

# ResultsPlus

Examiners' Report

June 2010

GCE Government and Politics 6GP04 4B

**ResultsPlus**  
look forward to better exam results  
[www.resultsplus.org.uk](http://www.resultsplus.org.uk)

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](http://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/>



ResultsPlus is Edexcel's free online tool that offers teachers unrivalled insight into exam performance.

You can use this valuable service to see how your students performed according to a range of criteria - at cohort, class or individual student level.

- Question-by-question exam analysis
- Skills maps linking exam performance back to areas of the specification
- Downloadable exam papers, mark schemes and examiner reports
- Comparisons to national performance

For more information on ResultsPlus, or to log in, visit [www.edexcel.com/resultsplus](http://www.edexcel.com/resultsplus).

To set up your ResultsPlus account, call 0844 576 0024

June 2010

Publications Code UA024044

All the material in this publication is copyright

© Edexcel Ltd 2010

## Introduction

The general standard of responses to this paper were broadly in line with previous examination sessions. A significant discriminator in relation to essay responses was the success or otherwise of candidates in meeting the new expectations about synopticity. In most cases, candidates were aware that synopticity required that they show an awareness of two or more sides of an argument, usually related to tensions between sub-traditions within an ideology, or between an ideology and opposing ideologies. In other cases, however, candidate performance was damaged by a tendency to adopt a purely analytical, or worse, a purely descriptive, approach to the question set. Candidates will do well to remember that all essay questions are now an invitation for them to engage in a debate or argument. Candidates who do this effectively will tend to gain higher marks for AO2, synopticity and, in all probability, AO3 as well.

The performance of candidates in relation to the topics that are new to this specification - multiculturalism and ecologism - was gratifyingly high in many cases. This showed that teachers and students had often done a considerable amount of work in getting on top of the relevant ideas and arguments. Sadly, this did not apply to all responses, and in the case of multiculturalism in particular, a small minority of candidates wrote about it as if it were a political issue rather than an arena of ideological and theoretical debate.

### Question 1

This question was answered well by a large proportion of candidates. Some highly impressive responses were developed on the basis of the different justifications for diversity offered by, for example, liberal multiculturalists, pluralist multiculturalists and cosmopolitan multiculturalists. These often showed a sophisticated understanding of the range of multicultural thinking on the issue of cultural diversity. Less impressive responses, however, tended either to focus on just one multiculturalist defence for diversity or provided a descriptive rather than an analytical account of multiculturalist thinking. A small number of very weak responses were nevertheless developed, it seemed, on the basis of popular newspaper accounts of multiculturalism, usually of a negative character. These responses were reminiscent of some early, weak responses to feminist questions, which drew from a stereotypical and clearly pejorative image of feminism. The hope is these crude and un-theoretical accounts of multiculturalism will die out quickly.

Multiculturalism is an ideology which values diversity above all else. With diversity being any culture, religion, background & beliefs that distinguish them from the majority as they are a minority group.

Early liberals like Locke valued individualism. Meaning that the needs of the individual must come first without any restrictions from the state or any other group. Liberal Democracies value individual freedom in particular. Multiculturalist agree with this so they believe that in this case group, need the freedom granted by any other individual. This is because Multiculturalist believe that all groups should have equal freedom, no matter what the religion, background, culture or beliefs are. This is essential to multiculturalist as it creates more unity in society. However many liberals argue against this as if Multicultural freedom interferes with any individual freedoms. For example Islamic Radicals must not have the right to break any laws or rules in a liberal democracy.

Multiculturalist also agree with liberals equality

of opportunity' (Mill) as they believe that everyone should have equal choices in life, without any restrictions from their background, race, gender, religion, culture etc... This is required to add diversity in society. However many may disagree with this if it restricts opportunities from other individuals. For example many employers seek for a more multicultural workforce so they are not considered as unethical. This is a huge concern as it may demotivate potential employees because <sup>others</sup> they are being employed for their background, ~~get~~ culture, race etc. not because they are 'fit for purpose'. However multiculturalist may argue that they are taking jobs that individuals don't want & that they need the same amount of equality in all areas in life. To conclude this adds more diversity in society which multiculturalist defend.


**ResultsPlus**

Examiner Comments

This answer confuses multiculturalism with liberalism, and does not demonstrate any knowledge of different forms of multiculturalism. It ends with a criticism of diversity, which is not relevant to the question asked. (3)


**ResultsPlus**

Examiner Tip

Remember that this question is not 'for and against'. You are being asked to give a range of grounds, from more than one multiculturalist position.

Multiculturalism is an ideology that aims to promote diversity and the acceptance of minority groups, they do not wish to impose superiority upon the dominant culture, but aim to increase acceptance of minority cultures in a state.

Multiculturalists aim to increase tolerance of minority groupings in a state because through modernisation, it has become apparent that individuals may be of dual identities. An individual may have different cultural beliefs to that of the dominant culture and, through promoting diversity and tolerance, multiculturalists seek for this to be more greatly accepted.

It is through diversity, that minority cultures can live equally with a dominant culture. e.g. Asian British is now accepted as a nationality within Britain. Without the acceptance of these cultures, they would not be able to flourish, thus infringing upon their liberties as an individual.

Multiculturalism derived from liberalism, liberals have always sought to increase tolerance of minorities, but as

the world modernised, multiculturalists sought new approaches to this viewpoint.

Multiculturalism believed that through the integration of these minority groups, the indigenous culture can be educated on cultures other to their own. Also, it reduces conflict because of acceptance.

Diversity promotes the acceptance and integration of minority cultures, which in turn, reduces conflict.

Also an individual can feel a sense of belonging, rather than feeling an outsider of the state.

It is, in the opinion of multiculturalism, diversity that allows their core values of equality and tolerance to flourish. ~~and~~



**ResultsPlus**

Examiner Comments

While this provides a range of benefits of diversity for both individuals and society, none are fully developed. The answer treats multiculturalism as a 'job lot', not drawing out any of the different multiculturalist positions. It therefore remains in mid Level 2. (8)



**ResultsPlus**

Examiner Tip

Remember that this question is not 'for and against'. You are being asked to give a range of grounds, from more than one multiculturalist position.

