Exam practice mark schemes

Chapter 1

Question number	Indicative content
1	**24 marks** Areas of agreement: + All liberals agree on the preservation of individual rights and freedoms. This is reinforced by the ideas of a social contract between the people and government. The ideas of Locke influenced both the French and American revolutionaries. One of his phrases is in the American Declaration of Independence, which stated a commitment to 'life, liberty and the pursuit of happiness'. + All liberals argue that all individuals are capable of rational informed ideas and are morally agreeable. This positive view differentiates liberalism from the more pessimistic conservatism. + All liberals agree that men and women are essentially equal. Mary Wollstonecraft, J.S. Mill, Betty Friedan and John Rawls all explicitly argued that women should be recognised as rational and equal individuals within society and economy. + All liberals accept that some inequality is inevitable in a free society as individuals have different strengths and abilities. Areas of disagreement: + Modern liberals would agree with the classical liberal, John Locke, that 'life, liberty and the pursuit of happiness' are human rights, but the modern liberal ideas espoused by Mill, Friedan and Rawls argue that they can only be achieved with an interventionist state to guarantee such freedoms. + Modern liberalism argues that classical liberalism underplays the inequality of society. Society is not equal, and some individuals have a distinct advantage over others. Likewise, the idea that individuals are autonomous is also overstated. + Classical liberals favour the negative freedom which underpins egoistical individualism and the minimal state. Modern liberalism argues for the positive freedom which underpins developmental individualism. It promotes an enabling state, an idea associated with John Rawls. + All liberals accept that some inequality is inevitable in a free society as individuals have different strengths and abilities. However, modern liberals argue for equality of opportunity by enabling all citizens to have access to education and for society to be truly meritocratic, which will destroy artificial privileges based on the unnatural advantages of social class.
2	**24 marks** Areas of agreement: + Classical liberalism and modern liberalism are united by Locke's natural laws that emphasise property rights for the individual. The right to own property is a natural right that must be protected by the state and the rule of law. + Classical and modern liberals both support the efficacy of capitalism as a system and the belief that free markets promote economic activity and welfare creation. Locke, J.S. Mill and Rawls were all positive on the free market. + Classical and modern liberals agree that it is rational for individuals to pursue economic and social self-interest in a free-market economy. Areas of disagreement: + Classical liberals prefer laissez-faire capitalism and minimal state interference in the economy, opposing taxation, subsidies and the welfare state. Modern liberalism argues that laissez-faire capitalism can lead to exploitation, deprivation and excessive inequality. Rawls sanctioned state interference in the economy, using individual and corporation taxation to state manage welfare provision as a way of achieving developmental individualism. + Modern liberals favour Keynesian economics of state management to negate the effects of recessions, as well as a welfare state to assist developmental individualism. Classical liberals are critical of the supposed efficacy of Keynesian economics, believing the state is ill equipped to plan or intervene in the economy.

	+ Classical liberals prefer the minimal state, arguing that such economic interference erodes egoistical individualism and negative freedom, and leads to a dependency culture. Furthermore, welfare spending is expensive and can lead to the state building up potentially unmanageable levels of debt that risk bankruptcy. Modern liberals prefer the enabling state, arguing for state management to manage the economy carefully via Keynesian economics and a welfare state to provide positive freedom.
3	**24 marks** Areas of agreement: + Locke argued that there are natural rights that humans are born with and the state must not encroach upon them. This principle of foundational equality is something that both classical and modern liberals support. + Mary Wollstonecraft forcefully argued for foundational equality for women in her work *A Vindication of the Rights of Women* (1792) at a time when women were denied equality in terms of property ownership, political representation and employment. J.S. Mill argued for votes for women decades before enfranchisement was achieved in his book *The Subjection of Women* (1869). + All liberals support formal equality and the rule of law, and oppose artificial forms of inequality such as a hereditary aristocracy. Modern liberalism has broadened the definition of foundational equality and explicitly focused on social justice: + Modern liberals insist that the state has an obligation to give people equality of opportunities through education and differing degrees of welfare benefits. + Betty Frieden argued for further legal and economic parity in the workplace in the latter half of the twentieth century. She also argued that the state had to be enabling to assist women to be free and therefore to underpin social justice. + Martin Luther King invoked modern liberal ideas in his civil rights movement, demonstrating that the judicial interpretation of the US Constitution was failing to acknowledge all races equally. The Civil Rights Act of 1964 and the Voting Rights Act of 1965 began the process of creating true foundational equality of opportunity for all races in the USA. + Rawls argued that a just society must provide equality of opportunity and social justice for everyone, and this could only be achieved by the state taking a larger role in society. Such ideas mean that modern liberals champion women, racial minorities and LGBTQ+. Classical liberals are less focused on equality of opportunity as they assume that individuals are responsible for their own advancement. + Rawls' conception of social justice (he used the term 'distributive justice') was that inequality in a modern capitalist society could be justified as long as those who do well economically do not do so at the expense of the least well-off in society.

Chapter 2

Question number	Indicative content
1	**24 marks** Areas of agreement: + Traditional conservatives, one-nation conservatives and the New Right are all in agreement on the efficacy of capitalism as an economic system of government. + Key thinkers such as Burke, Rand and Nozick all support laissez-faire economics and free markets, with free trade and a broad commitment to limiting state intervention. These beliefs are heavily influenced by free-market economists such as Adam Smith. + Traditional conservatives, one-nation conservatives and neo-conservatives all argue that taxation should be used to fund state interventions in society, although the extent of this intervention varies dramatically. + Private property gives individuals a stake in society, be it an atomistic society as favoured by neo-liberalism, or an organic society as favoured by the rest of conservatism. + All conservatives regard private property as a vital component of the economy, as it provides psychological security for individuals in society, especially during economic recessions and depressions. Areas of disagreement: + Some traditional conservatives were sceptical of the free market and preferred protectionism to safeguard their markets. Traditional conservatives influenced by Burke, one-nation conservatism and the New Right all prefer free-market economics. However, the Trump administration's use of tariffs against China shows that the influence of traditional conservatism — with its preference for some degree of protectionism to protect domestic markets — still exists.

My Revision Notes: Pearson Edexcel A-level Politics: Political ideas 2nd edition © Tuck, Mogridge and McNaughton 2021

	✚ After the Second World War, one-nation conservatives subscribed to Keynesian economics, whereby the state intervened in the economy to maintain full employment and to regulate economic cycles. Both branches of the New Right disagreed with such economic theory, preferring free-market economics. ✚ The New Right is ambivalent on the issue of the economy. Neo-conservatives are sympathetic to the free-market economics espoused by neo-liberals, but they still prefer pragmatism to principle. ✚ Neo-conservative pragmatism was demonstrated by the Republicans during the Covid-19 crisis in 2020. Donald Trump's Republicans supported $2.2 trillion of economic stimulus with the Coronavirus Aid, Relief, and Economics Security Act (known as the CARES Act) 2020. ✚ Neo-liberals would dismantle the welfare state and, if not abolish, severely reduce taxation. Neo-conservatives and one-nation conservatives argue that it would be practically impossible to return to a minimal state and that taxation and a welfare state must continue to exist to maintain society. ✚ Neo-conservatives argue for less taxation and a smaller state than one-nation conservatives. Neo-liberals are radical — they favour drastic political, economic and social change in the organisation of the state and society based upon ideological doctrines that leave no room for state-sponsored paternalism.
2	**24 marks** Areas of agreement: ✚ Traditional conservatives, one-nation conservatives and neo-conservatives all believe that society is organic and that the ruling elite had a duty of care, a paternal responsibility derived from their hierarchical position of rank to help those less fortunate, who cannot act in their own interests. This paternalism takes the form of noblesse oblige and is a pragmatic belief that the state must counter societal problems. ✚ Burke's ideas influenced Disraeli, who developed the idea of one-nation conservatism whereby the ruling elite had a paternal responsibility to the poorest in society. Later one-nation conservatives and neo-conservatives both developed these ideas by maintaining welfare states that include education and healthcare obligations (although admittedly disagreeing on the optimal size of a welfare state). ✚ All branches of conservatism, including neo-liberals, favour voluntarism (charitable contributions) that are organised by the individual, rather than by the state. Such ideas can be traced back to Burke's idea of the 'little platoons' in society. Neo-liberals such as Rand and Nozick would argue that individuals who practise voluntarism do so based on their own logic, rather than as a state obligation. Areas of disagreement: ✚ Later one-nation conservative paternalism, from the 1950s to the present day, has been influenced by rational ideas of state management with the utilisation of Keynesian economic policies and increased state spending on welfare. Conservative thinkers such as Michael Oakeshott were uneasy about paternalism derived from rational ideas, as they were not empirical in nature and ignored the limits of human reason. ✚ Neo-conservatives such as Margaret Thatcher argued that the unintended consequences of one-nation conservatism's paternalistic welfarism is that those they were trying to help became hopelessly dependent on the state. ✚ Neo-conservative paternalism is therefore akin to tough love, acknowledging the need for the state to intervene in society but wishing to narrow the parameters and the scale of its assistance. In practical terms this means that the state provides less assistance for individuals in a neo-conservative society than in a one-nation conservative society. ✚ Neo-liberals reject state-sponsored paternalism as it restricts negative freedom. Individuals are obligated to pay taxation to finance welfare spending that they may not support. ✚ Neo-liberals argue that paternalism arrests individuals' development and risks making them dependent upon the state. The rest of conservatism accepts (to differing degrees) the need for positive freedom, whereby the state enables individual development. ✚ Conservatives vary dramatically on the amount of state paternalism that government should provide. Modern one-nation conservatives argue for the most, neo-conservatives argue for smaller state involvements, while neo-liberals argue that individuals and not the state should decide what levels of paternalism should be provided and that this should be voluntary (i.e. charity) and not an enforced obligation.
3	**24 marks** Areas of agreement: ✚ Traditional conservatives, one-nation conservatives and neo-conservatives are all united in the belief that traditions encompass the accumulated wisdom of the past that underpins the whole of the organic society. ✚ Burke speaks for all the above branches of conservatism when he states that tradition, custom and habit should inform human action rather than abstract thought. ✚ All the above branches of conservatism argue that wisdom is found in long-standing societal traditions such as monarchy, universities, communities and customs. Traditions allow individuals to feel a sense of belonging and a sense of identity, reinforcing the social cohesion of society.

