

Candidate 1 evidence

ENTER NUMBER OF QUESTION		DO NOT WRITE IN THIS MARGIN
1(b)	Direct Democracy is a form of democracy which allows voters to decide on issues directly through the use of frequent referenda and voting. This takes away the reliance of an elected representative to make these decisions leading many to feel it is the ~~the~~ purest form of democracy. With its heightened control, role in helping create political literacy, legitimacy and lack of reliance on representatives, ~~many~~ ~~there~~ it certainly has many advantages, however many argue it's lack of stability, division of labour and practicality makes it unworkable in large democracies.	
	The first argument which many have for direct democracy is that it heightens control^m and allows citizens to ^{be} directly ~~involved~~ ^{involved} in decisions that can affect their future, through frequent use of referenda. An example of this is the Swiss Cantons and their use of direct referendum, putting the power into the hands of the people. The people are also much more likely to accept decisions made by them directly, ~~and so~~ meaning an overall more satisfied population. However, many argue	

ENTER NUMBER OF QUESTION	DO NOT WRITE IN THIS MARGIN
	that in societies such as the UK, representative democracy is much more practical ~~as there~~ ^{would be} simply too many people having to vote on a regular basis on issues that may not even affect them. Electing a representative allows them to dedicate their time to voting on all kinds of issues, whilst increasing practicality. For example; Direct Democracy and frequent referenda were used in Ancient Athens, however they only had a population of around 250,000, with only 40,000 being able to vote, ~~and~~ showing just how impractical it would be in societies such as the UK with millions of people. Overall, the argument for heightened central may play out in smaller groups, though in large societies would not be practical.
	Another strong argument for direct democracy is that it creates more politically literate and aware citizens, people much more knowledgeable about the country's issues. For example, in the run up to the 2014 Scottish Independence Referendum, media and news coverage heavily focused on issues such as the economy, foreign policy etc, exposing

ENTER NUMBER OF QUESTION	DO NOT WRITE IN THIS MARGIN
	voters to political arguments and language. It is also likely that voters would do their own research before voting and reach their own conclusions, creating a more politically literate society. In contrast, many who support a representative democracy argue that a division of labour is necessary and essential, suggesting there must be a divide between the people and those who make regular decisions. Politicians work very hard and ~~make~~ ~~co~~ endure constant voting and debate, and there is ~~a~~ a high chance that if direct democracy was introduced, voter turnout would drop and many would feel fatigue. An example of this is that average turnout for local elections is at only around 60%, with some European Parliament elections being as low as 30% during Brexit, suggesting a small section of population is making the decisions. ~~Overall, this low voter turnout would~~ Overall, whilst a direct democracy might create a more politically informed society, representative democracy means regular citizens don't have to endure constant voting on decisions that may not even affect them.

ENTER NUMBER OF QUESTION	DO NOT WRITE IN THIS MARGIN
	~~Another~~ Furthermore, another argument for direct democracy is that it means there is no reliance on 'self-serving' politicians to make decisions for the people, putting power into their own hands and letting them vote in accordance with their own beliefs. Many politicians are tied down due to 'party whips' and so many only vote in line with their party and peers, often failing to reflect the views of the people. An example of politicians voting controversially was when in 2015 MPs voted to give themselves a pay rise - which many believed to be unfair as they had the chance to vote on an issue only they would see the benefits from. Direct democracy would take away this 'middle man' and let voters ~~themselves~~ vote for themselves. In contrast, many argue that ordinary people are not all as knowledgeable as politicians on some matters such as the economy, foreign policy etc, and so there is a need for experts to an extent. Theon's 'Plato' Parnachy stated that someone is needed to 'steer the ship', suggesting there must be someone higher up

ENTER NUMBER OF QUESTION	DO NOT WRITE IN THIS MARGIN
	in control, or else people may end up
	voting on issues they are not very knowledgeable about.
	For example, California referendum once seen
	the people restrict the government from solving
	financial issues, a scenario many argued to
	be dangerous as governments have a level
	of expertise that not all regular people have.
	Overall, whilst Direct takes away the reliance
	on politicians, many still argue that a representative
	is safer and more practical as it puts
	someone in control who is well-informed on
	the decisions they'll be making.
	Finally, the last argument for a direct
	democracy is that it heightens legitimacy.
	It is the purest form of democracy in action
	and allows individuals to get involved in
	decisions that may affect them. People are also
	much more likely to accept decisions made by
	themselves, as they understand they
	have been made democratically and the result
	is the true will of the people. For example,
	the 2014 Scottish Independence Referendum, 2016
	Brexit Referendum, and the vote on Scottish

ENTER NUMBER OF QUESTION	DO NOT WRITE IN THIS MARGIN
	Revolutions all gave citizens of the UK an opportunity to partake in democracy in a legitimate way, and ~~also~~ the outcome of these ~~the~~ votes gave the government a very clear mandate to act on these decisions and pursue the wishes of the people. In contrast, representative democracy ensures stability and accountability. The UK political system allows citizens to elect a government through free and fair ~~election~~ ^{election}, and vote them back out at the next election if they believe their actions to be unsatisfactory, showing fair democracy and accountability. An example of this would be the Lib Dems, who after their coalition with the Conservatives lost many seats, as people believed they hadn't accurately pursued the promises they had pledged, demonstrating the constant accountability possible in a Representative Democracy. In ~~the~~ ^{evaluation}, there are strong arguments for both: Direct and Representative Democracy. Direct Democracy heightens control, creates political discussion; takes away reliance on politicians.

