens (Thomas Hobbes). The decisions which nation states reach determine how global relations develop and a nation state's sole responsibility is to its own citizens. Liberals believe that nation states should cooperate with other nation states and non-state actors in institutions of regional and global governance such as the European Union or the United Nations so encouraging "complex interdependence" (Robert Keohane and Joseph Nye). (AO1, AO2)
  - Realists respond that nation states are autonomous and are critical of how the sovereign interests of nation states can be challenged in shared institutions of governance like the European Union or the International Criminal Court. Liberals believe the dominance of nation states encourages state egoism which leads to conflict and so want to dilute this by encouraging a collective response to shared dilemmas through regional and global governance. Human rationality makes this possible (John Locke, JS Mill). (AO1, AO2)
  - According to realists, the nation state is autonomous and sovereign in global relations and so there can be no supranational authority justified in imposing its will on a nation state. Liberals believe that if human rights are being abused (John Locke natural rights) then the sovereignty of nation states can be challenged (UN Responsibility to Protect). (AO1, AO2)

3

- A good answer should include the following points:
  - Realists believe that the nation state should prioritise its own interests in global relations and so therefore doubt the utility of institutions of global governance such as all members will be pursuing their own interests. Liberals believe that institutions of global governance like the United Nations provide the only effective way of resolving the collective dilemmas that all nation states face. (AO1, AO2)
  - Liberals thus argue that institutions of global governance are vital since nation states cannot independently resolve collective dilemmas such as climate change. Since liberals believe that nation states are rational (John Locke) they can work together to achieve beneficial collective outcomes.

Realists respond that there is no authority higher than the nation state and so they are wary of institutions of global governance which try to put limits on national sovereignty believing they are too utopian to work (Thomas Hobbes, Michael Oakeshott). (AO1, AO2)

- Realists claim nation states are solely accountable to their citizens and so institutions of global governance like the International Criminal Court lack legitimacy and effectiveness as they try to put arbitrary limits on national sovereignty. Liberals respond that global governance is important in imposing rules on nation states so lessening the likelihood of international anarchy provoking war. The International Court of Justice and the World Trade Organisation provide examples of this. (AO1, AO2)

4

- A good answer should include the following points:
  - Liberals believe that since all human beings have "natural rights" (John Locke) then there is an obligation to encourage and enforce these rights wherever possible. This is sometimes known as the "obligation to save strangers". Realists dispute this as they believe that the sole purpose of the nation state is to survive in an anarchic world order (Thomas Hobbes). (AO1, AO2)
  - Consequently, realists do not believe that human rights protection is significant in international relations. Nation states are sovereign and determine the rights of their citizens. Liberals respond that because of our shared humanity human rights protection is not solely the responsibility of the nation state and that all nation states must protect human rights according to the United Nations Universal Declaration of Human Rights (1948). (AO1, AO2)
  - Liberals also believe that if systematic and large-scale human rights abuses are taking place within a nation state the international community has an obligation to intervene (UN Responsibility to Protect, 1948) to "save strangers". Realists criticise this viewpoint as they believe that respect for Westphalian principles of state sovereignty provide the foundations for global stability. Since humanitarian interventions challenge this then they are highly destabilising and increase the likelihood of war. (AO1, AO2)

5

- A good answer should include the following points:
  - Anarchical society combines elements of liberalism and realism although it is not firmly in either tradition. It connects with realism because it focuses on the nation state as the central player in international relations. It also acknowledges that the nation state does and should act out of national self-interest (Thomas Hobbes). (AO1, AO2)
  - However, anarchical society connects to liberalism because it acknowledges that nation states are rational and so can be cooperative with other nation states and non-state actors in collective institutions of global governance (John Locke). Nation states are therefore not simply power maximisers. (AO1, AO2)
  - Anarchical society connects to realism because even though nation states can cooperate in institutions of regional and global governance, they do this to maximise their national self-interest rather than for any higher goal such as encouraging human rights, the rule of law, democracy, or free trade. (AO1, AO2)
  - Anarchical society thus accepts the liberal principle that cooperation between rational nation states is preferable to nation states acting autonomously. However, it does not aspire to world government since it maintains the realist emphasis on the importance of the nation state as an independent and sovereign body. (AO1, AO2)

Chapter 18 The state and globalisation

1

- A good answer should include the following points:
  - Both economic and political globalisation have established institutions of global governance such as the WTO, IMF, World Bank (economic) and United Nations, ICC, and COP meetings (political) to encourage cooperation between nation states. All include intergovernmental elements encouraging states to cooperate. (AO1, AO2)
  - Economic and political globalisation are both based on a liberal worldview which encourages "complex interdependence" (Robert Keohane and Joseph Nye) between nation states so discouraging the chance of war. (AO1, AO2)
  - Critics claim that both reinforce structural inequalities in global relations because the United States dominates institutions of political globalisation (the UN Security Council) and has the most voting power on the World Bank and the IMF. (AO1, AO2)
  - Economic and political globalisation both encourage dialogue between nation states and non-state actors. For example, the United Nations works closely with global pressure groups such as Human Rights Watch and COP meetings involve input from environmental pressure groups like Greenpeace and the C40 Cities Initiative. The World Trade Organisation is also lobbied by industrial and agricultural pressure groups and the European Union is a full member although not a nation state. (AO1, AO2)

2

- A good answer should include the following points:
  - Political globalisation is driven by the need to resolve shared political dilemmas such as how to maintain peace and stability, combat climate change and protect human rights and advance the reach of international law. This is carried out by institutions like the United Nations, Conference of the Parties climate change meetings and institutions of international law like the International Court of Justice and the International Criminal Court. (AO1, AO2)
  - Economic globalisation is driven forward by neo classical economic theory which states that global free trade provides the most effective way of generating global wealth and lifting people out of poverty, as has been seen in the case of China and India. (AO1, AO2)
  - Economic globalisation is encouraged by institutions such as the World Bank and the IMF which advance the model of free market economics and by the World Trade Organisation which encourages its 164 member states to lower tariffs and subsidies, so they trade more freely together. (AO1, AO2)

3

- A good answer should include the following points:
  - Cultural globalisation impacts on the developing world by challenging indigenous cultures with the appeal of materialism and consumerism. This can be seen through the Americanisation of brands such as McDonalds, KFC, Apple, and Google. (AO1, AO2)
  - Cultural globalisation can also provide an opportunity for the developing world to spread its own culture. South Korea has been able to do this successfully through K-Pop, South Korean Netflix dramas and award-winning films like "Parasite". Bollywood and Nollywood provide further examples of how the developing world can take advantage of globalisation to spread its own values. (AO1, AO2)

