

Examiners' Report  
June 2016

GCE Government & Politics 6GP03 3B

## 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](http://www.edexcel.com) or [www.btec.co.uk](http://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](http://www.edexcel.com/contactus).



### 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](http://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](http://www.pearson.com/uk).

June 2016

Publications Code 6GP03\_3B\_1606\_ER

All the material in this publication is copyright  
© Pearson Education Ltd 2016

## **Introduction**

The overall standard of responses in Unit 3B was broadly in line with that in previous exam series. There were relatively 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 only answer two questions from section A, either through choice or time constraints, and this should be strongly discouraged. An important discriminator, as in previous years, was the extent to which candidates focused on the specific question set and candidates who did this were able to perform better. Some good advice to candidates preparing for exams is to spend time thinking about the question, identifying the key words or terms and, for essays in particular, planning their answer before starting to answer the question.

## Question 1

This was a popular question and generally well answered. Stronger responses tended to give a definition of 'collectivism' at the start and were able to deal with the 'how' as well as the 'why' part of the question. Some less well developed responses dealt exclusively with the 'why' or, less frequently, exclusively with the 'how'. A few candidates conflated collectivism with collectivisation which limited the level of responses these students were able to give.

~~See~~ Collectivism can be defined as the concept that cooperative human endeavours are superior to ~~the~~ individual self-interest. ~~Socialism~~ Socialists have ~~can~~ often supported collective ownership of property (by which they refer to the means of production) as well as that of wealth.

Socialists firstly support collectivism based upon their perception of human nature. For socialists, human beings are sociable beings, thus meaning they have an innate preference for collectivism and cooperation.

Furthermore, socialists argue that this tendency of human beings results in compassion for others, hence human nature involves the desire to help others. Therefore, socialists have supported collectivism on the basis that it facilitates human nature.

Moreover, socialists have supported collectivism as they argue it builds better values. In this regard, socialists argue that

alternative systems, such as capitalism, promote selfishness and greed. On the other hand, socialists view collectivism as promoting sympathy, care, empathy and compassion, amongst other values. This is due to collectivism promoting cooperation, thus causing <sup>individuals</sup> ~~people~~ to work for the good of the community as opposed to attempting to advance their own individual ~~expend~~ interests, sometimes at the expense of others. Based upon this, socialists can be seen to have supported collectivism ~~for~~ in terms of the morality it develops.

In addition to this, socialists have supported collectivism on the grounds of justice. For orthodox Marxists, justice is equality of outcome for all individuals, resulting in a positive view of collectivism because it has a tendency to equalise all individuals. Similarly, social Democratic socialists can be seen to support collectivism through nationalisation, as the main industries become commonly owned, hence no one individual excessively benefits. For instance, Attlee's Labour government in Britain sought to nationalise the 'commanding heights of industry'. Therefore, regardless of the type of social -

ism, socialists can be seen to support collectivism in order to promote social justice.

Overall, socialists have supported collectivism (through common ownership as well as redistribution of wealth) due to human nature as well as the positive benefits that arise, notably the development of better values and further social justice.

⊛ especially in terms of common ownership of wealth, as social class no longer acts as a division.



**ResultsPlus**

**Examiner Comments**

This answer has a short definition at the start. It goes on to address the 'how' as well as the 'why' part of the question. This is an example of a strong level three response.



**ResultsPlus**

**Examiner Tip**

Be ready to provide a concise definition of key terms. This will help you to focus on answering the question.

## Question 2

This was a very popular question and generally well answered. Stronger responses often gave a short definition at the start and provided several justifications, with explanation and development. A few weaker responses did not provide more than one justification, or gave justifications for a meritocracy instead. Occasionally candidates presented arguments against hierarchy, which was not asked for in the question.

Conservatives justify social hierarchy on the basis that it forms naturally with 'natural governors' forming the higher layer of the principle. This belief is present due to the fact that society is organic and forms with all elements working together.

