

Examiners' Report

June 2012

GCE Government & Politics
6GP03 3B

Edexcel and BTEC Qualifications

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

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

If you have any subject specific questions about this specification that require the help of a subject specialist, you can speak directly to the subject team at Pearson.

Their contact details can be found on this link: www.edexcel.com/teachingservices.

You can also use our online Ask the Expert service at www.edexcel.com/ask. You will need an Edexcel username and password to access this service. See the ResultsPlus section below on how to get these details if you don't have them already.



Get more from your exam results

...and now your mock results too!

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

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

For more information on ResultsPlus, or to log in, visit www.edexcel.com/resultsplus. To set up your ResultsPlus account, call us using the details on our contact us page at www.edexcel.com/contactus.

Pearson: helping people progress, everywhere

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 raising achievement through innovation in education. Find out more about how we can help you and your students at: www.pearson.com/uk.

June 2012

Publications Code UA032354

All the material in this publication is copyright
© Pearson Education Ltd 2012

Introduction

The general standard of responses in Unit 3B in this examination session was broadly in line with previous sessions. Two general issues would, nevertheless, be worth bearing in mind.

Firstly, although there are clear signs that essay performance in relation to synopticity has generally improved, in many cases synopticity marks are still lower than the marks for Assessment Objectives 1, 2 and 3. A continuing emphasis on ensuring that candidates recognise that each and every essay question is an invitation to debate or discuss a particular political issue would therefore have a beneficial impact.

Effective responses in this respect not only highlight the nature of that debate in the introduction to their essays, but also structure their argument around the contending viewpoints or perspectives.

Secondly, in doing this, candidates should not merely provide an account of rival stances or arguments, showing sometimes a largely descriptive awareness of the arguments that other people have put forward. Instead, they should analyse and evaluate these arguments in order to reach a reasoned but clear conclusion, recognising that all questions require answers. How effectively their answer (or conclusion) stands up in the light of the foregoing debate and discussion very largely determines the candidate's marks in terms of synopticity and Assessment Objectives 2 and 3.

As ever, though, a major discriminator in this examination (and possibly all examinations) was the extent to which candidates focused clearly on the question set, rather than on the general issue of the question.

Question 1

This was a popular question. A large proportion of responses demonstrated at least a basic understanding on the nature of negative freedom. However, the extent to which positive freedom was understood and explained, varied significantly. Only a minority was able to discuss, with any coherence, self-realisation or self-mastery.

In some weaker cases, one or both of the concepts of freedom was explained simply by reference to their implications for the state, seemingly implying that this defined the term. The key discriminator in this question was the extent to which both concepts of freedom were clearly explained, and not just discussed in terms of the difference between a minimal and an enabling state.

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

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

Chosen Question Number:

Question 1 ☒ Question 2 ☒ Question 3 ☒
Question 4 ☒ Question 5 ☒

Negative freedom is the absence of external constraints on an individual's liberty, such as coercion by another individual or by the state. Classical liberals have advocated negative freedom because it ~~allows~~ allows individuals to act freely and independently without interference. Negative freedom is upheld ~~by~~ by enforcing principles such as the rule of law, whereby ^{all} individuals are equal before the law, ~~where~~. This is a consequence of the ~~the~~ classical liberal belief in foundational equality among humans, ~~whereby~~ which maintains that as humans are born equal in the Judeo-Christian tradition, they should

to enjoy equal rights and entitlements.
~~Negative freedom~~ ^{early} The liberal thinker
Thomas Jefferson, for instance, advocated

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

a rights-based form of negative freedom whereby all ~~individual~~ humans have the 'inalienable' rights to life, liberty and the pursuit of happiness by virtue of being human. A belief in negative freedom leads to imply advocacy of a minimalist state in the 'nightwatchman' form envisioned by most Classical Liberals such as John Locke and James Madison.

Positive freedom recognises that there may be constraints on an individual's liberty which require external intervention, and thus ~~not~~ produces a form of developmental individualism - as opposed to negative freedom's egotistical individualism - ~~it~~ which seeks to promote human flourishing by helping individuals to help themselves. Positive freedom was the branchchild of modern liberal philosophers such as TH Green and Isaiah Berlin, who saw that unequal opportunity, in particular, could restrict freedom and thus sought to develop the classical liberal concept of negative freedom.

