

Examiners' Report
June 2014

GCE Government and Politics 6GP04 4B

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 UA039027

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

Introduction

The overall standard of responses in Unit 4B was broadly in line with that in previous sessions. There were relatively 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 (x)

This was the least popular of the Section A questions. Many candidates made a clear link between identity politics and multiculturalism and covered issues of negative stereotypes and the desire to advance and celebrate positive identities. Some answers drifted into more general features of multiculturalism, without specific reference to identity politics.

This was the least popular of the Section A questions. Many candidates made a clear link between identity politics and multiculturalism and covered issues of negative stereotypes and the desire to advance and celebrate positive identities. Some answers drifted into more general features of multiculturalism, without specific reference to identity politics.

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

Identity politics is used to describe the politics of groups that wish to redefine their identity from a damaging cultural stereotype. Movements of identity politics are defined by the beliefs they are opposed under a political-cultural stereotype, based on majority culture and morality, that is imposed upon them, leads to feelings of inferiority and shame. They therefore seek to raise consciousness of their amongst the groups and posit positively 'redefine their identity', for instance with "gay pride".

Multiculturalism can be seen as a form of identity politics as it eschews a monocultural society, and encourages the toleration of a plethora of different cultures, religions, and ways of life. Pluralist multiculturalists, for example, believe in value pluralism: that

There are many different and equally valid perceptions of the good life. Therefore, people shouldn't pass judgement on other groups, as their system of beliefs is equally valid. This therefore shows multiculturalism to be fighting against the culture of stereotyping and imposing one's own values on other people.

Furthermore, Multiculturalists such as Charles Taylor can be seen as furthering identity politics. Taylor is a Communitarian, that believes individuals an identity is shaped by the community and their upbringing. Charles Taylor argues that all cultures should be recognised, and accepted, as this allows the members of it to equally be recognised. People become subjects by virtue of being recognised by other subjects. Without this recognition of other cultures, people will may try to conform to the majority culture, and they will ultimately be heritage 'misrecognised' or discriminated against. Taylor also, therefore, encourages the understanding of other cultures and communities, so people are not socially oppressed by a stereotypical view of their background; they instead may feel like they have a social and cultural belonging.



ResultsPlus
Examiner Comments

This is a strong level three response. The answer makes clear reference to identity politics and covers the importance of challenging stereotypes for both multiculturalism and identity politics.

Question 2 (x)

This was the most popular question in Section A and was mostly answered well. Most candidates were able to give a clear explanation of why radical feminists have claimed that 'the personal is the political' with reference to patriarchy and oppression in the family and the need to challenge the public/ private divide.

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

Feminism is defined by the advocacy of rights ~~but~~ for the equality of sexes. Radical Feminists ~~argued that the per~~ such as Kate Millet and ~~and~~ Shulamith Firestone have argued that the personal is the political due to their belief that patriarchy, the dominance of males and the subordination of females, is in both the public and the private sphere. ~~They argued that patriarchy starts in the home whether~~ They have thus redefined the word 'political' to mean any power relationship, which in this case means between men and women. They argue that patriarchy starts within the home whether it be the relationship between man and wife or ~~husband~~ father and ~~and~~ daughter. They argue that

This is then mirrored into the public sphere, and is thus the explanation of the lack of females in top jobs such as CEO's and within government. This is the basis of Kate Millet's argument that 'half the population that is female is governed by half the population that is male'. Radical Feminists suggest that to overcome this there must be a 'sexual revolution' whereby females rise up against the patriarchal structures. They also argue that to prevent the personal from being the political, that homes must subscribe to 'conscious raising' whereby children are raised to be self-aware and androgynous, - meaning to be a sexless person whereby your biology is not destiny.



ResultsPlus
Examiner Comments

This response identifies the key points about the private and the public spheres, and the importance of patriarchy (and challenging patriarchy) in family relationships. It is less well developed on how changes in the personal sphere can lead to major changes in the public sphere. It was given a high level two mark.

Question 3 (x)

This was a popular question and generally answered well. Nearly all candidates were able to give at least one clear distinction between nationalism and racialism, and most were able to give two. In a very small minority of cases candidates conflated racialism with racism and discussed hostility to immigration in general.