ENTER NUMBER OF QUESTION	DO NOT WRITE IN THIS MARGIN
	and ensures legitimacy, and so to an extent it is very effective, however mainly in smaller societies such as Ancient Athens, and not effective in large scale societies such as the UK. Representative democracy is the more practical, more stable form of democracy for large populations, ensuring accountability.
2a)	The passage of legislation in both the UK and the US has many similarities. Both systems involve the bill moving sequentially through many stages, from when introduced to reaching upper chambers and committee stage. Both systems involve executive influence, and influence of the Head of State, though there are a few slight differences. Overall, both systems are very similar.
	One great similarity between the UK and the US is that legislators can introduce bills. In the UK, MPs can introduce 'private members bills' and in the US, all formal legislation is

ENTER NUMBER OF QUESTION		DO NOT WRITE IN THIS MARGIN
	introduced by senators and representatives. An example was when MP Chris Bryant introduced the Assault on Emergency Workers Act, which later passed. ~~as it is the UK~~. In the USA, if the governing party has a majority, it is very easy for legislation to pass. For example, Tony Blair sat in office from 1997-2007 and was able to pass his entire legislative programme due to his large majority. Showing ~~that~~ that more popular parties are rewarded with easier introduction and passage. In the US, due to the separation of powers, the POTUS can't actually introduce bills and instead must rely on a senator or representative to do so. For example, Obama's renowned scheme 'Obamacare' was actually introduced by representatives. Overall, the introduction of a bill in the UK is very similar to the introduction in the US, as legislators can introduce bills, and in both countries a parliamentary majority greatly assists with the introduction of bills, however the only slight difference is that the ^{POTUS} ~~executive~~ cannot ~~introduce~~ ^{introduce} bills.	

ENTER NUMBER OF QUESTION	DO NOT WRITE IN THIS MARGIN
	Furthermore, the next key similarity is the role of the ~~upper chamber~~ ~~House of~~ <del> Lords</del> House of Lords in the UK and ~~the~~ congress checks and balances in the USA in scrutinising a bill. In the UK, once ~~a~~ legislation passes through the commons, it must go to the House of Lords to be checked and scrutinised, where they can also propose any amendments. For example, the 2024 Safety of Rwanda Act ~~being passed~~ between the two houses as the Lords continuously proposed amendment. However, the House of Lords only have the ability to delay legislation for up to a year, and the Commons can reject proposals as they are the more powerful chamber, and so it is much easier for legislation to pass through the UK. In the USA, both chambers of government, the House of Reps + the Senate have equal legislative powers due to the separation of powers, and both look at legislation simultaneously. They both have the ability to 'kill' the bill when it reaches committee stage, meaning it will progress no further.

ENTER NUMBER OF QUESTION		DO NOT WRITE IN THIS MARGIN
	~~However~~ If the opposing party ~~the~~ controls one of these chambers, it can also be especially difficult to pass legislation. For example, in 2018 the Democrats controlled the House and heavily scrutinised much of the legislation passed through. Overall, whilst both systems are similar, the checks + ~~the~~ scrutiny of legislation in the USA is much more intense, meaning legislation is especially hard to pass.	
	In the UK, the executive plays a big role in the passage of legislation as they can introduce legislation, and easily pass programmes with large majorities. Parties in the UK also have 'party whips', and so ~~the~~ MPs must vote in accordance with party views ~~and~~ otherwise they can 'lose the whip'. For example, Boris Johnson lost nearly 30 MPs in 2019 after they voted against Brexit. However, typically party whips make legislation easy to pass for the executive as they are assured that MPs will vote in their favour. In the US,	

ENTER NUMBER OF QUESTION	DO NOT WRITE IN THIS MARGIN
	POTUS has much less role in the passage of a bill, however relies on Reps and Senators to put forward and amend bills for them. Close allies such as the Vice President also sit in the Senate and so it can be easy for them to influence legislation. Similarly to the UK, party control greatly affects how easy passage of a bill is. Overall, both systems ~~there~~ are different when it comes to executive influence as the PM sits in parliament unlike the POTUS and has much greater say.
	The final ~~stage~~ ^{stage} in the passage of legislation is the role of the Head of State. In the UK, bills must be granted Royal Assent by the monarch before they can be enforced. However, these days Royal Assent is seen as being more symbolic than a genuine stage, as it has not been ~~refused~~ refused since 1707, making it almost guaranteed. In contrast in the US the President is the Head of State and does play an active role in the final stage of legislation passage,

ENTER NUMBER OF QUESTION	DO NOT WRITE IN THIS MARGIN
3/a)	The dominant ideologies of a political party can have a major effect on their electoral performance. Today we will compare Margaret Thatcher and Tony Blair, and how their ideologies affected their political performance.
	One dominant idea of Thatcher's was her belief in a unitary state and that the UK should be governed by the one government, however this was not always her stance. Leading up to the 1979 election, Thatcher openly supported Scottish Devolution and the Scottish people's right to self determination, ~~however~~ she had a belief that reassured many Scots and made some interested in the Conservative Party. However when elected, she did nothing to bring this about and in the Perth Town Hall in 1988, Thatcher stated that she was openly against devolution, which led to a full-scale Tory downfall in Scotland, and the Scottish people feeling misrepresented. ~~After~~ after the 1987 elections, Conservatives had lost all Scottish seats, suggesting the negative impact this dominant idea

ENTER NUMBER OF QUESTION		DO NOT WRITE IN THIS MARGIN
	had on their electoral performance. Tony Blair's 'New Labour' promised change, and promised - a Scottish referendum ~~to~~ to vote on devolution. Labour won a landslide victory in 1997, fully defeating the Conservatives, and soon after, they delivered a referendum. This suggests that their openness to constitutional reform heavily appealed to Scots, and led to electoral success. Overall, this shows that the Conservative Dominant Idea on constitutional arrangements ~~for~~ actually led to electoral defeat, whereas Labour capitalised and gained success.	
	Another dominant idea of Thatcher ~~is~~ was her strong foreign policy and tough international reputation. After fighting back in the Falklands War, she gained international recognition for being a strong leader, and her large victory led to major electoral success, in elections for years to come, with her reign lasting 11 years. This shows her hard foreign policy greatly assisted with ~~her~~ electoral results as it reassured many Britons,	

Candidate 2 evidence

ENTER NUMBER OF QUESTION		DO NOT WRITE IN THIS MARGIN
1	b) Democracy is said to be 'rule of the people', as the citizens of a country are the ones participating towards the decisions. There are two types of Democracy - representative and direct. Representative democracy is where citizens choose the politicians that make decisions for them and direct is where the citizens vote on those decisions and proposals themselves. This essay will argue that representative democracy is more effective than direct democracy. ^{factor} One benefit of direct democracy is that it heightens the control of the citizens. This is because citizens	