Positive freedom has led to beliefs in the importance of equality of opportunity, which for modern and social liberals such as Green ought to be provided by an enabling and altruistic state, whose role is far larger than classical advocates of negative freedom have envisioned. Positive freedom has also spawned the advent of welfareism, which was marked in the UK by the TP publication of the Beveridge Report in ~~1943~~ 1942, which sought to rid society of the five pillars of social exclusion - 'want, ignorance, squalor, idleness and disease'. This led to the formation of a welfare state which sought to provide what Beinh dubbed 'a level playing field' and enlarge freedom in a positive sense through the state provision of healthcare, unemployment benefit, housing ~~advice~~ and education.



ResultsPlus

Examiner Comments

This response contains an excellent understanding of the nature of negative freedom, which is discussed with genuine theoretical insight. The discussion of positive freedom is good. It acknowledges the role of human flourishing and the contribution of key thinkers, but it does not fully explain the sense in which positive freedom is positive. The response received 14 marks.

Question 2

Weaker responses to this question sometimes said little more about utopianism than that it involves a belief in a perfect society, with little or no reflection on why or how that society might be considered perfect or ideal. Stronger responses generally focused on the anarchist view of human nature, attempting to explain why anarchists believe that a stateless society and absolute freedom are realisable goals. The two key discriminators were the degree to which an understanding was demonstrated on the nature of utopianism and the extent to which the links between anarchism and utopianism were fully and clearly explained.

Indicate your first question choice on this page.

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

Put a cross in the box ☒ indicating the first question that you have chosen.

If you change your mind, put a line through the box ☒
and then indicate your new question with a cross ☒.

Chosen Question Number:

Question 1 ☒

Question 2 ☒

Question 3 ☒

Question 4 ☒

Question 5 ☒

Utopianism is the idea of a perfect society or an ideal world. Anarchists can be seen as linked to utopianism because of their optimistic view of human nature. Anarchists believe that humans are rational and social human beings. Anarchists believe that because of this, if left alone by the state and other forms of authority humans would be able to cope and live in society without harming each other. This can be seen as utopianism because critics would argue that this is a fantasy world belief and can never be reality. Liberals would argue that ~~the~~ negative freedom could arise as there would be no restraints on human action, and because of the selfishness of human nature one individual's freedom could harm another's.

Another link between anarchism and utopianism is the view Anarchists have of authority. Anarchists believe that any authority whether it be the church or the state is evil and not needed. The idea that society can be free and ~~doesn't~~ does not need regulations or rules is an example of utopianism.

Anarchists do not have a strategy of how this stateless society will come about, they just believe that it is right for society, since

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

anarchists do not believe in power it is unlikely that their stateless society will actually be a reality. Therefore supporting the view that anarchists are linked to utopianism because this society is unlikely to happen and therefore unrealistic.

However supporters of anarchists would argue that anarchism is linked to utopianism, but in a positive way. Anarchists have an optimistic view of human nature and would like to live in an ideal or perfect society. Supporters do not see this as a negative aspect of anarchism, in fact it just shows that anarchists have high values for humans and society.

In conclusion anarchism can be linked to utopianism in a negative way, they can be seen as having an unrealistic view of society. However they can also be linked to utopianism in a positive way, because of their faith in human nature.



ResultsPlus Examiner Comments

This response demonstrates a clear awareness of the nature of utopianism, reflecting on both its negative and positive aspects, even if the account of the positive model is a little rudimentary at times. The linkage between anarchism and utopianism is explained, although points are not always made in a coherent and ordered way. It received 12 marks.

Question 3

Most responses to this question had a clear understanding of how revolution differs from reform, but it was only in stronger responses that revolution was clearly and fully defined. This was a question in which the key discriminators included both quality and quantity considerations.

Strong responses were distinguished by the fact that they either or both offered a clear explanation of socialist arguments in favour of revolution and considered a range of such arguments, or at least more than a single argument. In some cases, the arguments offered were not convincing, as in the idea that some socialists have favoured revolution simply because it is quicker than reform.

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

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

Chosen Question Number:

Question 1 ☒

Question 2 ☒

Question 3 ☒

Question 4 ☒

Question 5 ☒

Marxists and other fundamentalist socialists advocated revolution rather than overthrowing the capitalist system, in contrast to social democrats who have sought to change it by evolutionary means such as the inevitability of gradualism.

Revolution is effective because it destroys capitalism and allows a qualitatively different system to take its place. Marxists believe that capitalism is systematically flawed because it relies on the exploitation of the proletariat by the bourgeoisie in order to provide surplus, meaning the workers are paid less than what their labour is worth. This leads to alienation and as the Marxist view of human nature is that they achieve self-actualisation through creative labour, shows that capitalism disassociates people from their nature as creative and sociable human beings (capitalism encourages competition rather than Kropotkin's ideal of 'mutual aid').

