

Examiners' Report
June 2014

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 2014

Publications Code UA039015

All the material in this publication is copyright
© Pearson Education Ltd 2014

Introduction

The overall standard of responses in Unit 3B was broadly in line with that in previous sessions. There were few examples of candidates misunderstanding or misinterpreting questions. Even so, an important discriminator was the extent to which candidates focused on the specific question set. Those candidates who did not do this were unable to score as highly. Good advice to candidates preparing for exams is to spend time thinking about the question, identifying the key words or terms and, for essays in particular, planning their answer *before* they put pen to paper.

Question 1

This was a very popular question and generally answered reasonably well. Candidates were often stronger on the 'why' than the 'how', with clear references to the danger of abusing power and almost all candidates referring specifically to Acton. However, for the 'how' part some candidates wrote about liberal constitutionalism and the need to guarantee individual rights, rather than dealing specifically with the fragmentation of *government* power. Stronger responses dealt well with both aspects of the question and explained the ways in which liberals have supported various constitutional devices to fragment government power.

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

The fragmentation of government power ^{through internal and external checks} is on the whole supported by liberals due to their belief in human nature.

There is a liberal belief that humans are on the whole rational beings, but there is an inclination that when given power, the individual or group will use this for their own personal advantage. This was emphasised by Lord Acton who suggested that "power tends to corrupt and absolute power corrupts absolutely" therefore, to ensure that government doesn't infringe on individual freedom, a system of external and internal checks must be put in place.

The use of checks on government power is illustrated by Montesquieu who felt that due to the potential power that a government could have, it must be

limited to prioritise individualism (placing the individual ^{as} supreme importance over any collective group.) Therefore, external checks such as a written constitution such as the US ~~the~~ is important to liberals as it outlines the powers and capabilities that a government is able to employ. Furthermore, a Bill of Rights is thought to be advantageous as it clearly defines the rights of the individual in a legal document, thus the government aren't able to legally infringe on our human rights. Lastly, such as in the UK, an unwritten constitution is thought to be substantial means for ensuring government doesn't become too powerful.

In addition, Montesquieu recommended that internal checks were practiced, such as ensuring that the legislative, executive and judiciary are firmly separate. This ensures that no single part can have ultimate control over the nation. This is the case in the US where the fragmentation of political power is separated clearly into three distinctive groups: Presidency, congress and the Supreme Court. Therefore, by

dismantling the connections between the three institutions, government power is kept to a minimum, thus ensuring that the individual remains at no risk of their individual rights being curtailed



ResultsPlus
Examiner Comments

This response is very strong on both the 'why' and the 'how' and uses the example of the USA to illustrate the separation of powers. The candidate also makes specific reference to government power in the answer. This is an excellent response and was given full marks.

Question 2

This was the most popular short question and was generally answered well. Stronger answers usually gave a definition of authority at the start and covered a range of grounds, with some explanation of each. They were also likely to cover the Conservative view that humans crave order and security, sometimes extending this to cover the New Right and their attitude towards authority.

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

Authority can be described as the right to exercise power over an individual against their will. It forms an important part of the conservative ideology, and they have defended its use on various grounds.

Firstly, conservatives see authority as a necessary method of advice and guidance. Much in the same way ^{that} a ~~parents~~ parent exercises authority over their child, the state exercises authority over its citizens. This is known as 'paternalism' and it is justified on the grounds that the state really does know 'what is best' for its citizens. Authority can be seen to be exercised 'from above' absolutely, naturally and absolutely justifiably.

Secondly, conservatives see ^{exercising} authority as the best

way of instilling a sense of safety and security in citizens. Conservative ideology views humans as 'psychologically imperfect' creatures; careful, drawn to 'the known' and with a thirst for security. Authority enforces the idea of everybody 'knowing their place' first brought about by Organic Society. 'Everybody knowing their place' - and staying there - satisfies the citizens' psychological imperfection and ~~and~~ keeps them contented.

Finally, conservatives see authority as the only viable way of maintaining the law and social order. Without a strict punishment system, conservatives argue, nothing would stand between civilized society and chaos. This is largely based on the conservative assumption that humans' nature is violently self-interested - an anarchist, for example, would not think this way.

To conclude, conservatives defend authority on three key grounds - that it upholds social order, it satisfies citizens psychologically by giving them a place and purpose, and it advises and guides them.