- Economic globalisation impacts on the developing world by providing new opportunities for its low-cost work force to manufacture cheap mass-produced goods. China, India, and Vietnam have all successfully used industrialisation to lift millions out of poverty. (AO1, AO2)
- However, economic globalisation can also be responsible for people working long hours in poor band unsafe working conditions as Multi-National Corporations seek to maximise profits. This can be seen in developing countries like Bangladesh which have few labour, or safety rights and workers may thus be exploited (Rana Plaza factory disaster). (AO1, AO2)

4

- A good answer should include the following points:
  - Global governance and world government both challenge the nation state as the main actor in global politics. They are both based on a liberal view of global relations which emphasises the importance of cooperative endeavours to achieve mutually beneficial outcomes, rather than absolute state sovereignty. (AO1, AO2)
  - Both seek to resolve the problem of global anarchy by bringing nation states together with non-state actors so reducing what liberals regard as the corrosive force of state egoism. The United Nations is the most advanced form of global governance attempting to do this, although the World Trade Organisation and International Criminal Court have similar objectives. (AO1, AO2)
  - They are also different because world government would mean the complete removal of a nation state's sovereignty. World government is thus based on supranationalism, whereas institutions of global governance such as the United Nations and the World Trade Organization are intergovernmental since they provide a framework for cooperation and require the consent of member states to be successful. (AO1, AO2)

5

- A logical structure for this essay would be:
  - Political globalisation is under threat as can be seen with the weaknesses of the International Criminal Court and the withdrawal of the Philippines from its jurisdiction. Russia has also ignored the ICC's indictment of President Putin and in 2022 withdrew from the jurisdiction of the European Court of Human Rights when it condemned its invasion of Ukraine. (AO1, AO2) Economic globalisation has much broader global impact and states cannot be isolated from it in the same way. (AO3)
  - However, the impact of economic globalisation can also be limited by nation states, as the tariffs and subsidies to US manufacturing which the Trump and Biden administrations have introduced demonstrate. (AO1, AO2). It is though much more difficult to totally abandon economic globalisation since countries in both the Global North and the Global South benefit from it and will not abandon it. Nation states are though able to disengage from political globalisation as it is not essential to them, as the lack of effectiveness of the UN Security Council and the lack of authority of the International Court of Justice demonstrates. This suggests that political globalisation is under greater threat. (AO3).
  - Nation states still retain significant influence which undermines the effectiveness of political globalisation as can be seen with the lack of consensus achieved in conference of the parties climate change meetings. (AO1, AO2) However, the most recent round of (Doha) trade negotiations at the World Trade Organisation have also failed and its senior appellate court has not been functioning because of US criticisms. This suggests that neither economic nor political globalisation are operating effectively and so are both under threat. (AO3)

- **Conclusion:** Economic globalisation is less threatened than political globalisation because, despite challenges, trade between nation states is still very strong and difficult to limit. Political globalisation is much less pervasive and important to nation states and so can be more effectively limited. (AO3)

6

- A logical structure for this essay would be:
  - **Introduction:** Define political, economic, and cultural globalisation and explain the impact that they can have on nation states.
  - Political globalisation impacts on nation states through institutions of global governance like the United Nations, COP meetings and international judicial bodies like the ICC and the ICJ. (AO1, AO2) These depend upon the consent of member states to be successful so this suggests that nation states can best resist this form of globalisation. The COP Paris Treaty, for example was only able to agree Nationally Determined Contributions rather than mandatory cuts in emissions. (AO3)
  - Many critics therefore suggest that economic globalisation is more impactful because the free market is global and includes all states (apart from North Korea). Nation states can also not avoid the economic impact of global crises such as the collapse of Lehman Brothers (2008). However, nation states (especially if they are powerful) can still introduce tariffs to protect themselves and subsidise their own industries as both the Trump and Biden administrations have done. (AO1, AO2) Despite this nation states cannot completely disengage from economic globalisation, as, for example, Russia has from international legal bodies which suggests political globalisation is less impactful. (AO3)
  - Cultural globalisation has impacted widely through Americanisation (the global appeal of Hollywood) and the Internet provides the global public with new ways of communicating and sharing information. The Arab Risings (2011) against authoritarian rulers were organised through Facebook. This suggests that cultural globalisation is pervasive. (AO1, AO2) However, the Chinese firewall and Russia's banning of the BBC demonstrates that authoritarian states can now deploy significant control over their populations so limiting the impact of cultural globalisation. This therefore suggests that nation states (especially if they are powerful) can control the impact of cultural globalisation. This is especially the case if a powerful nation state can present a powerful cultural alternative to cultural globalisation. Weaker states may not be able to protect their borders as effectively. (AO3)
  - **Conclusion:** On balance nation states are influenced by globalisation. However, there are ways of limiting its impact, especially in terms of political and cultural globalisation, while even economic globalisation can be resisted although not completely avoided. (AO3)

7

- A logical structure for this essay would be:
  - Advocates of world systems / dependency theory (Immanuel Wallerstein) argue that economic globalisation has had a negative impact on the developing world because it has encouraged neo-colonial dependency and reinforced existing structural inequalities in the global economy. (AO1, AO2) This suggests that cultural globalisation has been less negative because it has simply provided more cultural opportunities. (AO3)
  - However, the evidence shows that economic globalisation has lifted millions of people out of poverty in the developing world creating greater convergence between the global north and the global south. (AO1, AO2) This suggests that economic globalisation has been by far more helpful because it has helped to dramatically reduce poverty levels globally. This is much more positive than cultural globalisation which is often associated with Americanisation and has been accused of undermining traditional cultures with bland and superficial materialism. (AO3)

- Despite this economic globalisation can be responsible for a "race to the bottom" with multi-national corporations exploiting workers in poor and unsafe factory conditions (Bangladesh textiles). (AO1, AO2) However, we cannot take this argument too far as many companies now advertise corporate social responsibility (Nike, Apple, Google) and life in subsistence agriculture is not necessarily better than life in a factory. Cultural globalisation does not have the same existential impact on people's lives, although it can provide more cultural choice rather than simply Americanisation. (AO3)
- **Conclusion:** Although economic globalisation has been criticised, it has lifted millions out of extreme poverty. This is of fundamental importance and so indicates that economic globalisation has had a more positive impact on the world than cultural globalisation. (AO3)