	✚ Traditional conservatives, one-nation conservatives and neo-conservatives fear making decisions based on abstract ideas rather than respecting long-standing traditions. Such conservatives cite unintended consequences of the French Revolution as an example of why such faith in rationalism is dangerous. ✚ All the above branches of conservatism would agree that abandoning traditions is risky for society and that change should be carefully and empirically considered. As Oakeshott argued, 'What has stood the test of time is good and must not be lightly cast aside.' Areas of disagreement: ✚ While religion used to be the most important tradition for conservatism this is now only true for traditional conservatives and neo-conservatives. One-nation conservatives respect religion but are heavily influenced by secular values, while neo-liberals prefer rationalism to the superstition of religion. ✚ Rationalism has challenged the traditions of religion and empiricism. Neo-liberals prefer rationalistic ideas such as natural rights and meritocracy over the traditional conservative customs of hierarchical society. Neo-liberals prefer an atomistic society. Meanwhile many one-nation conservatives espouse secular values. ✚ Rationalism has also influenced later one-nation conservatives who prefer the rationalistic ideas of Keynesianism and state management to the long-standing tradition of supporting laissez-faire economics. The New Right is critical of abandoning the tradition of the limited state.

Chapter 3

Question number	Indicative content
1	An introduction will set the stage for the arguments for and against commitment to collectivism. Arguments for commitment: ✚ Collectivism is a core idea and principle of socialism that broadly resonates across all branches of socialism. Humans are social animals and the ideal society will be achieved through common endeavour that will reflect social unity and social responsibility. Collectivism in economic terms implies utilising the capabilities of all the individuals within society efficiently and limiting wasteful competition among individuals. ✚ The different branches of socialism vary in their commitment to collectivism. Revolutionary socialists like Marx and Engels as well as Rosa Luxemburg argue that a collective uprising is inevitable and that communism will involve collective ownership. Democratic socialist Beatrice Webb did not believe in collective uprising but argued that collectivism would involve centralised state planning, which is what communist-inspired governments like the USSR and China pursued after their revolutions. ✚ Social democracy has argued for more moderate forms of collectivism. Attlee's 1945–51 government sanctioned a mixed economy, with what Anthony Crosland called state-managed capitalism that coexisted with the free market but saw key state industries nationalised under state control and workers organised in trade unions. Likewise, the welfare state was an example of the fraternity of social collectivism, organising healthcare, education and housing. ✚ The Third Way advocated collectivism the least, out of all the branches of socialism. However, as Anthony Giddens has stressed, community and communal responsibility to the collective are essential to promote social cohesion, shared values and social responsibility, offsetting the negative consequences of the free market. ✚ The Labour Party under Jeremy Corbyn returned to advocating more collective solutions to the running of society and the economy. Corbyn speculated on renationalising privatised utilities, declared his ambition to reverse university tuition fees and advocated repealing legislation that limits the powers of trade unions. Arguments against commitment: ✚ Revolutionary socialism, collectivism's strongest exponent, is regarded by some as an historical relic since the collapse of communism in 1991. The democratic socialism of Beatrice Webb was replaced by social democracy as the dominant form of reformist socialism quickly moved away from purely collectivist solutions, and as early as 1945 it accepted both private property and the role of the free market. ✚ This continued in the second half of the twentieth century. With the rise of individualism, via the neo-liberal policies of the New Right, social democracy moved further away from collectivist policies even before the emergence of the Third Way. Social democrat governments across Europe gradually abandoned the state planning of Keynesian economics and further nationalisation.

My Revision Notes: Pearson Edexcel A-level Politics: Political ideas 2nd edition © Tuck, Mogridge and McNaughton 2021

	✚ The rise of the Third Way has accelerated the impotence of collectivism within socialism. New Labour, under Tony Blair, abandoned Clause IV and accepted the permanence of the New Right reforms of the recent conservative governments, such as trade union reform and the privatisation of nationalised utilities. ✚ Third Way thinkers such as Giddens have accepted the primacy of individualism over collectivism. Giddens rejected the state-managed capitalism of social democracy's Anthony Crosland and argued instead for the benefits of the free-market economy and individual entrepreneurship. ✚ The Third Way has also advocated a less generous welfare system, acknowledging the New Right's critique of the dependency culture. Third Way-inspired governments have removed universal collective benefits via means testing. Likewise, Third Way-influenced governments such as Tony Blair's introduced tuition fees for university students. A conclusion will state that although the broad themes of collectivism such as the importance of community remain, socialism has steadily moved away from collectivism over time. The collapse of communism and revolutionary socialism has inflicted a significant ideological defeat on collectivism. Social democracy through to the Third Way has continually acknowledged the efficacy of individualism for solutions to the organisation of society and the economy. However, the weakening of the Third Way in the UK may see a revival of collectivist policies.
2	It is important to outline the points that illustrate the extent to which socialism is committed to equality. Arguments for: ✚ All socialists agree in foundational equality, which is the belief that all individuals are born equal and are entitled to the same political and legal rights. Humans are entitled, as a right of birth, to be treated equally by the state and to enjoy equality before the law. Different branches of socialism favour different aspects of equality. ✚ Revolutionary socialists like Marx and Engels and Rosa Luxemburg are the most committed to equality within socialism as they advocate absolute equality so that everyone receives the same rewards within society providing they make a contribution. ✚ Revolutionary socialists Marx and Engels and Rosa Luxemburg and democratic socialist Beatrice Webb argued for an equality of outcome whereby rewards were based on an individual's contribution. Social democrats have not advocated such universal levels of equality of outcome. However, through what Anthony Crosland describes as state-managed capitalism, Attlee's Labour government of 1945–51 showed a commitment to narrowing inequality of outcome via state nationalisation and state planning within a mixed economy. ✚ Social democrats and the Third Way argue for equality of opportunity whereby everyone has equal chances to make the best of their abilities within society. Anthony Crosland argued for a society with no class barriers and Anthony Giddens argued for a society based upon social inclusiveness to increase access to higher education. ✚ Social democrats favour equality of welfare. They in particular have argued for a 'cradle to grave' welfare state, epitomised by the introduction of welfare states across Europe after the Second World War. The Third Way prefers a less generous equality of welfare, with 'means-tested benefits' such as university tuition fees as opposed to free universal higher education. Arguments against: ✚ Although all branches of socialism are committed to different types of equality, they are riven with disagreement about the efficacy of which equality is best for society. ✚ Both social democrats and the Third Way utterly reject revolutionary socialism's belief in absolute equality as impractical, also rejecting the communist society that is a prerequisite for absolute equality to exist. Social democracy never acted upon Clause IV's common ownership of the means of production, advocated by Beatrice Webb, and Tony Blair, influenced by the Third Way, removed it from the Labour Party constitution in 1994. ✚ Social democrats, although reducing inequality of outcome, were never as committed to it as revolutionary socialists because they did not reject capitalism, which by its very nature creates unequal outcomes. The Third Way has moved further away from equality of outcome. Anthony Giddens supports free-market competition and is not opposed to individuals achieving great wealth (as long as society overall prospers). The Third Way also has reduced universal benefits in favour of means-tested ones and abandoned the mixed economy. ✚ Revolutionary socialists such as Marx and Engels and Luxemburg rejected equality of opportunity, which is strongly supported by social democrats and the Third Way, declaring it futile, as it does not address the inherent inequalities of capitalism. Webb agreed and argued for gradual reform to ensure a socialist society. Social democrats and the Third Way reject such criticism, agreeing with Crosland's assessment that 'Marx had little or nothing to offer the contemporary socialist'.