ENTER NUMBER OF QUESTION		DO NOT WRITE IN THIS MARGIN
	and they are already influenced	
	by politicians. This shows	
	how a direct democracy can	
	lead to less turnout meaning	
	the results won't accurately	
	reflect a country's views.	
	However a ^{factor} benefit of	
	representative democracy is that it	
	is more practical. It is more	
	reasonable and practical to	
	ask citizens to turnout every	
	50 years. In the UK general	
	elections are held every 5	
	years. It is more practical	
	for citizens to turnout for	
	these and pick a representative	
	rather than voting all the	
	time. For example ~~a~~ issues	
	such as education are more	
	likely to impact teachers	
	and families, rather than	
	the likes of a pensioner, so	
	it is more practical to	
	have someone making decisions	

ENTER NUMBER OF QUESTION		DO NOT WRITE IN THIS MARGIN
	rather than asking everyone to	
	vote on issues that may not	
	even impact them.	
	This shows that representative	
	democracy is more beneficial	
	and practical as it also	
	saves time as votes do not	
	need to be counted regularly.	
	Proves it is more efficient for	
	a country.	
	Overall, this shows that	
	representative democracy is	
	better as it is clearly ~~and~~ more	
	effective for citizens to	
	pick a rep they feel will	
	vote the way they would	
	rather than consistently	
	turning up for issues that	
	may not impact them.	
	Another ~~benefit~~ factor of	
	direct democracy is that	
	it increases political	
	literacy. If citizens are voting	

ENTER NUMBER OF QUESTION		DO NOT WRITE IN THIS MARGIN
	regularly then they will	
	develop a wide and deep	
	understanding of politics.	
	therefore increasing political	
	literacy. This is good as it	
	means citizens will make	
	informed decisions therefore	
	being effective towards a	
	country. However, many	
	have argued that the	
	Brexit results in 2016	
	were skewed due to voter	
	ignorance and many not	
	researching the issue. This	
	shows that with a	
	direct democracy it can lead to	
	inaccurate results as voters	
	may not care or bother to	
	look into issues.	
	A feature of representative	
	democracy is that it ~~is~~	
	increases participation.	
	With general elections every	
	5 years in the UK, it	

ENTER NUMBER OF QUESTION		DO NOT WRITE IN THIS MARGIN
	is that it reduces the number of corrupt politicians. This means that politicians cannot solely run for just power as the power is with the people. A study showed that in the 1992 Maastricht Treaty on Denmark's position in the EU, showed that the Danish people knew more about the issue than politicians. This shows that a direct democracy is ~~valued~~ as ~~it clearly~~ is beneficial as it clearly gives power ~~and~~ to the people rather than solely one politicians which could lead to radical decisions being made not in favour of the people. A feature of representative democracy is that elected officials tend to have more knowledge & many MP's	

ENTER NUMBER OF QUESTION		DO NOT WRITE IN THIS MARGIN
	have backgrounds in law,	
	economics or politics degrees.	
	PM Keir Starmer was formerly	
	a human rights barrister.	
	This is important as it shows	
	that the people making	
	decisions are informed and	
	clearly know what they are	
	doing. MPs also sit on	
	committees if they have	
	specialised knowledge therefore	
	effective decisions can be	
	made. Overall this shows that	
	representative democracy is	
	more effective as it means	
	that those in charge usually	
	have a specialised background	
	and they are able to make	
	informed decisions on behalf	
	of a country.	
	A feature of direct democracy	
	is that it offers more	
	legitimacy. As the people	

ENTER NUMBER OF QUESTION		DO NOT WRITE IN THIS MARGIN
	are voting for it, it gives	
	~~are~~ a clear accurate and	
	legitimate result. For example,	
	in 1979 there was	
	a referendum on Scottish	
	devolution, proposed by	
	the Labour government.	
	The Conservatives were	
	strongly opposed to this	
	and it can be argued	
	that if this was a vote	
	in parliament it would have	
	gone through with a Labour	
	majority. This shows that	
	direct democracy is effective	
	as it gives a clear result	
	of what the people want.	
	eg the Scottish voted for	
	this rather than a	
	smaller group of MP's.	
	one feature of representative	
	democracy is that it is	
	more stable. MP's must	
	work together to ensure	

ENTER NUMBER OF QUESTION		DO NOT WRITE IN THIS MARGIN
	What they said.	
	In conclusion, representative	
	democracy is more effective	
	than direct democracy	
	Representative democracy is	
	more practical as far	
	citizens as they pick a	
	representative they feel they	
	share views with.	
	Representative is more better	
	for participation as	
	citizens only turnout every	
	few years.	
	Representative is better as	
	elected officials tend to	
	have more knowledge.	
	Representative offers more	
	stability and accountability.	

ENTER NUMBER OF QUESTION	DO NOT WRITE IN THIS MARGIN
2 b1	

ENTER NUMBER OF QUESTION		DO NOT WRITE IN THIS MARGIN
	pass policy easily. This is	
	good as it means that	
	the executive clearly has	
	the power to create policy	
	and pass it through easily.	
	Commons are also able to	
	override decisions made by	
	the lords, proving that	
	the PM clearly has the	
	power to create and pass	
	policy.	
	In the USA the president	
	does not sit in chamber.	
	Congress is made up of the	
	Senate and the House of	
	Representatives, the president	
	does not sit in any.	
	Any laws or bills will	
	have to pass through	
	Congress first to become	
	a law. Obama had a	
	Republican majority	
	Congress therefore they	
	were opposed to some of	

ENTER NUMBER OF QUESTION		DO NOT WRITE IN THIS MARGIN
	his proposals such as immigration and healthcare. This shows that it is not as easy for the president to pass bills and laws through as easily due to their political system having Congress separate from the executive, meaning that without majorities it is difficult to pass policy effectively.	
	Overall, this shows that the UK has more flexibility and effectiveness for policy making whereas it is more difficult for the executive in the USA to make policy.	
	The second factor I will discuss is formal and informal powers. In the UK the PM has the royal prerogative which means they can pass laws without a vote, this is usually done for issues like foreign	