Revolution was seen as appealing because much of the working class did not have the right to vote in the past so direct action through revolution was the only way to be heard. The 'Sacred instinct of revolt' was seen to be the only way.

Also revolution does not involve political procedures with the state. In Marxism, the state is seen as a 'bourgeoisie state' which acts to preserve the interests of the ~~working~~ ruling classes and only in a proletarian revolution could this state be replaced by a 'dictatorship of the proletariat' which would work in the workers' interests. The state is seen as a weapon of the bourgeoisie as it is used to put forth a false ideology (notably liberalism) to prevent the working classes achieving class consciousness. Indeed some neo-Marxists claim it is the 'contented majority' which prevented proper social change as people became indoctrinated.

A Revolution works in the 'pre-history of mankind' as Marx's four stages had to be overthrown by class conflict to achieve Communism - primitive communism, slavery, feudalism and capitalism. Only with the overthrow of capitalism could collective ownership be enforced, allowing fairness and equality of outcome as all people are innately equal.



ResultsPlus

Examiner Comments

This response demonstrates a reliable understanding of revolution, even though it does not offer an explicit definition of the term. Its key strengths are that it contains at least three relevant socialist arguments in favour of revolution and, in each case, these arguments are clearly and carefully explained. The response received 15 marks.

Question 4

In only a small number of cases was the idea of an organic society completely misunderstood, usually being mistaken, however oddly, for the belief that there *is no such thing as society*. Strong responses nevertheless highlighted the idea of a complex web of social relationships, often pointing out that, from an organicist perspective, the whole is more than simply a collection of parts.

The key discriminators were, first, the extent to which the implications of the belief were clearly and fully explained and, second, the range of implications addressed. The range of legitimate implications was, as many candidates, recognised, wide.

Indicate your second question choice on this page.
You will be asked to indicate your third question choice on page 9.

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

Chosen Question Number: *Implications. Conservative belief in organic soc.*

Question 1 ☒ Question 2 ☒ Question 3 ☒
Question 4 ☒ Question 5 ☒ *Class conflict*

In order to determine the implications of the Conservative belief in the organic society, one must first define the Conservative notion of the organic society. ~~conservative~~ *Traditional* Conservatives liken state and society to a living organism in which each component has a purpose or specific role to play. The entire entity is more than the sum of its parts and as such society, which is necessarily hierarchical, is more important than ^{any} ~~the~~ individual within it.

This leads to the first and arguably most important implication of the organic society - the importance of the collective body over the individual. This is the basis of one of the main differences between conservative and liberal thought. Conservatives such as Edmund Burke disliked the French revolution, as Burke ~~commented~~ commented in his book "Reflections on the Revolution in France" (1790). Conservatives

had a negative reaction to the Enlightenment of the eighteenth century. This was based on the principle that society as a whole - or the whole ~~and~~ living organism - is more important than any individual or group of individuals.

Another implication of the Organic Society is the Conservative belief in hierarchy and the idea that every person has a function which cannot be changed. It is often likened to a pyramid, in which there are natural governors who have authority over others but do not exceed the sovereignty of the state and society as a whole. Additionally, if hierarchy ~~by~~ ^{by} implication is both natural and desirable, by implication, Conservatives perceive class, ~~by~~ but not class conflict. Individuals need rules, ~~and~~ restrictions and need to be governed by the natural governors of society which conservatives perceive themselves to be.

As the society is more important than any individual, it follows that Conservatives draw some of their most important ideas ^{on tradition} from this belief. The rationality of society as a ¹ whole over generations is more reliable than the rationality of any individual since humans are intellectually imperfect. Burke famously ~~had~~ reinforced this view by stating "The accumulated wisdom

You should start the answer to your third question choice on page 9

of the ages is the best source of virtue and goodness" in which the "accumulated wisdom" ^{of society} provides more rational thought than any individual within it.

Another implication can be identified as "One Nation" Conservatism, a term coined by Disraeli and enacted by Macmillan in the 1950s post war census. Disraeli highlighted the french term "Noblesse Oblige" which means "privilege entails obligation". This referred to the need to help the least well off in society which Disraeli defined as the "Poor Nation" in order ~~to elevate~~ to prevent more radical democratic demands and rebel revolution. This lead to ~~imperial~~ ~~this implications~~

Thus the implications of the Organic society can still be experienced today in the NHS in Britain and welfare and housing reforms.



ResultsPlus

Examiner Comments

This response provides a very clear, full and explicit understanding of the notion of an organic society. It also identifies at least four implications of organicism. Each of these implications is clearly explained, often with appropriate theoretical insight. The response received 15 marks.

