Chapter 1

1 Explain [6 marks] and analyse [3 marks] any three of the following:
- Locke held a positive view of human nature, arguing that all humans are born free and born rational. Locke’s idea that individuals should be given the widest possible freedom to act according to their will is based on their possession of reason.
- Wollstonecraft shared this positive view of humans as rational. She argued that women are human; humans are rational and so women are rational and deserve equal rights with men.
- Mill’s optimistic view of human nature can be seen in the principle of developmental individualism. Society should be built to give freedom to individuals to constantly develop their distinctive talents, characteristics and knowledge.
- Green took the idea of developmental individualism to state the case for positive freedom rather than negative freedom.

2 Explain [6 marks] and analyse [3 marks] any three of the following:
- The free market, based on the principle of private property as established by Locke, leaves the role of the state as the protection of property and the enforcement of contracts.
- Wollstonecraft argued that the state should provide women with the right to property and the right to work so that women would not need to marry out of financial necessity.
- Green saw that the injustices of free-market capitalism were creating social and economic obstacles to individuals achieving their full potential, so the state needs to intervene in the economy to promote positive freedom.
- Rawls used the original position and the ‘veil of ignorance’ to argue that individuals would select a society based on fairness. Therefore, the state has a social contract to design its economic policies to benefit the least well-off; policies such as some progressive taxation and redistribution of wealth.

3 Show that you clearly understand all the key points in the extract by summarising them and developing them. Introduce relevant wider knowledge, refer to other thinkers in this tradition of political ideas and evaluate the ideas in the extract.

Analyse, evaluate and compare some of the following potential arguments:
- Minimal state – the state’s role is limited to protecting life, liberty and property. This leads to the classical liberal support for free-market capitalism, where the role of the state is to enforce contracts and protect property. This can be contrasted with the modern liberal support for Keynesian economics and the welfare state based on Rawls’s principle of distributive justice. However, both classical and modern liberals support private property and capitalism.
- Minimal state – underpinning this idea is strong support for the concepts of negative freedom and egoistical individualism. This idea was further enhanced by Mill through his harm principle. This could be contrasted with developmental individualism and the need for positive freedom (Green) as the basis for the enabling state. But, in both cases, liberals see the purpose of the state as promoting freedom and individualism.
- Social contract – the state is created by the social contract. This idea emerges from Locke’s state of nature which is peaceful, with natural rights and natural law. This can be contrasted with Rawls’s original position and ‘veil of ignorance’, which is like a modern social contract but creates an enabling rather than a minimal state.
- Government by consent – originally, Locke only based this on the interests of property-owning men but it can be seen as the basis for free, fair and regular elections. However, Wollstonecraft argued to extend voting to women, whereas Mill extended Locke’s principle by supporting the idea of universal suffrage.
- Constitutionalism – Locke’s support for constitutionalism is consistent with his opposition to absolute monarchy and support for the minimal state. His constitutional principles can be seen reflected in the US constitution. Based on Mill’s fear of the ‘tyranny of the majority’, modern liberals have tended to propose greater constitutional limits on the power of government.
- Conclusion – remember to offer judgements throughout on the various points from the extract, arguing which points are most convincing and why, as well as covering any key points that have been left out. This should enable you to write a clear conclusion that offers a balanced judgement that is in line with what you have been arguing throughout the essay.
Chapter 2

1 Explain (6 marks) and analyse (3 marks) any three of the following:
- The Hobbesian view was the most cynical view of human nature, seeing humans as selfish, fearful of others and driven by a ‘desire of power after power, that ceaseth only in death’. Hence the need for a Leviathan state to maintain law and order.
- The Burkean view was more sceptical than cynical; human nature is flawed and cannot be perfected but is capable of goodness and affection if people’s actions are informed by custom and tradition.
- The Burkean view was that humans naturally seek the safe, the familiar and the bonds of trust with others, so are drawn together into ‘little platoons’.
- Oakeshott considered human nature to be fragile and fallible, with a gap between human dreams and reality. This leads humanity to favour the known over the unknown and to oppose radical change that aims to create a perfect society.