	✚ For similar reasons, revolutionary socialism rejects the 'futility' of equality of welfare as it does not seek to remove the structural inequalities that make welfare necessary in the first place, namely capitalism. Social democrats disagree, believing, as Crosland stated, that state-managed capitalism delivers greater social equality via a redistributive welfare state. The Third Way disagrees with social democracy and has also shown less commitment to equality of welfare. Giddens has argued that it creates a dependency culture and the taxation required to fund it harms economic investment. A conclusion should point out that there is no debate that socialism is broadly committed to equality. However, there are irreconcilable differences over the nature of this equality. Social democrats and the Third Way dismiss absolute equality and equality of outcome, advocated by revolutionary socialism, as impractical. Revolutionary socialism dismisses equality of opportunity and equality of welfare, as broadly favoured by social democrats and the Third Way, as futile for not opposing capitalism.
3	**24 marks** The various strands of socialism have different views about the economy. Areas of disagreement: ✚ Revolutionary socialist thinkers such as Marx and Engels and Rosa Luxemburg argue that capitalism and the free market are incompatible with socialism's core principles. Such is capitalism's inherent inequality and exploitation that it cannot be reformed, so revolutionary socialists reject the ideas of social democracy and the Third Way as being futile. ✚ Revolutionary socialists disagreed over which economies could experience revolution. Luxemburg disagreed with Marx and Engel's theory that capitalism must reach a final stage before it can be abolished, theorising that it could happen in less economically developed societies. ✚ Socialism disagrees over the role of the state in organising a socialist economy. Revolutionary socialists Marx and Engels envisaged the state withering away as a communist society would emerge free from internal class conflict. Democratic socialist Beatrice Webb argued for the expansion of the state, with specialised administrators to organise, plan and regulate the economy. ✚ Anthony Crosland disagreed with Marx and Engels, arguing that the economy no longer had the inherent contradictions that they described and that capitalism could be managed for the benefit of society. The Third Way architect Anthony Giddens disagreed with the 'top-down' Keynesian-inspired 'state management capitalism' favoured by social democracy's Crosland as inefficient and ineffective. Instead, Giddens embraced the entrepreneurial dynamism and economic growth of the free-market economy. ✚ Giddens disagrees with the extensive wealth and welfare distributions favoured by social democracy. Crosland argued such equality of welfare was true to the egalitarian core principles of socialism. Giddens argued that it created a dependency culture and that the high taxation required to fund such welfare discouraged the investment essential in a competitive market economy. Areas of agreement: ✚ All forms of socialism are critical of the negative effects of the free market such as economic inequality, poor working conditions, alienation and economic exploitation. All forms of socialism are committed to creating and managing the economy for a fairer society, although admittedly their ideas on this differ. ✚ All forms of socialism, to differing degrees, are critical of wasteful competition within capitalism and emphasise the need for cooperation. This is most obvious within revolutionary socialism and social democracy, but it is also inherent in the Third Way, which argues that communal responsibility is essential to offset the negative effects of the free market. ✚ Revolutionary socialism espoused by Marx and Engels and Luxemburg and democratic socialism espoused by Webb are in agreement that capitalism cannot be reformed and must be radically transformed into a socialist society with absolute equality and equality of outcome. ✚ Social democracy and the Third Way both accept the need for the free market and that material rewards incentivise individuals and must be harnessed for the greater good of society. Therefore both aspects of socialism argue that equality of welfare must exist, even if they differ on the exact levels of welfare and the levels of taxation required to fund it. ✚ Both social democrats and the Third Way are supportive of equality of opportunity within society. Anthony Crosland argued that state-managed capitalism would remove class barriers within society and the economy. The Third Way embraced a narrower aspect of equality of opportunity. Anthony Giddens argued that investment in infrastructure and education would increase meritocracy and improve job opportunities. A conclusion will summarise that revolutionary socialists such as Marx and Engels and Luxemburg and democratic socialists such as Webb do not think capitalism can be reformed and argue for a socialist state. Such a viewpoint cannot be reconciled with either social democracy or the Third Way, which argue the opposite, that capitalism can be reformed. However, social democracy's top-down state interventionism conflicts with the Third Way's embracement of free-market ideas. Overall, socialists disagree more about the economy than they agree.

My Revision Notes: Pearson Edexcel A-level Politics: Political ideas 2nd edition © Tuck, Mogridge and McNaughton 2021

4	**24 marks** To a significant extent, socialists agree on their view of human nature — they have an optimistic view that believes that humans are rational, social creatures. Areas of agreement: ✚ Socialists argue that people are naturally inclined (it is in their human nature) to work together and cooperate. ✚ Socialists also feel that human nature can be adversely affected by society — for example, capitalist society causes selfish, individualist and greedy behaviour. The belief is that human nature is moulded by society. ✚ They also believe that a change to the economic structure of society will lead to human nature returning to its natural state. Areas of disagreement: ✚ Beatrice Webb was the only socialist to have a negative view of human nature, believing that humans can be selfish. ✚ Revolutionary socialists and social democrats argue that capitalism has distorted human nature into a false consciousness of greed and selfishness. ✚ The Third Way (Anthony Giddens and his followers) argues that capitalism can be beneficial to human nature. Economic rewards can be utilised for the common good if correctly married to core socialist beliefs of cooperation, fraternity and community. Conclusion: a reiteration that the consensus of socialist opinion is positive about human nature with the main disagreement being between those who blame capitalism for any negative aspects of human nature and those that see a benefit of the capitalist system.
5	**24 marks** Introduction: different strands of socialism have different visions of the role of the state. Areas of agreement: there is no universal socialist agreement on the state. More radical socialists advocate for revolutionary overthrow of the capitalist state, while most others argue for democratic change and even acceptance of capitalism. Areas of disagreement: ✚ Revolutionary socialists, such as Marx and Engels, believed that the state would wither away after a communist revolution. However, Rosa Luxemburg, also a revolutionary socialist, believed that the capitalist state should be replaced with a socialist state. ✚ Neo-Marxists agree with revolutionary socialists that revolution is the only way to bring about change. The 'parliamentary road' to socialism is flawed. ✚ Democratic socialists and social democrats, such as Webb and Crosland, argued that there was no need for a radical revolution, believing that parliamentary democracy can lead the way to social reform. ✚ The Third Way argues that support of the free market can improve society, and argues further that the private sector should be given a role within the state. Examples should be given of communist states (and their success or otherwise) and of capitalist states under socialist rule.

Chapter 4

Question number	Indicative content
1	**24 marks** There are various aspects to the issue of sex and gender. Areas of agreement: ✚ The majority of feminists — liberal, radical, socialist and postmodern — can be described as equality feminists who acknowledge the obvious natural physical differences between men and women as sexes but argue that these are inconsequential when understanding the innate behavioural qualities of gender characteristics. Gender characteristics are therefore artificially constructed within society by patriarchy. ✚ Early feminist thinkers Simone de Beauvoir and Charlotte Perkins Gilman heavily influenced the feminist movement with their ideas on sex and gender. De Beauvoir argued that the sex of an individual does not determine their gender role, rather patriarchy does. Women are socialised into gender roles such as motherhood. Gilman's ideas echo this as she argued against gender stereotyping in childhood.

