



Examiners' Report

June 2011

GCE Government and Politics 6GP03 3B

Edexcel is one of the leading examining and awarding bodies in the UK and throughout the world. We provide a wide range of qualifications including academic, vocational, occupational and specific programmes for employers.

Through a network of UK and overseas offices, Edexcel's centres receive the support they need to help them deliver their education and training programmes to learners.

For further information, please call our GCE line on 0844 576 0025, our GCSE team on 0844 576 0027, or visit our website at www.edexcel.com.

If you have any subject specific questions about the content of this Examiners' Report that require the help of a subject specialist, you may find our **Ask The Expert** email service helpful.

Ask The Expert can be accessed online at the following link:
<http://www.edexcel.com/Aboutus/contact-us/>



Get more from your exam results

...and now your mock results too!

ResultsPlus is Edexcel's free online service giving instant and detailed analysis of your students' exam and mock performance, helping you to help them more effectively.

- See your students' scores for every exam question
- Spot topics, skills and types of question where they need to improve their learning
- Understand how your students' performance compares with Edexcel national averages
- Track progress against target grades and focus revision more effectively with NEW Mock Analysis

For more information on ResultsPlus, or to log in, visit www.edexcel.com/resultsplus.
To set up your ResultsPlus account, call 0844 576 0024

June 2011

Publications Code UA028084

All the material in this publication is copyright
© Edexcel Ltd 2011

Introduction

The aim of Unit 3B is to introduce students to political ideologies by acquiring a knowledge and understanding of the three major ideological traditions - liberalism, conservatism and socialism - as well as anarchism, which overlaps substantially with liberalism and socialism. The overall standard of responses to Unit 3B questions was, in this examination session, broadly similar to the standard in previous years. The major discriminator between mediocre and good performance was, as is so often the case, the difference between candidates who were able to provide a broadly accurate but essentially descriptive account of the ideology or sub-traditions in question, and candidates who were able to properly analyse and evaluate such material. The separate marking of AO2 on the essays (45 mark, Part B) questions, means that this distinction can be exposed effectively. The extent to which candidates were able to respond to the requirements of synopticity was also a significant discriminator in the marking of essay responses. However, there is evidence of general improvement in this respect. In a growing number of cases, centres appear to be training candidates to recognise from the outset, and through the body of the argument itself, contention between two or more viewpoints or perspectives. However, a significant proportion of candidates still fail to do this adequately, in the weakest cases just uncritically presenting a single viewpoint. A further common discriminator, on both short (15 mark, Part A) questions and essay questions was the extent to which explicit conceptual understanding was demonstrated, the strongest candidates being able to do this by recognising the often complex nature of the terms and concepts encountered in 3B.

Question 1

This question was generally well done, with a large proportion of candidates recognising the key features of collectivism and showing at least an awareness of how and why collectivism is linked to socialism. The principal causes of under-performance in this question were a tendency to mistake collectivism for collectivisation, and a generally greater emphasis on the 'how' aspect of the question than the 'why'.

A typical threshold level 2 response demonstrated the following:

- Accurate, if possibly implicit, awareness of the nature of collectivism
- Narrow or limited awareness of 'how' socialists support collectivism

A typical threshold level 3 response demonstrated the following:

- Clear, and probably explicit, understanding of the nature of collectivism
- Knowledge of a range of ways in which socialists have endorsed collectivism
- Sound explanation of 'why' socialists endorse collectivism

The strongest responses were often able to show an awareness of differences within socialist ideology, which are reflected in differing justifications for collectivism as well as in differing strategies for advancing collectivism.

Indicate your first question choice on this page.
You will be asked to indicate your second question choice on page 6.

Put a cross in the box ☒ indicating the first question that you have chosen.
If you change your mind, put a line through the box ☒
and then indicate your new question with a cross ☒.

Chosen Question Number:

Question 1 ☒

Question 2 ☒

Question 3 ☒

Question 4 ☒

Question 5 ☒

Collectivism refers to a set of ideas that are rooted in their belief that collective endeavour has greater moral and practical value than any individual self-serving action. Collectivism implies that social groups such as the ~~state~~ nation, races and classes are meaningful political entities. The idea of collectivism has great appeal for socialists. This is because socialists believe that human nature is sociable, generous and cooperative and that relationships among humans are born out of sympathy, harmony and mutual care for one another. This means that humans can't only be understood through the social groups in which they are attached to, and without any such institution humans become isolated and unfulfilled creatures. This idea also emphasises the ^{nature} ~~nature~~ side of human beings over nature and suggest that the collective action of human beings is likely to achieve more than the effort of any single individual. Cooperation and collective action are therefore desirable because they nurture human sympathy and care for each other, in contrast to competition which pits individuals against each other and thus is unnatural.

