Pearson

Examiners' Report
June 2017

GCE Government & Politics 6GP03 3B

ResultsPlus

edexcel

Edexcel and BTEC Qualifications

Edexcel and BTEC qualifications come from Pearson, the UK's largest awarding body. We provide a wide range of qualifications including academic, vocational, occupational and specific programmes for employers. For further information visit our qualifications websites at www.edexcel.com or www.btec.co.uk.

Alternatively, you can get in touch with us using the details on our contact us page at www.edexcel.com/contactus.

ResultsPlus

Giving you insight to inform next steps

ResultsPlus is Pearson's free online service giving instant and detailed analysis of your students' exam results.

- See students' scores for every exam question.
- Understand how your students' performance compares with class and national averages.
- Identify potential topics, skills and types of question where students may need to develop their learning further.

For more information on ResultsPlus, or to log in, visit www.edexcel.com/resultsplus.
Your exams officer will be able to set up your ResultsPlus account in minutes via Edexcel Online.

Pearson: helping people progress, everywhere

Pearson aspires to be the world's leading learning company. Our aim is to help everyone progress in their lives through education. We believe in every kind of learning, for all kinds of people, wherever they are in the world. We've been involved in education for over 150 years, and by working across 70 countries, in 100 languages, we have built an international reputation for our commitment to high standards and raising achievement through innovation in education. Find out more about how we can help you and your students at: www.pearson.com/uk.

June 2017

Publications Code 6GP03_3B_1706_ER

All the material in this publication is copyright
© Pearson Education Ltd 2017

Introduction

The overall standard of responses in Unit 3B was broadly in line with that of previous years. There were few examples of candidates misunderstanding or misinterpreting questions, although in some cases candidates did not make explicit their understanding of the key concepts within a question by providing a concise definition. A small minority of candidates opted to answer only two questions from section A, and this should be strongly discouraged. An important discriminator was the extent to which candidates focused on the specific question set and as a general rule candidates who did this performed better. Some good advice to candidates preparing for exams is to spend time in the exam thinking about the questions they intend to answer, identifying the key words or terms and, for essays, planning their answer *before* starting to answer the question.

Question 1

This was a fairly popular question and generally well answered, with nearly all candidates referring to Disraeli. Stronger responses gave a range of points, with explanation and development, explaining the 'why'; they also addressed the 'how' part of the question. A very small minority of responses spent time discussing conservatives who do not support One Nation principles, but this was not asked for in the question.

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 nationism is a patemalistic form of ~~conservit~~ conservatism centring largely on social obligation, derived from Disraeli's thinking. Firstly, One nation principles have been supported on the basis of prudence, or pragmatism. This is a result of the need for limited reforms to the conditions of the working class, to pacify them and therefore ensure the protection and longevity of the pre-existing social order, summarised in Burke's words, 'change in order to conserve'. This means that limited change allows the sumival of conservative social order.

Secondly, conservatives have supported One nation principles due to a

belief in paternalistic obligation to those less privileged in society, a a result of the 'noblesse oblige'. In this way, the natural inequality of society causes an inequality of duty, in which it is believed the most privileged have an obligation to help improve the conditions of those in the lower classes, stemming from a support for preindustrial relationships between the nobility and their reliant peasants.

Conservatives have supported One Nation principles through the ~~existance of~~ existance of 'tory welfare' or 'compassionate conservatism'. This allows limited use of state intervention and welfare to improve the conditions and lives of those less well off. This can originally be seen in Disraeli's reform acts, but can more recently be seen in Cameron's 'Big Society', which attempted to improve provisions for the poorest, and

was reminicent of Disraeli's intentions to prevent two nations; one of the poor and one of the rich.

ResultsPlus
Examiner Comments

This response covers both the 'why' and the 'how' parts of the question. It has a clear focus on the question and is clear and accurate throughout. This is an example of a strong level three response.

ResultsPlus
Examiner Tip

For 'how' and 'why' questions it is very important to address both parts in your answer. This is often a discriminator between levels in the mark scheme.