	✚ These ideas heavily influenced liberal and radical feminism. Liberal feminist Betty Friedan argued that artificially constructed gender roles are so powerful and pervasive that society perceives them as normal and not artificial. Radical feminists such as Kate Millett argued that gender roles were constructed by the family and mirrored by society. ✚ Socialist feminism and postmodern feminism expand the debate on sex and gender. Sheila Rowbotham argues that patriarchy and economics are interlinked. In the past, exploitative economic systems, such as feudalism and capitalism, helped to determine subservient gender roles for women. bell hooks agrees with Gilman that gender roles are socialised from a very young age. Areas of disagreement: ✚ The main disagreement within feminism over sex and gender concerns a minority group of feminists called difference feminists who, unlike equality feminists, argue that biological differences are consequential and do determine gender differences. Equality feminists are very critical of difference feminists as they feel that the latter's rebuttal of society determining gender roles undermines both feminist history and women's continuing struggle against patriarchy. ✚ Difference feminists maintain that men's and women's biological distinctness makes their gender characteristics fundamentally different. It is the biological difference between the sexes that explains patriarchy and women's lower status in society, as males have sought to dominate females and this has determined society's gender roles. ✚ Moreover, difference feminists like Carol Gilligan have criticised equality feminism for encouraging women to replicate male behaviour, which has had the unintended consequence of alienating women from their own gender distinctiveness. ✚ The most extreme aspect of difference feminism is a sub-strand called cultural feminism. Rather than seeking the societal parity that an equality feminist would advocate, cultural feminists challenge the dominance of male values in society and argue that 'women's values' should be promoted as they are superior. ✚ Postmodern feminist Kimberlé Crenshaw's intersectionality challenges the notion that gender is the most important factor in understanding women's lives. bell hooks argues that race was as important as gender in understanding oppression of black women in the USA in the early 1980s. ✚ Equality feminists disagree on solutions to gender stereotypes. Liberal feminists like Friedan argue for reform within the public sphere of society. Radical feminists argue that the 'personal is political' and that private family life must also be addressed. Unlike liberal feminism, radical feminism argues that patriarchy is too pervasive to reform and has a plethora of diverse revolutionary solutions to transform society, as argued by the likes of Millett and Rowbotham, to name but two of many. The conclusion will point out that difference feminists argue that biological sexual differences influence innate gender characteristics, which conflicts with equality feminism, which argues that gender characteristics in the main are constructed by a patriarchal society. This is a schism in feminist thought that cannot be reconciled. However, it must be remembered that the vast majority in the four waves of feminism are equality feminists, who broadly agree that patriarchal society and not sexual biology constructs gender characteristics. Nevertheless, there is debate among equality feminists on exactly how gender characteristics are constructed, while postmodern feminist intersectionality theory questions the prominence of patriarchy in understanding the gender roles of women.
2	**24 marks** There are various core ideas about the topic of patriarchy. Areas of agreement: ✚ Most feminists are equality feminists and use the term 'patriarchy' to define a society that is dominated by men and seeks to oppress women. Patriarchy should therefore be understood as a cultural construct — biological differences are irrelevant and gender oppression is a cultural phenomenon. ✚ First wave feminists Charlotte Perkins Gilman and Simone de Beauvoir identified gender stereotyping and female socialisation ('otherness') respectively. These early theories were very influential, ensuring the dominance of equality feminism within the women's movement. Liberal feminists such as Betty Friedan and radical feminists such as Kate Millett explicitly define patriarchy as a cultural and not a biological phenomenon. ✚ There is agreement among equality feminists that patriarchy is not a static concept. Sylvia Walby's six structures of patriarchy attempt to pinpoint how patriarchy works within society. Third wave feminist Naomi Wolf discusses how modern media have attempted to define female beauty and body shape, while 'perfect' photoshopped images have oppressed a new generation of young women. ✚ The majority of equality feminists agree that patriarchy must be opposed in the public sphere. Liberal, radical and postmodern feminists are usually described as equality feminists who wish for legal and political parity within society consistent with the liberal idea of equality of opportunity, to end gender stereotypes and discrimination.

My Revision Notes: Pearson Edexcel A-level Politics: Political ideas 2nd edition © Tuck, Mogridge and McNaughton 2021

	Areas of disagreement: ✚ Liberal and radical feminists disagree on where to challenge patriarchy. Liberal feminists will challenge the public sphere only. Radical feminist Carol Hanisch argued that 'the personal is political' and Millett built on this idea, arguing that the patriarchal father dominates the family and the mother socialises children into gender roles, which gives men the power that it denies women. Gilman and bell hooks also argue that socialisation of gender roles begins within the private sphere of the family. ✚ Liberal feminism's refusal to challenge the private sphere of family life is the traditional schism with equality feminism for dealing with the consequences of patriarchy. Radical feminists argue that liberal feminists' attempts to reform society will fail unless they also reform private sphere patriarchy. It is for this reason that second wave radical feminists opined a variety of revolutionary theories to transform society as they lacked faith in the reformist model. ✚ Socialist feminist Sheila Rowbotham argued that female oppression was not just a result of patriarchy but was interlinked with women being oppressed economically as well as culturally. ✚ Postmodern feminism's ideas of intersectionality challenged the notion that gender, and therefore patriarchy, was the most important factor in understanding women's lives. Intersectionality embraces the complexity of reality and argues that gender is but one of numerous interacting factors, such as race, class, religion, age, country of origin, etc. ✚ Post-feminists argued that most feminist goals have been achieved and that patriarchy has largely been defeated. Post-feminist thinkers such as Camille Paglia have criticised liberal and radical feminism for portraying women as 'victims' and argued that women needed to take responsibility and not just blame men for their problems. ✚ Like equality feminism, difference feminism argues that patriarchy is not explained by cultural factors but by biological distinctness. Patriarchy is therefore men trying to ensure that their male characteristics are more dominant than women's within society. Difference feminists argue that women need to embrace their feminine nature and not try to replicate male characteristics, their chief criticism of equality feminism. Cultural feminism, a sub-strand of difference feminism, argues that female characteristics are superior to men's. The conclusion will state that the majority of the feminist movement are equality feminists agreeing with the importance, primacy and evolving nature of patriarchy as a cultural explanation for the oppression of women. Whether patriarchal society should be reformed by the state or transformed by revolution is where disagreement traditionally lies. Liberal feminists argue that the state should reform the public sphere of society, while radical feminists demand revolution to transform the private sphere of family. More recently, socialist feminists and postmodern feminists have argued over the primacy of patriarchy in the oppression of women, especially postmodern feminists who argue for intersectionality. Difference feminism defines patriarchy as a biological phenomenon and not a cultural one, while only post-feminists question the actual validity of patriarchy existing.
3	**24 marks** There are various views concerning 'the personal is political'. Areas of agreement: ✚ Carol Hanisch is attributed with the earliest use of the phrase 'the personal is political', which discussed the private sphere of family life and how women were oppressed in their traditional role as wife and mother within the family unit. In the 1960s and 1970s violence against women was largely ignored by society as it was perceived to be a private matter. Radical feminism seized upon the private sphere of a woman's life, thus making it a political idea. ✚ Charlotte Perkins Gilman was among the first to argue that socialisation of gender roles begins within the private sphere of family. ✚ Radical feminism's Kate Millett is chiefly associated with 'the personal is political', arguing that the family is a key tool of patriarchy as it socialises boys and girls into hierarchical gender roles, oppresses women who carry the burden of domestic work even when they are employed, and oppresses married women who sacrifice their career prospects. ✚ Radical feminism broadened the concept of the personal is the political. Erin Pizzey's writing was centred on domestic violence, while Germaine Greer wrote about how women had been socialised not to enjoy sexual congress and to believe that the function of sex was merely to procreate. Millett added that literature reiterates the idea of dominant men and compliant women as a natural state when depicting private life. Liberal feminism does not normally get involved in the private sphere of life but has supported legislation against domestic violence. ✚ Socialist feminism advocates 'the personal is political', with women regarded as a reserve army of labour. Sheila Rowbotham argues that women are oppressed economically and culturally. She claims that society contains cultural conditioning in regard to child rearing and that women are doubly oppressed by both capitalism and domestic work in the home.