Collectivism has a number of implications for socialism, embodied in the various ways that socialists have proposed to achieve collectivism. ~~Radical~~ ^{Fundamentalist} socialists have attempted to bring about collectivism in a radical

You should start the answer to your second question choice on page 6

sense. This implies common ownership of means of production, whose mechanism may be through the abolition of the state, as envisaged by Marxists, who believe in a communist society in which human beings live in ^{small} communities and own means of production in common, or, as envisaged by Leninists and Stalinists, state socialism in which collectivism would mean the state ownership of all means of production and a planned economy. Revisionist socialists have embraced a more moderate method in which collectivism can be achieved, in which there is a blend of state interference and market economy to deliver the goods and a social welfare state to promote general advancement of the whole community and foster bonds between those above and those poorer. Common ownership, whether in its extreme or milder form, therefore has been seen by all socialists as the key mechanism through which collectivism can be brought about, believing it to foster human sympathy for each other and mutual cooperation against competition.



ResultsPlus
Examiner Comments

This is an excellent response to question 1, which received 15 marks out of 15. It contains a very good definition of collectivism, an excellent explanation of why socialists support collectivism and highlights a variety of ways in which socialists have tried to advance collectivism.

Question 2

This question was both popular and generally answered well. A key discriminator was the extent to which constitutionalism was understood, with some less successful candidates merely defining a codified constitution. On the other hand, successful candidates were often able to convey a clear understanding of constitutionalism, but also recognised that it encompasses the idea of both establishing external checks on government and not introducing internal checks through fragmenting power among a number of bodies or institutions. The extent to which candidates were able to explain a specifically liberal concern about government power, especially concentrated government power, was another important discriminator.

Typical features of a level 2 response were as follows:

- Awareness of nature of constitutionalism, probably demonstrated by a knowledge of constitutional devices, such as 'written' constitutions, the separation of power, parliamentary government etc.
- Some awareness of the corrupting nature and its implications for constitutionalism

Typical features of a level 3 response were as follows:

- Clear, and probably explicit, understanding of the nature of constitutionalism, with an awareness of both its legal and institutional forms.
- Sound explanation of specifically liberal concerns about the corrupting nature of power and the implications of unchecked government power.

Indicate your first question choice on this page.
You will be asked to indicate your second question choice on page 6.

Put a cross in the box ☒ indicating the first question that you have chosen.
If you change your mind, put a line through the box ☒
and then indicate your new question with a cross ☒.

Chosen Question Number:

Question 1 ☒

Question 2 ☒

Question 3 ☒

Question 4 ☒

Question 5 ☒

Liberals realise the need for government, but they also realise that there are negative aspects to having a government. As government is sovereign, it is able to threaten individual rights. This ~~also~~ highlights a liberal fear of power. ~~Liberals~~ Locke said "Where there is no law, there is no freedom", however, in order to preserve the freedom of individuals in society, government needs to be subject to internal and external constraints, which can be brought about via constitutionalism and democracy.

Constitutions outline the duties, powers and functions of government institutions, and prevent them from ^{therefore constitutes 'higher' law} ~~from~~ abusing their power. A codified constitution is a single authoritative document ~~which~~ containing a preamble, a main body and possibly an entrenched bill of rights. The first codified constitution was the US Constitution, established in ~~1787~~ 1787, but now most liberal democratic states have one, with the exception of the UK, Israel and New Zealand.

You should start the answer to your second question choice on page 6

The bill of rights is an entrenched definition of the rights of individuals ~~and~~ (giving it written expression so making ~~it easier~~ rights easier to defend in the courts), and also defining the relationship between ~~of~~ the individual and the state.

The first 10 amendments of the US Constitution are an entrenched bill of rights, and the 'Declaration of the rights of Man'¹³ were ~~also~~ adopted ⁱⁿ the French revolution. However, as the UK does not have a codified constitution, liberals stress the importance of statute law in constraining and checking government powers.

~~Another way liberals defend liberal also defend constitutionalism~~ as Constitutionalism also puts internal constraints on government, by ~~as part~~ internal fragmentation, achieved by a separation of powers between the legislature, executive, and judiciary. In the US this has caused for the separation of the congress, the presidency and the Supreme Court. It is important that these institutions of government in the UK, ~~Q. 1. 1. 1.~~ particularly the judiciary, remain separated as the judicial independence, ~~strict~~ and neutrality are very important principles. The judiciary interprets all laws and checks the powers of government, so it must remain

You should start the answer to your second question choice on page 6

independent and neutral so they do not exert
a bias. In the UK up until 2006, the Lord
Chancellor was both head of the judiciary and
a cabinet member, however the role of the
head of the judiciary has been taken over by
Lord Chief Justice since 2006.

Other ways that government can be constrained
are cabinet government (which checks the
power of the Prime Minister) and devolution
(which fragmented the power of Parliament), as
well as local government (which checks the
power of the central government).



ResultsPlus

Examiner Comments

This is a good response which received 12 marks out of 15. It contains a very thorough range of devices through which government power can be limited, and a good awareness of liberal concerns about power. However, it is weaker in explaining these liberal concerns, specifically in explaining how and why power corrupts.

Question 3

Very few candidates failed to recognise that the individualist anarchist tradition provides evidence of the link between anarchism and individualism. Some less successful responses, indeed, did little more than describe features of this tradition. However, more successful responses got the heart of the question by explaining how and why individualism, in its extreme form, implies absolute freedom and so has anarchist implications, using individualist anarchism to illustrate these linkages.

Typical threshold level 2 responses contained the following features:

- Accurate, if possibly implicit, awareness of the nature of individualism
- Some awareness of the link between individualism and anarchism, probably demonstrated by references to individualist anarchism.

