

Candidate 1 evidence

1.(c)

To some extent can voting behaviours in the UK be influenced by the age of voters. Its normalised for older voters to vote conservatives and younger voters vote labour. Voting behaviours are the way in which individuals vote and these are grouped by age, social class and media.

One way in which voting behaviours in the UK can be explained is by the age of voters. A persons age can have a huge impact on the parties they support. Older people are more likely to vote conservatives which younger people are more likely to vote labour. For example, in 2020, 60% of over 40s supported Conservatives. This shows that over half of people above 40s vote Conservatives due to their beliefs and what they support. However, there has been change for age voting behaviours in recent years. There has been a recent split between ages within voting behaviours. More younger people are starting to support conservatives and more older people supporting labour. This could For example, in recent years there was a 5% difference in people over and under 40 voting Conservatives. This shows that as time goes on age is starting to lose influence as a voting behaviour and individuals of different ages are voting for the same parties. Overall, voting behaviours in the UK being influenced by the age of voters is influential to a low extent.

Another way in which voting behaviours in the UK can be explained is by social class. Someones social class has a big influence on who the individual support and vote for. People with higher incomes are first class and individuals with medium incomes are middle class. Middle class voters will vote based on social class when parties are willing to work on incomes and finance. For example, 60% of ABC1 voters supported Conservatives. This shows that a majority of ABC1 voters will support Conservatives due to their high income and rich lifestyle which Conservatives make decisions by. However, there has been a recent class dealignment. Most people in the UK consider themselves as middle class. Social class has been less effective in influencing voting behaviours due to the idea of no one considering class while making their decision while voting. For examples, recently 40% of C2BE voters supported Conservatives. This shows that times are changing and just below half of C2BE voters are supporting Conservatives which show that social class is decreasing in influence and is no longer affecting voting behaviour. Overall, voting behaviours being influenced by social class of voters is influential to some extent.

A final way in which voting behaviours in the UK can be explained is through media. Social media is used by party leaders to promote their parties to a younger audience. Promoting through social media is a cheap and efficient way to gather more supporters. For example, last year in the UK there were hundreds of thousands of tweets posted by parties. This shows that social media is a popular and reliable way to promote and catch attention of younger voters, gaining more votes.

Also, things such as memes, gifs and emojis can be used. These can be used to grab the attention of voters especially younger voters as they can be found as humourous and shows off the politicians personality. For example, Jeremy Corbyn frequently used memes throughout the election period. This shows that a party leader created and posted memes to help him throughout his election and got a huge increase of votes. Overall, voting behaviours being influenced by media is influential to a high extent.

In conclusion, UK voting behaviours can be influenced by many factors. Age is the least impactful factor for influencing voting behaviours due to the fact less people are voting based on their age category. Other factors involve social class and media which are more effective due to still being effective in recent years.

2.(c)

Criminals aren't born bad, it's the way they are brought up which causes these bad behaviours. Individuals go through problems throughout life which may lead to them committing crimes or may leave them stuck and needing to commit crimes in order to survive. Factors include alcohol and drugs, poverty and poor education.

One cause of crime is Alcohol & Drugs. Alcohol and drugs are the main reason for crime in the UK. Alcohol impairs an individual's brain thoughts and makes them act in violent and unusual ways. For example, around 70% of UK prison population stated they were under the influence while committing their crime. This shows that alcohol and drugs are a significant cause of crime and there is a clear link.

However, social instances. It may be argued that it's the social situations people are consuming alcohol and drugs in that are leading to crime. Most individuals consume alcohol at night, when it's dark and with high amounts of people. In the UK it's the norm to drink heavily, be loud and aggressive. For example, it is shown that a majority of crimes take place during midnight to 3am. This shows that the social instances people consume alcohol are having an impact on individuals committing crime. Overall, this shows that criminals aren't born criminals and factors such as alcohol and drugs could have an impact on these individuals.