2 Explain (6 marks) and analyse (3 marks) any three of the following:
- Hobbes held the view that the people come together in a social contract to create a sovereign. This sovereign has absolute power in order to ensure the order and stability necessary to allow society and freedom to thrive.
- Oakeshott, based on his view of human nature, argued that the state should be guided by pragmatism and that the role of the state is more like keeping the boat afloat, on an even keel, rather than trying to sail the boat to a particular destination.
- Burke was opposed to vast, centralised and remote state structures, instead favouring local communities where the natural bonds of trust, duty and loyalty can emerge.
- Rand and Nozick saw a minimal role for the state, arguing that its only purpose is to guarantee national security, enforce contracts and protect private property.

3 Show that you clearly understand all the key points in the extract by summarising them and developing them. Introduce relevant wider knowledge, refer to other thinkers in this tradition of political ideas and evaluate the ideas in the extract.
Analyze, evaluate and compare some of the following potential arguments:
- Pessimistic view – Hobbes held a deeply pessimistic view of human nature in its individualism, selfishness and constant search for power. This is a pessimistic tradition that is widely supported in conservatism, which is often described as the politics of imperfection.
- The sovereign – Hobbes’s concept of human nature as security-seeking has fundamental implications for the nature of the state, whose role is to provide peace and security. This strongly resonates throughout conservative thinking from traditional conservatism to the New Right in its desire for a stable society and law and order.
- The social contract – the concept of the social contract marks Hobbes out from other conservative thinkers and makes his view more in line with liberal thinkers such as Locke. Burke argued that the only contract that existed was between the dead, the living and the yet to be born. The present must nurture and protect tradition and custom to pass it on to future generations.
- Rationalism and individualism – the traits that Hobbes clearly identified in human nature tie in with the thinking of Rand and Nozick about human nature, although Nozick would oppose the idea of a brutal human nature. However, they are at odds with thinkers such as Burke and Oakeshott. Burke did not see humans as individualistic, selfish and brutal, but rather as capable of goodness and affection. Oakeshott saw humans as ‘fragile and fallible’, not rational and selfish.
- Absolutism – Hobbes drew from human nature that the state must have absolute power to impose peace and security. This clashes with traditional conservatism’s and the New Right’s conceptions of the state.

Chapter 3

1 Explain (6 marks) and analyse (3 marks) any three of the following:
- The Marxist view of social equality is based on the principle of ‘from each according to his ability, to each according to his need’. This form of social equality would eradicate the class system.
- Social democratic thinkers like Crosland also support social equality. This involves tackling poverty and reducing the inequality between classes to create a more equal distribution of wealth, income and status within society. This would weaken the class system.
- Crosland saw some level of social equality as the prerequisite for equality of opportunity. A more equal distribution of wealth is central to meaningful equality of opportunity.
- Giddens [and the third way] rejects the emphasis on social equality of both Marx and Crosland, focusing on equality of opportunity. The funding of education and targeted welfare to tackle social exclusion can create meaningful equality of opportunity.
2 Explain (6 marks) and analyse (3 marks) any three of the following:
- Marxism rejects capitalism as a system of class oppression and exploitation that inevitably creates a class consciousness among the proletariat; capitalism creates the conditions for the revolution. Private property will be replaced by common ownership.
- Webb saw crippling poverty and inequality as a result of capitalism not individual moral failings. She argued that capitalism was warping human nature to become selfish and greedy. As a result, the only solution was the gradual move from capitalism to socialism.
- Crosland argued that the power of capitalism can be harnessed and humanised. Managed capitalism (via Keynesian economics, progressive taxation and universal welfare) can produce continuous growth and social equality.
- Giddens broke with previous socialist thinkers in accepting the free market of neo-liberalism as the best engine for wealth creation and growth. He married the free market with a commitment to equality of opportunity and community.

3 Show that you clearly understand all the key points in the extract by summarising them and developing them. Introduce relevant wider knowledge, refer to other thinkers in this tradition of political ideas and evaluate the ideas in the extract.