Typical threshold level 3 responses contained the following features:

- Clear, and probably explicit, understanding of the nature of individualism
- Sound explanation of the link between anarchism and individualism, associated with support for enlarging individual freedom.

Indicate your first question choice on this page.
You will be asked to indicate your second question choice on page 6.

Put a cross in the box ☒ indicating the first question that you have chosen.
If you change your mind, put a line through the box ☒
and then indicate your new question with a cross ☒.

Chosen Question Number:

Question 1 ☒

Question 2 ☒

Question 3 ☒

Question 4 ☒

Question 5 ☒

Anarchism is a political philosophy which rejects any form of coercion, especially in the form of state or gov-t. Pierre-Joseph Proudhon was the first to announce proudly, in 1840, : "I am an anarchist" as an advocate of individual freedom, self-government and self-determination.

Anarchism can be broadly sub-divided into two main schools of thought: left-wing ultra-socialism and right-wing ultra-liberalism.

Ultra-liberal strand of anarchism is the one which has links with the concept of individualism i.e a belief that human beings are

You should start the answer to your second question choice on page 6

work more efficiently if they act as atomistic individuals.

Egoists like Stirner believe in that human beings are rational and self-seeking creatures, thus they qualify to obtain liberty and self-determination. They also point out that individual self or "ego" should be at the center of the moral universe and all individuals should be allowed to do what they want to regardless of any laws and moral or social conventions. As a result Stirner's egoism pushes egoistical individualism to its logical conclusion.

Anarcho-capitalists like Rothbard are more concerned with economic issues rather than moralities.

Anarcho-capitalism like egoism adopted an ambivalent view of human nature by saying that human beings are rational and self-seeking at the same time. Therefore

You should start the answer to your second question choice on page 6

they pursued free market "laissez-fair" economics where natural forces of supply and demand (also known as Adam Smith's 'invisible hand') are allowed to allocate resources. This economic theory is based upon mechanistic view of society where free individuals are allowed to enter the market and succeed or fail on their own merit i.e. meritocracy and no gov-t or state should intervene into this self-regulating system. Thus anarcho-capitalism encourages rational individuals to enterprise and operate as 'atoms'.



ResultsPlus
Examiner Comments

This is a sound response to the question. It was given 10 marks out of 15. Although it starts with some generalised points that do not clearly address the question set, it highlights, particularly in its account of the ideas of Stirner, why individualism can have anarchist implications.



ResultsPlus
Examiner Tip

Individualism could and should have been defined. The conceptual link between individualism and anarchism should have been explained more clearly and explicitly.

Question 4

This question was popular and generally well answered, with very few candidates failing to demonstrate at least a basic grasp of the One Nation thinking within conservatism. Less successful responses to the question tended to offer a largely descriptive account of the disposition within conservatism towards welfarism, without adequately explaining where this comes from, politically and ideologically. By contrast, successful responses dealt very effectively with the grounds on which conservatives have supported One Nationism, often being able to recognise both principled and pragmatic grounds. The clarity and depth of analysis in this respect was a key discriminator between sound, good and very good responses.

Typical threshold level 2 responses exhibited the following features:

- Some awareness of the nature of One National principles
- Limited knowledge of at least one conservative justification for One Nationism.

Typical threshold level 3 responses exhibited the following features:

- Clear, and probably explicit, understanding of the nature of One Nation principles
- Sound explanation of both principled and pragmatic justifications for One Nationism, or very full explanation of one justification.

Indicate your first question choice on this page.
You will be asked to indicate your second question choice on page 6.

Put a cross in the box ☒ indicating the first question that you have chosen.
If you change your mind, put a line through the box ☒
and then indicate your new question with a cross ☒.

Chosen Question Number:

Question 1 ☒

Question 2 ☒

Question 3 ☒

Question 4 ☒

Question 5 ☒

One Nation Conservatism is otherwise known as Paternalistic conservatism - literally father-rule.

Conservatism as an ideology favours hierarchy & One Nationism seeks to conserve this tradition.

Benjamin Disraeli theorised the One Nation theory in *Sybil & Coningsby* & believed that people in power have a noblesse oblige (obligation of rank) to care for those to which they are responsible. A conservative would support this because those in power have innate leadership qualities. Although there is an unequal distribution of privilege, there is an unequal distribution of responsibilities.

Not only this, but noblesse oblige ensures that those individuals who are less capable of looking after themselves are cared for. Humans are intellectually flawed & more importantly, psychologically fallible. We desire familiarity & the security of an ordered, organic society. Noblesse

You should start the answer to your second question choice on page 6

oblige uphold this by providing paternalistic guidance ~~to~~ for those less capable. This ensure social order - a prime concern of Disraeli. Disraeli implemented the Second Reform Act 1867 to improve working class lives, to prevent revolution & consolidate hierarchy. As E Burke said, "a state without the means of change is without its means of conservation." In addition to upholding the principle of authority & providing security for the masses - Disraeli believed in the importance of the nuclear family. The father ~~is~~ is at the Head of the family with a social responsibility to care for the other relatives - just as Government must care for the ill-equipped people.