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

Nationalism is the idea that the nation is the central unit of political governance and that every body in the nation has a shared history, language, culture and past, defined differently by political and cultural nationalists. Contrastingly, W.E.B. Du Bois has defined 'racialism' as the philosophical belief that races are different biologically, psychologically or philosophically even that each race has a different "Soul."

Consequently, nationalism is predominantly an inclusive doctrine whilst racialism is specifically exclusive. Political/civic forms of nationalism define the nation in an inclusive sense, based on citizenship. Indeed Ernest Renan in "What is a Nation" described nationalism the nation as a "daily referendum" whereby each individual gives consent to be part of the nation. Renan identifies the inclusive nature of nationalism where anyone can join a

Particular nation if they wish. In contrast, racialism as defined by Bois is an exclusive doctrine which asserts differences between races. As such, race is genetic and it is impossible to merely join another race as you can do with a nation.

Indeed nationalism is also a political idea whereas racialism is scientific. Nationalism is a political doctrine whereby the nation is viewed as the central unit of governance. This hence characterises a political idea of the nation which has been defined by political and cultural nationalists differently. In contrast racialism is a scientific theory which seeks to scientifically prove the differences and superiority between races. This was emphasised by ideas of völkisch nationalism espoused by the pan-German League after 1891, who saw the German race as superior and hence fused ideas of racialism into nationalism.

Moreover, nationalism (liberal) espouse ideas of equality whereas racialism views humankind as distinct and hierarchical. Liberal nationalism is committed to the notion of

self determination such that each nation has an equal right to self government, as espoused by Wilson at the Paris Peace Conference. In contrast racialism views each race as a separate entity and sees some races as superior to others. This is particularly emphasised by paligenetic ultra nationalists, as defined by Roger Masters, who view each nation as an organic whole held by primordial bonds. Paligenetic ultra nationalists here see some races as superior to others, which is a form of expansionist /chauvinist nationalism.

Also, nationalism (liberal) can be committed to peace whereas racialism is inherently chauvinist and expansionist which leads to war.



ResultsPlus
Examiner Comments

This response is wide ranging and identifies a number of key distinctions between these two terms. As well as the contrasts between culture/ biology and inclusive/ exclusive the candidate goes on to include the contrasts between equality/ hierarchy and the notion of political and scientific concepts. The response is very well written and was awarded full marks.

Question 4 (x)

This was one of the less popular questions in section A. Most candidates were able to explain two or more key ideas of eco-anarchism. In a small number of cases candidates became overly concerned with more general aspects of anarchism, such as hostility to the state, without locating this in the context of eco-anarchism.

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

Eco-anarchism is the strand of anarchist ecologism that either, or cross cuts with the ideology anarchism. Anarchism, based on the liberal principle of freedom and the socialist principle of equality, can be seen to be sympathetic with the goals of ecologism based on its beliefs on the way in which society should be organised. A link can also be established with Eco-anarchism fundamentally believe that the goals of ecologism can be reached through anarchism and its goals.

One major key idea of eco-anarchism is the idea that the goals of ecologism can be achieved through the establishment of ~~an anarchist~~ an anarcho-collectivist society. This is due to the fact that anarcho-collectivists envisage a world made up of small, self-sufficient communes. This means that the people have to become reliant on nature for survival. Eco-anarchist believe this would achieve the ecological ~~world~~ aim of eccentric ~~thought~~ thought, as well as appealing to the

idea of 'land ethic', as humans would naturally start to see nature as having intrinsic worth and as equally valuable as humans.

A second principle of eco-anarchism is the idea that a decentralized, stateless society can resemble and reflect an ecologists idea of ecosystems. Like ecologists believe ecosystems are maintained in a natural balance of stability and harmony through homeostasis, ~~anarchists believe~~ with no external forces, anarchists believe that without the state and external hierarchy, communities achieve a 'natural order' spontaneously.

A third principle is the belief that anarchists aim of achieving a post-industrial society, brought by the abolishment of the state and capitalism, also achieves the ecologist aim of limited or 'zero-growth'. Without capitalism, humans will be able to embrace Eric Fromms principle of going from a 'having to being' attitude, moving away from materialism and consumerism thus not exploiting or destroying the natural world



ResultsPlus
Examiner Comments

This is a wide ranging response with three main points, each with some development. It was awarded a high level three mark.

