

AC2.1 - Compare campaigns for change

ASPECT	CLARE'S LAW	SARAH'S LAW	SIMILARITIES	DIFFERENCES
AIMS AND BACKGROUND (PURPOSE)	Clare's Law helps people in relationships find out if their partner has a history of domestic violence. It was named after Clare Wood, who was killed by a man with a violent past.	Sarah's Law helps parents find out if someone who has access to their child is a convicted child sex offender. It was named after Sarah Payne, who was kidnapped and murdered by a known sex offender.	Both laws were created after tragic events where access to information about dangerous people could have possibly saved lives. They aim to protect vulnerable people.	Clare's Law focuses on protecting adults from domestic violence, while Sarah's Law is about protecting children from sex offenders.
DRIVING FORCES	Clare Wood's father, Michael Brown, pushed for this law after his daughter was murdered. Her case showed how important it is to know about a partner's violent history.	Sarah Payne's mother, Sara Payne, fought for this law after Sarah was killed. She wanted to make it easier for parents to know if someone around their child has a history of sexual offenses.	Both laws were driven by the victims' family members, who became campaigners to help prevent more tragedies.	Clare's Law deals with the risk of domestic violence, while Sarah's Law focuses on child sexual abuse by convicted offenders.
SUPPORTERS	Clare's Law was supported by people like Theresa May (former Home Secretary), members of Parliament, and charities like Refuge and Women's Aid. Public support was very important too.	Sarah's Law had support from high-profile people like David Cameron and Richard Branson, along with child protection groups and large parts of the public.	Both laws were backed by politicians, charities, and the general public.	Sarah's Law had more celebrity and media attention, while Clare's Law was more supported by MPs and institutions like the police.
METHODS	Clare's Law was promoted through media coverage, especially by the BBC and newspapers, as well as through petitions and lobbying from charities like Women's Aid.	Sarah's Law had a strong media campaign led by the tabloid News of the World, which got over 700,000 petition signatures and ran front-page stories pushing for change.	Both laws used the media, public petitions, and support from charities to raise awareness and pressure lawmakers to act.	Clare's Law used documentaries and news reports, while Sarah's Law had a more sensational tabloid-driven campaign.
LASTING IMPACT (SUCCESS)	Clare's Law became a national policy that lets people ask the police if their partner has a violent past. It has helped raise awareness about domestic abuse and protected people in relationships.	Sarah's Law allows parents and guardians to ask the police if someone who has access to their child is a convicted sex offender. It has helped communities protect children from possible harm.	Both laws created systems that give the public important information about potentially dangerous people. They've both helped protect vulnerable groups.	Both laws have helped protect people and raised awareness, though they rely on people knowing about them. Overall, they've made a big difference in keeping people safer.

AC2.1 - Compare campaigns for change

ASPECT	CAMPAIGN TO LEGALISE MARIJUANA (FOR MEDICAL USE)	CAMPAIGN TO REFORM THE LAW ON ASSISTED DYING	SIMILARITIES	DIFFERENCES
AIMS AND BACKGROUD (PURPOSE)	The goal is to legalise marijuana for both medical and recreational use. It focuses on its health benefits and its potential to boost the economy. It started by helping people with serious health problems like epilepsy.	The goal is to allow people who are terminally ill (people who are going to die) to choose to end their life with medical help, so they can die with dignity.	Both campaigns want to change laws to help people who are suffering from serious illnesses.	The marijuana campaign is about giving people more treatment options, while the assisted dying campaign is about giving people the choice to end their life if they are terminally ill.
DRIVING FORCES	The campaign was inspired by cases like Billy Caldwell and Alfie Dingley, two young boys with epilepsy. Their families fought to get medical cannabis legalised.	This campaign was driven by cases like Debbie Purdy (who had multiple sclerosis), Tony Nicklinson (who had locked-in syndrome), and Noel Conway (who had motor neurone disease). They fought to have the right to die legally.	Both campaigns were pushed forward by real people with serious health problems, whose stories helped change public and political opinions.	The marijuana campaign is more about allowing a medical treatment, while the assisted dying campaign focuses on the moral issue of choosing to end your life.
SUPPORTERS	Supported by well-known people like William Hague, Richard Branson, and Professor David Nutt, as well as groups like CLEAR and United Patients Alliance (UPA).	Supported by public figures like Sir Patrick Stewart, Terry Pratchett, Lord Falconer, and the group Dignity in Dying.	Both laws were backed by politicians, charities, and the general public.	The marijuana campaign gets much backing from people who want scientific and economic benefits, while the assisted dying campaign is supported by people who focus on human rights and personal choice.
METHODS	The campaign used high-profile cases, lobbying politicians, media coverage (BBC, The Guardian), public petitions, and protests to push for change.	This campaign used legal challenges (like Debbie Purdy's case), lobbying politicians, public petitions, and media coverage (The Times, The Guardian), with support from groups like Dignity in Dying.	Both campaigns used the law, the media, and petitions to raise awareness and push for legal change.	The marijuana campaign uses a lot of scientific evidence and medical support, while the assisted dying campaign is more about ethical and personal freedom debates.
LASTING IMPACT (SUCCESS)	Medical cannabis was legalised in 2018, but it's still hard to access. The campaign continues to push for full legalisation, including for recreational use.	Assisted dying is still illegal, but the campaign is gaining support, and there's a plan for a vote in Parliament by 2024.	Both campaigns have sparked public and political debates, leading to partial success or ongoing momentum for change.	The marijuana campaign has had some success with medical legalisation, while assisted dying remains illegal, though it's becoming more widely supported. MPs will vote on a change in the law in November 2024.

