Write your name here Surname	Other names	
Pearson Edexcel Level 3 GCE	Centre Number Candidate Nu	ımber
Politics		
Advanced	nment and Non-core leas	
Advanced Paper 2: UK Govern	leas	

Instructions

- Use **black** ink or ball-point pen.
- **Fill in the boxes** at the top of this page with your name, centre number and candidate number.
- There are **two** sections:
 - in Section A answer either 1(a) or 1(b) and then either 2(a) or 2(b)
 - in Section B answer **either** 3(a) **or** 3(b), 4(a) **or** 4(b), 5(a) **or** 5(b), 6(a) **or** 6(b), 7(a) **or** 7(b).
- Answer the questions in the spaces provided
 - there may be more space than you need.

Information

- The total mark for this paper is 84.
- The marks for **each** question are shown in brackets
 - use this as a guide as to how much time to spend on each question.
- Calculators are not permitted.

Advice

- Read each question carefully before you start to answer it.
- Check your answers if you have time at the end.

Turn over ▶



DO NOT WRITE IN THIS AREA

DO NOT WRITE IN THIS AREA

SECTION A: UK GOVERNMENT

Answer one question from either Question 1(a) or Question 1(b) and then answer one question from either Question 2(a) or Question 2(b).

EITHER

1 (a) This source is adapted from an article 'It's good theatre, but what's the point?' in the Guardian newspaper which examines the pros and cons of prime minister's questions (PMQs). The source considers the arguments for and against PMQs.

Nick Clegg told BBC Radio 5 Live that prime minister's questions (PMQs) were '... ridiculous and should be scrapped. They are an absolute farce.' PMQs began life in 1961 as two weekly 15-minute sessions on Tuesdays and Thursdays, before Tony Blair replaced them with one 30-minute session on a Wednesday in 1997. This provides the scrutiny which is an essential part of democracy. The main exchange between Corbyn and May lasts 10 minutes or so, as the leader of the opposition only gets to ask six questions.

Even those 10 minutes are rarely enlightening, as the art of PMQs is to avoid embarrassment. Frequently, this means answering a completely different question from the one asked, or providing some accomplished waffle. Getting straight answers is almost impossible. More effective scrutiny would arise from greater reliance on select committees, the liaison committee, Westminster Hall debates and the greater use of parliamentary petitions

PMQs could be improved. Banning backbenchers from shouting out would be a start. Individually, MPs all say that the heckling is a bad thing, but put them in the House of Commons together and they don't seem to be able to help themselves. Bizarrely, having the TV cameras in the Commons only encourages them to behave worse: so much for the surveillance society.

Yet even in its current, deeply flawed format, PMQs are worth preserving. PMQs ensure that the prime minister of the day has some command of all areas of policy and is held accountable, at least partially, for them. There is nothing any prime minister would like more than to get rid of PMQs. Even the most accomplished performers have dreaded them; that alone should be reason enough for them to be retained. Without them, we lose a fragment of our parliamentary democracy which makes us so distinct from other democracies.

(Source: adapted from John Crace, The Guardian, 19 Jan 2015 at https://www.theguardian.com/politics/shortcuts/2015/jan/19/are-primeministers-questions-past-sell-by-date-as-nick-clegg-argues)

Using the source, evaluate the view that Prime Ministers Questions should be abolished and replaced by other forms of parliamentary scrutiny of the executive.

In your response you must:

- compare and contrast the different opinions in the source
- examine and debate these views in a balanced way
- analyse and evaluate only the information presented in the source.

(30)



THIS AREA

DO NOT WRITE IN

AREA

THIS

2

DO NOT WRITE

OR

AREA

DO NOT WRITE IN THIS

(b) These sources are adapted from newspaper articles following the High Court decision that the executive does not have the power to trigger Article 50 (the process of leaving the European Union) without the agreement of Parliament.

The press, MPs and public have every right to criticise the judges. This judicial decision is wrong. This country is governed by the rule of law which is not the same as the rule of judges; the judiciary interprets the law passed by Parliament, which is sovereign.

No one is challenging the independence of judges, but they made the wrong judgement in this particular case, since the government was within its rights to use the Royal Prerogative.

In recent years, the advance of 'judicial activism' has made rulings against ministers commonplace. If it is fine for the courts to reject unlawful executive action, criticising ministers, they cannot expect to be immune from criticism themselves.

The decision to leave was made by voters in a referendum following an Act of Parliament. It is therefore for the Government to fulfil their wishes. This is upholding parliamentary sovereignty and it is not appropriate for judges to interfere.

(Source: adapted from 'Judges should have stayed out of the Brexit process. It's up to the Supreme Court to fix their mistake.' Telegraph View. 6 November 2016 • 10:00pm)

The criticisms of judges in this case are wrong and dangerous and an attempt to influence their judicial independence through public pressure.

After the referendum the Brexiteers talked about using the Royal Prerogative, an ancient right that kings and gueens once used to by-pass Parliament.

Even Michael Gove, a leading Brexiteer, agreed that it was a good thing for Gina Miller to contest in the High Court the constitutional pillar of parliamentary sovereignty. She claimed only Parliament could take away rights that Parliament had itself granted in the 1972 Act that took Britain into what is now the EU. The Supreme Court agreed.

Politicians and the media should support judges when they uphold the rule of law which is an essential part of our unwritten constitution. This judgement also demonstrates the principle of judicial independence, which is another important restraint on arbitrary government.

