

Examiners' Report
June 2013

GCE Government and 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 or www.btec.co.uk.

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



Giving you insight to inform next steps

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

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

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

Pearson: helping people progress, everywhere

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

June 2013

Publications Code UA036086

All the material in this publication is copyright
© Pearson Education Ltd 2013

Introduction

The standard of responses in Unit 3B during this examination session was broadly in line with that in previous sessions. None of the questions posed particular problems and there were very few examples of candidates misunderstanding questions. However, a major discriminator was the degree to which candidates focused on the specific question set. Where candidates did not do this, they provided general information about the ideology in question or they reproduced an answer to a different question and one that had come up in the previous examination series.

Candidates who spend time thinking about the question itself and working out how they can construct a coherent and relevant response have a major advantage over other candidates. Such time is never wasted. Other important discriminators included strong responses demonstrating thorough and confident conceptual knowledge, not just defining terms accurately, but also discussing rival conceptions or meanings of terms where relevant. In contrast, other responses either provided very rudimentary definitions or, more commonly, simply took terms to be self-evident.

The better responses tended to be analytical with arguments and viewpoints properly explained and, where relevant, evaluated compared with others that were highly descriptive. On essay questions, higher marks were achieved by candidates who dealt with the demands of synopticity better than others who found this difficult. It is surprising, in view of the age of the specification, how many candidates still struggle to deal effectively with the synoptic aspect of essay questions, often providing largely one-sided responses, or responses that do not show a clear awareness of the debate that lies at the heart of the question itself. As in previous years, the best responses demonstrated a level of knowledge and understanding, and a confidence in deploying intellectual skills that was truly impressive, showing genuine insight into theoretical and ideological issues and providing evidence of good and stimulating teaching.

Question 1

This was a popular question. The principle discriminators were the number of relevant conservative justifications for private property that candidates identified and the extent to which each of these were fully and clearly explained. Some responses tended to rely on just a single justification, which sometimes was repeated with the wording slightly adjusted, or by a purely descriptive or highly rudimentary account of the justifications. In some cases, arguments were given for private property to be seen sometimes as an expression of tradition, possibly on the grounds that everything in conservatism is linked in some way to tradition. However, in the very best responses, candidates were able to distinguish between traditional conservative justifications for private property and those associated more with the New Right. In these cases, a recognition was demonstrated that conservatives have viewed private property as both a right and a duty.

For conservatives, the most basic right of individuals is an ordered society, indeed Burke stated 'Good order is the foundation of all good things' and Hobbes warned of the 'nasty, brutish and short' outcome of a disordered society. It comes as no surprise that, that the conservative support for ^{private} property, something that it shares with liberal philosophy, is rooted in the conservative desire for order and security. They believe that private property is essential to social stability. Those who own property are more likely to exhibit social responsibility. This is because they have a stake in society and are therefore more likely to contribute to the preservation of order. Conservatives see property as a means to creating a more cohesive society that conforms to their vision of an organic society. Conservatism as a movement however has not always been supportive of universal property rights. While Margaret Thatcher may have advocated the 'property and share-owning democracy', early conservatives felt threatened by the rise of the property owning class. This rise in the capitalist middle class threatened to sweep away the existing traditional authority.

of the ruling class. But pragmatism soon led them to support the interests of all those who own property. They supported measures such as low property taxation, opposition to nationalisation and a hard stance on law and order. This ensured the support of the middle class particularly in Britain where they are seen as traditional conservative voters.



ResultsPlus

Examiner Comments

This is a Level 2 response. The principle justification highlighted is linked to the ability of property to promote order and stability. This is explained both in terms of the underlying conservative fear of disorder and the capacity of property to give people a stake in society, so generating social cohesion. This places the response towards the top of Level 2, but it does not achieve Level 3 because of the absence of a clear additional justification. The final section of the response is less coherent and less clearly related to the question set. This response gained 10 marks.

Question 2

There were some very good responses to this question. In some respects, every aspect of liberalism could be said to be linked to individualism, so foundational is the principle of individualism to liberal thinking. That said, some responses explained how and why liberal ideas and theories have drawn on individualism much more effectively than others. Good responses were often able to provide a very full account of individualism, providing not only an accurate single-sentence definition of the term, but discussing rival conceptions of individualism - methodological and ethical individualism, as well as egoistical and developmental individualism. Such an approach often led to the construction of highly impressive answers. The best responses were able to show not only how individualism shapes core liberal ideas, for example, freedom, but also how different conceptions of individualism have produced rival positions within liberal ideology, notably, difference between classical and modern liberalism.