ResultsPlus
Examiner Comments

This is a level three response. The candidate gives a definition of 'authority' at the start and goes on to explain several grounds on which Conservatives have defended authority. In order to achieve a higher mark the candidate would have needed to further develop the points made and presented them in a more sophisticated way.

Question 3

This was one of the less popular short questions. Most candidates could identify collectivist traditions of anarchism, though in some cases this became descriptive rather than explaining the link between anarchism and collectivism as such. Stronger responses would typically start with a short definition of collectivism and make a clear link between anarchist views on human nature and these collectivist traditions.

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

The link between anarchism and collectivism is found within the collectivist tradition of anarchism. This rejects capitalism, and instead argues for the common ownership of wealth, thereby calling not only for collectivist forms of production, but collectivist modes of living too, requiring no regulation by the state.

Mutualism, for instance, associated with Pierre-Joseph Proudhon, despite calling for some degree of individual ownership of property, ^{or possessions} ~~did~~ never does, nevertheless call for ~~the~~ large-scale industry to be owned in common by workers, in order to eliminate the exploitation of workers. Further, Proudhon was inspired by the watchmakers of Switzerland, who lived in small, self-governing communes with a high degree of self-sufficiency. He therefore called for individuals to live together in voluntary communities, ~~Mutualist~~, ^{anarchist} therefore, ~~is~~ has a link to ~~collectivism~~, both through ~~can~~ a with no need for

regulation by a coercive state, since people are bound together by the recognition of a common humanity.

Anarcho-communism pushes collectivist thinking to its limits to reach anarchist conclusions. It recognises that since workers alone produce wealth for producers who merely own it, "all forms of private property are therefore theft. As a result, the common ownership of wealth should be implemented. Further, anarcho-communists also proposed communal living in groups - Kropotkin argued membership would be based on humanity, whilst Bakunin called for federations of workers, since workers share a natural affinity. Despite this slight difference, relations would be harmonious - thus sharing a link with the usually utopian view of human nature anarchists have - and again eliminating the need for a state to 'police' society and each community would exhibit a high degree of independence, since too much interdependence would result in the restoration of capitalist exchange systems, threatening the collective ownership of wealth.



ResultsPlus

Examiner Comments

This is a level three answer. It is good on its coverage of the collectivist traditions, but weaker on the moral dimension of collectivism and would benefit from a succinct definition of 'collectivism' at the start.

Question 4

This was the least popular short answer question. Candidates who did attempt it generally answered it reasonably well, particularly with regard to the Marxist tradition. Responses were generally less developed on social democratic/ revisionist traditions, although strong responses explained clearly that social class has tended to be relegated to a relatively minor factor in socialist theory and practice, being largely replaced by ideas related to inequality.

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

A social class is a group of people who share similar socio-economic position. All socialists argue that class is the most desirable and important of social divisions in society. Marxists define social class in terms of an individual's relationship to the means of production and economic position. By contrast, social democrats define social class in terms of income and status.

Marxists argue that social class, particularly the working class, is the analytical tool to which socialism could be achieved. This is because Marx argued that takes a scientific analysis of history and argues class conflict has been prevalent in every society. This involves the four stages of direct class system. First, tribal societies - conflict over material scarcity. Second, slavery - conflict between master and slave. Third, Feudalism -

conflict between landowners and serfs. Finally, capitalism - conflict between the propertied bourgeoisie (ruling class) and ~~proletariat~~ ~~work~~ ~~ing~~ ~~class~~ property-less proletariat (working class). Marx ~~is~~ argued the social class in this stage ~~is~~ plays an important role in socialist analysis as conflict between bourgeoisie and proletariat is needed in ~~an~~ order for a mass uprising of the proletariat to overthrow capitalism leading to a dictatorship of the proletariat of the workers state to ^{safeguard} ~~prevent~~ counter-revolution from the bourgeoisie leading to the state to wither away in order for the final stage ~~of that is~~ of that is communism. ~~That~~

By contrast, social democrats differ in Marxist view and argue that social class is important in socialist analysis as they believe the distribution of wealth in society ~~is~~ should be through ~~a~~ a system of progressive taxation and welfare benefits, ~~and~~ whereby the ~~rich~~ middle class (rich) are needed in order to distribute their wealth to the working class ~~and~~ (poor). This ~~is~~ would provide equality of opportunity to the working class ~~and~~ as well as reduce inequality. This would ~~also~~ also foster a bond between the richest and poorest in society - leading to cooperation rather than competition.



