



POLITICAL IDEAS

Liberalism, Conservatism, Socialism, Nationalism, Multiculturalism, Ecologism

Answers to exam-style questions

Chapter 1: Liberalism

Students should incorporate the following key points in their answers. These points should be expanded using appropriate examples (gleaned from throughout the main text of the relevant chapter) and developed with reference to each ideology's key thinkers (see both the main text and 'Key thinker' boxes within the chapter).

AQA

Short-answer questions

1

- John Locke and other key thinkers believe human beings are *rational* and therefore driven primarily by reason and logic. This enables human beings to determine solutions to most of the problems they encounter, thus allowing men and women to make steady progress towards a more fulfilling and painless existence.
- John Stuart Mill was keen to stress that human nature is *developmental* and that 'man is a progressive being'. This is significant, Mill argued, because human beings are steadily more rational, enlightened and educated, paving the way for a steadily improving society.
- 'Liberal feminists' such as Mary Wollstonecraft and Betty Friedan remind us that the positive attributes of human nature – such as reason, logic and a capacity to progress – are applicable to both men *and* women. Human society can thus be driven forward by both the male and female of the species, thus maximising the prospect of progress.

2

- Via mechanisms including a Bill of Rights and a Supreme Court, John Locke believed a codified constitution would enshrine our 'natural' rights and 'natural' liberties. These would apply to all individuals, including those with minority characteristics. Locke therefore believed that liberty is best advanced within a liberal state, underpinned by a codified constitution.
- Reflecting the doctrine of what became known as 'negative liberty' and the 'harm principle', Mill and other classical liberals stated that governments should leave individuals to make their own decisions and determine their own lives – just so long as this did not harm the liberty of others. Mill and other classical liberals therefore believed that, once constitutional government had been established, liberty was best promoted by minimal state intervention.
- T.H. Green and other modern liberal thinkers, like John Rawls, subscribed to the doctrine of 'positive liberty', where the state would extend its activities and thus 'enable' more individuals to self-determine and self-fulfil. The implications of this were typified by the UK's post-war 'welfare state', which 'freed' individuals from the effects of poor health care, deficient housing and inadequate education. But it also led to a huge increase in state intervention, which some liberals resented.



POLITICAL IDEAS

Liberalism, Conservatism, Socialism, Nationalism, Multiculturalism, Ecologism

Extract question

3

- Clarify and highlight the *core issue* within the question – in this case, ‘the significance of liberty within liberalism’.
- Consider the *provenance*, or background, of the extracts, demonstrating prior knowledge if possible:
 - Regarding Extract 1, Mill was an influential classical liberal, writing at a time when the prospect of democracy was being discussed and when socialism was posing new threats to liberalism’s ‘natural rights’ – especially private property.
 - Regarding Extract 2, Beveridge was a modern liberal, much influenced by the earlier work of T.H. Green. The 1942 Beveridge Report proved the bedrock of Britain’s post-war ‘welfare state’.
- *Analyse* content of extracts, always mindful of the question’s core issue:
 - Reference Mill’s belief that an individual’s liberty generally involves an absence of restraint by others unless it may harm the liberty of others. Reference Mill’s related belief that individuals should be free to determine for themselves what is in their own interests.
 - Reference Beveridge’s belief that freedom is now threatened by social and economic factors, such as ‘want’ (poverty) and ‘idleness’ (unemployment).
- *Compare* the implications of the two extracts, with reference to other key thinkers:
 - Mill’s version implies that liberty requires minimal state interference and that governments should generally adopt a laissez-faire relationship with their citizens, standing back and allowing them to lead their own lives. This view upholds the notion of ‘negative liberty’ associated with other classical liberals like Locke.
 - By contrast, Beveridge suggests that liberty is now threatened by factors which individuals alone cannot overcome. Subsequently, his view of liberty is one that requires more state intervention in the lives of individual citizens. This view upholds the notion of ‘positive liberty’ advanced by earlier modern liberals like Green and later modern liberals like Rawls.
- *Evaluate* the two extracts, mindful of the question’s core issue and with reference to key thinkers:
 - Evidently, both authors are committed to the furtherance of individual liberty. But they have differing views about what this requires and, implicitly, different views about how much state intervention is desirable.
 - As part of the evaluation, students should offer their own judgement. Does Mill’s support for ‘negative’ liberty and limited government now seem dated in light of universal adult suffrage and various recent crises? Did the Covid-19 crisis, for example, and the subsequent furlough scheme and vaccination schemes, vindicate Beveridge’s implicit view that individual liberty requires more, not less, state provision? In other words, does the pandemic strengthen the analysis of Green and Rawls? Or does the questionable performance of the state in recent years – in relation to the ‘lockdown’ of individuals and its limited impact in the face of economic recession – endorse Mill’s sceptical view of state intervention?



Edexcel

Essay questions

4

Introduction: Although liberal thinkers share many common goals, such as a commitment to individual liberty and capitalism, they also have significant disagreements. One of the most important concerns the nature of the state. Such disagreements can be demonstrated in several ways:

- First, liberal thinkers disagree about the state's role in promoting liberty. Classical liberals, such as Locke and Mill, argue that the liberal state should reflect the principle of 'negative liberty' by usually standing back from individuals' lives (just as long as some individuals do not harm the liberty of others). However, modern liberals such as Rawls uphold the doctrine of 'positive liberty' by insisting that the state should intervene extensively to 'liberate' individuals from various social and economic obstacles to individual freedom – such as defective education or health care. The UK's National Health Service is thought to illustrate this approach.
- Secondly, liberal thinkers disagree about the state's role in the economy. Classical liberal thinkers, like Mill, believe the state should adopt a laissez-faire, or stand-back, position, allowing capitalism and market forces to operate freely without much interference from governments. However, modern liberals like Rawls prefer the ideas of economists such as John Maynard Keynes, who believed the state should seek to 'manage' or 'direct' capitalism via frequent adjustments to public spending, taxation and interest rates.
- Thirdly, liberal thinkers disagree over the extent to which the state should be democratic. Early classical liberals like Locke thought voting should be restricted to property owners, while later classical liberals like Mill thought voting should exclude adults who were without formal education. Modern liberals such as Rawls, however, believe in the principle of universal adult suffrage.

However, liberal thinkers also exhibit much agreement about the nature of the state. This too can be demonstrated in several ways:

- First, both classical liberals like Locke and Wollstonecraft, and modern liberals such as Rawls and Friedan, believe in a *constitutional or limited* state where arbitrary, unlimited power is prevented by a codified constitution – which, in turn, is protected by a supreme court.
- Secondly, both classical liberals such as Locke, and modern liberals such as Rawls, believe that the state's main role is the protection of 'natural rights', along with the promotion of individual liberty (what Rawls termed 'state-sponsored individualism').
- Thirdly, both classical liberals like Wollstonecraft, and modern liberals like Friedan, advocate a state where power is dispersed and not concentrated. They would therefore all agree with Lord Acton's famous dictum that 'power tends to corrupt ... and absolute power corrupts absolutely'.

Conclusion: All liberal thinkers agree the state should prioritize individualism and capitalism. But they disagree over exactly *how* the state should do this and the extent of state activity required.

5

Introduction: Liberty is consistently at the heart of liberal thinking and is something all liberal thinkers wish to advance. However, there are some inconsistencies in what liberal thinkers recommend. This can be demonstrated in several ways:

- First, classical liberals like Mill uphold the concept of 'negative liberty'. That is, they assume the state should only interfere in individuals' lives if those individuals are 'harming' the liberty of others. However, modern liberals like Rawls and Friedan uphold the concept of 'positive liberty'. They



POLITICAL IDEAS

Liberalism, Conservatism, Socialism, Nationalism, Multiculturalism, Ecologism

therefore believe that certain social and economic conditions – such as poverty and unemployment – are beyond the control of most individuals. This means the state must intervene more so that individuals are ‘enabled’ to regain control of their destiny.

- Secondly, classical liberals like Locke and Mill believe that liberty is best secured through a *laissez-faire*, capitalist economy where the state allows market forces to operate naturally. However, modern liberals like Rawls believe there can be no liberty if there is mass unemployment; to avoid this, the state must seek to ‘manage’ and ‘direct’ capitalism in order to secure economic growth and stability.
- Thirdly, classical liberals like Mill believe that private companies and businesses should be left to conduct their own internal affairs, free from state interference. However, some modern liberals, such as Betty Friedan, believe a liberal state should sometimes promote ‘positive discrimination’ or ‘affirmative action’, forcing such organisations to give greater opportunities to individuals who have previously suffered disadvantage (such as female employees).

However, liberal thinkers also exhibit certain consistencies in their approach to liberty. This too can be demonstrated in several ways:

- First, liberal thinkers – from Locke to Rawls – consistently believe that liberty was incompatible with ‘absolutist’, medieval states, where political power was exercised mainly by monarchs.
- Secondly, both classical liberals such as Mill and modern liberals like Friedan consistently believe that liberty is best promoted by a certain type of state. Such states are characterised by a codified constitution and the dispersal of political authority through mechanisms like federalism, bicameralism and the ‘separation of powers’.
- Thirdly, both classical liberals such as Locke and modern liberals such as Rawls consistently believe that liberty requires a respect for private property. As a result, they consistently believe that a capitalist economy, based on private ownership and private enterprise, is a vital precondition of liberty.

Conclusion: Individual liberty is consistently important to all liberal thinkers. However, they are inconsistent about how much state interference is needed for liberty to be guaranteed.

6

Introduction: Some may assume that liberalism and democracy are synonymous and inseparable. However, the relationship between the two concepts is not straightforward and they can be described as in conflict. This conflict can be demonstrated in several ways:

- First, early classical liberals such as Locke, and the US Founding Fathers, were opposed to universal adult suffrage, insisting that only property owners should be allowed to vote – otherwise the ‘natural right’ of property owners might be threatened.
- Secondly, later classical liberals like Mill were concerned that democracy should be delayed until formal education was universal – otherwise elections could be determined by voters who were irrational, intolerant and disrespectful of individualism.
- Thirdly, modern liberals continue to recognise a clash between liberalism’s interest in the individual and democracy’s interest in what *collections* of individuals prefer. This echoes Mill’s fear that democracy could lead to a ‘tyranny of the majority’, where individuals who are part of a minority are disrespected.