Individualism is seen as the defining feature of liberalism. Individualism is the belief in the supreme importance of the individual over any collective body or social group. Within liberalism, there are various forms of individualism, and both classical liberals and modern liberals express a varying link between liberalism and individualism.

Firstly, there are differences between classical and modern liberal views. Classical liberals believe in egoistical individualism. Egoistical individualism emphasises self-interest & self-reliance. It is based on the view that individuals are self-interested creatures. Alternatively, modern liberals believe in developmental individualism. T. H. Green expressed that human beings stressed the ~~fact~~ human capacity to realise their full potential, & and focused on human-flourishing. As such, both classical

and modern liberals advocate differing views of individualism, and these have ~~various~~ various implications for liberal beliefs on the state, welfare system etc.

Secondly, the link between individualism and liberalism is strengthened due to the belief in human beings as autonomous creatures. Immanuel Kant argues all human beings are born equal, and therefore of equal moral worth. He states humans are 'ends in themselves'. Autonomy implies the individual should be free from all restrictions and constraints, emphasising ~~the~~ individual sovereignty.

Furthermore,

~~Thirdly~~ liberals believe in natural rights. These are inalienable rights, ^{often} seen as God-given, in virtue of being human. These rights are expressed in form of civil liberties & human rights, which stress the link between individualism & liberalism.

Thirdly, liberalism advocates individualism on the basis of ~~rationality~~. Individuals are human nature. Liberals have ~~an~~ optimistic view of human nature, believing that individuals are rational creatures. ~~In addition~~ This enables them to act in ~~their~~ best the best interest of themselves and society. ~~Additionally~~, ~~individuals~~ They are able to use ~~reason~~ reason to make rational decisions. ~~Additionally~~, individuals are superior, due to ~~these~~

are free will. They are the only creatures who possess free will & the ability to make moral decisions. On this basis, there is a strong link between individualism and liberalism.

However, liberals do not have ~~absolute~~ blind support for individualism. ~~Modern~~ liberal Although the individual is sovereign, minimal regulation is required in order to ensure conflict, exploitation and disorder do not occur. Utilitarianism, as developed by Jeremy Bentham & Mill, argue for the maximum utility: 'greatest happiness for the greatest good'. As such, majority rule overpowers individual views.

Therefore, within liberalism there are varying forms of individualism; development and egoistic. Although ~~classical~~ ^{modern} liberals adopt a more collectivist viewpoint, there remains a strong link between liberalism and individualism.



ResultsPlus

Examiner Comments

This is a Level 3 response. It provides a very clear overall definition of individualism, and highlights the contrasting ideas of egoistical individualism and development individualism, showing how these explain differences between classical and modern liberalism. In addition, it explains how and why individualism shapes liberal thinking on matters such as human nature, personal autonomy, rights and freedom. The response is consistently analytical and the communication is effective. The response received 15 marks.

Question 3

A large proportion of candidates recognised that this question addresses the Fabian Society belief in 'the inevitability of gradualism', although an explicit reference to this was not necessary to achieve a high Level 3 mark. Where candidates attempted to provide an explanation at the outset of 'gradualism', this usually provided the basis for a more coherent overall response. In some cases, responses went little beyond offering a largely descriptive account of the democratic 'road' to socialism, without explaining why this 'road' was assured of success. In other cases, the only explanation given was that the working class are in the majority. Better responses, on the other hand, not only pointed out why the working class constitutes the majority in traditional industrial societies, but also why they would use their vote to support socialist parties and how the formation of socialist governments would lead to a transformation from capitalism to socialism.

This was a question in which the distinction between descriptive and analytical responses was of particular importance. Some candidates wasted time by discussing why the democratic 'road' had failed, rather than why its victory was thought to be inevitable.

One reason that democratic socialists believe that the victory of gradualism is inevitable* is that with the advent of political democracy largely from the late ~~nineteenth~~ nineteenth century onwards, which caused huge ~~optimism~~ optimism throughout much of the socialist movement, there was a belief that political equality would be achieved throughout capitalist society primarily ensured by working class enfranchisement. Secondly they believe

A second reason is that given the exploitative nature of capitalist ~~or~~ the political home of the working is always socialism, and as a result this would lead to growing

participation and political education, as well as the growth of working class institutions such as trade unions, sports and social clubs and political parties.