Question 5 (x)

This question was generally answered well. Most candidates were able to provide more than one ground on which Conservatives have criticised multiculturalism, with some illustration.

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

Conservatives have criticized multiculturalism on the grounds that its support for diversity within society leads to instability which poses a threat to the natural order, the maintenance of which is the central tenet of conservatism.

Conservatives have criticized multiculturalism on the grounds that it conflicts with the conservative belief in human imperfection. This states that humans are psychologically imperfect, preferring the 'familiar to the unknown', as said by conservative thinker Michael Oakeshott. As a result, people are drawn to those similar to themselves in terms of language, religion and perhaps even ethnicity, and, ^{naturally} fear and distrust those who are different to them. As a result, multiculturalist societies are seen to breed suspicion, hostility and maybe even aggression. Thus conservatives view the multiculturalist belief in 'unity with diversity' to be a contradiction in terms, disproved

by simple facts of social psychology.

Conservatives also criticize multiculturalism on the grounds that it breeds jealousy and tension within society through its support for minority rights. These were defined by Kymlicka as falling into three categories: self-government rights, whereby devolved powers are given to national minorities; polyethnic rights, which help to preserve distinctive cultures, usually in the form of legal exemptions such as Jews and Muslims being exempt from animal slaughtering laws; and representation rights, which aim to redress the under-representation of minorities in education and public life. Conservatives argue that these, and more broadly what Parekh advocated as 'variegated treatment', serves to subordinate and devalue 'host' cultures simply because they have prospered or held associations with colonization. They thus, this inequality within society breeds tensions between minorities and the majority, threatening the natural order.

Finally, conservatives have criticized multiculturalism due to the fact that their views are more closely in line with those of nationalism. They view a common culture and shared national identity to promote national unity, therefore as a necessary precondition for a stable and successful society. As a result, the multiculturalism emphasis on diversity and the tolerance of many cultures is seen to threaten this.

Conservatives are empirical, and view the multi-cultural Roman Empire, which eventually resulted in collapse, as proof that multicultural societies do not work, thus do not help to maintain the natural order.



ResultsPlus

Examiner Comments

This response is well written and covers a wide range of Conservative grounds for criticising multiculturalism, including the Conservative view of human nature, support for a cohesive nationalism and hostility to devaluing aspects of the national culture. It was awarded full marks.

Question 6

This was a popular essay question and most candidates covered liberal, socialist and radical feminism. Stronger responses made continued reference to the question and developed a clear argument in their essays, with most arguing that e.g. liberal and socialist feminism are compatible while radical feminism is not compatible with other political ideologies. Some candidates argued that feminism and Conservatism are not compatible, due to their different views on the family. The vast majority of candidates provided a clear concluding paragraph summing up their arguments.

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

First wave feminism, founded by political thinkers such as Wolfstonecraft and J.S. Mill's was linked to a Liberal way of approach to the matter of inequality. Liberal feminism stemmed from the Liberal belief of universalism and individual freedom and essentially is the Liberal approach to gender inequality in regards to its adoption of separation of the private and public sphere, leaving the personal life as a realm of choice. Radical feminism, which ~~was~~ was the re-emergence of feminism in the 1960's and 1970's (prompted by Liberal feminist Betty Friedan) rejects the normative means of the pursuit of equality and approaches the issue of female subjugation in terms of psychological and sexual effects. Radical feminism is not really seen as compatible with other political ideologies as it tends to focus solely on issues of gender inequality ~~which~~ in a consciousness lifting approach which it ut adds with other ideologies. Socialist feminism adopt the Marxist theory that the economic base determines the superstructure of society and therefore women's subjugation can be explained in terms of economic exploitation. Postmodern feminists take a new approach and ~~attribute~~ dismiss liberal and radical beliefs as being too narrow and take into account a whole range of issues, such as race and religion. Where feminism is incompatible completely with an ideology is with Conservatism due to the belief in organic ~~socialist feminism~~ society, natural hierarchy and tradition.

