

Candidate 1 evidence

ENTER QUESTION NUMBER BELOW	Do not type in this shaded box	DO NOT WRITE IN THIS MARGIN
2)	<p>The Democrats clearly won the 2012 elections by convincingly defeating the Republicans at every level and their performance in 2012 was almost as impressive as in 2008.</p> <p>“The Democrats clearly won the 2012 election by convincingly defeating the Republicans at every level”</p> <p>Source A can be seen to support the viewpoint to a certain extent. The source shows that in 2012 the percentage of votes for the Democrats presidential nominee was 51.1% compared to the Republicans nominee at 47.2% (2.9% difference). The source also shows that in terms of electoral college votes the Democrats won 332 compared to 206 for the Republicans, which is a 126-seat difference.</p> <p>Source B can be seen to support the view to a certain extent. Source B shows that in 2012 the Democrats won 55 Senate seats compared to 45 Republican Seats, which is a difference of 10. As well as this Source B shows that the Democrats actually had 201 seats in Congress compared to 234 for the Republicans, although they lost 8 whilst the Democrats gained 8.</p> <p>“Their performance in 2012 was almost as impressive as in 2008.”</p> <p>Source A supports the viewpoint to a certain extent. The source shows that in 2012 the vote share for the Democrats was 51.1% this compares to 52.9% in 2008 (1.8% difference). The source also shows that in 2012 the Democrats won 332 Electoral College votes compared to 365 in 2008 which is a loss of 32 votes.</p> <p style="padding-left: 40px;">shows</p> <p>Source B can also be seen to support this viewpoint to a certain extent . Source B shows that in 2008 the Democrats won 59 seats in the Senate compared to 55 in 2012 which is a reduction of 4. As well as this the source shows that in 2008 the Democrats had 257 seats compared to 201 in 2012 a drop of 56 seats after losing 64 in 2010.</p> <p>Overall, the sources can be seen to support the viewpoint to a certain extent. Whilst the Democrats did win this presidential election in terms of vote share they actually only gained 2.9% difference hence this cannot be deemed as</p>	

ENTER QUESTION NUMBER BELOW	Do not type in this shaded box	DO NOT WRITE IN THIS MARGIN
	<p>“convincingly defeating” them in terms of vote percentage. This being said in terms of electoral college places they had an 126 seat difference which can be deemed as being a ‘convincing defeat’ against the Republicans as the difference was almost double. As well as this Source B shows that whilst the Democrats gained more seats in both Congress and the Senate these the Republicans still had a greater majority in Congress and thus they were not ‘convincingly defeated at every level’. Also they won the presidential election and senate they did not win congress and thus the Democrats did not ‘clearly win’ in this sense. In regards to the result between 2008 and the 2012 the percentage of the vote did not move dramatically between 2008 and 2012 (1.8%) they lost 32 EC votes and as such it cannot be deemed as ‘almost as impressive as 2008’ whereby they clearly done far better in 2008 and ‘almost’ would suggest they would have a similar amount. Although they did do much better than in 2010 in which they lost 64 seats so in this sense they did have a more ‘impressive’ result compared to 2010.</p>	
	<p>In the 2012 presidential election Barack Obama defeated his Republican opponent Mitt Romney by decisive margins across every area and in all sections of society. The Republican candidate in 2016, Donald Trump, performed significantly better among all voter groups compared to Mitt Romney in 2012.</p>	
	<p>“In the 2012 presidential election Barack Obama defeated his Republican opponent Mitt Romney by decisive margins across every area and in all sections of society”</p> <p>Source C can be seen to support this to a certain extent. The source shows that Obama done significantly better than Romney in the East, Midwest and West regions with gaps of 10-20% whilst Romney done better than Obama in the South with a gap of about 15%. As well as this the source shows that Obama performed much better than Romney in big and mid-size cities with Obama having about 40% more votes in the big cities. In contrast, the source shows Romney fared better in towns and rural/suburban areas gaining 15% more votes than Obama in towns.</p> <p>Source D also supports the viewpoint to a certain extent. The source shows that those aged 39 and under were much more likely to vote for Obama than Romney was with 60% of 18-24 years voting Obama compared to 36% Romney. However, the source also shows that those aged 40 and over were more likely to vote Romney with those 56% aged 65+ voting for him compared to 44% Obama. As well as this the source shows 93% of blacks would vote Obama compared to 6% Romney which is a large difference for this section of society. As well as this the source shows that those earning under \$49,999 were more likely to vote for Obama whereas those earning about \$50k were more likely to vote for Romney. In terms of gender the source shows that whilst Obama won most of the female vote (55% vs 44%) Romney won more male votes (52% vs 45%) thus Romney fared better in terms of mal voters.</p>	

ENTER
QUESTION
NUMBER
BELOW

Do not type in this shaded box

DO NOT
WRITE
IN THIS
MARGIN

“The Republican candidate in 2016, Donald Trump, performed significantly better among all voter times when compared to Mitt Romney in 2012.”

