

# ResultsPlus

## Examiners' Report January 2010

### GCE Government and Politics 6GP03/3B

**ResultsPlus**  
look forward to better exam results  
[www.resultsplus.org.uk](http://www.resultsplus.org.uk)

Edexcel is one of the leading examining and awarding bodies in the UK and throughout the world. We provide a wide range of qualifications including academic, vocational, occupational and specific programmes for employers.

Through a network of UK and overseas offices, Edexcel's centres receive the support they need to help them deliver their education and training programmes to learners.

For further information, please call our GCE line on 0844 576 0025, our GCSE team on 0844 576 0027, or visit our website at [www.edexcel.com](http://www.edexcel.com). If you have any subject specific questions about the content of this Examiners' Report that require the help of a subject specialist, you may find our **Ask The Expert** email service helpful.

Ask The Expert can be accessed online at the following link:

<http://www.edexcel.com/Aboutus/contact-us/>



ResultsPlus is our unique performance improvement service for you and your students.

It helps you to:

- **Raise attainment** - by providing in-depth analysis of where your class did well and not so well, enabling you to identify areas to focus on/make improvements.
- **Spot performance trends** at a glance by accessing one-click reports. You can even choose to compare your cohort's performance against other schools throughout the UK.
- **Personalise your students' learning** by reviewing how each student performed, by question and paper you can use the detailed analysis to shape future learning.
- **Meet the needs of your students on results day** by having immediate visibility of their exam performance at your fingertips to advise on results.

**To find out more about ResultsPlus and for a demonstration visit**

<http://resultsplus.edexcel.org.uk/home>

January 2010

Publications Code UA022839

All the material in this publication is copyright

© Edexcel Ltd 2010

## New GCE 6GP03 3B – Introducing Political Ideologies

### General Comments

The standard of responses to this first sitting of the new specification Unit 3B was broadly in line with the standards previously associated with the old specification Unit 4B. A major discriminator between mediocre and good performance was, as ever, the difference between candidates who were able to provide a broadly accurate but essentially descriptive accounts of the ideology or sub-traditions in question, and candidates who were able properly to analyse and evaluate such material.

The separate marking of AO2 is likely to expose this distinction more effectively. The extent to which candidates were able to respond to the new requirements linked to synopticity was also a significant discriminator in the marking of essay responses. While some centres are evidently already training candidates to recognise from the outset, and through the body of the argument itself, contention between two or more viewpoints or perspectives, most candidates failed to do this adequately, sometimes just uncritically presenting a single viewpoint.

Enhancing candidates awareness of debates, discussions and arguments about the nature of the ideological traditions that feature in Topic B, usually (but not always) associated with rival sub-traditions within the ideology, is an important way of improving performance and outcomes.

### Question 1

The relationship between liberalism and democracy is a well established and familiar theme on the political ideologies specification. However, it seems that this question focused on the issue that many candidates find most challenging: the reasons why liberals have *supported* democracy. Breaking perhaps the most basic rule of examination technique – answer the precise question set, rather than the one you would have preferred to come up – many candidates wrote, sometimes at considerable length, about why liberals have *feared* democracy. A great deal of attention was therefore given to irrelevant issues such as the ‘tyranny of the majority’.

A further reason for under-performance was that in a number of cases candidates wrote not about democracy, but about the liberal aspects of liberal democracy. They therefore, and unhelpfully, discussed the benefits of constitutionalism, institutional checks and balances and civil liberties, seemingly unaware that these have appealed to liberals in part because they serve to constrain ‘excessive’ democracy. Strong responses, on the other hand, were often able to highlight a range of liberal arguments in favour of democracy, such as those associated with public accountability and freedom, political participation and personal self-development, and the maintenance of balance and stability in a pluralist society.

A key distinction was nevertheless between those candidates who merely referred to the supposed benefits of democracy and ones who explained why and how democracy furthered specifically liberal aspirations and concerns. This was not a question that required candidates to say much, if anything, about differences between classical liberalism and modern liberalism.