The view of diversity differs radically within the different strands of multiculturalism. The liberal multicultural outlook essentially adopts 'diversity within a liberal framework'. This seeks to endorse cultural diversity and tolerate the existence of different cultural groups on the basis of a liberal commitment to ~~their~~ their view of all individuals as morally autonomous regardless of social constraints such as language, race or ethnicity, and also bases itself on tolerance as the cornerstone of liberal doctrine. Yet, the primacy of the individual and his rights comes before those of any other group, so liberals inherently cannot endorse cultural practices that conflict with the principles of tolerance and autonomy. Liberal multiculturalists advance equality before the law, that is formal equality, to attain a cohesive and viable multicultural society.

Pluralist multiculturalists on the other hand advance a critique of liberal multiculturalism in that by refusing to endorse cultural practices such as the wearing of headscarves in schools (as seen in a now widely republished form of multiculturalism in France) they are inevitably attacking multiculturalism itself. Pluralist multiculturalists advance a theory of value pluralism, which does not esteem any moral system to be superior to another, ~~as~~ as it cannot be demonstrated.

~~the extent that~~ Diversity is therefore seen to be a value in its own right, capable of providing social stability through the cross-cultural success promoted and the advancement of each group on the basis of establishing equality across all groups. Particularist multiculturalists emphasize difference further as they positively discriminate ~~against majority groups in favour of~~ ~~minority~~ to enhance the status of minority groups. Liberal multiculturalists however deeply criticize this form of multiculturalism, arguing of the danger for embracing diversity at the expense of unity. Through an express celebration of said diversity, critics such as Amartya Sen argue that it leads to a instrumentalisation of humanity, amounting to a form of 'ghettoisation' commensurate with the 'segregation theory', seeing forms of monoculturalism take hold which in turn foster violence and instability.

The Cosmopolitan multiculturalist view of diversity is a positive one in that it argues that through natural conflict diversity eventually will need to a synthesis of a new world order, where the same moral theory is adopted by all. Diversity is a value, fostering ~~an~~ a cross-cultural understanding and an enrichment of society as a whole.

~~The~~ Multiculturalist in general are characterised by a stubborn refusal to admit to social instability on the basis of diversity. Multiculturalism as a definition is of vast importance here; it does not simply mean 'all and diversity', rather it is used as a term to condemn the progress of culturally diverse



groups into unity. An embrace of diversity is a core feature of all forms of multiculturalism, yet as can be seen above each strand interprets the expression of unity differently.


**ResultsPlus**

Examiner Comments


**ResultsPlus**

Examiner Tip

Remember that this question is not 'for and against'. You are being asked to give a range of grounds, from more than one multiculturalist position.

This answer provides well developed explanations of three multicultural positions on diversity, with one position briefly described. It draws out some tensions between the different positions, which is creditworthy. (14)

## Question 2

There were some highly impressive answers to this question, as is the case in relation to many feminism questions. The general, and sensible, approach was to consider this from the perspective of radical feminism, and explain how and why radical feminists have believed that the 'public/private' divide has traditionally served to conceal the realities of patriarchal power and female oppression. Those that recognised that this question was linked to the idea that 'the personal is the political' generally developed sound or better responses. Other candidates, not unreasonably, looked at the issue from the perspective of liberal feminism and socialist feminism as well, contrasting these positions with that of radical feminism. However, when candidates started to explain how and why liberals have emphasised the importance of the 'public/private' divide, they tended to be moving away from the question set, thus restricting the marks they were able to achieve.

The divide of the 'public' and 'private' spheres are usually defined on political and personal grounds. The public sphere concerns everyone and includes such organisations as the government. The private sphere includes more personal and his institutions such as the family. However, feminists believe this divide is blurred or does not exist. Kate Millet, a 20<sup>th</sup> century radical feminist, defined the 'political' as

any 'power-structure within which one group of persons controls another'. In this sense, she argued that the family ~~is~~ can be described as a political institution and thus part of the public sphere. Considering this, the divide between the public and the private can be criticised for being non-existent, merely a social construction enforced by a patriarchal society.

Feminists ~~do~~ tend to criticise the public/private divide because they ~~to~~ believe it reinforces patriarchal values. The family may be considered a 'microcosm' of ~~the~~ <sup>society</sup> and the public sphere. The patriarchal nature of society is recreated in the private sphere.


**ResultsPlus**

Examiner Comments

This is an example of a good answer to only one aspect of the question: 'How'. It gives a good explanation of the 'personal is political' argument without explaining why especially radical feminists hold this to be crucial. (10)


**ResultsPlus**

Examiner Tip

Remember that this is a two part question - you must make sure to answer both 'how' and 'why' aspects for a comprehensive answer.

Traditionally politics only addresses the issues of human organisation in the public realm, legislation ultimately conditioning how we operate in the public rather than the private sphere (home life etc.)

However some feminists mainly socialist and radical feminists have been critical of this divide for a number of reasons. Firstly liberal feminists maintain that legislation on equal rights and opportunities will lead to gender equality. Most feminists regard the formal egalitarianism of public legislation as insufficient and see the two realms as linked. Radical feminists believe women's oppression is rooted in the patriarchal family as well as the definition of women as sex objects and also the sexual or physical domination of men in all areas of society, both public and private. Thus the personal is political leaving the distinction of the public and private divide inadequate for the betterment of women. Radical feminists also reject the public/private divide because it encourages an individualist outlook, maintaining that formal egalitarianism means inequality that is present as a result of individual failings in education or skill etc. Radical and socialist feminists wish to form a sense of community among women across the public/private divide to help ensure the further progress of women in society. Socialist feminists see the roots of women's oppression in the economic and social philosophy of capitalism whereby domestic labour receives the male workforce and provides

a reserve army of labour for times of increased production because they believe as Marx said that 'the prevailing ideas in society are that of the ruling class'. The public/private divide becomes meaningless because the family structure mirrors societal structures and without a wholesale change of the public realm no change in the private realm can exist.

