

Examiners' Report  
June 2015

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

Alternatively, you can get in touch with us using the details on our contact us page at [www.edexcel.com/contactus](http://www.edexcel.com/contactus).

## ResultsPlus

### Giving you insight to inform next steps

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

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

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

### Pearson: helping people progress, everywhere

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

June 2015

Publications Code UA041706

All the material in this publication is copyright  
© Pearson Education Ltd 2015

## Introduction

The overall standard of responses in Unit 3B was broadly in line with that in previous sessions. There were relatively few examples of candidates misunderstanding or misinterpreting questions although in some cases candidates did not make explicit their understanding of the key concepts within a question, by giving a short definition. A small minority of candidates opted to only answer two questions from section A and this should be strongly discouraged.

An important discriminator, as in previous years, was the extent to which candidates focused on the *specific* question set. 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* answering the question.

## Question 1

This was one of the less popular questions in section A. Most candidates were able to identify the link, although some over emphasised the anarchist opposition to the state and worked backwards from there. Stronger responses tended to have a short definition at the start, a clear focus on the question and made a range of points.

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

Anarchism is a political ideology defined by its opposition to the state, that is, a political body which holds sovereign political power over a defined geographical area. Individualism is a philosophy which keeps individual human beings and their rights at its heart.

One area where there has been a link between the two is in the belief in the rights of the individual, perhaps stand ~~liberal~~ egoist strand of individualist anarchism. Egoism is a philosophy which places the individual at the centre of all political of the moral universe. This ~~means~~ lead the philosopher Max Stirner to believe that all concepts such as justice, law, religion

and morality were merely "spooks" and externalisations of individual preferences. Egoists have tended to suggest ~~the~~ suggest that humans have the "right of might", that is, the right to do whatever they can and want to do. This is the most extreme form of individualism found in anarchism.

The link between individualism and the libertarian strand of individualist anarchism is more linked to the belief in the individual always being permitted to follow their own ~~own~~ moral conscience, as opposed to the concept of morality not existing as put forward by egoists. Henry David Thoreau, for example, followed his conscience by avoiding taxes due to his opposition to slavery, and argued in "Civil Disobedience" that each individual has the right to ignore laws they believe are unethical. This is a less extreme individualism than ~~egoism~~ egoism, as it implies the existence of morality that applies egoism denies.

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

placing instead an emphasis on individual moral principles.

Anarcho-capitalists are linked to individualism by their faith in absolute, objective human rights, that the state has no right to invade. Anarcho-capitalists such as Rothbard ~~argued~~ that there is a ~~as well as~~ their faith in individual actions is a ~~free~~ free market economy to provide for all human needs. Anarcho-capitalists such as Rothbard believe that the state robs people through taxation and that instead individual rights, free markets and private property can be the basis for all of society. They therefore believe this is, in essence, ~~as~~ a version of Adam Smith's free market economies taken to the extreme, with enough faith in individuals that they believe those principles are the basis for a fair and stable society, with all functions of society such as defence and courts being provided by voluntary agreements between individuals or businesses. Therefore, they have developed an extreme form of individualism, but based on objective ideas of human rights rejected by egoists.



**ResultsPlus**

Examiner Comments

There is a definition at the start, a clear focus on the question and several links covered, including the illustration of anarcho-capitalism at the end. This response was given full marks.

## Question 2

This was one of the more popular questions in this section. Most candidates were stronger on the traditional conservative view, but were able to compare this with the New Right perspective. Stronger responses developed and illustrated their explanations of each view.

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

Traditional conservatives came about in the 18<sup>th</sup> century as a reaction to the French revolution. The liberal New Right were half of the new right that came about in the 1970s as a response to the collapse of Keynesianism. As opposed to the conservative new right who came about in the 1960's as a response to "sex, drugs and rock and roll". Society is a group of people who come together because of similar activities and interests.

Traditional conservatives hold an organic view of society. Society is like a living organism which grows and develops wholistically over time. It is very fragile and cannot be taken apart and put back together. The whole of society is better than the collection of the sum of its parts. In contrast to this

The liberal New Right hold an atomistic view of society. Society is a collection of parts who only come together in order to avoid unnecessary collisions. Society is not fragile, it is mechanistic and hence can be taken apart and put back together like a machine.