ENTER NUMBER OF QUESTION		DO NOT WRITE IN THIS MARGIN
	affairs, military action and cabinet appointments.	
	This shows that the UK executive can clearly make decision quick policy without parliament's approval. They also have patronage powers. They are able to For example in 2022 Boris Johnson reshuffled his cabinet after covid scandals and MP's not members not voting in line. This is good as it means that the PM can easily pick and choose who they want who will give them the best result for when making policy. The PM also has a use of advisors available to help them. Important as it helps create the best quality policy. In the USA the	

ENTER NUMBER OF QUESTION		DO NOT WRITE IN THIS MARGIN
	President has different powers.	
	The president is able to	
	appoint supreme court judges,	
	ambassadors and cabinet.	
	For example, Trump has	
	appointed supreme court	
	judges such as Amy Coney	
	-Barnett whom has	
	Republican views, therefore would	
	vote that way if there was	
	any supreme court issues.	
	This is important as it means	
	the president is able to use	
	this power to their	
	advantage to get votes in	
	their way. When on policy	
	The president also has the	
	power of the veto which	
	means they can block	
	any laws that they do not	
	agree with.	
	This shows that the	
	president does have power	
	to some extent as they	

ENTER NUMBER OF QUESTION		DO NOT WRITE IN THIS MARGIN
	are able to override laws they do not agree with.	
	Overall this shows that both executives have a similar level of power, when it comes to policy the ~~UK~~ is more ~~ext~~ they have a similar level of power ~~and~~ as they can both scrap laws easily and pick who they want to be in government.	
	The third factor I will discuss is party leader. In the UK the PM is the party leader and with a majority they are head of government in 2024, Labour had 412 seats making Keir Starmer the clear PM, and in 2019 the Conservatives got 369 seats	

ENTER NUMBER OF QUESTION	DO NOT WRITE IN THIS MARGIN
	making Boris Johnson PM.
	This is important as
	~~the~~ as the executive they
	are setting out policy and
	with the clear majority
	they are able to effectively
	pass anything with a large
	majority behind them. The
	PM also has the party whip
	power. This means that
	~~with~~ they can put this
	whip on anyone that votes
	out of line with the
	party. This is important
	as it means the PM
	can impose this on any
	MP in the party that
	votes out of line; therefore
	making passing policy
	more effective
	~~The~~ In the USA however
	the president is not
	a leader for congress.
	They do not sit in

ENTER NUMBER OF QUESTION		DO NOT WRITE IN THIS MARGIN
	therefore cannot debate or	
	vote on policy.	
	The president can however	
	bring in 'emergency' ~~leg~~	
	legislation without a	
	vote. Joe Biden done	
	this throughout his term	
	on issues such as	
	student debt and the	
	climate crisis.	
	This is overall important	
	as it means that the	
	president can pass any	
	policy effectively. However	
	checks are run with	
	checks and balances and	
	anything deemed	
	unconstitutional will go	
	to the supreme court	
	overrule this shows that	
	the UK is more effective	
	as the PM actually	
	sits in parliament	
	and can debate and	

ENTER NUMBER OF QUESTION		DO NOT WRITE IN THIS MARGIN
3	a) Dominant ideas of labour party.	
	In 1983 Michael Foot was labour leader.	
	The manifesto was 'old labour' and seen as a socialist manifesto; it was very economically left. It was deemed ~~are~~ a manifesto like a 'suicide note'.	
	Labour suffered an extreme election defeat losing near 60 seats. It can be argued here that Thatcher had already been seen as a 'strong' leader, winning the Falklands war and the right to buy. Overall this shows that 'old labour' ideas did not contribute well to	

ENTER NUMBER OF QUESTION		DO NOT WRITE IN THIS MARGIN
	election success and caused	
	significant loss and	
	defeat in the 1983 GE.	
	In 1997 Tony Blair was	
	leader. They created 'new	
	labour' which moved	
	away from high taxes and	
	moved toward the middle	
	ground of politics.	
	Labour were extremely	
	successful gaining 418	
	seats in the 1997	
	general election.	
	This shows that 'new	
	labour' dominant ideas	
	were key to their electoral	
	success in 1997.	
	However it can be	
	argued that people were	
	sick of 18 years of	
	Tory rule so voted labour.	
	Overall, ~~it~~ this	
	shows that with	

ENTER NUMBER OF QUESTION		DO NOT WRITE IN THIS MARGIN
	100 seats. This shows that the 'old labour' ideas did not do well electorally in ~~the~~ 2019, proving that the dominant ideas of old labour did not lead to any success. It can also be said that Corbyn was unpopular with the media and against Johnson, who had a charismatic campaign. Overall, this shows that old labour ideas did not contribute to electoral success in 2019.	
	In 2024 Sir Starmer was leader and wanted change for labour. Labour moved back to the middle ground and policies focused on cost of living for all and	

ENTER NUMBER OF QUESTION		DO NOT WRITE IN THIS MARGIN
	fixing the economy.	
	Labour won ~~41~~ 412	
	seats in the 2024	
	election, proving that	
	moving back to the	
	centre middle ground	
	they gained electoral	
	success.	
	However, this was seen	
	as a 'change' election	
	and it can be	
	argued people voted	
	Labour to get the Tories out.	
	Overall, this shows that	
	Labour were more	
	successful when they	
	have centrist	
	ideologies of 'New Labour'	
	as they can keep their	
	working class support	
	and also gain	
	middle class support.	

[illegible]

Candidate 3 evidence

Q1a

Power, authority and legitimacy are all fundamental concepts in 21st century. Everyone has differing opinions on each one however what is widely agreed is that they all work harmoniously together. That in a sense they almost empower each other into being even greater, and even more effective. In this essay we will look at power, authority and legitimacy through the work of Max Weber and Steven Lukes. For background knowledge on the pair, Weber was a sociologist and political theorist born in Germany in the 1860s. Lukes was an Oxford graduate who was also a political theorist.