However, liberalism and democracy can also be complementary. This can be demonstrated in several ways:



POLITICAL IDEAS

Liberalism, Conservatism, Socialism, Nationalism, Multiculturalism, Ecologism

- First, democracy is consistent with Locke's belief that governments are only legitimate when based on the 'consent of the governed'. It is difficult to see how this could be upheld in a state that is *not* democratic.
- Secondly, universal adult suffrage fits with the liberal view that human nature is generally rational. Mill believed democracy would eventually make society more rational by engaging most individuals in the debates and decisions associated with elections.
- Thirdly, democracy complements the view, advanced by all liberal thinkers, that political power should be widely dispersed. Modern liberals like Rawls thought this was especially important when the 'enabling state' increased its levels of taxation and regulation.

Conclusion: Liberalism and democracy have not always co-existed. Liberals also remain anxious about certain forms of democracy, particularly referendums, which threaten what Mill termed a 'tyranny of the majority'. However, liberals agree that representative democracy, underpinned by universal adult suffrage, is an essential feature of a liberal state.

Chapter 2: Socialism

Students should incorporate the following key points in their answers. These points should be expanded using appropriate examples (gleaned from throughout the main text of the relevant chapter) and developed with reference to each ideology's key thinkers (see both the main text and 'Key thinker' boxes within the chapter).

AQA

Short-answer questions

1

- Early socialists like Karl Marx and Friedrich Engels believed equality and capitalism were incompatible. This meant that capitalism, and the existing state which served it, should – and inevitably would – be destroyed by a proletarian revolution.
- Later socialists such as Beatrice Webb agreed that, ultimately, equality required a state-owned, post-capitalist, economy. However, unlike Marx, Webb insisted this could be achieved gradually within the existing political system. As a result, democratic socialists like Webb believed in a parliamentary, non-revolutionary path to a more equal society.
- Revisionist socialists including Anthony Crosland and Anthony Giddens argued that a healthy capitalist economy, with steady growth, would allow socialist governments to finance greater public spending, of the sort that would benefit the less advantaged in society. Crosland and Giddens therefore believed equality did not require the end of capitalism, either immediately or eventually, and in fact saw capitalism as a vital tool for achieving greater equality.

2

- Revolutionary socialists such as Marx, Engels and Rosa Luxemburg saw the existing state as a mere servant of the dominant economic class. In other words, the existing state's primary role was to service the interests of capitalism and the bourgeoisie. The existing state was therefore seen by Marx and Engels as an obstacle in the struggle for socialism; once capitalism had been destroyed by revolution, there would have to be a new state – the dictatorship of the proletariat – serving new economic interests.
- Marx argued that the 'end of history' was communism – a society so perfect and harmonious that no formal authority was required. Marx and Engels therefore believed that, ultimately, there should



POLITICAL IDEAS

Liberalism, Conservatism, Socialism, Nationalism, Multiculturalism, Ecologism

be no state at all – the post-revolutionary, socialist state (dictatorship of the proletariat) having ‘withered away’ when all traces of capitalism were eliminated.

- Webb believed that socialist governments could use the existing state to gradually replace a capitalist economy with a state-owned economy, one that was more conducive to equality. Likewise, Crosland and Giddens thought the existing state could ensure that capitalism functioned in a way that produced greater equality – through, for example, ever-increasing public spending. Reformist socialists therefore reject a key aspect of Marxism by arguing that, under socialist governments, the existing state can be a vehicle for genuine progress towards socialism.

Extract question

3

- Clarify and highlight the *core issue* within the question – in this case, ‘socialism’s view of capitalism’.
- Consider the *provenance*, or background, of the extracts, demonstrating prior knowledge if possible:
 - Regarding Extract 1, Karl Marx is arguably the father of revolutionary socialism and one of socialism’s most important thinkers; his critique of nineteenth-century capitalism and the existing state is exemplified by this extract from 1875 (written almost 30 years after his most famous work, *The Communist Manifesto*).
 - Regarding Extract 2, Sidney Webb – the brother of Beatrice Webb – was self-evidently a major influence upon the UK Labour Party, which in 1918 was still in its infancy. Both Sidney and Beatrice Webb saw the Labour Party as a vehicle for the non-revolutionary, democratic socialism they favoured. Clause IV of Labour’s constitution outlines what this entailed and it remained a controversial aspect of Labour Party politics throughout the twentieth century.
- *Analyse* the content of extracts, always being mindful of the question’s core issue:
 - Reference Marx’s vision of a communist society, which he considered the ultimate stage of social and economic development. Also note the contrasts he implicitly draws with conditions under capitalism. In the extract, Marx implies that, under capitalism, individuals are ‘enslaved’, their ‘all-round development’ suppressed, and their ‘abilities’ secondary to their ‘needs’. It is therefore easy to see from this extract why Marx looked forward to capitalism’s demise and ‘the higher phase of communist society’.
 - Reference Clause IV’s support for an economy where workers receive ‘the full fruits’ of their work in a fair and ‘equitable’ way. Furthermore, the second extract argues that this should occur on the basis of ‘common ownership’ – in other words, not on the basis of *private* ownership, as under capitalism. This, in turn, shows that Clause IV and the Webbs were opposed to capitalism.
- *Compare* the implications of the two extracts with reference to key thinkers:
 - First, both extracts are critical of capitalism and look forward to a time when it no longer exists. Both Marx and Clause IV (and, by implication, later socialist thinkers like Beatrice Webb) believe that capitalism is unfair and undesirable in its effects, and that a better society is worthwhile and attainable. This view was also endorsed by Rosa Luxemburg.
 - Secondly, not all socialist thinkers were hostile to capitalism. Later, revisionist socialists like Crosland and Giddens thought that non-capitalist economies were unlikely to produce wealth that could be distributed evenly and fruitfully; consequently, they considered Marx’s views outdated. Crosland and Giddens argued that Labour should scrap the original Clause IV of its constitution in favour of a commitment to modern capitalism, which would then finance greater public spending on, for example, state health care and education.
- *Evaluate* the two extracts in view of the question’s core issue, and with reference to key thinkers:



POLITICAL IDEAS

Liberalism, Conservatism, Socialism, Nationalism, Multiculturalism, Ecologism

- Evidently, both extracts are hostile to capitalism. But the extracts conceal important differences between Marx and Webb about how and when capitalism should be replaced. Prior knowledge tells us that Marx, like Engels and Luxemburg, believed it should be destroyed comprehensively in a revolution that also curtailed the existing political system. But we also know that Webb believed capitalism should be replaced gradually, by socialist parties like Labour, working within the existing political system.
- As part of the evaluation, you should give your own judgement. Do the genocidal atrocities committed by revolutionary 'Marxist' regimes, such as those of Stalin or Mao, strengthen the case for Webb's 'evolutionary' road to socialism? Does the collapse of the Soviet Union, or China's recent embrace of market economics, suggest that both extracts were mistaken about capitalism's durability? Or do the recent problems besetting capitalist economies, and the questionable record of 'revisionist socialist' governments in the UK, suggest that both extracts still have validity?

Edexcel

Essay questions

4

Introduction: Socialism is a highly varied ideology. And those who have described themselves as socialists, including both revolutionary socialists who admire Marx and reformist socialists within the UK Labour Party, offer very different ideas and policies. It can therefore appear that the views of different socialists – particularly revolutionary and reformist socialists – are more divided than united, making socialism an incoherent ideology. These divergent views can be demonstrated in several ways:

- First, revolutionary socialists like Marx and Luxemburg believe that the violent overthrow of capitalism, and the eventual emergence of communism, are 'historically inevitable'. Reformist socialists like Webb and Crosland are much less 'determinist' and believe that socialist outcomes require resolve and careful planning over a long period.
- Secondly, revolutionary socialists like Marx and Engels see the existing state as the unswerving servant of a capitalist elite and therefore incapable of effecting socialist change. Reformist socialists like Webb and Crosland believe that the existing state, if controlled by elected socialist governments, can steer society and the economy in a socialist direction (Crosland referenced the Labour governments of 1945–51 as a prime example).
- Thirdly, revolutionary socialists are all hostile to capitalism and wish to see it destroyed completely as soon as possible. Reformist socialists such as Webb believe that the disappearance of capitalism should occur more peacefully and gradually. Indeed, some reformist socialists, like Crosland and Giddens, believe capitalism should be retained, as it produces the wealth necessary for a better, more equal society. Third Way socialists such as Giddens even wanted to see capitalism *extended* through, for example, the privatisation of certain public services.

However, revolutionary and reformist socialists still share certain basic beliefs. This can be demonstrated in several ways:

- First, both revolutionary socialists like Marx and reformist socialists such as Giddens uphold a *normative* view of politics; they are both driven by a vision of how society and the economy *should* be and reject the conservative view that the politician's role is simply to 'keep the ship afloat' rather than steering it in a certain, constant direction.
- Secondly, both revolutionary socialists such as Luxemburg and reformist socialists such as Crosland imagine a society where there is greater fairness and co-operation and less inequality of outcome.



POLITICAL IDEAS

Liberalism, Conservatism, Socialism, Nationalism, Multiculturalism, Ecologism

- Thirdly, both revolutionary socialists like Marx and reformist socialists like Giddens reject the view that human nature is intrinsically fixed, selfish and egotistical. Instead, they argue that human nature is malleable and naturally fraternal and communal.

Conclusion: It is hard to deny that reformist socialists like Giddens have more in common with modern liberals like Rawls than with revolutionary socialists like Marx. However, when we examine socialists' broad ideals – such as their sceptical view of tradition (as associated with conservatism) and their rejection of competitive individualism (as associated with liberalism) – we see vital links between both revolutionary and reformist socialist thinkers.

5

Introduction: Socialists are historically unsure about the role of the state in capitalist society, and the extent to which it can be endorsed as a vehicle for socialism. This uncertainty can be demonstrated in several ways:

- First, revolutionary socialists like Marx thought governmental power, of the sort embodied by the state, was subordinate to the economic power of society's 'dominant economic class'. Consequently, radical political change had to begin outside the existing governmental system, involving a revolution that would smash the existing economic system. In other words, political change by the state had to be either preceded or accompanied by economic change by those outside the existing state.
- Meanwhile, revolutionary socialists like Marx and Engels saw the existing state as a 'mere committee' for managing the everyday affairs of capitalism's dominant economic class (the bourgeoisie). They alleged it was not politically neutral, and its personnel and apparatus were for ever geared to protecting bourgeois (non-socialist) interests.
- Consequently, socialists such as Marx and Engels believed the state in capitalist society is unaffected by election results and the subsequent composition of both the legislature (parliament) and executive (government). Even if senior politicians wished to introduce 'socialist' reform, they would quickly find themselves frustrated by anti-socialist elements in the bureaucracy, judiciary and military. In the state in capitalist society, 'socialist' politicians thus find they are 'in office but not in power'.