These views of society are held because of the belief in human nature. Traditional conservatives believe in an organic society because of a ~~best~~ pessimistic view of human nature. Humans are morally, psychologically and intellectually imperfect human beings, they therefore seek the security and familiarity of a society that has developed over time using accumulated wisdom of the past. The liberal New Right however have a belief in an atomistic society because they believe humans are rational. They do not need security and belonging but they will come together to avoid unnecessary collisions because they are rational.





**ResultsPlus**  
**Examiner Comments**

This candidate spends much of their time providing definitions at the start and this leaves less time to answer the question. They go on to outline the two different views, but without the necessary development to score a higher mark. This response achieved a higher level two mark.



**ResultsPlus**  
**Examiner Tip**

There is no need to provide an introduction when answering section A questions. It is a good idea to define key terms where necessary, but this candidate has given themselves less time to answer the question due to their lengthy introduction.

### Question 3

This was one of the more popular questions in this section. Most candidates were able to give two or more reasons for supporting a revolutionary 'road', along 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

~~Socialists~~, ~~part~~ ~~Fraser~~ Some socialists, notably fundamental socialists, believe socialism can only be brought by the means of revolution - a forcible overthrow of government in favour of a new system. This is grounded on a variety of ideas.

Firstly, the working class in the 19<sup>th</sup> Century were excluded from political life, ~~later~~ being refused the right to vote and ~~prohibit~~ for join ~~the~~ for political movements. For example in Russia, where the 1917 social revolution happened, the working class were prohibited from joining trade unions - ~~the~~ This meant revolution was seen as the ~~the~~ only answer. Landed aristocrats dominated ~~autocratic~~ ~~monarchies~~ a monarchies and where representative democracy existed, it was restricted to certain sections of society - i.e. the middle class - through a property qualification. This therefore reinforced ~~the~~ the need of revolution for socialists.

Secondly, reform is seen as pointless as the state is an instrument of class domination, biased in favour of capital ~~and~~ with political power representing the interests of the bourgeoisie. Regular elections and ~~universal~~ <sup>universal</sup> suffrage are a ~~facade~~ facade to some socialist, concealing the reality of unequal ~~the~~ class and misdirecting the energies of the proletariat and hence ~~so~~ some socialists support the revolutionary road to socialism ~~because~~ <sup>because</sup> reform will not ~~the~~ <sup>solve</sup> the fundamental issue of an oppressive state; it is merely ~~paper over~~ 'paper over the cracks.'

Thirdly, ~~some~~ revolution ~~promises~~ promises to ~~bring a~~ bring a fundamental transformation of society. ~~which is why~~ The old remnants of the oppressive capitalist system can be ~~eradicat~~ eradicated and a new system can be put in place, namely state collectivism. This can be seen for example in the case of the ~~Khmer Rouge~~ ~~Khmer Rouge~~ Khmer Rouge, which seized control of Cambodia and proclaimed the 'Year Zero'. Therefore this is why some socialists support the revolutionary road as opposed to holding faith in the inevitability of gradualism like evolving socialism.



### ResultsPlus Examiner Comments

This is a wide ranging response with development and illustration of each point. An unhelpful example is given towards the end, but this does not detract from the overall point. This response achieved a high level three mark.

## Question 4

This was the most popular question in this section. The vast majority of candidates were able to distinguish between negative and positive freedom. Stronger responses acknowledged that all liberals support freedom and that positive freedom is best viewed as an addition to, rather than a substitute for, negative freedom.

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

Liberals are seen to be divided over the concept of freedom in 2 complex ways. These views differentiate into the classical liberal view and the modern liberal view. The ~~disagreement~~ divide has come amongst complexity of Isaiah Berlin's writings 'on liberty', in which he declared that there are in fact 2 types of freedom; positive freedom & negative freedom. Positive <sup>liberty</sup> ~~freedom~~ is simply known as the freedom to which means that individuals are free to develop rationality and other individualistic ~~concepts~~ <sup>concepts</sup> which has notably been adopted by modern liberals such as T.H. Greene.

The disagreement concerns this is the opposing view of negative liberty which is known as the freedom from which means that

individuals are free insofar that they are not being constrained by others and the implications of this are adopted by classical liberals.

Due to this divide within the concept, there are now differences in how liberals wish to see ~~the~~ the state. Those who are believers of positive liberty (modern liberals) believe that the state should be big and that it should provide institutions which enable us to further develop our individuality, essentially acting as a welfare state which is then pushed further by the Beveridge report which seeks to offer cradle to grave welfare.