(Source: adapted from Yes-Brexit-not-mob-rule-GINA-MILLER-triggered-article-50-challenge-says-democracy-respected-legal-certainty, by Gina Miller For The Mail On Sunday, published 4 December 2016)

DO NOT WRITE IN THIS AREA

DO NOT WRITE IN THIS AREA

Using the source, evaluate the view that judges should not exercise control over the power of government

In your response you must:

- compare and contrast the different opinions in the source
- examine and debate these views in a balanced way
- analyse and evaluate **only** the information presented in the source.

(30)

4



DO NOT WRITE IN THIS AREA

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



DO NOT WRITE IN THIS AREA

DO NOT WRITE IN THIS AREA



DO NOT WRITE IN THIS AREA

DO NOT WRITE IN THIS AREA

,



DO NOT WRITE IN THIS AREA

AREA

DO NOT WRITE IN THIS

DO NOT WRITE IN THIS AREA

AREA

THIS

DO NOT WRITE IN

AND EITHER

2 (a) Evaluate the argument that there are more advantages to having a codified constitution than remaining with an uncodified constitution.

In your answer you should draw on relevant knowledge and understanding of the study of Component 1: UK politics and core political ideas. You must consider this view and the alternative to this view in a balanced way.

(30)

OR

(b) Evaluate the view that the conventions of ministerial responsibility no longer adequately account for the actions of ministers.

In your answer you should draw on relevant knowledge and understanding of the study of Component 1: UK politics and core political ideas. You must consider this view and the alternative to this view in a balanced way.

(30)



DO NOT WRITE IN THIS AREA

DO NOT WRITE IN THIS AREA



DO NOT WRITE IN THIS AREA

.
•

DO NOT WRITE IN THIS AREA



DO NOT WRITE IN THIS AREA

DO NOT WRITE IN THIS AREA

,
TOTAL FOR SECTION A = 60 MARKS



DO NOT WRITE IN THIS AREA

DO NOT WRITE IN THIS AREA

SECTION B: NON-CORE POLITICAL IDEAS

Answer ONE question EITHER (a) OR (b) from the political idea that you have studied.

Anarchism

EITHER

3 (a) To what extent do anarchists agree on the nature of a future anarchist society?

You must use appropriate thinkers you have studied to support your answer and consider both sides in a balanced way.

(24)

OR

(b) To what extent is anarchism more united than divided?

You must use appropriate thinkers you have studied to support your answer and consider both sides in a balanced way.

(24)

(Total for Question 3 = 24 marks)

Ecologism

EITHER

4 (a) To what extent do ecologists agree about the role of the state in protecting the environment?

You must use appropriate thinkers you have studied to support your answer and consider both sides in a balanced way.

(24)

OR

(b) To what extent do ecologists disagree about the type of society they wish to create?

You must use appropriate thinkers you have studied to support your answer and consider both sides in a balanced way.

(24)

(Total for Question 4 = 24 marks)



AREA

DO NOT WRITE IN THIS

DO NOT WRITE IN THIS AREA

AREA

THIS

2

DO NOT WRITE

Feminism

EITHER

5 (a) To what extent do feminists agree that gender distinctions are based on human nature?

You must use appropriate thinkers you have studied to support your answer and consider both sides in a balanced way.

(24)

OR

(b) To what extent is feminism more divided than united?

You must use appropriate thinkers you have studied to support your answer and consider both sides in a balanced way.

(24)

(Total for Question 5 = 24 marks)

Multiculturalism

EITHER

6 (a) To what extent does multiculturalism promote divisions in society?

You must use appropriate thinkers you have studied to support your answer and consider both sides in a balanced way.

(24)

OR

(b) To what extent do multiculturalists disagree over the limits of tolerance?

You must use appropriate thinkers you have studied to support your answer and consider both sides in a balanced way.

(24)

(Total for Question 6 = 24 marks)



DO NOT WRITE IN THIS AREA

DO NOT WRITE IN THIS AREA

Nationalism

EITHER

7 (a) To what extent do various nationalists have a common understanding of what forms a nation?

You must use appropriate thinkers you have studied to support your answer and consider both sides in a balanced way.

(24)

OR

(b) To what extent do different nationalists agree that nationalism promotes inclusive societies?

You must use appropriate thinkers you have studied to support your answer and consider both sides in a balanced way.

(24)

(Total for Question 7 = 24 marks)



DO NOT WRITE IN THIS AREA

Indicate which question you are answering by marking a cross in the box \boxtimes . If you change your mind, put a line through the box \boxtimes and then indicate your new question with a cross \boxtimes .		
Chosen question number:	Question 3(a)	Question 3(b)
	Question 4(a)	Question 4(b)
	Question 5(a)	Question 5(b)
	Question 6(a)	Question 6(b)
	Question 7(a)	Question 7(b)



DO NOT WRITE IN THIS AREA

DO NOT WRITE IN THIS AREA

,
,



DO NOT WRITE IN THIS AREA

DO NOT WRITE IN THIS AREA

DO NOT WRITE IN THIS AREA

TOTAL FOR SECTION C = 24 MARKS TOTAL FOR PAPER = 84 MARKS

Every effort has been made to contact copyright holders to obtain their permission for the use of copyright material. Pearson Education Ltd. will, if notified, be happy to rectify any errors or omissions and include any such rectifications in future editions.