Lukes believed that power could be broken down in 3 'faces', suggesting that there are 3 different types of power one can have. The first face he speaks on is the 'open' face. This face is often referred to as decision making power throughout Lukes' book. It is very transparent as people can clearly see who has the power, and what they are doing with their power. An example of this could be the smoking ban legislation in 2006, which was a ban made to make smoking illegal in public places in Scotland. This was not done by the Scottish people however it was done in their best interest. The second face Lukes speaks on is the 'secretive' face. This face is very different to the open face as it is not transparent. This face is also not very democratic as it usually where one person holds most of the power. An example of this could be when Thatcher was prime minister she was strongly opposed to the Scottish Devolution so she chose to avoid talking on the subject as she has the power to do so. A danger to this power is that the person in power sets the agenda making them able to avoid talking about things, meaning people can feel unheard and rebel against the person who is in power, causing many issues as this threatens their authority. Finally the last face Lukes speaks on is the 'manipulating' or 'desires' face. This face is the most dangerous of all. This is because it can cause people to do things that are not in their best interest. An example of this type of power being used could be in 2003 when Tony Blair was prime minister, he made accusations that there was very strong evidence that Iraq had nuclear weapons they were ready to use on the UK. However this was all found out to be a lie made up to justify the invasion of Iraq. Understandably so the public were outraged when they found out their prime minister had abused his power in order to gain public confidence. Showing that yes this power can be very effective if used secretly, however if/when people are found out to be using it there can be serious backlash. This would put a really large dent on that person's legitimacy. Overall all 3 faces are very much still in use throughout 21st century politics, however more and more now we are seeing the third face being used. A reason for this may be because of the rise of social media platforms, which is making executing this face a lot easier, through spreading misinformation. An example of this could be Reform UK using inflated statistics in their online campaigning to scare people into siding with their party beliefs. This face of power has worked effectively for them though as we have seen Reform

really grow in the last few years, a party which has been one of the most effective at doing this in the 21st century.

Weber believed that if done right power can become authority. He believed that there are 3 types of authority; charismatic, traditional and legal-rational. The first type charismatic is where people consent to being ruled by people with 'special-human' qualities. This type very rarely ever passed down it is usually earned through popularity. An very recent example of someone with this type of authority could be Zohran Mamdani, the now mayor of New York. Mamdani was very loved by the people of New York due to people finding him relatable and charming, of course him bringing new socialist policies to the state was attractive however people like him because he was seen as a man of the people. His type of authority would unlikely be passed down onto his children as his authority lies mainly in himself. However the next type traditional is unlike charismatic in that sense. Traditional authority typically passed down through generations and very rarely ever earned. Think of the British Monarchy for example, Charles did not need to 'win' his reign it was simply passed down to him. An example of someone with this type of authority could be Kim Jong Un, the current leader of North Korea. His authority over his subjects was passed down to him through his father he did not require to work for it. The same will happen to his daughter she will just be given her title. The type of authority is usually well accepted due to long-standing tradition. However a danger to this type is that if people do not agree with who has the authority they may rebel against it, meaning the government may have very little control over their citizens. Finally the last type of authority Weber speaks on is legal-rational. This type of authority is generally very well respected by citizens as it is granted by laws, rules and procedures made by the population. An example of someone with this type could be John Swinney, the first minister of Scotland. He earned this authority not through charm or legacy but through a fair process. This type in a sense can be passed down from leader-to-leader. However it is not passed down through family. When the time comes that Swinney will no longer be the first minister, someone else will be able to win the authority he once had through a fair process. This type of authority sees little-to-no rebelling as people are the ones that granted this person their authority. Overall all types of authority are effective as they all work best for different things in 21st century politics. The type of authority we are seeing more and more is charismatic. This could be because the world is in a place where people are fighting for their liberties and self governance, and charismatic authority allows the people to feel heard whilst also giving the person in authority the space to do what needs done.

Finally legitimacy. Weber believed if done right authority can become legitimacy, he defined legitimacy as 'the right to rule'. For one to have legitimacy they must have authority. If a government was not legitimate it would eventually collapse. A government needs legitimacy for things to run smoothly so that people will obey to the authority. If a

government makes decisions through a non-democratic process but is still accepted by their citizens, their authority can still be seen as legitimate. Weber looks at how legitimacy is perceived whereas Lukes looks at how it can be manufactured. Through the third face of power 'manipulating desires', power can become legitimate if the public have their trust in that person, this can be referred to as 'artificial legitimacy'. Legitimacy can be used against the public to help them support whatever cause they want them to support. An example of this could be in May of 2025 when Pakistan and India were in a conflict. The Indian government, a source seen as legitimate, used their legitimacy to have the public agree with whatever they put up. They flooded the media with fake news articles in order to scare them into siding with them. Overall legitimacy in the 21st century can be described as the glue that connects power to authority, this suggests that if someone has authority but no legitimacy then they have no power. However if someone has legitimacy and authority then they have power. Legitimacy being the right to rule is what allows, authority to be executed, because if someone in the 21st century has authority without legitimacy it is futile as it cannot be used.

To come to an overall conclusion for this essay, power, authority and legitimacy do all continue to be relevant in 21st century politics. We can see this through Lukes faces of power where different types of power work well for different things. For example the manipulating desires face works well in gaining public interest into certain things whether it's for their own good or bad. As we spoke earlier about how the rise of social media has actually empowered this type of power into becoming far easier for anyone to use, through the use of things such as fake news into scaring people to vote for a specific party. Then we looked at all 3 types of authority, and how some are easily accepted and obey, and how others are rebelled against. In the 21st century especially we see traditional and legal-rational authority being undermined time and time again, as people now through the use of social media have access to even more information than ever before, making them question who has the power over them. Overall as proven in this essay power, authority and legitimacy do all still remain relevant on how our 21st century politics runs.

Q2a

The UK and US passage of legislation do have similarities, yet some major differences. The prime minister in the UK holds more power than the president in the USA when it comes to creating bills. In the UK there are several different stages into getting a bill passed it must go through several readings in parliament, it must hear the opinions from advisors, it passed be checked by the monarch before it can be made. The prime minister also has the power to put forward a bill. In the UK also usually the prime minister has a majority meaning their own party will usually vote in favour of their bill. However there has

been cases like for example Gordon Brown where this was not the case. Meaning it is straight forward for prime ministers in the UK to get a bill they want passed.

However in the USA it is far more complicated than that. The president has no power in congress, he does have to power to recommend bills to people in his party. However those people are in no obligation to actually recommend the bill. Far fewer bills in the USA get passed than in the UK. We can see with Obama and the bill named after him showing that the president still does have some influence over bill making.