However, the rift within freedom emerges when classical liberals (who wish for negative liberty) seek to have a small/minimal state.

They wish to have a small state because they believe that man is fundamentally selfish, egoistic, self-reliant and rational and by having a small state with limited restrictions they will ~~they~~ truly be able to develop their capacity. The idea of there being ~~with~~ a small state with no government intervention draws upon the idea of the economy and market.

Furthermore

~~Further~~, the concept of freedom creates  
dispute on how the market should be  
~~structured~~ structured. For modern liberals who are  
keen believers of positive liberty, they believe  
that the economy should be mixed but  
more towards the side of government provision.  
However in opposition to this, believers of  
negative liberty think that we should live  
in a society dominated by the freemarket  
as the 'invisible hand', as Smith puts it, would  
distribute goods allocatively and efficiently.

However, the disagreement of freedom can also  
be seen as minimal as there are common  
grounds on which all liberals believe in  
E.g. Freedom of speech. J.S. Mill believes that  
speech should only be censored if it directly  
harms someone (the harm principle) otherwise we should  
encourage it as it allows us to further our own  
capacity. He pushed this further by issuing a 'devil's advocate'  
to oppose every opinion in the belief that it allows us  
to reinforce our beliefs and understand others beliefs. Voltaire  
is also in agreement as he says "I detest what you  
say but will defend to the death your right to say  
it."



### ResultsPlus Examiner Comments

This candidate makes the point that all liberals support freedom. They go on to develop their explanations of negative and positive freedom, showing the implications each has for the state. This response achieved a high level three mark.

## Question 5

This was one of the less popular questions in this section. Most candidates were able to give more than one illustration. Stronger responses tended to have a wider range of points and more development and illustration of their points.

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

Anarchists have held a positive view of human nature either in their conception of human nature as innately good, or in their belief that human nature is 'plastic' and thus that the potential for moral perfection resides within every individual.

Collectivist anarchists, notably Kropotkin, argue that humans are innately sociable and gregarious and thus have a natural propensity towards harmonious organisation without the need of a government or state. Kropotkin especially argued that people prefer to pursue to pursue their goals collectively and that they have a natural capacity to do so, advancing a theory of 'mutual aid' on the basis that humans are inherently bound by the ties of social responsibility, sympathy, common humanity and affection.

Individualist anarchists have <sup>also</sup> argued that human nature is inherently good, but for different reasons. They tend to stress the rational and moral 'enlightenment'

that exists within each individual, and advocate the primacy of individual conscience for this reason.

Some anarchists, including Bakunin have, conversely argued that there is no 'natural morality', and that when born individuals are neither good nor bad. In this respect human nature is 'plastic' and shaped by social, political and economic circumstances. However, this is still ultimately an optimistic and favourable <sup>view</sup> of human nature in that it presumes that any human behaviour that is greedy, selfish or inconsistent is the result of social institutions like the law, government and state that foster these values, not any baser instinct or nature. Thus, most anarchists argue that, with the right 'moral' and 'rational' educations, humans have the innate capacity to achieve moral perfection.



**ResultsPlus**  
Examiner Comments

This is a relatively concise and well written answer. Each point is well put and there is development. This response achieved a mid level three mark.



## Question 6

This was the most popular essay question. Most candidates gave a reasonably detailed summary of the traditional conservative view of human nature and provided some balance with the liberal New Right view. Stronger responses pointed out that the conservative New Right also believes in human imperfection and attempted to show how One Nation conservatism can be seen as departing from the traditional conservative approach.

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

Conservatism has been described by O'Sullivan as a philosophy of human imperfection, and to some extent this appears to be correct. Many conservatives, especially traditional ~~cons~~ conservatives, have agreed that humans are imperfect in at least three senses: intellectually, psychologically and morally, and their ~~best~~ core values, such as their beliefs in tradition and hierarchy, are based on this idea of human imperfection. It would be inaccurate, however, to conclude that conservatism is entirely about human imperfection, as this would ignore several strands of conservative thinking that takes a more positive view of human nature, in particular the liberal New Right. This essay will argue therefore, that whilst conservatism as a whole adopts a pessimistic outlook on human nature, it is ultimately humans are not entirely without redeeming qualities in conservative thought.

