

Questions 1 and 2 refer to Document 1.

- 1 (a) State the main conclusion of the argument. [1]
- (b) Identify **two** intermediate conclusions in paragraphs 2 to 4. [2]
- (c) Analyse the structure of the reasoning in paragraph 6. [4]
- (d) Identify **one** counter-assertion in paragraph 4. [1]
- 2 (a) Identify and explain **three** flaws and/or weaknesses in the reasoning in paragraphs 1 to 4. [6]
- (b) Assess the extent to which the reasoning in paragraph 7 supports the argument as a whole. [3]
- 3 Document 2 contains some statistical information.
- (a) Identify **one** way in which the support given by the statistic in paragraph 2 to the claim that 'nearly a quarter of the world's population is happy to live under a monarchy' is weak. [1]
- (b) Identify **three** ways in which the support given by the statistics in paragraph 5 to the claim that 'kings and queens are cheaper than presidents' is weak. [3]
- (c) Identify **two** ways in which the support given by the statistic in paragraph 8 to the claim that 'nearly two out of three Spaniards would prefer to keep the monarchy than to return to being a republic' is weak. [2]
- 4 *You are advised to spend some time planning your answer before you begin to write it.*
- 'Hereditary monarchy is good for a country.'
- Construct a reasoned argument to support **or** challenge this claim. In your answer you should make critical use of the documents provided. [27]

DOCUMENT 1

- 1 As long ago as 1726, the novel *Gulliver's Travels* satirised the idea of choosing those who rule on the basis of who their ancestors were and yet, even today, we often hear people saying how lucky we in the UK are to have a Royal Family. It is ridiculous that we retain a hereditary monarch as head of state almost a quarter of the way into the 21st century, and the system needs to change.
- 2 There is no perfect system for selecting heads of state, but most countries in the world choose theirs by some sort of election. Putting power and influence in the hands of someone on the basis of who their parents were means the resulting head of state is more likely to be incompetent or malevolent. History is full of examples of evil kings and queens who made life for their own citizens miserable. Furthermore, kings and queens are difficult to remove from office. So when you get a bad one you are stuck with them for life.
- 3 The role of the UK monarchs is uncertain anyway. They formally appoint a prime minister whose party won an election, who in turn forms a government; they add their signature to laws that have already been passed by democratically elected politicians. They have no power themselves to create or change laws, so there is no point in their existence. Some say that the monarch maintains stability and prevents governments from abusing their power but, if this is true, then the role could be undertaken by a similar figure who was directly elected, or appointed for a fixed term by people who have been elected.
- 4 The cost of maintaining the Royal Family is staggeringly high. They receive around £40 million (\$55 million) every year from the UK taxpayer and that does not even include the cost of security! The UK monarch has five official residences, not to mention the homes of the extended family, all of which maintain a staff all year round. If we don't want to continue to waste this much money, we must abolish the hereditary monarchy. Those who say that the Royals attract a lot of overseas tourists seem to have overlooked the fact that we could open up all these royal residences as tourist attractions and charge admission.
- 5 The notion that the Royals provide an ideal of family life to which others can aspire can be instantly dismissed by a quick glance at some tabloid newspaper headlines, or by watching a TV drama serial about royal families.
- 6 The existence of the Royal Family reinforces the idea of an elite ruling class. This influences the way people vote in elections – one only needs to consider the number of recent UK prime ministers that have come from wealthy privileged backgrounds. So the monarchy perpetuates social inequality.
- 7 Some worry that the alternative would be of the US presidential variety, but that need not be a concern for the UK. There are lots of alternative systems around the world. Many countries have an elected president that is much more low-key, with much less power or influence than the US one and that costs a lot less money.

DOCUMENT 2

The return of the king

Far from being an anachronistic relic of a bygone age, could constitutional monarchy be the way forward in the 21st century?

Currently, 44 out of 195 countries have a monarch as head of state, so nearly a quarter of the world's population is happy to live under a monarchy. The extent of royal power within these countries varies, from absolute, where the sovereign has supreme authority, to the more common constitutional monarchies, where the role of the king or queen is largely ceremonial.

A monarch can act as a figurehead to represent the whole people: politicians represent their own party and are often distrusted or actively disliked by large swathes of the population.