	✚ Postmodern feminist bell hooks also discusses 'the personal is political' as one of the multi-faceted factors for how women are oppressed. She argues that young girls are taught to be compliant and to please others as part of socialisation, while boys are socialised to deny they even have emotions. ✚ Radical feminism argues that 'the personal is political' is so pervasive within society that there must be a revolution to dismantle patriarchy within family life. Radical feminists offer a number of alternatives: Millett argued for a sexual revolution, where the nuclear family would be replaced by communal living and child rearing; Andrea Dworkin and Charlotte Bunch both advocated lesbian communities; Shulamith Firestone's revolutionary society would eliminate gender distinctions and embrace androgyny. Areas of disagreement: ✚ Liberal feminists disagree with radical feminism's obsession with transforming the private life of women. Although they have supported legislation against domestic violence in the home, much of their agenda has been focused upon reforming society. Gender stereotypes will disappear once discrimination in the workplace occurs, they argue, as young girls and boys will see women in positions of responsibility and perceive this as the norm. ✚ More recently, third and fourth wave feminists do not share the obsession with 'the personal is political' and have largely rejected the revolutionary transformation of public and private society as advocated by radical feminism. Instead liberal feminism has explored the mutating nature of patriarchy, such as Naomi Wolf's discussion of body image in the media, while postmodern feminism has explored the intersectionality and the multiple overlapping identities of women. ✚ Post-feminism is not overly concerned with 'the personal is political', arguing that these issues have long been settled and that women must stop portraying themselves as victims. Often seen as a white, middle-class aspect of feminism, it has mocked radical feminism's revolutionary ideas for alternative societies as being completely irrelevant and out of touch with what modern women want, and as an historical feminist relic from another era. ✚ Difference feminists disagree with radical feminism concerning 'the personal is political' as the likes of Carol Gilligan argue that biological differences lead to different gender characteristics between men and women. Female distinctiveness means that women are more nurturing, family orientated and home-making than men. Like post-feminists, they argue that the separatist societies advocated by some radical feminists have turned women off feminism. It might be concluded that feminism embraces 'the personal is political' in the sense that the private lives of women have been more widely discussed and perhaps its greatest success is that it has ended domestic violence being a taboo subject ignored by society. However, 'the personal is political' remains a radical feminism obsession. Liberal feminists have historically focused on society, and third and fourth wave feminism has abandoned the revolutionary separatist societies that the likes of Millett argued for in the 1970s.
4	**24 marks** Introduction: while all strands of feminism blame some form or other of patriarchy for the exploitation of women, there are disagreements on how to solve or remove patriarchy. It would be useful to include a definition and some examples of patriarchy. There are a variety of feminist ideas on solving patriarchy: ✚ Radical feminists, like Kate Millett, believe that the family should be abolished and replaced with communal living and child rearing. ✚ Germaine Greer argued for sexual liberation and the abandonment of traditional marriage. Like Millett, she favoured communal living and child rearing. ✚ Some radical feminists, especially difference feminists, advocate the creation of a separate matriarchal society. ✚ Feminists such as Andrea Dworkin and Charlotte Bunch believe that lesbian communities should replace the nuclear family and patriarchal society. ✚ Difference feminists focus on gender differences and the superiority of women, arguing that women need to accept and promote their female qualities. ✚ Liberal feminists believe that there is no need for radical societal change — that patriarchy can be reduced and eradicated through primary and secondary socialisation and education. ✚ Marxist feminists advocate for a communist revolution to solve patriarchy. Conclusion: Patriarchy remains a significant area of focus for all feminists. However, there is the inevitable disagreement about its true character and what it should be replaced with.

My Revision Notes: Pearson Edexcel A-level Politics: Political ideas 2nd edition © Tuck, Mogridge and McNaughton 2021

Question number	Indicative content
1	The logical introduction is to establish those principles and beliefs to which all anarchists subscribe and which therefore suggest this is indeed a single movement. These should include: + being anti-state + an insistence that individuals should regain all their personal sovereignty + anti-clericalism — all anarchists oppose organised religions and their hierarchies + the need for revolution, whether it be peaceful or violent The body of the answer should discuss the main variations in anarchist thought. These should include the following: + Anarcho-communism (Kropotkin, Malatesta, Reclus) — voluntary, natural, self-sufficient communities engaging in mutual aid. + Mutualism (Proudhon) and the idea of self-sufficient individuals or small communities trading freely with each other. + Federalism (Bakunin), a kind of decentralised form of socialism. + Individualism of various kinds, associated with anarchists such as Thoreau, Tucker and Spooner. + Egoism — the philosophy of Stirner. + Nihilism of the kind associated with Nechaev. + Anarcho-capitalism (Nozick and similar). The answer should drill down on the key philosophical, theoretical and practical differences between these movements: + the extent to which people are sociable or individualistic + the extent to which people prefer to live independently or in communities + the extent to which anarchists can tolerate private property + whether they are essentially socialist in their economic ideas or individualistic and can support free-market capitalism The conclusion should ask whether the four areas which unite anarchists are more important than the principles that divide them. It may be useful to argue that anarchism is a united movement in terms of what it is against, but that it is a series of varied movements in terms of goals and aspirations.
2	**24 marks** The introduction should set this question in context. This is that perhaps the most important forms of anarchism share many principles with socialism. The distinction is that socialists propose the maintenance of a workers' state, either permanently or temporarily, while anarchists cannot accept this. More deeply, however, it is necessary to consider whether the basic philosophy of anarchism contradicts socialism. Begin by explaining clearly that some forms of anarchism have virtually nothing in common with socialism. The following examples can be used: + Individualism as exemplified by Thoreau, Spooner, etc. + Egoism — Stirner, etc. reject all forms of social organisation. + Nihilism, a similar philosophy to egoism. + Anarcho-capitalism, which is clearly standing in opposition to socialism. Some kinds of anarchism, however, appear similar to socialism: + Communism looks very like socialism as it espouses common ownership, equality of outcome and destruction of markets. + Many anarchists propose the exchange of goods on the basis of labour value rather than exchange value. + The federalism of Bakunin looks very like syndicalism, which is a form of both socialism and anarchism, depending on the extent to which there is a compulsory organisation of economic activity. Answers should also look at the fundamental differences in philosophy in relation to four central themes: + Human nature: anarchists are more optimistic that individuals can engage in mutually beneficial trade, while socialists believe they need central organisation and regulation. + The state: for socialists, the state is a key means by which economic organisation can take place, in particular to impose equality of outcome. Anarchists, meanwhile, argue that the existence of a state actually creates inequality. Only voluntary communities, which replace the state, can guarantee equality. + Society: here there is congruence between socialism and most forms of collectivist anarchism, but there is a complete contrast between individualist forms of anarchism and socialism. + Economy: there is a good deal of similarity in that all but anarcho-capitalists seek the destruction of capitalism and the exchange system of value. However, there are differences in attitudes to private ownership of property.

	A useful conclusion would be to say that there are some forms of anarchism which have virtually nothing in common with socialism, so the proposition can be rejected. With collectivist forms of anarchism, however, there is some truth in the proposition. Nevertheless, the insistence by all anarchists that the state must be abolished separates the movement decisively from socialism.
3	The introduction should place this question in context. The reasons why anarchism and liberalism have been connected include the following: + Both stress the importance of individual liberty. + Both are highly suspicious of state power. + Both are concerned with legal and social equality. + Liberals and anarchists share a basically optimistic view of human nature, believing that we have a natural mutual empathy. The answer should then examine the key differences between the two traditions: + Despite their suspicions of the state, liberals accept that its existence is essential in order to protect rights and liberties and for creating social justice. + Liberals are generally supporters of free-market economics and the principle of the exchange value of goods and labour. + While anarchists support economic and social equality, liberals accept that inequality is natural to human society and may even be a positive force for economic development and wealth creation. + While egoists and many individualist anarchists share with liberalism the idea of individuals' pursuit of enlightened self-interest, liberals also believe that individuals will temper their pursuit of self-interest with feelings of sympathy for their fellow men. The answer should then examine the extent to which the basic values of liberalism and anarchism can be compatible: + Both share an optimistic view of mankind, believing that people's characters can be improved if society is improved (Rousseau, Godwin, T.H. Green). + The liberal idea of government by consent (Locke) is similar to the anarchist view that mankind should divide itself into natural communities (Kropotkin). + Both traditions support democracy, though anarchists tend to favour direct democracy while liberals prefer representative democracy. + The liberal desire for social justice goes part of the way to agreeing with the anarchist support for absolute equality of outcome. + The fundamental desire for individuals to be sovereign is shared by both traditions, while communist and collectivist anarchists such as Bakunin and Kropotkin believe that such individual sovereignty can be achieved only within the setting of a close-knit community. Liberals believe personal sovereignty is best achieved in the context of a weaker community. The key to this agreement between the two is the idea of self-realisation. This is a goal of both liberalism and anarchism. A conclusion possibly should stress the similarities between individualist forms of anarchism (Thoreau, Warren, etc.) or anarcho-capitalism and liberalism, in contrast to collectivist forms of anarchism which seem closer to socialism than to liberalism. However, it should also be stressed that there are fundamental distinctions (notably over the role of the state and the law) which make them very different traditions.