Also it is clear that the 'glass ceiling' phenomenon proves that public legislation does not complete the fulfilment of women to full equality.

and does not regulate the division of domestic labour although it does regulate industrial labour this for most feminist remains an incomplete system for seeking gender equality. Radical feminists believe that the pervasiveness of patriarchy and male domination is the cause of women's suffering and that this emerges from the private and is reflected in the public realm. To combat inequality in the public sphere ignores its <sup>root</sup> ~~cause~~ in the private, this means that the underlying attitudes and systems of organisation which ensure the perpetuation of women's suffering are not dealt with which leaves particularly radical feminists critical of the public/private divide.



### ResultsPlus

#### Examiners' Comments

This answer covers both aspects, explaining both the how - 'their personal is political', but also (eventually) the why - all women's oppression emanates from the private sphere. It also effectively uses the socialist feminist view as a contrast to the radical feminist position. Paragraphing would have been very helpful in making the argument clear and effective. (15)



### ResultsPlus

#### Examiner Tip

Remember that this is a two part question - you must make sure to answer both 'how' and 'why' aspects for a comprehensive answer.

### Question 3

Very few candidates who attempted this question did not have at least a basic grasp of the two terms, generally associating the former with human interests and the latter with the interests of the wider ecosystem. However, only the better responses were able to provide an explicit and reliable definition of the terms in question. It was also surprising that while candidates were able to provide good examples of ecocentrism, this was far less common in the case of anthropocentrism. A proportion of candidates, not unwisely, linked the terms to the distinction between 'shallow' ecology and 'deep' ecology. However, in other cases candidates effectively reworked the question to focus on a distinction that they had revised for, failing to adequately explain the link between anthropocentrism and 'shallow' ecology, or the link between ecocentrism and 'deep' ecology. Most candidates nevertheless experienced few difficulties here.

The anthropocentric view on the relationship between humans and nature is that humans are the most important factor and should always be put first and have the right to use as much of the resources at our disposal as we need. The ecocentric view is that we are not more important than nature and that animals, and in the case of deep ecologists, rocks, rivers, plants and any form of nature, is of equal value to humans. Ecocentrics believe that the earth is a limited resource and that we should look after it. Anthropocentrics disagree with this view as they feel that the resources are unlimited and that they have the right to use them if and when they choose. Ecocentrics view this as a "cowboy economy" where we feel the need to keep moving west if we run out of resources and will continue to move west until we cannot go any further. Ecocentrics have tried to stress to anthropocentrics that we are living in a "Spaceship Earth", in the sense that a spaceship has a very limited amount of resources and that the people there have to

use them sparingly, otherwise they won't have any left. They feel that the earth is a larger version of that spaceship and when the resources have been used, there will be no more to take its place. Anthropocentric totally dismiss this view and believe that the resources aren't limited and regardless should use them as if they run out, they won't be around to witness it as it won't take place until a long way in the future, and should focus purely on the short term. Ecocentric reject this view and believe it will happen sooner than they think.

**ResultsPlus**

## Examiner Comments

This answer provides brief and unsophisticated definitions of both concepts. It then follows with two relevant but undeveloped contrasts, while ending with some repetition of earlier points. This places it securely in the middle of Level 2. (8)

**ResultsPlus**

## Examiner Tip

This is a question that does require effective definitions of each concept.

### Question 4


Answers to this question ranged significantly in terms of quality. At the lower end, candidates often wrote generally about nationalism and appeared, sometimes, to be heading in the direction of a different question, usually one about the definition of the nation and the definition of the state. In these cases, the issue of the defence of the nation-state tended to be ignored. On the other hand, those who provided a clear and full definition of the nation-state at the outset and then outlined two, three or more of its advantages often produced good or better responses. Not uncommonly, these reflected on the different arguments that would be advanced by liberal nationalists (linked to freedom) and conservative nationalists (linked to social cohesion).

The main reason why nationalists defended the nation-state ~~was~~ is that nation provide legitimate right-~~to~~ self-determination - to form a state.


Nationalism have emerged in the 18th century when the ideas of <sup>the</sup> Enlightenment prospered. People have started questioning the legitimacy of ~~the~~ ~~the~~ ~~the~~ monarchy and autocratic rule. People were looking for a new ~~new~~ ground that the state can be build on, ~~the~~ ~~the~~ ~~the~~ which was brought by French revolution. The ground was nation.

Nation <sup>means</sup> ~~refers~~ cultural entity, ~~the~~ group of people who believe to have common circumstances of birth, whereas state refers to the political entity and territory under jurisdiction with certain boundaries. So <sup>nation</sup> ~~state~~ provides a base for states to be formed.

Nation brings the right of self-determination, proposed by Lock and Rousseau. This implies that people who form state as a nation will have equal rights and possibly opportunities within this state.

 **ResultsPlus**  
Examiner Comments

This is an example of an answer which attempts to answer two questions which were not asked. It firstly provides an explanation of the origins of nationalism, and then a definition of a nation. With no direct or effective points addressing the question actually set, it rises no higher than mid Level 1.(3)

 **ResultsPlus**  
Examiner Tip

This is a question requires an effective definition of the nation state, and grounds from more than one type of nationalism.



The nation-state is understood as a political entity where the boundaries of the nation coincide with where the government has a "legitimate monopoly of force".

The nation-state has been defended on a number of different grounds by different types of nationalists.

Most (with the exception of Expansionist and possibly cultural) nationalists agree that the nation-state should be defended because it guarantees the principle of national self-determination. This concept was outlined by Woodrow Wilson in his "14 points" which argued that nations have the right to control their own destiny and be free from foreign domination. Therefore the nation-state is defended for guaranteeing freedom and autonomy.