~~Enlightenment~~ Feminism is compatible with Socialism as the Socialist feminist branch of feminism adheres to Marxist beliefs through ~~the~~ the writings of Engels. Engels saw women as exploited by the nature of capitalism as they had been reduced to essentially unpaid laborers as domestic duties made them economically dependent on men. Naturally, Engels believed that the destruction of capitalism and creation of communism would bring equality to women as well as everyone else. Modern feminist Socialists have seen the answer to female subjugation within getting paid for domestic duties, which would release them of their economic dependence on men. Juliet Mitchell a Socialist feminist ~~and~~ exclaimed that ~~as~~ a profoundly unequal society had reduced women to sexual objects, unpaid laborers and reproducers. Socialism and feminism are therefore compatible in the sense that both ideologies seek equality.

Much of the ~~psychological~~ psychological and sexual inferiority of women has been attributed to the implications of the family structure, a structure which in Conservatism is believed to be at the heart of society. Radical feminists see such as Kate Millet and Germaine Greer see the family structure as perpetuating and reflecting women's subjugation in the wider society. The gender roles of husband and wife are believed to ~~perpetuate the structure~~ be responsible for the creation of passive female gender roles, which not only causes the subjugation of the women but also is involved in socialising children into adhering to unrealistic and wrong ideas of gender. Therefore, for feminists such as Shulamith Firestone the family structure should be completely dismantled and women should give up their previously perceived reproductive role in order to be truly liberated. Firestone advocated collective child rearing and technological means of reproduction. This completely opposes Conservative beliefs of the family structure, which is seen to be

The microcosm of the macrosystem of society (A belief that radical feminists agree with but don't necessarily in the positive conservative light) and therefore traditional order within the family structure should remain the same. Thus the emphasis on Judeo-Christian morality within Conservatism is transferred onto the perceived role of the women in the family structure as being ~~as~~ domestic. In practice this was realised when one of Thatcher's ~~strong~~ condemnations of Welfarism was that it decreases female dependency on the 'breadwinning' male and therefore leads to a breakdown in society. While conservatism has encouraged strong family structure Radical feminists have advocated the creation of all female societies in an effort to dismantle and destroy the damaging family gender roles, which reflect the wider society. In this sense feminism is most definitely not compatible with Conservatism.

Feminism can be interpreted as being compatible with ~~anarchism~~ Anarchism in regards to the state of false consciousness that is believed to encompass society. Simone de Beauvoir in 1949 expressed her theory of 'Otherness', which suggested that due to biological inferiorities ~~of~~ women they were perceived to be inferior in all aspects of life to men. Moreover, due to this belief women are not only inferior in men's eyes but also in their own too. Links can be made to Anarchism as Anarchists believe that society is under false consciousness as it believes that subjugation to the state is fair. ~~to~~

A ~~example~~ compatibility between Liberalism and feminism is realised within Liberal Feminism in regards to the private/public divide. Liberalism stresses the importance of the private lives of individuals remaining separate from politics and the public sphere. Betty Friedan who

wrote 'The femme Mystique' reacted to what she saw as an excess of radicalism and claimed that women should still be able to choose the role a domestic role if that was in fact a choice. The emphasis on freedom of choice within liberal feminism is in keeping with the liberal tenet of tolerance. However, liberalism does not accept intolerance so sexist practices such as Female Genital Mutilation is not regarded as acceptable. Liberal philosopher J.S. Mills expressed his liberal feminist agenda in his 'Reflection on the Subjugation of women' in which he expressed that the inferiority and subjugation of women was wrong due to utilitarianism which emphasises the foundational equality of all individuals. Moreover, like liberals, liberal feminists focus on the normative means of reaching equality such as political and social reform. This ensures feminism's compatibility with liberalism as liberalism advocates foundational equality and equality of opportunity within the peaceful and normative means.

Postmodernist feminism is not compatible with any ideologies that do not acknowledge the importance of a myriad of issues being taken into account in regards to identity formation. Postmodernist feminists reject radical and liberal notions as they are too basic in regards to gender oppression. A whole other host of factors need to be taken into account such as race, ^{and} religion ~~and~~.

To conclude, feminism is ~~not~~ compatible with mainly Socialism and Liberalism but the nature of radical feminism prevents feminism to adhering to normative means. Radical feminism adds a layer of complication to feminism as it believes in consciousness raising.

in regards to and therefore normative ideologies are not seen to be relevant to aiding the liberation of women as they focus on normative methods.



