

Candidate 1 evidence

ENTER NUMBER OF QUESTION	DO NOT WRITE IN THIS MARGIN
①(a)	<p>Power is the ability to make others do something that they might not otherwise do - which could very well be against their own interests - through the use of coercion of threats, sanctions, rewards and manipulation. Power clearly exists wherever there are social relationships. There are different definitions of power. Max Weber outlined that there was a fixed amount of power in any society and those who hold power would use it to further their own interests. Power can therefore be described as a 'zero-sum' game as in order for an individual/group to hold power, the another individual/groups must not hold any power. Another view of power is held by 'pluralists' who would argue that power is distributed throughout society with different groups holding the ability to use and influence how power is used and that would point to examples such as the introduction of the national minimum wage under New Labour as a consensus/compromise between British industry and of course Trade Unions. However, Marxists would argue that the power in</p>

ENTER NUMBER OF QUESTION	DO NOT WRITE IN THIS MARGIN
	<p>Society is held by a 'ruling elite' and the ruling elite will use the power that they have to further their own interests as they would contend that the previous example was merely a means to keep the 'workers' content and that the power in society continues to be held by them.</p>
	<p>Steven Lukes, in 'Power: A radical view' outlines the existence of three faces of power both closed and hidden. The first face of power is 'decision making' which is the power that people who make decisions hold such as MPs and other elected officials as they have the power to introduce bills to parliament, debate and vote on the proposals before passing them into law, of which citizens will have to follow. This face of power could be described as an 'open' face of power since ordinary citizens can clearly identify who is using decision making power, how they are using it and when it is being used since MP's voting records are easily accessible online. In addition to this, this face of power could also be described as an</p>

ENTER NUMBER OF QUESTION	DO NOT WRITE IN THIS MARGIN

more 'democratic' face as ordinary citizens hold the control of the power
 power to remove it from any elected official who either misuses it or abuses it, ~~from~~ by voting in elections. For example, the smoking ban in 2006 banned smoking in public areas in Scotland as a result of ~~the~~ MSPs discussing the proposed bill and cigarette companies, as well as healthcare professionals, were able to give evidence and lobby the MSPs to influence how this type of power was used and thus was a 'transparent' use of power.

The second face of power identified by Lukes was the non-decision making face which is the power to prevent, ~~or~~ certain decisions from being made or particular policies from being discussed. Power is therefore not just about imposing decisions/actions over people, but about setting the political agenda itself by influencing the option being considered in a decision. For example, prime minister Theresa May holds the non-decision making power of

ENTER NUMBER OF QUESTION	DO NOT WRITE IN THIS MARGIN
	<p>The third face of power advocated by Steven Lukes is 'shaping desires' which is the power to manipulate the wishes and desires of social groups to accept - or even to desire - particular outcomes ^{or decisions} which will be harmful to them but align to the wishes of those exercising this type of power. This face of power could be described as <u>covert</u> - or even 'insidious' - as it clearly gives the illusion that social groups wish a particular outcome, i.e. they support it, with very little indication (during the time power is being used) that they have had their desires shaped. Thus, it is very difficult to identify exactly when this power is being used. For example, former Prime Minister Tony Blair was accused by many of effectively 'shaping' the desires of both MPs and public opinion through the false evidence of Iraq, under Saddam Hussein, gaining weapons of mass destruction and thus tried to gain MPs support for military action, even though it was against their better judgement.</p>

Candidate 2 evidence

ENTER NUMBER OF QUESTION	DO NOT WRITE IN THIS MARGIN
1a	<p>Power is said to have the biggest impact on how things are done in politics. This can be through Steven Political power is the impact a person has in being able to change or change ^{determine} a persons views. Steven Lukes identified three faces of power which were open-face, ma secretive face and manipulating desires. Each face has a different effect on how things are done. This essay will analyse the concept of power</p> <p>The first face of power is open face One power identified by Steven Lukes is the secretive face which is about the</p>