The nation-state has also been defended for being a "remarkably stable and cohesive body" (Heywood) because citizens within the nation state are joined by cultural as well as political factors. They are joined culturally because nations are considered to be a people with common cultural bonds, and joined politically because their nation has created a body which generally speaking they will all support and moreover because the democratic process of the nation-state (e.g. voting) links citizens through the process of deciding a political direction for their country. Whilst conservative nationalists may have

reservations about the democratic element of the above process, they agree that nation-states should be defended for bringing stability and cohesion to peoples.

For liberal nationalists, nation-states are also defended for creating what Kant described as a "stable international order". Liberals believe that if every nation has its own democratic state, then war and conflict will cease to exist. Modern day liberals such as John Gray point to the lack of a war between two liberal states nation-states throughout history as proof of this fact.

For anti-colonial nationalists the nation-state is also defended because it brings freedom from oppression. ~~Mahatma Gandhi~~ Mahatma Gandhi;

famously argued that the nation-state will bring freedom from oppression as the principle of "one nation, one state" removes the right of colonialists to invade another state.



**ResultsPlus**

Examiner Comments

This answer begins with an effective definition of the nation state. It then provides grounds for support from the conservative and liberal positions, and at the end briefly from the anti-colonial view point. However, the liberal position is not fully developed, lacking an explanation of the importance of self determination, and so the answer can rise no higher than the bottom of Level 3. (11)



**ResultsPlus**

Examiner Tip

This is a question requires an effective definition of the nation state, and grounds from more than one type of nationalism.

Liberal nationalists believe that a nation state should be defended due to four reasons, the first being that it creates unity within the nation if they are able to rule themselves, this links in with the second point which is that a nation knows what is best for itself and knows how and what to do to achieve what it sees as necessary to keep it developing. The third undeveloped defence liberal nationalists have given for the nation state is that it allows for equality of opportunity and political equality. This means that all nations would have a chance to be equal and achieve the same things. This means that all nations have a right to rule themselves and (point 4) this leads to nations respecting one and another's right to be equal and rule their own state and this respect removes the chances of any wars and problems that could arise.



**ResultsPlus**

Examiner Comments

This the only credit worthy paragraph of a longer answer. It contains three undeveloped points implicitly relevant to the argument of self determination, but there is no clear reference to the concept, and no definition of a nation-state. Overall the answer merits the bottom end of Level 2. (7)



**ResultsPlus**

Examiner Tip

This is a question which requires an effective definition of the nation state, and grounds from more than one type of nationalism.

### Question 5

There were some very good and insightful answers to this question. The implications of androgyny as far as feminism as an egalitarian project is concerned were widely understood and explained well by many. The idea that women and men have the same basic nature as 'sexless' persons was widely seen to be a basic assumption of liberal feminism, socialist feminism and, in many cases, radical feminism. The nature of essentialism and of its link to difference feminism was similarly well understood, particularly in terms of the critique that equality can often encourage women to be 'like men', or in the terminology of difference feminism, to be 'male identified'. Weaker responses to this question tended to provide only a generalised understanding of the terms or failed to offer an explicit definition in either case, relying instead on a discussion of their supposed implications for feminism. Only a very small number of responses seemed to identify androgyny with liberal feminism and essentialism with radical feminism.

Feminists have different views on androgyny and essentialism, with some radical feminists like Firestone and Daly seeing women as fundamentally different to men because of genetic characteristics. Those that believe in androgyny believe that sex-differences are not significant and society could treat men and women equally - this embraces the concept of *gyns* by de Beauvoir that 'women are made, they are not born'.

Those that believe in androgyny see gender stereotyping as making women appear as 'the other' and different to men based on gender discrimination and conditioning - Millet linked this with early childhood and what role models and culture young girls are brought up in compared to boys. However, this 'gender' difference is purely a cultural one, underneath it men and women are equal - Wallstern spoke of women being equally rational and thus justified that they should have equal rights. However, for essentialists the division between men and women is not just cultural, underneath the gender differences there are fundamental biological distinctions that make women different. This particularly centres around women's ability to bear and suckle children - which some

feminists claim change their nature. Daly claimed this made women 'nature', compared to 'cultured men' - women, cannot be separated from nature because they are hormonally linked to natural rhythms by their genetics - particularly their menstrual cycle.

The distinction between androgyny and essentialism leads to different views on the ideal society. Those favouring androgyny would look for equality - for example, liberals would look for equality in the public sphere and some radicals would see private sphere equality as also important - for example, erasing the 70% share of women's current domestic work (as compared to men's to create symmetrical families where work is shared equally.) As men and women are essentially the same, androgyny proposes a gender-less society where gender differences are suppressed and everyone should be treated equally. However, essentialists say differences between men and women should be embraced. Gieler is particularly spoke about female sexual liberation and the idea that women need to embrace their own separate sexuality. Liberation can only come about in a female society, where women's values are put forward, not in a 'sexless' society (as women would not be allowed to truly self-actualise in this situation.) This, Greer and Firestone proposed women should live away from men for some time - Firestone even suggested this should be permanent as modern science (including IVF) means men's sexuality/reproductivity is removed. Androgyny sees neither men nor women as

Super, essentially would certainly see sex-differences as significant and Fiolore expressed that women could form a Super society.



### ResultsPlus

#### Examiner Comments

This answer provides clear definitions of both concepts, drawing out the contrasts. Having done this, it moves on to the ideological consequences in terms of their vision of the ideal society, with relevant and effective examples. This moves the answer to the top of Level 3. (14)



### ResultsPlus

#### Examiner Tip

You need to give as clear definition of both concepts, and then move to explaining the consequences of the distinctions.

One of the differences that take place within the feminist movement is whether or not women should embrace their feminine characteristics.

In the 1960's and 70's female characteristics were seen by radical feminists as a myth that came about as a way of oppressing women. As a result some feminists favoured the idea of androgyny. In an androgynous society men and women aren't expected to behave differently or have different roles. They are free to act naturally instead of conforming to socially constructed stereotypes.

However, the idea of androgyny has been ~~criticised~~ criticised by essentialist feminists who believe there are fundamental and unalterable differences between men and women. Women are for example far sensitive, cooperative and caring. These are all values that men can't appreciate. Women should embrace these ~~distinct~~ distinct characteristics of the female sex.

