

Candidate 1 evidence

ENTER NUMBER OF QUESTION	DO NOT WRITE IN THIS MARGIN
(2a)	<p>A constitution is a set of rules upon which the country, or political organisation runs. It may state the branches of government, and how they work as well as the rights of citizens or members. The constitution is generally regarded as the "law of the land." In the UK and USA, the constitutions are very important each in their own way, and have differences in nature and key features. However, each nation has its system which works best for them.</p>
	<p>The UK constitution is uncodified, or unwritten. It exists in a number of different written forms, for example - historical laws, judgments, and treaties. It also exists in customs and conventions, which describe the powers of government, and royal prerogatives - the powers of the monarch. Many argue the nature of the UK constitution allows it to change to meet the needs of society, and introduce new conventions. For example, referendums have developed as a new convention in the 21st century, to settle several issues - the Brexit referendum being a notable one. Therefore, the UK constitution is flexible. However, the US constitution is codified. It is one single legal document, and is inflexible. It can only be amended through a complex process which requires a majority of congress and state approval. The Supreme Court of the United States</p>

ENTER NUMBER OF QUESTION		DO NOT WRITE IN THIS MARGIN
	<p>power over legislation, even though it is all constitutional. If it is not, they will declare it so, and order it to be struck down. For example, there was dispute over what Trump was federal troops duty. FLM process in 2020 was constitutional. Critics have argued that the inflexibility of the US constitution makes society fall behind. For example, the rights to life and privacy were written for a country which was much poorer, and feared invasion - the US is no longer in that position, yet it still exists. However, supporters argue the US constitution better provides for citizens. Overall, it is clear the flexible nature of the UK constitution allows it to progress and remain relevant in society, whereas the fixed nature of the US means that society can fall behind.</p>	
	<p>Additionally, the UK constitution denotes a unitary political system. Wales, Scotland and Northern Ireland each have a devolved government subordinate to central government as Westminster. However, there is a hierarchy within this system, as the central government is able to create and take power over devolved matters. For example, the UK government overruled the gender recognition bill which was passed in Scotland earlier this year, and ordered it to not be implemented in Scotland. In Northern Ireland, regional disputes over power lead to multiple suspensions of the assembly at Stormont over a five year period. During this period, the UK</p>	

ENTER NUMBER OF QUESTION		DO NOT WRITE IN THIS MARGIN
	<p> government imposed a statute to equal marriage in Northern Ireland, one which the assembly may not have approved. In another, 185 claim that central government in the UK is able to settle disputes with devolved institutions by creating superior authority. However, the UK constitution denotes a federal political system with each state to its own government which deals with internal affairs, and federal governments in Washington D.C. to deal with foreign and external affairs. These governments work in parallel, and are cannot override the other. For example, during COVID, each state was responsible for managing their own response, with federal government limited to providing resources on request. This can lead to disputes among states competing for federal resources, as New York Governor Andrew Cuomo said requesting resources for COVID was "like being on eBay". Overall, it is clear that the UK federal system involves dual sovereignty between state and federal governments, which in the UK, central government has more power, to state of only at state of legitimacy. </p> <p> In terms of amendment, in the UK there is no single legal process of amendment. This allows for parliament to change the composition of the House of Lords by party the 1999 abolished any override from the judiciary. Supporters argue that this means the constitution will become more, as it changes </p>	

ENTER NUMBER OF QUESTION	DO NOT WRITE IN THIS MARGIN
	<p>to meet their needs. This was evident during COVID, as lockdown laws were implemented rapidly to keep us safe. However, critics argue that civil liberties can be at risk. This was evident when the UK government passed the police reform bill in 2021, which our class is protesting. The UK constitution is very hard to amend. Article V states the process for which amendments can be made. For an amendment to be approved, two-thirds of both congressional chambers, and three-quarters of states must be in support. This is how all 27 amendments were approved. Since amendments are very rare, some examples of failed amendments include equal rights for women, and imposing term limits on members of congress. Some argue that this system helped to avoid tyranny of the majority. However, critics say the complex process of amendments means many amendments which may benefit society die in congress. Overall, the UK process of amendments allows for quick changes to be implemented, which can be very beneficial to society in times of crisis, for example COVID, but may have unwanted effects like the US. Society has many potential benefits as change is so difficult under the constitution.</p> <p>Finally, the UK constitution is a hybrid parliamentary democracy. This is where the parliament has the final say on everything the government does, and can even remove the executive branches. For example, in 2022, a vote of no confidence was motioned against Prime</p>