Chapter 6

Question number	Indicative content
1	**24 marks** The introduction to this is difficult. However, it is probably advisable to suggest that nationalism normally has a reputation for being conservative or regressive, with key examples being fascism, Nazism, racist movements and various forms of chauvinism. It therefore seems paradoxical that nationalism could be progressive. Nevertheless, many movements have been progressive so there is a balance in our perspective of nationalism. Describe some of the examples of nationalism that have not been progressive but rather reactionary and regressive. These include: + Conservative nationalism tends to concentrate on the historical virtues of the nation, often glorifying past achievements and a golden age. + Conservative nationalists stress the importance of traditions, institutions and social values. + More extreme forms of radical nationalism stress the exclusivity of racial, religious or cultural distinctions.

	✚ Nationalism that seeks to unify or reunify nationalist peoples is not progressive as it seeks to preserve existing national virtues. ✚ Some forms of cultural nationalism, including Nazism, have sought to suggest that one culture is superior to others and lead to a glorification of a former time when the culture was dominant. By contrast, there have also been forms of progressive nationalism which have flourished. These have been largely liberal or socialist inspired. Socialist and anticolonial forms have included these: ✚ The synthesis of nationalism and socialism in Cuba or Tanzania, for example, has seen progress towards a socialist future being underpinned by a strong sense of nationalism. ✚ Marcus Garvey founded a form of black nationalism, associated with socialism and anti-imperialism. This is seen as progressive in that it hopes to relieve the oppression of black people and to create a new form of liberation nationalism. ✚ Some African forms, as in Ghana or Tanzania, have envisaged the simultaneous creation of a new 'national spirit' and a socialistic economic structure capable of resisting the forces of capitalist imperialism. Liberal forms have included: ✚ Republicanism, such as in revolutionary France (Rousseau), Mazzini's Young Italy movement and Ireland, have sought to extend progress by synthesising the liberal values of democracy and equal rights with those of nationalism. ✚ Movements that have sought to free a people from the dominance of a greater power, as in the nations in the declining Austro-Hungarian Empire in the early twentieth century, the former republics of the Soviet Union, and contemporary Scotland and Catalonia, see national liberation in terms of releasing the creative and superior qualities of a people that have been suppressed. ✚ Some pan-nationalist movements, seeking to unite scattered peoples, such as pan-Slavism and pan-Arabism, can be seen as progressive as they believe a people who can be united will make economic, intellectual and cultural progress. In conclusion, it should be clearly stated that nationalism has taken two dominant forms — conservative/regressive and progressive. The question is not, therefore, simply how progressive nationalism can be, but rather how it very much depends upon which form of nationalism one is discussing.
2	**24 marks** An introduction should explain the meanings of the term 'racism' and also examine why it is that racism and nationalism have become so intertwined in popular belief. Racism can be seen in the following terms: ✚ It suggests that one racial group is superior to others. This applied most dramatically to Nazism and the South African apartheid movement. ✚ Racism can lead to the oppression of some racial groups by others, again as with apartheid but also with imperialist movements and white supremacism in the USA and parts of Europe. ✚ Racism often concerns itself with mythological or quasi-scientific theories of the biological superiority of some peoples. The Nazis' theories of Aryanism are an example, but it also infected European imperialism in the nineteenth century. However, this link assumes that race is the principal characteristic of a national group. This is false. There are a number of criteria, including these: ✚ Language and culture, as Herder argued. ✚ Common historical experience, as with the British or French. ✚ Religion, as with the Jewish people. ✚ Geography, as is the case with the Swiss. The question refers to right-wing nationalism so it is important to identify specifically those right-wing nationalist movements which have not been based on race. Examples include: ✚ British conservative nationalism. ✚ Russian right-wing nationalism, while to some extent based on Slavic virtues, is largely based on territory (the 'Motherland') and shared history. ✚ Jewish nationalism and Zionism are based more on religion than on race. The conclusion should emphasise that right-wing nationalism is certainly often racially based, but that there are many other criteria that can bind a people together and some of these can be based on conservative or regressive principles, not merely race.

3	**24 marks** The main problem with the question is in defining culture in this context. It can be defined narrowly or broadly and also in terms of race and ethnicity. This should be made clear in an introduction. Having done that, an evaluation can be made. The three conceptions of culture are these: ✚ A narrow definition would be that it refers to the common practices, traditions and historical experience of a people. This would apply closely to Britain or France, for example. ✚ Broader definitions would include the above but add such criteria as religion (Jews), ethnicity (Italian fascism) or language (Germany). ✚ Culture can refer to race and this conception is often right wing in nature. Nationalism is then based on the idea that one race is superior to other races and may even be destined to become dominant over other races (German Aryanism). The main body of the answer should examine the various non-cultural forms of nationalism that have flourished: ✚ Republicanism is based on national spirit combined with the desire for liberty, democracy and government by consent. This had its origins in the French Revolution of 1789, inspired by the thought of Rousseau. ✚ Liberal nationalism is largely based on the principle of self-determination. If a people consider themselves to be a nation, they have a right to determine their own destiny. This has largely applied to nations which have been dominated and often governed by more powerful nations, sometimes by imperial powers. The principal examples emerged in the first part of the twentieth century (inspired by Woodrow Wilson's principles announced after the First World War). Czech, Hungarian and Slavic nationalism were key examples. ✚ Socialist and anticolonial forms of nationalism are not cultural in nature — they are liberationist movements, inspired by the desire to resist international capitalism and the economic imperialism that arises from it. Prominent examples of nationalism that are certainly cultural in nature include: ✚ extreme forms such as Nazism or South African Afrikaner nationalism ✚ conservative forms based on tradition and the desire to preserve an organic society, such as French or Greek nationalism ✚ very moderate forms where a national culture is threatened with extinction in the face of a more dominant culture. Such mild cultural movements stop short of an aspiration for national independence. Welsh nationalism is a good example. If we interpret the concept of culture in a very wide sense, we may conclude that all nationalism is cultural. If we do this, we have to include economic development, democracy, self-determination and liberty as cultural traits. However, interpreting culture more narrowly means we have to conclude that many forms of nationalism have little to do with culture.
4	**24 marks** Introduction: a distinction between progressive and regressive nationalism needs to be made. Progressive nationalism has as its focus a desire to move society forward, and to improve society, whereas regressive nationalism opposes progress or reform. Progressive nationalism such as socialist or liberal nationalism: ✚ Believes that people can be united around common values. ✚ Supports the values of democracy, liberty and tolerance. ✚ Is an inclusive form of nationalism. ✚ Being committed to the nation's values is the primary requirement for membership of that nation, so anyone who shares these values can join. Regressive or conservative nationalism: ✚ Tends to be more defensive and xenophobic. ✚ Favours militarism rather than cooperation. ✚ Is a more inward-looking form of nationalism. ✚ Historically conservative nationalism felt threatened by the French revolution. ✚ Believes that the state and associated institutions, such as the monarchy, can be used as a source of unity that embodies the spirit of the nation. National celebrations are therefore encouraged. ✚ Patriotism can be harnessed and exploited for the good of nationalism. Humans seek security and tend to be drawn to their 'own' people.