In addition it is supported due to the negative view of conservatives on human nature which sees individuals to be morally, psychologically and intellectually limited and flawed, and therefore is required to be controlled by the natural structure of society to keep the individual in order and in check to know their place in society. This links to the conservative support for authority which is created as a result of the social hierarchy where the people at the top need to assert authority to maintain the individual. This can be seen in the conservative advocacy of a small, strong state in order to provide a strong line of authority in order to ~~reduce~~ maintain law and order.

Social hierarchy is also a principle which forms much of the One Nation Toryism under Benjamin Disraeli. This advocated the principle of paternalism which gives a role to the people higher up in the social hierarchy. It showed that the price of privilege was social and moral duty and responsibility where the higher up people needed to help those less fortunate because the people at the top owed their status to the accident of birth and ~~and~~ ~~had~~ have a duty to help the 'deserving poor' because they are in essence deserving because they are not their own architects of their own misfortunes and therefore should be helped.

The justification of social hierarchy gives a role to everyone and can also be justified on the grounds that the people higher up need to help those who aren't as fortunate because of the selfish fear that the poor will revolt. The duty of the people higher up is to maintain political stability and therefore in this sense moderate reform is the antidote of revolution.



**ResultsPlus**  
Examiner Comments

This answer provides several conservative justifications for hierarchy, with development and explanation. This is an example of a strong level three response.



### Question 3

This was one of the less popular questions in this section. Stronger responses gave an accurate definition of 'rationalism' at the start and went on to clearly explain the links with liberalism.

Rationalism is the belief that the world has a rational structure. It means that individuals are seen as rational creatures capable of critical thinking. This is due to enlightenment, which led society away from superstition and ignorance and towards rationalism and progress.

A link between liberalism and rationalism is that rationalism increases individual freedom. This is because, individuals under rationalism, are able to make decisions for themselves and learn from their own mistakes rather than obeying the instructions of their family ~~and~~ or groups that they belong to. This means rationalism is against paternalism, which is authority from the above. This means that a link between rationalism and liberalism is that it underpins freedom in ~~the interest of~~ that it gives an individual greater choice, and the ability to choose for themselves.

Another link between liberalism and rationalism is that rationalism shows human history in terms of progress. This is because rationalism updates knowledge and experience from

generation to generation. therefore, <sup>it has</sup> ~~been~~ moved individuals away from following custom and tradition and towards scientific progress and realisation. this means that through rationalism, the previous stock of knowledge is updated and each generation will add to the stock of knowledge.

Furthermore, it can be argued that a ~~link~~ link between rationalism and liberalism is that rationalism can lead to ~~concerns~~ concerns.

this is because liberals understand, that humans are self-seeking creatures and this <sup>eg competition for scarce resources</sup> can lead to conflict. However through <sup>rationalism</sup> ~~research~~ ~~section~~, individuals are able to discuss, ~~open~~ debate and negotiate. therefore, a rational agreement can be made. This means that rationalism is linked to liberalism because it can prevent conflicts and lead to a balanced society, as individuals will be able to come to a rational conclusion.



**ResultsPlus**  
Examiner Comments

This answer has a clear definition at the start. This is followed by three relevant points, each with development. This is an example of a strong level three response.

## Question 4

This was one of the less popular questions in this section. Stronger responses addressed the 'how far' part of the question well and explained that both anarchists and Marxists are in favour of a future stateless society.

Anarchism is often paralleled to Marxism taken to its logical extreme. However, there are notable differences with regards to the role of the state.

Marxism is centered around an opposition to capitalism. Marx also described the state as 'the management system of the bourgeoisie' and wrote that the state as it existed must be overthrown as part of the broader revolution against the capitalist base system. He hypothesised that humans are capable of eventually living harmoniously in stateless communism. This is similar to the collectivist anarchist view that the state is the root of evil and corrupts human nature. Both would want a stateless society ~~and~~ as an end

result. ~~and~~ Godwin justified this by describing human nature as plastic. Explaining that what seems selfish and competitive would become compassionate and cooperative once ~~the~~ the state was overthrown. This shows that both anarchists and Marxists aim, ultimately for a society in which the state plays no part.