Question 2

This was one of the most popular questions in this section and was generally answered well. In some cases candidates focused more on the liberal attitudes towards the state rather than democracy and in a few cases candidates provided reasons why liberals do not support democracy, which was not required for this question.

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 such as JS Mill believe that without democracy, humankind will inevitably result in brutality and ignorance. Democracy promotes the "highest and most harmonious" form of the development of human capacities, eventually leading to human progress in knowledge, strengthening the liberal belief in progress. This is known as developmental democracy.

The earliest form of liberal justification is based on consent. Liberals believed that by popular rule through democracy, propertied individuals are able to control and effectively 'tame' government and those in power from abusing their positions to 'harm' individuals and to infringe on individual liberties. Since democracy is based on universal suffrage, or more precisely universal adult suffrage, citizens in free, fair and regular elections, such consent can be gained through the ballot box.

Utilitarians such as Jeremy Bentham believe that given that the characteristics of universal suffrage in free, fair and regular elections mentioned above, democracy is able to gain "the greatest happiness for the greatest number", and thus providing grounds for a liberal support in democracy.

Furthermore, liberals, especially classical liberals, believe in egoistical individualism, which is that individuals are self-interested, self-saving and self-reliant 'atoms' in society, and thus differing and opposing opinions may lead to conflict. Democracy offers different views a political voice, and thus allows for a platform for discussion, debate and argument, supported by liberals through their belief in rationalism.

Finally, liberals support democracy only in a restrained form of 'liberal democracy', with measures of constitutionalism in place - which is when there is a constitution in place limiting and checking the powers of government. This blends the liberal belief of limited government with the democratic offering of popular rule, allowing liberals grounds to support democracy. This could be in the form of federalism, where the executive,

legislation and judicial branches of government are separated, e.g. Cabinet government to check the powers of the Prime Minister, in the United Kingdom.

ResultsPlus
Examiner Comments

This answer covers a wide range of grounds, with explanation of each, and has a very clear focus on the question throughout. This response achieved a high level three mark.

Question 3

This was a less popular question in this section. The vast majority of responses referred to Stirner and made the link between egoism and individualist anarchism. Stronger responses explained this in more detail. A few weaker responses either gave a general narrative on the different forms of anarchism, or tried to link egoism to collectivist anarchism.

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** ☒

Egoism is the principle of self-striving and self-seeking individuals making decisions without concern for morals, laws and the needs of society. Individualist anarchists support egoism on the basis that individuals should and are autonomous beings. Stirner, who put forward the idea of egoism, argued that individuals behave in their own way, ~~with no need for a over-riding~~ free from external constraints. Anarchists supports egoism as it gives individuals sovereign.

Stirner also argued that egoism allowed humans to behave independently, with no need for an over-riding, authoritative body: A State. They aligns with anarchist anti-statists nature, arguing that

humans don't need a state because social order arises naturally. Egoism and anti-statism complement each other. They're both arguing that order arise naturally, due to ~~the~~ society being formed of atomistic individuals (according to a individualist perspective). There's no need for a state to create ×

Finally, Stirners writings influenced the writings of Nietzche and later nihilist texts. Egoism highlight individuals self-governing abilities, without a need for external consideration. Factors like morals and laws have no influence of decisions. This parallels with nihilism, an anarchist belief, which is a belief in nothing. Anarchists argue that individuals should not be influenced by religion (anti-clericalism), a State or social norms and morals. They must be ~~self~~ autonomous, self-governing and egoistical.

× coercive and oppressive laws in the aim of 'Social order', when it arise naturally out of self-governing individuals.

ResultsPlus
Examiner Comments

This response makes a clear link between anarchism and egoism and relates this to the sovereignty of the individual. This response achieved a level three mark.

Question 4

This was one of the less popular questions in this section. Responses tended to focus on either the 'how' or the 'why' in detail, at the expense of the other part of the question. A key discriminator was the extent to which candidates addressed *both* the 'how' and 'why'.