ResultsPlus
Examiner Comments

This is a high level three response. The candidate points out the importance of social class as an 'analytical' tool for Marxists and goes on to explain how social democrats have a different, though still important role for social class in their analysis of the deficiencies of current social systems and in their proposed remedies.

Question 5

This was a popular question and generally answered well. Stronger responses accurately referred to, and explained, both *positive* liberty and equality of *opportunity*, with appropriate illustrations.

Indicate your first question choice on this page.

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

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

If you change your mind, put a line through the box

and then indicate your new question with a cross .

Chosen Question Number:

Question 1

Question 2

Question 3

Question 4

Question 5

Social welfare is the idea that the state should play an interventionist role in society, helping those whose freedom is constrained by poverty. It therefore extolls practices like progressive tax in order to provide benefits or services like the NHS.

Modern liberals have defended social welfare due to their belief in 'positive freedom' which Berlin described as self mastery. Positive freedom holds that social injustice can prevent freedom thus welfare helps people to help themselves. As Elliott Dodds argues 'welfare is a form of liberty in that it frees people from social injustice which narrows their choices'. 'Positive freedom' thus stems from

the liberal commitment to individualism and the idea that ~~liberal~~ individual ~~and~~ freedom is of supreme importance. Welfare thus ensures freedom.

Modern liberals have also defended social welfare due to their belief of human nature. T.H Green argues humans are tempered with 'altruism' and thus want to help one another through ~~the~~ social welfare

Modern liberals have also ~~defend~~ defended the principle of social welfare in reaction to the high levels of poverty that ~~laissez~~ laissez-faire policies had brought, as outlined in the Beveridge report which highlighted the 'five giants' that industrialism had created. The minimal role the state had previously played had not brought general prosperity.



ResultsPlus
Examiner Comments

A definition at the start and three main justifications made, with development and illustration of positive freedom. Although not on the indicative content, the altruistic and practical/pragmatic justifications are valid. A level 3 response- true mark 12.

Question 6

This was a reasonably popular essay question and mostly well answered. Some balance was nearly always present, although candidates often emphasised the different traditions rather than the features of anarchism that are shared. Stronger responses had more balance and identified several common themes, such as the attitude towards the state and anti clericalism.

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

All anarchists fundamentally agree on the ~~abolition of the state~~ core principles such as the abolition of the state, human nature and the sovereignty of the individual, therefore it could be interpreted as a single doctrine. However, the many strands of anarchism such as anarcho-capitalists, anarcho-communists and anarcho-individualists differ on views regarding the economy and property, showing that ~~anarchism is a single doctrine~~ although they may agree on core values, they differ in many respects. Therefore, anarchism is a single doctrine, however to a very small extent.

A way in which anarchism could be perceived as a single doctrine is that they all share an innate hatred for the state. William Godwin, arguably the first anarchist, believed the state to be an 'unnecessary evil', and as all humans are 'rational, civilized' creatures. However, they greatly differ on how to ~~remove~~ or how and why the state should be removed. Anarcho-communists argue that the state is unnecessary as humans naturally want to work together in small communes, therefore the role of the state is superfluous. Kropotkin, an anarcho-communist, created the

'animal kingdom' theory, which suggested that as animals naturally work together in nature, humans will also have the innate propensity or key able to work together. However, this view would be challenged by an anarcho-capitalists, who stress that humans as 'egoistic' and ~~out to~~ or out to pursue 'happy and pleasurable' activities, therefore will not work in small communes but on their own, ~~the~~ making the role of the state redundant. ~~Any~~ therefore, we can see that anarchists differ on the views of collectivism and individualism, and although both agree the state should be removed, disagree about how to achieve that end, proving it is not a 'single doctrine.'

Another way in which anarchism is not a single doctrine is that they disagree about the role of property. Anarcho-communists believe private property to promote inequality and exploitation, and therefore has no place in the modern world. Rousseau, a french philosopher, states that 'property is the fundamental cause of all human oppression', and this statement has been done by many anarcho-communists, such as Mikhail Bakunin. Proudhon, an anarcho-mutualist, reluctantly suggested that property is in fact a 'necessary evil' in modern society, which is a stark contrast to the views of anarcho-communists. Despite this however, mutualists agree that property is exploitative, and should only be permitted if it does not oppress both worker and consumer and is distributed fairly, showing a similarity between the two anarchist groups. However, anarcho-capitalists believe in the localization of property, as long as it has been justly obtained and does not restrict upon anyone individual

Whether, therefore, we can see ~~that~~ ^{we see} that although ^{we see} some similarities between anarchists and the role of prophets, they greatly differ, therefore showing that anarchism is not a 'single doctrine'.