Another cause of crime is Poverty. People who are living in poverty may not be able to afford basic needs, this may lead to them committing crimes such as shoplifting or theft to pay for these needs in order to survive. For example, there are high shoplifting crime rates in Dundee which is a place of high poverty. This shows that due to a high rate of individuals in Dundee living with low finance, they will turn to crime to afford basic needs. However, not everyone in poverty goes on to commit crime. There are many individuals who suffer poverty but go down the path of committing crimes. There is help out there that individuals can get support from that means they can get basic needs without the need for crime. For example, there are high rates of food banks spread out amongst the UK. This shows that there are many opportunities for people living in poverty to get food if they are unable to afford it which prevents crime. Overall, this shows that criminals aren't born and factors such as living in poverty could have an impact on these individuals.

Another cause of crime is Education. Individuals who live in deprived areas might experience low levels of education which could lead to unemployment issues in life. Schools in areas of poverty may have poor quality staff, lack resources and understaffed. For example, it was found that around 30% of schools in the UK are underfunded. This shows that a high amount of schools are poor quality which suggests that many individuals leave school with a lack of education which may increase crime rates. However, not everyone with poor education goes on to commit crimes. Not everyone with a low education goes on to be a criminal which suggests there are other factors, these factors may include biological problems that affect an individual's way of learning. For example, people with ADHD are more likely to struggle in school. This shows that there are other factors which could lead to crime that aren't linked to poor education. Overall, this shows that criminals aren't born and factors such as low levels of education could have an impact on these individuals.

In conclusion, there are many factors which support the idea that criminals are not born, they are created by the society they live in. These factors include alcohol and drugs, poverty and poor education. However, the most impactful factor is alcohol and drugs due to the fact that most perpetrators are under the influence at the time of their crime. Poverty and education are less impactful due to not everyone with these problems going on to commit crime.

3. (a)

The world power i have chose is the USA. The government is successful to a high extent in responding to socio-economic inequalities. Inequalities include income inequality, crime inequality and education inequality.

One socio-economic inequality in the USA is income inequality. A majority of Black Americans are living in poverty in the US. This could be due to the fact that Black Americans experience low, poor quality education as schools are underfunded which leads to low employment opportunities. For example, over 50% of Black Americans experience financial problems while growing up. This shows that over half of Black Americans have signs of poverty which is mostly caused by childhood problems like school.

However, there has been a decrease in Black American poverty rates in recent years.

There was a helping system introduced called the US rescue plan. This was put in place to save and sustain jobs during the Covid-19 pandemic which was harming jobs and therefore leading to financial issues. For example, the US Rescue Plan saved millions of jobs. This shows that the government helped individuals keep their jobs while going through the covid pandemic and lockdown. Overall, the government has a high success in responding to socio-economic inequalities in the USA.

Another socio-economic inequality in the USA is crime inequality. Black Americans are most likely to be involved in crime, specifically violent crime. This could be due to growing up in poor backgrounds and environments where crime is normalised and happens often, or due to not having enough money to survive as lack of employment opportunities as a result of poor education. For example, its found that 1/3rd of the US prison population are Black Americans. This shows that a huge portion of the population in US prisons are Black Americans, this is more significant as Black Americans have a low population rate in the US compared to White Americans and other ethnic groups.

However, Black Americans are not the only group which commits crime. White Americans also take up a huge majority of the US prison population. It is more common in a murder with a white victim that the perpetrator is also white. For example, it was found that a majority of the time when a white person is murdered, they are murdered by another white person. This shows that White Americans are also highly involved with crimes, more specifically to other White Americans. Overall, the government has a high success in responding to socio-economic inequalities in the USA.

Another socio-economic inequality in the USA is education inequality. Many Black Americans experience poor education due to not having the funds to attend education, low education therefore leads to decreased employment options and then may result in poverty. For example, a study found that around 60% of Black Americans drop out of 4-year college courses. This shows that a majority of Black Americans drop out of college for a number of different reasons which may include struggling with finance.

However, there has been a recent shift in education inequality. In recent years there has been a decrease of students dropping out and an increase of students completing education. For example, studies show graduation rates in the US for Black Americans has increased by 20% in recent years. This shows that the education inequality is being less of a problem and recently more Black Americans have been finishing education and leaving education with employment. Overall, the government has a high success in responding to socio-economic inequalities.

In conclusion, the government is successful to a high extent in responding to socio-economic inequalities such as income inequalities, crime inequalities and education inequalities.

Candidate 2 evidence

1a

There are many different views about the most effective way to govern Scotland. This essay will focus on the 3 most popular options of governance in Scotland, Independence, Full fiscal autonomy and Status-Quo.