Harold Macmillan of 1950 UK was prime minister & adopted One Nation conservatism. He employed a 'Middle Way' economic plan to "regulate certain aspects of economy & the drive & initiative of private enterprise." He sought to create full employment & expand welfare. These economic principles would be supported by some conservatives as Macmillan is initiating an incentive for wealth & therefore prosperity by increasing employment & also ~~to~~ supporting the disadvantaged with welfare.

You should start the answer to your second question choice on page 6

One Nation conservatism attempts to consolidate hierarchy & prevent revolution of working classes. In doing so, they uphold key principles of conservatism including human imperfection, hierarchy & authority & organic society.



ResultsPlus
Examiner Comments

This is an excellent response to the question, which received 14 marks out of 15. It is particularly impressive in the fullness and clarity of its explanation and analysis.

Question 5

The quality of responses to this question varied significantly. Less successful responses sometimes demonstrated little understanding of either economic liberalism or social liberalism, in the weakest cases simply writing about other issues, such as freedom or toleration. In other cases, candidates recognised that economic liberalism and social liberalism are rooted, respectively, in classical liberalism and modern liberalism, but then proceeded to provide an account of the latter rather than the former. This enabled something relevant to be said, but it was an approach that failed to get to the heart of the question. On the other hand, there were some excellent responses that recognised, for instance, the market fundamentalism that operates at the core of economic liberalism and concerns that social liberals have expressed about laissez-faire.

Typical threshold level 2 responses exhibited the following features:

- Some understanding of one form of liberalism, with at least an awareness of the other form.

Typical threshold level 3 responses exhibited the following features:

- Sound explanation of both forms of liberalism, with at least some contrasts being made explicitly.

Indicate your first question choice on this page.
You will be asked to indicate your second question choice on page 6.

Put a cross in the box ☒ indicating the first question that you have chosen.
If you change your mind, put a line through the box ☒
and then indicate your new question with a cross ☒.

Chosen Question Number:

Question 1 ☒

Question 2 ☒

Question 3 ☒

Question 4 ☒

Question 5 ☒

~~Economic Liberalism~~

There has been tension within modern liberalism with regards to the role of the state.

Economic liberalism relates to a negative freedom. It draws on ideas of utilitarianism in that individuals are selfish and bent on the acquisition of material goods and wealth. Thomas Paine thus describes the state as a 'necessary evil' its role should be minimal and it should act on the metaphor given by Locke as a 'nightwatchman'.

These beliefs are clearly evident in the fact some modern liberals believe that the ~~the~~ free market possesses near miraculous qualities. Firstly, it produces an equilibrium and is self-regulating. For example, just like Adam Smith's 'invisible hand', Hayek likened the market to a central nervous system which is capable of regulating the economy.

You should start the answer to your second question choice on page 6

because it has the capacity to simultaneously send a number of messages. Secondly the free market is productive and efficient on a macro level as resources are drawn inexorably ~~and~~ and given to their most profitable use and on a micro level as ~~for~~ private businesses are more efficient because they are profit driven unlike public institutions thus having the motive to cut costs and reduce waste. Thirdly the market is democratic because ~~for~~ buyers will only produce what consumers are willing to ~~pay~~ ^{buy} at a price consumers are willing to buy thus the consumer holds sovereignty. Finally the market is socially just because it gives individuals the opportunity to rise and fall therefore material inequality, ~~and~~ reflects natural inequality in society.

In contrast social liberalism views the ~~role~~ role of the state in a more positive light. Adopting developmental liberalism, modern liberals advocate that the ~~role of the~~ state has the social responsibility to help those ~~disadvantaged~~ less well off by raising or removing disadvantage thus individuals have ~~an~~ equal or more equal life standards.

You should start the answer to your second question choice on page 6

and opportunities. Therefore in place of Lockes night watchman and minimal state modern liberals promote interventionism or an 'enabling state' in order to expand freedom ^{not diminish it} to those crippled by social disadvantages as mentioned in the Beveridge report (disease and squalor for example).

Social liberalism ~~that~~ was strengthened further by the emergence of 'so-called' social democratic liberalism. Hayek developed a defence of social liberalism on the grounds of 'equality as fairness'. He argued that ~~individuals~~ individuals should opt for an egalitarian society on the basis that desire to reduce poverty was greater than the attraction of riches. ~~There~~ ~~are~~ ~~the~~ ~~market~~ ~~the~~ Hayek thus developed the 'difference principle' in that those less well off in society must be helped by the wealthy and privileged. Hence



ResultsPlus Examiner Comments

This is an excellent response, which received 15 marks out of 15. Having located both economic liberalism and social liberalism in relation to wider issues, it then examines with impressive insight and clarity contrasting positions on the relationship between the market and the state within liberalism.

Question 6

Very few candidates found it difficult to highlight the relationship between socialism and equality. However, less successful responses tended to do little more than provide an account of contrasting socialist traditions, with relatively little being said about how these traditions deal with the issue of equality, particularly equality of outcome. More successful responses showed, in the first place, a greater insight into the nature of equality, and were to highlight the distinctive character of equality of outcome, usually distinguishing it from equality of opportunity. They then considered the contrasting traditions within socialism, but focused particularly on how, why, and crucially, the extent to which they have embraced distinctive conceptions of equality. It was disappointing that some weaker responses merely stated that socialists support equality of outcome without explaining what its supposed benefits might be.