Despite this, it is fair to say that many conservatives believe humans to be inherently sinful. This belief is especially strong within traditional conservatism, ~~which~~. One way in which traditional conservatives believe that humans are flawed is intellectually,

~~Conservative~~ Traditional conservatives maintain that ~~we~~ limited humans cannot possibly comprehend the whole of political reality, as liberals argue. Instead the ~~world~~ world is, as Michael Oakeshott put it, 'boundless and bottomless': it is beyond reason's grasp. This leads to an inherent scepticism within traditional conservatism with regard to abstract principles, ideas and values. Such things are ~~because~~ because such things are attempting to achieve the impossible: they are trying to impose order over an intrinsically chaotic world. Instead, traditional conservatives point to the value of tradition, as traditional values and institutions contain 'the accumulated wisdom of the past'. As ~~the~~ conservative Chesterton argued, given that humans are intellectually limited, it makes no sense 'to merely listen to people who happen to be walking around'; instead, a 'democracy of the dead' (Chesterton) is required, ensuring that human imperfections in an intellectual sense are overcome. Moreover, New Right conservatives do share this view strongly, mainly due to the use of 'permissives', or the idea of permitting numerous ethical choices. For many New Right conservatives, the traditional values, and especially 'family values' have been eroded and lost, and as a result society has 'lost its way'. Permitting unconventional institutions and values to flourish is misguided because humans are corrupt creatures: without the wisdom of tradition, which has survived because of its intrinsic value, humans will invariably go astray. Thus for both traditional and

New Right conservatives, humans are intellectually incompetent, and so we need tradition as a means of collecting ~~the~~ accumulating the wisdom of, as Burke said, 'those who are living, those who are dead, and those who are yet to be born'.

Such a view is not, however, shared by all conservatives. In particular, ~~the~~ <sup>the</sup> New-liberal strand of New Right conservatism has a far more optimistic view of human intellect, arguing that humans are capable of understanding and evaluating, with accuracy, the consequences of their actions. It is for this reason that individuals should have autonomy over their choices. This is especially true in the economic sphere: New Right ~~liberal~~ conservatives insist that individuals are capable of participating in the free market free of the constraints of tradition, or so-called 'established wisdom'. Indeed, the ~~beauty~~ 'beauty' of the free market lies in part in the idea that it is a product of human intellect. In addition, 'One Nation' conservatives also question the idea that humans cannot create abstract systems of value and moral codes. They have done this, in practice, by creating an abstract moral argument for helping the poor. On one level, One Nation conservatives have insisted that ~~the~~ <sup>the</sup> society's most vulnerable will, if ignored, as a reason that the only way to improve their social status is via evolution, to the detriment of all, as society is destabilised. Second, One Nation conservatives argue that it is irrational to believe that the poor are condemned to be poor due to their birth status.

An idea expressed, for example, by Sumner who argued that 'the drunkard in the gutter is exactly where he ought to be'; the only logical action is to offer support for society's most vulnerable. This conclusion, to help those in need, is supported by human reason alone, not by tradition, and is ~~both~~ ~~of~~ 'One Nation' conservatism, along with 'neo-liberal' conservatism, do not share the view that humans are intellectually ~~impaired~~ intellectually impaired.

The second way in which both traditional conservatives and the conservative strand of the 'New Right' argue that humans are impaired is on a psychological level. According to this view, humans are dependant creatures who crave assurance and security; humans want to know 'where they stand' in society.

This forms another degree of tradition: traditions enable people a 'sense of belonging', as they can identify with the traditions that they find familiar. The British Monarchy, therefore, is of immense value, as it allows the British populace to 'know their place' in relation to it. The idea that humans are psychologically ~~psychologically~~ psychologically impaired also gives ground for a belief in hierarchy. For traditional and 'New Right' conservatism, hierarchy enables people to know 'where they stand' in relation to the rest of society. Edmund Burke, for instance, talks about the need for a 'natural aristocracy', which can offer guidance and support for psychologically limited and dependent humans. Therefore, both ~~and~~ the notions of both tradition and

heavily are rooted in the concept of the innate psychological imperfections of human beings.

Once again, however, the liberal 'New Right' takes issue with this view. According to neo-liberals, individuals are capable of independence and independent choice; they are not psychologically dependent on society. Indeed, neo-liberals have often suggested that, in the words of Thatcher, 'There is no society; there are only individuals and their families'; this means that it is in fact impossible for the individual to be dependent on social norms, as traditional conservatives and New Right conservatives suggest, or there are no such things as social norms. In addition, the traditional conservative belief in hierarchy must contain an element of positivity, as there is an assumed belief that those with power and authority will be able to act with a degree of independence, intelligence and morality; in short, traditional conservatives imply that those the 'natural aristocracy' are not so imperfect that they must be overthrown. The idea that all humans are psychologically limited is, therefore, a root point in conservatism.