All anarchists have a very optimistic view on human nature, as they ~~wish~~ ^{wish} to believe humans will naturally create law and order without the need of a state to enforce it. Anarcho-communists believe that ~~these~~ humans will collectively work together after the removal of a state, which is extremely optimistic as there have been ~~no~~ successful, large scale examples and almost expect a paradigm shift to occur overnight. Anarcho-capitalists also share this overly optimistic view on human nature, as they believe humans will work individually, however co-operate with others in society to continue living. This view is also shared by anarcho-individualists, who say humans are ~~not~~ ^{not} naturally good creatures who will act morally and lawfully, therefore reducing the importance of the state to maintain law and order. The anarchist view on human nature has led many to brand it a 'utopian aspiration', however it is a belief they all fundamentally share, therefore showing it to be, in some respects, a single doctrine.

Despite this, anarchists fundamentally differ on views about the economy. Anarcho-capitalists believe in a completely unregulated free market. They believe that ~~as~~ individuals will provide for themselves due to their vested, equalised interests. Anarcho-communists differ, believing in small communities creating goods that will then be shared around equally amongst the people. However they do not believe

The state should be the vehicle of this. This could therefore be interpreted as a sentiment, as both ideologues believe that the state should play no part in upkeeping the economy.

In conclusion, we can see that although anarchists agree on the core principles, it would be wrong to suggest it is a ^{completely} simple doctrine. Any all fundamentally believe in the removal of the state, however disagree on the means of how to achieve that goal. Although they ~~share~~ ^{share} a very optimistic view on human nature, their state ~~disagreements about~~ ~~parts, the economy and removal of the state and fundamentally~~ believe in the sovereignty of the individual, this state disagreement about parts and the economy shows it to not be really a simple doctrine. However, as all strands stem from the same core values, perhaps can be seen as a simple doctrine, however to a very small extent.



ResultsPlus Examiner Comments

This is a wide ranging answer which deals with both parts of the question. Although it is less developed on the individualist tradition, apart from anarcho-capitalism, it is comprehensive, well structured and sufficiently analytical to be awarded full marks.

Question 7

Although this was the least popular essay question it was generally answered well. Most candidates identified the different approaches towards free market capitalism within Conservatism, exploring the different approaches of the Neo Liberal and Neo Conservative strands within modern Conservatism. On the other hand many candidates explained that there were many common and defining features of Conservatism, such as its respect for tradition and its views on organic society, which have no direct relation to supporting or not supporting free market capitalism. This was a legitimate approach as long as there was clear reference to the question through-out the answer.

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

The idea of Free Market Capitalism is a relatively new aspect of the Conservative Doctrine as it has only been present since Margaret Thatcher and the New Right. Although there's been much debate about whether the New Right's adoption of Neo-liberal economic doctrine has ~~changed~~ redefined conservatism as the Free Market is a radical ideological concept and conservatives support pragmatism over principle, I would argue that it is pragmatic in the same way one Nation conservatism, ~~and~~ was and this does not define capitalism conservatism. ~~As~~ Margaret Thatcher ~~additionally~~, however said when asked what the best thing she ~~did~~ ^{changed} in office was replied "New Labour". Additionally, she remained Neo-Conservative in her social principles suggesting at the heart of all pragmatic changes to conservatism is a commitment to "changing to conserve".

Certainly, traditional conservatism is not defined by Free Market Capitalism and is in fact, arguably in opposition to free market capitalism as capitalism assumes faith and rationality in the individual giving ~~him~~ them ^{individual} sovereignty over themselves. Whereas traditional conservatives have a far more pessimistic view on human nature - that it is intellectually/psychological limited. Free Market Capitalism also based on ~~concepts~~ a meritocracy and the value of wealth in terms of how it was earned whereas traditional conservatives like Burke ~~argued~~ believe in natural hierarchies based on the Organic Theory - that society is an organism containing different parts of different importance - the body politic.

Additionally, Free Market Capitalism is a new and radical political concept which traditional conservatives like Burke would have considered to be a threat to the "accumulated wisdom" of the past, and the belief in the importance of traditional institutions such as ~~state~~ Church, Monarchy, etc.

However some traditional conservatives might argue that Free Market Capitalism is a natural product of "the organic society" ~~and~~ and not radical change like the French Revolution with Burke disagreed with.