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** ☐

social equality → justice requires it
why → community and cooperation need
→ need extinguish basis of human exploitation
how: → Marx: communism, work for good of humanity
→ socialism: rel soc equal, strive reduce inequalities

Socialists follow a commitment to social equality for several reasons. Firstly, they follow the belief that justice as a fair and equal treatment of all within society, requires the precondition of equality in order to be effective. They believe that the liberal ~~idea~~ idea of formal equality is fundamentally flawed in the sense that it legitimises the notion that inequality is natural, rather than a product of society, and wilfully ignores the ~~what~~ inequalities that face the predominant working classes disproportionately, thereby maintaining the position of just so unfairly.

Also, equality has value worthy of commitment for socialists

further, as they believe it encourages community and cooperation. Much like the conservative idea that we are drawn to those like us, socialists believe that with difference comes conflict. Therefore it can be assumed that when faced with those with a similar ethnic and social standpoint to you, the bonds of sympathy and empathy will be stronger, encouraging community and cooperation. This idea is taken further by Marx in the sense that social groups tend to think and act together, and have done throughout history, meaning that logically, if there is less difference between groups in society, then there will be less strife and conflict.

Socialists also believe in social equality as the basis for human fulfilment. According to Marx, the essential requirement of this is need-satisfaction, allowing for the universal commodities necessary of food, shelter and work. He stated that in order to have a functioning communist society, the goods would have to be distributed by "from each according to his ability, to each according to his need".

This brings us onto how social equality is advanced by socialism. There are two key strands in this sense. The first believes

in state comm ownership of prop, in which people coopate and thrive for the good of the community. This is followed by Marxists and theoretically by Orthodox comunists, but the latter used the state as a mechanism to own the wealth on behalf of the whole. Secondly, social democrats have relied on the state and progressive taxation in order to redistribute wealth and achieve relative social equality. Ethical socialism uses the key beliefs of equality and charity in religions such as Islam to promote fairness and redistribution morally, in order to [illegible] due to a belief in the involvement as equal in the eyes of the Islamic creator.

ResultsPlus
Examiner Comments

This response focuses more on the 'why' than the 'how', but does have something on both parts of the question. This is an example of a level three response.

ResultsPlus
Examiner Tip

It is important that candidates address both parts of a 'how' and 'why' question in order to achieve a higher mark.

Question 5

This was a popular question in this section and generally answered well. The vast majority of responses provided at least two ways in which conservatives believe in human imperfection, with many providing three ways. A key discriminator was the extent of the development of the points made. A small minority of candidates could only identify one way, and this was usually some aspect of moral imperfection.

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** ☒

Conservatives believe that human beings are characterised by imperfection in a number of ways. One way in which this is seen is the view that humans are psychologically imperfect. Conservatives argue that humans are naturally drawn to that which is familiar and well known to them. Humans require a sense of order and stability in order to flourish as without this they feel rootless and uncertain. As such conservatives place value in institutions such as the family as an example of the human need for the familiarity of those close to them and their support as their psychological imperfection leads them to this. Conservatives also believe humans to be morally imperfect. They take the view that left to their own devices humans are selfish and self-interested creatures, and as such will be willing to exploit and undermine the position of other humans in order to advance their own position. This

leads to the conservative value of order and authority - as this moral imperfection leads to a necessity in the eyes of conservatives for a system by which to prevent humans from suffering and exploitation at the hands of the ambition and moral shortfallings of other humans.
Finally conservatives also see humans as intellectually imperfect, with much of the world too complex and beyond the understanding of most humans. This leads conservatives to be extremely cautious of abstract ideas and principles, and suspicious of radical change, due to the belief that these are too challenging to be fully understood by all. Furthermore, conservatives believe the world of politics in particular to be vastly deep and complex, too much so for most, and as such this view of intellectually imperfect humans leads to a reliance on tradition, and the tried and tested values of the past, as these humans may fall short in their ideas and make mistakes.

ResultsPlus
Examiner Comments

This is a comprehensive answer. It identifies and explains three distinct areas of human imperfection and is clear and accurate throughout. This is an example of a high level three response.