The third and final way in which traditional conservatives and 'New Right' conservatives see humans as imperfect is morally. For conservatives, humans are 'imperfect creatures, with a streak of evil' (Hoyt). The human nature is such that individuals, if left to their own devices, will engage in 'A war of all against all' (Hobbes), as humans are naturally greedy and selfish creatures. This generates a need for a strong state,

backed up by harsh punishments such as lengthy prison sentences; this, Hobbes argued (as have many conservatives following him), is the only way to keep immoral humans in check.

This pessimistic view of human morality has been criticised, however by neo-liberals, who argue that human nature has the capacity to be both moral and immoral in equal degrees; this is a much more balanced, positive view. Thus human morality is not deemed to falter, and humans should be free from external interference; this ultimately is a belief in 'negative freedom', the idea that all individuals should be allowed to make their own decisions as far as possible. Finally, One Nation conservatism also adopts a more optimistic view of human morality, believing that society can, should and must help those in need. Humans are <sup>thus</sup> morally capable of working together to achieve a moral end.

Therefore, it would be unwise to reduce conservatism to into the idea that it simply constitutes 'a philosophy - philosophy of impediment'; as the above shows, conservatism is deeply divided on the subject. This is to be expected within all ideologies, however; ideologies, as products of 'limited human thought', are necessarily restricted, as conservatives themselves argue, and so the fact that conservatism is divided between ~~the~~ over this issue is unsurprising.



**ResultsPlus**  
Examiner Comments

This is a well written, well-argued and wide ranging response. The candidate looks at different aspects of human imperfection in turn and compares the traditional conservative view with the liberal New Right view. This response was awarded full marks.

## Question 7

This was the least popular essay question. Most candidates wrote about Marxist or fundamental socialism and compared this with other traditions. Stronger responses maintained a clear focus on collectivism throughout their answers and kept a clear focus on the question. A small minority of candidates conflated collectivism with collectivisation or public ownership and this limited the scope of their responses.

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

'socialism is defined by its ~~belief~~ commitment to collectivism'. Discuss.

The term 'collectivism' refers to the believe that cooperation and collective effort is more economically and socially effecient than individual self striving. Although socialism has often been said to ~~a~~ have been defined by its commitment to collectivism, this isnt necessarily true. Although fundamentalist socialists were absolutely committed to collectivism, social democra~~b~~ have somewhat departed from this commitment. Furthermore, a neo-revisionist socialists have almost entirely abandoned collectivism, preferring to emphasise a commitment to communit-arianism. Therefore, although fundamentalist socialism may be defined by its commitment to collectivism, the same is not true for other strands of the ideology, and thus socialism as a whole.

Fundamentalist socialism can accurately be described as being defined by its endorsement of collectivism.

of socialism

Indeed, this strand has emphasized its commitment to collective endeavour for various reasons. Firstly, fundamentalist socialists argue that collective effort is more economically effective than competition. Closely linked to this is the fundamentalist socialist belief that humans are naturally co-operative creatures. Indeed, humans are 'comrades' and are naturally generous and sympathetic to their 'brothers' and 'sisters'. Collectivism thus utilises their natural traits; their generosity motivates them to work in aid of the 'common good'. Whereas, a capitalist system is based on competition, individualism and greed; therefore it goes against human nature. ~~Ado~~

Additionally, fundamentalist socialists have advocated collectivism on the basis that it is more 'just' than alternative systems. This is because, unlike a system of competition, it does not pave the way for stark inequality behind the pretence of a 'meritocracy'. ~~No one person will reap~~ This is highlighted by Marx's <sup>view of</sup> ~~desire for~~ 'from each according to his ability, to each according to his need'. This emphasises the fact that humans will no longer have to compete in order to survive. Under a system of collectivism, every person will work for the 'common good' and receive what they need, without having to 'earn' it. The fact that collectivism



appears to be a a fairer system to fundamentalist socialist means that they have given it their absolute commitment.

Indeed, this commitment to collectivism can be seen in fundamentalist socialists' desire to abolish private property. This is due to their belief that collective ownership is also a more just and natural means of achieving universal wellbeing.