However, some socialists take a less hostile view of the state in capitalist society. This can be demonstrated in several ways:

- First, democratic socialists such as Beatrice Webb thought that, once the working class was given the vote, socialist parties would inevitably win the elections held by the state in capitalist society. As long as subsequent, socialist governments were prepared and resourceful, Webb believed, they could gradually replace capitalism with 'common ownership', without any need for violent revolution.
- Secondly, social democrats such as Anthony Crosland believed that the state in capitalist society had been vindicated by the UK Labour governments of 1945–51. These governments had introduced a wide range of radical measures, such as the National Health Service and the nationalisation of key public services. For Crosland, this proved that the existing state could be adapted to bold socialist reform.
- Thirdly, Third Way thinkers like Anthony Giddens thought the existing state could be made more 'progressive' if it were reformed and modernised. Measures like devolution and House of Lords reform would help redistribute political power within the existing state, and thus enable politicians to redistribute wealth and power within society.

Conclusion: The presence of contemporary revolutionary socialist movements – such as the Socialist Workers Party – shows that socialists continue to disagree about the state in capitalist society. Yet, the vast



POLITICAL IDEAS

Liberalism, Conservatism, Socialism, Nationalism, Multiculturalism, Ecologism

majority of socialists today reject the Marxist view that the existing state must quickly be demolished. Instead, most socialists agree with Webb, Crosland and Giddens that practical socialism must involve engaging with the current political system.

6

Introduction: Equality is a vital aspect of socialism and most socialists agree that 'greater equality' is fundamentally important. Although socialists endorse equality of opportunity, most distinguish themselves from liberalism by also demanding greater equality of *outcome*. Indeed, most socialists argue that equality of opportunity is impossible without greater equality of outcome.

This commitment to equality of opportunity *and* outcome can be demonstrated in several ways:

- First, revolutionary socialists like Marx were opposed to capitalism, largely because it generated hugely unequal outcomes. They looked forward to a communist utopia where private property, class divisions and inequalities of wealth all ceased to exist.
- Equally, reformist socialists like Webb believed that grossly unequal outcomes would be eliminated by democratic socialist governments, which would gradually convert private ownership of the economy into common ownership.
- Similarly, Anthony Crosland's 'revisionist' defence of capitalism was based on his belief that a steady growth of public spending, within a largely capitalist economy, was the most effective way to guarantee greater equality. A modern capitalist economy, Crosland argued, was the most likely to create economic growth; this would finance extra state spending (for instance, on state education), and thus greater equality of opportunity.

However, some strands of socialism seem at odds with greater equality. This can be demonstrated in several ways:

- First, according to Marx the revolution would be followed by a new state – the dictatorship of the proletariat. As anarchists point out, any state inevitably leads to fresh forms of authority, hierarchy and therefore inequality.
- Secondly, by defending capitalism and private property, revisionists like Crosland therefore justify varying levels of property ownership, varying levels of income and, consequently, continued inequality.
- Thirdly, recent revisionists like Anthony Giddens defend *greater* inequalities of outcome by advocating further privatisation and deregulation of the economy. Giddens argued that such a 'neo-liberal' economy would grow faster, provide governments with greater tax revenue and allow better opportunities for all. Yet 'better opportunities for all' is not the same as 'equal opportunities'. Indeed, Third Way governments (such as those of New Labour after 1997) oversaw widening inequalities of wealth.

Conclusion: Most socialists today accept the analyses of Crosland and Giddens and allow for the continuation of capitalism and private property. As a result, they admit, implicitly, that inequality of outcome is inevitable. The anti-capitalist socialism associated with Marx, Luxemburg and Webb seems more consistent with greater equality of outcome. However, given the record of non-capitalist societies, this type of socialism may not have much appeal to either voters or modern socialist politicians.



Chapter 3: Conservatism

Students should incorporate the following key points in their answers. These points should be expanded using appropriate examples (gleaned from throughout the main text of the relevant chapter) and developed with reference to each ideology's key thinkers (see both the main text and 'Key thinker' boxes within the chapter).

AQA

Short-answer questions

1

- Traditional conservatives such as Edmund Burke see private property, on which capitalism depends, as something which can be bequeathed and inherited. For Burke, property was therefore an example of the 'partnership between the living, the dead and the yet to be born', one which Burke thought essential to a wise, functioning society.
- Conservatives such as Michael Oakeshott see capitalism as something that has developed organically, and that normally ensures that our material needs are met without adding to the obligations of the state. Oakeshott argued that capitalism provides a further check on the power of the state – a further 'taming of Leviathan' – by ensuring that economic responsibilities are dispersed and decentralised.
- New Right conservatives, such as Robert Nozick and Ayn Rand, believe that free-market, laissez-faire capitalism draws upon the unlimited creativity and energy of individuals and private organisations. Nozick and Rand therefore saw capitalism as the precondition of individual freedom and overall prosperity.

2

- Traditional conservatives like Burke see tradition as important in view of human imperfection. Tradition, Burke argued, represents the wisdom arising from *experience*, and usually relates to something which has been proven to work tolerably well. So, given humanity's tendency to miscalculate and misjudge, tradition is an essential way of avoiding unfortunate, unforeseen outcomes.
- Oakeshott argued that human nature includes a natural 'love of the familiar' and 'fear of the unknown'. Oakeshott therefore saw tradition as something which comforted and reassured people, in a frequently uncertain world.
- New Right conservatives, like Rand, argue that traditional families and traditional communities can provide individuals with security and welfare, and diminish their reliance upon the state. As a result, the state's own responsibilities can be 'rolled back', allowing for lower taxation and greater individual choice. Tradition can therefore be the bedrock of a minimal state and a dynamic, free-market economy.

Extract question

3

- Clarify and highlight the *core issue* within the question – in this case, conservatism's view of the state.
- Consider the *provenance*, or the background to extracts, demonstrating prior knowledge if possible:



POLITICAL IDEAS

Liberalism, Conservatism, Socialism, Nationalism, Multiculturalism, Ecologism

- First, Burke, an eighteenth-century Whig politician, is widely seen as ‘the father of conservatism’. His critique of the French Revolution had a profound influence upon traditional conservative thinking.
- Secondly, Oakeshott is widely seen as one of the most important conservative philosophers of the twentieth century. His views on human nature were seen as nuanced and incisive, and a corrective to the rather bleak views offered by earlier thinkers like Hobbes and Burke.
- *Analyse* the content of extracts, always being mindful of the question’s core issue:
 - Reference Burke’s belief that a state is essential because, while providing for ‘human wants’, it also restricts human behaviour. Burke also argues that the state cannot stand still: it must ‘change to conserve’, so that new threats to what we wish to preserve are addressed. Equally, he suggests that such change should be cautious and respectful of history and tradition.
 - Reference Oakeshott’s view that the state’s functions should be pragmatic and down-to-earth – ‘merely to govern’. He argues that it is not the state’s role to re-educate or inspire its ‘subjects’, but instead to ‘restrain, deflate, pacify and reconcile’ human behaviour.
- *Compare* the implications of the two extracts, with reference to key thinkers:
 - First, the stress that both extracts put on ‘restraining’ and ‘restricting’ human behaviour agrees with the analysis of Thomas Hobbes in *Leviathan* (1651). Hobbes argued that, without a state, life would be ‘nasty, brutish and short’ on account of our tendency to be selfish and self-destructive.
 - Secondly, the stress both extracts put on ‘restriction’ and ‘restraint’ clashes with the New Right view of thinkers like Nozick. He argued that the state was merely ‘restricting’ individual liberty, individual creativity and individual energy, and should therefore be ‘rolled back’ in the interests of freedom and prosperity.
- *Evaluate* the two extracts, in view of the question’s core issue and with reference to key thinkers:
 - Evidently, both extracts take an unromantic view of the state’s role, seeing it essentially as a mechanism for securing order as a result of restricting human conduct. Both extracts therefore reject the more ‘idealistic’ role of the state associated with both liberalism (which sees the state as a means of promoting ‘natural rights’) and socialism (which sees the state as a means of achieving more equality).
 - As part of your evaluation, you should offer your own judgement. Are Burke and Oakeshott right to say that the role of the state should be modest and pragmatic, given the foul consequences of many states which have had loftier and bolder objectives (the Soviet Union or Nazi Germany, for example)? Or do you agree with liberals and socialists that a better future can only be secured if the state’s role is more ambitious?

Edexcel

Essay questions

4

Introduction: Conservatism is widely seen as having a more downbeat approach to politics than ‘progressive’ ideologies like liberalism and socialism. This can be demonstrated in several ways:

- First, Hobbes argued that, before the arrival of a state and formal law, human beings were mercilessly selfish and that life was therefore ‘nasty, brutish and short’.
- Secondly, Burke warned that there was a ‘timeless chasm’ between human aspiration and achievement, and that change should therefore be slow and cautious.
- Thirdly, Oakeshott warned that human existence was hard to plan and predict and that the ‘ship of state’ should focus merely on ‘staying afloat’ rather than heading for some idealised destination.



POLITICAL IDEAS

Liberalism, Conservatism, Socialism, Nationalism, Multiculturalism, Ecologism

However, conservatism is less pessimistic than many assume. This can be demonstrated in several ways:

- First, Oakeshott took a forgiving view of human nature, arguing that humanity was capable of kindness, generosity and innovation.
- Secondly, New Right thinkers such as Nozick argued for a more laissez-faire approach to economics. He was confident this would energise individuals and lead to greater economic growth. Nozick particularly opposed any notion that conservatives should simply 'endure not solve' problems, 'choose the lesser evil', or generally 'make the best of a bad job'.
- Thirdly, Ayn Rand argued that many individuals were potentially brilliant and were only held back by an overreaching state.

Conclusion: In terms of human potential, traditional conservatism is more sceptical than liberalism and socialism, although Oakeshott is perhaps more forgiving of the status quo than many liberal and socialist thinkers. The New Right, meanwhile, takes a far more optimistic view of what can be achieved, especially in the economic arena, if the principles of neo-liberal economics are applied.

5

Introduction: Conservatism self-evidently wishes to conserve and is therefore often associated with opposition to radical change. This can be demonstrated in several ways:

- First, Burke – the father of conservative philosophy – was severely critical of the French Revolution, warning that its disregard for tradition, experience and evidence would have disastrous results.
- Secondly, Oakeshott claimed that human beings were driven by a 'love of the familiar' and 'fear of the unknown' and were therefore drawn to established practice and traditional communities.
- Thirdly, New Right conservatives argued that their agenda would help preserve traditional morality and traditional values, reversing the 'permissive' and socially liberal reforms of the 1960s.