However, whilst Marxists believe in the state to play a role in the progression towards communism, collectivist anarchists do not. Marx's dictatorship of the proletariat would have been absolutely despised by anarchists as they see any state, any confiscation of evil as a cardinal sin. ~~This indicates that~~ To quote Lord Acton "all power corrupts" as it did in Stalinist Russia under an arguably Marxist regime. This shows fundamental disagreement about what role the state should have.

Ultimately, Marxists and anarchists agree on ~~the~~ what they think of the state would be in their respective utopia (non-existent) but disagree on ~~on~~ whether or not ~~it~~ the state is a needed part of the ~~of~~ process.



**ResultsPlus**  
Examiner Comments

This answer is very strong on the analysis of 'how far' Marxists and anarchists disagree. It outlines their distinct views towards the current state, as well as explaining that they both aim for a future stateless society. This is an example of a strong level three response.

## Question 5

This was a reasonably popular question choice. It was generally well answered, but there were a number of responses where candidates strayed from the question and went on to consider whether or not some contemporary socialists still believed in radical change or a very limited reform of capitalism. Stronger responses maintained a clear focus on the question.

Many socialists have supported an evolutionary road to socialism on the basis that socialism can be achieved peacefully through democratic and constitutional reforms or that such a change was inevitable.

Firstly, many socialists support evolutionary socialism as they believed the ~~rest of~~ working class would eventually be given the right to vote. They therefore argued that this would put electoral power in the hands of the working class due to the fact they make up the majority of society. The fact that many democracies are ~~not~~ based on majoritarian voting systems ~~for most socialists~~ where decisions are made in favour of the 'majority' or 51%. Many socialists believe electoral power would be put in the hands of the working class.

Moreover, socialists believe that the working class would then vote for socialist parties as socialism is the 'natural home' for the working class due to the fact it is dedicated to narrowing social inequalities in society, improving working

conditions and helping ~~workers~~ create social justice. On the other hand, workers would ~~not~~ be put off by parties that support capitalism as it helps create social inequalities. Many socialists therefore believed that all the working class would vote for socialist parties.

Furthermore, due to their belief that the working class would all vote for socialist parties and that they make up the majority of society, many socialists were positive that socialist parties would ~~a~~ certainly be elected into government and therefore be able to carry out wide ranging policies to help ~~a~~ reform society and narrow its inequalities, creating a socialist society through democratic ~~for~~ reform. Therefore making socialism ~~an~~ through an evolutionary route not only possible but inevitable.

In addition, many socialists <sup>have</sup> supported an evolutionary road to socialism as it does not involve the use of violence. Historically, revolutionary socialism has often led to public outrage and a lack of support as people condemn the use of violence and ~~terror~~ terror. For this reason, many socialists have supported evolutionary socialism as it is a much more peaceful and democratic road so is much more likely to gain sympathy and support ~~for the~~ from the general public.



**ResultsPlus**  
**Examiner Comments**

This is a wide-ranging answer which contains several relevant points with development. It has a clear focus on the question throughout. This is an example of a strong level three response.



## Question 6

This was a fairly popular essay question and generally well answered. Stronger candidates kept a clear focus on the question and considered both desirability and possibility in their answers. A few responses became overly descriptive about the different strands of anarchism, without linking this to the question.

To an anarchist, all anarchist society is ~~is~~ certainly both desirable and possible. Tensions, however, rise with the critique of anarchism in relation to other ideologies, particularly conservatism and liberalism who believe anarchism to be nothing more than a mere fantasy; in other words unachievable. On the other hand, Anarchists reject this belief and argue that an anarchist society ~~is~~ would give the most harmonious and fulfilling self development.