**ResultsPlus**

Examiner Comments

This answer links the benefits of democracy to several relevant points: freedom of choice, education and self-fulfilment, government accountability and a curb on absolutism. There was a recognition of the liberal fear of power and its capacity to corrupt; the answer would have been better if it had explained that point, with reference to the liberal view of human nature as self-interested and therefore likely to use power to abuse others. The answer, therefore, had range but lacked some depth of explanation.

Liberals support democracy <sup>as</sup> ~~has~~ a core belief for them is freedom which they believe democracy provides, unlike Aristotle!!  
Liberals support democracy as it provides freedom of choice and party pluralism which ~~for~~ ~~gives~~ ~~pe~~ allows people to develop different views. ~~#~~

Liberals also support democracy as it educates and empowers people. It allows them to develop their own opinions and achieve self-fulfilment through voting. Liberals believe that democracy prevents people from becoming lazy, passive serfs, ~~some~~ part of the reason why in the 18<sup>th</sup> Century Paine supported an increase in democracy. Liberals also support democracy ~~as~~ it acts as a check to governmental rule. Democracy allows the people to hold the government to account as

as well as opposition parties. Locke in the 17<sup>th</sup> Century was against an absolute monarchy and therefore supported democracy. Similarly, the Liberal Democrats criticised Tony Blair for having a "sofa government" as it reduced accountability to the people. They therefore support democracy.

Liberals also like democracy as it allows people to form independent organisations such as Fathers4Justice. Creating a more politically active society. Democracy also guarantees civil liberties as it cannot form an absolute government which acts against society's wishes. For example, Lord Acton stated that "power corrupts, yet absolute power corrupts absolutely" illustrating why liberals support democracy.

In conclusion, liberals support democracy as it underpins core liberal values: freedom, the development of the individual to achieve self-fulfillment and toleration resulting in the support of democracy.

## Question 2

A very common approach to this question was to state, often early on, that anarchism and collectivism are clearly linked because of the existence of a collectivist anarchist tradition within wider anarchist ideology. This was then followed by an often generalised description of various aspects of collectivist anarchist thinking, including mutualism, anarcho-syndicalism and anarcho-communism. More effective responses provided an explicit definition of collectivism and explained how and why it is linked to anarchism.

In the best responses, the social essence of human nature, which is basic to collectivist thinking, was linked to the idea of spontaneous harmony and natural order, explaining why statelessness is both feasible and desirable. In some cases, collectivism was mistaken for collectivisation, and in other cases – more helpfully, but still inadequately – collectivism was understood to mean common ownership, in which case the question was reworked to focus on the link between anarchism and communism.



### ResultsPlus

Examiner Comments

This answer begins with a useful attempt to define 'collectivism', though a better and fuller definition would have been 'the belief that humans operate both more ethically and more efficiently as cooperative groups than as self-striving individuals'. It goes on immediately to make the link with the anarchists' positive view of human nature. It then describes one form of collectivist anarchism - accurate, but less useful than the final section where it explains the view that 'collectivism is the only way a stateless society would function'. The final point, that 'anarchism, and freedom from a state, is only possible if social solidarity exists first', summarises the connection well.

Question 4 ✕

Question 5 ✕

The ideology of anarchism has a strong collectivist side. Collectivism can be defined as the belief that because human beings are social animals, we should work together for a common goal. It is a direct contrast to individualism.

Collectivist anarchists argue from the same standpoint as all others: a very positive view of human nature. It is argued that in the right conditions, mankind is a good creature that will cooperate with his fellow men simply because he likes to do so. Heywood described anarchist relationships as "voluntary & harmonious". Though liberals may argue that "there is no such thing as society, only individuals" (Thatcher), ~~and~~ collectivist anarchists would argue that we exist only to be part of society.

Syndicalism, seen around Europe & Latin America in the early 20<sup>th</sup>, illustrates this link. Anarchists saw good ideas in collectivist syndicalism, a sort of radical class warfare, and hijacked it. Because it offered a good way of organising post-revolution society, syndicalism was seen as a good investment. George Orwell in 'Homage to Catalonia' illustrates this link by showing how anarchist groups during the Spanish Civil War, tried to use the nation's biggest trade union, the CNT, to their advantage.