See source D and E can only to show this to some extent. Source D shows that Trump manage to gain 6% more of the under \$30,000 vote when compared to Romney with 41% of the vote compared to 35%. On top of this the two sources show that Trump gained 3% more of the Asian vote than Romney with 29% of the vote vs 26% with Trump also performing better for the Hispanic and Black vote. The sources also show, however, that Trump lost 2% of the female of the female vote when compared to Romney. As well as this Trump managed to lose 3% of the over 65 vote with it reducing from 56% to 53%

Overall, the sources can be seen to support the viewpoint to a certain extent. Whilst Obama did fair better in larger certain parts of the country and by ‘decisive’ margins of 60% Romney also fared better than Obama in areas such as towns thus it would be wrong to say that Obama defeated Romney in every area. As well as this it would also be wrong to say that Obama performed better in ‘all sections of society’ as the sources show that whilst Obama did do better in some areas, such as black voters, Romney performed better than Obama in other areas such as white voters and male voters with a gap of 8% in terms of male voters. In regards to trump the source can only be seen to support the viewpoint to a certain extent. This is due to the fact that whilst Trump did fair better in some areas when compared to-Romney, such as some ethnicities this was not amongst ‘all voter groups’ as he lost some female votes and 3% of the over 65 vote. Thus, this viewpoint is only supported to some extent by the sources.

In terms of the viewpoint as a whole, the sources can only be seen to support it to some extent. This is largely down to the fact that whilst many statements that have been made are only partially true in the sense the sources only support part of it. For example the source suggest that Trump done better than Romney in all areas when it is only show to be true in some areas.

ENTER NUMBER OF QUESTION	DO NOT WRITE IN THIS MARGIN
	<p>Source A partially agrees with the statement.</p> <p>In 2012, Obama had 51.1% of the vote compared to 52.4% in 2008 - not a huge fall, but a fall nonetheless. However, while Obama beat McCain by almost 7% in 2008, the gap between Obama and Romney was over under 4% in 2012 - a drop of over 3%. As such, 2012 can hardly be described as a "convincing defeat", at least when examining the popular vote. However, Obama did beat Romney by over 120 electoral college votes in 2012, which certainly qualifies as "convincing" - though not quite as "convincing" as the almost 200 vote lead he held over McCain in 2008.</p> <p>Source B also contests the</p> <p>"Their [the Democrats] performance was almost as impressive as in 2008".</p>

ENTER NUMBER OF QUESTION		DO NOT WRITE IN THIS MARGIN
	<p>Source B doesn't agree with the statement - it shows that while the Democrats gained 8 seats in the Senate in 2008, they lost 6 in the midterms in 2010 and only won back 2 in 2012 - a net loss of 4, hardly an "impressive" performance. Certainly nowhere near 2008 standards. The situation in congress was even less impressive; while in 2008 the Democrats won 21 seats, in the midterms they lost 61 - they won back only eight of those in 2012, making for a net loss of 53 - more embarrassing than impressive.</p>	
	<p>"In the 2012 presidential election Barack Obama defeated his Republican opponent Mitt Romney by decisive margins across every area and in all sections of society."</p>	
	<p>Source C largely disagrees with the statement, though concedes that there were some select</p>	

ENTER NUMBER OF QUESTION		DO NOT WRITE IN THIS MARGIN
	<p>areas in which Obama "decisively" defeated Romney. For example, Obama outperformed Romney by about 12% in the Midwest^{East}, and by around 5% in the Midwest - both of which would be considered "decisive margins." In the West too, Obama won big, with a margin of around 9% over Romney - definitely "decisive." However, when it came to the South, Romney had a 10% lead on Obama, which shows Obama did not "decisively" defeat Romney in each area. In terms of communities, in Big Cities Obama had a more than 30% lead on Romney, and almost 20% in Mid Size Cities - both of which, as "decisive margins", support the statement. However, in Suburban/Rural areas Romney sat just 1 or 2% ahead of Obama, while in towns Romney held a lead of just over 10% on Obama - again, this highlights that Obama didn't quite defeat Romney by "decisive margins" in "every area."</p>	

ENTER NUMBER OF QUESTION		DO NOT WRITE IN THIS MARGIN
	<p>Source D also agrees with the source, but agrees only partially. Source D shows that in terms of gender, Romney beat Obama by 7% in terms of men, while Obama beat Romney by 11% for women. So while Obama did defeat Romney by a "decisive margin" when it came to females, Romney beat him for men. In terms of age, Obama dominated the younger year groups - from ages 18 right through to 34. Obama consistently beat Romney by "decisive margins", with the closest Romney coming being within 13%. However, Romney split split the older age groups, taking the lead from the 40-49 year group onwards. This highlights that Obama didn't manage to defeat Romney in "all sections of society".</p> <p>When it came to ethnicity, the only ethnicity Obama didn't win by a "decisive margin" was White - 54% of whom voted Romney. In all</p>	