The key doctrine of anarchism is its anti-statist belief. Sebastian Fauré describe anarchism as 'the rejection of the principle of Authority'. In other words, anarchists believe Authority is an offence against both the individual freedom and equality, as anarchists believe in maximum individual freedom and unrestrained political equality. They also believe the state to be coercive, destructive and exploitative because it takes away property in the form of taxes, backed up by the threat of punishment. Authority is said to be corrupting in that if authority didn't exist, humans would live in harmony therefore indicating why an anarchist society is possible. The factor that the state being coercive, destructive and

exploitative is also argued to be due to the fact that humans can be good or bad depending on circumstances, and when ~~someone~~<sup>one</sup> is in a position of power, they will abuse it for their own ends. Liberals disagree with the stateless society as they believe the state of nature would be 'lasy, brutish and short': Hobbes. Moreover, conservatives believe the state is a form of authority which is necessary to ensure stability and order. However, anarchists place faith in the ability of social institutions to uphold and maintain order. On one hand, collectivists place faith in the community, arguing that the collectivisation of wealth will maintain stability as everyone will be equal hence there will be no social tension. Individualists place faith in the market, believing the market tends towards a long run equilibrium, hence a stateless society is both desirable and possible.

The key reason why anarchists believe this is due to their utopian belief in human capacity. Anarchists believe humans are 'educated creatures with rational minds and tolerant judgement'. Hence the state is an 'unnecessary evil' as oppose to the liberals 'necessary evil'. Humans should be absolutely free as they have a natural capacity to work and live with each other without the need for conflict and violence. Anarchists say

that the universe is biased towards natural balance and utopianism, hence utopianism is not merely a dream and the possibility of a stateless society is realistic. Liberals, however, argue that although humans are rational creatures, they can be selfish and self-seeking due to the egoistical individual, hence liberals reject the utopian belief in human nature. Moreover, conservatives argue that humans are imperfect creatures who are security-seeking and therefore need a recognisable state to fall back on and offer protection. ~~Realist~~ Hence, from this perspective, an anarchist society is neither possible nor desirable. \*

Another key doctrine of anarchism is its belief in economic freedom. They believe political power is intrinsically linked to economic power, therefore to be politically free from a stateless society must also mean to be free in economic power. However, this is where the ideology becomes divided, whereby individualist anarchism can be critiqued through liberalism and collectivist anarchism critiqued through socialism.

Collectivist anarchists believe humans are cooperative and sociable and gregarious creatures who are able to live in harmony without the need for a coercive body. Kropotkin took Spencers 'Survival of the Fittest' analysis

whom he'd applied to competition and argued that in fact successful species were able to harness the collective energy of the species in order to promote the common good. Hence, humans had a natural propensity to work together for the common good. Anarcho-communism believed that if there was a system of collectivism, state intervention would be unnecessary because the wealth would automatically be used for the good of humanity, and given that humans could live and work together cooperatively, social order would maintain. The key criticism here from a fundamentalist point of view is how this stateless society is achieved. For Marxists, ~~the state~~ a temporary proletarian state is the best way to achieve the end goal of a stateless society, as it first puts in place the social institutions. Anarcho-communists reject the state fundamentally, believing a complete overthrow of the state is the only way to achieve an anarcho-anarchist, stateless society.

Individualist anarchists, notably anarcho-capitalists, place faith in the market to provide the best allocation of resources, and any government intervention will inevitably lead to government failure as the market is too big and complex to understand. This also places faith in human rationality, as it believes humans are

capable of managing their own economic affairs without the need for a state, hence an anarchist society is certainly possible and desirable. However, liberals reject anarcho-capitalism on the grounds that some state is necessary in order to ensure market competition, for example through the avoidance of monopolies by competition policy.