Independence is a popular view on the best way to govern Scotland. Independence is where Scotland would leave the UK and being an independent country. Being independent would give Scotland the opportunity to re-apply for EU membership, NATO membership and have diplomatic relations separate from the UK. Independence is a popular choice as it would give Scotland the powers to control all of its own taxes, immigration and defence. The 2 main independence partys, SNP and Scottish greens, who are the current government in Scotland, Have called for Scotland to get rid of nuclear weapons, and independence would allow this. After Brexit, where the majority of Scotland voted to remain in the EU, Support for independence increase due to the opportunity for Scotland to re-apply independently. A recent poll Showed just over 50% of people in Scotland would support independence, Showing independence to be a popular view on the best way to govern Scotland.

However, During the Independence referendum in 2014, the majority of Scotland voted to remain in the UK. This means that when Scotland was given the chance to become independent, it choose not to. Some people have concerns over the defence of Scotland if it were to become independent, due to independence parties not supporting the renewal of trident, the nuclear weapon program, which could also make it more difficult for Scotland to apply for NATO membership. This shows that to a large extent views differ on the best way to govern Scotland.

Another option for governance in Scotland is Full fiscal autonomy or "Devo-Max". This is where Scotland would have almost all powers devolved to them apart from defence, immigration and international relations. However, This option would not allow for Scotland to get rid of its nuclear weapons or to apply to international organisations. A poll showed Less than 20% of people in Scotland think Devo-Max is a good idea, showing it is not a largely supported option for governance of Scotland.

Another option for governance in Scotland is status-quo or "direct London rule. This is where Scotland would remain as is with its devolved parliament with many powers being reserved to the UK. As Shown in the 2014 referendum this is a popular choice amongst the Scottish people. This option means funding for Scotland comes in the block grant calculated by the Barnett formula, where Scotland receives 20% more money per head than England due to its unique Rural and island communities. However, This option means Scotland has a government it does not vote for. In Westminster, the winning party is often not a party Scotland voted for. For Example, over the last 14 Years before the current government, Scotland did not vote for a majority conservative government, however had to have one due to the rest of the Uks votes. This is similar to when Scotland was forced out the EU after voting to remain, leading many to believe Scotlands voice is not heard and is undemocratic.

In Conclusion, Views on the most effective way to govern Scotland differ to a large extent. While devo-max is not a popular view, Independence and Status quo are both very different but very popular views, with topics such as Defence and international relations being big issues.

2b	<p>In Scotland and The UK, there have been many government measures to reduce inequalities. This essay will focus on, Free School meals, the equality act and free bus travel.</p> <p>In Scotland, Free School meals are available for many primary School Children, and discounted School meals are available to many children who's family are on a lower income. This helps reduce inequality between children living in poverty and children from higher income families and allows all children to learn after having a School meal and not have to go hungry while learning. This also helps improve learning outcomes, which further reduces inequality due to better outcomes for pupils leading to well paid jobs. However, Child poverty and hunger rates in Scotland whist have somewhat improved, remain high. This shows Free School meals have only been slightly effective and have not had a significant effect on reducing inequality.</p> <p>In the UK, The equality act prohibits discrimination against people based on age, race, disability, gender and sexual orientation. This helps to reduce inequality for many groups. For example, businesses and organisations must provide reasonable adjustments to allow disabled people to access the workplace, such as adding a ramp. This significantly reduces inequality disabled people face by allowing them to access the workplace and earn money. However, Despite the equality act, people still face discrimination and inequality in the UK. For example, The UK still has a gender pay gap, meaning on average Men still make more money than women, Showing the equality act hasn't been completely successful in reducing inequality.</p> <p>In Scotland, the government subsidies free bus Travel for under 22's and over 60's. This means anyone in these age ranges can apply for free bus travel. This reduces inequality faced by young people with no transport and allows them to access Volunteering, work and education opportunities. It also allows elderly people who may no longer be able to drive to access leisure and shopping opportunities and to attend hospital and doctor appointments, which reduces health inequality. However, not all areas are well served by buses meaning that some young people still face inequality. Showing this measure has somewhat failed at reducing inequality.</p> <p>In conclusion, there have been many government measures to reduce inequality, however these have somewhat failed at reducing inequality. While they have improved the lives of people facing inequality, inequality remains high in Scotland and the UK and have only seen a small reduction.</p>	
3a	<p>In the USA, One branch of government is the executive/ The president. The president has the power to sign executive orders, veto legislation and appoint supreme court judges. For example, on starting his second term as president, Donald Trump signed a large number of executive orders and introduce tariffs on many countries. This shows the executive branch has a large ability to dominate government decision making.</p> <p>Another branch of government in the USA is the legislative. This branch is made up of congress and the senate. This branch has the power to make legislation and to impeach the president. For example, during Donald trump's first term the legislative branch held a vote to impeach him, requiring a two thirds majority. However, despite being able to impeach the president and create legislation, the President has the power to veto legislation to stop it becoming law. Also, despite trying to impeach multiple presidents, this requires a two thirds majority and is difficult to achieve. For example, when</p>	