8

- A logical structure for this essay would be:
  - Political globalisation has failed to adequately protect human rights as the limitations of the International Criminal Court demonstrate (ten convictions 2002-2023). This suggests that political globalisation has done more to resolve climate change because regular Conferences of the Parties take place and agreement has been reached to limit carbon emissions. (AO1, AO2) However, the IPCC regards these limits as insufficient, so this does not suggest political globalisation has been more effective in resolving environmental challenges. (AO3)
  - International tribunals (the former Yugoslavia, Rwanda, Sierra Leone, and Cambodia) demonstrate the utility of human rights protection. However, these courts have failed to deter egregious human rights abuses from taking place (Myanmar, Ukraine, and Yemen) which indicates their limits. (AO1, AO2) Climate change conferences have though established a global consensus that environmental issues must be resolved which suggests that political globalisation has created a greater consensus over climate action. (AO3)
  - However, the International Court of Justice has achieved some successes in encouraging nation states to prioritise human rights (the UK is now prepared to negotiate over the Chagos Islands). (AO1, AO2) But more usually powerful states regularly ignore human rights, as has been seen with President Putin ignoring his indictment by the International Criminal Court and Chinese genocidal policies towards the Uighur Muslims. Political globalisation has involved climate change conferences agreeing to donate $100 billion to the developing world to help combat climate change which suggests that environmental issues have achieved more positive and far-reaching outcomes. (AO3)
  - **Conclusion:** Neither have achieved the outcomes they require. However, there has been a greater consensus over environmental action and the results (although still inadequate) have been significantly greater than over human rights enforcement. (AO3)

Chapter 19 Global governance: political and economic

1

- A good answer should include the following points:
  - The veto powers of the permanent members of the UNSC mean that they can prevent any resolutions that are against their national interests. (AO1) This means that the UNSC is frequently unable to pass resolutions and action is not taken in conflicts where international intervention might help. (AO2)
  - The UN General Assembly cannot pass binding resolutions, unlike the UN Security Council. (AO1) This means that its resolutions have no legal authority and can be ignored by states. (AO2)

- The UNSC consists of five permanent members (US, China, Russia, UK and France) and ten non-permanent members which change every 2 years (AO1). This means that five states, two of which (the UK and France) can no longer be regarded as world powers, are given exclusive power and status to pass binding resolutions and to block those that are not in their national interest (AO2).

2

- A good answer should include the following points:
  - The International Monetary Fund has been criticised for structural adjustment programmes (SAPs) which impose strict conditions on states in return for loans during financial crises. (AO1) This means that the IMF impedes the sovereignty of states by forcing them into economic changes in line with the Washington Consensus that sometimes do not benefit the states themselves. (AO2)
  - The World Trade Organization is responsible for widening access to world trade as well as being the arbiter in trade disputes between states, however it has not successfully expanded trade to developing states since 2002, with the failure of the Doha Development Round. (AO1) This means that the member states of the WTO have protected their own trading interests at the expense of developing states which are disadvantaged and excluded from global markets. (AO2)
  - Both the IMF and the WTO are dominated by Western states, most notably the United States, which has the largest voting share in the IMF as it is the largest donor and has significant bargaining power over weaker states. (AO1) This shows that both the IMF and the WTO fail to take into account the interests of weaker states and frequently drive the interests of wealthier, Western states. (AO2)

3

- A good answer should include the following points:
  - The orthodox model of development focuses on the increase in GDP as the best model of development in contrast to the alternative model of development which focuses on other ways of measuring development such as access to health and education. (AO1, AO2)
  - The alternative model of development thus emphasises the importance of encouraging human development which can be measured in terms of the Human Development Index (HDI). This contrasts with the orthodox measurement of development which focuses solely on the extent to which the size of an economy has increased. (AO1, AO2)
  - The orthodox model of development is associated with organs of global economic governance such as the WTO which seeks to encourage global trade as the best way of increasing economic development. The alternative model of development focuses on many other factors and is more likely to be followed by instructions of global economic governance like the World Bank which emphasises the importance of issues such as gender equality, sustainable development, and empowering communities to take control of their own development. (AO1, AO2)

4

- A good answer should include the following points:
  - According to neo-classical economic theory (Adam Smith, Milton Friedman) free markets provide the most effective way of stimulating growth in the developing world because they provide developing countries with the opportunity to engage in free trade. In contrast world systems theory (Immanuel Wallerstein) states that developing countries will be exploited if they adopt free market policies. (AO1, AO2)
  - This is because core states in the developed world will be able to sell cheap manufactured products to developing states so they cannot escape a state of neo-colonial dependency. Neo-classical development argues that free trade has the opposite effect because it enables developing states to

utilise their cheap work force so they can take advantage of new opportunities in global free trade. (AO1, AO2)

- Neo classical economic theory states that all nation states have a comparative advantage (David Ricardo) in world markets which they can utilise to develop their economies. However, world systems theory argues that free trade is used by powerful economies in the Global North to force open developing economies in the Global South so that they remain in a state of neo-colonial dependency and do not industrialise themselves. (AO1, AO2)

5

- A logical structure for this essay would be:
  - The UN has had significant success with its millennium and sustainable development goals. (AO1, AO2) However, some critics suggest that their success has been primarily due to the impact of globalisation. It might therefore be argued that UN peace-keeping missions, for example in the Democratic Republic of Congo, have had more tangible success. (AO3)
  - ECOSOC's influence is limited by the fact that it has competing and conflicting jurisdictions which undermines its effectiveness, especially as some UN aid agencies report directly to the UN General Assembly. (AO1, AO2) However, aid agencies like UNICEF, the World Health Organisation and the UN World Food Programme provide vital relief during global emergencies. These may be seen as more successful and of greater long-term impact than UN peace-keeping missions which lacked a strong enough mandate in Bosnia in the 1990s and was much too slowly endorsed in Rwanda in 1994 allowing genocide to take place. (AO3)
  - However, UN peace-keeping missions have helped to minimise suffering in long term crises such as South Sudan, Darfur, and the Democratic Republic of the Congo, while UN mandated intervention in East Timor (1999) ensured that it did not slide into civil war. (AO1, AO2) However, the success of these operations is relatively small compared with the success of UN organisations like the World Food Programme which possesses a global reach. (AO3)
  - **Conclusion:** Although some UN peace-keeping operations have been successful their effectiveness has been limited to specific areas, whereas the developmental work of the UN has a global reach and significance which suggests that it is more important. (AO3)