Typical threshold level 2 responses exhibited the following features:

- Awareness of nature of equality of outcome
- Limited awareness of divisions amongst socialists over the nature of equality, probably linked to the rival ideas of equality of outcome and equality of opportunity.

Typical threshold level 3 responses exhibited the following features:

- Sound and explicit understanding of the nature of equality of outcome, and of its link to socialism
- Clear explanation of how and why different socialist traditions disagree over equality of outcome.

Put a cross in the box ☒ indicating the question that you have chosen.
If you change your mind, put a line through the box ☒
and then indicate your new question with a cross ☒.

Chosen Question Number:

Question 6 ☒

Question 7 ☒

Question 8 ☒

Equality of outcome is the type of equality that attempts to bring about an equal distribution of rewards, meaning that ^{regarding} individuals' action and contributions, they should all be ~~be~~ rewarded with the same amount. Socialists have been attracted to equality in general and equality of outcome in particular because it appeals to socialists' desire to create a society where everyone is treated equally and out of sympathy and harmony with each other. However, the extent to which socialists embrace equality of outcome differs to some ~~or~~ degree, which will be assessed in the following way.

Socialists have been ~~so~~ attracted to equality of outcome for a number of reasons. Equality of outcome is believed to promote genuine and justice more than any other types of equality. Equality of outcome is argued by socialists to be genuine equality as it ensures that individuals are rewarded with the same amount of rewards in contrast to inequalities of outcome which are likely to promote social division and exploitation by those who own more. Equality of outcome in this sense, promotes social values like sympathy and harmony as those who own the same amount of wealth are more likely to share with each ~~or~~ other and promote social values and it also fosters cooperative action among human beings in general. This is compatible with socialists' belief in the natural goodness of the individual whose relationships are based on social and generous principles. Equality of opportunity is a sham in that it

justifies the inequalities ~~of~~ prevalent in society which are ^{arguably} made more by unnatural treatment by society rather than individual skills and talents.

Foundational and formal equality are inadequate in the sense that they fail to deal with the inherent inequalities in society by offering largely ineffective tactics to combat them.

9 Fundamentalists have been most committed to the achievement of equality of outcome. Fundamentalist socialists such as Marx in particular have defended equality of outcome on the grounds that "need" is a more important human satisfaction than "want".

Marx ^{had} argued that all economic decisions in society should therefore be made to satisfy the need of the individual rather than their own ambitions and aspirations, as material inequalities, embedded in the ownership of private property, serve to create social divisions in society, especially in terms of classes, namely the bourgeoisie who own the means of production and earn profit and the proletariat who are exploited and barely satisfy their needs through the sale of their labour. Genuine equality therefore demands the abolition of all material inequalities to promote material equality, which has even been carried further by Marx to manifestly in the form of absolute equality, the idea that individuals should be entitled to equality of ~~resources and~~ material and reward distribution in its strictest sense. Marx had envisaged this extreme form of equality of outcome to be conducted by a future communist society, created ^{not} via revolution by the proletariat against the bourgeoisie and then via a period of dictatorship of the proletariat in which a temporary state would oversee the ~~at~~ construction of such a communist society. In this final stage, equality of outcome would be realized in the form of common ownership by all those who inhabit in such communities, where production would occur on

the basis of need of the community and harmony and sympathy.

In reality, equality of outcome had already been strictly enforced, ~~also~~ though in a distorted version from the original Marxist interpretation, made possible in the form of state socialism. In this way, equality of outcome was achieved by state distribution of means rather than out of voluntary and natural achievement as envisaged by Marx. The state regulated the economy and ~~produced~~ ^{collected} all products produced by workers into a central pool, part of which would be equally distributed to each individual in society on the basis of their needs, and the surplus of which would be reinvested to generate further wealth for the society. The best example of this is the Soviet Union under Stalin in the first half of the twentieth century, though it turned out to be a repressive regime.

However, economists have been ^{more} reluctant to embrace strict equality of outcome compared to their predecessors and more orientated towards equality of opportunity. This is because of their recognition that equality of outcome, despite being rather appealing to other socialists, would result in the leveling downwards of all those in society and the ~~same~~ production of goods and ~~many~~ services merely on the basis of human needs, as unlikely to deliver general prosperity to the community. Equality of opportunity, in recognizing the different abilities, talents and contributions of individuals and attempting to reward accordingly, is seen to have greater moral and practical value than equality of outcome. Social democrats, for example, have advocated a blend of both ~~good~~ government intervention and an enterprise culture in the economy, believing that in the market mechanism and thus capitalism are able to generate wealth for the whole community, it is valued as a means through which human cooperation and mutual understanding can take place. They have also mixed the idea of equality of

material rewards to individuals, replacing it with a milder form of intervention namely welfare state, in which the state provides welfare for individuals to be able to stand up in society and move them from the appalling state of poverty. The 3rd way even carried this to the extreme, largely abandoning the goal of equality of outcome and instead subscribing to absolute equality of opportunity, reducing the role of the state as a nanny taking care of interests of everyone in society and believing that each individual should be responsible for the outcome of their actions through their own efforts and hard work. ~~Thus~~ Some have argued that by rejecting equality of outcome the Third Way no longer locates themselves within the socialist branch.