the legislative branch tried to impeach Donald trump, this was unsuccessful. This shows the legislative branch has a small ability to dominate government decision making. The Final branch of Government in the USA is the Judicial. This consists of the Supreme court. This branch has the power to declare acts of the legislative and the executive unconstitutional. For example, the supreme court has declared acts and executive order by the president unconstitutional. However, the supreme court judges are appointed by the President, meaning that they will be biased while serving under the president who appointed them and when a new president is chosen, they will be biased against them. The judicial also does not have the power to create legislation or make executive decisions, showing its ability to dominate government decision making is limited. In conclusion, there is some ability one branch of government to dominate government decision making, the Executive. This id due to the powers this branch has and the difficulty faced to try and remove them from office.

Candidate 3 evidence

1a. There are many different views on how the Scottish government should be governed. This consists of the conservatives approach, nationalists approach and the Labour approach. These are all many different ways that would benefit the Scottish government, but would end up with many people upset and feel like they have been treated unfairly. I am arguing that the Labour approach is the best alternative governacae.

One view on on the most effective way to govern Scotland is the Labour approach. They think that Scotland and Uk are in a good condition and there is no need to change right now. They beleive that we have all of the needs to create a good Scotlnad and England with the amount of money, recoureces and much more. For example, former prime minister Rishi Sunak and Douglas Ross were talking about how the UK used their finacal power to help reaseach Covid-19. This shows that they where using their money to benefit evryone in the the UK. The Scottish governments didn't get much say in the matter of the how to spend the money and could result in them wanting to leave the Uk and spending making their own decisions on want to spend the money on. This impacts the Scottish peoples decions on who to vote for and what and think about what they want instead. On the other hand, people think that Scotland should be an independant Country and that Scotland should be free of the Uks descions. This means that Scotland would make their own decisions on what to spend money on and create a different place from England. The downsides to Scotland leaving is the money in over the money that comes out and how much debt Scotland is in. For example, The difference between the money that comes in to the money spend is £26 billion. This suggests that if Scotland leave the UK they would be in a lot of debt which could end up with them needing help from other countries. This then could lead to better relationships with the world. Overall this shows that the Labour views is more about finacials and this is the way that Scotland can still do well while in the UK.

Another view is the Nationalists approach. They beleive that in the UK Scotland need more power to influence decions and show the difference they would make. Their view is that Scotland is a major partt to the UK and deserve more impact on the decions and even create their own. This would lead to an equal amounts of power in Scotland and the UK, but the standards of the Uk and Scotland are no where near other places in the world. For example, the UKs and Scotlands livingf standards anr no where near Irelands and Swedens. This emphasises on how even if Scotland have more powers they need to work together to bring the whole place back togehter and create a good united Kingdom. This could lead to Scotland thinking they are better off alone. On the other hand, some people view that Scotland shouldn't get extra powers in the UK. This view beleives that they don't need it a there population is low compared to England so why would they need extra powers. This means that the power are spread out proportioantly depending on their global status and how much of Scotland makes up the UK. For example, Scotlands population is 8% of the whole UK. This suggests that the powers are all fairly givern to each countrie in the Uk and they all have a say for how much they give to the UK. This can lead to people disleking the way the powers are given out as everyone should be equal in the Uk all have their opions expressed. Overall this shows the nationalist approach is flawed with the powers being influenced by size.