Question 5

There were some fairly generalised responses to this question, in keeping with the standard of some anarchist responses in previous years.

Stronger responses nevertheless focused more clearly on the nature and implications of collectivism, from an anarchist perspective. These placed a particular emphasis on the assumptions about human nature that underpin it and noted how and why these help to sustain a belief in natural or spontaneous order.

Most responses chose, sensibly, to address the 'how' part of the question by drawing attention to the collectivist anarchist tradition, although this sometimes turned into an over-long descriptive account of that tradition. The key discriminators were the extent to which the 'how' part of the question and the 'why' aspect of the question elicited clear explanations.

Indicate your second question choice on this page.
You will be asked to indicate your third question choice on page 9.

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

Chosen Question Number:

Question 1 ☒ Question 2 ☒ Question 3 ☒
Question 4 ☒ Question 5 ☒

Collectivism: better to work collectively with shared responsibility rather than strive as an indiv.

Collectivist anarchists:

mutualism - fair exchange of goods + services
∴ collective

anarcho-syndicalism - rev trade unionism - decentralise,
no hierarchy ∴ work coll.

anarcho-comm - small self managing comms - direct
democracy + self gov. utopian.

common ownership + sociable co-op creatures

Collectivism can be defined as the belief that
it is better to work together with shared
responsibility rather than strive as an individer.
Anarchism can be seen to endorse this.

particularly through collectivist anarchists - one of the key strands of anarchism.

Anarchism can be linked to collectivism as

You should start the answer to your third question choice on page 9

it seeks to remove the state and therefore, communities will work together, collectively. Collectivist anarchists support the idea of common ownership which illustrates that people can work together without state intervention. This idea is endorsed through their belief in mutualism, created by Proudhon, as a fair exchange of goods and services are crucial.

Moreover, collectivist anarchists support anarcho-communism which Kropotkin considered a form of "mutual aid". This idea believes that supports small, self-managing communities as they are a form of self governance and direct democracy. They consider this to be possible as humans are naturally sociable and co-operative thus they can successfully live in harmony together.

Finally, collectivist anarchists support the idea of anarcho-syndicalism. This is a form of revolutionary trade unionism which is decentralised with no hierarchy. It works instead as a grass-roots idea thus it relies on humans working together with a collective goal.

In conclusion, anarchists have a significant link to collectivism particularly because they are anti-statist and consider the state to be ~~ea~~ a corrupting influence. Thus people work better in small communities. Collectivist anarchists in particular have a strong link due to their optimistic view on human nature.



ResultsPlus

Examiner Comments

This response contains clear understanding of the nature of collectivism. It also demonstrates an ability to explain how and why the propensities that underpin collectivism can be used to explain that 'people can live together without state intervention', although this sometimes lacks theoretical sophistication.

The 'how' part of the question is addressed, but this tends to be done largely through a reference to collectivist anarchism and, later, to anarcho-syndicalism.

The response received 11 marks.

Question 6

This question probably worked better in this form than in the previous ways in which it has been asked, usually by reference to ruling class ideology. Hardly any candidates misunderstood to what the *interests of the privileged and prosperous* referred. Many responses addressed the question through a discussion of the general features of conservative ideology, recognising both criticisms and defences of conservatism. Needless to say, the implications of the belief in authority, hierarchy and property received much attention, from this perspective.

However, many of the strongest responses placed considerable emphasis on conservative sub-traditions. Commonly, the *One Nation* tradition received a great deal of attention, but so did *New Right* thinking, with candidates (quite reasonably) linking the liberal New Right both to a stress on meritocracy and social mobility and to the rolling back of welfare provision.

The key discriminators in this question were the extent to which relevant criticisms and defences of conservatism were clearly explained and whether or not account was appropriately taken of conservative sub-traditions.

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

Chosen Question Number:

Question 6 ☒

Question 7 ☒

Question 8 ☒

It is often stated that "conservatism merely reflects the interests of the privileged and prosperous" and whilst it can be ^{argued} ~~stated~~ that conservatism seeks to protect the ~~interest~~ inheritance of property and tradition, there have been instances in conservative history where the interests of the less privileged have been protected, this is sometimes referred to as paternalism or One nation conservatism.

At the outset, the ^{pessimistic} ~~Conservative~~ view of human nature allows conservatives to ~~defend~~ justify their defense of their privileges and prosperity. Conservatives see human nature as imperfect in three ways, one of these is the morally imperfect human. There is profound scepticism about the natural goodness of human beings and a sense of original sin that

humans are innately selfish and as such need to safeguard their possessions and privileges against man who is inherently immoral. However a Marxist would criticise this view as simply an excuse to protect the "bourgeois ideology" it believes Conservation to be. A Marxist ~~view~~ could argue that ^{Conservative} ~~these~~ view of human is simply an excuse to protect the interests of the property owning classes ~~at the expense~~ in capitalism. Thus Conservatism can be seen to reflect the interests of the privileged and the prosperous.

