3.1 Conservatism: 30-minute Pack

EDEXCEL 9PL0 · about 30 minutes

Total Marks

Name: _____ Date: ____ / ____ / _____

Answer ALL questions. For levels-marked questions, write a well-structured, developed response using accurate political knowledge, named thinkers and precise terminology. This pack forms part of Edexcel Paper 1 (9PL0/01), Section B: Core Political Ideas.

1 This question is about privatisation as an example of New Right economic policy.

(a) State two examples of privatisation carried out in the UK during the 1980s. **(2)**

(b) Explain one economic argument in favour of privatisation. **(3)**

(Total for Question 1 is 5 marks)

© Revision Library | revisionlibrary.co.uk

2 Evaluate the extent to which one-nation conservatives and New Right conservatives agree about the role of the state.

(Total for Question 2 is 24 marks)

© Revision Library | revisionlibrary.co.uk

Mark scheme · 3.1 Conservatism: 30-minute Pack

Question 1

(a) one accurate, correctly dated example, e.g. British Telecom (1984)	**B1**
(a) a second accurate, correctly dated example, e.g. British Gas (1986)	**B1**

(a) Answer: Any two of: British Telecom (privatised 1984); British Gas (privatised 1986); British Airways (privatised 1987); the Housing Act 1980 'Right to Buy' scheme, allowing council tenants to purchase their homes.

(b) identifies a valid economic argument, e.g. competition/market discipline increases efficiency	**B1**
(b) development, e.g. state-run monopolies lack the competitive pressure to control costs or innovate	**B1**
(b) further development or example, e.g. privatisation can also raise revenue for the government and widen share ownership	**B1**

(b) Answer: Privatisation exposes previously state-run monopolies to competitive market pressure, which proponents argue increases efficiency and encourages innovation, since a state monopoly has less incentive to control costs; privatisation can also raise revenue for the government and, through share sales to the public, widen individual share ownership.

Question 2

Level 0 No relevant content.	**0**
Level 1 Basic, limited knowledge of one-nation and/or New Right conservatism, with little or no developed analysis or evaluation. Examples, if present, are generalised or inaccurate.	**1-6**
Level 2 Clear, mostly accurate knowledge of both strands with some developed analysis; evaluation is present but may be one-sided, assertive rather than substantiated, or only loosely tied to named examples.	**7-12**
Level 3 Detailed, accurate knowledge deployed in a sustained analysis engaging with both strands, using well-selected, accurate examples and thinkers; evaluation weighs agreement against disagreement and reaches a reasoned judgement, though development may be uneven.	**13-18**
Level 4 Sophisticated, wide-ranging and accurate knowledge used to construct a tightly argued evaluation that directly compares one-nation and New Right positions on the state, using precise, well-chosen examples and thinkers throughout, and reaches a clearly substantiated, balanced judgement on the extent of agreement.	**19-24**

Indicative content:

- Case for significant disagreement: one-nation conservatives (associated with Disraeli's paternalism and the post-war 'middle way' consensus) accept, and at times actively support, state intervention in the economy and welfare provision to preserve social cohesion, viewing this as a pragmatic duty (noblesse oblige) of the privileged to the less fortunate.
- Case for significant disagreement: New Right (Thatcherite) conservatives sought to 'roll back the frontiers of the state' economically - privatisation (e.g. British Telecom 1984, British Gas 1986), trade union reform (Employment Acts 1980, 1982, 1988), and monetarist policy - arguing extensive state welfare and intervention fosters dependency and economic inefficiency; this is a direct rejection of one-nation economic paternalism.
- Case for underlying agreement: both strands support a strong state in matters of law and order, national defence, and upholding property rights and established institutions (monarchy, Parliament, family); neither strand favours a minimal 'night-watchman' state across the board, since both value state authority to preserve social order.
- Case for underlying agreement: both strands are sceptical of radical or utopian schemes for remaking society, and both are ultimately pragmatic rather than dogmatic, tracing a shared Burkean caution about untested, abstract change even where their specific policies diverge sharply.
- Andrew Gamble's 'The Free Economy and the Strong State' (1988) captures the New Right's own internal combination of economic withdrawal and social/security-focused state strength, which can be read either as evidence the New Right departs sharply from one-nation paternalism (in economic policy) or as evidence that both strands share a belief in a strong, authoritative state (just applied to different domains).
- A substantiated conclusion might argue the two strands disagree sharply and consequentially over the state's economic and welfare role, but agree at a deeper level on the necessity of state authority to preserve order, property and traditional institutions, so the overall answer to 'the role of the state' depends on distinguishing its economic role from its social/security role.
- Credit should be given to answers reaching either conclusion (substantial disagreement or substantial underlying agreement) provided the argument is supported by accurate, well-explained evidence and does not present either strand as the sole 'authentic' form of conservatism.

© Revision Library | revisionlibrary.co.uk