Some Anarchists would also argue that collectivism is the only way a stateless society would function. If there were to be no law enforcement, people would need to trust each other to work ~~for~~ for a collective interest. If individual rights were put first, the strong could trample all over the weak.

Collectivism would also be needed to make the transition to a stateless society. George Sorel in 'Reflections on Violence' called it 'a revolution of empty hands' that would collectively reject government.

Bakunin argued that "social solidarity is the first human law, freedom is the second," implying that anarchism, & freedom from a state, is only possible if social solidarity exists first.

### Question 3

Responses to this question were generally well focused and there were a significant number of high quality answers. The strongest responses often started by analysing the nature of gradualism, explaining it in terms of evolutionary socialism and parliamentary or constitutional processes. Many candidates recognised that the notion of the 'inevitability of gradualism' derived from Fabian thinking in the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries. High quality responses were often able to examine a number of reasons why the victory of gradualism was thought to be inevitable, noting, for example, the numerical strength of the working class, the reasons why the politically emancipated working class would support socialist parties, and the processes through which socialist governments will enact socialist reform over a period of time.

Weaker performance sometimes stemmed from a focus on the issue of gradualism without properly addressing the question of inevitability, or from, in some cases, misconstruing gradualist inevitability with Marxist inevitability. Some weak responses simply explained the democratic socialist belief in the 'inevitability of gradualism' in terms of the flaws and failings of revolution and insurrectionary change.



## ResultsPlus

### Examiner Comments

This answer starts by correctly identifying 'gradualism' as the parliamentary road to socialism. It correctly identifies the processes which will make this 'inevitable': universal suffrage means that the working class get the vote; since they are the majority class and their natural home is socialism, socialist parties will inevitably win elections. They will then introduce policies such as 'the support of trade unions, the nationalisation of industries and greater distribution of wealth in society'. The answer links gradualism to the Fabian Society and the founders of the UK Labour Party, who wrote the totemic Clause IV. The answer then digresses onto the perceived failures of gradualism in the UK, which was unasked-for and, therefore, gained no further marks.

Democratic Socialists are a strand of evolving  
socialism. Evolving socialists believe socialism  
should be imposed gradual via democratic principles  
through parliament. They agree with Marx that the  
capitalist system needs to be done to socialism.  
They believe, like Marx that the ~~conflict~~ conflict between  
the ideology spread to the bourgeoisie by the  
bourgeoisie to the proletariat via the superstructure  
all conflict with the reality of everyday life and that  
this will cause social change. However this is where  
Marxists and evolving socialists differ in their views.

whereas Marx believes that this will lead to revolution to overthrow the bourgeoisie and for the workers to take control of the base and the means of production, Evolutionary socialists believe that ~~this~~ by the franchise being granted to the working class, they will vote for a Socialist party to come to power as the working class are the majority and it was seen that their 'home' was Socialism. This gradualism was seen as inevitable.

By the election of a socialist party by the working class, this party will be able to gradually eradicate capitalism by ~~passing~~ passing a series of social and economic reforms through parliament and gradually bringing about socialism. Such policies would include the support of Trade Unions, the nationalisation of industries and greater distribution of wealth in society. British democratic socialists were formed largely around the 'Fabian society' towards the turn of the 20<sup>th</sup> century. In 1918, when the British Labour party adopted socialism as its ideology, the ideas of gradualism were inserted into the party. The Fabians were instrumental in the enactment of clause IV, "The common ownership of the means of production". This statement essentially sums up democratic socialism and demonstrates their social view of human nature and belief in collectivism - that the "collective endeavour of human kind is ~~more~~ practically and morally greater than the individual self-striving".