Q3b

Media strategies.

Throughout history not just political parties but any sort of group that wants to gain people's interest has shown things off that they hope will make people like them. In the last 100 or so years we have seen political parties get more and more creative with their media strategies that they are using. In this essay we will evaluate older media strategies, for example political broadcasts and newspapers; and much a much newer strategy social media.

One of the oldest and most traditional forms of campaigning has got to be party political broadcasts. This is where parties get to share their manifesto with the public whilst also criticising other parties. It is usually presented in a fast-paced engaging videos where the leader of the party will not show what the parties goals are but also what they are already doing to achieve those goals. This works very effectively as the public are not just having words thrown at them and being overloaded with facts and figures they get to visually see what is being for them. This makes it very attractive to the parties, it was reported that parties spend millions and upon millions each year just on these broadcasts. However as much as the broadcasts are attractive to the parties they are not very attractive to be people. A survey by Ipsos-Mori found that 74% of those surveyed claimed that they would rather pay household bills than watch one of the broadcasts. This suggests that yes the strategy in theory should be extremely effective however in reality it may not be as effective as it seems as people do not like watching them after the parties spend millions on them. Overall party political broadcasts are very informative and do reach many people, however people are not actually sitting and watching the broadcasts enjoying what they are hearing, so it essentially defeats the entire purpose. However as much as people do not enjoy watching the broadcasts they are a very effective way of having people understand the parties values.

Another traditional form of media, arguably even more traditional than the broadcasts are newspapers. Newspapers are obviously not only used for political campaigning however a lot of what they put out is political. Although newspaper circulation has significantly decreased in the last few years, people are still reading what they put out. This is because due to the rise

of social media newspapers outlets have had no choice but to start publishing through social media. They do this through the use of 'click-bait' headlines, this does work very effectively though as people are inclined to click on the article to find out about what it is talking about. Despite the decrease of circulation newspapers are still highly relevant, the papers create point of interest and talking points for TV programs such as BBC news to talk about on their show. So as much as people may not be reading the physically copies they still have a lot of influence within politics. An example of their influence could be the fact that typically whoever the papers try and push out the public tend to win the next election. An extract from a quote Rupert Murdoch (owner of the Sun and various other very influential newspapers), effectively sums up the influence the newspapers have, "I go to Downing Street...and they do what I say". This quote suggests that the newspapers play a vital role in shaping our government. We can also see an example of their influence in the fact that historically the newspapers always pushed out the Conservative party as they aligned with their the wealthies priorities of low taxation. However in 2024 there was a switch up the papers actually became more Labour-aligned, we saw this after they referred to the conservative party, "become exhausted" and "disorganised". This was a turning point in newspaper history. A study found that many people of the older generation claim that they believe the news papers unbiased and merely informative, this further suggest that the media's influence can actually be hidden in plain sight. Overall newspapers do shape do shape people's views and opinions on political parties during election campaigns, through their sheer power and influence they have over the UK public. However the newspapers do not always have all the influence an example of this could be the papers moving away from SNP in the last few years, yet the SNP still winning the majority of votes in many areas across Scotland. Newspapers keep finding and probably will continue finding new ways to stay relevant in politics and election campaigns.

Finally the last type of media strategy this essay will cover is social media. Social media is the newest of the 3 strategies this essay speaks about. With the recent rise of various social media platforms like TikTok and Twitter parties have been left with little-to-no choice but to begin to use social media to connect with younger voters. This is done through the use of short snappy videos that quickly gain a young person's interest. Yes, this strategy can work on older people with the use of platforms like Facebook, however for older people other strategies like newspapers have been found more effective. A bad side to the rise of social media especially for the parties themselves is that anyone can produce misinformation about the parties and publish it for the entire world to see. So parties now have this to deal with when campaigning. In 2024 it was reported that Labour spent £2.4 million solely on social media campaigning, showing that parties are really buying into this strategy. However as much as yes the videos and posts are being published the people who are seeing the parties videos are likely people who are already planning on voting for that party meaning it's not really bring in new voters. Making the strategy become what some

would call an 'echo-chamber', suggesting that the parties are not reaching a wider audience. Overall this strategy can be effective for political parties during campaigns as nowadays people constantly have phones as various other devices surrounding them at all times, meaning they will constantly be seeing parties' campaigns. This is a good thing for parties as they know that their stuff is being pushed out to the wider public, however it can also feel annoying to people who have little-to-no interest in politics as they are constantly being bombarded by information they do not wish to hear. In this current world state, it seems all parties must be doing at least something with social media.

Overall, all media strategies evaluated in this essay help to influence people's thoughts and beliefs in some way during political campaigns. It is not hard to believe that these strategies will all remain relevant for the next 10 years, as the strategies are quickly adapting to the world around it.

Candidate 4 evidence

ENTER QUESTION NUMBER BELOW	Do not type in this shaded box	DO NOT WRITE IN THIS MARGIN
	1b) There are two main forms of democracy, representative democracy and direct democracy. This essay will argue that direct democracy is more effective than representative democracy. Direct democracy is a true form of democracy as the people have control. It is a true form of democracy as every citizen has the right to vote for their own destiny and everyone has a voice. There is no distinction between government and people as the government has no more power democratically than the people. An example of direct democracy is the EU referendum of 2016 where 72% of brits turned out to vote in an election that would have serious consequences on the British economy. This highlights that direct democracy is giving people control as ultimately it is up to the citizens to make major decisions for themselves rather than for a minority of politicians who make decisions. However, direct democracy may lead to there being a tyranny of the majority. This means that in an election like the EU referendum where the vote was 48% to stay and 52% to leave, a huge proportion of society did not get what they voted for. This means that people are not having their voice heard as due to a couple thousand votes for the majority they miss out on getting their choice. This is a negative as many people feel as though there is no point in voting as they don't ever get what they want which could lead to voter apathy. Direct democracy is also good as it increases political involvement and political literacy. Due to the fact that people can vote on big issues that affect them, many citizens choose to watch party broadcasts, debates and read manifestos as there is excitement in the country. Many see themselves as being part of something bigger as their vote actually makes a change to the way that society is run. For example, in the 2014 scottish independence referendum, the number of people registering to vote reached an all time high with 97% registering as they wanted to vote on the future of Scotland. Additionally this excitement was the cause of the highest voter turnout in any British election with 85% of people voting on that day in 2014. School students also become more politically literate as the younger generation had the opportunity to go to the SSE Hydro in order to ask questions about independence which made our younger generations, who, typically did not vote, have a desire to become involved with politics. Furthermore, every single Scottish party witnessed a rise in their memberships at the time of the referendum and the SNP, saw a huge rise with 1 in 50 Scots being a member at the time. This highlights that Direct democracy does increase voter participation and literacy as people began to become involved in politics. However, what has to be argued is that people eventually tire from constant elections. If there are elections on small issues every day, people will not be inclined to vote as they simply cannot be bothered as they lose interest. This is shown by the fact that in the general elections, typically, the average turnout is around 65%, compare this to in the local council elections and we see this number dwindle to just 50%. This highlights that people do not vote on things that they do not care about as they get tired of seeing party broadcasts and they are tired of debates etc. Representative democracy is needed to take care of the day job as ultimately it is difficult to keep the population interested for every decision made. Winston Churchill stated that "the best argument against democracy is to spend five minutes with the average voter". This shows that the Direct democracy is not effective as the people who are voting cannot understand how vital their vote is and that the people don't understand what the elections are and how important they are.	