My Revision Notes: Pearson Edexcel A-level Politics: Political ideas 2nd edition © Tuck, Mogridge and McNaughton 2021

Question number	Indicative content
1	**24 marks** An introduction should place the question in context — why is multiculturalism normally associated with liberalism? There are several reasons. Multiculturalism is associated with: ✚ pluralism ✚ equal rights ✚ tolerance all of which are closely associated with liberalism. However, there have been aspects and strands of multicultural thinking that do not necessarily conform to liberalism: ✚ Identity politics, associated with Charles Taylor, accepts that full integration may not be attainable or desirable, so separate identities have to exist within the same society. ✚ Liberalism assumes that all values are of the same worth, but various multicultural thinkers have suggested that there can be a hierarchy of values. ✚ While all multicultural thinkers support tolerance, many argue that different legal systems can coexist in the same political system, e.g. Sharia law alongside secular, national laws. ✚ Many liberals view positive discrimination as fundamentally illiberal as it offends the principle of equality, but it is often seen as a vital part of multiculturalism. There is also a movement which is associated as much with conservatism as with liberalism. ✚ Tariq Modood proposes a kind of one-nationism based on diversity and a shared 'national' interest in inclusiveness. ✚ It can be argued that in the case of countries like the UK and the USA, the very diversity of society has become part of the 'national tradition'. ✚ The minority groups that now flourish in multicultural societies have been compared to the 'little platoons' identified more than 200 years ago by the conservative thinker Edmund Burke and echoed in David Cameron's 'Big Society'. These active groups, it is argued, are vital in maintaining social cohesion. Socialism can also inspire aspects of multiculturalism, notably the aspiration that, in a truly multicultural society, those minority cultures that traditionally have been economically exploited can find equality in the principles of multiculturalism. Nevertheless, it should also be stressed that multiculturalism is largely liberal-inspired: ✚ As the introduction says, it is associated with several fundamental liberal principles. ✚ Even those conservatives who have added to the multicultural debate (e.g. Cameron, Osborne) are on the liberal wing of that movement. ✚ All those interested in how a multicultural society can work successfully accept that it has to be based on respect for both individual liberty and the democratic state. A conclusion is likely to argue that multiculturalism is fundamentally a liberal movement, but that there are some aspects that do not fully conform to liberalism and that conservative and socialist ideas have also been added to it.
2	**24 marks** It would be advisable to make this answer as synoptic as possible. In order to do this it would be useful to identify four different strands of conservatism. This could form the basis of the introduction. They would be: ✚ traditional one-nation conservatism ✚ neo-liberal conservatism ✚ neo-conservatism ✚ modern liberal progressive conservatism The degree to which multiculturalism is compatible or incompatible with conservatism depends upon which kind of conservatism is being referred to. At first sight there is an incompatibility between one-nationism and multiculturalism: ✚ Multiculturalism and pluralism threaten the unity of society. ✚ The existence of various cultural traditions threatens the dominance of the national culture. ✚ Potential conflict between minority groups threatens order. ✚ The artificial introduction of cultural minorities is a denial of the organic society.

	Nevertheless, if minority groups accept the dominant culture and play a positive role in the development of society, multiculturalism can be a positive force. Neo-liberalism and multiculturalism seem more compatible. The existence of free markets should allow access to various minority groups. However, socialists point out that free-market capitalism also creates opportunities for the exploitation of such minorities. The neo-liberal attack on excessive welfare is a threat to multiculturalism as it may encourage inequality, which leads to social conflict. Neo-conservatism and multiculturalism do not sit well together. Neo-conservatives stress the need to impose national values which threaten minority values. More importantly, the neo-conservative stress on strong law and order is not compatible with the idea of minority legal systems coexisting with national law. Modern progressive liberal conservatism can accept the principles of multiculturalism for a number of reasons: + It is based on pluralism — an acceptance that people identify both with the state and with their own cultural groups. + It is a tolerant tradition. + Modern liberal conservatives insist on the protection of group rights. + Liberal conservatism is communitarian in nature. It accepts that we see our identity in terms of the communities to which we belong and not merely in terms of individual self-interest. A conclusion will point out that the conservative attitude to multiculturalism varies a great deal. Many conservatives believe that multiculturalism has failed and should be replaced by assimilation. Others, however, argue that it still has a future provided that minority cultural groups can accept the existence of a dominant set of cultural values which is superior to their own.
3	**24 marks** Clearly the introduction should identify the nature of identity politics: + We see ourselves in terms of the cultural groups to which we belong. + These may be based on such identities as religion, gender, ethnicity, race, sexual orientation, etc. + Identity politics normally leads to political action aimed at protecting the economic interests, rights and culture of such groups. Identity politics can be a challenge to multiculturalism in a number of ways: + Excessive identification with minority culture threatens a group's integration with the rest of society. + Excessive identification with a cultural group may lead to intolerance between groups. + By threatening traditional political institutions, identity politics can undermine attempts by representative institutions to foster integration and mutual respect. Multicultural thinkers such as Charles Taylor have suggested that identity politics and multiculturalism can be compatible. This is for a number of reasons: + By having a strong sense of our own identity we can learn to respect other identities. + Provided the state engages with cultural identities it can promote the 'politics of recognition', which promotes mutual respect for each other's identities. + Parekh and Modood have both extolled the virtues of diversity as a positive feature of modern multicultural societies. This is compatible with the politics of identity and with multiculturalism. + As long as the state recognises the possibility that there can be different rights assigned to different groups (differential rights), identity politics can be made compatible with national law. However, more conservative versions of conservatism attack identity politics. This is on several grounds: + There are national values which must be adhered to if society is to remain unified and not dissolve into social conflict. + The organic society is not compatible with strong identity politics. + The principle of the rule of law is not compatible with differential rights or the coexistence of minority cultural laws with national law. + National identity and patriotism are crucial to the survival of a society. Identity politics may threaten both if individuals harbour allegiances higher than those they have to the state. A conclusion to this answer is likely to suggest that supporters of multiculturalism have generally attempted to make identity politics compatible with multiculturalism, but that they have had variable success. The challenge of identity politics in the last decade or so has weakened multiculturalism severely, but it still survives among many liberals and progressive conservatives.

My Revision Notes: Pearson Edexcel A-level Politics: Political ideas 2nd edition © Tuck, Mogridge and McNaughton 2021

4	**24 marks** All multiculturalists agree that all groups in society need to have their economic needs attended to. Differences in opinions on the economy basically depend on whether a multiculturalist is a capitalist or a socialist. Capitalism and multiculturalism: ✚ see free market capitalism as an aid to the economic development of various minority groups ✚ accept that free-market capitalism can create inequality and that steps need to be taken to recognise and counteract this ✚ Cosmopolitan integration sees globalisation as a positive development for various cultures. Globalised economies provide opportunities for migrant groups forced to travel for economic reasons. ✚ There is the recognition that free-market capitalism does create inequality and disproportionate poverty for certain groups. Therefore, precautionary steps are necessary to recognise and counteract this. Socialism and multiculturalism: ✚ see inequality as caused by free-market capitalism, which tends to affect minorities disproportionately ✚ support measures such as positive discrimination to counteract this ✚ Economic policies to combat inequality must also include recognition of the special problems encountered by minority communities.

Chapter 8

Question number	Indicative content
1	**24 marks** There are various views among ecologists about human nature. Areas of agreement: ✚ Ecologists agree that post-Enlightenment rationalism altered human nature and the way humans perceived the planet and their environment. The legacy of these ideas is that humans view nature as existing for the benefit of humanity rather than for its own intrinsic value. The belief in a rational mechanistic world view convinced humans that they could isolate and explain nature, which made them feel they were masters of nature as opposed to being part of it. ✚ Ecologists agree with Rachel Carson that the human race has been exploiting the environment for so long that they are oblivious to the damage they are causing. Ecologists are in agreement that human ethics and human consciousness must alter so that the concerns of the non-human world are considered within the organisation of state, society and economy. ✚ Ecologists argue that human nature's obsession with materialism and consumerism is a false consciousness and ultimately these things do not bring true happiness and are false needs. Both shallow green and deep green ecologists argue that this aspect of human nature must change, as the consequences of ever-increasing consumer and material consumption are harmful to the environment. ✚ Ecologists argue that human nature must embrace the concept of sustainability, which would alter conventional human ethics and anthropocentrism. Sustainability is the capacity of the ecological system to maintain its health over time and was developed to counter the unsustainable production of economic growth, which threatens to damage the planet beyond repair. Areas of disagreement: ✚ Shallow green and deep green ecologists disagree over how human nature must change concerning conventional thinking on consumerism and materialism. Shallow green ecologists are reformist, arguing that humans must become satisfied with less. Deep greens are revolutionary. E.F. Schumacher argues for radical post-materialism and post-consumerism where environmental ethics and environmental consciousness are transformed to the extent that the consumption of possessions is no longer equated with happiness. ✚ Ecologists disagree on the extent of environmental ethics. Deep green ecologists such as Aldo Leopold argue for holistic ethics and ecocentrism, with a radical transformation of society, while shallow green ecologists argue for reform and enlightened anthropocentrism, tackling single issues such as animal rights. ✚ Some deep green ecologists, for example Schumacher, argue for a radical change in environmental consciousness that is influenced by Buddhism. Other deep green ecologists are dismissive of such ideas; Murray Bookchin preferred rational thought to mysticism.