Question 6

This was a less popular essay question. Stronger responses generally contrasted anarchist optimism with conservative and, to some extent, liberal pessimism. Weaker answers sometimes provided a description of the different anarchist traditions with relatively little focus on the specific question.

Indicate which question you are answering by marking a cross in the box ☒. 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** ☒

Anarchism has been defined as 'the negation of the principle of Authority'. Anarchism has often come under major criticism for its ideas and beliefs about how a future stateless society would operate. Whilst many believe that an anarchist society is a 'utopian ~~idea~~ fantasy' because of an unrealistic optimistic view on human nature (most significantly), the conservative, liberal and socialist critique of the anarchist versions of their core ideas (second most significantly) and the ineffectiveness of the means of achieving ~~a~~ anarchism (third most significantly), others argue a stateless anarchist society is possible because (most significantly) of the positive view of human nature, the strands of anarchism believing their ideas to be ~~workable~~ workable in such a society (second most significantly) the success of different roads to anarchism (least significantly). In this essay, I will be arguing that 'Anarchism is a utopian fantasy' to a large extent.

Firstly, the most significant factor against the idea that 'Anarchism is a utopian fantasy' is the positive view of human nature. Anarchists such as William Godwin believe humans have the capacity to

be sociable, gregarious creatures who can live in harmony with one another. They ~~believe that~~ disagree with liberal 'social contract' theorists such as Hobbes and Locke who believe a stateless society would amount to a brutal civil war between and amongst citizens and that life would be 'nasty, brutish and short' in a 'state of nature'. Anarchists believe that it is the corruptive influence of the state that makes people violent as war is 'the health of the state' according to Randolph Bourne. Individuals are able to act in a civilised fashion and they are able to live harmoniously. They see human nature as 'plastic' shaped by their society and subscribe to a form of utopianism, believing in the unlimited capacity of human self-development. Thus, 'Anarchism' is not a 'utopian fantasy' according to anarchists. However, it could be argued that even anarchists themselves see that human nature is not always perfect. They believe that although humans are perfectable, according to Bakunin and Proudhon, 'a capacity for violence lurks within each and every individual. Thus,

'Anarchism is a utopian fantasy' to a large extent as even anarchists themselves see the potential for human ingenuity and evil.

The second most significant factor against the above is that collectivist and individualist anarchists see their versions of anarchism as workable in a stateless society. Individualist anarchists, libertarians such as Lysander Spooner, Tucker, Warren and Proudhon propose their anarchic society is workable. Proudhon argued that 'that government is best which governs not at all', his own anarchic sentiment to Jefferson's liberal idea that 'that government is best which governs least'. Tucker argued that at times of conflict, disputes could be settled either by human rationality, discussing and negotiation, or through a mechanism by which sovereign individuals could live in harmony. Warren argued this could be achieved through 'time stores' or a 'labour-for-labour' exchange where individuals work for work/services in return. Thus, he believed that 'genuine Anarchism is consistent' Manchesterism 'referring to policies of John Bright and Richard Cobden. This way, all individuals could enjoy the diminish of

labour. Other individualist Anarchists such as anarcho-capitalists such as Ayn Rand and Murray Rothbard adopted free market principles of Smith, Ricardo, Hayek and Friedman and believed in competitive justice regimes of 'private courts' and judicial system, which would be better as they would be driven by the profit incentive. Thus, individualists see their form of anarchism as realistic. However, conservatives would argue that due to innate selfishness and greediness, authority is natural, necessary and beneficial. De Maistre, for example, argued in favour of hereditary monarchy, believing authority is necessary for order. Liberals would argue that although paternalism may give rise to the abuse of authority, a 'minimal' state or 'nightwatchmen' (Locke) is a 'necessary evil' (Paine) to ensure stability and protect natural rights. This would be 'tamed' through constitutionalism and as Montesquieu said, 'power should be a check to power'. Thus, 'Anarchism is a utopian fantasy' to a large extent.