ResultsPlus

Examiner Comments

This response is strong on each of the three main strands of feminism and keeps a strong focus on the question. The candidate also brings in other ideological traditions, including Conservatism, and is strong on evaluation. This answer was awarded full marks.

Question 7

This was the most popular essay question and mostly answered well. Most candidates covered liberal and expansionist nationalism, with stronger responses bringing in other forms, such as anti-colonial or cultural nationalism. A key discriminator was continuously referring back to the question and evaluating the extent to which nationalism, in its different forms, breeds conflict and war. The vast majority of candidates provided a clear concluding paragraph summing up their arguments.

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

Nationalism has often been thought of as an aggressive and militaristic ideology, but this merely illustrates the extent to which it has been hijacked by chauvinistic and racist politicians in the 20th century. In fact, nationalism as originally developed by 19th century liberals has a progressive and liberating doctrine committed to securing a peaceful, stable and harmonious international order. Thus, although nationalism has indeed contributed to two highly destructive world wars in the past 100 years, it would very much be inaccurate to suggest that it inevitably breeds conflict and war.

Liberal nationalism, far from espousing conflict or war, actually arose out of a principled belief in national self-determination. This arose out of the writings of Rousseau, who articulated the doctrine of popular sovereignty and the notion of the general will that was the seed of nationalist doctrines. 19th century nationalists gradually fused the struggle for self-determination with that for popular self-government since the multinational empires they opposed were also autocratic, oppressive and expansionistic. At the heart of liberalism is the belief in individual freedoms, traditionally expressed in the language of rights. Liberal nationalists believe that nations are sovereign entities entitled to rights, most notably the right to self-determination. In this sense, all nations are equal irrespective of their size or wealth. Thus, nationalism can actually be a liberating force since it opposes all forms of foreign control, especially imperialism, and embodies the doctrine of popular self-government.

Not only can nationalism be liberating, but it may actually help to uphold peace and stability since liberals believe that the principle of balance or ~~equilibrium~~ harmony applies not just to individuals within society but also to the nations of the world. The achievement of self-determination is thus likely to create a ~~more~~ peaceful and harmonious international order. Democratic ~~or~~ nation-states would naturally respect the territorial integrity of their neighbours and have no incentive to wage war or subjugate each other. For liberals, nationalism does ~~not~~ ^{not} divide nations from one another, promoting rivalry, distrust or possibly war. Instead, it ~~is~~ ~~is~~ promotes both unity within each nation and ~~harmony~~ ~~amongst~~ amongst all nations on the basis of mutual respects for national rights and characteristics. Such expectations have been partially borne out in reality, as shown by the unprecedented peace amongst the various nation-states in Continental Europe after centuries of warring war between the ~~imperial~~ ^{imperial} empires of Austria ^{or} Russia.

Indeed, liberal nationalists believe that nationalism can be tamed or controlled through various mechanisms. Firstly, in the event the constitutionalism and democracy are insufficient to secure peace in conditions of ~~the~~ 'international anarchy', ~~the~~ national interdependence can promote ~~the~~ mutual understanding and cooperation. This explains why liberals have embraced the idea of free trade; ~~the~~ ~~mutual~~ ~~interdependence~~ interdependence means that the material costs of conflicts are so great as to make warfare virtually unthinkable. Secondly, liberals believe that national ambitions can be checked through the construction of international institutions capable of bringing order to an otherwise lawless international scene. By establishing a law-governed state system, organs such as the UN allow nations to settle disputes peacefully, ~~definitely~~. At heart, Wilsonian nationalism looks beyond the nation-state to the concepts of multilateralism and internationalism. ~~Such~~ ~~checks~~ ~~and~~ ~~balances~~ in the international system help to uphold the rights and interests of all nations.

by preventing war or imperialism.