ENTER QUESTION NUMBER BELOW	Do not type in this shaded box	DO NOT WRITE IN THIS MARGIN
	Representative democracy is good as it is experts who make the decisions. Representative democracy is another form of democracy where people are elected and then make choices on behalf of the population. These people that I am referring to are MPs, who are elected by the people of the local constituency who the MP will represent in parliament. MPs are typically referred to as experts as they have a good understanding of the way that politics works and how they can get things done for their constituents. People argue that this system works as the decisions are made by the experts and they are smarter than the general public. Political theorist Plato said that the "state is like a ship and it needs a captain to steer it", what he means by this is that the state needs experts who know what they are doing to make crucial decisions on behalf of the country. In the UK, these experts are also in the house of lords and this is the clearest form of representative democracy as these members are selected due to their expertise in business or science etc. However, what has to be argued is that direct democracy stops the need to rely on self serving politicians. Over 45% of Brits do not believe that a politician would put country over party. In recent weeks we have found that Nigel Farage, the MP for Clacton and the most likely candidate for PM had claimed a 5 million pound donation from a crypto currency guru from Asia. This is alarming as in the same time period Mr Farage had been calling for people to invest in crypto currency. This highlights that these experts may not be trustworthy as many are simply in it for their own self interests, and ultimately do not care about the general population. They use their position in order to be powerful. Additionally, in 2020, when COVID was at its peak, the government, whilst we were in lockdown, hosted a cheese and wine party at Downing Street. This also highlights that the government is not trustworthy as they were partying and breaching their own regulations whilst the rest of the public could end up in prison for doing the same thing. Therefore, it is clear that representative democracy is not good as self serving politicians care about themselves before the citizens of the country. It can be argued that it is good as it is practical. In the UK, there are over 50million people who can vote and there are 650 MPs, that equals around 1 MP per 92,000. Without representative democracy it would be impossible for the country to be run as it would be difficult for the government to count up all the votes. In conclusion it is evident that direct democracy is more efficient than representative democracy. Due to the fact that the people have control of what happens in the country, the responsibility falls on the people rather than the government as it is a true form of democracy as they determine their future. If the people have control, then they make the decisions for themselves as we have witnessed the government implement legislation that does not align with the interests of the British people. Additionally, it is more efficient as you have a smarter society politically. Due to the fact that people can vote on major issues people will actually research what they are voting for and the people understand what is good for the country and what would be bad for the country as they have the knowledge to understand how the political establishment works. Therefore it is more efficient. Although representative democracy is effective in the fact that it is experts making the decisions for the country, direct democracy is more effective as it eliminates corruption as there are no self-serving politicians who care about themselves and it is left to the people to make decisions who will vote for what is best for the country.	

ENTER QUESTION NUMBER BELOW	Do not type in this shaded box	DO NOT WRITE IN THIS MARGIN
	2b) In the USA, the president is the executive whereas in the UK the Prime Minister is the executive. This essay will look at who out of the two is more effective in making policy. Fiscal powers relate to the power that the executive has over the financial state of the country. In the UK the prime minister and the chancellor create what is known as the budget. The budget is simply a plan for the country over the next financial year and it discusses interest rates, govt spending etc. The key thing about the UK is that the budget is not voted on. Although it can be debated in parliament and scrutinised, what is laid out by the chancellor is all down to the PM and the chancellor. The cabinet of the government does not even have a say on this. This is very important for the PM for making policy as it is easy for the PM to implement their manifesto as it cannot be altered by other parties. For example, in 2023, the Prime Minister at the time Liz Truss and her chancellor introduced a mini-budget and this proposed £45bn of unfunded tax cuts which is still having a huge impact on the economy today as it caused a mini recession in the country. This shows that the PM is powerful as Liz Truss majorly impacted the economy and despite the controversy of the budget, there was nothing that parliament could do about it. However, in the USA, the president also has to lay out what is known as a budget and the key difference is, is that it has to be voted on and there has to be a cross-party agreement on the budget. If the budget is not agreed upon, then the government enters a shutdown in which all federal funding stops and members of the government stop getting paid which causes major disruptions to flights etc. The last govt shutdown was last year and it lasted for 43 days (the longest ever shutdown). This was due to healthcare schemes that made healthcare cheaper for many Americans. Additionally in the UK, the PM is effective at making policy as they have a greater control over their party. In the UK, the Prime minister is originally voted in as party leader as the wider party likes their policy and views them well. In the UK parties typically have a strong ideological base which makes the party vote for the candidate who best represents the parties views. The government tends to have good cohesion. This is due to the fact that they want to appear strong to the public so that they can retain power. It is easy for the PM to pass legislation as due to the fact that the party has a strong ideological base, members of the party will almost always vote in favour of the PM. Additionally the party is close as MPs want positions on the cabinet and the only way to do that is to back the Prime Minister in the hopes of gaining a position. However, this is only true of the PM is popular with the public. If the popularity of the PM drops, then the party may lose faith in them and there may be a lot of fighting within the party. Although the party has no way of removing the PM, they vote against them in order to send a message which can make passing policy very difficult. An example of this is that Keir Starmer lost the local elections badly as Labour saw huge losses across the country. This has made many in the party lose faith in him, with some demanding that he resigns. This lack of cohesion has sparked a coup in the Labour party and starmer due to him being unpopular with voters is losing support. In the USA, the parties (until MAGA) had less of an ideological base. For example when you look at the democrat party, you have moderate liberals such as barrack Obama and then you have socialists like Bernie Sanders. This shows that the President may struggle to make policy as he has to be appealing to the whole party as they have such different views on things. Furthermore in the USA, members of the party are far more likely to speak against the President as they have less cohesion outside of elections. For example, Marjory Taylor Greene, a republican congresswoman, who used to be	