ENTER NUMBER OF QUESTION		DO NOT WRITE IN THIS MARGIN
	<p> Minister David Johnson, which he narrowly survived by 30 votes. If he lost the vote, a new election would've been called. As a consequence, statutes passed by parliament are the most important source of the constitution, overruling any other. The UK has popular sovereignty, where the people have the final say. The constitution was written by "the people". In 2020, there was discussion around delaying the presidential election due to COVID, and whether Trump could remain in office. However, the people's constitution should be maintained. Many argue the UK president must act in the people's interests, since they have the power. This leads to Locke's theory of limited power, where the people consent to the president to act on their behalf. Overall, it is clear that parliamentary sovereignty in the UK, supported by the constitution means that politicians are bound to hold the power to run the country for the people, whereas the more popular nature of the US constitution gives people more direct power over the political process. </p>	
	<p> In conclusion, there are clear differences in forms of nature and status and functions of the UK and US constitutions. In terms of status, the US constitution is more of a document to people in their everyday lives, as they can refer to it. </p>	

ENTER NUMBER OF QUESTION		DO NOT WRITE IN THIS MARGIN
	<p>more equal whereas what takes the right they have as the winners. The great nature of the UK constitution means society can fall behind others, as it is difficult for radical changes to be made. The UK constitution is left open to the people, it can be said that society dictates their constitution, what is the UK society is dictated by the constitution. With the UK's uncodified nature, societies' needs will never stop to rest, and the people can live in a radical and progressive way. In future, it's unlikely for Conservatives to change much, as they were the foundation of what the UK and UK were built, and ultimately, each country has their own unique system which they deem to work best for them.</p>	

Candidate 2 evidence

ENTER NUMBER OF QUESTION		DO NOT WRITE IN THIS MARGIN
	<p>2b) The Executives of both the UK & US have many powers but such as power of appointment & commander in chief. But these powers also come with limits. From this essay it is clear that the President has more limits to their power than the Prime Minister.</p>	
	<p>To begin, the President of the US can be impeached for things such as high crimes and misdemeanors. For example, President Richard Nixon was impeached for his involvement in the scandal with the oval office tapes. However this attempt to impeach was unsuccessful because Nixon resigned before it could be passed. Similarly in the UK the Prime Minister can receive a vote of no confidence from their party. These, like impeachment typically result in the exec executives resignation. For example, a vote of no confidence against Theresa May was tabled in the House of Commons in January 2019. However this was unsuccessful as she won with a vote of 325 to 306. But this</p>	

ENTER NUMBER OF QUESTION		DO NOT WRITE IN THIS MARGIN
	<p>did not prevent her in resigning which she did shortly after in July 2019. This is because of vote of no confidence in the UK executive means your party no longer supports you as their leader, this makes it difficult for the Prime Minister to pass legislation and so votes of no confidence result in resignation demonstrating that this is an effective limit on their power.</p> <p>However, impeachment is less constraining to the President because no president has ever been successfully impeached. For example, Donald Trump was the third president to be impeached and the first to be impeached twice. However neither attempts were successful because the senate needs a $\frac{2}{3}$ majority which is very hard to do. Therefore this shows that impeachment is an effective limit to the role of the President however it doesn't directly limit their power because it has never been successful so suggesting this does not limit them the way a vote of no confidence do does the Prime Minister.</p>	

ENTER NUMBER OF QUESTION		DO NOT WRITE IN THIS MARGIN
	<p>Moreover, the President has the power to appoint members to their cabinet and to the supreme court. A president is said to roughly appoint 25 members during their term time (Similarly) For example Joe Biden nominated Miguel for secretary of Education in 2020. Similarly, the UK Prime minister can appoint 22 members to their cabinet during their time. For example, Rishi Sunak recently appointed Dominic Raab as vice Prime minister & Suella Braverman as Home secretary. However despite these similarities the President has clear limits on their powers to appoint. This is because any candidate they put forward must be approved by the senate. If the candidate is rejected they are forbidden from fulfilling that position. For example, George Bush senior nominated John Towers for secretary of State in 1989, but he was rejected and he remains the last candidate to be rejected by the senate. Whereas the Prime Ministers appointees do not have to be approved by anyone other than</p>	

ENTER NUMBER OF QUESTION		DO NOT WRITE IN THIS MARGIN
	<p>themselves. For example Suella Braverman resigned from Lizz Truss' cabinet after sending sensitive emails, but then one week later she (rejoined) was appointed to Rishi Sunaks cabinet. This outraged some people but others opinions do not matter because it's only the Prime Minister that can make this decision. Therefore, this shows that the US executive is more limited by the constitution with this power, whereas the UK do not have a constitution. so the Prime minister's power is not limited in regards to appointment.</p>	
	<p>The US president is named the commander in chief in the constitution and is in charge of military affairs / weapons and troops. However one is thing the President cannot control in this role is declaring war as the constitution forbids it. They also have limits on their other powers in this role such as they aren't allowed to send troops away for more than 60 days at a time. The prime minister also controls the UK's military affairs, the such</p>	