6

- A logical structure for this essay would be:
  - Define economic and political global governance. States are committed to both economic and political global governance, but economic global governance has more tangible benefits to states than political global governance and so tends to be more successful.
  - Political global governance has been more successful than economic global governance as the UN has created a wide range of political institutions which are able to solve shared problems, ranging from human rights to climate change and conflict. (AO1, AO2) The UN Security Council is able to act decisively in deploying peacekeepers and the UNFCCC has steadily been making progress and providing states with a forum for negotiation since 1992. (AO3)
  - Economic global governance has been more successful than political global governance as states are more motivated to cooperate to become more prosperous and expand their economic power. (AO1, AO2) There have been fewer sacrifices in economic cooperation as states have created more international trade agreements through the WTO and helped each other to resolve common economic threats through the structural adjustment programmes of the IMF and the development assistance of the World Bank. (AO3)

- Furthermore, economic global governance has been more successful than political global governance as realist-minded states have increasingly been gridlocked in dealing with issues of conflict at the UN Security Council (for example, through the vetoes of the permanent members) and the failure to agree effective action against climate change in the UNFCCC's annual climate change summits. (AO1, AO2) Such obstructive behaviour has been less evident in economic global governance. (AO3)
- However, economic global governance has failed to eliminate the North / South divide and the willingness of states to become prosperous has led to significant inequality between states. (AO1, AO2). The Washington Consensus has been driven by institutions like the IMF and the WTO, but many states remain marginalised from the benefits of international trade, as seen through dependency theory. Poverty remains a significant challenge, especially in sub-Saharan Africa, as progress against the UN's Millennium and Sustainable Development Goals since 2000 has been inconsistent. However, more states have benefitted from economic globalisation as the success of China and India demonstrates. (AO3)
- **Conclusion:** Economic global governance has, overall, been more successful than political global governance as states have been more motivated to cooperate for their own economic gain. (AO3)

7

- A logical structure for this essay would be:
  - Critics claim that NATO has been divided over problems like Afghanistan and that this has minimised its effectiveness greatly. However, the Russian invasion of Ukraine has prompted much greater unity amongst its members. (AO1, AO2) In contrast, the UN Security Council is fundamentally divided over issues such as Ukraine and the General Assembly, since it represents all the world's states finds unity difficult. Therefore, NATO is a more united body. (AO3)
  - NATO can claim to be more successful because it has maintained peace in Europe by deterring aggression and from the 1990s has carried out important nation building operations in the Balkans. The UN has also had a successful peace-keeping role in crises such as East Timor. Critics of NATO also suggest that its expansion has provoked a more assertive and paranoid Russia. (AO1, AO2) However, NATO is based on Article 5 (collective security) which has been more important in deterring Russian aggression than the UN Security Council, which often fails to decide on action. (AO3)
  - It could be argued that the United Nations is more successful because it has engaged in peace-keeping operations globally and NATO has been responsible for significant failures in Afghanistan and Libya. The United Nations also provides global leadership on climate change. However, sufficient progress on climate change has been limited, while NATO has recently become stronger with more members fulfilling their spending targets and Finland and Sweden applying for membership. (AO1, AO2) This suggests that NATO is more successful since it is achieving its central purpose of maintaining western security. (AO3)
  - **Conclusion:** The evidence suggests that NATO is more united and successful than the United Nations. The UN is very divided and frequently this stops it achieving its objectives, unlike NATO which has become increasingly united around its original purpose of deterring Russian expansion. (AO3)

8

- A logical structure for this essay would be:
  - According to world systems / dependency theory (Immanuel Wallerstein) economic globalisation enables core states in the developed world to exploit peripheral states in the developing world. They do this by using free trade to open their markets so that they can sell cheaply produced goods

to them. (AO1, AO2) However, China and India have lifted millions out of poverty through economic globalisation and are both powerful emerging economies. This suggests that economic globalisation has challenged the North / South Divide. (AO3)

- The rise of the G20 which includes the most powerful economies in the Global South and the Global North further challenges the view that economic globalisation has strengthened the North / South Divide. (AO1, AO2) Although economic exploitation does take place in the Global South (race to the bottom) this still means that developing countries are generating more wealth further challenging the North / South Divide. (AO3)
- Economic globalisation has not led to a rise of democracy and human rights protection in the Global South. Liberals expected that this would be the case. However, emerging economies like China have become increasingly economically powerful and intolerant of criticisms of its lack of democracy and poor record on human rights. (AO1, AO2) Politically then the North / South Divide may have been strengthened as emerging economies become more powerful. (AO3).
- **Conclusion:** Economic globalisation has dramatically increased economic convergence between the Global North and the Global South. However, politically the gap between North and South may have become stronger with increased concerns about the lack of human rights protection in the Global South. (AO3)

Chapter 20 Human rights and environmental global governance

1

- A good answer should include the following points:
  - The ICJ and the ICC have both been criticised for not being effective in enforcing their judgments on nation states if they are unprepared to cooperate. The ICJ relies on the UN Security Council to enforce its judgments, but this is unlikely to occur, and the ICC has no enforcement arm. (AO1, AO2)
  - Realists claim that both institutions challenge the sovereignty of nation states. Since there is no supranational authority capable of compelling the obedience of nation states both institutions could therefore be seen as illegitimate. The United States, for example, does not recognise the legitimacy of the ICC, while Israel has ignored unfavourable judgments against it on the ICJ because they conflict with Israeli state sovereignty. (AO1, AO2)
  - A specific criticism of the ICJ is that it has no chief prosecutor and so cannot initiate policies. The ICC has been criticised in the developing world because from 2002-2023 its ten convictions had all been of Africans suggesting to some a neo-colonial bias. (AO1, AO2)

2

- A good answer should include the following points:
  - Both tribunals have been successful in punishing significant human rights abusers such as the former prime minister of Rwanda, Jean Kambanda, and the Bosnian Serb military commander Ratko Mladic. (AO1, AO2)
  - The tribunals have though been criticised for “victors justice”. Although Human Rights Watch notes that NATO was responsible for civilian deaths in 1999 in Kosovo, NATO was not held accountable by the Yugoslavia tribunal for this. Similarly, the Rwandan tribunal only prosecuted Hutus even though there is evidence of Tutsi atrocities. (AO1, AO2)
  - Both tribunals have advanced new principles in international human rights law. The Rwandan tribunal established the principle that rape can be used as a way of perpetuating genocide and that the media can be convicted of abetting genocide. By putting on trial the former Serbian president,

Slobodan Milošević, the Yugoslavian tribunal advanced the principle that former heads of state cannot claim "state immunity" from prosecution. (AO1, AO2)