Thirdly, given that the parliamentary democracy ~~represented~~ supposedly reflects the interests of the majority, social democrats would inevitably be in power consistently, as they would enjoy the support of the working class, ~~the undoubtedly~~ undoubtedly the largest social group within society.

Finally, due to the fact that they always enjoy ~~majority~~ the support of the majority, this means that they would be able to drastically transform society through a peaceful process of social reform which, due to their ~~office~~ ~~sup~~ holding office being supposedly guaranteed, would ultimately lead to a transform of society and the economy from capitalism to socialism.

* A belief influenced by the ideas of the Fabian Society, who helped influence the UK Labour Party. ^{largely}



ResultsPlus

Examiner Comments

This is a Level 3 response. It highlights the significance of the extension of the franchise to the working class, points out why working class voters will see socialism as their political home, and notes that the advance of parliamentary socialism is linked to the numerical strength of the working class. These points were explained clearly, but with insufficient development and sophistication to get into the mid or high Level 3 bands. The response gained 12 marks.

Question 4

Some responses to this question paid little attention to the ideas of constitutionalism and consent. Instead, they turned the question into one about the anarchist critique of the state, arguing, usually simplistically, that as anarchists reject the state they must also reject constitutionalism and consent, as these could not exist without the state. Better responses recognised the supposed role and purpose of constitutionalism and consent, and were able to contrast the conventional notion, based on liberal theory, that constitutionalism and consent are vital mechanisms for taming government power and preventing tyranny, with the anarchist belief that their purpose is to deepen oppression by creating the myth of limited government. This myth enslaves, rather than emancipates the masses. Candidates were often able to develop impressive responses when they explained why anarchists believe that government is not less oppressive and objectionable for being cloaked in constitutionalism and democracy.

Anarchists have rejected constitutionalism as it ~~is~~ acknowledges the presence and power of the state which they believe is fundamentally wrong as any power exercised over another is in danger of becoming repressive and tyrannical. Constitutionalism, the liberal concept, envisions a set of laws and power checks in order to hold the state accountable but anarchists believe any power exerted over someone else, at any level is wrong as 'Power corrupts, absolute power corrupts absolutely', a view similar to libertarians.

Anarchists reject consent as it again acknowledges the process of one holding

power over another. An example of consent would be the 'social contract' theory by Locke where one gives up part of their freedom ~~in order~~ so the state can keep order. Anarchists reject this as giving the state power opens the door to corruption and tyranny of the majority, a concept John Stuart Mill developed. Anarchists instead believe in ultimate freedom, rather than negative freedom, as even minimal state control is undesirable.

The existence of a state or ~~part~~ body exercising power in any form is undesirable. Even within a liberal framework designed to counteract tyranny such as in America where the three bodies: congress, senate and the President, check each other's power, there still lies the possibility of abuses of power such as emergency powers where a President can put through laws uncontested, or even within Germany, Hitler achieved dictatorial status through the constitution. Anarchists do not believe that the

risk is worth taking and that all power is untrustworthy so constitutionalism and consent, as they acknowledge the existence of power, they should be rejected outright.



ResultsPlus
Examiner Comments

This is a Level 3 response. It demonstrates a sound understanding of both constitutionalism and consent, and offers some clear explanation of anarchists concerns about constitutionalism and consent, helpfully contrasted with liberal thinking. However, these points were not sufficiently developed to merit a mark in the mid or high Level 3 bands. The use of the Acton to illustrate the anarchist viewpoint shows some confusion, as anarchists would never argue that only absolute power corrupts absolutely. The response gained 11 marks.

Question 5

There were some very impressive answers to this question and with most demonstrating at least a basic understanding of relevant issues. The neoliberal critique was often explained particularly well, with good use being made of the rejection of economic and social intervention. Good responses were able to explain where and when neoliberals are prepared to accept the need for the state, even if only as a necessary evil. Where some candidates fell down was in confusing neoconservatism for paternalist conservatism, arguing that neoconservatives support welfare and social reform, and so did not recognise that neoconservatives agree with neoliberals in rejecting economic and social intervention. However, better responses focused on the implications for the state of neoconservative authoritarianism, often seeing the the New Right as being characterised by support for a strong but minimal state. Some very good responses were able to discuss tensions between neoliberalism and neoconservatism over the state's role in moral matters.