However, conservatism's opposition to change can be overstated. This can be demonstrated in several ways:

- First, Burke did not oppose change as such – only a certain type of change (revolution).
- Secondly, Burke actually argued that evolutionary change was necessary in order to conserve what we value. In other words, we must 'change to conserve'. Oakeshott later described this as a 'doctrine of maintenance'.
- Thirdly, New Right thinkers like Nozick and Rand favoured radical, *iconoclastic* change in the economic sphere – their ideas were duly demonstrated by the privatisation programme of the Thatcher governments, which are generally seen as among the most radical UK governments of the twentieth century.

Conclusion: Conservatives do indeed value tradition, experience and continuity and are consistently opposed to revolution. However, they recognise that society cannot 'stand still' and are generally opposed to 'turning back the clock'. New Right conservatives have been especially prepared to undertake radical, economic change in order to sustain capitalist societies.

6

Introduction: During the 1970s and 1980s, many commentators thought the New Right conservatism of Rand and Nozick was very different from the traditional conservatism of Burke and Oakeshott. This could be demonstrated in several ways:

- First, the New Right favoured radical economic change – in contrast to the slow, evolutionary change commended by Burke.



POLITICAL IDEAS

Liberalism, Conservatism, Socialism, Nationalism, Multiculturalism, Ecologism

- Secondly, the New Right was prepared to be confrontational and divisive in its approach to politics – in contrast to the consensual, ‘one nation’ approach associated with politicians like Disraeli and traditional conservative thinkers like Oakeshott.
- Thirdly, the New Right seemed to be guided by dogma and rigid ideas of how society and the economy should be structured (hence Margaret Thatcher’s claim to be a ‘conviction politician’). This contrasted with Burke’s preference for an empirical, evidence-based approach to society, and Oakeshott’s belief that ‘the ship of state’ should be focused on the everyday business of staying afloat rather than steadfastly sailing to a fixed destination.

However, there are important overlaps between traditional conservatism and the New Right. This can be demonstrated in several ways:

- First, the New Right had a neo-conservative element that sought to update traditional conservative principles – such as its ‘Hobbesian’ belief that the prime role of the state was the maintenance of order and security.
- Secondly, the New Right endorsed the kind of social conservatism associated with traditional conservatives like Oakeshott – such as its commitment to ‘traditional family values’ and Judaeo-Christian morality.
- Thirdly, New Right thinkers like Nozick were keen defenders of private property – as were traditional conservatives like Burke, who regarded private property as a guarantee of stability, tradition and orderly change.

Conclusion: The abrasive and controversial tone of New Right conservatism did clash with the more consensual rhetoric of traditional conservatism, as did the New Right’s preference for bold and radical change over cautious, gradual reform. However, the circumstances of the 1970s and 1980s were also unusual, with communism abroad and militant trade unionism at home seeming to threaten the essentials of a conservative society. This led many of those who supported New Right conservatism to argue that drastic times called for drastic measures, and that New Right ideas were simply the latest illustration of conservatism’s readiness to ‘change in order to conserve’.

Chapter 4: Multiculturalism

Students should incorporate the following key points in their answers. These points should be expanded using appropriate examples (gleaned from throughout the main text of the relevant chapter) and developed with reference to each ideology’s key thinkers (see both the main text and ‘Key thinker’ boxes within the chapter).

AQA

1

Introduction: Define multiculturalism – a controversial ideology, but one that is widely misunderstood.

Multiculturalism is not the same thing as a multicultural society: it is possible to oppose the former but support the latter. Instead, multiculturalism is a political strategy for *uniting* a multicultural society, through *state-sponsored diversity*.

One of the main reasons that multiculturalism is a controversial ideology is that it provokes the claim that it promotes discord rather than harmony. This claim can be analysed and evaluated in several ways:

- First, multiculturalism allegedly promotes discord because it highlights important cultural differences. It therefore risks downplaying the values that unite us, which are vital to the cohesion of society.



POLITICAL IDEAS

Liberalism, Conservatism, Socialism, Nationalism, Multiculturalism, Ecologism

- The above view would probably be endorsed by conservative thinkers such as Oakeshott, who uphold the concept of 'one nation' as a way of uniting society's disparate elements. Just as 'one nation' conservatives dislike talk of class, as it fosters division and instability, so they also dislike cultural diversity for similar reasons. However, this is disputed by multiculturalist thinkers such as Isaiah Berlin, who believe that modern states should acknowledge the reality of 'value pluralism' within modern, multicultural societies. If this is done, then multiculturalism can be a force for harmony and stability.
- Secondly, multiculturalism promotes discord because it threatens to undermine one of the key principles of a liberal democracy: rationalism. Critics argue that by legitimising certain minority religion communities, multiculturalism threatens to weaken reason and rationality in political debate, while admitting the validity of views based on faith and superstition. This will eventually destabilise a society that is based on the values of the Enlightenment.
- The above view has been expressed by Amartya Sen and other liberal critics of multiculturalism. However, it would be dismissed by Will Kymlicka and other proponents of liberal multiculturalism, who argue that a harmonious society depends on the principle of 'government by consent', outlined by John Locke over 300 years ago. If the state acknowledges and sponsors minority cultures, its citizens are more likely to give their consent to the state that governs them, which in turn promotes harmony.
- Thirdly, multiculturalism supposedly promotes discord by fostering division among working-class and economically challenged voters. Instead of highlighting the shared economic circumstances of the various cultures and communities, multiculturalism risks obscuring them by focusing on cultural differences. As a result, the unity and solidarity of society's most vulnerable members are arguably undermined. Critics of a multicultural and multiracial society might even use cultural difference – as loudly advertised by a multiculturalist state – to sow resentment within the majority, white community. This could lead to suggestions that multicultural societies and immigration are the cause of economic hardship, as opposed to the inequalities naturally generated by capitalism. The outcome, obviously, would be heightened discord rather than harmony.
- The above view has been expressed by Brian Barry and other socialist critics of multiculturalism. It is one of the main reasons why multiculturalism has been rejected by most senior figures in the UK Labour Party and its affiliated trade unions. However, that view would not be accepted by some Labour politicians, notably Jeremy Corbyn and Ken Livingstone, who agree with many of the ideas expressed by Bhikhu Parekh, who argues that cultural equality is a vital element in a fairer and more harmonious society. Parekh has also hinted at a 'coalition of the disaffected', which embraces both cultural minorities and economically vulnerable young people in their quest for social justice.

Conclusion: Multiculturalism may seek harmony, but it also creates discord among politicians and key political thinkers. You should attempt a personal evaluation here. Do you agree with Kymlicka and Parekh that multiculturalism is the inevitable outcome of a multicultural society? Is recent interracial violence in the USA, for example, a result of multiculturalism being denied? Or do you think multiculturalism only exacerbates and inflames the tensions found within a multicultural society?

2

Introduction: Define multiculturalism – a controversial ideology but one that is widely misunderstood.

Multiculturalism is not the same thing as a multicultural society – it is possible to oppose the former but support the latter. Instead, multiculturalism is a political strategy for *uniting* a multicultural society through *state-sponsored diversity*.

One of the reasons that multiculturalism is a controversial ideology is the claim that it is now discredited. This claim can be analysed and evaluated in several ways:



POLITICAL IDEAS

Liberalism, Conservatism, Socialism, Nationalism, Multiculturalism, Ecologism

- First, the UK's Cattle Report, conducted following a series of urban riots in 2001, found that various minority religious communities were now living 'parallel lives' within areas like Bradford and Oldham, rarely interacting with each other and creating a 'fractured and toxic' environment. Critics of multiculturalism, such as Trevor Phillips, author of the UK's *Race and Faith* report, 2016, argue that this dangerous situation would be worsened by multiculturalism, with its stress on the separate needs and identity of various cultural communities.
- The above view would be endorsed by conservative writers, who argue that we should instead be fostering a sense of 'one nation' and all the things our communities have in common. However, it would be rejected by multiculturalist thinkers like Bhikhu Parekh, who argue that the riots preceding Cattle's report were an indictment of the non-multiculturalist approach adopted in the UK. 'Fractured and toxic' environments, Parekh argues, are what arise when the state does not properly recognise the distinct character of minority communities.
- Secondly, the terrorist atrocities committed in multicultural cities like London (2005) and Manchester (2017) were committed by individuals who lived and worked in the societies they were attacking. Such violent individuals were obviously disconnected from the mainstream culture of society. By encouraging the 'politics of difference', and by emphasising cultural 'otherness', multiculturalism might exacerbate this problem, making violent acts against society even more likely.
- The above view would again be endorsed by conservative writers, who would call for a renewed rejection of multiculturalism and the adoption of alternative approaches to multicultural societies – such as assimilation and individualist integration, both of which aim for greater cultural consensus. However, this view would be rejected by multiculturalists like Tariq Modood, who point out that such terrorism has also occurred in France and the USA, where multiculturalism is explicitly rejected. Existing approaches, Modood argues, are simply not creating unity in a multicultural society and should therefore be side-lined in favour of the value pluralism advocated by Isaiah Berlin.
- Thirdly, the 2021 report of the Commission on Race and Ethnic Disparities (CRED) praised the UK's progress towards being 'a successful and harmonious multi-racial society'. Having largely rejected multiculturalism in favour of individualist integration, the UK was now – according to CRED – 'a model for other White-majority countries'.
- The above view would naturally be endorsed by CRED's chair, Tony Sewell – himself from an ethnic minority background. Any movement towards multiculturalism, he argues, would undo the significant progress made in recent decades. However, this view would be challenged by multiculturalists like Will Kymlicka, who point to growing evidence of alienation among those from black and minority ethnic backgrounds. This seriously threatens the liberal principle of government by consent and can only be countered, Kymlicka argues, through multiculturalist measures like positive discrimination and group differentiated rights.

Conclusion: Growing support for allegedly racist politicians, sickening acts of terrorism in the name of minority religions, and the surge of movements like Black Lives Matter, all suggest that modern multicultural societies are far from harmonious. But commentators disagree over whether this discredits or vindicates multiculturalism. You should also attempt a personal evaluation here. Does the Cattle Report hint at the problems which may arise if multiculturalism is officially applied? Or does it show what occurs when multiculturalism is ignored? Do the findings of the CRED report discredit the ideas of Parekh, Kymlicka and Modood? Or, in view of the BLM protests, is CRED's rejection of multiculturalism misguided and naïve?