Another view is the Conservative approach. They beleive that England should get more devolved powers within the UK. They beleive this beacuse they contibute more to the UK and have the highest popultiuon by a lot. This then would result in England almost fully taking over the Uk and having all of the Power over Scotland. For example, When conservatives where in power Scotland aksed for another independance vote and it got deinied. This therefore shows that when the conservatives are in power in the Scotland they will let England control them and let England create whatever they want. This then result with anger within Scotland as they desrve more of the choice and

then more and more of the people within Scotland will want to not have conservatives in power. However, conservatives would never get into power with Scotland. This is because Scotland is a two state government with a trend of the same two switching in powers. This then would lead to Scotland not wanting a change and giving up the power that they always needed. For example, in Scotland there has only really been two parties in power either the SNP or Labour. This suggests that Scotland doesn't want to give up all the powers the England and that they at least deserve some of the powers to influence change and help create the UK. Overall this shows that Scotland would never go for a Conservative view as they don't want to give up their powers.

In conclusion the Labour approach is easily the best view as they want to keep things in the same state. As if Scotland goes independent they have to get out of billions of debt but at the same time Scotland won't give up all their power. So the Labour approach would be the most beneficial for Scotland.

2a. There are many different measures the government have put out to try and stop inequalities within the UK. They vary from minimum unit pricing, minimum living wage and universal credit, but they haven't been very successful in stopping what they were created for. I am arguing that the government measures have failed in stopping inequalities.

The UK introduced the minimum living wage to help younger people out of poverty and create a better wage for them. This when you get paid a certain amount of money per hour to earn enough to live and get all the essential needs in your life. It gives you money to buy a place to live, food on your table, and the clothes you need to wear. This introduced many alternatives to people who were working underneath it when it first came out. For example, the minimum living wage is £12.21 an hour. This gives people enough money to live their life and keep all the essentials that you need to survive. With the money boost people could also enjoy themselves more and spend more money with family and friends. This could result in boosts of moods and steering away from poverty. On the other hand, the minimum living wage is not enough for those with a family. This means that if you have a family and are working on minimum living wage there is little way you can get all the essential needs for each person. This could lead to losses in necessary nutrients, clean clothes and much more. For example the minimum living wage for a family is £30,000 a year. The minimum living wage doesn't let you reach to these amount of money and shows that the people couldn't treat themselves and how with the increases they still can't fully support their own families. Overall this shows that the addition of the minimum living wage hasn't helped much people get out of poverty and with families they will still struggle with getting the essentials they need.

Another measure the UK has introduced is the minimum unit pricing. This means more people will stop drinking as it is getting more expensive and could result with them going into poverty. This would help people addicted to alcohol as they can't stop drinking it and would make them think before buying it next time, also saving themselves at the same time. For example, after the introduction of minimum unit pricing the death related to alcohol went down by 8%. This suggests that it was somewhat successful in stopping people with little amounts of money buying alcohol. It also shows that it is saving lives and that this change has led to more people wanting to do other things rather than consume alcohol. However, some people rely on alcohol in their lives. This means they drink alcohol to forget about something or get past a rough time in their lives. Some people need it as it is the only way they can cope with their own feelings. They also consume after a long day to as a relaxant and to make sure the day is over. For example, most adults in the UK drink at hazardous levels. This suggests that they like to drink when they have finished work and use it as a way to cope with all the stress of work. This then makes them addicted so they

drink it whenever they can to try and mask the addiction and stress at the same time. Overall this shows that the minimum unit pricing hasn't been successful as people will still drink if they are addicted or overcoming stress.

Another measure the UK put in is Universal credit. This is when you earn £16,000 a year or less the government will give you benefits to help you get all of the essentials foods, clothes and more. This helps many people all over the UK and can result in some people starting their lives again, creating new opportunities. For example, 6.4 million people in the UK use Universal Credit. This suggests that it is helping a big proportion of the UK and how it is impacting so many people's lives. This can lead to them trying new things and searching for better jobs which can help them fully get out of poverty. On the other hand, people argue that it is not enough money. This means that even with the universal credit you are still likely to be in poverty and struggling to supply yourself and others. This can lead to people wanting more from the government and asking for more help. For example, 50% of people who have universal credit are still in poverty. This shows that it doesn't really help the majority of people receiving it. This could then lead to people wanting a change and more help when they are struggling. Overall this shows that it hasn't been successful as at least half of the people that receive it is still in poverty.