ENTER NUMBER OF QUESTION		DO NOT WRITE IN THIS MARGIN
	<p>use of power to make decisions without a lot of knowledge of others from for example in the political world politicians not fully being open to their constituents. An example of this can be said to be when Margaret Thatcher was in power, talks of Scottish Independence were in the air, however she decided this would not be talked about ^{discussed} in parliament meaning that it it was not put on the agenda. This situation could be said to be illegitimate use of power as Margaret Thatcher passed off the idea as if it was nothing which meant that many Scots</p>	

ENTER NUMBER OF QUESTION		DO NOT WRITE IN THIS MARGIN
	the way politicians use the	
	power and support they hold	
	to change and alter effectively	
	control the decisions made by	
	the public. This power can be	
	seen to be an illegitimate use	
	of power due to the way whoever	
	^{chooses} chooses to do so, uses the	
	trust they of their people	
	supporters to satisfy their	
	own needs. A recent example	
	of this can be said was the	
	Tony Blair Iraq scandal.	
	Former prime minister Tony	
	Blair used the power he had	
	to change change the views	
	of voters in order to win a	
	vote on whether the Britain and the	
	United States should join forces	

[illegible]

Candidate 3 evidence

<small>ENTER QUESTION NUMBER BELOW</small>	Do not type in this shaded box	<small>DO NOT WRITE IN THIS MARGIN</small>
1b)	<p>Representative democracy has a number of key features, which make it the preferred system in modern times.</p> <p>The main positive feature of representative democracy is that it is practical for a modern society. With around 55+ million people living in the UK it is not practical to vote on every issue that arises as it would be a logistical and cost nightmare that would simply be unaffordable in this current climate. The recent use of referenda in the UK supports this as the EU referendum was estimated to cost £10s million to facilitate to due to the likes of counting and printing ballot papers. This is simply unaffordable to organise to vote on small issues such as implementing new traffic laws etc. Representative democracy allows people to vote once every 4 years, which is much more practicable and cost effective method as it provides a means of citizens till being able to make decision on who is in charge without having to vote on everything. Indeed it is likely if a direct democracy was in place votes would have to take place on very small legislative matters that little people would care about. This would mean a large cost for very little gain as the decision could be made by elected representatives and as such is clearly the most favourable mehod .Malta is an example of a country that had to revert to a representative democracy, as despite having a small population could not make direct democracy work. This shows that for modern times representative democracy is the best option as its key feature of being more practicable and less costly is the best option for this century.</p> <p>Representative democracy also allows for experts in fields to make informed decisions about varying subjects. Many MPs come from specialist backgrounds that give them the knowledge to make informed decisions about varying issues. This is compared to the 'lay-person' whereby people may have no idea what they would be voting for. Plato states that someone is needed to 'steer the ship' as people in general cannot be as intelligent enough to make informed decisions. Indeed whilst Burke was a conservative he too added that people are 'not smart enough' to have the ability to make such vital decisions and as such it should be left to the experts. Decisions on the likes of defence policy should be made by those who have access to all the information and can make informed decisions rather than general members of the public who likely have little clue on what the vote would actually mean. Whilst it is the case that representative democracy allows for decisions to be made by experts some are just too big not to ask the people. For example the vote on Brexit would have cause a legislative nightmare if was decided by parliament rather than the people. This shows that whilst representative democracy for the whole party provided the best and most informed decisions some are just too big and as such, the people have to be the ones to decide. Overall though the key feature of allowing informed individuals to make decisions is a positive one and clearly supports the case for a representative democracy.</p> <p>Representative democracy also reduces the likelihood of decisions being made by a small part of the electorate. As it stands turnout to general elections sits</p>	

ENTER QUESTION NUMBER BELOW	Do not type in this shaded box	DO NOT WRITE IN THIS MARGIN
	<p>between 60-70% with council and EU elections being much lower. A representative democracy helps make sure that key decisions are not being made by just a small % of people as it is highly likely if votes were held on ever issue that would otherwise be debated in parliament would have very low turnouts . Examples of this include the London Mayor referendum whereby only 1/3 of eligible voters actually turned out. This clearly raises legislative issues, as only a small amount of people would be making key decisions whereas with a representative democracy general elections could give a legitimate mandate for the government to make decisions. With much of the turnout coming from older voters it is likely a direct democracy would have decisions only being made by older generations as 'voter fatigue' would kick in and people would simply not bother voting. In this sense, it is clear that representative democracy provides the greatest benefits overall and would not allow for the decisions to be made by the small number of people that would turn out to vote.</p>	