AC2.1 - Compare campaigns for change

ASPECT	CAMPAIGN TO LEGALISE MARIJUANA (FOR MEDICAL USE)	CAMPAIGN TO REFORM THE LAW ON ASSISTED DYING	SIMILARITIES	DIFFERENCES
AIMS AND BACKGROUD (PURPOSE)	The goal is to legalise marijuana for both medical and recreational use. It focuses on its health benefits and its potential to boost the economy. It started by helping people with serious health problems like epilepsy.	The goal is to allow people who are terminally ill (people who are going to die) to choose to end their life with medical help, so they can die with dignity.	Both campaigns want to change laws to help people who are suffering from serious illnesses.	The marijuana campaign is about giving people more treatment options, while the assisted dying campaign is about giving people the choice to end their life if they are terminally ill.
DRIVING FORCES	The campaign was inspired by cases like Billy Caldwell and Alfie Dingley, two young boys with epilepsy. Their families fought to get medical cannabis legalised.	This campaign was driven by cases like Debbie Purdy (who had multiple sclerosis), Tony Nicklinson (who had locked-in syndrome), and Noel Conway (who had motor neurone disease). They fought to have the right to die legally.	Both campaigns were pushed forward by real people with serious health problems, whose stories helped change public and political opinions.	The marijuana campaign is more about allowing a medical treatment, while the assisted dying campaign focuses on the moral issue of choosing to end your life.
SUPPORTERS	Supported by well-known people like William Hague, Richard Branson, and Professor David Nutt, as well as groups like CLEAR and United Patients Alliance (UPA).	Supported by public figures like Sir Patrick Stewart, Terry Pratchett, Lord Falconer, and the group Dignity in Dying.	Both laws were backed by politicians, charities, and the general public.	The marijuana campaign gets much backing from people who want scientific and economic benefits, while the assisted dying campaign is supported by people who focus on human rights and personal choice.
METHODS	The campaign used high-profile cases, lobbying politicians, media coverage (BBC, The Guardian), public petitions, and protests to push for change.	This campaign used legal challenges (like Debbie Purdy's case), lobbying politicians, public petitions, and media coverage (The Times, The Guardian), with support from groups like Dignity in Dying.	Both campaigns used the law, the media, and petitions to raise awareness and push for legal change.	The marijuana campaign uses a lot of scientific evidence and medical support, while the assisted dying campaign is more about ethical and personal freedom debates.
LASTING IMPACT (SUCCESS)	Medical cannabis was legalised in 2018, but it's still hard to access. The campaign continues to push for full legalisation, including for recreational use.	Assisted dying is still illegal, but the campaign is gaining support, and there's a plan for a vote in Parliament by 2024.	Both campaigns have sparked public and political debates, leading to partial success or ongoing momentum for change.	The marijuana campaign has had some success with medical legalisation, while assisted dying remains illegal, though it's becoming more widely supported. MPs will vote on a change in the law in November 2024.