In conclusion, it is obvious that an anarchist would describe an anarchist society to be both possible and desirable. This is due to where they place their faith in human perfection: they are good or bad depending on circumstances. If humans are 'tabula rasa', then without a state there is not corrupting influence meaning humans can be free enough to develop from the influence of nature and the environment, hence humans have the capacity to be naturally good. However, disagreements lie with individualist and collectivist anarchism, as differences with economic morality indicate that the future of an anarchist society ~~however~~ is debated. Nevertheless, the anarchist society to both strands is desirable and possible.



**ResultsPlus**  
Examiner Comments

This response is wide-ranging and is well focused on the question throughout. There are criticisms of aspects of anarchism from a liberal, conservative and socialist perspective and the answer covers the different anarchist traditions. This is an example of a strong level three response.

## Question 7

This was a very popular essay question and generally well answered. Stronger responses were better able to address the 'to what extent' part of the question, showing areas of agreement as well as division. Stronger responses also tended to cover a wider range of points, with better explanation and development.

Liberals are divided over the role of the state to a fairly large extent because they all believe it is necessary, however perceive the role of the state in different ways.

Liberals are not divided over the role of the state in the sense that all liberals believe the state to be necessary. This is because they argue that human nature involves a self-interested aspect, meaning every individual will act in order to advance their own interests. This results in liberals <sup>advocating</sup> ~~advocating~~ the existence of the state because the self-interest of individuals has the possibility to conflict, meaning each individual would be perpetually threatened. This creates an issue for liberals because they seek to maximise the liberty of individuals, yet they are not truly experiencing freedom if the freedom of others places them under constant threat. Therefore, they argue the state is necessary in order to protect the freedom of individuals, as

stated by Locke who argued "freedom can only exist under the law. Where there is no law, there will be no freedom". In this regard, liberals are not divided over the role of the state to any extent because they all agree that the state is necessary to protect freedom.

Furthermore, liberals are not divided over the state's role due to their belief it poses a threat to sovereign individuals. By this, liberals argue that although the state exists to protect freedom, it also poses a threat because self-interest also affects those of the state. ~~liberals~~ In this regard, liberals argue those in control could become accustomed to the power and use it for their own interests, perhaps inflicting harm on the liberty of all other individuals. Liberals could be seen to be influenced by Lord Acton, who argued that "power corrupts and absolute power corrupts absolutely", hence leading liberals to fear the concentration of power. In this regard, liberals are not divided to any extent over the role of the state as all liberals view the state as having the potential to be tyrannical.

The threat of concentration of power also leads all liberals to advocate constitutionalism and consent, again highlighting an instance in which liberals are not divided over the role of the state. By consent, liberals could be seen to be influenced by Locke's 'Two Treatise on Government', in which he outlined the people must support the use of state power for it to be legitimate. Moreover, all liberals support constitutionalism, which results in a check on the exercise of power. This could be seen to be influenced by Montesquieu, who argued "power should be a check to power". Liberals therefore advocate written constitutions which restrain the power of politicians, as is the case for the American constitution (to which only twenty seven amendments have ever been made) or a system of checks and balances through federal government systems (where by national government and state government are divided) or institutionalised fragmentation (as is the case in the United States of America, where government is split into the Executive, Legislative and Judiciary). Based upon this, liberals are not divided to any extent over



the role of the state because all liberals support the notion of constitutionalism and consent.

Contrary to this, liberals can be seen to be divided over the role of the state due to the two strands of liberalism: classical and modern.