3

- A good answer should include the following points:
  - The UNFCCC is significant because it establishes the framework through which climate change conferences regularly occur. These conferences of the parties (COP) provide a vital opportunity for nation states to regularly meet to discuss ways of combatting climate change. (AO1, AO2)
  - The IPCC is important because it summarises objectively the current research on climate change and using this data projects the likely way in which the climate will change according to the most recent and reliable data. Its reports are therefore highly regarded and politically significant. (AO1, AO2)
  - However, the UNFCCC has not been able to impose binding targets on COP member. Instead, since the Paris Treaty (2015), member states have committed to their own Nationally Determined Contributions (NDC). These are, however, generally inadequate, according to the IPCC. (AO1, AO2)
  - Like the UNFCCC, the IPCC possesses no mandatory authority. Thus, although it can warn that NDC are inadequate to stop temperature increase going beyond 1.5°C (as it did in 2023) it has no enforcement power over nation states to make them act more urgently. (AO1, AO2)

4

- A good answer should include the following points:
  - The Paris Treaty was a success because all the member states agreed to cut their greenhouse gas emissions through Nationally Determined Contributions (NDCs). (AO1, AO2)
  - However, no binding emissions cuts were agreed so nation states cannot be held accountable if they do not cut their emissions sufficiently. (AO1, AO2)
  - The Glasgow meeting achieved agreement that the use of coal should be "phased down" rather than "phased out". Since coal use is a major contributor to climate change this was a significant failing. (AO1, AO2)
  - At Glasgow 174 states agreed that they would work towards keeping temperature rise beneath 2°C and as close to 1.5°C as possible. Since the IPCC recommends that temperature rise this century does not exceed 1.5°C this century this was a qualified success. (AO1, AO2)

5

- A logical structure for this essay would be:
  - Humanitarian interventions can resolve significant human rights abuses. This can be seen by NATO humanitarian interventions in Bosnia (1995) and Kosovo (1999). (AO1, AO2) However, critics point out that these interventions were resented by Russia who claimed that they were geo-strategic. This helped to undermine relations between Russia and the West so contributing to growing tension. This suggests that humanitarian interventions can create more problems than they resolve. (AO3)
  - However, significant loss of life was stopped in Bosnia and Kosovo, and both were rebuilt by NATO forces with a robust mandate for nation building. Similar successful nation building also took place in East Timor (1999). (AO1, AO2) But not all humanitarian interventions involve a successful commitment to nation building. This was not the case in Libya and when the regime of Colonel Gaddafi was not replaced with a viable government Libya became a failed state with massive negative repercussions for the surrounding region. This suggests that humanitarian intervention can resolve problems successfully but only if it is combined with a long-term commitment to nation building. (AO3)

- Liberals argue that humanitarian interventions successfully punish ruthless leaders who abuse human rights such as Charles Taylor of Liberia whose forces had been intervening in the civil war in Sierra Leone until British intervention in 2000. This suggests that humanitarian interventions can help to bring stability to a region. (AO1, AO2) However, realists note that Westphalian principles of state sovereignty provide the foundations for global stability and that the principle of humanitarian interventions can be subjectively and selectively applied. Russia intervened in Ukraine, for example, claiming to be stopping genocide in the Donbass. Consequently, there is a strong case to suggest that the precedents set by humanitarian intervention can be potentially highly destabilising. (AO3)

6

- A logical structure for this essay would be:
  - There is evidence that western powers have intervened in some humanitarian crises like Bosnia and Kosovo where their geo-strategic interests are most involved and have not intervened in crises where they are less directly involved such as Rwanda. (AO1, AO2) However, western powers have intervened in crises such as Somalia and Sierra Leone where their vital interests are not involved which challenges this argument. (AO3)
  - Critics claim that western powers have ignored human rights abuses in Yemen and yet have intervened in Libya suggesting double standards as Saudi Arabia which has led the intervention in Yemen is an ally of the United States. (AO1, AO2) There is some truth in this argument. However, the West has also intervened in crises where her vital interests were not involved such as the implementation of safe havens within Iraq following the First Gulf War in 1991 (UN Responsibility to Protect). (AO3)
  - The West has been accused of not acting over human rights abuses in Syria, Myanmar (Rohingya Muslims) and China (Uighur Muslims). This suggests double standards because they have intervened in the Balkans and in former imperial possessions like Ivory Coast (France) and Sierra Leone (UK). (AO1, AO2) However, in cases such as Syria, China, and Myanmar intervention would be very difficult and in the case of China impossible, so this suggests practical sense not double standards. (AO3)
  - **Conclusion:** There is evidence of double standards, but it is not overwhelming. It is also important to understand that not being able to do good everywhere does not invalidate those cases when it is possible to protect human rights. (AO3)

7

- A logical structure for this essay would be:
  - Since the establishment of the UNNFCCC at the Rio Earth summit (1992) climate change conferences have regularly been held to encourage a unified global approach to climate change. This is a significant achievement. (AO1, AO2) However, nation states have not been prepared to agree collective binding targets which has significantly undermined the success of these conferences given the urgent need to reduce carbon emissions (IPCC). (AO3)
  - However, at the Paris Treaty COP member states agreed to reducing carbon emissions with Nationally Determined Contributions (NDC). (AO1, AO2) However, these have generally been insufficient so it could be argued that progress has been ineffective. (AO3)
  - Climate change conferences have increasingly recognised the scale of the crisis with Glasgow emphasising the need to keep temperature rise as close to 1.5°C as possible and a commitment to "phase down" the use of coal and combat deforestation. (AO1, AO2) However, the promises being made are still insufficient given the scale of the problem which suggests that climate change conferences need to be much more ambitious. (AO3)

- **Conclusion:** Climate change conferences have provided an increasingly proactive response to climate change. However, although the decisions reached have become more ambitious, IPCC findings suggests they are still not enough to resolve the crisis. (AO3)

8

- A logical structure for this essay would be:
  - Non-state actors are increasingly significant in raising awareness about the challenge of climate change. These include global opinion-formers such as David Attenborough and Greta Thunberg. (AO1, AO2) However, it is nation states which make decisions on the extent to which they will legislate to reduce greenhouse gas emissions which suggests that they are still most important in determining the extent to which action is taken on climate change. (AO3).
  - Significant action is being taken by 96 global cities in the C40 Cities initiative to reduce carbon emission and innovation is being encouraged by the Earthshot Prize and global entrepreneurs (Breakthrough Energy Alliance). This is significant because together they represent 20% of the global economy. (AO1, AO2) However, nation states attend the Conference of the Parties, and they must decide the extent of the Nationally Determined Contributions (NDC) they agree. This suggests nation states are still most significant as the IPCC recognises that NDC are the most important factor in determining whether temperature increase is limited. Only nation states can, for example, determine policy on reducing coal use and reducing methane emissions. (AO3)
  - The European Union is a significant member of climate change meetings and has agreed to ambitious greenhouse gas reduction targets. (AO1, AO2) However, other regional organisations lack the ambition of the European Union (the Arab League and USMCA have policy on climate action) so nation states do remain the most important global actors. (AO3)
  - **Conclusion:** Although there are now many global players involved in combatting climate change, nation states still possess the vital legislative authority to act on limiting carbon emissions which suggests they retain central importance. (AO3)