Further, collectivist anarchists also believe their version of anarchism is workable. Proudhon's 'mutualism' argued the introduction of

Mutual credit banks that gave ~~[illegible]~~ loans with an interest rate only high enough to cover the cost of the ~~[illegible]~~ running of the banks would allow for common exchange and harmony. He admired smallholding peasantries that adopted this and Swiss watchmakers. Anarcho-communists such as Peter Kropotkin also argue that anarchism is feasible. He believes humans are sociable and gregarious and re-examined Spencer's view of the 'survival of the fittest' theory of Darwin, and argued instead that it is because humans have been able to manage their collective harnesses that species have survived. Kropotkin also admired small self-managing communes because they use direct democracy and face-to-face interaction. They believe in social solidarity, believing 'social solidarity is the first human law and freedom is the second'. Thus, ~~[illegible]~~ anarcho-communists see their anarchist society as workable. Thus, 'Anarchism is not a utopian fantasy'.

In conclusion, although there may be a case for the idea that Anarchism can work, there is more substantial evidence that it cannot. Also, ~~[illegible]~~ one could argue the means of achieving

Anarchism are far more a defining or determining feature of the realistic anarchist society. Thus, anarchism is a utopian fantasy to a large extent.



ResultsPlus

Examiner Comments

This is a wide-ranging and analytical answer with a consistent focus on the question. This is an example of a high level three response.

Question 7

This was a popular question and generally answered well. Stronger responses provided some balance and addressed the 'to what extent' part of the question, before reaching a conclusion.

Indicate which question you are answering by marking a cross in the box ☒. 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** ☒

Liberalism ~~has~~ is one of the oldest and most influential ideologies of the least few centuries. Whilst liberalism is centred in the same roots, the emergence of modern liberalism in response to the failures of classical liberalism and capitalism have caused it to diverge. As such, whilst it is clear that liberalism, both modern and classical, holds similar roots, I do believe the divergence means liberalism is no longer a coherent doctrine.

One way liberalism is no longer coherent is the divergence from negative to positive freedom. Classical liberals believe in egotistical individualism, the idea that "the individual is sovereign" (MILL) and as such support the concept of negative freedom, as freedom from external constraint that removes sovereignty. Modern liberals, however, believe in developmental individualism, seeing that the individual is capable of "the highest and most harmonious development of human capabilities" (LOCKE) under the right conditions. Positive freedom, the freedom

to do and achieve things are therefore favoured as they allow for greater human development. Consequently, there is division between classical liberals and modern liberals over Social Darwinism being replaced with social liberalism. Social Darwinism refers to the idea that humans should be self-sufficient and self-reliant to get ahead, as proposed by Spencer. As such, they believe "Heaven helps those who help themselves" (SMILES) rather than those who are 'spoonfed'. Social liberalism instead encourages helping people to help themselves through institutions such as the welfare state. Resultantly, it is clear there is division over how the individual can best thrive, through being self-seeking and self-reliant or through being helped and aided.

Conversely, it could be said that liberalism is a coherent doctrine as there is a core focus on individualism in both prominent branches of liberalism, there is a focus on the individual and how society can best function to allow the individual to flourish. Whilst they may disagree over how, their goal is ultimately the same. ~~Many~~ Many

modern liberals claim that their stance of developmental individualism is a consequence of seeing the gross inequality that capitalism caused. This is inevitable as "where there is great property, there is great inequality" but modern liberals see helping people to help themselves as a means to an end where people ~~are~~ have the foundational equality to help themselves. Thus, it could be said that the shared core ~~goal and~~ principle of individualism provides coherence within the doctrine of liberalism.

Another way ~~it could be said~~ that liberalism is not a coherent doctrine is their differing view on civil society. Classical liberals believe that where there is need, it shall be provided for by the civil society. Their belief in the human capacity for spontaneous social order and the economic capacity for efficient allocation of resources means they believe institutions, such as the Church, will be able to meet the needs of the needy. They prefer this to governments providing as they believe "the government is best which governs least" (THOREAU). Modern liberals do not match this same optimism about the human propensity for spontaneous social order to match need. They

instead believe that government intervention is necessary to ensure all people are provided for. As such, modern liberals champion the welfare state where classical liberals prefer minimal state intervention and ~~the~~ a 'night-watchman state'. In summation, it is clear divisions exist over the role the government should and needs to play which makes liberalism incoherent.