Overall, all socialists have been committed to equality of outcome to some extent.



ResultsPlus

Examiner Comments

This is an excellent response to the question. It demonstrates very broad and accurate knowledge and understanding, consistently strong intellectual skills, an impressive awareness of contrasting viewpoints within socialism, and also advances a coherent overall argument, clearly communicated. The marks it received were 12, 12, 12, 9.

Question 7

As seems to happen with anarchism questions, there are a proportion of candidates who use them as an opportunity to write all they know about anarchism, paying relatively little attention, in the process, to the theme of the question. Fortunately, this only applies to a minority of candidates, but it applied again this year. More successful responses dealt effectively and explicitly with viability or practicability of the anarchist goal of a stateless society, often helpfully recognising that this concerns the link between anarchism and utopianism. In better cases, anarchist ideas were set against critical views, advanced, amongst others, by liberals, conservatives or Marxists. A key discriminator was the effectiveness with which anarchist utopianism was explained, which ranged from simply assertions that 'anarchists believe that people are naturally good' to the recognition that anarchists believe that human nature is malleable and that positive potentialities only blossom in particular economic and political circumstances.

Typical threshold level 2 responses exhibited the following features:

- Awareness of the core aim of anarchism, the achievement of a stateless society
- Awareness of disagreements between anarchists and their critics over the practicability of this goal.

Typical threshold level 3 responses exhibited the following features:

- Clear explanation of anarchist utopianism, linked to the feasibility of a stateless society, probably through reference to human nature
- Clear explanation why critics of anarchism have regarded statelessness as unachievable.

Put a cross in the box ☒ indicating the question that you have chosen.
If you change your mind, put a line through the box ☒
and then indicate your new question with a cross ☒.

Chosen Question Number:

Question 6 ☒

Question 7 ☒

Question 8 ☒

~~Yes, despite opposition to human nature, state is defended due to social progress
of conventional politics
we are not necessarily the case that a free society could achieve more than the
justification of state intervention. I believe in state~~

Anarchists are primarily defined by their opposition to the state as a form of coercive, compulsory, absolute power and authority over the individual. Their principle 'demand', therefore, is that humans be able and allowed to live free from the imposition of state authority. On one level, this demand is realistic - anarchists argue that man is inherently good-natured and society can therefore exist harmoniously and prosperously without state control; it may be that the market can replace the state. However, there are inherent limits to anarchists' arguments, such as the view that their view of human nature is over-optimistic and the fact that the market has proved itself ineffective at providing all services, which mean that the demands of anarchists are in reality impossible to achieve.

Anarchists base their demand for no state on the view that man is inherently good-natured, that he knows what is best for him. Individualist anarchists such as William Godwin argue that man can act autonomously and can arrange his affairs without regulation. Collectivist anarchists accept the view of Peter Kropotkin and others

that the human species works best and prospers when individuals work together for common benefit - the idea of 'mutual aid'. Either way, anarchists believe in the utopianism of man, that without state authority and the subsequent repression of his true characteristics, he is able to lead a happy life and society, in turn, can naturally be ~~ordered~~^{ordered}, harmonious, peaceful and prosperous. They are right in suggesting that there is really no evidence that man cannot be as perfect as they say, because humans take on the characteristics of the community in which they live - because man has in recent centuries always lived under the state, he becomes greedy and selfish, and life is, as put by Hobbes, 'nasty, brutish and short'. Without the state, it is entirely possible that society can be even more ordered than it is currently, and thus anarchist demands do not appear to be impossible.

It is also the case that anarchists have put forward alternatives to the current system, showing that they are not merely critics and they have thought about how to achieve their 'demands'. Individualist anarchists put forward the idea of man being self-reliant, pursuing his own choices freely. Anarcho-capitalists such as Murray Rothbard argue that the state can be replaced by market capitalism, that it cannot only produce the products that man desires, it can also provide the services he requires. The market can, for example, provide private law courts. As they would run within the competitive market system,

they would be run efficiently. The profit-motive would require them to be honest, and thus the best and most neutral courts would attract the most clients seeking a fair and honest trial. Collectivist anarchists put forward many means by which society can exist harmoniously without the state. Mutualists such as Pierre-Joseph Proudhon argue for a system of property ownership that is free from exploitation, whereby individuals negotiate and trade without profit. Such a system is voluntary and beneficial and requires no regulation. Anarcho-syndicalists such as Georges Sorel argue that the workers can overpower the state through revolutionary trade unions, by which they can exert their true political influence and live without the state. Anarcho-communists put forward the idea of living in communes, ~~where~~ which are small and based on the idea of face-to-face interaction, thereby requiring little or no government regulation. Thus, anarchists have provided alternatives to the state system. Which seems to be effective, meaning that they do not demand the impossible.