Conservative nationalists have also highlighted the extent to which nationalism can prevent domestic conflict. Indeed, they are attracted to the promise of social order embodied in the ~~desires~~^{sentiment} of patriotic loyalty. For conservatives, ~~society~~^{the nation} is 'organic' - it arises naturally out of the desire of people to live with those with whom they share the same views, habits or appearances. Thus, the goal of nationalism is to uphold national unity by fostering ~~national~~^{patriotic} loyalty or national pride, especially in the face of the divisive idea of class solidarity preached by socialists. Indeed, nationalism has often been viewed as an antidote to class revolution by ensuring that ~~the~~^{patriotic} loyalty ~~is~~^{is} stronger than class solidarity. Thus, the defence of traditional institutions and a traditional way of life ~~are~~^{are} embodied in conservative nationalism can be a powerful tool to bind the nation together and paper over domestic conflicts, thus keeping instability and insurrection at bay.

However, ~~the~~^{the} nationalism has indeed been used as a justification for imperialism and militarism, meaning that there is some truth to the statement that it breeds conflict or war. Expansionistic nationalists have used nationalism as a justification for imperial conquest, and military victories have often provoked public celebrations. ~~The~~^{This} phenomenon of ~~the~~^{'jingoism'} was first termed in the UK during the heyday of the British Empire, ~~meaning~~^{meaning} and indeed 19th century colonialism was largely justified on the grounds that Western nations were racially and culturally superior to other nations - Even more disturbingly, nationalism has overlapped with socialism at times - for example in the ~~the~~^{the} doctrine of Pan-Slavism or Pan-Germanism. Such ideas were used as a justification for aggressive militarism, which reached ~~its~~^{its} height ~~before~~^{before} and

during World War II. Indeed, the use of nationalism by fascist regimes in Italy, Japan and Germany to justify wars of imperial expansion have badly furnished ~~the~~ ^{its} image ~~as a political ideal~~ in the eyes of many. ~~superstition~~

• National ~~ideology~~ ~~doctrine~~ chauvinism highlights the dangers of intense nationalist feelings, which tends to be expressed through a desire in expansion and war. Charles Maurras feared this phenomenon integral nationalism, in which individuals lose their identity and rationality within the ~~the~~ all-powerful nation ~~which~~ which has a meaning beyond the life of any single individual. Indeed, the civilian population is militarised, infected by the martial values of absolute loyalty, complete dedication and willing self-sacrifice. Ultimately, nationalism is capable of inspiring strong militarist feelings since ~~the~~ military ~~is~~ victory is seen as the ultimate evidence of national glory and triumph. Such chauvinistic political creeds breed from a clear distinction between 'them' and 'us', with the outsiders routinely used as a scapegoat for all the misfortunes suffered by 'us'. • These fascist ideologies were ultimately responsible for ~~the~~ the Holocaust or the Rwandan Genocide, illustrating the extent to which nationalism can indeed cause violence.

To sum up, although nationalism does not inevitably breed conflict or war, it is certainly capable of doing so, particularly when it is hijacked by ruthless ~~the~~ ~~politicians~~ politicians for their own agenda. ~~Thus~~ The mistake of liberals was to ignore the darker side of national, the 'national bonds of tribalism' that has led people to fight or die for their country regardless of the justice of their nation's cause. Nations rarely live in convenient and discrete geographical areas and most countries in reality ~~do~~ include a variety of minority groups, meaning that the ideal of a ~~politically~~ ^{culturally} homogeneous and ~~not~~ politically unified nation-state can only be achieved through forcibly deporting minority groups.

Thus, nationalism has often led to bloodshed and violence and indeed many of today's nation states have only been formed after decades of ethnic cleansing and endemic warfare, most recently seen in the former Yugoslavia in the 1990s.



ResultsPlus

Examiner Comments

This response has very good coverage of liberal and expansionist nationalism, with a clear focus on the question throughout. It is well written and well-argued and achieved a high level three mark.

Question 8

This was not a popular essay question. Stronger responses made clear reference throughout to conventional moral thinking and were able to show how different forms of ecologism were either in line with it, or went beyond it. A key discriminator for candidates was this focus on moral thinking rather than more generally contrasting the different strands within ecologism. The vast majority of candidates provided a clear concluding paragraph summing up their arguments.

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

Ecologism is in a sense distinct from all other political ideologies and doctrines. While other doctrines unanimously agree that the interest of human beings are paramount, ecologists have however questioned this assumption.