POLITICAL IDEAS

Liberalism, Conservatism, Socialism, Nationalism, Multiculturalism, Ecologism

Introduction: Define multiculturalism – a controversial but widely misunderstood ideology. Multiculturalism is not the same as a multicultural society: one can oppose the former while supporting the latter. Instead, multiculturalism is a political strategy for *uniting* a multicultural society through *state-sponsored diversity*.

One of the reasons that multiculturalism is a controversial ideology is the claim that it has no clear and consistent strategy for achieving its aims. This claim can be analysed and evaluated in several ways:

- First, it is argued that there are significant inconsistencies between the ‘shallow diversity’ associated with liberal multiculturalists such as Will Kymlicka and the ‘deep diversity’ advocated by pluralist multiculturalists such as Bhikhu Parekh. Kymlicka argues that multiculturalism should be pursued within a broadly liberal consensus that emphasises constitutional government and human rights. Parekh argues that this smacks of ‘plural monoculturalism’, steeped in the values of secular western societies. Effective multiculturalism, Parekh argues, requires greater ‘recognition’ of non-western cultures.
- This example of inconsistency has been highlighted by liberal critics of multiculturalism, such as Amartya Sen, who believes that Kymlicka is disingenuous in his attempt to reconcile cultural diversity with liberalism, given liberalism’s belief that ‘natural rights’ are universal and non-negotiable. However, both Kymlicka and Parekh agree that modern states must urgently secure the consent of their citizens and that they are most likely to secure this by endorsing the value pluralism of Isaiah Berlin.
- Secondly, Kymlicka wishes the law and constitution to accommodate group differentiated rights, so as to ensure that the rule of law is more sensitive to a multicultural society. However, Parekh argues that a multiculturalist state should go much further by promoting legal pluralism, where different laws (in respect of, for example, marriage and divorce) apply to different communities.
- This example of inconsistency has been highlighted by socialist critics of multiculturalism like Brian Barry, who argues that multiculturalism has no clear strategy for ensuring solidarity in a multicultural society and that a clear strategy is the precondition of progress towards social justice for all. However, Parekh and Kymlicka agree that unity must involve rejecting the two main alternatives to managing a multicultural society: namely, assimilation and individualist integration. All multiculturalist thinkers argue that these ‘traditional’ approaches do not give enough weight to the ‘politics of recognition’ described by Charles Taylor and have failed to resolve tensions in a multicultural society. They agree that a new approach is required, based on the multiculturalist principle of ‘unity through diversity’.
- Thirdly, multiculturalist thinkers such as Tariq Modood argue that state-sponsored diversity can help create a ‘new and more inclusive national story’ for post-imperial states like the UK, one which highlights how various cultures have historically contributed to a nation’s ‘story’. However, Parekh fears that this might only reinforce colonial tendencies within a multicultural society, by fuelling the idea that minority cultures have been largely reframed by the colonialist culture of the majority. Parekh argues that Modood’s analysis grants insufficient respect to the value pluralism prescribed by Berlin.
- This example of inconsistency has been highlighted by conservative critics of multiculturalism, who remain deeply sceptical about multiculturalism’s capacity to ensure a sense of ‘one nation’ in a multicultural society. However, Modood, Kymlicka and Parekh insist their differences are about details, not strategy. Consequently, they are consistent in their belief that state-sponsored diversity is the only strategy for ensuring harmony and stability.

Conclusion: All forms of multiculturalism are consistent in their rejection of the two other main approaches to securing harmony in a multicultural society (assimilation and individualist integration). Nevertheless, in terms of rhetoric and specific policies, multiculturalism’s key thinkers have important differences in approach. This may explain why multiculturalism has not yet been applied consistently in most



POLITICAL IDEAS

Liberalism, Conservatism, Socialism, Nationalism, Multiculturalism, Ecologism

multicultural societies. You should attempt a personal evaluation here. Do the differences between key multiculturalist thinkers, like Kymlicka and Parekh, compromise the credibility of multiculturalism as a political ideology? Or are such differences unimportant compared with the limitations of other approaches to managing a multicultural society (assimilation and individualist integration)?

Edexcel

Essay questions

4

Introduction: Define multiculturalism – a controversial ideology, but one that is widely misunderstood.

Multiculturalism is not the same thing as a multicultural society – it is possible to oppose the former but support the latter. Instead, multiculturalism is a political strategy for *uniting* a multicultural society, through *state-sponsored diversity*.

Multiculturalism's key thinkers believe it is possible to reconcile multiculturalism with national unity. Indeed, they argue that *only* multiculturalism can produce national unity. This can be demonstrated in several ways:

- First, Will Kymlicka and other advocates of liberal multiculturalism believe that, in a multicultural society, the liberal principle of government by consent can only be secured if the state recognises and sponsors the range of cultures within such a society.
- Secondly, thinkers like Charles Taylor believe that, by supporting the 'politics of recognition', the state in a multicultural society will prevent large sections of society being alienated and marginalised, thus damaging national unity.
- Thirdly, Bhikhu Parekh and other advocates of pluralist multiculturalism argue that alternative approaches to uniting a multicultural society – such as assimilation in France and individualist integration in the USA – have failed. The state should therefore promote the value pluralism suggested by Isaiah Berlin.

However, multiculturalism being a controversial ideology, there are those who argue that it is incompatible with national unity:

- First, conservative thinkers like Oakeshott argue that multiculturalism threatens 'one nation' by highlighting differences between communities rather than common beliefs.
- Secondly, modern liberal thinkers like Rawls might argue that, by validating cultures largely defined by religion, multiculturalism weakens the 'politics of rationalism' and threatens individual rights within certain communities.
- Thirdly, socialist thinkers like Marx might have argued that multiculturalism is a 'divide and rule' strategy, designed to weaken solidarity among the working class and the financially challenged, and thus to impede the struggle for economic equality.

Conclusion: Almost by definition, multicultural societies can be the enemy of national unity.

Multiculturalism acknowledges this and its advocates have a commitment to averting tension and division. However, multiculturalism's critics argue that it simply exacerbates the problems inherent to multicultural societies.

5

Introduction: Define multiculturalism – a controversial ideology, but one that is widely misunderstood.

Multiculturalism is not the same thing as a multicultural society – it is possible to oppose the former but



POLITICAL IDEAS

Liberalism, Conservatism, Socialism, Nationalism, Multiculturalism, Ecologism

support the latter. Instead, multiculturalism is a political strategy for *uniting* a multicultural society, through *state-sponsored diversity*.

Multiculturalism can be viewed as supporting the 'politics of difference'. This can be demonstrated in several ways:

- First, it owes much to Isaiah Berlin's argument that states like the UK and USA must practise value pluralism if they are to respect the various cultures and lifestyles within modern society. Only by doing this, Berlin argues, can tolerance and enlightenment be guaranteed.
- Secondly, multiculturalism reflects Will Kymlicka's view that modern states should enshrine in their constitutions not just individual rights but group differentiated rights. This would involve the state granting certain, bespoke rights to certain communities – based, for example, on their religion – which do not apply to all communities.
- Thirdly, one of the most important strands of multiculturalism is the pluralist multiculturalism commended by Bhikhu Parekh. Often referred to as 'deep diversity', Parekh's ideas include the variation of a state's laws from community to community, and a multilingual format to most forms of state communication (such as documents relating to taxation or the licensing of vehicles).

However, some are sceptical about the relationship between multiculturalism and the 'politics of difference'. This can be demonstrated in several ways:

- First, the liberal multiculturalism of Kymlicka has been labelled 'shallow diversity' in that it only supports diversity within a liberal framework of individual human rights and respect for individual choices. Kymlicka seems to ignore the fact that many of the communities within a multicultural society give priority to duties and obligations rather than individual rights and are prepared to restrict individual choice in the name of religion.
- Secondly, although the problems of liberal multiculturalism are addressed by the pluralist multiculturalism of Parekh, it is only the liberal multiculturalism of Kymlicka that has so far been practised by modern states (such as Canada and New Zealand).
- Thirdly, critics argue that, in terms of its effects, multiculturalism *obstructs* the 'politics of difference' by emphasising cultural divisions. Far from encouraging a society which celebrates difference, multiculturalism may just lead to a society that is fragmented – one where individuals are defined by and effectively locked into their own cultural communities, leading 'parallel lives' and rarely interacting with different communities.

Conclusion: In theory, multiculturalism is fundamentally committed to the 'politics of difference' and seems more likely to promote this than alternative approaches to the management of a multicultural society (such as assimilation and individualist integration). However, the depth of this commitment varies between the two main strands of multiculturalism, while critics argue that the divisive effects of multiculturalism are likely to contradict the ideology's central aim of 'unity through difference'.

6

Introduction: Define multiculturalism – a controversial ideology but one that is widely misunderstood.

Multiculturalism is not the same thing as a multicultural society – it is possible to oppose the former but support the latter. Instead, multiculturalism is a political strategy for *uniting* a multicultural society, through *state-sponsored diversity*.

Critics of multiculturalism are likely to agree that it promotes segregation rather than integration. This can be demonstrated in several ways:

- First, conservative critics would argue that it undermines the principle of 'one nation' and threatens what Samuel Huntington called the 'clash of civilisations', both between and within societies.



POLITICAL IDEAS

Liberalism, Conservatism, Socialism, Nationalism, Multiculturalism, Ecologism

- Secondly, liberal critics like Amartya Sen argue that it drives individuals into cultural ghettos, where they only interact with people of their own 'birth culture' rather than integrate with people from other, various backgrounds.
- Thirdly, socialist critics like Brian Barry argue that multiculturalism threatens solidarity among people with similar economic circumstances. This failure to assemble the economically challenged members of society, instead dividing them along cultural and religious lines, only harms progress towards greater equality and social justice for all.

However, multiculturalism's key thinkers would vigorously repudiate this charge, insisting that they offer a highly relevant prescription for integration within modern, multicultural societies. This can be demonstrated in several ways:

- First, liberal multiculturalists such as Kymlicka argue that any integrated society upholds the liberal concept of government by consent. This is more likely to be secured, he argues, if the state respects and validates all cultures within society.
- Secondly, advocates of pluralist multiculturalism, such as Parekh, argue that integration will not be achieved if the state simply expects minority communities to downplay their cultures and superficially endorse the values of the majority. Integration instead requires that the state recognises *and promotes* all the cultures and values of a modern, multicultural society.
- Thirdly, supporters of cosmopolitan multiculturalism, such as Jeremy Waldron, argue that members of a multicultural society can effectively integrate themselves by adopting the value pluralism cited by Isaiah Berlin.