Governments come and go – either democratically or sometimes by force – but monarchies endure, providing stability for a country in potentially turbulent times. A political scientist from the University of Washington has stated that, since the mid-20th century, monarchies in North Africa and the Middle East, like Morocco, Jordan and Saudi Arabia, have shown more stability than neighbouring countries with other forms of government.

Contrary to popular belief, kings and queens are cheaper than presidents. The US president's salary may be only \$400 000 per year, but when security, buildings and travel are included the costs become staggering – it is estimated that each time President Trump visited his Mar-a-Lago estate it cost the US taxpayer \$2 million. The French presidency, which works in a similar way to the US one, costs \$140 million a year. The Italian president, despite having a more monarch-like constitutional role, still costs \$270 million. By some estimates the UK monarchy costs only \$60 million, the Dutch \$43 million, while the Belgian, Danish and Spanish monarchies cost less than \$15 million each.

Monarchies are less corrupt. Politicians are inherently untrustworthy – making promises before an election that they have no intention of keeping. Research suggests that, where governments are failing or suspected of corruption, those in constitutional monarchies are more likely than those in republics to consult their people with early elections. A paper from a Swedish university found that social trust is higher in monarchies, and crime and corruption are lower. The fact that being a king or queen is a job for life means they can't be bought – they have nothing to gain or lose and they usually don't need the money.

What matters most to many people is the economy, and monarchies seem to win in that regard too. The World Bank estimates that, of the 10 top-performing economies in the world, 5 are monarchies. This is a much higher proportion than would be expected by chance and could be due to a number of factors related to stability, brand perception or even direct tourism. It is estimated that the British Royal Family accounts for around \$750 million per year in tourist revenue for the UK.

Most monarchies are broadly happy with their heads of state. According to a 2018 poll from a respected polling company, Spain is the least content, with 37 percent of respondents wishing to abolish the monarchy – but that means nearly two out of three Spaniards would prefer to keep the monarchy than to return to being a republic. Some countries are even considering restoring their monarchies. Romania has been a republic since 1947, when King Michael abdicated. The Romanian parliament recently discussed putting the monarchy's restoration to a public vote. Some royalists have been saying similar things recently in Brazil. Such sentiments arise not only from nostalgia but also from perceived political failings and corruption in republics.

DOCUMENT 3**Barbados to drop Queen as head of state***

Barbados has announced its intention to remove Queen Elizabeth II as its head of state. Barbados is a prosperous Caribbean island that gained independence from the British Empire in 1966 but retained Queen Elizabeth II as constitutional monarch and head of state.

In the Barbadian parliament, the Throne Speech outlining the government's programme for the new session of parliament is read by the governor general, the Queen's representative in Barbados. The text of the speech, however, is written by the elected Prime Minister of Barbados, currently Mia Mottley, the first woman in the post. In 2020, the speech included a statement of intent to become a republic in time for the 55th anniversary of independence. 'This is the ultimate statement of confidence in who we are and what we are capable of achieving,' the speech read. Buckingham Palace, site of the Offices of the Crown in London, said that the decision was a matter for the government and people of Barbados.

Barbados will not be the first Caribbean country to remove the Queen as head of state (Guyana did it in 1970) but such a move has been discussed and debated regularly since independence, over half a century ago. Barbados's first prime minister, Errol Barrow, hinted at the possibility of a Barbadian head of state when he said that the country should not 'loiter on colonial premises'.

In addition to Barbados and the UK, the Queen serves as the head of state for 14 other countries. Some of these are small islands, while others can be relatively large – Canada is the second-largest country in the world by land area. Some of these countries have considered moving to a republican system over the years, but it is still a relatively uncommon move – the last to do so was Mauritius in 1992.

Countries that have Queen Elizabeth II as head of state:

Antigua and Barbuda
Australia
Bahamas
Barbados
Belize
Canada
Grenada
Jamaica
New Zealand
Papua New Guinea
Saint Kitts and Nevis
Saint Lucia
Saint Vincent and the Grenadines
Solomon Islands
Tuvalu
United Kingdom

***Newspaper article from early 2021**

DOCUMENT 4**Comments on an internet discussion forum**

The monarchy provides a stable transition between elected governments – it really is a cornerstone of democracy.

RM, Sweden

Transparency International's perceptions of corruption index shows that 7 of the top 10 countries for transparency and absence of corruption – Denmark, New Zealand, Sweden, Norway, the Netherlands, Luxembourg and Canada – have a king or queen as head of state.