The ideas of essentialist feminism have led to concepts such as lesbianism and separatism. Basically ideas that condone women escaping from the oppressive influence of men, believing they'll be able to live a better life.

Feminists who follow these ideas see women who have a male partner as being male identified and are due to this weak. Women who engage in celibacy or political lesbianism are seen as women-identifying women who have managed to escape the clutches of male oppression.

Separatism is where women live separately from men in order to escape from their oppressive influence. This has been taken to extreme levels.

Generally. Generally though political lesbianism and separatism are seen by most feminists as being very extreme and there is little space for the ideas and practices.



**ResultsPlus**

Examiner Comments

This answer describes some of the basic features of essentialism without giving their theoretical origins. Since it provides almost no description or explanation of androgyny it cannot make any effective answer to the question, and so is confined to Level 1. (5)



### Question 6

Weaker responses to seemingly any nationalist question tended to outline a range of nationalist traditions - usually liberal nationalism, conservative nationalism, chauvinist nationalism and anti-colonial nationalism - in the hope that this account of 'nationalisms of the world' would somehow contain the answer to the question set. Needless to say, specific questions need specific answers. In this case, the key debate at the heart of the question was very much between liberal nationalism, which sees the nationality principle as the key way of ensuring peace and international order, and chauvinist nationalism, which has been strongly associated with militarism, expansionism and war. In the best cases, candidates demonstrated an understanding of Wilsonian ideas about the peaceful implications of a world of democratic nation-states, as represented by his Fourteen Points. Only the best candidates sought properly to answer this question by being able to weigh up the significance of these rival tendencies as far the history of nationalism has been concerned. Some very good answers pointed out that until 1945 nationalism had predominantly been seen as a threat to peace and international order, whereas in the post-1945 period and especially in recent decades, the decline in inter-state war can be seen as one of the consequences of the wider acceptance of national self-determination and democratic governance.

Nationalism can help peace and international order. Liberal and Socialist multiculturalism can lead to a peaceful international and national stage. There are ~~an~~ areas of ~~con~~ nationalism drawn to conflict such as Expansionist nationalism, post-colonialism ~~to~~ and conservatism to some extent.

Liberal nationalism address several key features of the nationalism doctrine. They believe that each nation is entitled to the same rights as any other nation, as each are of equal moral worth. This leads to a strong emphasis on self-determination, the right for every nation to rule themselves. The idea of each nation being of equal moral worth means that no nation would interfere with another as that would be interfering with the rights of that nation. This idea produces peace and order as no nation ~~see~~ can see its own priorities above another.

Liberal nationalists don't believe in the use of force unless it is the only option. They instead seek to use reason or negotiation to work differences out. This can involve the debating, arguing or negotiating of differences.

This approach would ensure violence isn't used and peace and international order sustained.

Socialist nationalists believe that a world socialist state can be formed as capitalism is going to collapse. This would also ensure peace and order. The socialist view on human nature is that people seek to be with other people and they wish to cooperate with one another. This would lead to states cooperating with one another in harmony in order to pursue the common good. This would avoid confrontation as people seek to cooperate with one another and peace and order be maintained.

Liberal internationalism has a strong belief in supranationalist bodies. These are institutions such as the EU which have memberships of many nations in order to ensure peace. This is achieved by setting out moral codes and laws such as the Convention of Human rights which is a universal law. This helps to bring a form of law to a lawless international scene. The notion of liberal internationalism promotes peace and international order.

Expansionist nationalism is a form of nationalism brought about by extreme enthusiasm for one's nation. This does lead to nations believing they are superior to other nations, as was seen in Nazi-Germany. This strongly opposes the liberal view that each nation is of equal moral worth and entitled to the same rights. Expansionist nationalism seeks to mobilise the public as a military force in pursuit of national pride. National pride and prestige is acquired by the domination of as they see, inferior nations. Expansionist nationalism is extremely violent, militaristic and is a threat to peace and international order.

Conservative Nationalism can in a way be seen as to ~~threaten~~ <sup>uphold</sup> peace and international order. Their belief in tradition ~~shows~~ puts strong emphasis on identity. This is in order to raise the level of patriotism. This can be in the celebration of nation events such as America's Independence day and raise national pride. The ~~continuity~~ continuity of these events leads to a strong national pride which doesn't threaten violence and maintains peace.

Anti-Colonial Nationalism can be violent or peaceful. India's independence from the UK is an example of a peaceful revolution in which their economy was strong enough to support themselves. However, examples such as Cuba and Czechoslovakia and Hungary show examples where violence is used in order to achieve independence. They also show a general distaste towards western

They also show a general distaste towards 'Western nations' in the example of Cuba who have been under Western influence and oppressed. This often leads to them adopting Marxist or socialist views. These in turn do help to stabilise nations but anti-colonialism can swing either way.

There is much evidence to show that nationalism is a recipe for peace and international order. The liberal notions of equal moral worth, reason, self-determination provide the basis for peace and order. The socialist view ensures peace and order as human nations seek to cooperate with one another and seek in order to work towards the common good. Liberal internationalism strongly supports supranationalist bodies which provide peace and order on an international scene. Conservative nationalism is more focused on one's own nation and strong national patriotism. This helps ensure peace and order as that nation is concerned only with itself but may lead to exploitation of other nations. Generally, nationalism promotes peace and order only expansionist and on occasions anti-colonialism use violence to promote their interests.