Conclusion: Its key thinkers insist that multiculturalism is *the only* way to secure the integration of a multicultural society; they also refer to the 'non-integration' of multicultural societies like France and the USA, where multiculturalism has been rejected. However, multiculturalism's opponents argue that the problems of such societies will only be compounded by the ideas of Kymlicka and Parekh, and that those who support them are 'sleepwalking to segregation' (Trevor Phillips, former chair of the UK's *Race and Faith* report, 2016).

Chapter 5: Nationalism

Students should incorporate the following key points in their answers. These points should be expanded using appropriate examples (gleaned from throughout the main text of the relevant chapter) and developed with reference to each ideology's key thinkers (see both the main text and 'Key thinker' boxes within the chapter).

AQA

Essay questions

1

Introduction: Explain the idea that the type of unity and stability nationalism aspires to create is between citizens living in nation-states and between nations internationally. Explain that the key debate therefore revolves around whether nationalism is more often a force which promotes unity and stability within and between nations or one that tends instead to promote disunity and instability within and between them.

When explaining the argument that nationalism is a force for unity and stability, the following points could be made:



POLITICAL IDEAS

Liberalism, Conservatism, Socialism, Nationalism, Multiculturalism, Ecologism

- Liberal nationalism is based on the idea of creating a world of democratic, self-determining nation-states. Jean-Jacques Rousseau and Giuseppe Mazzini argued for the creation of republican nation-states whose citizens would respect both each others' rights and the sovereignty of other nations. After the First World War, Woodrow Wilson argued that extending national self-determination and liberal democracy to all the remaining imperial colonies would promote peace and unity and remove the tensions caused by imperialism and national separatism.
- Conservative nationalists have argued that nationalism is a force for promoting social cohesion and unity within a state. Johann Gottfried von Herder inspired this tradition with his idea of the unifying *Volksgeist* tying people with a common language and culture to each other. Conservative nationalists from the late nineteenth century onwards have promoted the unifying properties of shared national traditions and heritage as an antidote to the divisive effects of internationalist ideologies (such as socialism and liberalism) and immigrants preserving their own cultural traditions rather than integrating into the dominant national culture.
- More radical forms of nationalism might seem to inspire conflict and division but ultimately claim that the reordered national societies they are striving for will provide stability and unity. Marcus Garvey, for example, might argue that a pan-African nation would provide this for the African diaspora forced to endure exclusion and alienation in white European-dominated nations. Charles Maurras might argue that his vision of an ethnically homogenous France based on pre-revolutionary traditions would provide citizens with the stability and unity lacking in the context of the upheaval following the 1789 Revolution.

When explaining the argument that nationalism is not a force for unity and stability, the following points could be made:

- Maurras, and the fascist movements he inspired, encouraged and often carried out the persecution and exclusion of minority ethnic and other minority groups from their national communities. They also championed war with other nations as part of their integral nationalist belief in the superiority of their own nation and of the need for citizens to place loyalty to this nation above any sense of individual liberty or self-preservation.
- Garvey and the black nationalists he inspired based their ideology on the idea of the impossibility of achieving unity and stability between the white and black races. Post- and anti-colonial nationalists have also advocated violent struggle against colonial oppressors, with Frantz Fanon even proposing a cathartic need for violence as part of the decolonisation process.
- Even forms of nationalism claiming to be promoting unity and stability have been accused of instead creating alienation and division. Promoting loyalty to a nation's dominant culture within conservative nationalism has been seen to marginalise citizens from minority cultures or those who don't subscribe to these dominant values. Conservative nationalism has also been seen to create hostility to other nations, as was arguably seen in the readiness of populations to go to war in 1914 and more recently in the decline in willingness to co-operate internationally exemplified by Brexit in the UK and the Trump administration in the USA.

Conclusion (this is an example, rather than a definitive, answer): Despite liberal nationalist aspirations for co-operation between nation-states and conservative nationalist aspirations for promoting social cohesion within nation-states, nationalism in the age of well-established nation-states has tended primarily to provoke division and conflict between and within them.



POLITICAL IDEAS

Liberalism, Conservatism, Socialism, Nationalism, Multiculturalism, Ecologism

2

Introduction: Define race (supposedly biologically distinct categories of human) and ethnicity (the sharing of a long common ancestry and thus also cultural heritage). Outline the debate regarding how some forms of nationalism (liberal, conservative) have typically tried to distance themselves from race and ethnicity, while others (integral, black nationalism) have placed significant emphasis on it.

When explaining the argument that nationalism has little to do with race and ethnicity, the following points could be made:

- With its overwhelmingly civic focus, liberal nationalism claims that race and ethnicity are totally irrelevant to its ideology. For Rousseau and Mazzini, the value of the nation-state was that it conferred universal rights on its citizens regardless of their ethnicity. Wilson also advocated a world of nation-states bound together by a common understanding that liberal democracy was the ideal form of civic society regardless of the dominant race or ethnicity within the nation.
- Conservative nationalism also argues that values bind a nation together, rather than race or ethnicity. Provided an individual chooses to celebrate and integrate into a nation's culture and history, conservatives will argue that their race and ethnicity are irrelevant.
- Although anti- and post-colonial nationalism often, in effect, involve oppressed non-white communities seeking to reverse the effects of white oppression, they generally don't frame their analysis in racial or ethnic terms. Very often (as in the case of Castro's Cuban nationalism or Ho Chi Minh's Vietnamese nationalism), it is presented as a socialist struggle against the oppression of global capitalism.

When explaining the argument that nationalism has a lot to do with ethnicity and race, the following points could be made:

- More culturally defined forms of nationalism tend to place more emphasis on ethnicity. Herder identified a *Volksgeist* which drew together a nation with commonly evolved traditions and language whose historic links tend to imply a common ancestry and ethnicity.
- The black nationalism of Garvey and those he inspired clearly divides humanity into races, seeing the only route to independence and self-determination for the African race as separation from the white European races which have historically oppressed them.
- Maurras advocated the exclusion of certain ethnic groups (notably Jewish people) from his French nation. The fascist groups he inspired tended to view these groups as races. For example, the Nazis excluded and persecuted Jewish people as elements which they claimed polluted the purity of their racially pure Aryan German nation.

Conclusion (this is an example, rather than a definitive, answer): Nationalism has mostly only involved race in isolated, and often extreme, circumstances. Although the enduring appeal of the nation being a group of people with a shared cultural heritage has led ethnicity to play a more consistent role, the mainstream elements of civic and cultural nationalism (liberal and conservative respectively) at least aspire to be inclusive of all ethnicities.

3

Introduction: Outline the debate regarding nationalism being viewed as a 'chameleon doctrine', which changes to suit the context in which it is constructed, as against the idea that all forms of nationalism have a meaningful set of shared characteristics.

When explaining the argument that nationalism lacks a coherent set of beliefs, the following points could be made:



POLITICAL IDEAS

Liberalism, Conservatism, Socialism, Nationalism, Multiculturalism, Ecologism

- Different forms of nationalism vary as some are mostly concerned with promoting individual rights (Rousseau, Mazzini and other liberal nationalist thinkers), while other forms demand that individuals place their rights below the interests of the nation (Maurras, fascism etc.).
- Some forms of nationalism are mainly cultural (Herder), ethnic (Maurras) or racial (Garvey) in their outlook, whereas others are mainly civic (Rousseau, Woodrow Wilson, SNP etc.) or political (post-colonial socialist nationalism).
- Some forms of nationalism are chauvinistic and expansionist (Maurras, imperialism, fascism), while others explicitly call for the sovereignty of other nations to be respected (Wilsonian nationalism).

When explaining the argument that there are common, coherent themes running through nationalism, the following points could be made:

- Virtually all forms of nationalism view the nation as the ideal community on which to base political organisation. Even civic forms of nationalism believe that the reason a nation can organise itself politically is because its people share a common cultural heritage (Mazzini's romantic Italian republicanism is a helpful example of this).
- All forms of nationalism therefore have both cultural and civic elements, just to varying degrees.
- All forms of nationalism believe, to some extent, that humanity can and should be divided into nations. That this is a meaningful area of agreement can be seen in the fact that it puts them at odds with the wide community of liberal and socialist internationalist thinkers who disagree with this idea.

Conclusion (this is an example, rather than a definitive, answer): The universal appeal of nationalism (seen in the world's division into 193 nation-states) is not based on it having a coherent set of beliefs. Instead, this appeal is a result of nationalism being able to assume a range of contrasting, often contradictory, forms.

Edexcel

Essay questions

4

Introduction: Explain that, although virtually all forms of nationalism are based on the idea that the nation is the ideal community on which to base a sovereign state, different forms of nationalism have advocated very different roles for the state beyond this. When explaining the argument that nationalism does have a consistent view on the state, the following points could be made:

- Strongly contrasting forms of nationalism have argued that the state should be based on the will of the people of the nation (from Maurras and the fascists he inspired, to liberal and republican nationalists like Rousseau and Mazzini, to post- and anti-colonial movements).
- There is also reasonably widespread consensus among more culturally and ethnically defined forms of nationalism (conservative nationalism, Maurras' integral nationalism, fascism) that the state is the servant of the nation, put in place to celebrate and strengthen its heritage.
- There is a similarly widespread consensus among more civically and politically defined forms of nationalism (Rousseau, Wilson and other liberal nationalists) that the nation is the servant of the state, helping the state to ensure that citizens' rights and liberties are maximised.

When explaining the argument that nationalism does not have a consistent view of the role of the state, the following points could be made:

- The difference between the more civically and culturally defined ideas of nationalism regarding the state is profound. Civic nationalism (conservative, integral, fascist) operates on the basis that the state evolved organically out of the nation. In contrast, cultural nationalism (liberal, republican)



POLITICAL IDEAS

Liberalism, Conservatism, Socialism, Nationalism, Multiculturalism, Ecologism

operates on the basis that the nation-state was actively created to transform subjects of an autocratic regime into citizens of a nation.

- Differences can also be found between the culturally and ethnically defined forms of nationalism. Conservative nationalists consider the role of the state to be to serve all the citizens of the nation who are prepared to subscribe to its traditions and heritage. Integral nationalists (Maurras) and fascists, however, see the role of the state as extending to excluding all those considered insufficiently ethnically or racially pure.
- Differences can also be found between civically and politically defined forms of nationalism. Liberal nationalism sees the role of the state as guaranteeing the maximum possible freedom for individual citizens. Post-colonial nationalist movements which have adopted socialism, however, have typically seen the role of the state as enforcing an official form of Marxism which individual citizens are not allowed to deviate from.