ENTER NUMBER OF QUESTION		DO NOT WRITE IN THIS MARGIN
	<p>as weapons, troops assignment & warfare.</p>	
	<p>However, even though the Prime Minister can declare war, it^{their decision} must be approved by the monarchy as "the army is vested in his majesty the King". Therefore this can be argued as a limit, but to their power, but it is very unlikely that the King would decline the Prime Minister request of war therefore it is a does not limit them. The president on the other hand is totally forbidden by the American constitution therefore it's clear the President has more limits in their role as commander in chief than the Prime Minister does.</p>	
	<p>Lastly, both the President and Prime Minister have constitutional cont constraints. The President is limited in the amount of time they serve as they are only allowed to serve a maximum of two terms in a row which equates to 8 years. For example President Obama served from 2008 all through to 2016 but could not run again in</p>	

ENTER NUMBER OF QUESTION		DO NOT WRITE IN THIS MARGIN
	<p>The 2016 election because of this limit. Whereas in the UK the Prime Minister has no limit on how long they can serve in this role. For example Margaret Thatcher was the PM for 11 years & Tony Blair served 10 years. This shows that once again the American executive is more limited compared to the UK. Moreover, the American President can only belong to only branch of government, the executive. For example, President Obama transferred from the judiciary branch to the executive after he was elected. In comparison the UK Prime Minister still remains an MP and belongs to the House of Commons after they have been elected or when they resign. For example Theresa May resigned in 2019 as PM but still remains an MP in the House of Commons in 2023. This shows that the American executive is heavily limited by the constitution whereas the UK Prime Minister is not because they do not have a constitution. Therefore it's</p>	

ENTER NUMBER OF QUESTION		DO NOT WRITE IN THIS MARGIN
	clear the President is has more constraints to their power.	
	In conclusion it's clear that the President	
	has more limits to their powers than	
	the UK prime minister does. This is	
	because their appointees must be approved	
	by the senate, they cannot declare	
	war and they can only serve 8 years	
	in office & belong to one branch of	
	government. This limits the President's powers	
	in ways that the Prime Minister is free	
	to make their own choices. So showing	
	that (the American executive) despite the	
	UK prime executive having a few limitations	
	constraints to their power. The American	
	executive's (is not) power is more constrained	
	overall.	

Candidate 3 evidence

ENTER NUMBER OF QUESTION	DO NOT WRITE IN THIS MARGIN
3a	<p>The SNP dominate ideas are Independence and to stay in the EU. The dominate ideas of the Conservatives is "Get Brexit done" and eradicating poverty. These dominate ideas from the parties had a significant impact on their electoral per performance.</p>
	<p>The SNP dominate idea is Independence, regardless of Scotland voting "No" in 2014, it still remains as a key idea. Another dominate idea of the SNP is to remain in the EU as in the Brexit election all the councils results in Scotland voted to stay in the EU. An impact of this was when Britain did leave the EU, Scotland felt let down by the government. Another impact was that in 2014 the SNP managed to secure 48 out of the 59 seats in the Scottish Parliament (45%), this showed that the dominate ideas from the SNP had a great impact on their electoral performance.</p>

ENTER NUMBER OF QUESTION	DO NOT WRITE IN THE MARGIN
<p>The Conservative dominate ideas of "Get Brexit Done" was their key idea which SNP opposed of. In the Brexit election older people were more likely to vote leave as most people are traditional and vote Conservative. Another dominate idea that the Conservatives have is eradicating poverty. The Conservatives introduced a First Home Scheme where first time buyers would get 30% discount on their first home. The Conservatives also want to build 1 million more houses. These dominate ideas had a huge impact on the electoral performance as the Conservatives continue to be the strongest party.</p>	
<p>Overall the dominate ideas of the SNP had a massive impact on their electoral performance as they nearly hold half of the percentage of the Scottish Parliament regardless of the Conservatives being opposed to the</p>	

Candidate 4 evidence

3.9	The Labour party can be broken down into two main strands - 'old' Labour, which is closer to traditional socialism and is embodied by figures like Jeremy	
-----	-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	--

ENTER NUMBER OF QUESTION	DO NOT WRITE IN THIS MARGIN
	<p>Colbyn, and 'New' Labour which is closer to neo-liberalism and is embodied by Social Democrats like Tony Blair. Each have differing views on Taxation & Economy, Defence and Education, all of which have impacted their electoral performance throughout the years, all of which will be explored in this essay.</p>
	<p>In 1983, Michael Foot's Labour party proposed in their manifesto that the top rate of tax would be increased so that "the wealthy can pay their fair share", which was expected of the Labour party at the time. This arguably contributed to Labour's terrible performance in 1983.</p>