Chapter 21 Power and developments

1

- A good answer should include the following points:
  - The United States and China both exert great global power through their huge military capability. This includes their nuclear deterrents, aircraft carriers and battle groups. The United States has 800 military bases overseas and is a member of NATO and AUKUS. China is expanding her overseas military influence through her String of Pearls strategy. (AO1, AO2)
  - Both exert significant influence through the strength of their economies. The United States exerts enormous power in international trading negotiations as the world's biggest economy and exerts huge structural power through its leading position on the World Bank and the IMF. China wields huge economic outreach through the Belt and Road Initiative and the Asian Infrastructure Bank. (AO1, AO2)
  - The United States exerts influence through the appeal of its culture. A major element of this soft Institutes power influence is through Hollywood and through popular American brands such as McDonalds, Apple, Google, and Amazon. China also utilises her soft power through Confucius Institutes and global brands such as Ali Baba and Tik Tok. (AO1, AO2)
  - Both possess great structural influence as permanent members of the UN Security Council since they can veto key decisions involving the use of force to resolve global conflicts. (AO1, AO2)

2

- A good answer should include the following points:
  - Rogue and failed states both threaten international stability. This is because rogue states like North Korea act in defiance of international law by threatening their neighbours. Failed states, like Somalia, also threaten international stability because they can become a haven for criminal gangs and terrorists (Al Qaeda planned the September 11, 2001, attacks on the United States from Afghanistan). (AO1, AO2)
  - Rogue and failed states will not accept the usual norms of international behaviour. North Korea and Iran are rogue states which have links with terrorist organisations and carry out systematic and widespread human rights abuses. Failed states like Somalia are infiltrated by criminal and terrorist organisations and cannot protect the human rights of their citizens. (AO1, AO2)
  - However, rogue states will have a functioning government so can enter dialogue with other nation states (North Korea negotiated with the United States during the Trump Presidency). Failed states lack a functioning government so it is impossible to negotiate with them. (AO1, AO2).

3

- A good answer should include the following points:
  - According to realists a bipolar distribution of power can provide stability because it creates a favourable balance of power (stable equilibrium) so that two evenly matched powers do not have an incentive to risk war with each other. (AO1, AO2)
  - More negatively liberals argue that bipolarity can encourage conflict because it is based on fear and suspicion and so this can generate crises such as the Cuban Missile Crisis in 1962. (AO1, AO2)
  - According to some critics unipolarity encourages stability because the global hegemon can act as a global policeman ensuring stability (benign hegemon theory). This was the case during the Pax Romana during the Roman Empire. Other countries can also emulate the values of the hegemon further encouraging stability through shared attitudes. (AO1, AO2)
  - However, unipolarity can be destabilising because the hegemon can act in defiance of international law (malign hegemon theory) so challenging global order, as was the case, some critics suggest, when the United States invaded Iraq (2003). (AO1, AO2)

4

- A good answer should include the following points:
  - A great power will possess significant structural influence, for example, the United Kingdom and France are great powers which are both members of the UN Security Council. An emerging power like India may not possess the same sort of structural power yet. (AO1, AO2)
  - An emerging power, like China, will possess an expanding population and a rising GDP growth rate. In contrast, a great power does not have to have an expanding population and may be experiencing declining growth rates. (AO1, AO2)
  - A great power will be part of the existing balance of power, like France or Germany. However, an emerging power like India or Iran will challenge the existing balance of power. (AO1, AO2)

5

- A logical structure for this essay would be:
  - Authoritarian and semi-authoritarian states pose a great threat to global stability because their legitimacy often derives from military success, as can be seen with the Argentinean junta's invasion of the Falklands in 1982. (AO1, AO2) However, according to realism all states are power maximisers

and so the nature of a state is irrelevant since all states can risk conflict to increase their power and prestige in the anarchic state of international relations. Both the Soviet Union and the United States intervened in civil wars (Africa and South America) during the Cold War to increase their global influence. (AO3)

- Despite this, authoritarian states do not have to be concerned about challenges from the rule of the law, opposition groups and the media and so this might encourage them to engage in military adventurism. (AO1, AO2) However, democratic states can also engage in military conflict to expand their geo strategic interests as the United States did in Vietnam and Iraq which suggests that both can equally challenge global stability. The Project for a New American Century shows how the United States was prepared to engage in conflict to maintain its dominant hegemonic status. (AO3).
- According to some critics, authoritarian states are less concerned with obeying international law and protecting human rights than democratic states and so are more likely to threaten war. President Putin has, for example, ignored his indictment by the ICC and China has a poor record on human rights (Uighur Muslims) and threatens Taiwan. (AO1, AO2) However, it is also alleged that the United States has acted in defiance of international law (invasion of Iraq, 2003) and the United States is not a member of the International Criminal Court. (AO3).
- **Conclusion:** Although authoritarian states have no restraints on engaging in conflict, the anarchic state of global relations means that all nation states seek to advance their geo-strategic interests suggesting that it is not the political make-up of a state that determines how likely it is to engage in conflict. (AO3).

6

- A logical structure for this essay would be:
  - Failed states provide a very significant threat to international stability since they can be used as a base for criminal and terrorist gangs. Al Qaeda used Afghanistan as a base to plan the September 11 terrorist attacks on the United States. (AO1, AO2) Rogue states are also likely to have connections with global terrorist groups (North Korea / Hezbollah) so this does not mean that failed states are necessarily a bigger threat. (AO3)
  - Failed states create opportunities for regional conflict. For example, the collapse of the Democratic Republic of the Congo in the 1990s encouraged neighbouring states to become involved. This has also been the case with Syria with great powers like Russia, Iran, and Turkey intervening. This has had the potential for encouraging a wider world conflict. (AO1, AO2) Rogue states will have functioning governments and will be attempting to acquire weapons of mass destruction (North Korea). Since North Korea directly threatens her neighbours with the threat of missiles rogue states might be seen as a greater threat. (AO3).
  - However rogue states have recognised governments (Iran and North Korea) which the United States has been prepared to negotiate with. This is not the case with failed states which will have no recognisable government ensuring that their actions are entirely unpredictable. (AO1, AO2) The lack of an effective government in a rogue state can though mean that they cannot develop weapons of mass destruction programmes or cooperate with other powers (Russia and Iran) to destabilise international relations which suggests rogue states are a greater threat. (AO3).
  - **Conclusion:** Rogue states are thus a greater threat because they have more power and organisation to challenge global stability than failed states which lack the same effective planning capability and access to weapons of mass destruction. (AO3)