Conclusion (this is an example, rather than a definitive, answer): The profoundly different views of cultural and civic nationalism regarding whether the state is the servant of the nation or vice versa, and the significant differences even within these forms, suggests that nationalism cannot be said to have a consistent view of the role of the state.

5

Introduction: Explain that nationalism, in its various forms, has been viewed both as an ideology that promotes individual or national freedom, from autocratic or imperial regimes, *and* as an ideology that severely impinges on such freedoms by insisting on conformity to a set of prescribed national cultural values or to the rule of a dominant ethnic or racial group.

When explaining the argument that nationalism does promote freedom, the following points could be made:

- The liberal and republican nationalism of Rousseau and Mazzini was explicitly designed to transform the unfree subjects of monarchs and emperors into free citizens of nation-states.
- This tradition has been continued by modern nationalist groups such as the SNP, which claims that independence for Scotland is the only means for the Scottish nation to gain the freedom of true self-representation as the UK governing parties have traditionally enjoyed little support in Scotland.
- Garvey's black nationalism and anti- and post-colonial nationalist leaders have focused on gaining the freedom of political self-determination and cultural self-expression for black and other non-European nations from the dominance of white European colonial powers.

When explaining the argument that nationalism does not promote freedom, the following points could be made:

- The priority of conservative nationalists (whose ideology is largely inspired by Herder) is to promote social cohesion rather than freedom. Citizens are encouraged to support fixed national narratives and traditions and are criticised as being unpatriotic for refusing to do so.
- Maurras' integral nationalism and the fascist movements he has inspired go further in denying individuals rights and freedoms by excluding whole ethnic and racial groups from the political nation. They have also advocated, and carried out, colonisation of other supposedly inferior nations, depriving them of the freedom of national self-determination.
- Some would argue even liberal and republican nationalists (such as Mazzini), in seeing the nation as the main determinant of political organisation, forced uniformity on the citizens of each nation-state. Socialist forms of anti- and post-colonial nationalism have also tended to impose authoritarian forms of Leninist-Marxism on citizens within their nation-states.



POLITICAL IDEAS

Liberalism, Conservatism, Socialism, Nationalism, Multiculturalism, Ecologism

Conclusion (this is an example, rather than a definitive, answer): Modern nationalism, as originally conceived by Rousseau, Mazzini and the movements they inspired, was forged primarily to provide freedom through the creation of nation-states. In a world of well-established nation-states, however, it has since developed a tendency to increase state power over individuals and their nations.

6

Introduction: Outline the following competing arguments: (a) that nationalism separates humanity into distinct nations, in some cases even stigmatising other nations and those individuals not thought to fit in with the values or ethnicity of their nation, and should be viewed as divisive; (b) that nationalism has been seen as instead providing both internal unity within a state through patriotism and international unity through mutual respect among nations for each other's right to self-determination.

- When explaining the argument that nationalism can be viewed as divisive, the following points could be made:
 - Herder's and Mazzini's concept of humanity being grouped into nations made distinct by the development of a unique *Volksgeist* can be viewed as divisive, particularly from the perspectives of socialist and liberal internationalism. Garvey, and the black nationalists inspired by him, might also be viewed as divisive in viewing humanity as comprised of mutually incompatible races.
 - The willingness of Maurras, and fascists inspired by him, to exclude certain ethnic groups from their nation represents a more extreme form of divisiveness. Their national chauvinism also has a tendency to provoke conflicts with other nations.
 - Even conservative forms of nationalism aimed at uniting nations through patriotism often instead divide them into those who subscribe to certain nationalist narratives and those who don't (for example, Brexit and the 'Make America Great Again' movement).

When explaining the argument that nationalism should not be viewed as divisive, the following points could be made:

- The cultural nationalism of Herder and the romantic nationalism of Mazzini, in seeking to unify those with a common language and cultural heritage, are simply bringing together people who are naturally compatible. Garvey and later black nationalists would similarly argue that their Pan-Africanism involves bringing together the largest culturally compatible group possible.
- The liberal nationalism of Woodrow Wilson, and today's United Nations, seeks to bring unity between nations by encouraging them to work together and respect each other's national sovereignty. This builds on the ideas of Rousseau and Mazzini that states in which sovereignty rests genuinely with the people of the nation will be both internally united and externally peaceful.
- Conservative nationalists will claim that the love of nation and pride in its cultural heritage that they encourage promotes social cohesion as it brings people of all social backgrounds together.

Conclusion (this is an example, rather than a definitive, answer): Liberal and conservative nationalists aspire respectively to promote international and internal unity among states. The overriding tendency of nationalism, however, through its insistence on dividing humanity into nations with distinct traditions and outlooks, is to divide.



Chapter 6: Ecologism

Students should incorporate the following key points in their answers. These points should be expanded using appropriate examples (gleaned from throughout the main text of the relevant chapter) and developed with reference to each ideology's key thinkers (see both the main text and 'Key thinker' boxes within the chapter).

AQA

Essay questions

1

Introduction: Define capitalism as the dominant global economic system based on private enterprise, competition and economic growth. Outline the huge spectrum of ecologist approaches to capitalism, from green capitalists who see the free market as the solution to the challenge of environmental degradation, to eco-anarchists and eco-socialists who see capitalism as the root of the problem. When explaining the argument that ecologism is defined by its opposition to capitalism, the following points can be made:

- Social ecologists see capitalism as central to humans' oppression of one another. Eco-anarchists such as Murray Bookchin see capitalism as the root of globalisation and environmental degradation and therefore advocate the devolving of power and economic structures to small-scale bioregions. Eco-socialists see capitalism as the root of excessive consumption and therefore dismantling capitalism as the means to addressing the climate crisis. Eco-feminists such as Carolyn Merchant see capitalism as the damaging result of the mechanisation of humanity's relationship with nature.
- Deep ecologists prioritise fighting the endless economic growth model of capitalism as has been influenced by Ernst Schumacher's 'small is beautiful' message.
- Most environmentalists argue for a need to regulate capitalism (following Rachel Carson's warnings regarding the unsustainability of humans simply exploiting nature for their own material gain), hence the calls for carbon taxes or subsidies for renewable energy from green parties and pressure groups.

When explaining the argument that ecologism is not defined by its opposition to capitalism, the following points could be made:

- Some green capitalists (sometimes known as eco-capitalists) see the free market as the solution to the environmental degradation it caused in the first place. All that is needed, for them, is the transformation of consumers from those demanding material comfort to those demanding sustainably produced goods.
- Other environmentalists are happy to work within a significantly modified framework of capitalism. Green parties and pressure groups are generally prepared to work to reform rather than overthrow free-market capitalism and liberal democracy.
- Arguably deep ecologists and some social ecologists, especially eco-feminists, are not defined by their opposition to capitalism. Capitalism, for them, is instead a by-product of more fundamental problems – anthropocentrism for deep ecologists (such as Aldo Leopold) and patriarchal mechanistic thinking for eco-feminists (such as Merchant). For these ecologists, anthropocentrism and the patriarchy are what need to be tackled first.

Conclusion (this is an example, rather than a definitive, answer): Although capitalism is not always viewed as the root cause of environmental degradation by ecologists, the vast majority see its effect as negative and something which needs urgently addressing. On the whole, therefore, it is fair to say that ecologism is largely defined by its opposition to capitalism.



POLITICAL IDEAS

Liberalism, Conservatism, Socialism, Nationalism, Multiculturalism, Ecologism

2

Introduction: Define revolutionary change in this context as relating to either social revolution (as advocated by social ecologists), ethical revolution (as advocated by deep ecologists) or a revolution in political and economic priorities (as advocated by environmentalists). Explain that the debate revolves around whether the differences between these desired revolutions are more significant than the similarities.

When explaining the argument that ecologists are divided over whether revolutionary change is required to achieve their aims, the following points could be made:

- Environmentalists are happy to advocate change within the framework of the dominant systems of liberal democracy and free-market capitalism, which puts them significantly at odds with social ecologists who see the root of environmental degradation as systems of social oppression that must be overthrown. Bookchin and eco-anarchists, for example, require global capitalism to be overthrown in favour of small-scale living in bioregions, while Merchant and eco-feminists argue that, without overthrowing patriarchal oppression of women and nature, environmental degradation cannot be addressed.
- Environmentalists, in their focus on achieving environmental sustainability primarily for the prolongation of human life, can also be seen as significantly different from deep ecologists, who argue that only a revolutionary shift in moral values towards ecocentrism (based on Leopold's 'land ethic') can address the climate crisis.
- Social ecologists (especially Bookchin) have regularly clashed with deep ecologists on the sort of revolution that is required. Bookchin has ridiculed what he sees as the naivety of deep ecologists in believing that a shift away from anthropocentrism is achievable, desirable or, by itself, sufficient to deal with the problems created by environmental degradation.

When explaining the argument that ecologists are not divided over whether revolutionary change is required to achieve their aims, the following points could be made:

- The realisation that the impact of humanity's behaviour on the natural world must be factored into any evaluation of political or economic decision making was revolutionary when it was first made by Carson in the 1960s. It remains something which distinguishes green parties from the 'grey parties' they characterise as no longer fit for purpose due to their refusal to prioritise environmental issues.
- In many ways the different revolutions advocated by environmentalists, social ecologists and deep ecologists would all require similar approaches. Although environmentalists do not advocate the abandonment of anthropocentrism or the overthrow of global capitalism or liberal democracy, it is hard to imagine how such aims as achieving zero carbon emissions by 2050 (or significantly earlier, as pushed for by some environmentalist pressure groups) can be achieved without radically changing these systems. Most environmentalists, for example, follow Schumacher's call for the revolutionary shift to a 'small is beautiful' approach to the distribution and organisation of resources.

Conclusion: Although all ecologists demand significant change in order to tackle environmental degradation, the fact that environmentalists are prepared to work within systems that social ecologists wish to overthrow suggests a significantly divergent approach. Deep ecologists' unique requirement of the abandonment of a human-centred view of the natural world also fundamentally distances their prescribed revolution from that of other ecologists.