In this sense, fundamentalist socialist absolute and unrelenting advocacy of collectivism can be accurately described as the defining feature of this strand of the ideology.

However, although social democrats do recognise the benefits of collectivism, they are not dedicated to the principle to the same extent as fundamentalist socialists. For this reason, it would be inaccurate to claim that their commitment to collectivism is the 'defining' feature of social democracy.

Despite this, social democrats have still utilised collectivism and its benefits. Indeed, social democrats have acknowledged the willingness of mankind to contribute to the 'common good', especially when it offers the prospect of helping those in need. For example, social democrats' preference of high taxation and generous social welfare

demonstrates their commitment to collective endeavour. Additionally, the nationalisation of major industries ~~or~~ highlights social democrats' appreciation of collective ownership.

However, social democrats do not hold a total commitment to collectivism. For example, their advocacy of a mixed economy highlights their willingness to allow private enterprises to compete for profit. This is due to social democrats' acknowledgement that humans do also benefit from material incentives. They therefore believe that collectivism isn't necessarily the most economically efficient system. Thus, collectivism is not the defining feature of social democracy. Indeed, it would be more accurate to label their desire for social justice as the defining feature of this strand of socialism.

Furthermore, neo-revisionists have further departed from the socialist commitment to collectivism. For example, neo-revisionists appreciate and value private enterprise, innovation and competition. They therefore do not ~~no~~ advocate collective effort as a means of generating wealth. Furthermore, neo-revisionists

have placed greater emphasis on 'communitarianism'. They believe that, although success is deserved, individuals have accomplished success with the help of others. They therefore have some responsibility to 'give back'. Although this does hint at a neo-revisionist support of collectivism, it still advocates individual self striving. Therefore, ~~not~~ a commitment to collectivism cannot be described as a defining feature of neo-revisionism.

In conclusion, ~~not~~ it is true that a 'commitment to collectivism' is a defining feature of fundamentalist socialism. However, it is evident that this commitment is not shared equally amongst all strands of socialism, with social democrats emphasising collectivism to a lesser extent and neo-revisionists abandoning it in favour of communitarianism. It therefore cannot be argued that socialism as a whole is defined by its commitment to collectivism.



**ResultsPlus**  
Examiner Comments

This candidate provides a definition at the start and retains the correct focus on collectivism, rather than just public ownership. The candidate goes on to discuss Marxist, social democratic and neo-revisionist strands of socialism. This response was awarded a level three mark.

## Question 8

This was a reasonably popular essay choice. Most candidates identified that equality is a key concept for all liberals. Most were also able to distinguish between classical and modern liberal views on equality. Stronger responses pointed out that while both classical and modern liberals support the principle of equality of opportunity, neither support equality of outcome.

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

Liberalism as an ideology emerged during the enlightenment period (the Age of Reason - 1650's to 1780's) and is currently the most pervasive and influential ideology in the world. One might argue that it has been heavily influenced by the works of John Locke, the father of liberalism as well as other philosophers, even those such as Jean-Jacques Rousseau. The principle of equality is traditionally associated with socialism, however, ~~in~~ <sup>within</sup> this essay I will explain how liberals have endorsed said principle as well as the extent to which they have endorsed it.

Firstly, one might argue that liberals, do, to some extent, endorse the principle of equality. Firstly, one must point to the core themes of liberalism. Liberals believe in foundational equality and thus equality of opportunity. They believe that all humans are born with an equal moral worth and consequently argue that each human should ascertain the right to achieve his or her potential. This ties in ~~to~~ with the principle of equality because liberals are arguing that ~~everyone~~ everyone is born equal and that everyone should thus receive an equal chance or opportunity to fulfil their potential.

Moreover, the fact that liberals have a strong ~~where~~ belief

in tolerance ~~means that~~ promotes the principle of equality. To exemplify this, it was Voltaire who once said "I detest what you say, but I will defend to the death your right to say it." He thereby argues that everyone should have ~~the~~ equal rights to say or do how they please. ~~and~~ Further, as ~~they~~ Liberals tolerate almost anything (as long as Mill's harm principle is upheld) it means they are in support of pluralism. This is wherein ~~more than one~~ two or more groups ~~live~~ live in the same community or ~~the~~ society harmoniously. This ties in with the principle of equality in that everyone deserves an equal right to live where and how they want to.