ENTER NUMBER OF QUESTION		DO NOT WRITE IN THIS MARGIN
	<p>Other ethnicities Obama had huge leads upwards of 45% over Romney except from other where his lead was only 20% - though this still more than qualifies as a "decisive margin". For income, Obama didn't do so well - though he had decisive leads from under \$30K up to \$49K, beyond this Mitt Romney took a significant lead. All this highlights that while Obama did enjoy many "decisive margins", they most certainly did not permeate "every area" and "all sections of society".</p>	
	<p>"The Republican candidate in 2016, Donald Trump, performed significantly better among all voting groups compared to Mitt Romney in 2012."</p>	
	<p>Source E disagrees entirely with the statement.</p>	

ENTER NUMBER OF QUESTION		DO NOT WRITE IN THIS MARGIN
	<p>Though Trump made very few increases in vote share in a limited number of groups, none of them qualify as "significant". In the Male group, Trump only performed 1% better than Romney and had 2% less female votes than his 2012 counterpart. In terms of Age, Trump lost 1% of the votes in the 18-24 category, 2% in the 30-39, and 3% in the over 65 age range. He gained only 1% in the 25-29 and 50-64 age ranges, and made no impact at all in the 40-49 age group. The majority of these are losses, let alone "significantly better". When it came to Ethnicity, Trump's lack of improvement continued. He managed to lose 1% of the White votes Romney had held, and 1% of other ethnicities too. However, he did make some small increases here too - +2% to Black, +2% to Hispanic and +3% to Asian. None of this exactly qualifies as a "significant"</p>	

ENTER NUMBER OF QUESTION	DO NOT WRITE IN THIS MARGIN
	<p>increase though. Income is the Section Where Trump enjoyed most increase, all though meaning was "Significantly better" than Romney's 2012 performance. In the Under \$30K department, Trump gained 6%. He also gained 1% and 2% in the \$30K-49,999 and \$50K-99,999 brackets respectively. In the \$100K-149,999 bracket, he lost 6% of the support Romney had attracted, and he did this. In the \$250K+ bracket too. However, the \$200K-249,999 is the closest thing to "Significantly better" that Trump enjoyed, with a 7% increase over Romney. Even at that though, with the other information shows that even if this 7% can be considered "Significant", Trump performed worse than Romney in many areas - directly contradicting the statement.</p> <p>In conclusion, sources A-E Partially agree</p>

Candidate 3 evidence

ENTER NUMBER OF QUESTION	DO NOT WRITE IN THIS MARGIN
11	Source A states "Hobbes
	maintained that the social
	contract was an arrangement
	only between the people
	and not between them
	and their monarch".
	Where as Source B states
	"For Locke the social contract
	exists between the individual
	and the state as long
	as the state existed to
	protect the natural
	rights of life, liberty and
	property". Sources A and
	B disagree about
	the social contract
	between the people
	and the state. Hobbes
	believes the contract is

ENTER NUMBER OF QUESTION	DO NOT WRITE IN THIS MARGIN
	only between the people and nothing to do with the state where as Locke thinks the state is part of the contract.
	Source A says Hobbes supported the idea of an absolute state with unlimited power. Where as source B says "For Locke, man was a socialist animal but he accepted that disputes could arise and therefore a state with limited powers would be required to resolve these Sources A and B disagree

ENTER
NUMBER
OF
QUESTIONDO NOT
WRITE IN
THIS
MARGIN

At the start of the paper the state should have Hobbes believes in a state with unlimited power to prevent anarchy and disorder where a state believes that ~~state~~ should have limited power in order for the people to live peacefully.

Finally Source A says "Hobbes argued that the only way out of this position, would be for people to accept some dominant power to enforce peace and order as everywhere". Source B says "This then

ENTER
NUMBER
OF
QUESTIONDO NOT
WRITE IN
THIS
MARGIN

would lead to people agreeing to establish government and laws to ensure the protection of "their natural rights".
Some A and B both agree that there has to be ~~be~~ a government in place so that everyone could live safely and not in fear.