Neoliberals are a form of both liberalism and conservatism as they share values from both. Neoconservatives stem from traditional conservatism.

The neoliberal view of the state is the same as a classical liberalist, which is that it should have a laissez faire attitude and minimal intervention. However, neoliberals are strongly in favour of a free-market economy where the individual can express their freedom. In other words, neoliberals think the state should intervene with political matters; in order to keep liberty restored, but not in economic matters, as individuals should be free to achieve self-realisation and fulfill their potential, which is a key liberalism belief.

On the other hand, neoconservatives hold a different view of the role of the state to neoliberals. They believe in state intervention which stems back to the traditional conservative belief ~~which is~~ on human nature, which suggests humans lack morals and without authority will all fight for power. ~~They also~~ This strongly differs from ~~neoliberals'~~ neoliberals' view, that the state should have minimal intervention.

Another key concept of neoconservatism regarding the state is that they believe in strong punishment for crime. This will prevent individuals from stepping out of line and reinforce the hierarchy that conservatives so strongly agree with. Neoliberals are more reasonable with their views on human nature, and whilst they agree that it would be too competitive a world without the state, they oppose the view of any harsh punishments.

To conclude, neoliberals believe in a state that intervenes politically, but lets the economy run

itself, this comes from the classical liberalist view that individuals should be able to pursue freedom. In contrast, neoconservatives crave strong state intervention as it supports all of their traditional beliefs such as hierarchy and their view on human nature.



ResultsPlus

Examiner Comments

This is a Level 3 response. It contains a clear and full account of the neoliberal view of the role of the state, recognising in particular its rejection of economic intervention. However, the account of neoconservative thinking is less clear.

Neoconservative support for strong punishment is noted, but the relevance of conservative thinking about matters such as human nature and authority is not brought out fully. This places the response in the low band of Level 3. It gained 12 marks.

Question 6

This was a popular question. The majority of candidates who attempted it recognised that the underpinning debate concerned tensions within liberalism over support for democracy. In some cases, candidates saw this as essentially a debate between classical liberals and modern liberals, the former rejecting democracy while the latter supporting it. In some cases, the issue of democracy tended to fade from view, as attention turned instead to wider tensions within liberalism. On the other hand, better candidates were able to use the classical/modern liberal divide to pick out and explain particular arguments over democracy, without giving the impression that liberalism has shifted from wholehearted opposition to democracy to wholehearted support for it.

The principle discriminators in this question were the extent to which liberal arguments for and against democracy were analysed and explained, rather than simply described, and the clarity and insight that was demonstrated in the process. Good responses were able to focus on a range of arguments in each side, while others were often over-dependent on a small number of arguments, and in some cases only focused on concerns about the 'tyranny of the majority'.

Liberal democracy is a political regime which combines a 'liberal' preference for limited government with a 'democratic' preference for majority rule. The key features of a liberal democracy are regular free and fair elections (based on universal adult suffrage), significant constraints on government power (in the form of constitutionalism, consent and rule of law) and a vigorous civil society.

Liberal democracy is arguably a contradiction in terms as liberalism promotes ~~the~~ individualism (the primacy of the rights of the individual over any group, society or state) and ~~reason~~ rationalism (the belief that knowledge flows from reason and logic, rather than tradition, custom or faith); both of which suggest that individuals can govern

themselves and that, ^{thus,} ~~that~~ a democracy ('rule by the people') is not necessary.

Furthermore, Liberals are traditionally extremely weary of democracy as it suggests collectivism (the belief that individuals work best, that is most ethically and efficiently, in cooperative social groups rather than as self striving individuals) which Liberals are directly opposed to. In addition, democracy implies majoritarianism and the potential for 'tyranny of the majority'; the rule of the 51% which can result in the oppression of minorities. This also does not follow Liberal's belief in the significant value of every individual.

Liberalism is arguably defined by its promotion of individual freedom (the ability to think or act as one wishes); however, democracy suggests equality over freedom. In addition, democracy suggests increasing state political and economic intervention which may result in

threat to property rights and the over management of the free-market economy which could affect its ability to reach a natural equilibrium.