Candidate 4 evidence

ENTER NUMBER OF QUESTION	DO NOT WRITE IN THIS MARGIN
1B.	
	Representative democracy is the more
	commonly used nowadays for many
	reasons. One reason being that it
	would be extremely impracticable for
	modern societies to have direct
	democracy. It would be too time
	consuming and expensive for people
	to participate in voting for every
	single matter. Direct democracy would
	only be effective in places with
	smaller populations such as the
	Swiss Cantons.
	Representative democracy also
	works well as not everyone is
	interested in making decisions all
	the time. This will then lead to
	people not showing up to vote and
	the results will not reflect a fair
	Democracy. Socrates argued that

ENTER
NUMBER
OF
QUESTIONDO NOT
WRITE IN
THIS
MARGIN

arguments. The public also might not trust the elected politician to pass on their queries. This distrust in selfish politicians who may vote on their own behalf or their party's behalf instead of their people's makes representative democracy less popular.

Candidate 5 evidence

ENTER NUMBER OF QUESTION	DO NOT WRITE IN THIS MARGIN
	Section 1 (power) 3.a
into	Steven Lukes came up with the theory that there were three different faces of power these being the decision making power, the non decision making power and the manipulative desires power.
para 1	Steven Lukes first face of power is known as the decision making power which is better known as being the open power due to the fact that the public are aware of what is happening. Because of this it can be said to be more transparent and therefore is the fairest form of power as it is usually there to be seen. Because it is open and transparent anything that happens

ENTER NUMBER OF QUESTION		DO NOT WRITE IN THIS MARGIN
	<p>this power is very fair and legit and overall is why it still remains very relevant today.</p>	
para 2	<p>The second face of power is the non decision making face. The non decision making face is known as the closed face due to the lack of transparency and the fact that in many cases things are happening behind closed doors. This therefore gives the party in charge massive amounts of so called unfair power due to the fact they can agenda set and not need to talk about things they do not want to. One example of this happening would be the conservative government not willing to even discussing Scottish independence.</p>	

ENTER NUMBER OF QUESTION	DO NOT WRITE IN THIS MARGIN
	<p> devolution although the pm at the time said he backed it. So this shows that the second face / non election face of power is not as the the public won be fed of but in many cases it is good for the government and also in many cases not all things that happen happen need to be seen by the public. Therefore all though this is not a very fair face of power it is still extremely realistic today with politicians using it in there favor / best interest but not exactly for the people. </p>
para 3	<p> Stellen likes third face of power is known as the manipulatory election face. This face is where the </p>

government convince the public that what they are saying we in their (the public's) best interest. They can do this in ways that the public either fear or want and for example when Tony Blair he told the British public that Saddam had weapons of mass destruction they could hit the UK with in only 45 minutes. This consequently had the effect of making them feel the need to support Blair when he said they had weapons also due to the sheer factor of fear. Another example of non-rational choices comes from the credit crunch where a big red bus had written on the side in massive writing that he would send £350 million to the car so why not spend on our cars.

ENTER NUMBER OF QUESTION	DO NOT WRITE IN THIS MARGIN
	<p>and this had the result of many people going out and voting solely based on this factor and in fact it turned out to be false. The fact this factor is still relevant however it should not be the case as this factor is abusing power they have by tricking the public</p>
<p>Conclusion</p>	<p>Overall, The open factor is the best factor of power in the way of the public and the non decision making factor is the best interests of the government therefore a mixture of the two should be used today with the third factor not being used when so ever</p>

Candidate 6 evidence

ENTER NUMBER OF QUESTION		DO NOT WRITE IN THIS MARGIN
2b)	In both the UK and US political systems, opportunities are presented to allow the legislature to scrutinise the actions of the government. The Bi-cameral nature of both systems combined with the use of committees and the electoral process sees that scrutiny can suitably arise.	
	In both the UK and US political	