However, as is evident in the development of the Labour party of the past 90 years since then, gradualism has

proved not to be such an inevitability. Capitalism has proved stable and flexible. In 1956 ~~crossed~~ Crossland wrote of the development of a new class of 'managers and technocrats' essentially society was no longer the noted class conflict between proletariat and bourgeoisie. Moreover the working classes had become 'materially satisfied' and

thus more conservative in their outlook this not really for radical social change. This has caused the Labour party to nearly completely abandon its socialist doctrine, changing class 10 to "opportunity into the hands of the many, not the few" and ~~that~~ the inevitability of gradualism → ~~is~~ illustrated by the fact that around ~~is~~ a third of the working class in Britain vote Conservative.

### Question 4

This question elicited a wide range of responses. Unfortunately, some candidates chose to interpret this question in a highly generalised sense, considering broad differences between traditional conservatism and the New Right rather than focusing just on their views of society. In such cases, candidates often wrote, semi-relevantly at best, about issues such as tradition, hierarchy, authority and property, before addressing the issue of society. Strong responses, on the other hand, provided clear and analytical accounts of the traditional conservative emphasis on an organic society and the contrasting liberal New Right focus on an atomistic society. Whereas atomistic individualism tended to be well understood and explained, very commonly drawing on the services of the much-used Thatcher quote, accounts of organicism were more variable. In some cases, candidates merely stated that traditional conservatives view society as a 'living thing', while in other cases they were able to explain what it means to view society in organic terms and how organic models of society differ from mechanistic ones. The best responses dealt confidently with the issue of extent, usually by highlighting differences within the New Right, whereby, although the liberal New Right clearly departs from organicism, the conservative New Right remains faithful to organicism.

In some cases, candidates got confused because although they tried to highlight differences between traditional conservatism and the New Right, they only seemed to recognise the conservative New Right or neoconservatism. This made it impossible to construct an adequate response.

Although this conclusion does not assert that the prime minister is dominant, nor does it suggest he is not, it remains firm because it reiterates the circumstances which determine whether an individual can dominate or otherwise.



**ResultsPlus**

Examiner Comments

This answer firstly identifies the traditional conservative belief in an organic society and gives some useful explanation: 'a natural order where all parts are necessary but some are more important than others'. If it had also explained that the whole is more important than the sum of its parts, and that this is a collectivist rather than individualist perspective, it would have gained more marks. On New Right neo-liberalism, the answer gives the Thatcher quote 'There is no such thing as society', without which no answer would be complete. It refers to individualism, but there is no explicit reference to atomism. This answer failed to get into Level 3 because it did not correctly address the 'extent' part of the question by identifying New Right neo-conservatism as organic, like traditional conservatives. New Right neo-liberals 'believe in a complete meritocracy'; New Right neo-conservatives do not.

Trad cons

- organic society
- Natural order & hierarchy
- one nation conservatism - obligations of the rich to the less well off

New Right

- Thatcher "There is no such thing as society"
- Focus on individual achievement.

~~Conservative ideology~~ The Conservative Ideology is one that has a number of forms, which have evolved from one another over the roughly 200 years which the term & ideology of conservatism has been in existence. The Conservative view on society is one sector of the Ideology that has changed ~~dramatically~~ dramatically over this period. From traditional conservatives views on an organic society to the New rights ideas on no society, there is

a large divergence of opinion

Traditional conservatives believe in something known as the "organic society". This means a Natural ~~way~~ method by which society is ordered or Natural order. Traditional Conservatives think that an organic society, ~~which~~ is like a body. All parts of the body are necessary, but some are more important than others e.g. the brain is more important than the foot or in real life terms a doctor is more important than a ~~man~~ refuse collector, but both are needed. This ~~view~~ <sup>analogy</sup> demonstrates ~~how~~ the conservatives dislike of change, because ~~the~~ the human body does not radically change, and if it did then it may not function as well. ~~This ~~idea~~~~ Traditional conservatives apply the metaphor

to society.