Classical liberals and modern liberals can be seen to be divided over the role of the state to a fairly large extent in terms of the ~~role~~ amount of intervention. For classical liberals, the role of the state involves minimal state intervention. This position is influenced by a support for Berlin's negative freedom. This is the idea that all individuals should be free to act without the imposition of external constraints. Therefore, classical liberals adopting negative freedom argue that freedom is achieved through the least amount of state intervention possible. This could be seen to be expressed by Jefferson who argued "that government is best that governs not at all". On the other hand, modern liberals are more favourable towards state intervention. Both Modern liberals adapted the classical liberal view

of human nature to include the desire for self-mastery, hence meaning they ~~are~~ <sup>support</sup> developmental individualism. As a result, they have been more associated with Berlin's positive freedom, as ~~they~~ modern liberals argued negative freedom is not enough. T.H. Green criticised negative freedom, highlighting a shortcoming of it in the sense that the condition to self-realise does not naturally occur. This modern liberal perspective therefore results in modern liberals advocating state intervention in the regard of an 'enabling state'. By this, modern liberals suggest the state should create provisions for those unable to pay for them, so that every individual is able to self-master. This could be empirically seen in Gladstone's creation of state education in Britain, as it allowed children of all backgrounds access to education. Based upon this, classical and modern liberals ~~clear~~ divided over the role of the state in terms of how much intervention is desirable. However, this is not a divide to a complete extent, because modern liberals do not argue for the removal of private provisions, nor

do they reject the classical liberal position, they instead argue far more is required.

Furthermore, liberals can be seen to be divided over the role of the state in terms of economics. In this instance, the divide is to a complete extent because modern liberals reject the classical liberal version of economics, meaning the only common feature is the use of capitalism. Classical liberals favour the economics of Adam Smith's 'The Wealth of Nations', in which he analyses the economy as a series of interlinking markets composed of individuals. In this version of economics, state intervention is rejected because Smith argues the market is self-regulating, based upon the market forces (supply and demand) and the invisible hand of capitalism (self-interest). Therefore, classical liberals reject state intervention in the economy, instead arguing the conditions are created then no regulation is required. In contrast to this, modern liberals can be seen to adopt a Keynesianist approach to economics. Keynes argued that herd psychology was evident, meaning that when confidence was high,

then there was greater investment and economic activity. Keynes then argued that once this confidence dropped, people would do the reverse and there would be a cyclical spiral downwards, resulting in economic depression. By adopting this form of economics, modern liberals encourage the role of the state by arguing the state has a responsibility to control aggregate demand. Therefore, in a recession, modern liberals would support the state injecting spending into the economy, as Keynes argued this would result in a multiplier effect (one injection of spending creates greater economic activity). This form of economics could be witnessed in public works schemes, for example the building of ~~the~~ dams in America during the depression. In this regard, liberals are entirely divided over the role of the state because modern liberals support state intervention into the economy when necessary, while classical liberals reject any state intervention.

Overall, liberals are divided to a fairly large extent over the role of the state because while they all believe it is a necessary evil - there is disagreement over the role of the state

| between classic and modern liberalism..... |



**ResultsPlus**  
**Examiner Comments**

This is a wide ranging answer. It is balanced and addresses the question well throughout, with a clear line of argument. This is an example of a strong level three response.

## Question 8

This was a less popular essay question. It was generally well answered, with stronger responses providing more balance and covering a wider range of areas of agreement and disagreement.

The New Right was a political theory that was both developed and implemented in the 1970s and 1980s in both the UK and USA. It is characterised by the blend of neo-conservatism, authoritarianism and neo-liberal economics.

One of the principal areas for discussion on the New Right is the importance of the economy. The revival of economic liberalism by the Chicago School and the movement towards market fundamentalism underpinned the New Right. Economists Hayek and Friedman criticised the Keynesian economic system for being ineffective and a hindrance to prosperity. They therefore advocated that the market was of moral and practical superiority to the government and should be left to operate as the central nervous system of the economy. Neo-liberal thinking is therefore summed up as 'private good; public bad'. The neo-liberal thinking also pushed for the 'rolling back of the State' in terms of social welfare. This is because welfare creates

a 'dependency culture' which saps initiative, and enterprise, in turn damaging prosperity. It also wished to roll back the State to protect individual liberty against the 'creeping collectivism' of a big State.