In this way although some classical liberals may accept Free Market Capitalism they ~~do not~~ certainly do not define it.

Similarly One Nation Conservatives ~~was~~ is not defined by Free Market Capitalism but rather a paternalist approach to the economy. Disraeli developed the idea of "Nobles Obligez" suggesting the ruling class had a moral duty to the working class. This majoritarian aspect directly contradicts the individualist meritocracy of Free Market Capitalism. However, ~~and~~ they were both pragmatic responses to the political climate of the time, Disraeli suggested his politics was designed to gain "the lasting affection of the working class" ~~with~~ with passing through bills like the 1867 Reform

Act - which gave ^{suppressing} ^{and has towards} ^{revolution} ~~the~~ ^{suffrage} to working class males. In this sense, Free Market Capitalism may define conservation in the same way One Nation Nobles Oblige did - the best pragmatic way to defend the fabric and security of society at the time.

Macmillan's "compassionate conservatism" is arguably One Nation conservatism taken to its extreme, as it justifies a larger state with more taxation and spending on public services, this directly disputes Free Market Capitalism as free market is based on a small state (or a Nightwatchman state, as liberals originally termed it) that ~~puts~~ puts most of its trust in "the hidden hand of the market" (Adam Smith). However, again as much as the same way compassionate conservatism doesn't define conservatism neither does the Free Market. Rather, it is what they stand for and seek to achieve that defines conservatism.

The New Right however, is largely defined by the Free Market as it is ~~was~~ such a radical change from classic conservative theory - right down to the ~~concept~~ idea of human nature, where Disraeli still maintained the concept of natural hierarchy. Thatcher's meritocratic ideas were very different. Certainly, the major privatisation, poll tax and Anti-Statism did define ~~the New Right~~ the New Right. However, so did Neo-conservatism, which was the basis for most of her social politics, which upheld the importance of traditional institutions following Burke's idea that society is a conversation between the dead, the living and those yet to be born", such as the Monarchy, the Church and particularly the nuclear family.

~~The New Right~~ She also upheld the importance of authority (which comes from the traditional view that humans are security seeking, and Burke's Body Politic) through strong laws and order.

In this way, the Neo-liberal aspect of the New Right is only half the game and although it appears not to,

still remains faithful to the idea of "change to conserve".

Finally, I would argue that the Free Market Capitalism does not define the Conservative Doctrine as it is a relatively new part that ultimately still has its roots in traditional conservative assumptions about pragmatism. Additionally, some conservatives accept it as a product of the 'organic society'. In this sense, I believe that conservatism is defined by the underlying currents of all its political movements including David Cameron's 'Big Society', which is pragmatism to ^{preserve} ~~conserve~~ traditional and social order.



ResultsPlus
Examiner Comments

This is a strong level three response. It is very well written and was suitably rewarded for A03. The answer is wide ranging with some development of the points made. It is less strong on support for free market capitalism and there is a suggestion that the debate is only a modern one, rather than more historical. Nevertheless it is comprehensive and well argued.

Question 8

This was the most popular essay question and mainly well answered. Most candidates gave a reasonable or better account of the differences between Marxist and reformist socialist traditions. Stronger answers gave more detail and analysis of the differences within reformist traditions and/or identified that the Marxist position is based on its view of the state as an instrument of oppression (rather than as a neutral arbiter).

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

Early socialists who followed the teachings of Marx and Engels were clear in their pursuit of revolutionary means. Yet, as history has progressed and the predictions of Marx and Engels failed to materialise many within the socialist movement began to revise that policy and instead moved towards democratic means to achieve their goals. Thus, the ~~the~~ extent to which socialists have disagreed about the means of achieving ~~their~~ socialism has ~~the~~ come down to ~~the~~ the argument between those who favour revolutionary means and those who favour revisionism.

Firstly, when socialism was first defined as a doctrine its followers believed in revolutionary means. Karl Marx in particular advocated revolution because he thought that it was the only way that the vestiges of capitalism and bourgeois

oppression could be removed. This fundamentalist idea was also based on his scientific and empirical analysis of history. His theory of dialectic materialism held that the capitalist system embodied its antithesis: the proletariat or workers. Due to this contradiction the proletariat would revolt and overthrow their oppressors to reach 'the end of history' or communism, which contained no internal contradictions. Even though the first socialist revolution (Bolshevik revolution of 1917) was more of a coup d'état than a popular uprising it was clear that these orthodox Marxists, led by Lenin, were committed to revolutionary means. Therefore, early socialists did not agree disagree over the means of achieving socialism as they were dedicated to ~~revolutionary~~ revolution.