The Organic theory of the state can be seen as the conservative justification for their belief in ~~natural~~ hierarchy, and natural governors. The Organic theory of the state likens State and society to a living organism in which the components work together in necessarily unequal harmony. The entire entity is more than the sum of its parts and as such, ~~the~~ society, which is necessarily hierarchical ~~and~~ is more important than any individual within it. The Organic state leads Conservatives to not only believe in ^{natural} hierarchy, but to suppose it is also desirable. Conservatives have argued that ~~there~~ they ~~view~~ perceive class, but not ~~class~~ ~~politics~~ class conflict. Thus those who are not as privileged or prosperous are happy as their society brings them stability, security and rootedness. However many modern liberals would see this as Conservatives ignoring social disadvantage and could ~~see~~ argue that their ~~re~~ ~~cases~~ ~~an~~ interest in protecting their privileges and prosperity is damaging to the equality of opportunity needed to allow

individuals to flourish and reach their potential. However Conservatives believe it is only with societies that

individuals can flourish and prosper, ~~and that~~ working towards a common goal is beneficial for society as a whole.

It was this strand of thinking that has led Conservatives such as Benjamin Disraeli to coin the term "One Nation" Conservatism. It was Disraeli's belief ~~that~~ that Britain was separating into ~~two~~ "Two Nations: the Rich and the Poor". It was Disraeli's wish to unite the two nations to become one. Disraeli feared that capitalism had allowed some individuals to accumulate wealth to the extent that they thought themselves superior to society as a whole. It was feared the ~~unions~~ uneasiness felt by the "Poor Nation" could manifest itself in radical ideas and form a revolution. Thus Disraeli felt the need for concessions to forestall ~~a~~ more radical democratic demands. ~~The~~ ~~The~~ idea of "Noblesse Oblige" which means "privilege entails obligation" was identified by Disraeli as the paternal duty of the "privileged" and "prosperous" to protect the interests of others further down in the pyramid hierarchy of ~~of others less fortunate in a circumstance of~~ society. These ideas were taken up by Macmillan in the 1950s in the Postwar Consensus. Welfare reforms such as the NHS and ~~the~~ proper housing were secured to ~~forestall~~ prevent outrage and support for communist ~~many~~ thought that had been gaining pace across Europe. This could be identified by "One nation" Conservatives as reflecting the common interests of the unified society as a whole rather than simply the prosperous. However it could

be argued by socialists & their followers of socialist thought that by providing a few benefits to the "proletariat" or "working classes" this could benefit Conservatives and protect their privileges and property in a wider sense. Thus Conservatives can be identified as ~~self-seeking~~ protecting their own interests by feigning an interest in those below them in the hierarchy.

Conservatives such as White would argue that "Privilege is the reward of bare honorable service" but by this White infers that those who have contributed to society, have a right to protect their ~~property~~ privileges such as property.

Conservatives stress the importance of ~~class~~ inheritance in tradition, both of practices and institutions from earlier periods and of property. It is seen as a natural right and that maintaining the correct order of society is beneficial for all not simply the prosperous.

Conservatives would argue that they do not merely reflect the interests of the privileged and prosperous as they simply have a pragmatic approach to dealing with problems. Conservatives argue that they ~~do~~ preserve what is best from the past and accept a limited and controlled response to changing circumstances rather than act with reference to utopian ideas or ^{rigid,} doctrinaire principles. Instead Conservatives argue that they are merely pragmatic and ~~responsive~~ reactionary in their approach to politics. White stated that "Conservatism is less a political doctrine than a habit of mind, a mode of feeling, a

way of living" and is not simply to victimise those who lack prosperity and privileges.

Overall Conservatives place great emphasis on Order and stability for the psychologically imperfect human who is security seeking and suspicious of change. Kirk ~~defined~~ cemented this principle by stating that "Genuinely ordered freedom is the only sort of liberty worth having".⁴ To this end, it is Conservatives believe it is ~~the task of the~~ ^{their} task as the natural governors of society, to provide for themselves in order that they can pass on their ^{and privileges} property they have inherited to the next generation. ^{This will} ~~to~~ provide another set of natural governors to ~~keep~~ guide the security seeking members of society to order and stability. In this way Conservatives believe they reflect the interests of society as a whole and ^{the} common interests of individuals can write "One Nation".^{However,} I believe Conservatism does reflect ~~the~~ the interests of the privileged and prosperous and paternalism is an excuse to prevent class conflict.