**ResultsPlus**

Examiner Comments

This answer provides sound though not fully developed treatments of the liberal and expansionist nationalist positions. It then attempts to bolt on the general socialist view on human nature, and also the conservative view of nationalism as an aid to domestic order. Neither are relevant to the question asked, and do not gain any credit in this context. The paragraph on anti-colonial nationalism is also not relevant to the question asked, as the points made do not relate to international order. Nevertheless, the effective sections reached the top of Level 2. (The question obtained AO1-8, AO2-7, AO3-6, Synopticity-7, for a total of 28)

### Question 7

Two approaches to this question were commonly adopted, both potentially successfully. In the first, the battle lines were between multiculturalism and its various critics, notably conservative nationalists, feminists and socialists or social reformists. In these cases, multiculturalism was portrayed as a supposed solution to the potential tensions and conflicts of a multicultural society, cultural recognition helping to overcome marginalisation and promote civic cohesion. By contrast, conservatives, feminists and others have seen multiculturalism as a breeding ground for tensions and social conflicts of various kinds. The alternative approach to this question was to consider divisions within multiculturalism. When this approach was adopted, liberal multiculturalism was widely viewed as a solution to cultural tensions and social conflict, on the grounds that it endorses diversity only within a framework of liberalism and confines it principally to the 'private' sphere, while pluralist multiculturalism has often been criticised for breeding a form of plural monoculturalism, thereby strengthening social tensions and conflicts. Weak responses to this question tended to be insufficiently grounded in the theories, ideas and doctrines of multiculturalism as a political tradition.

Multiculturalism is a highly controversial ideology, especially in modern day society. The idea of many separate cultures living together harmoniously is unrealistic due to historic discrimination or prejudice, yet, it is highly important that these past events do not create an ongoing pattern of social injustice.

Multiculturalist societies, such as that of London have many positive attributes. People who come over from poorer backgrounds with fewer opportunities are happy to be employed for jobs that citizens of that society may not want themselves. This improves areas where there is a lack of employment, they also will be more determined perhaps with any job they get as the opportunity means more to them. Multiculturalism also enables for a better understanding of different races, ethnicities or otherwise. This can prevent xenophobia and racism, as many are discriminative only because of a lack of knowledge. A collaboration of different people provides a richer culture in a society, through religion, education, entertainment, food, music and

many more areas of life. This harmony benefits all as it prevents any dangerous activities, such as terrorism, but it is never that simple.

Different people have separate ideas about what makes a multiculturalist society, the ideology is vast and its acceptance fluctuates. One thing it greatly affects is the economy, as bigger populations need lots of people with separate skills to contribute to the welfare of that society. It gives a range of opportunities and aids children growing up in that society, ~~an opportunity~~ <sup>to have</sup> a new level of acceptance for those from any background to avoid future social discrimination.

There are two types of discrimination; positive discrimination and negative discrimination. An example of positive discrimination is that of the African Americans in the nineteenth century and twentieth century America whose colour gave them more jobs, particularly <sup>manual</sup> labour, but this was an opportunity for them and despite the basis of why they had these jobs, the employment aspect was a big development from slave labour. An example of negative discrimination is that of the Nazi regime where they attempted to create a superior Aryan race, which provided a deeply anti-semitic culture. The discrimination

caused humiliation, a serious feeling of being outcasted, loss of jobs, loss of lives and a very dark point in European history. Discrimination of this kind is very dangerous and damaging to a race and remains in a prejudice from them to those whom inflicted such pain and injustice.

Multiculturalism can be suggested to provoke social conflict and cultural tension due to many people who believe and live their lives in very different ways, living so closely together, there are bound to be many disagreements. Religious beliefs can really conflict to cause issues, for example with religious holidays, the main religions <sup>in that area</sup> will be superior to having these yet more less superior ones will possibly not be allowed off work due to a lack of empathy for the importance to that religion. Another example is that of in France, with the use of religious clothing and the right for those living in an area dominated by a separate religion, having to abide by certain laws and are disrespected for not obeying, or feel deep feelings of a lack of understanding for being denied the right to wear religious clothing, such as a headscarf or cross necklace. This can cause many conflicting emotions

and racism. Multiculturalism is important for diversity and change but typically traditionalist conservatives are against this progress as they tend to preserve what is, and what works from the past, as multiculturalism is a fairly modern ideology.

Overlooking the positive attributes a multiculturalistic society brings and the negative friction produced by so many cultures living together, it is clear that a diverse society allows understanding and acceptance but it will never be purely harmonious. ~~It~~ The importance of not dividing all cultures up and away from each is ~~to~~ great, as there is dependance on these relationships; for example getting food from overseas which are unable to grow in separate habitats and other resources such as oil, gold, materials. These relationships are vital for modern day needs and acceptance of multiculturalism would do more good than harm.

**ResultsPlus**

Examiner Comments

This answer is only relevant where it makes some descriptions of problems of contemporary society. The attempt to graft on a discussion on discrimination is completely ineffective, and also based on inaccurate knowledge. This is an example of an answer that lacks any effective grasp of the different theoretical positions and falls back on an impressionistic understanding of contemporary debates. It thus only achieves Level 1. (A01-4, A02-3, A03-2, Synopticity-2, for a total of 11).



Multiculturalism is the acceptance and belief in the desirability of cultural diversity, as well as <sup>aiming to</sup> reduce and eliminate any disadvantages that particular groups may face. ~~Multiculturalists would completely disagree with the statement that it breeds tension and social conflict.~~  
~~Multiculturalist believe~~

Multiculturalists would completely disagree with the statement that this doctrine breeds tension and social conflict. This is because they believe that diversity creates stability and inclusion as well as peace and order. By accepting a range of values, customs and beliefs it will allow individuals to be more accepting of contrasting ideas, as well as promoting the vigour and health <sup>of</sup> society in which diversity is embraced. ~~Some~~ Gandhi, for example fused Indian nationalism with an ethic of non violence and sacrifice and this demonstrates the ability for multiculturalism to be peaceful and free of conflict.

However ~~Some~~ Fanon emphasized the link between the colonial struggle and violence. He believed that ~~violence is necessary for the~~ the cathartic experience of violence is necessary to ~~achieve~~ achieve a psycho political regeneration to overcome colonialism. This can be

seen in the tension that was evident between colonised nations and the West, ~~high~~ clearly demonstrating the social conflict that can exist in order for ~~the~~ multiculturalism to be achieved successfully.