Analyse, evaluate and compare some of the following potential arguments:
- The bourgeois state – Marx and Engels argued that the state is a committee for the ruling class, which will defend and promote private property and capitalism. The state cannot be captured and reformed, only overthrown and replaced with the revolutionary dictatorship of the proletariat. This places Marxism at odds with socialists such as Webb, who believe that socialism can be delivered via the ballot box.
- The revolutionary state – the dictatorship of the proletariat uses the force of the state to suppress the bourgeoisie in order to protect the proletariat and replace private ownership with common ownership. This places Marxism at odds with social democracy (Crosland), which aims to use the state to humanise capitalism not overthrow it.
- The state as an agent of change – it is clear that Marx and Engels saw the state as an agent of change, as it plays a key role. This belief in the state as an agent of change is echoed in the writings of Webb and Crosland, who saw the state as playing a key role in delivering their socialist ideas.
- The state and equality – Marx and Engels saw the state as playing the role of overthrowing private property and replacing it with common ownership, leading to social equality and the end of class divisions within society. Although Crosland saw the state as playing a role in tackling class divides, the state is to minimise not end class divisions, while Giddens only saw a role for the state in delivering equality of opportunity not social equality.
- Communism – Marx and Engels saw the end of class leading to an end of the purpose of the state, so it will wither away, leaving a classless, stateless society: communism. This idea is rejected by the other socialist strands.

Chapter 4

1 Nationalism is aggressive and expansionist:
- Based on chauvinism (some nations are superior to others) and can be seen in various elements of nationalism such as imperialism and colonialism. This form of nationalism was expansionist, ignoring the self-determination of nations across the globe in the nineteenth century, especially in Asia and Africa, viewing these nations as unable to govern themselves.
- Chauvinism can be seen in the pan-Slavic and pan-German movements of the nineteenth century. Pan-Slavism, which is based on the idea that the Slavic people are one nation, can be linked to aggressive and expansionist policies by Russia in Crimea and Ukraine.
- Integral nationalism [Maurras] views one’s own nation as somehow superior, implying that other nations are inferior. This view tends to be highly militaristic and has a strong appeal to nations who feel isolated, under threat or powerless.
- Racialist models of nationalism, which link the nation with race as in Nazi Germany, are associated with projects of regional or global domination.

Counter arguments:
- Anti-colonial nationalism, such as the idea of Africa for Africans put forward by Garvey, were about freedom and self-determination, not expansion or aggression.
- On the other hand, minority forms of nationalism such as the SNP in the UK or the movement for independence in Catalonia are about protecting identity and culture [von Herder]. They do not seek aggression or expansion but independence.
- Liberal nationalists see nationalism as based on the idea of freedom of the nation and the individuals within the nation [Mazzini]. Based on the ideas of Rousseau, they see self-determination as the antidote to war and international rivalry.
Nationalism is not a single doctrine:

- Romantic vs rational nationalism – the rational nationalism of the state, where the world is divided into natural political communities that are self-governing (based on the ideas of Rousseau) versus the more romantic view of nationalism, such as Welsh nationalism which is based on the idea of a common and distinct language and culture.

- Progressive nationalism vs regressive nationalism – progressive nationalism, such as the SNP view of Scottish nationalism, sees nationalism as helping the nation achieve political, social and economic progress, whereas regressive nationalism is returning back to past glories. UKIP sees Brexit as returning the UK to past glories but would view this as progressive not regressive.

- Inclusive vs exclusive – inclusive is based on civic nationalism, associated with Rousseau, and can be associated with American or UK citizenship. Exclusive nationalism is based on cultural (von Herder) not political nationalism. The more chauvinistic variants include the integral nationalism of Maurras and at the extreme equating the nation with race.

- Expansionism vs self-determination – nationalism has promoted the expansionism of colonialism and imperialism, pan-Slavism and pan-Germanism as well as the regional or international domination of fascism. In contrast, liberal nationalism promotes self-determination (Rousseau, Mazzini) and this is seen by some as driving the Kurds, Scots and Catalans to seek their own state.

- Liberal versus conservative – liberal nationalism is about the freedom of all nations and individuals within nations; the freeing of nations from state nationalism or from colonialism and imperialism is seen as progressive. Conservative nationalism is based on the preservation and promotion of the nation rather the freedom of the individuals within it (security vs rights debate).