The New right have a completely different view of society, in fact they do not believe in it. As New Right politician Margaret Thatcher famously said, "there is no such thing as society". This is true for New right thinkers, because they like to emphasize that the freedom and achievement of the individual should not be restrained by the bounds & obligations of the

traditional organic society. The New right is essentially a form of neoliberalism. This means fairly liberal social policies and a completely free market for trade. New right conservatives totally disagree with traditional conservatives about the idea from one nation conservatism that the rich have an obligation to the poor. New right conservatives believe in a complete Meritocracy where anyone from any social background can become wealthy & successful, Think of "yuppies" in the Thatcher era.

To conclude, New right & traditional conservatives ~~then~~ differ greatly in the opinion to society, ~~because of the~~.

### Question 5

This was a question that was answered successfully by a large proportion of candidates. A range of different approaches were adopted, however. Some candidates merely pointed out that anarchists view the state as evil and oppressive because it is irreconcilable with their beliefs about unbounded freedom and personal autonomy. While not being irrelevant, such points failed to highlight what is distinctive about the anarchist approach to the state and state power.

Others explained the evil and oppressive nature of the state from the anarchist perspective in terms of the tendency for those who exercise political authority over others to become, necessarily, corrupt and tyrannical. In the best answers, this was explained in terms of the anarchist emphasis on the malleability of human nature and its negative as well as positive potential. There were some very impressive responses that adopted such a line of argument.

A third approach was to examine what is distinctive about the anarchist interpretation of state authority, focusing on its tendency to be sovereign, compulsory, coercive, exploitative, destructive and so forth. Once again, candidates who were able to explain, rather than simply describe, why, from an anarchist perspective, state authority has these characteristics were able to achieve a very high level of performance. The most impressive responses often acknowledged each of these three lines of argument.



**ResultsPlus**

Examiner Comments

This answer firstly mentions the corrupting influence of the state on 'both those who are subject to authority and those who deliver it'. It goes on say that the state 'is an offence to the principles of freedom and equality', and that anarchists reject social contract theory because the relationship between state and individual is involuntary. They also dislike the state's 'alliance with the wealthy' and its destructive capacity for war. The answer utilises a couple of quotes to emphasise the coercive power of the state and ends with the perspective that state taxation is legalised robbery. In sum, the answer covers a very good range of points. If it had explained the corrupting power of the state with reference to human nature, it would have attained full marks.

Anarchists enemy is the state and its key ideological objection is to abolish it. They believe the state is evil and oppressive for many reasons. Firstly, they believe it corrupts and destroys both those who are subject to authority and those who deliver it. They believe it is an offence against the principles of freedom and equality and reject the liberal theory of the social contract and the agreement between the state and the individual is involuntary. They believe it acts in alliance with the wealthy and controls us via psychological power through a pattern of dominance and submission. They view the state as destructive and believe as Randolph Bourne said, 'War is the health of the state.' They believe we are oppressed and controlled and as Emma Goldman said 'The state is the gun, the baton, the handcuffs and the prison' They believe that the state is pure evil and replace the liberal phrase that 'power tends to corrupt and absolute power corrupts absolutely' with 'power in any shape or

form corrupts absolutely.' Anarchists agree with Proudhon's quote that, 'to be governed is to be inspected, directed, indoctrinated, controlled and censored, censored by creature who have neither the right, nor the wisdom, nor the virtue.' They believe society is unequally distributed in terms of political power and due to the state's dominating characteristics, as Paul Goodman said, 'Many are

ruthless and most live in fear.' Anarchists view of the state is similar ~~to~~ to Marx apart from the transition between the current political system and abolition of the state where Marx believed in a Proletariat dictatorship but anarchists don't distinguish between a proletarian state and a bourgeoisie state. Anarchists believe as Jean, Jacques R. put it, 'Man was born free yet everywhere he is in chains' They believe the state deprives and robs through taxation and is morally corrupt. For these reasons anarchists believe the state is inherently evil and oppressive ~~and the~~ which justifies their main objective which is abolition of the state.