~~Democracy~~ Democracy can also be associated with the production of dangerously powerful demagogues, such as Hitler, ~~which~~ ^{which} is directly opposed to liberal's desire to have a minimal state and fear of ^{their} the oppression of minorities which ~~is~~ ^{contradicts} their belief in toleration. (I may not agree with what you say but I shall defend to the death your right to say it - Voltaire)

However, liberal democracy is arguably not a contradiction as both classical liberals and modern liberals advocate the need for a state, ^{to different extents,} ~~and~~ ^{in order to} ~~protect~~ ^{protect} rational but self-serving individuals from one another. Classical liberals advocated a 'nightwatchman state' and believed that it was a 'necessary evil'. Thomas Jefferson famously said 'that government is best which governs the least'. Furthermore, modern liberals advocated government intervention in the economy to promote positive freedom,

freedom for individuals to ~~in~~ develop their skills and achieve ~~their~~ fulfilment. Thus, to different extents, liberals promote government intervention and thus the idea of a 'liberal democracy' is not a contradiction as it merely means that ~~they~~ it is possible to impose the required restrictions on government, in order to ensure that it is controlled but effective. This can be done through constitutionalism, the separation of powers, bicameralism, ~~intervention~~ and many other methods.

Furthermore, Liberals believe that in order to have power the government should have legitimate authority. This can only be provided through consent, the agreement of the people to be governed which grants the government legitimate authority.

In addition, liberals believe in the rationalisation of human beings, also promotes their support for democracy which is an educative process which allows individuals to make rational choices and develop ~~themselves~~

intellectually.

Democracy can also promote a tolerant and stable society, which is favoured by liberals, as it can allow the peaceful discussion of disputes through debate rather than violence.

In addition, democracy can help individuals to promote civil liberties. Liberals also believe that the people can act as a limiting force on the government and that through the creation of a liberal democracy a social contract is formed. A social contract is an agreement of individuals to be governed, in a sense resulting in authority from below. This means that the government should act in the interests of the individuals but, if they do not and they break the contract, the individuals have the right to rebel and overthrow the government.

In conclusion, ~~with~~ the term 'liberal democracy' may initially seem

contradictory due to the Liberal beliefs in individualism and rationalism which suggest opposition to any form of centralised control or democracy. However, in reality Liberal democracy is not a contradiction in terms as it merely allows limits to be enforced on government, thus promoting core Liberal doctrine, whilst also allowing majority rule to ensure that governors have legitimate authority.



ResultsPlus

Examiner Comments

This is a Level 3 response. Liberal democracy is clearly explained at the outset, setting up the overall argument well. The response contains a very thorough and accurate account of the arguments on both sides, highlighting consistencies and inconsistencies between liberalism and democracy. The analysis is often sophisticated. The response is very well organised and coherently developed and it focuses consistently on the issues raised by the question. The marks received were 11, 11, 10 and 8, producing an overall score of 40.

Question 7

For a question about socialist attitudes to capitalism, it was surprising that few candidates who attempted the question provided a definition of any kind of capitalism. Where this was done, it often led to a better focused and more insightful analysis. Few responses did not recognise that there has been a major disagreement over capitalism between fundamentalist socialists, usually identified as Marxists or communists, and revisionist socialists, usually identified as social democrats, the former rejecting it while the latter embracing it, at least to some extent. However, while some responses largely provided descriptive accounts of these contrasting positions, using empirical examples to support their points, better responses analysed and explained the contrasting positions. For example, in dealing with the fundamentalist critique of capitalism, emphasis was placed on why and how capitalism constitutes a system of class oppression, and for which reason it is incapable of reform. Similarly, better responses were able to explain how and why revisionist socialists had revised their analysis of capitalism, and were also able to discuss those aspects of capitalism revisionists wished to preserve and those they wanted to reject. Good use was sometimes made of neorevisionism, explaining how this has moved social democracy to a closer alignment with capitalism. On the other hand, in some cases the emphasis on neorevisionism almost obscured the more important revisionist stance.

PLAN:

YES → MARX - capitalism doomed to fail

fundamentalist → politics of ownership - common ownership

capitalism inherently flawed + imperfectable

revolution

NO → reformist → Bernstein, work within capitalism - humanize

→ redistribute wealth through prog. tax + welfare

→ capitalism benefits all by producing wealth

Early socialism developed as a reaction against the increasing exploitation and oppression of the newly formed early working class and therefore encapsulated a rejection of capitalism as an inherently flawed and unimprovable economic system. However, reformist socialists (social democrats) ~~now~~ argue that capitalism itself can be improved and 'humanized' and therefore does not reject it outright. This debate is a main source of tension within socialist thought.