I will argue therefore that although some ecologists have maintained conventional ideas about morality ecologism as a doctrine has gone well beyond conventional moral thinking.

What Arne Ness described as 'shallow ecologism' appears to have remained within the confines of conventional morality.

Shallow ecologists have remained anthropocentric in ~~there~~ their moral outlook. These ecologists and environmentalists adopt the conventional moral perspective that human interests will ~~always~~ come above the interests of other organisms and of the inanimate world. These shallow ecologists such as the UK Green party look to

ecologists protect the environment not because it has inherent value but because it has instrumental value. Greenpeace, for example, have protested against the use of fossil fuels to protect the interests of people. They see that global warming in particular will have severe detrimental effects on humans - particularly because it will cause rising sea levels and therefore floods. In this sense shallow ecologists have do not appear to go beyond conventional morality - they like most seek to improve the living quality of humans. There is however a sense in which these shallow ecologists have moved beyond conventional morality. Firstly they seek to protect the well-being of future generations. This is a small but significant step beyond conventional morality, which does itself rarely look beyond the concerns of those of the living. They have shallow ecologists have also made definite steps beyond conventional morality in their attitude to animal welfare. These shallow ecologists are prepared to put the interests of animals

before the interests of humans. Peter Singer for example appears to have gone beyond conventional morality by applying utilitarian principles to animals. Singer argues that the maxim 'the greatest happiness for the greatest number' should apply to animals as well as humans.

Singer ~~however~~ ~~can~~ and other supporters of animal welfare can ~~be~~ however be seen as applying conventional morality in unconventional ways rather than necessarily going beyond it. The Animal rights movement does still ~~represent~~ however represent a move away from conventional morality.

The extent to which shallow ecologists can be seen as moving beyond conventional morality ~~the~~ depends upon our conception of 'conventional morality'. If we understand 'conventional morality' as something resembling a utilitarian ethic, that we should attempt to promote human happiness, then shallow ecologists have not gone far beyond conventional morality. Alternatively, we could argue that conventional morality is, after the emergence of neoliberalism,

essentially egoistical. ~~For~~ From this perspective shallow ecologists have moved well beyond conventional morality.

Deep ecologists on the other hand appear to have moved beyond conventional moral thinking however we understand define conventional ethics. Deep ecologists have rejected the conventional method of looking at, and understanding, the world. Fritjof Capra identified what he called the 'Newtonian-Cartesian paradigm'; a way of understanding the world in line ~~the~~ with René Descartes dualism and Isaac Newton's laws of physics. This world view embodied by the doctrine of scientism sees understands the natural world as a mechanical machine, ~~but~~ furthermore it is dualistic in seeing humans as separate from the natural world. The implication of the 'Newtonian-Cartesian paradigm' is that humans believe they can adapt and manipulate the natural world for their advantage. Deep ecologists have rejected this world view on two

grounds; firstly it is mistaken and secondly it has devastating implications for the natural world. Deep ecologists therefore reject conventional metaphysics. Instead they adopt a radically holistic understanding of the world, Deep ecologists have drawn on ideas from contemporary quantum mechanics, eastern religions and pre-Christian spirituality to form a new paradigm - a new way of understanding the world. Deep ecologists' rejection of the conventional paradigm implies that they will also be fundamentally opposed to conventional morality. And there is much evidence to support this. Deep ecologists have, based on their holism, adopted the principle of ecocentricism. They argue that humans are not at the center of the world, instead ~~they~~ humans are part of an interconnected whole. This implies that humans do not have moral priority over ~~the rest~~ other organisms or indeed the inanimate world. Deep ecologists have therefore adopted the principle of biocentric equality - all organisms are of equal moral worth. These ideas represent a clear

and significant move beyond conventional anthropocentric moral thinking.

~~Shallow~~ In conclusion, shallow ecologists have taken steps beyond beyond conventional moral thinking. Deep ecologists has however taken such radical steps beyond conventional moral thinking that its ideas are wholly irreconcilable with the status quo.



ResultsPlus
Examiner Comments

This response is well written and focuses on the question throughout. Some key distinctions between shallow and deep ecologists are given, along with some evaluation of the extent to which they do, or do not, go beyond conventional moral thinking. This is a level three response.

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 many of the 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