In conclusion some A and B disagree about the role of the state. With some A giving Hobbes' view that the people are

Candidate 4 evidence

ENTER NUMBER OF QUESTION		DO NOT WRITE IN THIS MARGIN
①	<p>Source A states " Hobbes compared government to a Leviathan, a dominant state created to enforce order, and his work focused on the reasons for political obligation and the basis of the states rights to rule" and source B states "Lockes work had a lot of impact on a legitimate government. He sided with the Protestant parliament against the catholic king James II in the Glorious revolution of 1688. The event reduced the power of the king and made parliament the major authority in english government." This shows that source A takes the view that the state should be the ultimate ruler and one should decide all whereas source B thinks that a parliament should</p>	

ENTER NUMBER OF QUESTION	DO NOT WRITE IN THIS MARGIN

rule so there is legitimacy in the decisions. This shows they disagree on what should rule.

Source A states "Hobbes maintained that the social contract ~~between~~ was an arrangement between only the people and not between them and their monarch" and Source B states "For Locke the social contract existed between the individual and the state as long as the state existed to protect the natural rights". This shows that Source A takes the view that the state should be formed on an agreement only among the people whereas Source B takes the view that it should

ENTER
NUMBER
OF
QUESTIONDO NOT
WRITE IN
THIS
MARGIN

be formed on an agreement between both people and the ruler. This shows they disagree.

Source A states "Locke, ~~again~~ ~~was a so~~ Hobbes argued that the only way out of this position would be for people to accept some dominant power to enforce peace and order on everyone" and source B states "For Locke, a man was a social animal but he accepted that disputes could arise and therefore a state with limited power would be required to resolve these. This shows source A thinks state should be dominant over

ENTER NUMBER OF QUESTION		DO NOT WRITE IN THIS MARGIN
	society and have a cost of	
	power and source B thinks	
	the state should only be	
	there when needed and	
	not have too much power.	
	Therefore this shows they	
	disagree.	
	Overall, sources A and B	
	largely disagree about the	
	state. Source A thinks the	
	state should have an ultimate	
	ruler whereas source B views	
	that there should be a	
	legitimate parliament. Also	
	source A thinks the people	
	should be agreement regarding	
	the state whereas source B	
	thinks the state and individuals	

Candidate 5 evidence

ENTER QUESTION NUMBER BELOW	Do not type in this shaded box	DO NOT WRITE IN THIS MARGIN
1)	<p>My first point of comparison is that Hobbes and Locke have different views on what power a state should have. Source A shows that Hobbes believed in a “absolute state with unlimited power” whereas source B shows that Locke believed that we did need a “state with limited powers”.</p> <p>My second point of comparison is that both Hobbes and Locke agree that there is source of power needed to prevent some for of conflict and to keep peace. Source A shows that Hobbes believed that without a main power there would be “no laws”, “everyone would live in constant fear” and that there would be a “war of all against all”. Source B shows that Locke has a similar view as he says without a government “disputes could arise and therefore a state with limited powers would be required to resolve these”.</p> <p>My third final point is that they have completely opposite views on human nature and why that means we need a state. Source A shows that Hobbes believed that man was “evil” so a state was needed to controll everything as he couldn’t trust man to be independent. Whereas in source B Locke believes that man is “benelovent, happy and peacfull” so a state with limited powers is all that is necessary.</p> <p>My overall conclusion is that Hobbes has a much darker view on man as he has nno trust in it at all. He believes we need controlled wheras Locke has a much more positive view on man so therefore believes a state with limited power is all that is necessary.</p>	

Candidate 6 evidence

ENTER NUMBER OF QUESTION		DO NOT WRITE IN THIS MARGIN
①	<p>From Source A, the conservative view of the state was that it should have "unlimited power" in order to impose law and order to prevent anarchy and disorder. Source B on the other hand, suggests that the liberal view of ^{the} state is that it should have "limited powers" to resolve any disputes. This means that effectively, the conservative view is that the state should be very powerful in order to settle conflict and ensure that individuals do not take the rights of others away and ultimately maintain social order, whereas the liberal view has that the state should have a minimal role, taking very limited intervention in the lives of citizens due to the liberal view that human nature is rational, thus greater trust is given to citizens.</p> <p>From Source B which states that the liberal view of the state is that individual rights are "inalienable and could never be voluntarily given up or taken away by individuals" and thus the role of as the state should be one of an "arbiter to ensure the rights of citizens could not be</p>	

ENTER NUMBER OF QUESTION	DO NOT WRITE IN THIS MARGIN

encroached by others" whereas, Source A states that the conservative view of the state is one which makes sure that people "accept some dominant power to enforce peace and order on everybody". This means that whilst conservatives see that individuals should accept all authority above them, liberals only believe that some of this power should be accepted.

Source A states that people would agree to "accept the unquestioned rule of a sovereign state" which is the conservative view of the state whereas source B states that "individuals had the right to remove and replace the system of government and laws". Therefore it is clear that conservatives believe that the state's authority and power must always be accepted whereas liberals believe that the state's power should only be accepted for as long as the life, liberty and property of its citizens are protected thus giving individuals the power to remove the power of the state.