7

- A logical structure for this essay would be:
  - The significance of hard power has been shown in recent conflicts such as Ukraine where the limitations of the Russian military hard power meant that Russia was unable to quickly achieve her

military objectives. The EU's military support of Ukraine further demonstrates the importance of military power. (AO1, AO2) However, soft power is also significant since President Zelensky has been able to mobilise western support with a powerful narrative. This suggests soft power narrative is significant. (AO3)

- Russia's lack of influence in her near abroad is due to her lack of soft power – the United States has much greater global outreach in East Europe and in Asia (South Korea, Japan, and the Philippines) because of her soft power influence. This indicates that soft power helps to provide a nation with global outreach by gaining it friends and allies. (AO1, AO2) However, the importance of hard power has been demonstrated in the Middle East where the Assad regime has been kept in power by Russian and Iranian military support. This suggests hard power is significant but that regional and global influence is maximised through soft power outreach. (AO3).
- Economic hard power is shifting the balance of global influence towards China with the Asian Infrastructure Bank and the Belt and Road Initiative. This is proving a major challenge to the US dominance exercised through Bretton Woods. Russia's increased oil exports to countries like India further demonstrates how economic hard power has enabled Russia to withstand western sanctions. The European Union is also deploying economic hard power through its 300-billion-euro Global Gateway Initiative. (AO1, AO2) However, soft power is still significant in expanding influence. In 2023, Vice President Harris toured Africa in a bid to challenge Chinese influence in Africa by emphasising US values. Wen US values are at their most popular (fall of Communism in 1989-1991) this provides the United States with a very effective way of expanding influence. (AO3).
- **Conclusion:** Although hard power is very important in global relations, to argue that it has become more important is not true. Hard power has always been at its most successful when combined with a powerful soft power narrative (smart power). (AO3)

8

- A logical structure for this essay would be:
  - The rise of emerging powers like China and Russia's bid to re-establish regional and global influence has put significant strains on US hegemonic status. The Obama administration failed to intervene in sufficient strength during the Syrian civil war enabling Russia, Turkey, and Iran to become the main outside players in the conflict. (AO1, AO2) Despite this the United States still has 800 military bases globally and is the leading state in the world's most powerful military alliance, NATO. Russia also lacks the military outreach to be able to operate anywhere in the world in contrast to the United States. The rise of India is unlikely to challenge US hegemony as they share a common interest in limiting the rise of China so this could even help the United States maintain hegemonic status. (AO3)
  - Although China is putting significant military and diplomatic pressure on Taiwan and is building up her military outreach in the South China sea, China cannot yet extend her influence globally in the same way as the United States only recently opening her first overseas military bases at Djibouti. The United States also maintains significant influence in the southern hemisphere through military alliances like AUKUS and treaties with Japan and South Korea as well as military support to Taiwan. (AO1, AO2) No emerging power comes close to US military outreach (aircraft carriers), although China is slowly developing her String of Pearls strategy to expand China's military influence. (AO3).
  - Economically there is a stronger case that US hegemony is being challenged. The European Union can now negotiate with the United States from a position of comparative strength (although the EU is not generally seen to threaten the United States). (AO1, AO2) China though does through the Belt and Road Initiative band the Asian Infrastructure Bank challenging US Bretton Woods hegemony. (AO3)

- **Conclusion:** Militarily, there is a strong case to suggest that the United States can still claim hegemonic status as the only power able to simultaneously take military action in both hemispheres. No emerging power can do this. Economically though China's rise is likely to provide a more immediate challenge to US hegemony. (AO3)

Chapter 22 Regionalism and the EU

1

- A good answer should include the following points:
  - Economic regionalism helps to increase trade and economic opportunity between states within a particular region, for example by reducing tariff and non-tariff barriers on preferential terms. (AO1) States which neighbour each other are particularly motivated to build regional organisations which deepen economic ties. (AO2)
  - Political regionalism helps to resolve shared problems and challenges within a particular region, especially those which cross borders such as organised crime, conflict and the environment. (AO1) States are therefore motivated to build regional organisations which can address shared challenges with clearly negotiated solutions and, in the case of the EU, laws. (AO2)
  - Shared political objectives within a particular region are also a motivation for both economic and political regionalism (AO2), such as the desire to reconstruct postwar Europe or bolster economic integration in South-East Asia to counterbalance the economic power of China. (AO1)

2

- A good answer should include the following points:
  - The African Union focuses on security and political integration, including a significant peacekeeping force with contributions from many states and intervening in support of numerous African Union states. This shows that the AU focuses considerably on security threats that its member states share (AO1, AO2).
  - ASEAN focuses on economic integration, including significant reductions in tariff and non-tariff barriers and visa-free travel within the region. This shows that ASEAN prioritises economic integration between its geographically proximate member states to create an economic counterweight to China's economic power in the region (AO1, AO2).
  - The regionalism of the AU must contend with a much larger and geographically diverse membership than that of ASEAN, with every African state a member of the AU. This means that the AU is less able to develop strong economic or political integration, rather focusing on a few areas (such as security) on which cooperation is more feasible (AO1, AO2).

3

- A good answer should include the following points:
  - The term "widening" in the context of the European Union means that its membership has steadily increased. This was especially the case in 2004 when ten new member states joined. In 2007, Bulgaria and Romania also joined the EU and in 2013 Croatia. (AO1, AO2)
  - "Deepening" refers to the way in which the connections between member states are made closer despite the EU expanding. If this did not happen there would be the acute danger that the EU could expand into irrelevance since decisions would be so difficult to reach amongst so many members. (AO1, AO2)
  - The Nice (2003) and Lisbon (2009) treaties have thus tried to balance widening with deepening. Nice did this by increasing Qualified Majority Voting (QMV) on the Council of Ministers so reducing opportunities for nation states to wield the veto. Lisbon (2009) also did this by further expanding

QMV, establishing an EU President and EU High Representative for Foreign Affairs and a European External Action Service (EEAS) to represent the EU in global relations. (AO1, AO2).