Another argument to corroborate the notion that Liberals endorse the principle of equality is the modern liberal argument. As modern liberals stress positive liberty, they consequently believe in <sup>some form of</sup> welfarism. For example, Keynes wanted to intervene in the market in order to achieve full employment, he ~~the~~ wanted to do this via public spending and increasing taxes. This links to the principle of equality as it redistributes income from the wealthy to the poor and thus reduces the gap between the two, and hence creates more economic equality. Further, the Beveridge Report (1942) ~~has helped~~ ~~the~~ demonstrates that modern liberals endorse the principle of equality. In this Beveridge wanted to eliminate the "5 giants: disease, ignorance, squalor, want and illness" by way of state intervention and collectivism. In eliminating the 5 giants, Beveridge wanted to raise the standards of living for

the poorest in society and thereby increase social equality. Therefore, one might argue that to quite a considerable extent, liberals endorse the principle of equality.

However, one might also argue that liberals do not endorse the principle of equality to a large extent. Firstly, equality ~~defeats~~ the of outcome defeats the <sup>liberal</sup> belief of individualism and 'atomism'. Liberals argue that society does not exist, there is merely a collection of individuals. Hence, each individual is different and individuals ~~have~~ are masters of their own fate and will individually determine whether or not they are successful. This implies that there will be an unequal distribution of success as certain individuals will be more successful, both socially and economically, than others and therefore does not endorse the principle of collectivism. Moreover, liberals believe in capitalism and private property. Capitalism ~~is~~ produces mass unemployment and is divisive in that it separates society into separate classes, such as rich and poor. Further, private property creates social inequality as there is a key difference between those who own property and those who do not. Therefore, one might argue that liberalism's core themes imply contradictions with the principle of equality and that therefore the extent to which liberals believe in equality is limited.

With reference to strands of liberalism, one might argue the extent to which liberals endorse equality is limited. Firstly, early classical liberals such as Locke (Two treatises of government 1689) Voltaire, Montesquieu, Paine (The

Rights of Man (1791) and Thomas Jefferson, stress ~~that~~ the rights of property owners and argue that only those who own property should be allowed to vote, which <sup>thus</sup> creates clear inequality. Further, they have an egotistical view of human nature in that they argue humans will pursue self-interest and self-happiness and ~~that~~ as people all have different interests, inequality ~~is~~ <sup>is</sup> inevitable. Therefore one might argue early classical liberals do not advocate democracy.

Moreover, later classical liberals such as Samuel Smiles ("Self Help" 1859) and Herbert Spencer ("Man vs the State" 1884) both argued for made arguments that implied a limited belief in equality of outcome. Smiles said "heaven helps those who help themselves" and thus extolled the virtue of self-reliance. ~~He argued that~~ <sup>people</sup> Spencer devised 'social Darwinism' and argued that we should "let the weak go to the wall." <sup>Spencer</sup> ~~They~~ argued that we live in a meritocratic society whereby social position is justified by hard work and ~~to~~ ability. He therefore believes that there would inherently be inequality of outcome as some would work harder than others. He thus argued a meritocratic society leads to survival of the fittest and that a consequence of this was inequality.

Further, ~~made~~ neoliberals argue that there ~~should~~ should be a stress on laissez-faire capitalism. Consequently, this will create a society where individuals cannot 'depend' on the state and ~~that~~ that unemployment and deprivation will

occur, thus creating inequality between those who ~~have~~ ~~benefited~~ ~~to~~ benefit from capitalism and those who are exploited by it. Therefore, one might argue that neoliberals, too, show a limited endorsement of the principle of ~~equality~~ equality.

To conclude, one might argue that although some arguments suggest that liberals do endorse equality, there are others to suggest the extent to which they do is limited. Overall, one might argue that liberals do not endorse the principle of equality in its entirety, rather, they support equality of opportunity but not equality of outcome.



**ResultsPlus**  
Examiner Comments

This is a wide ranging essay with a clear focus on the question. Analysis is strong throughout. This response was awarded a high level three mark.



## **Paper Summary**

Based on their performance in this paper, candidates should:

- make sure they answer all the questions required
- time themselves carefully on each question so as to avoid having to rush any answers
- ensure that answers remain focused on the specific question that has been asked
- avoid lengthy introductions when answering section A questions
- provide balance where required, but only where required
- provide short definitions of key concepts as appropriate.

## **Grade Boundaries**

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

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



Ofqual



Llywodraeth Cynulliad Cymru  
Welsh Assembly Government



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