ENTER QUESTION NUMBER BELOW	Do not type in this shaded box	DO NOT WRITE IN THIS MARGIN
	a huge supporter of Trumps, turned against him due to his handling of the Epstein Files and has spoken out many times against him. This has caused problems for Trump as it has caused many to lack confidence in him as the President. Lastly when it comes to managing sub national governments the Prime minister can still make policy. Due to the fact that most powers reside in Westminster, the devolved nations of Scotland, Northern Ireland and Wales still have to rely on a lot of policy from Westminster. This means that the PM has a lot of power as they are able to have a say over their policy and how the country is governed. For example the Scottish parliament tried to make it easier for Transgender people to use single sex spaces, however, the UK implemented legislation to stop this as they deemed that it is down to the sex at birth that determines what toilet is used. Additionally, the PM has power as they can determine things like benefits for the devolved nations as this power resides in Westminster. For example, this year the UK government removed the two child benefit cap and this was implemented nationally as the PM has the power to do this as he can control parts of the UK. However, in the USA, the government uses a federal system, meaning that the states equal powers to the federal government. This makes it difficult for the president as he cannot make decisions for certain states as they have their own powers that the President cannot have an impact on. For example, this year, Governor Newsom blocked federal troops from entering California to detain illegal migrants as the state has equal power to the government. This shows that the President lacks in powers as he cannot make policies for the whole country and he cannot control everywhere. In conclusion it is clear that the PM is more effective at making policy than the President. When it comes to fiscal powers, the PM is more effective than the President as the budget does not have to be voted on by parliament meaning that they have no restrictions on what they can implement as it only has to suit their agenda, whereas in the USA, it can be difficult for the government to pass their budget (especially in the current political climate) as the other party has to agree. Therefore the PM is more effective. When it comes to power over party again the PM is more effective than the President as in the UK the political parties have a stronger ideological base, meaning that the parties will agree on most policies the PM wants to introduce which means that the party will vote in favour of the legislation which allows for the PM to make policy. In the USA it is harder as the parties lack that ideological base as many members are at opposite ends of the political spectrum which makes the President less effective than the PM. When it comes to power over sub national government, the Prime Minister is more effective at making policy as the USA has a federal form of government which makes it very challenging for the president to make policy in the states as they have their own power that the federal government cannot control. Whereas in the UK, the national govt has control over the majority of powers and has the ultimate say on what happens in the country which means that the PM is more effective. 3a) I will discuss the dominant ideas of the SNP in this essay. The SNP believe that the constitutional arrangements should be different and that Scotland should be its own independent nation. The SNP have had this view since they were formed and originally wanted full independence immediately. However, under Alec Samond, the party shifted their views on this	

ENTER QUESTION NUMBER BELOW	Do not type in this shaded box	DO NOT WRITE IN THIS MARGIN
	and decided for a more gradual approach, with the party wanting to receive devo max (maximum powers but still a devolved nations) and then eventually branching off entirely as an independent state. This attracted many voters and we have witnessed that due to this policy the SNP have done well in many elections. For example, in 2011 the SNP won the election, removing Labour from power and having enough members to be a majority. This was solely due to the fact that they promised an independence referendum to the voters which made many vote SNP. In 2014 they delivered that promise and despite losing the referendum by 10%, the fact that they got a vote highlights their desire for Scotland to be an independent nation. However, in 2024 in the general election, the parties electoral performance dropped majorly as the party only won 9 seats in parliament down from 45 in the previous parliament. This shows that the independence idea did not capture voters the way they thought it would as they failed to win a large number of seats. Showing that their ideas have not been successful on their electoral performance. Another dominant idea of the SNP is that they believe in social justice, meaning that they believe in closing the wealth gap by giving poorer people benefits etc. The SNP has launched schemes such as the baby box which is a one time box that gives new parents necessities for becoming parents. This has had an uptake of around 93% which is highly successful. Furthermore they have created the Scottish Child Payment which is a £40 a week payment to families in low incomes that supports children who desperately need help. This idea has been successful for the SNPs electoral performance as before the SNP were a party, Labour were the party of the working class as they believed in social justice, however, now the electorate votes for the SNP and we witnessed this as in my area of Inverclyde which is the most deprived area in the UK went from voting Labour in the Scottish elections to being arguably an SNP stronghold as Stuart MacMillan retained his seat again in the latest elections that occurred on May the 7th. However, what has to be noted is that the SNP may not be doing so well from this policy as areas such as Ferguslie Park, a very deprived area, voted for the Conservative party as they did not like the SNPs independence viewpoint which people in ferguslie park disagreed highly with, despite the SNP offering more welfare they did not care about this as they vote for single issues. The last dominant idea of the SNP is that they are Pro-EU. In the 1970s the SNP were anti-EU as they wanted full independence however, they changed their views on this as they believe that if Scotland were independent they could rely on the EU to help them. After the EU referendum Nicola Sturgeon came out to make a statement that an indepdent Scotland would be in the EU, hoping to attract voters as Scotland voted 62% to 38% to remain in the EU, however, she did not get the result she thought she would as in the 2017 general election the SNP did not perform well, losing seats from the prior election. This was unexpected for the SNP as they focussed so much on the EU and failed to win over the voters. This shows that the idea of Pro-EU had a negative impact on the electoral performance of the SNP.	