ENTER NUMBER OF QUESTION	DO NOT WRITE IN THIS MARGIN
	<p>as Margaret Thatcher's conservative advised policies which had actually helped to elevate many working class into middle class earners, thus these earners may have been reluctant to vote for a party they felt would take all of their earnings away. This is a contrast to New Labour's approach to taxation, in 1997 New Labour were keen to distance themselves from the old, collectivist style Labour of the past and revamped their economic economic policy to reflect this. This included pledging to not increase the top rate of tax, which left many shocked as that was generally always a Labour pledge, this caused many middle class voters</p>

ENTER NUMBER OF QUESTION	DO NOT WRITE IN THIS MARGIN
	<p>to take a second look at labour, as they so felt that their income wasn't being threatened by policies of high tax. This was an ultimately successful, as in Labour's 1997 election victory, there was a massive 10.5% point swing from the CON to LAB, the showing that many Conservative votes felt that Labour could be trusted with their money and this shows that when Labour are less far left with their economic policy, they can win over votes from all parties, as they see prosperity and opportunity but moving too far to the left can ostracise the aspirational middle class and higher earners, as they victory seen white</p>

ENTER NUMBER OF QUESTION	DO NOT WRITE IN THIS MARGIN
<p>Hot off the heels of the 1982 Falklands war, MT's popularity was at an all time high, and this was the focal point of the CON 1983 manifesto. "There is no issue more important than the defence of our country" Labour, however, were campaigning for nuclear disarmament, which did not go down with the electorate well at all, as the country overall felt we needed to defend ourselves more than ever in light of events at the time. This created an image of Labour being 'soft' on the international stage they were keen to distance themselves from, which was seen in 1997 manifesto where it looks like Labour took inspiration from</p>	

ENTER NUMBER OF QUESTION	DO NOT WRITE IN THIS MARGIN
	<p>The COWS 1983 manifesto stating "Our number one priority is the defence of our nation." Political tensions in Europe were high at this time, due to the fall of the USSR and subsequent the break up of Yugoslavia, so New Labour wanted to demonstrate to the electorate that they were serious about defence, even pledging to increase spending as a % of GDP on defence to 2%. This shows that when Labour takes a harder line on defence, especially at points of international conflict, the public are more likely to put their trust in them, as seen in 1997, as people did not feel safe without the prospect of a nuclear deterrent.</p>

ENTER NUMBER OF QUESTION	DO NOT WRITE IN THE MARGIN
	<p>like MF was proposed to renew in 1983 1983.</p>
	<p>Education was not a main talking point of 'The largest suicide note in history' however it was said that it labor were to gain power, corporal punishment would be abolished, private schools would be abolished along with academic selection. This was opposed by many who felt that academic selection was a good way for academic talent to be fostered and to gain opportunities, so full abolishing it was wrong as well as parents who sent their kids to private school felt it was unfair for the state to decide if not they get to invest money in their children's education.</p>

ENTER NUMBER OF QUESTION	DO NOT WRITE IN THIS MARGIN

This arguably contributed to why in 1983 Labour did not score points with many middle class families, as they felt by Labour trying to nationalise everything, they weren't getting the chance to send their children to good schools and thus improve their prospects. Education, was a it not the main area of the 1997 manifesto. One of Tony Blair's most repeated sayings was "Education, Education, Education!" and New Labour proposed policies such as smaller class sizes and more teachers in order to convey their attitude to improving education. Crucially, they also pledged not to touch private schools, which like their tax policy, was a surprise and a move.

ENTER NUMBER OF QUESTION	DO NOT WRITE IN THIS MARGIN
<p>drastically to the center, unsees from Labour until this point. This arguably contributed to Labour's (unusual) but impressive performance in Southern England in 1997, as parents in Southern England are statistically more likely to send their children to private schools, thus they would not feel that their children's education being threatened by an incumbent Labour Govt, thereby that a more centrist view on education is electorally beneficial for Labour.</p>	
<p>In conclusion, when Labour appeal more to the center than the left, they perform better electorally. This is arguably due to the class de-alignment which took place</p>	

ENTER NUMBER OF QUESTION	DO NOT WRITE IN THIS MARGIN
	<p>in the 1980s, which saw many go from working class to middle class and as a result, the new middle class were reluctant to give their hard earned money back to the Govt. so when Labour promised to keep the tax bracket at where it was under Major's administration people felt less reluctant to vote for Labour. Labour typically being soft on defence and top labelled "hippies" because of wanting to abolish the Trident painted the CONs as the party serious about defending Britain which meant when Labour moved closer to the CON position on defence in 1997, they garnered a support</p>