Fundamentalist socialism can be said to be defined by its rejection ^{of} capitalism. Capitalism was seen as a system of

class oppression which exploited the masses, led by the ruling class. All institutions within capitalist society, especially the state, therefore served to protect the interest of the ruling class and ensure the working class remained powerless.

Exploitation was caused by surplus value - that is, labourers being paid less than their labour is worth in order for profit to be made. Capitalism's constant quest for profit meant that it could never create equality of outcome. ~~as this was~~ a key aim of fundamentalist socialists such as Marx. Capitalism is therefore viewed as irredeemable, as it is inherently unjust and relies upon exploitation in order to make profit.

Marx viewed the destruction of capitalism as inevitable, due to its inherent contradictions. ~~passed~~ "within capitalism lies the seed of its own destruction" which Marx viewed as the proletariat. They were the 'gravediggers' of capitalism and through their inevitable revolution would cause the end of capitalism. ~~There would be~~ ~~is~~ capitalism consisted of two classes - the proletariat and the bourgeoisie. Just as all previous stages of history had ended due to class struggle, so too would capitalism. The dialectic between the two classes would eventually, combined with rising working class consciousness due to deep economic crises, result in revolution, cutting ties with capitalism and eventually leading to a communist society in which everyone would own wealth in common.

Fundamentalist socialism focuses on the politics of ownership and therefore views justice as being equality of outcome. Work is seen as a communal activity and therefore the 'fruits of their labour' should be enjoyed by

the whole community. work also strengthens the bonds of common humanity and fraternity, leading to the social solidarity which is part of our human nature. Capitalism oppresses ~~the~~ our nature as it fosters competition between us, and inequality in society as a result of unequal distribution of wealth. Inherent to capitalism is the institution of private property which is believed to be divisive and fosters conflict. ~~This is not the~~

The rejection of capitalism throughout fundamentalist socialism has tended to lead to a belief in revolution as this ensures complete transformation of society. Capitalism and socialism are therefore viewed as qualitatively different.

As capitalist societies developed, socialist attitudes to capitalism shifted. Bernstein revised Marx's interpretation of the capitalist model, arguing that despite capitalism being deeply flawed, it is reformable and redeemable through a process of 'humanising'.

~~That~~ Bernstein argued that capitalism was not merely a system of class oppression. The state and other societal institutions were a neutral force rather than biased towards ruling class interests and therefore could be used as a means of improving capitalism, hence the belief in a parliamentary route towards socialism.

Society had become increasingly graduated and complex, with members of the working class increasing as people were able to accumulate wealth through hard work in the free market. The meritocratic aspect of capitalism was

seen to be benefitting more and more workers and therefore prosperity ~~was~~ was increasing. Far from becoming more fragmented, Bernstein argued that society was becoming more complex due to capitalism. It had in a sense proved its worth, with unemployment levels at a low and poverty being reduced.

Capitalism had been shown as ~~the~~ perhaps the only reliable means of generating wealth. It could therefore be harnessed and used as a means of creating a welfare state to prevent poverty and increase social justice. This could be achieved through progressive taxation and the redistribution of wealth. Politics of ownership was abandoned in favour of the politics of social justice, and therefore capitalism couldn't ~~co~~ coexist alongside common ownership but it could produce a society in which each has their needs satisfied and abject poverty is eradicated through an extensive welfare state. Equality of opportunity within capitalism became the main focus of socialists. The general prosperity that capitalism generated benefited society as a whole and therefore it is seen as a legitimate economic system.

~~Keynesian economics~~ As socialism had developed, it has increasingly embraced capitalism as a flawed but redeemable system which is not qualitatively different from socialism. As the emphasis shifted from the politics of ownership to that of social justice, capitalism is no longer viewed as incompatible with socialism in the modern

day. fundamentalist socialism, however, ~~would~~ still argue that it must be completely abandoned in order for a just society. Anti-capitalist movements have been revived in recent years due to the economic crises which could be the beginning of a resurgence of outright rejection of capitalism as expressed by Marx.