POLITICAL IDEAS

Liberalism, Conservatism, Socialism, Nationalism, Multiculturalism, Ecologism

3

Introduction: Define technological change as scientific and industrial developments that can be viewed as having both negative and positive environmental impacts. Outline the range of approaches ecologists have taken to technological change, from green capitalists and eco-anarchists who (in very different ways) embrace it, to green parties, pressure groups and eco-feminists who have opposed it. When explaining the argument that ecologists are committed to reversing the impact of technological change, the following points can be made:

- Environmentalists (following Carson's initial warnings regarding pesticide technology) have long lobbied for the decreased use of industrial technologies such as private cars, commercial flights and unabated burning of coal to produce power.
- Eco-feminists (such as Merchant) have gone further in viewing technological change achieved since the scientific revolution of the seventeenth century as marking a damaging shift in humanity's relationship with Mother Nature, from nurturing and holistic to mechanistic and exploitative. This is clearly something they want changed.
- Deep ecologists have likewise identified technological change since the seventeenth century with the development of a damaging Cartesian–Newtonian paradigm which has allowed humans, uniquely as a species, to override the Earth's natural homeostatic processes. They have advocated the reversal of this through radical means such as opposing the use of modern medicines and procedures to prolong human life in an attempt to reduce the human population.

When explaining the argument that ecologists are not committed to reversing the impact of technological change, the following points can be made:

- Some green capitalists have argued that the very things which created man-made environmental degradation, technological progress and the global free market, also provide the key to solving it. The promotion of green consumers, they argue, will encourage necessary investment in green technology (such as wind and sea power) in order to address the climate emergency.
- Eco-anarchists, such as Bookchin, argue that technology is never something they have considered the enemy. He has, instead, claimed to embrace it with its potential to enable a post-scarcity society in which people can live rich and fulfilled lives without the need for globalisation and the environmental degradation it brings. Eco-socialists similarly have argued that capitalist individualism, not technological progress, is the real enemy.
- Thinkers who have had a profound influence on the deep ecology movement have also embraced technology. James Lovelock, originator of the Gaia hypothesis, has been a consistent advocate of nuclear power. Schumacher's emphasis on 'small' living was not a call to reverse technological advance but rather to harness it to benefit communities on a local rather than global level.

Conclusion (this is an example, rather than a definitive, answer): Ecologists tend to want to reverse the impact of industrialisation and globalisation but not the impact of technological change itself. Many, from across the ecological spectrum, have wanted instead to tap the opportunities for further technological change.



Edexcel

Essay questions

4

Introduction: Introduce the main views on this issue – that an ecocentric society (favoured by deep ecologists), a society in which capitalism, globalisation and/or the patriarchy have been overthrown (favoured variously by social ecologists), and an environmentally sustainable society constructed within current prevailing economic, social and political structures (favoured by environmentalists), either are or are not compatible.

When explaining the argument that ecologists are to a reasonable extent agreed over the type of society they wish to create, the following points could be made:

- All ecologists have heeded the warnings of Carson that humanity cannot continue its exploitative interaction with the natural world and so agree that a significantly different society needs to be constructed. Even green capitalists, who favour harnessing the power of the free market to address environmental degradation, look to a society in which consumer attitudes and behaviour are radically changed.
- Despite their protestations to the contrary, it could be argued that social and deep ecologists share an essentially similar vision of an ideal society. Both Bookchin's eco-anarchist society of small-scale communes and deep ecology's call for a society which recognises the 'difference between big and great' seem essentially to point in the same direction (both seemingly influenced by Schumacher's 'small is beautiful' ethic).
- Likewise, Merchant's eco-feminist call for the rediscovering of a nurturing partnership with Mother Nature can also be seen to lead to a similar conclusion to the deep ecologist call for an ecocentric society in which the value of all non-human life is seen as possessing 'value independent of its usefulness for human purposes' (both seemingly influenced by Leopold's 'land ethic').

When explaining the argument that ecologists do not agree to any significant extent about the type of society they wish to create, the following points could be made:

- The willingness of environmentalists to create a society within the existing prevailing social, economic and political structures is arguably fundamentally incompatible with the societies envisioned by social and deep ecologists. Social ecologists argue that until humans' oppression of each other (through the structures of capitalism, patriarchy, liberal democracy etc.) is addressed, nothing meaningful can be achieved with regard to addressing environmental degradation.
- Likewise, deep ecologists maintain that the type of society envisaged by environmentalists fails to understand the nature of the problem: that is, humans' anthropocentric assumption that the natural world exists to support them rather than the other way around.
- This difference also arguably makes the societies aspired to by social and deep ecologists incompatible. Social ecologists (especially Bookchin) have ridiculed deep ecologist visions for an ecocentric society as unrealistic 'eco-la-la' for failing to recognise the social roots of humans' oppression of nature. Deep ecologists have, in turn, criticised the social ecologist emphasis on human social structures as both the obstacle and the solution to creating an ideal society as hopelessly short-sighted and anthropocentric.

Conclusion (this is an example, rather than a definitive, answer): Overall it would seem that, although all ecologists favour a significantly changed society, their analysis of what needs changing means that their visions for the type of society they would wish to create are fundamentally very different.

5



POLITICAL IDEAS

Liberalism, Conservatism, Socialism, Nationalism, Multiculturalism, Ecologism

Introduction: Define anthropocentrism as a human-centred view of the natural world. Explain that the debate here centres on whether only deep ecologists, who seek explicitly to overturn anthropocentrism, are significantly committed to challenging it or whether the analysis of social ecologists and environmentalists can also be viewed as offering a meaningful challenge.

When explaining the argument that ecologists are committed to challenging anthropocentrism, the following points could be made:

- Since Carson (in *Silent Spring*, 1962) drew attention to the dangers of human attitudes towards the natural world remaining as they were, even the shallowest of ecologists have advocated that humans must show a greater appreciation for the impact of their behaviour on the environment. Even green capitalists who see the free market as the solution to environmental degradation want to challenge the anthropocentrism of consumers in order that they demand sustainable practices, rather than simply affordable and quality goods, from producers.
- Even social ecologists, who have generally denied the wisdom of trying to solve environmental degradation by adopting ecocentrism, can be seen to challenge humanity's anthropocentrism. Bookchin, as an eco-anarchist, has called for the devolving of authority to non-hierarchical eco-communes living within bioregions because this, as an antidote to globalisation, will cause humans to develop a much clearer awareness of the limits of the natural resources they live among. Merchant, as an eco-feminist, has called for humanity to rediscover its nurturing and holistic, as opposed to mechanistic and exploitative, relationship with Mother Nature.
- Obviously, for deep ecologists, the root cause of environmental degradation is humans' anthropocentric failure to understand that they are an integral part of the natural world with a duty to sustain it, not the other way round (as articulated in Leopold's 'land ethic' – 'a thing is right [only] when it tends to preserve the integrity ... of the biotic community').

When explaining the argument that ecologists are not committed to challenging anthropocentrism, the following points could be made:

- Only deep ecologists, who are very much a minority group within the wider ecologist movement, explicitly advocate the abandonment of anthropocentrism through the adoption of ecocentrism and the following of Leopold's 'land ethic'.
- Social ecologists arguably adopt a human-centred approach to their analysis in that they see human exploitation of nature as being a result of human systems of social oppression of one another. The solution, for them, is the emancipation of groups of humans – the working class, women etc. Bookchin, in particular, was particularly robust in his criticism of the deep ecologist call for the abandonment of anthropocentrism, viewing it as fundamentally unrealistic and undesirable.
- Environmentalists generally advocate measures to combat environmental degradation because of the existential threat it poses to humanity. Even those regarded as more radical tend to point to the moral obligation to provide social justice for future generations of humans as their primary goal rather than the preservation of the natural world for its own sake (see the UK Green Party founding principle that 'every person ... should be entitled to basic material security as of right').

Conclusion (this is an example, rather than a definitive, answer): Although it is only deep ecologists who explicitly call for the abandonment of anthropocentrism, all branches of ecologism call for a significant re-evaluation of humanity's relationship with the natural world. The birth of modern ecologism in relation to the revelations of works like Carson's *Silent Spring* was based on the realisation that the failure to factor this relationship into political or economic decisions up to that point was no longer sustainable.

6

Introduction: Define the divide between deep and shallow ecologists – that deep ecologists require humanity to abandon its human-centred approach to interacting with the natural world, while social



POLITICAL IDEAS

Liberalism, Conservatism, Socialism, Nationalism, Multiculturalism, Ecologism

ecologists and environmentalists generally do not. Explain that the debate here revolves around whether the deep ecologists' insistence on the adoption of ecocentrism puts them at odds with social ecologists and environmentalists with regard to how they propose to address environmental degradation.

When explaining the argument that deep and shallow ecologists are divided in their approach to tackling environmental problems, the following points could be made:

- Social ecologists (especially the eco-anarchist Bookchin) have strongly criticised deep ecologists' insistence that environmental degradation is mostly caused by humans' anthropocentrism, arguing that the root of man's oppression of nature is his oppression of his fellow man.
- Mainstream environmentalists could also be argued to diverge dramatically from deep ecologists in that they argue that environmental problems can be addressed within the prevailing economic structures of free-market capitalism and liberal democracy. In this sense they follow Carson's warnings that humanity must reform its relationship with the natural world, while deep ecologists follow Leopold's calls for it to revolutionise its relationship through the adoption of his 'land ethic'.
- Many of the measures some deep ecologists have called for in the name of ecocentrism, especially with regard to reducing the human population through non-intervention in famines and disease epidemics, have been viewed as morally repugnant by both environmentalists and social ecologists.

When explaining the arguments that deep and shallow ecologists are not divided in their approach to tackling environmental degradation, the following points could be made:

- Deep ecologism could be seen as compatible with other forms of what it has defined as 'shallow ecologism'. With their claim that the root cause of environmental degradation was humanity's replacing of a holistic and nurturing view of the natural world with a compartmentalised and mechanistic view of society, eco-feminists (such as Merchant) seem to share a lot of ideas with deep ecologists and their desire to reverse humanity's adoption of the Newtonian–Cartesian paradigm whereby technological progress is valued more than living sustainably within the natural world.
- Many environmentalist demands are arguably similar to those of deep ecology. Carson's call for humanity to revisit its relationship with the natural world is something which lives on in environmentalism today. The distinction between green and 'grey' political parties might be argued to be more significant than the distinction between deep ecologists and environmentalists.
- Arguably deep ecologists and the vast majority of shallow ecologists agree in their anti-capitalist and anti-globalisation stance. Schumacher's claim that 'small is beautiful' resonates throughout the ecologist spectrum, from Naess and Sessions' distinction between 'big and great', to Bookchin's call to devolve power to bioregions, to the localism demanded by most green parties.

Conclusion (this is an example, rather than a definitive, answer): There is much that unites ecologists in opposition to traditional political ideologies that do not consider humanity's relationship with the natural world. On the other hand, deep ecologism, especially with its uncompromising stance on the need to adopt ecocentrism, is overall very different in its approach from shallow ecology.