What is more, in modern times, globalisation and the growth of international markets has reduced the importance of the state. People have been forced to look for alternative systems, and the growth of the unregulated internet as a major market has seen anarchism grow in importance because the internet reflects the core anarchist values of freedom from

authority and oppression. In addition, anarchism has had increasing influence on political ideologies such as environmentalism. Libertarian tendencies, perhaps influenced by Henry David Thoreau, have emerged within both the left and the right. Thus, anarchism is growing in importance and is arguably having an influence, meaning that it is increasingly not demanding the impossible or its chances of success increase.

However, it is arguable that anarchists do demand the impossible because they are utopian in their view of human nature. The entire anarchist belief in the efficacy and value of a society free from the authority of the state is based on the idea that without a state, man is able to live peacefully and prosperously within a harmonious society. There is no evidence, however, that this is the case. Anarchists themselves accept that within all individuals there is the innate possibility of greed and corruption. Thus, if there is even this possibility, an anarchist society would be incredibly unstable and at risk of descending into civil war, proving the views of Hobbes and others that man's state of nature is one of conflict. Thus, the founding principle on which anarchism is based can be questioned, severely undermining the idea that their demands are possible.

Anarchist methods have also meant that their demands are impossible to achieve. Their rejection of conventional politics, which they believe to be oppressive &

hierarchy and do not therefore wish to condone by taking part in it, mean they have no way of influencing people to accept, or even understand, their views. Their recourse to violence, such as the assassination of President McKinley and other terrorist activities simply alienates support and shows them to be no better than the coercive and oppressive state. Pacifism, as demonstrated by Tolstoy and Gandhi, is so limited in its inherent nature that it cannot hope to attract widespread support for anarchist values, even though it does demonstrate the strength of their own convictions. Revolution and anarchist syndicalism have had no hope of succeeding because they believe it will occur spontaneously, whereas of course such action requires organisation. Therefore, anarchists do demand the impossible because there are no realistic methods by which they can effectively achieve their demands.

Finally, their criticism of the state and the individualist anarchists' defence of the market have been undermined. The market has shown himself to be ineffective at providing all services because of the free-rider effect, by which some individuals benefit without paying, therefore reducing the efficiency of the service. Collectivist anarchists themselves have recognized always that the market cannot deliver equality or prosperity for all, and you do need collective action to help and increase

the general welfare of society and all individuals within it. The inherent divisions within anarchism have undermined its cause, because each side of the argument has recognised the deficiencies of the other. With regard to the market, the state has always been forced to step in to provide welfare, and the defence of it by liberals that it protects and, for modern liberals and people such as John Rawls, increases freedom by allowing people to exert their right to choose, has simply undermined the arguments of anarchism and shown that they demand the impossible.

Anarchism has challenged traditional assumptions and has arguably influenced other political traditions in libertarian thinking, but at the end of the day it has failed to make any progress in achieving its demand for an a stateless society, or even persuading people as to the merits of such a change. Its view of human nature is utopian and impractical; it has failed to find a method by which it can effectively and successfully bring about the change which it demands; and the state has been shown to be effective at what it does, at maintaining order, improving prosperity and providing insurance and security. Thus, up to now at least, anarchists have demanded the impossible.



ResultsPlus Examiner Comments

This is a highly effective response to the question. It contains excellent knowledge and understanding, strong intellectual skills, a clear understanding of differences within anarchism over this matter, and a coherent argument, clearly communicated. The marks it received were 12, 12, 12, 9.

Question 8

This was a popular question, generally well answered by a large proportion of candidates. The most successful responses focused effectively on the issue of human imperfection, often helpfully recognising that conservatives believe that human beings are imperfect in a variety of ways. They then explained each of these imperfections and evaluated the extent to which different traditions within conservatism hold these views, usually with an awareness of differences between traditional conservative and the liberal new right, although One Nationist ideas could also have been discussed. Less successful responses sometimes struggled with the idea of human imperfection, sometimes failing to recognise distinctively conservative thinking on the matter. In these cases, generalised and poorly focused responses were offered.

Typical threshold level 2 responses exhibited the following features:

- Awareness of at least one clear sense in which conservatism is a philosophy of imperfection
- Some awareness of divisions within conservatism over imperfection, probably associated with rival views of traditional conservatism and the liberal New Right.

Typical threshold level 3 responses exhibited the following features:

- Sound explanation of two or more ways in which conservatism is a philosophy of imperfection
- Clear understanding of how and why the liberal New Right departs from the traditional view.

Put a cross in the box ☒ indicating the question that you have chosen.
If you change your mind, put a line through the box ☒
and then indicate your new question with a cross ☒.

Chosen Question Number:

Question 6 ☒

Question 7 ☒

Question 8 ☒

Conservatism is a political ideology that puts emphasis on social hierarchy, tradition and customs and resistance to sudden change. At the heart of conservatism lies a pessimistic and ~~reluctant~~ non-utopian view of human nature. Conservatives see human beings as self-seeking and unreliable. They believe human beings are morally flawed – an idea embedded in the biblical story of Adam and Eve who opened the Pandora's box and introduced suffering for themselves and all their progeny. From this point of view, a conservative would argue, human beings are a fallen race, cast out from Eden by a vengeful God dismayed at the cupidity of ~~human~~ his creation.