### Question 6

The debate at the heart of this question is between two tendencies within conservative ideology, one of which, traditional conservatism, clearly favours pragmatism over principle, while the other, the liberal New Right or neoliberalism, which distrusts pragmatism and places considerable faith in the politics of principle. In many cases, even though this basic tension was acknowledged, the debate was presented as simplistic, traditional conservatives practising pragmatic politics, while the liberal New Right practises the politics of principle. Strong responses to this question were able to do two things in analysing traditional conservatism. First, they were able to explain why conservatives favour pragmatism over principle, looking at intellectual imperfection and the unfathomable complexity of political and social existence, making all theories and principles unreliable at best. Second, they acknowledged that traditional conservatism is not simply a belief in pragmatism; if it were, conservatism itself would not be an ideology in the conventional sense. Good responses therefore recognised that in the case, for example, of One Nationist paternalism, there is a pragmatic justification for it (social reform is the antidote to social revolution) as well as a principled justification for it (the obligations that are associated with wealth and social privilege).

Similarly, strong responses were able to explain how and why the liberal New Right practises the politics of principle, focusing on the extent to which neo liberals draw on rationalist beliefs, grounded in the liberal tradition. Similarly, they were often able to discuss the idea that while the liberal New Right has embraced abstract theories and political principles, its conversion to such a form of politics was perhaps dictated by pragmatic factors (the failure of the post-war social democratic consensus, and so on).

A general issue of concern was an unreliable grasp of the meaning of 'pragmatism'. In a large number of cases, candidates used the term pragmatism in a broadly appropriate way, but failed to provide an adequate definition of it. In the best cases, pragmatism was defined as behaviour shaped in accordance with practical circumstances and goals rather than ideological objectives, allowing subsequent comments about it to be made with greater precision and insight. However, in some cases pragmatism was confused with a range of other terms that each began with 'p', the most common one being paternalism. This suggests that candidates had had little familiarity with the idea of pragmatism before they sat this paper.

### Question 7

This question was both popular and successfully answered by a high proportion of candidates. There were very few weak responses to this question, and many responses were very impressive. The least successful way of addressing this question was by providing an essentially descriptive account of classical liberalism and modern liberalism, allowing the examiner to identify implicit contrasts between the two.

Fortunately, most candidates had a good range of issues that enabled them to highlight where and when modern liberalism departs from the ideas of classical liberalism. Successful responses therefore often worked their way through issues such as individualism (egoistical individualism versus developmental individualism), freedom (positive freedom versus negative freedom), the state (the minimal state versus the enabling or interventionist state), and so on.

The strongest responses, however, dealt explicitly and clearly with the issue of extent. This was the debate that lies at the heart of the question, between modern liberals who believe that modern liberalism built on, and largely remains faithful to, classical liberal thinking, and classical liberals who believe that modern liberalism has, in effect, betrayed core or classical liberal ideas and departed radically from them. Support for the modern liberal tradition can, for instance, be found in the fact that modern liberals favour welfare intervention but retain a commitment to individual self-reliance because their welfare philosophy aims to help people to help themselves. Similarly, modern liberals support positive freedom, but only in circumstances where social disadvantage prevents them from making wise decisions in their own interests. From the classical liberal perspective, modern liberalism departs radically from classical thinking because, by supporting state intervention, it embraces collectivism and abandons individualism. When the issue of extent was either ignored or only partially addressed, candidates found it very difficult to demonstrate synoptic skills.

This answer begins well by 'setting out its stall' in the introduction, and then by contrasting and explaining the classical liberal belief in possessive individualism versus the modern liberal belief in developmental individualism and concluding that 'rather than departing from classical liberalism, modern liberals have built on this idea', and 'they still hold that the individual is at the heart of the ideology'. The essay goes on to analyse the classical liberal belief in negative freedom versus the modern liberal belief in positive freedom (with some slight digression about natural rights). It then identifies their different views on equality and social justice, and on free market versus Keynesian economics. The concluding paragraph provides an excellent evaluation of the extent of departure, concluding that 'they share the same key values' and 'rather than departing from classical liberal ideas, modern liberalism has adapted them to the political realities of society and in so doing has rescued liberalism from the rise of socialism.' The only significant omission was any reference to the classical liberal view that modern liberalism has betrayed core liberal values.