Nonetheless, it is sometimes stated that shared views of human nature and rationality create coherency within liberalism. All branches of liberalism believe humans are "rational and reasoned beings" (LOCKE). For both branches, this feeds into a belief in the ability to solve all disputes with rationality and reason and feeds into the focus on individual sovereignty whilst modern liberals are willing to support more government intervention, both branches of liberalism believe that the rationality of humanity supports the lack of need for everyday government intervention for all. As such, there is some coherence over how human nature and the way ability of the human to defend his own interest.

Liberalism also lacks coherency over the economic systems it advocates. Classical liberals support Adam Smith's classical liberal economic model which promotes a lack of government intervention as the market can function on "his own greed" (SMITH) ~~This suggests~~ Modern liberals, however, support Keynesian economics. After ~~which~~ seeing ~~saw~~ the failings of ~~pure~~ classical liberal economics, the Great Depression and inequality, Keynes ~~and~~ instead suggested that government intervention into the market, in the form of welfare and employment, would benefit the economy. This strictly contradicts the idea that ~~only~~ "the invisible hand of the market" (SMITH) ~~should~~ would adequately provide for all as Smith's classical liberal economics suggests. Therefore, the division over the type of economic system that would best serve a ~~pee~~ society is another way that liberalism is ~~how~~ incoherent.

Alas, it is clear that the shared principles ~~and~~ of individualism, tolerance, ~~and~~ social justice and human rationality are not enough to cover over the ~~cat~~ divisions within liberalism. Modern liberals have diverged and evolved from classical liberalism, creating new and starkly different stances on ~~the~~ individualism,

freedom, the role of the state and economics.
It ~~would~~ can therefore be suggested that to very
little extent is Liberalism a coherent doctrine.

ResultsPlus
Examiner Comments

This is a comprehensive answer which addresses the 'to what extent' throughout. The arguments throughout the essay lead to a final conclusion. This is an example of a level three response.

Question 8

This was a reasonably popular question in this section. Stronger responses addressed areas of unity as well as division and avoided an overly descriptive summary of the different socialist traditions. Some less strong responses were muddled in parts and did not draw out clearly the areas of unity and division.

Indicate which question you are answering by marking a cross in the box ☒. 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** ☒

Socialism as an ideology developed out of protest at the harshness of industrialisation on the workers and has subsequently modernised over the years and has been applied to the developing Capitalist System. Socialism as a doctrine is certainly united in its core beliefs of; Cooperation, Community, class politics, common ownership, equality. However, Socialism is disunited over its means and aims which has subsequently displayed faultlines in its ideology. In this regard it is evident that Socialists are more divided and united particularly in the realisation of the change from ~~Revolutionary/fundamentalist to Revolutionary/pacific~~ fundamentalist to Revisionist Socialism over the years and further departure from fundamentalist measures.

Despite this, Socialism is united on the grounds of Cooperation and Community. Socialists Collectively believe that humans are understood in terms of the groups to which they belong as humans are gregarious and Social Seeking Creatures. All Socialists hold an optimistic view of human nature in that we can improve ourselves in the future. Socialists Commitment to Cooperation stems from the belief that we work better together, derived from the belief that Collaboration is better than Competition. Also, the Socialist belief in Community originates from a belief of togetherness and the fact that Communities are typically seen in a positive light that Compliments Cooperation. All Socialists are united

in their belief of these key pillars of Collectivism Cooperation and Community Spirit allows for Collectivism Debated.

Socialists are also united in their Commitment to Equality. Equality is a prime pillar of Socialist theology and indeed all Socialists believe in some degree of Equality. Despite differences between fundamentalist and Revisionist Socialists (that will be discussed later) equality is supported in some shape or form, whether it be Marx's belief in absolute equality and "each according to his ability, each according to his need". Democratic Socialists (1900-1945) are committed to high levels of equality, Social Democrats (1945-1990) are committed to relative levels of equality and indeed neo-Revisionists are committed to equality of opportunity through the belief in 'a hand up not a hand out'. Ultimately, Equality is central to Socialist thought and although the extent of equality has changed as Socialism has progressed, they nevertheless are united in this sense.