In conclusion all the measures the UK put in to prevent inequalities have been unsuccessful. Through them not changing anything to people not wanting to change. So this shows my argument is correct and that the UK's measures have not worked.

3c. The effects of terrorism in Israel and Palestine is affecting the whole world. This means that people at their homes are being affected by these terror attacks as they are concerned for the people and also ashamed by the way their governments are reacting. This was seen when the surprising attack by Hamas on October 7th 2022. This was the most deaths in a terror attack for a while killing 1,200 Israelis. This then affects the wider communities by putting them in distress and wanting their governments to do something to stop the attacks. This would lead to different people getting angry at their own governments forcing them into making a decision on who to help and what side to take. On the other hand, people were surprised by this attack as there has been a fall off in attacks recently. This means there hasn't been as many attacks but all of a sudden one of the biggest terror attacks happen. This then would result in fear within the globe as we never know when a terror attack is imminent. For example, according to the Global Terrorism Index the amount of terror attacks have fallen by 24%. This suggests that more fear has been put in communities all over the world as they don't want to die in a bombing. This could also result in a scare of a world war and how no one wants that. Overall this terror attack surprised and scared wider communities.

Another effect of terrorism on wider communities was the Dylan Roof attack. This done his terrorism due to race and how he wanted to start a war. This would scare other black people and the government increase their is an outbreak of terror attacks of black people. For example, Dylan Roof a 26 year old went into a black church and killed 9 people, he said he wanted to start a race war. This then creates fright within black people as they don't know if a person will come up and kill them as there were online groups talking about what they would do. On the other hand this could make races start rioting. This means because of this attack more black people will want protection and something to stop people doing this. They would want changes from governments all over the world. For example, they would riot in the streets like the farmers in 2024. They would do this to try get a change and protection from people like Dylan Roof. This then suggests that they would try and do other things to try and change the outcomes of terror attacks on their people in their own countries. This would then affect the wider community through the outrage of the black people.

Candidate 4 evidence

1) a) There are many different views on how best Scotland should be governed, these include Direct Rule, Devo-Max, Federalism and Independence. However, each have varying levels of success.

One way to govern Scotland would be Direct Rule from Westminster, as the way Scotland was governed before 1999. Direct Rule would save significant costs on administration as it costs just below of £100 million a year to run the Scottish Parliament. It's argued that instead of spending this money on Holyrood, the money could be contributed to the UK Parliament, to make a more effective government for the whole of the UK. Moreover, Direct Rule would result in consistent laws all across the UK. At present, there are different rules on drink driving in Scotland and England: in Scotland, the maximum amount of alcohol allowed in 100ml of a driver's blood is 50mg, whereas in England it's 80mg. Direct Rule would ensure that the ~~same~~ same laws are followed across the UK, preventing any confusion for drivers.

crossing the border between Scotland and England. However, Direct Rule results in a democratic deficit in which Scottish people are ruled in a way that they didn't vote for, no support. In Westminster, only 59 out of the 650 MPs are Scottish. Therefore, a law which affects Scotland could be passed without the support of any Scottish MPs. In evaluation, Direct Rule is an ineffective way to govern Scotland as Scottish citizens ^{would} have significantly less influence on decision-making.

Another way to govern Scotland is Dev-Max. Instead of receiving a block grant from the UK Exchequer (as at present), the Scottish Parliament would collect all tax levied in Scotland. The Scottish Government would be given a broader range of powers, including financial, allowing it to tackle issues which are specific to Scotland. However, Dev-Max fails to answer the West Lothian Question, which asks why Scottish MPs are permitted to have a say on issues only affecting England, when English MPs don't have a say on

Scotland-specific laws. As a result of this, English MPs introduced 'English Votes, English Laws', otherwise known as EVEL, preventing Scottish MPs from voting on issues only impacting England. As a consequence, this heightened tensions between MPs of the different countries of the UK. To evaluate, Devolution could be an effective way to govern Scotland as it gives Scottish people more responsibility to deal with issues specific to them.