### Question 8

This question was successfully answered by a good proportion of candidates. Virtually all responses recognised differences between communism and social democracy, the two most prominent forms, respectively, of fundamentalist socialism and revisionist socialism. The use of the latter terminology often helped candidates focus on the central issues of the question in hand, preventing them from writing about wider differences between communism and social democracy.

In a small number of cases, candidates failed to focus adequately on the issue of capitalism, concentrating instead, much to their detriment, mainly on the means of achieving socialism and therefore on differences between revolutionary socialism and evolutionary socialism. The best responses recognised that socialism has been divided in important ways over ends (that is, the nature of the future socialist society), and that these differences are rooted in differing critiques of capitalism. For fundamentalist socialists, capitalism is viewed as a system of class oppression which is destined to collapse or be abolished, giving rise to a qualitatively different society. Many strong responses explained this in Marxist terms, by reference to the idea of surplus value and the exploitative nature of the capitalist system. However, while some merely described the exploitative nature of the capitalist system, better responses analysed and explained the nature and implications of surplus value. Fundamentalist socialism is therefore defined by its opposition to capitalism, in that it practises the politics of ownership and locates the roots of exploitation and oppression in the institution of private property.

Strong responses were fully synoptic, in that they also analysed the alternative social democratic or revisionist socialist position, usually acknowledging that while capitalism is still criticised (particularly in terms of its tendency to distribute wealth unequally), it is also valued as a means of generating wealth.

From this perspective, revisionist socialism sought to reconcile socialism with capitalism, achieving a kind of reform or 'humanised' capitalism, implying that socialism is no longer defined by its opposition to capitalism. Instead, social democracy practises the politics of social justice, being defined by the pursuit of relative equality within the capitalist system itself. Successful responses often examined the contribution of theories such as Bernstein and Crosland in considering the nature and implications of revisionist socialism.



**ResultsPlus**

Examiner Comments

This answer begins, usefully, by defining the key title terms. However, 'capitalism' does not always take free market form; and, rather than subdividing socialism into evolutionary and revolutionary, it would have been more appropriate for this question to subdivide it into 'fundamentalists' – who seek the complete abolition of capitalism, and 'revisionists' – who seek to tame or humanise capitalism. The essay goes on to explain why socialism, with its goal of equality of outcome, opposes exploitative capitalism; but also why later socialists came to see the positive, wealth-creating aspects of capitalism and therefore sought only to reform it. There is some useful description of Marxist fundamentalism, and mention of other key socialist values such as collectivism (though reference to 'five key evils' in the context of reformist socialism suggests some confusion with modern liberalism). In conclusion, the essay disagrees with the title statement. There was no explicit reference to revisionism or neo-revisionism, which would have gained more marks. 40/45.

Socialism is the political ideology that places emphasis on the society as a whole and the power of collective achievement over individual achievement. Two key forms of socialism is collectivism and redistributive and a prominent figure of redistributive socialism is Karl Marx. Capitalism is the result of a free market economy where wealth is accumulated by market forces of supply and demand. Due to its unregulated prices of products, labour and profits are determined by market forces. This can lead to exploitation, great wealth, cheap and expensive products and both rich and poor people it is undeniably and fundamentally an unequal mechanism. To state socialism is defined by its opposition to capitalism is both an incorrect and brief statement socialism

obtains other and somewhat more prevalent values and socialist forms such as voluntary socialism somewhat accepts capitalism. Thus this essay will examine to what extent socialism is and is not defined by its opposition to capitalism.