Counter arguments:

- Nationalism has an overriding concern with the nation, aiming to place the nation at the centre of its ideas and promote its wellbeing.

The main goals of nationalism are national autonomy, national unity and national identity.

- However, nationalism is shaped by the historical circumstances in which it emerged so, beyond this, there is very limited agreement. It is used to advance a wide variety of causes, as can be seen in the differences between state and minority nationalisms.

Chapter 5

1 Feminism is not a single doctrine:

- Major differences can be highlighted between liberal and radical feminism. Liberal feminism is reformist, highlights discrimination within the public sphere and is rooted in the individualist tradition of seeking to give women formal equality and economic equality to liberate them (Wollstonecraft, Friedan). Radical feminism (Millett) is revolutionary and sees patriarchy not discrimination as the key problem, highlighting that the personal is the political and emphasising sisterhood over individualism.

- Major differences can be highlighted between difference and equality feminists. Equality feminists subscribe to androgyny and the idea that personhood is difference-blind; they see a clear difference between sex and gender. Difference feminists, within the radical tradition, reject androgyny and believe that biology matters.

- There are differences between radical feminists (Millett), who focus on patriarchy, and socialist feminists (Rowbotham), who see patriarchy and capitalism as woven together to oppress women in the home and at work. Although both are revolutionary, radical feminists want to remove patriarchy root and branch, whereas socialist feminists wish to overthrow capitalism and patriarchy.

- Postmodern feminists are critical of early forms of feminism for giving a voice to only part of the struggle. Postmodern feminists like bell hooks see imperialist white supremacist capitalist patriarchy as promoting injustice, exploitation and oppression that is different for different groups.

Counter arguments:

- Feminism starts from the point that women are entitled to equal treatment with men, which was once a radical idea but is now widely accepted.

- Women have a subordinate role in the state, society and the economy, suffering persistent injustices and systemic discrimination on the basis of their sex.
Feminism aims to advance the role of women. The subordination of women is not desirable or permanent and women’s role in the state, society and the economy can and should be changed via political action (e.g. suffragettes, suffragists). Beyond that, there is limited agreement between feminists.

2 Feminism aims for equality:
- The idea is that biological differences between men and women are of little importance and their human nature is basically the same. Gender roles are socially constructed to advantage men at the expense of women (de Beauvoir).
- Equality feminists subscribe to androgyny and the idea that personhood is difference-blind; they aim for the idea of freeing women from difference so that there is equality.
- Liberal feminists subscribe to this view, seeing equality in terms of being granted equal rights and equal opportunities (Wollstonecraft, Friedan, e.g. Equality Act 2010 in the UK).
- Radical feminists (Rowbotham) seek to overthrow patriarchy to create equality, with a radical transformation in all spheres of life including a woman’s control over her own body, sexual freedom and equality, and freedom in terms of reproductive labour.
- Socialist feminists (Rowbotham) seek to overthrow both capitalism and patriarchy to create equality in the home and the workplace.

Counter arguments:
- There are clear, biological and psychological differences between men and women and these differences matter. So liberation can only be achieved through difference not equality.
- The idea of androgyny is entirely misplaced as it ignores the significance of these biological differences. Carol Gilligan’s *In a Different Voice* (1982) showed that men and women had a different approach to moral dilemmas.
- By seeking liberation through equality, women are seeking to be male-identified rather than having their own woman-centred approach.
- In its place, difference feminists have argued for cultural feminism based on the values of women, which are different from those of men, or separatist feminism, as patriarchy is a direct expression of male human nature.

Chapter 6

1 Cultural mixing is beneficial for society:
- Societies with a range of lifestyles, cultural practices, traditions and beliefs are more vigorous and vibrant. Cross-cultural exchange allows cultures to grow, develop and remain intellectually fresh and alive (Parekh, Modood).
- Cultural mixing promotes tolerance and understanding and therefore a willingness to accept ‘difference’, rather than hostility or suspicion. This creates a meaningful base of support from all cultures for the wider political community (Kymlicka, Taylor) that is critical in diverse societies like the UK and USA.
- Cultural mixing enlarges the options available to the individual, thereby promoting personal growth and development – a key aim for liberals. This may encourage individuals to choose whether to stay within their culture, revise their culture or reject their culture and adopt another. It may even encourage individuals to see themselves as global citizens rather than rooted within their culture or their nation (cosmopolitan multiculturalism).