AS, Austria

Just because Queen Elizabeth II adopted a deliberately passive approach to her role does not mean her successor will do likewise. He seems to care about the environment but believes in homoeopathy and is not afraid to tell people that's what he thinks. And he can hand out knighthoods!

IK, New Zealand

It's a bit embarrassing, really. All that pomp and circumstance and people cheering when a golden carriage goes past looks a bit tragic and makes my country look to the rest of the world like it is living in the past and not looking to the future. Monarchy is a relic of history and forms a barrier against progressive reforms.

KU, UK

Most royals have very little real power and use what power they do have for good causes. Public adulation of royals is as harmless as public adulation of celebrities.

MN, Japan

History shows that removing a king leads to a lot of political upheaval. France removed its king over 200 years ago, thousands died and what replaced it was no more popular with its people.

RB, Canada

I don't get the argument about monarchies providing stability. Around the world, countless wars have been fought over who is to succeed the old king or queen. Most kings and queens are where they are today simply because their ancestors managed to kill more people than your ancestors or mine.

JN, India

The idea that any human being deserves to have a role within a state institution purely because of their bloodline is as offensive as the idea that it is OK for some people to be born into wealth and others into poverty.

PS, Mexico

Between 2014 and 2018 the British Royal Family is estimated to have made a net contribution of \$2.8 billion to the national economy; in Belgium, the figure was valued at \$160 million, and in Spain it was around \$100 million. A pretty good deal overall.

RG, Netherlands

Governing a country is hard work – just look how soon new leaders start showing their grey hair! Separating the positions of head of state and head of government means that the workload is split: ceremony is taken care of by the king so the prime minister can focus on running the country.

JB, USA

DOCUMENT 5

Some statistics about monarchies¹ in 2021The 10 richest² countries in the world

<i>Country</i>	<i>System</i>	<i>Authority of head of state</i>
Luxembourg	Monarchy	Ceremonial
Singapore	Republic	Ceremonial
Ireland	Republic	Ceremonial
Qatar	Monarchy	Executive
Switzerland	Republic	Executive
Norway	Monarchy	Ceremonial
USA	Republic	Executive
Brunei	Monarchy	Executive
San Marino	Republic	Executive
Denmark	Monarchy	Ceremonial

The 10 most and least prosperous³ countries in the world

<i>Most prosperous</i>	<i>System</i>	<i>Authority of head of state</i>
Denmark	Monarchy	Ceremonial
Norway	Monarchy	Ceremonial
Switzerland	Republic	Executive
Sweden	Monarchy	Ceremonial
Finland	Republic	Ceremonial
Netherlands	Monarchy	Ceremonial
New Zealand	Monarchy	Ceremonial
Germany	Republic	Ceremonial
Luxembourg	Monarchy	Ceremonial
Austria	Republic	Ceremonial

<i>Least prosperous</i>	<i>System</i>	<i>Authority of head of state</i>
South Sudan	Republic	Executive
CAR	Republic	Executive
Yemen	Provisional	n/a
Chad	Republic	Executive
Somalia	Republic	Executive
Afghanistan	Republic	Executive
DR Congo	Republic	Executive
Eritrea	Republic	Executive
Sudan	Provisional	n/a
Syria	Republic	Executive

¹ In 2021 there were 44 monarchies, out of a total of 195 countries.

² Based on gross domestic product per person.

³ Based on a variety of measures, including personal freedom and safety, governance and society, business and economy, infrastructure, living conditions, health, education and environment.

BLANK PAGE

Permission to reproduce items where third-party owned material protected by copyright is included has been sought and cleared where possible. Every reasonable effort has been made by the publisher (UCLES) to trace copyright holders, but if any items requiring clearance have unwittingly been included, the publisher will be pleased to make amends at the earliest possible opportunity.

To avoid the issue of disclosure of answer-related information to candidates, all copyright acknowledgements are reproduced online in the Cambridge Assessment International Education Copyright Acknowledgements Booklet. This is produced for each series of examinations and is freely available to download at www.cambridgeinternational.org after the live examination series.

Cambridge Assessment International Education is part of Cambridge Assessment. Cambridge Assessment is the brand name of the University of Cambridge Local Examinations Syndicate (UCLES), which is a department of the University of Cambridge.