	+ Ecologists are divided over reform or radical change. Shallow green ecologists argue for weak sustainability, which is reformist and proposes green capitalism and managerialism. Deep green ecologists are critical of this position, arguing that weak sustainability does not challenge conventional anthropocentric human nature. Deep green ecologists argue for strong sustainability, which would radically alter human activity by ending the pursuit of economic growth and materialism with a shift to small, ecocentric communities. + Social ecologists disagree with deep green and light green ecologists on human nature. Bookchin conceptualised 'social ecology', arguing that social structures must first be altered and only then could radical ecological change occur. He argued that the domination inherent in capitalism led to ecological exploitation. A shift to anarcho-communism would lead to ecocentrism. Social ecologists have agreed with Bookchin's theory but disagreed over social structure. Carolyn Merchant, an ecofeminist, argues that human nature must reject patriarchy, which causes industrialism and environmental disregard. In conclusion, ecologists broadly agree on the conventional anthropocentrism of human nature and the need for a change in environmental ethics. However, they are irrevocably divided over how human nature must change. Shallow green ecologists argue for reform, for enlightened anthropocentrism, where humans still dominate but steward nature responsibly. Deep green ecologists argue for human nature to radically transform from anthropocentrism to ecocentrism. Social ecologists insist that radical societal shifts within human nature, be they feminist, anarchist or socialist, must occur before environmental consciousness is possible. Ecologism is therefore more divided than united when considering human nature.
2	**24 marks** The role of the state provokes numerous suggestions among ecologists. Areas of agreement: + Shallow green ecologists are the most enthusiastic advocates of the state enforcing sustainability, arguing that with enlightened anthropocentrism the state can manage responsibly, via managerialism and technological solutions. Rachel Carson's arguments persuaded the US government to manage pollution by not using DDT pesticides that were damaging the environment. + Shallow green ecologists also argue that the state can adopt 'green capitalism', a market-based solution to environmental problems. Likewise, the state should explore and promote technological solutions such as carbon-based capture technology to help manage climate change. These shallow green ecology ideas are informed by the post-Enlightenment mechanistic world view that nature is like a machine to be understood, fixed and replaced in isolation. + Aldo Leopold, whose ideas resonate with deep green ecologists, argued that the state has a role to play in protecting the environment. Deep green ecologist E.F. Schumacher, while regarding the state as overbearing, still argued that a decentralised state was needed for his proposed society. + Social ecologists such as ecofeminists argue that the state will be needed to oversee an environmentally sound society. However, as Carolyn Merchant has argued, the state will first need to be purged of the patriarchal elements of domination that have been the source of oppression for both women and the environment. Areas of disagreement: + Deep green ecology and social ecology are more negative on the role of the state. Both advocate radical changes within society and perceive the state as part of the environmental problem and not the solution. Murray Bookchin's 'ecotopia' is the most critical, arguing for the complete removal of the state, with a society based on 'anarcho-communism'. + Deep green ecologists regard the state as anthropocentric in nature and the enlightened anthropocentric state initiatives advocated by shallow green ecology do not convince them. Solutions such as green capitalism and managerialism underestimate capitalism's addiction to economic growth and demonstrate the arrogance of anthropocentrism, even when it attempts to be enlightened. Aldo Leopold first realised this inherent contradiction when he argued that conservation would fail as it was still based on the old economic model and was not ecocentric. + Deep green ecologists are critical of the sustainability advocated by shallow green ecologists, which they regard as weak and ineffectual, and they doubt the validity of green capitalism or managerialism because they are opposed to economic growth, materialism and consumerism. Deep green ecologists therefore favour strong sustainability. + Deep green ecologist Peter Berg challenged nation-state borders, proposing a series of local communities dubbed bioregions whose boundaries were created by environmental features. This would create new environmental ethics of 'living democracy' where decision making would be taken locally and focused on strong sustainability. This has much in common with Schumacher's vision of a decentralised state and society.

My Revision Notes: Pearson Edexcel A-level Politics: Political ideas 2nd edition © Tuck, Mogridge and McNaughton 2021

	In conclusion, although different aspects of ecology argue that the state can have a role in environmental politics, its main advocates are shallow green ecologists, who argue for enlightened anthropocentrism. Deep green ecologists dismiss such state intervention as simply adapting the post-Enlightenment mechanistic world view and not embracing ecocentrism. For deep green ecologists, state involvement would be dramatically reduced in decentralised communities or totally removed with the eco-anarchism of Bookchin's ecotopia.
3	**24 marks** Arguments that ecologism and the modern industrial economy are compatible: ✚ Shallow green ecologists would argue that enlightened anthropocentrism is compatible with the modern industrial economy. With modified environmental ethics, the state would act as a steward to ensure that the modern industrial economy can both coexist and facilitate ecologism. ✚ Weak sustainability offers two ways that this can be achieved: green capitalism and managerialism: ✚ Green capitalism argues that market-based solutions can solve environmental problems by utilising the ethical consumer, as Greenpeace did successfully in 2010 when its campaign led to Nestlé adopting a zero-deforestation policy. Rising prices of natural resources will also see industry innovate, resulting in a decrease in use of natural resources. Corporations will rationally adopt sustainability as the logical way for them to continue to make a profit. ✚ Managerial approaches to capitalism include, internationally, via the UN Framework Convention on Climate Change, the Paris Accord (2015) and the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change, and nationally, via acts such as the UK Climate Change Act 2008 and green taxes to reflect environmental costs, for example taxes on air emissions. Rachel Carson's work on banning DDT pesticides in the USA is another example of state action. ✚ Shallow ecology also has faith in enlightened anthropocentric dynamism, within the modern industrial economy. Technological innovations such as carbon capture technology will help limit global warming. Arguments that ecologism and the modern industrial economy are not compatible: ✚ Deep green ecologists would argue that enlightened anthropocentrism is incompatible with the modern industrial economy. E.F. Schumacher maintains that the obsession with GDP growth is hugely damaging. Deep greens argue that the economy and economic activity must be radically transformed and environmental ethics must be ecocentric, as enlightened anthropocentrism is a contradiction in terms. ✚ Strong sustainability offers three ways that this can be achieved: opposition to economic growth, post-materialism and post-consumerism. ✚ Aldo Leopold argued for holism through his land ethic. Abandoning conventional ethics by opposing economic growth, materialism and consumerism, this would see the emergence of new environmental ethics and consciousness. Capitalism must be abandoned because of its relentless addiction to commodity consumption. Property ownership reinforces anthropocentric domination and must be replaced by collective ownership, where the land is used for the ecocentric benefit of all. ✚ Schumacher argued for Buddhist economics with post-materialism and post-consumerism, adopting a simpler economic structure based on wellbeing rather than consumption, where humans are content to appreciate what Schumacher called 'enoughness'. Economic activity should be based on Schumacher's 'small is beautiful' theory of decentralised communities; bioregions advocated by Peter Berg and Bookchin's stateless ecotopia are similar in their aims. ✚ Social ecologists such as ecofeminists are also critical of the modern industrial economy. Ecofeminists, like Carolyn Merchant, argue that the economy is patriarchal in nature, exploiting and dominating nature in the way it does women. In conclusion, only shallow green ecology is optimistic about the ability of the modern industrial economy to be compatible with ecological concerns. Deep green and social ecology are both pessimistic about the modern industrial economy and continue to see it as a cause of ecological concern and not a potential solution. These more radical forms of ecology propose an economy that will radically reform the modern industrial economy, in some cases abandoning economic growth as a primary aim and in others adopting communism as the ecocentric economic solution to ecological problems.
4	**24 marks** Introduction: definition and discussion of the nature of consumerism could form part of the introduction. Consumerism is a cultural view that focuses on the consumption of goods and services as a means to feeling good about oneself. Ecologists agree that consumerism is like a vicious circle, creating more demand for consumption. Ultimately, rather than making a person happy, consumerism can lead to misery and a feeling of lack, because of the need to keep up to date with the latest things.

	Opinion on consumerism within ecologism is largely divided between deep and shallow green ecologists. ✚ Dark green ecologists such as Schumacher argue for a radical post-materialist society where wellbeing is maximised, but consumption is minimal. The 'self-regarding' individual, only interested in material gain, is transformed into the 'other-regarding' citizen who cares for the environment. Although materially poorer, the other-regarding citizen is spiritually and ecologically happier than their materialistic predecessor. It would be a fundamentally different economic system not based on material accumulation. ✚ Shallow green ecologists advocate a conserver rather than a consumer society. Individuals would consume less, lowering production and preserving resources. A more sustainable economy free of the relentless pursuit of possessions would redefine happiness in spiritual terms rather than material ones and preserve the environment.

My Revision Notes: Pearson Edexcel A-level Politics: Political ideas 2nd edition © Tuck, Mogridge and McNaughton 2021