ResultsPlus Examiner Comments

This response is characterised by a good attempt to balance the arguments of both sides. Clear explanations are provided of criticisms of, and defences for, conservatism. The significance of the *One Nation* tradition is well discussed, but little attention is given to the *New Right*. There is a tendency for the response to be generalised, which means that not all of the points made are relevant to the question. The marks received were 10, 9, 9 and 7.

Question 7

Most candidates recognised that at its heart lay a disagreement between fundamentalist socialists and revisionist socialists, about the proper meaning and true nature of socialism.

In very strong responses, this was sometimes seen as a tension between those socialists who practise the 'politics of ownership', based on a core preference for common ownership over private ownership, and those who practise the 'politics of social justice', placing their emphasis instead more on redistribution and a narrowing of distributive inequalities.

When responses were weaker, this was usually because answers tended to be descriptive rather than analytical, and some were undermined by an unreliable focus on the question set, often leading to a generalised account of the core features of socialism.

The key discriminators in this question were the extent to which socialist arguments for and against wholesale common ownership were clearly explained, and whether or not these contrasting positions were appropriately evaluated.

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

Chosen Question Number:

Question 6 ☒

Question 7 ☒

Question 8 ☒

Common ownership is a core theme of socialism with all socialists considering it crucial to the prosperity of society. However, the strands of socialism - Marxism, Social Democracy and the Third Way have significantly different views on the extent of the importance of common ownership. Marxists consider it part of the crucifix of success whereas the Third Way consider other factors, ^{including economic prosperity} more important.

Marxists are without a doubt the staunch supporters of common ownership as they believe that ^{private} ~~property~~ breeds acquisitiveness, materialistic desires and it divides communities and groups. Co-operation and community are crucial to Marxists who ultimately seek a classless communist society in which everyone co-operates. Private

property; however, creates competition between people which ~~is~~ therefore prevents society from successfully working in harmony with one another. Marxists believe that a revolution would occur because there ~~are~~ ^{is} unequal

ownership of wealth and property with the Bourgeoisie owning all the modes of production whilst the Proletariat are exploited, oppressed and alienated from their product. Their belief in common ownership is a key reason for why the Proletariat ultimately become class conscious, due to irreconcilable differences, and rise up to overthrow the Bourgeoisie creating a dictatorship of the Proletariat. ~~After~~ Once a counter revolution has been prevented society will become classless and communist thus common ownership is achieved.

The extent that Marxists are willing to go in order to achieve this goal illustrates the importance of communal wealth. Moreover, Marxists consider capitalism to be inherently evil thus they seek to remove it. Capitalism is a key aspect which prevents common ownership of wealth ~~as~~ in society as it promotes competition and the necessity of individual hardwork, two actions which Marxists do not seek. Furthermore, Marxists ~~are~~ promote the idea of equality of outcome thus everyone will have the same wealth and property ~~once~~ in the end.

In contrast, Social democrats ~~have~~ support common ownership of wealth less particularly because they believe that capitalism has gradually matured with workers ~~having~~ receiving increased wages. The growth of trade unionism gives workers an increased ~~threat~~ ^{sense} of belonging and an opportunity to voice their opinions. Therefore, not only do Social Democrats, led by Bernstein, believe that a revolution is unlikely, they also tolerate capitalism and seek to reform it as they consider it the only reliable means of generating wealth. Their embracing of capitalism is a significant step away from the marxist support of communal wealth as it therefore ~~justifies~~ ^{legitimises} ~~that~~ inequality of wealth. ~~is~~ moreover, Social Democrats seek to reduce inequality but not remove it which therefore means that communal wealth is unlikely to be achieved.

However, Social Democrats do not disregard the idea of common ownership of wealth completely as they believe that there are significant problems within capitalism. It breeds structural inequality which leads to structural poverty and it is poor at ~~redistributing~~

redistributing wealth. Moreover, redistribution of wealth is crucial to social democrats which allows common ownership of wealth to be more likely. Furthermore, Social democrats

support common ownership of the commanding heights such as oil and gas industries thus illustrating the importance of ~~some~~ key wealth to be communally owned.

The Third Way are the next step on from Social Democracy and the most significantly removed from Marxism. ~~For~~ Most notably, under Blair, the Third Way did not repeal any of Thatcher's Trade Union or Privatisation legislation both of which go against the idea of common ownership of wealth. Privatisation increases the importance of the free market and therefore increases competition which makes communal wealth unlikely. Instead of achieving equality of outcome the Third Way seek equality of opportunity thus they follow a more meritocratic ideology allowing people to rise and fall within society. They seek to redefine

welfare so that it is only received by those who deserve it thus common ownership of wealth is made even more unlikely.