4

- A good answer should include the following points:
  - ASEAN was established in 1967 to act as a political counterweight to the regional great powers China and Japan. It was also designed to encourage free trade and prosperity amongst its ten member states. (AO1, AO2)
  - ASEAN has been successful in establishing a free trade area amongst its members based on the almost complete elimination of tariffs. It has also been successful negotiating extensive free trade agreements with other powers, notably the Regional Comprehensive Economic Partnership (RCEP) with China, Japan, South Korea, New Zealand, and Australia in 2020. (AO1, AO2)
  - The African Union replaced the Organisation of African Union in 2002. It aims to encourage peace and prosperity in the African continent by encouraging dialogue and facilitating trade. It is also designed to represent African interests in global affairs. (AO1, AO2)
  - The African Union has established the principle of an African Continental Free Trade Area (AfCFTA). In 2022, the Guided Trade Initiative began allowing tariff-free trade in a limited number of goods in eight member states. African Union peace-keeping missions have been successful in limiting violence in South Sudan, Darfur, Mali, Burundi, and the Central African Republic and Somalia. (AO1, AO2)

5

- A logical structure for this essay would be:
  - **Introduction:** Define the EU. The EU is very different from other regional organisations as it is a system of government which covers economic and political regionalism and has supranational institutions able to make laws and enforce these on member states.
  - However, regional organisations such as ASEAN have sought to replicate some of the economic integration of the EU in terms of both freedom of movement (with a visa-free travel area) and removal of tariffs on most goods traded within the region. (AO1, AO2) However most regional organisations follow an intergovernmental structure as opposed to the supranational type of decision making in the EU. The Arab League is a very loose form of political regionalism, with decisions made by consensus, which means that decision making is relatively weak and ad hoc. USMCA is also very different from the EU in that it focuses on a few specific areas of trade and does not eliminate tariffs entirely. (AO3)
  - Nevertheless, the EU has influenced political integration in the African Union, even though the AU has not directly replicated the EU's depth of political and economic integration. (AO1, AO2) There is a pan-African Parliament and a Security Council which can discuss and make decisions on areas of mutual interest, albeit through intergovernmental decision-making processes. (AO3)
  - **Conclusion:** The EU is unique in the depth of political and economic integration and its system of government, supported by supranational institutions. Other regional organisations may have been influenced by the success of the EU to explore regionalism suited to their own region's needs and desires, but it is not convincing to say that other regional organisations have modelled themselves on the EU. (AO3)

6

- A logical structure for this essay would be:
  - **Introduction:** Define economic and other forms of regionalism (political and security). Economic regionalism is the main objective of the EU, ASEAN and the USMCA and therefore most of the regional organisations studied.
  - Economic regionalism is at the centre of the institutions and objectives of the most economically integrated regional organisation, the EU. The EU is the most integrated economically, with a single currency and the European Central Bank which sets monetary policy for the region. (AO1 / AO2) However, security regionalism is a significant focus of the African Union and, increasingly, the EU. For the AU, this has led to it becoming a reliable international partner supplying peacekeeping troops where the UNSC is unable to do so. The EU's security role has been growing, with operations in the Mediterranean to combat illegal people smuggling. (AO1, AO2) This suggests economic regionalism is challenged by other forms of regionalism. (AO3)
  - Economic regionalism is also a major objective of ASEAN and the USMCA. ASEAN has established tariff-free trade on most goods, while the USMCA is a much narrower trade agreement with lower tariffs on three specific industries. (AO1, AO2) Political regionalism remains a significant part of the work of the EU, the African Union, and the Arab League. The EU does this with the most depth, in that it is able to create laws and enforce these through the Council of Ministers, Parliament and Court of Justice. (AO3)
  - Although some regional organisations like USMCA focus entirely on trade, other regional organisations focus on political and security issues as well (AO1, AO2) The African Union has created a political role for itself, though less powerful and deep than the EU (for example, through its unified criticism of the International Criminal Court and the threat of AU states to withdraw from the Rome Statute). This political role has developed faster than its limited success in achieving a free trade area. (AO3)
  - **Conclusion:** While it is true that economic regionalism is the core objective of the EU, ASEAN and the USMCA and that this represents most of the regional organisations, regional organisations tend to adopt a hybrid approach instead of focusing purely on economic regionalism.

7

- A logical structure for this essay would be:
  - The EU wields significant global influence through its economic power and so has been able to negotiate an extensive free trade agreements with Japan. (A01) However, the EU is not alone in being able to negotiate free trade agreements as ASEAN has negotiated the far reaching Regional Comprehensive Economic Partnership (RCEP) with China, Japan, South Korea, New Zealand, and Australia. (AO2, AO3)
  - However, the EU is the only regional organisation to have demonstrated global leadership during the climate crisis. It attends Conference of the Parties meetings and is pledged to be carbon neutral by 2050. (AO1, AO2) No other regional organisation has made this sort of powerful commitment on carbon reduction or provided such leadership on such a pressing world issue. Other regional organisations like USMCA include environmental commitments and the African Union and ASEAN have delivered statements on climate change but none come close to the EU's global influence. (AO3)
  - The EU has great structural power as a member of the WTO, G7 and G20. Since the Lisbon Treaty (2009) the EU also has a legal identity and so can negotiate directly with nation states in a way that no other regional organisation can do. (AO1, AO2) However, the EU has not provided significant leadership during crises such as Syria, Libya, or the Balkans in the 1990s. Here it could be argued that African Union peace-keeping missions (South Sudan, Somalia, Mali, Burundi) have been more important challenging the claim that the EU possesses most world influence. (AO3)

- **Conclusion:** There is a case to suggest that the EU does possess most global influence. However, other regional organisations have shown growing economic and political influence so its status as the leading regional organisation in international politics, is not without challenge. (AO3)

8

- A logical structure for this essay would be:
  - The EU exerts considerable global influence through its economic hard power as demonstrated by the Global Gateway Initiative which provides aid to the developing world. However, the UN is also a member of Conference of the Parties climate change agreements. (AO1, AO2) This suggests that it also wields significant global influence in environmental issues. (AO3)
  - As a major economic power, the EU can negotiate favourable trade deals with other powers, and it is also a full member of the World Trade Organisation. The EU also possesses significant structural influence as a member of the G7 and the G20 and it has also negotiated with Iran its nuclear deal together with the 5 permanent members of the UN Security Council. (AO1, AO2) This suggests that its global influence is not simply economic as it has shown itself to be very significant in other areas of foreign policy. (AO3)
  - The EU possesses significant influence in its near abroad since aspiring members want to join the EU to share in the Four Freedoms. This has helped to encourage peace in areas like the Balkans. (A01, A02) However, the EU is also providing military assistance to Ukraine and has launched several humanitarian missions suggesting its influence goes significantly beyond economic. (AO3)
  - **Conclusion:** The evidence suggests that although the EU has significant economic power it also possesses growing structural and political influence which are of equal value. (AO3)