Kymlicka identified minority rights ~~that~~ such as polyethnic rights, which help ~~minority~~ ethnic minorities to uphold their cultural distinctiveness. Examples include the exemption of Muslim school girls from school dress codes and the exemption of Sikhs to wear helmets when riding ~~a~~ a motorcycle. Also, special representation rights are a type of "positive" discrimination where certain groups are given privileges over others such as black students in a university or in California being allowed to gain admission with lower grades than other students.

~~While~~ while Kymlicka's minority rights may help ~~groups~~ <sup>groups</sup> to maintain their cultural distinctiveness ~~as~~ as well as make up for past injustices, it could breed social conflict and tension because ~~individual~~ <sup>individual</sup> rights are being undermined at the expense of collective rights, which is why liberal multiculturalists do not support deep diversity. They refuse to accept customs that threaten individual rights such as female circumcision and arranged marriages and for this reason conflict could occur between certain communities due to the restrictions they may face in upholding and maintaining their cultural distinctiveness.

Parekh, for example, highlighted the dialect and interplay between human nature and culture, stating that our culture defines our values and beliefs and therefore who we are, therefore

there is inevitable tension between cultural values and individual values.

On the other hand other forms of ~~the~~ multiculturalism adopt a 'deep' diversity such as pluralist multiculturalism. ~~Gray~~ Gray highlighted that ~~impossibility of demonstrating the superiority of~~ this pluralist ~~view~~<sup>perspective</sup> shows a post-liberal stance where liberal ideas can no longer be seen to enjoy the monopoly of legitimacy. Berlin advanced "value pluralism" that focuses on the impossibility of demonstrating the superiority of one moral system over another, which certainly goes further than liberal ideas and therefore may show that multiculturalism has a capacity to accept all beliefs and ideas.

However Berlin failed to demonstrate how liberal and illiberal ideas can coexist ~~and~~ in a society, therefore showing that their mixing of ideas could inherently lead to conflict. Examples of this include militant forms of Islam that is not accepted in the West.

Perhaps cosmopolitan multiculturalism is the only form of multiculturalism that does ~~not~~ have a capacity for conflict and tension. It is the idea that diversity is only a transitional state and that throughout time a 'melting pot' of cultures ~~will~~ will exist where all cultures blend into one common culture.

This ~~view~~ highlights an organic form of diversity that will happen naturally and gradually, however some may feel that this is not a viable form of multiculturalism and it does not demonstrate a variety of cultures living together, but instead one large culture being a bi-product of multiculturalism.

Overall it can be said that multiculturalism does have a capacity for breeding ~~conflict~~ social conflict and tension, and this is due to the 'clashing of civilisations' that ~~may~~ may arise when multiculturalism is adopted. Also Fanon's criticism of liberal multiculturalism for creating a society of monocultures seems to be relevant here, as multiculturalism seems to be unachievable due to the conflict that will arise.

However, whether or not it is agreed that cosmopolitanism is a viable form of multiculturalism, it can be ~~be~~ said that this form, nonetheless, offers an alternative that seems to overcome the tension that seems to arise with all other forms of ~~multiculturalism~~ multiculturalism.



### ResultsPlus

#### Examiner Comments

This answer provides a range of viewpoints, but they are not fully developed. In the case of the paragraph on Fanon, it is not made relevant to the question asked. By not fully developing the points, the answer does not provide a balance between the 'pro' and 'anti' positions. The critique of multiculturalism as breeding tension and conflict is only made in a substantive way at the bottom of the second page. Thus despite the range of accurate references, the answer is confined to the top of Level 2. (AO1-8, AO2-7, AO3-6, Synopticity-8)



### ResultsPlus

#### Examiner Tip

This question addresses issues that in contemporary debate are often conducted in the form of a polemic - ie the use of unsupported assertions which ignore alternative positions. Avoid this approach at all costs and remember that you are being asked to provide a discussion of different positions, while making your own judgment at the end.

### Question 8

The vast majority of responses to this question recognised that this was an invitation to discuss the balance between unity and disunity within ecological thinking. Successful responses often started by highlighting broad similarities that united all ecological traditions, usually linked to the recognition of an intrinsic relationship between humankind and nature as reflected in the principle of ecology. The divisions that candidates identified and discussed were, with reason, wide ranging, as there is no established or unchallengeable account of key divisions within ecologism. For many, the key divisions were between rival hybrid forms of ecologism, notably eco-socialism, eco-conservatism, eco-fascism, eco-feminism and so on. In other words, ecologism was presented as a cross-cutting ideology, making its differences sometimes more prominent than its similarities. Others, examined contrasting tendencies between mainstream ecology, often linked to liberalism or conservatism, and radical forms of ecology that call for either radical social reform or the paradigm change that deep ecologists believe is necessary. Others, focus primarily on the difference between 'shallow' ecology and 'deep' ecology. However this was approached, many answers were thorough, analytical and based on extensive knowledge and understanding. Weak answers, on the other hand, tended to provide little more than a descriptive account of different ecological traditions, offering little scope for an analysis of similarities and differences.

All ecologists believe that the environment is being damaged and will ~~soon~~ eventually be destroyed by humankind, but through action this can be changed. However, how the similarities end as ecologism is a deeply divided ideology and has numerous sub-ideologies within it. Arne Naess was the first to identify the difference between 'shallow ecologism' and 'deep ecologism' but there are also other groups such as eco-anarchists, eco-socialists and eco-feminists. These different groups have very different beliefs regarding human's place in the environment, the make-up of the environment and the proposed society that would solve ecological problems. Overall though, the aim of improving the environment is enough to unite the spectrum of ecology into a single ideology.