ResultsPlus
Examiner Comments

This is a top Level 3 response. The knowledge and understanding it demonstrates is consistently impressive, the arguments are analytical and well evaluated and the overall thrust of the response is coherent and balanced. Although neorevisionism is not explicitly discussed, the social democratic stance is outlined very clearly. This response meets reasonable expectations on all counts. The response was marked 12, 12, 12, 9, giving an overall score of 45.

Question 8

A large proportion of responses to this question showed an awareness that statelessness, the core goal of anarchism, is widely seen as misguided or impossible. Better responses linked such thinking to rival ideological traditions, usually liberalism and conservatism, with an emphasis often being placed on the social contract theories of theorists such as Hobbes and Locke. These were especially relevant to the question as they advance a critique of statelessness, seen as the 'state of nature' that treats statelessness, not as impossible but as profoundly undesirable. The state of nature is a condition which all rational people would wish to avoid or from which they would seek to escape. The other side of the argument, justifying anarchist statelessness, usually led to an analysis of the anarchist theory, or theories, of human nature. In some responses this tended to develop into little more than the assertion that anarchists believe in natural goodness. In stronger responses, an emphasis often was placed on human 'plasticity' and its implications. Similarly, strong responses tended to show an awareness of the extent to which all anarchists believe that natural harmony is maintained not only by human nature, but also by social institutions such as common ownership or the market mechanism.

Anarchism is often defined by its opposition to the state, inextricably linked ~~to~~ ^{to} ~~the~~ ^{its} utopian belief in human nature. Both Individualist and collectivist Anarchists have developed visions of anti-statist societies that in theory seem ~~not~~ plausible. Yet, as soon as one questions their arguably too ~~into~~ utopian view of human nature, the notion of a stateless society to a large extent becomes merely an anarchist fantasy.

Individualist anarchists emphasize the rational capacity of the individual. It is at times, seen as a mere extension of the Lockean principle of 'Natural Rights' and, indeed, Godwin sees that individual intellectual progress will drive social progress. Therefore, to some extent, a stateless society may not be seen as merely an anarchist fantasy since human seemingly have an ultimate capacity to organize their own affairs. Indeed, Rothbard saw an Anarchist society as entirely workable, in his justification of 'Anarcho-capitalism'. In his opinion, absolute faith should be placed in the free market economy, ~~which is~~ ^{similar to} the views of Hayek ~~who~~ who saw the market as a self-

Hayek's view were regulating central-nervous system of the economy. accepted & workable by classical Liberals is perhaps Rothbard's idea is not ~~far~~ merely a fantasy. Moreover, Rothbard suggested that ~~that~~ a better service would be provided by an anarcho-capitalist society. He saw for example 'protection agencies' instead of state-run police forces as being more efficient since in a free market, competition would force them to focus on an efficient and reliable service. In this sense, to a reasonable extent, Individualist Anarchism does not seem merely a fantasy, yet, Moorland did emphasize that "a capacity for corruption [exists] within every individual". Though Anarchists could argue this corruption is derived from the state, if, as is suggested by many Marxist socialists, it is the capitalist system that suppresses human nature, ~~and~~ without a state to watch over free egalitarian individuals, the capitalist emphasis on profit may cause a deterioration of the anarchist society by bringing out the evil of human nature. Perhaps an Anarchist society is merely fantasy.

Kropotkin stresses how ~~the~~ humans have a natural propensity for 'mutual aid'. This is the innate relationship between humans and therefore rather than anarcho-capitalism which breeds acquisitiveness and is divisive through its emphasis on private property, an anarchist society should be organized along the lines of Anarcho-communism. In this sense, a stateless society

would be plausible through the common ownership of wealth, as humans are motivated by moral as well as material incentives - an idea fully corroborated by Marx. Self-sufficient communes would therefore be entirely desirable where individuals are not corrupted by a state and work through the principle of mutualism, fair and equitable exchange of goods. Perhaps this idea is not merely a fantasy; Kropotkin based his ideas on small communities such as the watch-makers in Switzerland who provide evidence to show that an Anarcho-Collectivist society would work. Indeed, ~~the~~ Marx's ideal Communist and classless society would be anarchic, and ~~the~~ ^(the prospect of a stateless society is not merely an anarchist fantasy) this view was accepted by many, perhaps the Anarchist idea of a collective free stateless society, based upon the gregarious nature of mankind is not a mere fantasy.