Conservatives believe humans search for stability and direction "from above". They want to know where they stand in society and what is expected of them. They are security-seeking creatures who fear isolation and instability and balk at the prospect of being left alone. Human

beings are incapable of surviving on their own, cannot govern from below. A good example to illustrate this point would be the relationship between an infant and its parent. The parent virtually influence all aspects of its young life because it is fallible - the ~~being~~ infant does not know what is good for them - e.g. to be kept away from danger, to have a healthy diet, to go to bed at sensible times etc. It needs guidance ~~from~~ from its parents. Like human beings are imperfect and need to be under the tutelage of a prudent leader to survive in society.

conservatives believe that human beings are also selfish and greedy. Tracing back the fall of Adam and Eve, human beings have always sought self-enhancement. They are, therefore, morally corrupt. If they are given unlimited freedom, they will stoop to a criminal's level and create disorder and lawlessness. They need to be "taught" to rectify mistakes and lead an honest life free from corruption. Without control and punishment, human beings are unable to overcome this problem and they remain morally imperfectible.

Conservatives also hold that humans are psychologically and intellectually limited. The world is too complex and beyond their grasp. As philosopher Michael Oakeshott put it, "the world is 'boundless and bottomless' where everything appears to be a 'blooming, buzzing confusion'". Humans are unable to make sense of this complex world because of their lack of cognitive capacity. It is therefore the responsibility of the ruling class who possess wisdom and intellect ~~and~~ to help them ~~to~~ understand the intricacies of this complex universe. And because humans are prone to error, it is dangerous and risky to rely on them. Society should therefore be run by the aristocrats.

However, although traditional conservatives have a pessimistic view of human nature, a branch of conservatism, namely the neo-liberals, refute such view. They see the state and the aristocracy as the realm of coercion and unfreedom ~~and~~ where individual ~~liberty~~ liberties are infringed. Instead of placing power in the hands of a ~~few~~ so-called ~~few~~

"perfect" aristocrats, power should be distributed among all individual and government should trust the decision made by its subjects. Every decision should be a process of national thought, whereby human beings decide what is ~~the~~ best ~~for~~ for them by considering the pros and cons of possible course of actions. This is in stark contrast to traditional conservatives who think human beings are intellectually limited to make national decision.

Furthermore, the neo-liberals believe that humans should challenge the rule ~~imposed~~ imposed on them by ~~the~~ the ruling class if they are not satisfied. Government should not ~~be~~ left in the hands of elites and people, however imperfect ~~they~~ they are should not naively believe that whatever the traditional authoritative body decides is best for them. A good example is Margaret Thatcher who didn't hesitate to confront traditional and established institutions ~~such~~ such as trade unions, the church of England, established universities (e.g. Oxford and Cambridge) and the House of Lords if their policies proved ~~to~~ to be an

obstacle in the way of economic reform.

In addition, neo-liberals have espoused that ~~the~~ free-market capitalism should be given precedence over social stability, and as such people should be allowed to take part in government, pledge their allegiance and put forward ~~the~~ novel ideas. Their imperfect nature would be looked over if they can contribute to the formation of a free-market.

Neo-liberals criticise paternalistic, ~~the~~ traditional conservative ~~view~~ for portraying human beings as self-seeking creatures who ~~are~~ are only concerned about their own social condition. Although humans seek to meet their own needs, it is not because they are morally corrupt, but because they possess self-awareness and are capable of ~~the~~ decision making. Thus neo-liberals hold a more optimistic view of human nature than the traditional conservatives.

In conclusion, it can be seen that only the traditional conservatives have seen human

beings as imperfect ~~and~~ on the grounds that they are self-seeking, opportunistic, psychologically and intellectually limited. They easily succumb to mistakes and errors and should not be trusted at all. However, neo-liberals are more optimistic about human nature and argue that every human being is a self-aware, rational being and therefore should decide his own fate.



ResultsPlus
Examiner Comments

This was a very good response to the question. It exhibits consistently strong knowledge and understanding, impressive intellectual skills, a reliable understanding of differences within conservatism over the matter, all expressed in a clear and coherent overall argument. The marks it received were 11, 11, 9, 8.

Paper Summary

General advice for improving candidates' performance and outcomes in Unit 3B include the following:

- Strengthening conceptual understanding, not only by ensuring that candidates have accurate and robust single-sentence definitions of key terms, but also by making them aware of the wider and often complex meaning of these terms.
- Ensuring that candidates develop an analytical understanding of the relevant ideological traditions, rather than just a descriptive understanding.
- Enhancing candidates' awareness of debates, discussions and arguments about the nature of the ideological traditions that feature in Topic B, usually (but not always) associated with rival sub-traditions within the ideology.

Grade Boundaries

Grade boundaries for this, and all other papers, can be found on the website on this link:

<http://www.edexcel.com/iwantto/Pages/grade-boundaries.aspx>

Further copies of this publication are available from
Edexcel Publications, Adamsway, Mansfield, Notts, NG18 4FN

Telephone 01623 467467

Fax 01623 450481

Email publication.orders@edexcel.com

Order Code UA028084 June 2011

For more information on Edexcel qualifications, please visit

www.edexcel.com/quals

Pearson Education Limited. Registered company number 872828
with its registered office at Edinburgh Gate, Harlow, Essex CM20 2JE



Llywodraeth Cynulliad Cymru
Welsh Assembly Government