Counter arguments:
- Cross-cultural exchange involves meaningful conversation; however, too often there is talking but no listening due to the deep divides between cultures, as in the Salman Rushdie affair or the ongoing debates around African-American rights in the USA.
- The majority culture is in a position of dominance, raising questions about whether minority cultures need greater protection, such as laws to protect their cultures from offence. This raises a debate about the nature of group rights.
- Hybridisation is a potential issue as the ‘pick and mix’ approach can lead to the dissolving of authentic cultures and individuals adopting inauthentic identities. This can leave individuals feeling rootless and lacking the confidence that their culture gives them to make decisions about the type of life they wish to lead (Kymlicka). Parekh questioned whether it is possible to ever truly escape your culture as the individual is culturally embedded.

2 Multiculturalism is a source of tension and conflict in society:
- Multiculturalism is based on the principle of tolerance but this has led societies to tolerate values that go against their way of life.
- By introducing different values, beliefs and cultures, multiculturalism undermines the common culture and shared values necessary for a stable society.
- Multiculturalism has spawned segregation not integration by highlighting differences between cultures over what they have in common. Debates around the burqa and the niqab are relevant here.
- Multiculturalism has created tension and conflict – this is seen by some to have created the opposition to multiculturalism by Cameron and is reflected in the Trump presidency and the Brexit vote.

Counter arguments:
- Liberal multiculturalists would argue that toleration only extends to cultures which themselves are tolerant and no further (Kymlicka). Pluralists would argue that deep diversity is needed, either on the basis of the value pluralism of Berlin or from the criticism of liberal universalism by Parekh.
- Assimilation is a denial of minority rights and a refusal to recognise cultural difference. As cultural belonging is so central to identity (Taylor), this can only be a cause of conflict and tension. Multiculturalism provides the only meaningful way to deal with the difference that exists.
- Kymlicka argued that minority rights ensure justice and autonomy for individuals, creating a commitment to the wider political community. Parekh argued for the restructuring of the state around multiculturalism to create unity without uniformity.
- There is a feeling that some of the tensions between cultures are caused not by too much multiculturalism, but by too little.

Chapter 7

1 Anarchism is not a single doctrine:
- The key division within anarchism is between the collectivist and the individualist traditions. Individualists fear that the individual will be made a slave to the collective (Stirner), whereas collectivists see individuals as only being truly free through collective work and links to others (Bakunin). This emerges from different views of human nature and leads to different conclusions about the nature of economic freedom and the future, stateless society.
- There are divisions within the collectivist tradition, particularly over the nature of economic freedom, from the collectivism of Bakunin to the anarcho-communism of Kropotkin or Goldman to the mutualism of Proudhon.
- There are divisions within individualism, from the egoism of Stirner to the anarcho-capitalism of Rothbard, in particular over the nature of capitalism and property.
- There is a wider debate over whether anarcho-capitalism can be seen as a variant of anarchism, given its views on private property and its belief that freedom can exist without equality. Anarcho-capitalism may have more in common with the ideas of Nozick than with anarchists.

Counter arguments:
- Anarchism is united by rejection of the state but also by rejection of all coercive relationships. This is a rejection of the state in any form, placing all anarchists at odds with conservatism, socialism and liberalism.
- Anarchism is united in its support for unrestricted freedom for the individual; it argues for the autonomy of the individual and believes in the widest possible freedom of choice for all, including economic freedom.
- Anarchism is united by the idea that society without the state will be naturally harmonious and ordered. This future society will be based on voluntary agreements between individuals and there is no clear blueprint for the organisation of the new world order.