Firstly as stated in the introduction Capitalism is exploitative by nature it tears society as described by Bakunin into 3 groups, firstly the ~~majority~~ majority who are exploited, secondly the minority who are equally exploited as are exploitative and finally the small minority who are exploitative. Evidently the vast majority are exploited leaving a small minority with all the wealth. The Society created by capitalism equals total inequality and unjust outcomes. A fundamental value of socialism is equality of outcome and social equality, ~~this~~ Capitalism breeds but none of these values,

However it is evident that capitalism creates a substantial degree of wealth. Evolutionary socialists who propose a more pragmatic

approach to socialism recognize this and thus propose modifying capitalism. This is to be achieved and is to some degree effectively achieved in the UK by redistribution of wealth. Via high taxation to the richest members of society and low taxation to the poorest members of society. This allows for free healthcare, education and benefits to those in need. Therefore, an evolutionary socialist will see the positive aspects of capitalism and by ~~modifying~~ modifying where the wealth is spent will lead to more less unjust outcomes. In addition the introduction of minimum wages and limited working hours a week, exploitation will be eradicated from any legal business.

Thirdly, it is considered by revolutionary socialists to be exploitative oppression and capitalism merely protects and creates the bourgeoisie ~~which~~ and the proletariat. Extremists such as Karl Marx believe that capitalism is fundamentally wrong and should

totally be abolished by violence and revolt, it is unacceptable by all means. It creates the economic base where by the whole superstructure (forms/aspects of society) are determined. The ruling class, those who own means of production determine all aspects of life. Marx proposes revolt to the whole system, capitalism and the state to remove the bourgeoisie via the awakening of class consciousness the the masses who are exploited, the proletariat. Evidently extreme forms of socialism, as demonstrated by Karl Marx's beliefs ~~do not~~ is deprived by the opposition to capitalism, yet this is only an aspect of socialism, not a vanguard for the whole of the socialism.

Further and most importantly socialism obtains other key values. Its belief that as stated by Donne 'No man is an island' we are primarily social creatures and work best united and together. Furthermore socialism aims to eradicate

five key evils. Firstly, the removal of ~~Squalor~~, this is achieved by social housing, ~~to the~~ ~~same~~ secondly, idleness, the providing of job centers, and help into and finding jobs. Thirdly, disease this is removed by providing free health care to all NHS. Fourthly, ignorance is eradicated via free education and finally poverty whereby all the above aid its establishment but also a defined level of minimum living standards where no-one should fall below, a security net. Clearly all above concepts require state intervention and redistribution and create the greatest levels of equality whilst still accepting and allowing capitalism to operate.

Finally this essay will state the two sides of socialism, Redistribution and Expropriation. The question states; "Socialism is defined by its opposition to capitalism discuss." This essay has displayed the Redistribution socialists held at its core that capitalism must be abolished

in order to achieve a socialist or communist society. Yet evolutionary socialists welcome the idea of modifying capitalism and somewhat exporting the competitive mechanism itself, coming full circle and using it to create a socialist society. ~~Their~~ ~~Abolition~~ Therefore it is apparent ~~that~~ to state "socialism" is defined by its opposition to capitalism is too broad and itself ~~an~~ ~~use~~ ~~for~~ unanswerable without ~~the~~ breaking socialism down.

In conclusion "socialism" is ~~not~~ ~~to~~ neither defined or undefined by its opposition to capitalism. However it is argued that Revolutionary socialism is ~~more~~ to a large degree defined by its opposition and desire to abolish capitalism. Nevertheless evolutionary socialism ~~proposes~~ introduces reforming and modifying capitalism thus welcoming it to stay in their proposed socialist society.

## Statistics

### *Overall Subject Grade Boundaries*

Grade	A	B	C	D	E
Overall subject grade boundaries	56	50	44	38	33
Uniform Mark	80	70	60	50	40

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

Telephone 01623 467467

Fax 01623 450481

Email [publications@linneydirect.com](mailto:publications@linneydirect.com)

Order Code UA022839 January 2010

For more information on Edexcel qualifications, please visit  
[www.edexcel.com/quals](http://www.edexcel.com/quals)

Edexcel Limited. Registered in England and Wales no.4496750  
Registered Office: One90 High Holborn, London, WC1V 7BH

Ofqual  




Llywodraeth Cynulliad Cymru  
Welsh Assembly Government