Socialists are also united in their belief in Class politics as all varying strand of Socialism have recognised the differing Classes in Society. First, fundamentalist Socialists have understood Class ~~in terms of~~ on the basis of Marxist dialectical materialism, where two Classes exist; the proletariat (exploited workers) and ~~Bourgeoisie~~ Bourgeoisie (exploiting industrialists) believing that 'class-conflict' is an occurrence in the Capitalist System. ~~Social~~ Democratic Socialists believe in Class difference between 'blue collar' (workers) and

'White Collar' (businessmen) which distinguishes between manual labourers and office clerks for example. This distinction is merely a modernised application of marxist theory that highlights the recognition of class politics. Social democrats and neo-revisionists also recognise 'class', however have been less inclined to identify class distinctions due to the gradual breakdown of supposed 'class-barriers'. Nevertheless, all socialists are united in their recognition of class politics.

Despite the reasons why socialists can be labelled as united, they are nevertheless disunited over the means of achieving socialism. Firstly, fundamentalist socialists seek to achieve socialism via a violent revolution whereby the proletariat become 'class-conscious' and are aware of their own exploitation at the hands of the bourgeoisie. The revolution thus seeks to disassemble the ideological superstructure and eliminate the bourgeoisie. In the view of Gramsci the system must be destroyed as it will 'reform itself to maintain itself'. Democratic socialists on the otherhand are committed to the "inevitability of gradualism" and achieving socialism via a parliamentary route. The extension of the franchise denied socialism from the 'revolutionary bust' (Berki) and instead sought to utilise the extension of the franchise as the working class were seen as the 'natural home' for socialist parties. Socialist policies would thus be implemented by a count. ~~Democratic socialists~~ Social democrats and neo-revisionists

Revisionists committed to the parliamentary route of achieving Socialism, however the principles and intent of such Socialist stages remains disputed (as will be discussed next). Socialism is thus disunited over its means.

Finally, Socialism is disunited over its aims for a variety of reasons. Fundamentalist Socialists sought to abolish Capitalism, private property and class distinctions. This would be achieved through three stages of Marxism. First Communism would be established at the overthrow of Capitalism, second a dictatorship of the proletariat would take place and then finally after 'Counter Revolution' had been prevented the State would 'wither-away' (Marx). In practice, Revolutionary parties such as Lenin's Bolsheviks in Russia and then Communists understood the State was strengthened and did not wither away. In comparison Revisionist Socialist sought to bring about aims of Equality for State ownership of Wealth. Social democrats sought to control the "Commanding heights of the economy" (Gaitskell) and Neo-Revisionists accepted inequality through privatisation. Ultimately as time has progressed Socialists have become disunited as there has been a progressive leaning towards acceptance for the free market.

In Conclusion, it is clident that there is more that divides Socialism that unites it, particularly with the view that its aims and means as been 'watered down' as years have progressed and it has lost its 'radical edge' with an acceptance for the free market. Although many of Socialism's ~~core~~ values remain constant throughout its progression has meant that many have become tempted by the dominance of modern liberalism, although the rise in popularity of Corbynism would suggest a return back to post Socialist principles.

ResultsPlus
Examiner Comments

This answer is not that wide-ranging but it does address both unity and divisions and illustrates these with relevant examples. This is an example of a level three response.

Paper Summary

Based on their performance on this paper, candidates are offered the following advice:

- Time themselves carefully on each question, so as to avoid having to rush any answers to ensure that they answer all the questions required
- Ensure that answers remain focused on the specific question that has been asked
- Avoid lengthy introductions when answering section A questions
- Provide balance when required, but only when required
- Provide short definitions of key concepts used in questions, in order to demonstrate accurate understanding

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







Pearson Education Limited. Registered company number 872828
with its registered office at 80 Strand, London WC2R 0RL.