ENTER NUMBER OF QUESTION		DO NOT WRITE IN THIS MARGIN
	Systems there is a bi-cameral	
	set up which allows checks and	
	balances to be placed on government.	
	In the UK, the House of Lords is	
	the second chamber. It contains	
	appointed members that are experts	
	in various fields to review over	
	and scrutinise the work of government	
	as well as the House of Commons.	
	In contrast in the US has a second	
	house known as the Senate which	
	sits to carry out a similar role	
	to that of the House of Lords.	
	An example of the US superiority to	
	carry out scrutiny can be seen	
	by the fact that the Senate has	
	been democratically elected since	
	1914 whilst in the UK the House	
	of Lords is still not elected.	

ENTER NUMBER OF QUESTION		DO NOT WRITE IN THIS MARGIN
	what this shows is how the more	
	partisan nature of the US system	
	allows for the opportunity for deeper	
	scrutiny to occur. This was the	
	Senate to be controlled by the	
	opposition then they would be less	
	likely to pass legislation of the	
	government. The UK system does	
	however acknowledge the increased	
	legitimacy of the House of Commons	
	and as such states that the	
	House of Commons has dominance	
	to override the opinions of the	
	House of Lords. Whilst both systems	
	are bi-cameral the more partisan	
	nature and increased legitimacy of	
	the House of Senate allows for	
	greater scrutiny.	

ENTER NUMBER OF QUESTION		DO NOT WRITE IN THIS MARGIN
	ensures all evidence is heard as	
	the individual is compelled by	
	law to attend. This again displays	
	how whilst both systems employ	
	a successful form of government	
	scrutiny through committees, the	
	greater power of the US when calling	
	witnesses allows further scrutiny	
	from the legislature.	
	In combination to this the greater	
	budgetary resources at hand to	
	the US committees allows for far	
	greater scrutiny. US congressional	
	committees are very well funded and	
	have the main power to scrutinise	
	the government to a large extent.	
	An example of this can be seen	
	by in a two year period US	

ENTER NUMBER OF QUESTION		DO NOT WRITE IN THIS MARGIN
	US ensures that the executive,	
	legislature and Judiciary are all	
	separately elected. What this means	
	is that the president is not a	
	member of the legislature. In contrast	
	the prime minister is not elected	
	separately but rather is placed	
	in that role as the leader of	
	the majority party after a	
	general election. An example of this	
	can be seen in 2015 where David	
	Cameron became prime minister	
	as leader of the Conservative	
	majority government. This shows	
	that as such the UK system allows	
	for the government to be scrutinised	
	less. This is because a majority	
	government is able to pass bills	
	with relative ease as they	

ENTER NUMBER OF QUESTION		DO NOT WRITE IN THIS MARGIN
	have the legislative support to	
	ensure this. In contrast the separation	
	of power ensured in the US	
	Constitution results in the president	
	not being a member of the	
	legislature. As such, due to the	
	partisan nature of Congress they	
	may be scrutinised more if the house	
	is controlled by the opposition. However,	
	the UK system does not ensure	
	a majority government. In 2017	
	when Theresa May lost the Conservative	
	majority she had to rely on the	
	DUP support. This displaces how	
	in general the UK legislature are	
	able to scrutinise government to a	
	lesser extent than that of its	
	american counterpart, both the US	
	president and UK PM are	

ENTER NUMBER OF QUESTION	DO NOT WRITE IN THIS MARGIN
	experiencing in depth scrutiny as a result of the hostility of the legislature.
	In conclusion, both the UK and US political systems prevent similar opportunities for government scrutiny to arise. The US system however utilises the opportunity more and as such performs the role better. The bi-cameral nature allows further checks and balances to be carried out on government and the election of the Senate ensures greater legitimacy in this than the UK. Committees allow a suitable opportunity to question and analyse the government work, but the greater power and budget in the US leads to a more effective role being taken.