However, with the advent of ~~gradualism~~ the extension of the franchise across the developed world at the end of the 19th century, many ~~so~~ socialists began to favour ~~revised~~ revisionist means. As the working class now had the vote, ~~many~~

it was possible for them to influence government through other means. As well as this, the violent nature of the 1917 Bolshevik revolution appalled many Western socialists. Thus, thinkers such as Sidney ~~the~~ and Beatrice Webb and H.G. Wells of the Fabian Society and the humanist William Morris began to develop the theory of ~~the~~ gradualism. This stated that because the working class would naturally vote for socialist parties and because they made up the majority of society, the socialist parties would ~~never~~ ~~not~~ achieve unbroken success. They could then use their time in office to transform society. This implied that the state was a neutral arbiter and not the agent of class oppression that Karl Marx had derided it as. Furthermore, revisionist socialists, such as Bernstein, accepted that capitalism was a system of naked class oppression but it could be 'humanised' ~~is~~ by ~~it~~ creating a mixed economy and employing state intervention based on Keynesian economics. Thus, the extension of the franchise caused the socialist movement to disagree on what means could best achieve ~~the~~ socialist

goals.

Further revision of socialist means were experienced towards the end of the 20th Century as revisionist social democracy failed to continue to deliver economic growth in the 1970s. Social democratic parties began to lose ~~its support~~ their support as the traditional working class began to shrink due to increased prosperity. For example, in the UK the social democratic Labour party lost so much electoral viability that it failed to win government from 1979-1997. This prompted a third wave of revision led by Anthony ~~the~~ Giddens, that who proposed that ~~the~~ a dynamic market economy should be encouraged. Thus, 'third wave' socialism rejected the economic ~~policy~~ ^{means} of revisionist Socialism. They also rejected the 'welfare state' as a means of creating equality and instead endorsed a policy of 'welfare to work' or 'workfare'. Therefore, 'third wave' Socialists ~~disagree~~ created further disagreement over the means of achieving socialism.

Nevertheless, ~~however~~, the extent of disagreement was severely diminished after the collapse of ~~the~~ the Soviet Union 1989-1991. This historical event radically exposed the failings of state socialism and revolutionary means. Many socialists took it as a sign that capitalism was the only viable means of generating wealth. Thus, the disagreement within socialism over whether capitalism should be endorsed was limited to the extent to which it should be endorsed instead. Furthermore, revolutionary means have also all but been abandoned. Many ~~see~~ ~~the~~ Therefore, many see the fall of the Soviet Union as the completion of the conversion of socialism to democratic and free market means.

However, post 9/11 has seen the emergence of groups, ~~such as Occupy~~ ^{with the so} that have ~~renewed~~ renewed interest in revolutionary means. The actions of groups such as Occupy* have caused many to question whether this is the beginning of a whole scale conversion of socialism.

back to revolutionary. Yet, at present such groups have ~~very~~ little significance and so have not caused major debate or disagreement.

In conclusion, ~~some~~ the extent to which socialists have disagreed over the means of achieving ~~the~~ socialism has been deep. Even though now the debate is largely over, in the past disagreement has been a feature of the socialist movement. The revolutionary means endorsed by Marxists have contrasted sharply with both revisionist and 'third wave' socialism. Although 'third wave' socialists are closer to social democracy there ~~is also~~ has been large disagreement between the two strands of socialism of the extent to which the free market should be endorsed. Therefore, disagreement over the means of socialism has ~~so~~ occurred to a large extent in the past between socialists.



ResultsPlus
Examiner Comments

This is an excellent response with both historical and analytical arguments throughout. The essay has a strong introduction and gives consideration to the impact on the argument of the end of the USSR. Although there are a few small inaccuracies, the breadth and depth of this response meant that it was awarded full marks.

Paper Summary

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

- Read questions carefully, at least twice, before choosing which ones to answer. Make sure you are clear about what the question is asking you to do and answer those questions where you are confident you can do this.
- Avoid drifting away from answering the question. One way to help you avoid this kind of drift is to re-use or refer back to the key wording of the question in your answer.
- It is a good idea to give clear definitions or explanations of key concepts, e.g. for section A questions a succinct definition of a key term should help you to focus your answer.

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