Neo-conservatives, ~~in the 1980s~~ are often thought to disagree with a minimal state due to their advocacy of a strong authoritarian state in terms of ~~and~~ maintaining social order. However neo-conservatives do support the 'rolling back' of the state in economic terms. This is because unlike paternalistic conservatives the New Right does not believe that social and economic reform are sensible means of maintaining order. Instead they believe that the state should be strong in terms of social discipline and minimal in the economy. This can be summarised by Thatcher Margaret Thatcher when she stated 'what this country wants is less tax and more law and order!'

A second area for debate comes with the view of the individual. Neo-conservatives can be seen to be backwards looking as they take the traditional conservative approach of imperfect individuals. They believe that individuals were born with 'original sin'. They also believed

that the lack of authority, ~~to~~ to control these morally flawed individuals, was the reason for the rise in crime and delinquency. This is why they advocated a tough law and order as this was perceived to be the only deterrent from crime, essentially 'prison works'.

Neo-liberals however contrast this completely. They draw from <sup>the</sup> classical liberal belief of self-reliant, rational individuals. These individuals are able to make their own decisions, particularly in terms of the market, and fashion their own destinies. The state should not try to prohibit these <sup>atomistic</sup> individuals from acting in their own best interests.

The conflicting view of the New Right in terms of the individual leads directly to their view of society. Neo-liberals see society as atomistic, a collection of individuals acting for themselves. They also see society as meritocratic, this means individuals are able to rise and fall in society. It rejects any notion of a rigid hierarchy as this means individuals are not free to prosper. The idea of being stuck in your social position also ~~denies individuals from~~ removes an economic incentive. They hold the



belief that life should be played on a 'level playing field' where social position is determined by individual efforts and talents.

The neo-conservatives however believe that a hierarchy within society is desirable, it gives individuals a sense of 'rootedness' and duties. A hierarchy is also necessary as authority can only be imposed 'from above', from a higher power such as a state. Social structure is therefore necessary to implement social discipline.

The importance of property is a unifying factor amongst the New Right. This can be evidenced through Thatcher's 'right to buy' scheme in the 1970s in which she encouraged the sale of state-owned homes.

The neo-conservatism justification for property is derived from the belief that owning property gives people a 'stake' in society. By owning property people see the importance in protecting it which results in support for law and order. It also encourages individuals to respect the property of others, thus deterring them from crime or anti-social behaviour. The ownership of property is thus essential for maintaining

social order.

Neo-liberals value property as an economic incentive within society. Property is an aspiration and desirable therefore people are driven by the desire to acquire it. This fosters competition and activity within the economy thus promoting prosperity.

The New Right can be seen to be unified as the ideologies it blends together are both rigid theories that were formed as a rejection to the political circumstance before it. Neo-liberalism was formed as an attack on the Keynesian economic system whilst ~~the~~ neo-conservatism was born as a response to the 'permissiveness' of the 1960s and 1970s.

The New Right was also very politically successful in both the UK and USA. In fact, Margaret Thatcher was the longest reigning British Prime Minister. Despite this her attempts to implement the New Right was not always successful, it led to many economic issues and social uprisings in terms of the poll tax and miners strikes. The USA also had financial trouble which led to Ronald Reagan's government bailing out banks.

Overall I believe there is more that divides the New Right than unifies it. The New Right is an ideological paradox, it attempts to blend the extremes of two very different ideologies. Neo-liberals and neo-conservatives held opposing views on both the individual nature and the State. It is these principles that are the core of all ideologies, thus the New Right cannot be seen as compatible.



**ResultsPlus**  
Examiner Comments

This is a wide-ranging answer which addresses areas of agreement as well as disagreement. There is a clear focus on the question. This is an example of a strong level three response.

## **Paper Summary**

Based on the 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 and 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 where required, but only where required.
- Provide short definitions of key concepts as appropriate.

## **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>

Ofqual



Llywodraeth Cynulliad Cymru  
Welsh Assembly Government



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