Federalism could be another way to govern Scotland. This would mean that different 'states' of the UK (Scottish Parliament, Northern Ireland Assembly, Welsh Assembly, and English regions) would have their own system of law making and courts but Westminster would make decisions affecting the whole of the UK, for example, defence and immigration. This could be effective as it would solve the West Lothian Question by removing Scottish MPs from English issues. However, federalism could mean an end to parliamentary sovereignty.

The Supreme Court would have significantly more influence on how the country is run. In evaluation, federalism could be an effective way to govern Scotland as it brings power much closer to the people.

A final way to govern Scotland is Independence. Scotland would be a completely different country, with Holyrood making decisions for the whole country. It's argued that independence would significantly increase Scots' representation in decision-making. In the 2016 Brexit Referendum, $\frac{2}{3}$ of Scottish people voted to remain in the EU, however the UK left the EU as a result of the huge number of English votes to leave, overwhelming Scots' votes. Becoming independent could be an opportunity for Scotland to rejoin the EU. However, this is deemed highly unlikely as the other EU members may not welcome Scotland in, especially Spain, who wants to deter national independent movements. Furthermore, as an independent country, Scotland could derive large financial benefits from North Sea Oil to support the economy, as

countries like Norway do. The SNP predicted that Scotland could gain \$11 billion a year from North Sea Oil. However, it's forecast to run out in the next 50 years, and the price of a barrel of oil fell from \$100 to \$40. This demonstrates that the North Sea Oil would not be a stable, long-term source of income for an independent Scotland. To evaluate, Independence would be an ineffective way to govern Scotland due to the uncertainty Scotland would face regarding its economy and relationship with other countries. Additionally, Scotland receives a good deal in the UK: it receives 20% more money per person than England, and it receives more money than it contributes to the UK. To evaluate, Independence would be an ineffective way to govern Scotland due to the uncertainty Scotland would face regarding its economy and relationship with other countries.

In conclusion, Dev-Max would be most effective to govern Scotland as Scotland has increased responsibilities, but still benefits financially from remaining part of the UK.

2)b) In the UK, many inequalities exist in various forms: economic, education, health, social exclusion. Governments in the UK attempt to tackle these inequalities with numerous initiatives, however, they have varying levels of success.

One government measure taken to reduce economic inequality is Universal Credit. Universal Credit is a benefit introduced by the UK Government in 2013 which replaces six other benefits, including working tax credit and low income tax. Receivers of Universal Credit will receive enough money to live on, but will not receive more than they would if working. This is to incentivize employment, encouraging people to work to earn more money and have a better lifestyle. Usually, the minimum time taken to receive the first payment of Universal Credit is five weeks. Receivers can request an advance on payments, however, they are usually unaware that when they do this they are pushing themselves further into arrears. Moreover, Universal Credit payments are laid out in the same manner a

<p>monthly salary is to encourage work, this means that rent is no longer paid directly to landlords. This has created issues for individuals who are uneducated on the topic of finance, as they are often unable to budget their money and pay rent accordingly. In evaluation, Universal Credit was ineffective, it failed to reduce inequalities as it was unsuitable for people unsure about monetary topics, and doesn't truly encourage employment.</p>
<p>Another government measure to reduce education inequality is the Widening Access Scheme. This was a goal set by the Scottish Government for 20% of all Scottish university students to be from the 20% most deprived areas by 2030. This aim seems to be readily achievable as already Glasgow School of Art and the University of the West of Scotland have figures of 23.9% and 30.7% ^{poorer} poorer students. However, some could argue that this may discriminate against the remaining 80% of students who may be denied a place in a university purely because they are of a</p>

higher socio-economic status. Another Scottish Government initiative aiming to reduce education inequality is the Attainment Fund. This is a legal duty for Scottish councils to provide support to students from ^{more} 'deprived' backgrounds. However, the attainment gap is currently 17.2%, suggesting that these initiatives have been unsuccessful at narrowing the gap between poorer and wealthier students. To evaluate, ~~these~~ the Widening Access Scheme and the Attainment Fund failed to reduce inequalities as they didn't attempt to tackle root causes which can affect poorer students' academic performance.