However, ~~these~~ The Third Way supported community and moral responsibility under Blair with Blair himself being a staunch supporter of communitarianism.

thus illustrating that community work remains important even if all of society won't have access to the same wealth.

In conclusion Socialism is split over their views on common ownership of wealth. In order for it to be achieved capitalism and inequality must be removed so that everyone has the same access to wealth.

This however is supported to differing degrees with Marxists supporting this viewpoint wholeheartedly whereas the Third Way are significantly removed from the idea due to the fact that they embrace capitalism, seeing it as an enabler to the prosperity of society. This therefore illustrates that Marxists

favour common ownership of wealth much more than the Third Way and Social Democrats tend to sit in the middle ~~with~~ with ideas of both; they seek partial but not complete common ownership of wealth. ~~It can therefore be considered complex~~



ResultsPlus Examiner Comments

This response contains a competent and largely accurate account of competing socialist traditions and their views on common ownership. Relevant comments are made about the Marxist, social democratic and Third Way traditions, even though these, at times, lack theoretical sophistication. The response received 10, 9, 9 and 7 marks.

Question 8

This was a popular question. Very few candidates failed to recognise that this question invited them to consider the tension between classical liberalism and modern liberalism over the state, specifically between the rival merits of a minimal or night-watchman state and an enabling or interventionist state.

In the very strongest cases, candidates showed an awareness of the fact that modern liberals only give qualified support to interventionism and rarely support intervention for its own sake, implying that the 'gap' between classical and modern liberalism is not as great as is often assumed.

Weak responses sometimes confused the desire to minimise the role of the state with the wish to establish limited government. Issues such as constitutionalism and democracy therefore had relatively little relevance to the question set.

The key discriminators in this question were the extent to which liberal arguments in favour of a minimal state and in favour of state intervention, were clearly explained, and whether or not the significance of the rival positions was evaluated.

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

Chosen Question Number:

Question 6 ☒

Question 7 ☒

Question 8 ☒

A liberal's key value is freedom of the individual. They believe freedom is the essential nature of the individual and the suppression of liberty is a fundamental political evil. The state, though considered necessary, is a 'necessary evil' (the state being the sovereign body in society with the right the ability to impose law and order via government, and ultimately limit freedom). However liberalism is divided between negative and positive ideas of freedom, and with these modern and classical theories of liberalism, which envisage different roles for the state.

in order to enable their conceptions of freedom, and also equality, which comes in different forms.

Classical liberalism certainly is 'defined by the desire to limit the state'. The original liberals believed that freedom was of the

'negative' variety, i.e. freedom from external constraints. Each individual has a sovereign right to this freedom, by virtue of foundational equality - pure existence or as a rational being, i.e. giving innate dignity and worth. However, as J.S. Mill argued, negative freedom must always be subject to the 'harm principle' - we idea meet we are free as far as we cannot impinge on the freedom of others, ~~and~~ limiting their sovereignty and preventing their 'natural rights' (e.g. freedom of speech or movement). There needs to be a body which can enforce these rights, and create a system of protection for the individual by which we are also obligated to obey and respect (i.e. follow laws and thus not threaten the rights + liberty of others). This is the state, and 'social contract' theory - as mentioned by thinkers Hobbes and Locke. Hobbes declared a society without protection would be a 'state of nature' and life

would be 'hasty, brutish and short' and thus we must sacrifice a portion of our liberty to preserve the general

liberty of all. The state is thus necessary - however, it does also embody a form of power over others, and as a compulsory and possibly coercive body, limit our freedom, if we did desire to break its laws. Locke desired the state to protect 'life, liberty and ^{private} property' and nothing more, thus the state should be limited as much as possible ('rolled back') and especially have no interference in the private sphere - with the 'care of men's souls' - implicating toleration of diversity and religion. Locke also believed that if the state became more than the 'night watchman' and began to prevent liberty, more to men protecting it, we had a right to overthrow it, as government functions via the consent of the governed. This is seen in liberal attempts to fragment political power and disperse it; by external checks on government (codified constitution, ~~separate~~ codified bill of rights, neutral and independent judiciary enforcing 'higher law') and internal (bicameralism, parliamentary government,

free and fair elections, federalism, etc.) - It is also rejected in economic policy; we desire to limit the state rejects in the free market ideas by liberals such as Adam Smith, who in 'The Wealth of Nations' advocated de-regulation, lifting of trade barriers, etc as the economy is a series of interrelated markets which reach a natural equilibrium via supply and demand. This rejects Mill's idea of a 'free market of ideas' but in the economic sense is both morally beneficial (prevents 'dependency culture' and allows individuals to freely flourish) ~~and~~ and is economically beneficial, bringing prosperity and by virtue of the 'invisible hand' these ~~the~~ would trickle down into society through altruism and general increase of wealth.

used by Marxist - 'T.H. Green'
However, modern liberals consider freedom and equality altogether different, and this shows us a different view of the state, for both moral and ideological, and economic, reasons.