2 All anarchists are socialists:
- Most anarchists, in line with socialism, reject capitalism as a system of class exploitation and reject private property in favour of collective ownership. They have faith in a stateless society where equality and freedom for all will lead to a natural order.
- Thinkers from the collective tradition such as Goldman, Kropotkin and Bakunin agree with Marxism that a revolution is needed to bring change.
- Not all socialists are anarchists, however, as socialists believe socialism can be achieved by the state, but for anarchists socialism only emerges from free association and cooperation between individuals, workplaces and communities in the absence of the state.
- Anarchists believe that voluntary agreements between individuals can only happen where there is equality, and this position is even held by the individualist Stirner, who also opposed private property and capitalism.

Counter arguments:
- Anarchism is a wide river with many different currents within it. Individualists like Stirner, as well as mutualists like Proudhon, are deeply concerned that the individual will be made a slave to the collective.
- This leads Proudhon to argue that property is theft, but he supported the idea of possession rights or use rights to protect the individual versus the collective. In this way, Proudhon varied from socialism by arguing from each according to his ability, to each according to his work, a position also adopted by Bakunin.
- Individualists like Stirner may have rejected capitalism and private property but Stirner did not support socialism. He believed that only by losing respect for property can all have property.
- Anarcho-capitalists like Rothbard support private property as long as it is legally gained or earned. They see the free market as the best tool to create freedom and social order.
Chapter 8

1 Anthropocentrism is incompatible with ecologism:
- Anthropocentrism is the idea that humans are above and outside of nature and may exploit nature for their own purposes. This view places humanity as the master of nature; nature is purely a resource whose value is measured only by its use to mankind. All the strands of ecologism oppose this view as reductionist and part of the mechanistic world view that is causing ecological destruction.
- Dark greens argue for an ecocentric rather than an anthropocentric approach, giving priority to ecological balance and not human goals. This can be developed in terms of biocentric equality using Leopold’s ‘land ethic’ and/or the idea of a paradigm shift to an environmental consciousness (Naess and Ecosophy T).

Counter arguments:
- Light greens oppose the anthropocentrism of traditional ideologies as well as ecocentrism. Light greens argue that only human-centred arguments rather than nature-centred arguments can be used to protect the environment. This is based on Carson’s idea that, by waging war on nature, humanity is waging war on itself as man is part of nature.
- Light greens propose enlightened anthropocentrism, where nature should be protected so that it continues to sustain human life, and the principle of intergenerational equity, which is enshrined in policy as sustainable development.
- Social ecology, championed by Bookchin, dismisses anthropocentrism as the continued domination of man by man and nature by man.
- Bookchin also dismissed ecocentrism as ‘eco-la-la’, seeing the idea of a spiritual revolution as wildly unrealistic as well as deeply misanthropic. Social ecology argues that only the overthrow of all forms of domination of human by human can return humans to their true nature and an equal partnership with the natural world.

2 The protection of the environment cannot be achieved in a capitalist economy:
- Dark greens and social ecology are both opposed to capitalism; as the limitless exploitation of resources is impossible, production is also destruction, total recycling is impossible and, as Schumacher argued, growing GDP does not grow happiness.
- Bookchin argued that capitalism’s ‘grow or die’ imperative meant that persuading capitalism to ‘green’ and to limit growth was no more possible than persuading a human to stop breathing.
- There is clear criticism of the consumerism and materialism associated with society, which promote a greater concern for material goods than for people or nature. There will need to be a radical reordering of society based around ideas like Schumacher’s Buddhist economics.
- There will need to be a radical economic reordering based around Daly’s ideas of the steady-state economy and strong sustainability. These ideas are a radical challenge to traditional economic thinking.
- Both Bookchin and Schumacher advocated moving away from gigantism to small, autonomous economic communities that produce quality goods to satisfy need not want, using local resources and skilled labour, and working with, not against, nature.

Counter arguments:
- Light greens advocate that slower and smarter growth within capitalism is possible based on Carson’s ideas of the sustainable management of resources. Reform not revolution is the key to environmental protection. This is expressed through the idea of sustainable development.
- Science and technology provide a key route to deal with problems such as climate change and pollution.
- Ethical consumerism can use the capitalist market to persuade companies to ‘green’ their goods and their production processes in order to maintain their profits.
- Managed capitalism – through international treaties and deals (e.g. the Paris Agreement), laws at state level (e.g. the Climate Change Act) and the use of green taxes, the state can be used to ‘green’ growth and promote sustainable development.