A third government measure to reduce inequality is the Baby Box. This was a universal Scottish Government benefit which provided new-borns with clothes, books, toys, playmats, etc. Around 90% of all mothers offered the Baby Box agreed, suggesting that it was a well-liked idea. As a result of the Baby Box, more mothers under the age of 25 began breastfeeding and a small decrease in primary carers smoking and

newborns exposed to second-hand smoke was observed. However, the Baby Box made no impact on maternal or infant hospital admissions. This indicates that the Baby Box didn't have significantly lasting effects. This is reinforced by the fact that the decrease in smoking didn't last till post-natal. In evaluation, the Baby Box failed to reduce inequalities as it had very minimal impacts on the health and lifestyle of the children.

A final government measure aiming to reduce health inequalities is Minimum Unit Pricing (MUP). MUP is a Scottish policy which requires every unit of alcohol to be sold for at least 65p. It's estimated that every year MUP saves 150 lives, and prevents 400 hospital admissions. This shows the powerful impacts of MUP at reducing many alcohol-related illnesses. However, although people were deterred from purchasing alcohol due to the increased costs, the drop in alcoholic drinks purchases was mostly observed in the more deprived areas of Scotland. This created a new inequality as wealthier drinkers were unaffected, however poorer drinkers

<p>could no longer afford to buy alcohol, so the deterrence was unequal. To evaluate, MUP failed to reduce inequalities as it had a completely disproportionate effect, only reducing alcohol consumption in some areas.</p>	
<p>In conclusion, it could indeed be argued that Scottish and UK Government measures to tackle inequality have failed as many of them create further issues, or don't have significant impacts and fail at creating a more equal society.</p>	

3)a) The US President has the power of veto, which allows them to prevent a bill becoming legislation if they disagree with it. However, the veto is considered undemocratic, and as such, it's used sparingly. In 2016, President Obama vetoed the ~~Jan~~ Justice Against Sponsors of Terror Act (JASTA) which allowed families of 9/11 victims to sue the government of Saudi Arabia. Congress' check on this power is the ability to override a veto if they have a $\frac{2}{3}$ majority vote. However, this is unlikely to happen - due to the dominance of the Democrat and Republican parties, Congress is usually made up of roughly $\frac{1}{2}$ of the President's party. There's a low chance of members of the President's party seeking to override their leader as they support the President and their actions, or they are afraid to oppose their party leader as it could cause issue for them when trying to be re-elected. Therefore, it could be argued that the Executive branch dominates the decision-making ~~and~~ process as the Legislature is usually unable to oppose a veto.

The US President has the power to sign Executive Orders - these allow the President to make laws without congressional approval. The President may sign an Executive Order if they want a law to quickly come into place, or think Congress wouldn't pass the law. ~~The~~ The Judiciary's check on this power is the ability to remove a law that they feel doesn't align with the rules set out by the Constitution. In 2017, President Trump issued an Executive Order nicknamed the 'muslim ban', which aimed to protect the US from terrorism. The Executive Order was challenged in the lower courts, but was later upheld in a 5-4 ruling by the Supreme Court's conservative judges. Congress' check on this power is the ability to impeach the President if they are suspected of any wrongdoing. An impeachment is when the President is put on trial, and, ultimately removed ^{from office}. Impeachments require a $\frac{2}{3}$ majority vote from Congress. Once again, this is rare due to members of the President's party refusing to vote to remove their leader from office. In US history, only 3 Presidents have been impeached, and none of them were successfully

removed from office. Therefore, this indicates that the Executive can successfully dominate government decision-making as a result of the low chance of the President's own party seeking to override him/her.

A final power of the President is the Power of Appointment. The President can appoint members of their Cabinet (the senior most positions in government), overseas ambassadors and Supreme Court Judges. The Senate's check on this power is that it has to confirm approve these nominations. Trump's 2024 Cabinet nominations included Marc Rubio as Secretary of State, and Brooke Rollins as Secretary of Agriculture. Initially, Trump had nominated Matt Gaetz as Attorney General. However, Matt Gaetz withdrew from the nomination as he was aware that he would be questioned by the Senate about the sexual assault allegation against him. This demonstrates the Senate's ability to diminish the domination of the Executive, as the Senate can successfully intercept wrong choices, preventing immoral people from entering senior government positions and having a say in decisions which affect the whole country.