Firstly, the concept of 'positive' freedom is key - freedom is not defined by external constraints but by the ability to exercise our freedom and rationality, to be our own autonomous master. Freedom is only positive if it enables us to flourish and develop as an individual, and Mill placed great emphasis on the 'higher pleasures' i.e. developing the moral, intellectual and aesthetic sensibilities as more important than 'lower' pleasures - the physical. If we only have, as with the ~~the~~ Classical liberal ideal, the 'freedom to stare' what good is it? If the state only provides us with political and formal equality, we have name equality and enjoyed natural rights, but what chance do we have to access them, if we are impoverished labourers intent on survival? Thus the Classical liberal does not envisage a society where our key goal is to minimise the role of the state as envisaged by the classical liberals - or at least it does want to minimise the state, it is still a 'necessary evil' of sorts,

but this is in line with a different conception of freedom. The 'enabling state' intervenes in society to a degree as to ~~be~~ secure 'positive' freedom for all. Thus we have explained the moral benefits, this then leads us directly to economic and welfare interventionism. John Rawls explained this in terms of a 'thought experiment' - if we, behind a 'veil of ignorance', were to imagine the best society in line with equal freedom for all, not knowing where we'd be placed, and ensure a certain amount of state intervention for the lowest classes, so that all may equally flourish. Thus the state may provide equality of opportunity (to rise and fall in a meritocracy) and rights not only foundational but to things like welfare, education and a degree of redistribution of wealth via taxation - a key example of this is the 1942 Beveridge Report, attacking the 5 evils of society which included squalor and idleness. This ~~too~~ extends, in economic

to accepting the principles of John Maynard Keynes, who argued against untamed capitalism, in order to ensure employment by the state actually increasing 'aggregate demand' by injecting money into the economy and creating purposefully a budget deficit. Thus the state is a key actor in social justice, but always in order to preserve positive freedom and equality of opportunity.

To conclude, one might here dispute ~~on the~~ a prime facet observation of both modern and classical liberalism, that the key aim of all liberals is to limit the role of the state however, though they both desire to protect freedom and limit the state (as 'power corrupts - Lord Acton) in line with their shared idea of freedom.



ResultsPlus Examiner Comments

This response provides a thorough and wide-ranging account of the various attitudes within liberalism towards the state, based on good insight into both classical liberalism and modern liberalism. Although theoretical insights could, at times, have been more fully developed, good use is made of the link between contrasting views of the state and contrasting views of freedom. The response received 10,10,9 and 8 marks.

Paper Summary

General examination tips to improve performance on this unit include the following:

- Make sure that candidates know that, as far as examinations are concerned, relevance is all. However impressive their knowledge and intellectual skills may be, if they do not address the issues raised by the question, they cannot receive reward.
- Conceptual understanding is vital. Candidates should be able to produce clear and accurate single-sentence definitions of key terms related to the Unit, and, in the case of core concepts, they should be able to discuss these terms with insight and in some depth. Many short question responses, for instance, should start with a discussion of the meaning of the key term used in the question (few of them do so at present).
- The key to success in many short questions is to consider both quality and quantity issues; that is, to make sure that ideological arguments are fully and clearly explained (and not simply or briefly described) and that account is taken of an appropriate range of such arguments.
- Short question responses do not require a generalised introduction in the manner of essay questions. They are not mini essays.
- Performance in essays is strongly affected by candidates' ability to recognise the need to satisfy a variety of requirements. Although they generally understand the need to provide accurate and comprehensive knowledge and understanding (AO1), many candidates place insufficient emphasis on demonstrating the skills of analysis and evaluation (AO2), showing an awareness of contending sides of the argument (synopticity) and the ability to develop a clear and coherent argument (AO3).

Grade Boundaries

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

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

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

Telephone 01623 467467

Fax 01623 450481

Email publication.orders@edexcel.com

Order Code UA032354 June 2012

For more information on Edexcel qualifications, please visit

www.edexcel.com/quals

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



Llywodraeth Cynulliad Cymru
Welsh Assembly Government