The first divide is between whether an ecologist follows

an anthropocentric or a geocentric view of the earth. Many shallow ecologists (sometimes known as environmentalists) adopt a form of 'enlightened anthropocentrism', arguing that humans should protect and conserve the environment because it is in their best interests, thereby placing themselves above the rest of nature. However deep ecologists, such as Arne Naess, argue that ~~the~~ <sup>human,</sup> ~~environment~~ ~~that~~ are equal with the rest of the environment and should not see themselves as above it. This idea is represented by Leopold in his book 'Sand County Almanac' that puts forward the theory of 'land ethic' which claims all land has intrinsic value. This divide between ecologists is by a large one as it fundamentally changes how you deal with nature. For example, ~~shallow ecologists~~ <sup>shallow ecologists</sup> pursue animal welfare as human beings are above animals so should protect them, while deep ecologists (particularly Singer) pursue animal rights because animals are sentient beings so should be treated as equals. This divide has also occurred ~~as~~ within the school of eco-socialism. Some claim that socialism is the perfect realisation of ecologism because it asserts that all are equal and this belief will naturally extend to the environment, and lead to an ecocentric attitude (Joel Kovel has particularly argued this). However, when communist states have been created they have adapted fiercely anthropocentric ideas, using resources to feed industrialism. This has been shown in the Soviet Union, with the Chernobyl disaster particularly. Although there is a divide between anthropocentrism

and ecocentrism within eco-socialism, and ecologism or, a whole, all ecological thinkers propose a move from an aggressive anthropocentrism to a form of ecocentrism, it is just a matter of degree. While some wish to move to an enlightened anthropocentrism, or a moderate ecocentrism, others wish to adopt a purely ecocentric view.

The other divide in ecological thinking is how they see the earth, and this stems from how 'deep' their beliefs are. Shallow ecologists have historically followed the 'Cartesian-Newtonian' model of physics science that everything is separate and can be dealt with individually. For example, the UK Green Party will campaign on nuclear energy, animal rights and protecting the oceans separately. However, deep ecologists adopt a policy of 'Holism', primarily preached by Fritjof Capra. This was originally a belief of Buddhist and Taoist religions and implies that everything in the world is part of a single, connected whole. This means that all ecological systems are interlinked and humans are but part of this giant ecosystem. James Lovelock adapted this idea with the 'Gaia theory', which is a very extreme area of ecologism. He argued that the entire earth, including minerals and inanimate natural objects, were part of the living organism of the earth, which he named Gaia after the Greek Goddess. He claimed that this meant individuals should not interfere with the earth as it was self-regulating, and he quoted as evidence for this the fact that the sun had increased its temperature by

25% ~~are~~ yet the world hadn't got any tatter. This belief, which is partly ~~green~~ mysticism and paganism is not followed by all ecologists and therefore doesn't unite the ideology. Although, eco-feminists do believe in holism as they believe that women have a close bond with nature, developed through childbirth, that makes them suitable for ecologies while men are not. They argue that they can feel the 'rhythms of nature' and also subscribe to the ancient symbols of Mother Nature and the Greek goddess of the Earth, Gaia. However, with the emergence of 'new physics' and quantum theory, many shallow ecologists are beginning to accept that everything is connected in a web and that problems are ~~not~~ a separate as they originally measured. Therefore, although it is again a matter of degree. Ecologists believe that humankind and the earth problems are connected, it's just whether they believe in simply solving problems together or treating the planet as a single, living organism.

Ecologists are also divided over their methods and how they wish to achieve ~~an~~ the goal of saving the environment. Shallow ecologists seek to work within existing power structures and 'green capitalism', pursuing technology and sustainability in order to improve society. They do this through political parties and pressure groups e.g. UK Green Party and Green ~~Parties~~. However, deep ecologists believe that there must be a fundamental change in human consciousness to adopt what Arne Næss called 'Ecosophy', and all attempts to 'green capitalism' simply deal with symptoms. Their practical aims, after this is achieved are criticised as utopian by other ecologists; for example, Næss said the population of the earth should be reduced from 7 billion to 100 million. Eco-socialists claim that only the overthrow of capitalism and the existence of a communist society can save the environment by removing the drive towards growth. However, there is ~~not~~ a divide here



between 'red' and 'green' priorities, and as a Marxist believed ecologists should only campaign against capitalism as part of a socialist party. The German Greens faced this problem, but decided to become 'neither left nor right'. Eco-Anarchists propose a radically different society made up of various self-sufficient communities, prepared by Kropotkin. They claim this move away from the <sup>needs</sup> globalising state would lead to more ecological outlooks. It is in methods and practical aims where ecology is not decided as an ideology because there are many different proposed solutions to the environmental problem they identify.

In conclusion, although many groups and offshoots propose different methods and adopt varying views on 'anthropocentrism or ecocentrism' and the idea of Holism, the writing aims of addressing environmental problem is enough to unite them. This is seen in the German Green party, that separates itself from the rest of the political spectrum as it is the only party that will put the environment first. Ecologists are 'green', while all other ideologies are 'grey'.



### ResultsPlus

#### Examiner Comments

This answer successfully combined a fully developed discussion of the deep/shallow contrast with effective analytical treatments of the eco-socialist, eco-feminist and eco-anarchist positions. It was well-organised and used clear academic terminology effectively. This combination enabled it to achieve the higher reaches of Level 3. (AO1-11, AO2-11, AO3-8, Synopticity-11, for a total of 41).



### ResultsPlus

#### Examiner Tip

Remember that you should discuss the widest possible range of variations of ecological thought in answering a question formed in this way.

## Grade Boundaries

Grade	Max. Mark	a*	A	B	C	D	E	N	U
Raw mark boundary	90	62	56	50	44	38	32	26	0
Uniform mark scale boundary	100	90	80	70	60	50	40	30	0

a\* is only used in conversion from raw to uniform marks. It is not a published unit grade.



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

Telephone 01623 467467

Fax 01623 450481

Email [publications@linneydirect.com](mailto:publications@linneydirect.com)

Order Code UA024044 June 2010

For more information on Edexcel qualifications, please visit  
[www.edexcel.com/quals](http://www.edexcel.com/quals)

Edexcel Limited. Registered in England and Wales no.4496750  
Registered Office: One90 High Holborn, London, WC1V 7BH

Ofqual  




Llywodraeth Cynulliad Cymru  
Welsh Assembly Government