Yet, it must be borne in mind that Marx's ideas lost much credibility and therefore ^{collectivist} Anarchists too must concede that capitalism is the only workable system in modern societies, as it accepted by modern socialists such as Social Democrats like Crosland. Furthermore, ~~the~~ the revolutionary means of ~~an~~ developing an Anarchist society presented by Sorel and born out of the Syndicalist movement could also be seen as merely ~~fantasy~~ ^{fantasy}. A stateless society cannot be reached by the "revolution of empty hands" as it suggested by some

Anarchists since the revolutionary consciousness of the working class — the lynchpin of both Marx and Proudhon's ideas — has been lost ~~away~~ as well as this means ^{of achieving} ~~the~~ a stateless society being seen as outdated, ~~the~~ ~~idea~~ of Godwin's suggestion that direct action would lead to the establishment of a stateless society, have also ^{been} ~~seen~~ considerably discredited. He argued that revolutionary violence is inherently wrong and therefore direct action should be pursued to encourage egoistic individuals ~~who are~~ to realize they have an ultimate capacity to organize their own affairs. This has carried little weight as a legitimate means of bringing about a stateless society and therefore such a society to a large extent can be seen as a fantasy due to the difficulties in ~~to~~ the means of bringing it about.

Though Anarchists argue it is the state that is responsible for social evils by corrupting ~~individuals~~ ~~in~~ ~~power~~ as well as those in society, their utopian belief that humans have an ultimate capacity to organize their own affairs is ^{entirely} ~~then~~ questionable. If ~~one~~ ~~one~~ doubts the gregarious ~~and~~ ~~social~~ ~~nature~~ and rational nature of humans championed by Anarchists such as Proudhon and Godwin, the notion of a stateless society to a large extent becomes merely a fantasy. It would seem impossible for a stateless society to be plausible if for example, the conservative view of human nature was accepted. There is no way in which greedy, self-centred ~~and~~,

morally and morally, intellectually and psychologically imperfect ~~individuals~~ individuals could live harmoniously without a state. Conservatives ~~too~~ would argue that disorder would arise from the continuity of society being removed by the abolition of the state. Indeed, even classical liberals who similar to Individualist Anarchists, aiming to maximise freedom, stress the need for a "night-watchman" state to prevent egoistic individuals encroaching on the liberty of others further their own needs. A stateless society is therefore merely a fantasy for Anarchists.

In conclusion, despite Anarchists such as Moore and accepting that a "capacity for corruption" is innate to humans, the Anarchists remain committed to an entirely utopian vision of a stateless society. It may be ~~arguable~~ ~~in fact~~ ^{only} if one accepts that it is the state itself that corrupts human nature. For a large extent, Anarchists behold an overly utopian view of human nature - humans will always attempt to tread on the toes of others to further their own goals/lives. Moreover, in practice both the means and ends of achieving an Anarchist stateless society are ~~completely~~ merely a fantasy.



ResultsPlus Examiner Comments

This is a Level 3 response. The anarchist defence of statelessness is clearly explained, sometimes with sophistication. Although the conservative and liberal critiques of anarchism are not so well developed, these views are accurate and an attempt is made to explain each of them. Generally, the understanding is analytical and not merely descriptive. 10, 10, 7 and 9 marks were awarded giving a total of 36.

Paper Summary

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

- Before choosing a question, read it carefully, and read it at least twice. Make sure you fully understand the nature and demands of the specific question set.
- Make sure that your response focuses consistently on the question set, and does not 'drift away' from the question. Do not just regularly re-use the wording of the question in your response, make sure that you address the issue or issues that the question raises.
- Define and explain concepts clearly and fully. Many short question responses, for example, should start with a definition of the the key term in the question. If the meaning of the term is central to the question, as it often is, make sure that you can provide more than just a robust single-sentence definition of a term, recognising that many terms have a number of meanings or conceptions.
- Use the introduction to an answer to highlight the key issues in the question, indicating succinctly what your response is going to focus on. Introductions that only provide an overview of the ideology in question, often focusing on its historical development, are of very little help. Introductions are generally not needed for short questions.
- Make sure that arguments and viewpoints are properly explained by thinking about 'why' people hold the beliefs they do, rather than simply described.
- Make sure that essay questions are carefully planned. The key to formulating and communicating a coherent overall argument is to understand the synoptic debate that lies at the heart of the question itself.

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 Edinburgh Gate, Harlow, Essex CM20 2JE