

Candidate 1 evidence

To what extent were individual citizens able to influence democracy in Athens?

There were many opportunities for a citizen to influence democracy in Athens if they wanted to. One of the key opportunities was during the general assembly (ecclesia), which was held in the centre of the city of Athens and was where any citizen had the right to speak and make their argument if they wanted. Votes were taken by a show of hands, which made it easy for the masses of citizens to vote on topics that were important and that they cared about. Meetings were held regularly, (with roughly 40 meetings happening in a modern year) which meant there was a chance for citizens to get a say in any relevant topic that had come up recently. On paper, the Athenian democracy system looked fair towards every citizen, with easy voting, frequent meetings, and opportunities for everyone to say something if they wished to. The democracy was indeed designed around these principles. However there were still some faults, as the Ecclesia tended to favour richer citizens when it came to representation. The meetings, which were regular, also took up the majority of a day, and for those outside of the city of Athens it could be a days travel to get there as well. For many working citizens, a potential two days away from work was far too expensive. This meant that there was naturally a greater presence of richer citizens, as they could afford to leave whatever trade they had (usually as they had employees or slaves to do the work for them while they were gone). So while individual citizens definitely had opportunities to influence democracy in Athens, some had more opportunity than others.

Citizens also had the opportunity in 'ostracisms' about 4 times a year. Ostracisms were created to try and prevent one man from gaining too much power in the political sphere. Citizens who were present at the Pnyx (a big rock in the centre of Athens - also where the ecclesia was held) that day would all be given small shards of pottery (called *ostrakons*) which they could then inscribe the name of whoever they wanted to ostracise, usually the name of a prominent politician. Whoever had their name inscribed the most on the ostrakons would be exiled from Athens for 10 years, and if they tried to return sooner they would be executed. It was believed this exile would stop anyone's journey towards dictatorship in its tracks. This meant that any citizen present at the Pnyx had a power to stop people who they thought were beginning to rise above their place and were gaining too much power. This was a fair and democratic way to keep the democracy safe, while still letting everyone participate. However, there were flaws with the system, as it already automatically favoured anyone who could read or write, as illiterate citizens had to rely on others around them for assistance with their voting, which opened the door to corruption.

with the votes. So while there were ways that individuals could influence democracy, it was open to exploitation based on some citizen's attributes.

There is also the idea of being a 'citizen' in itself. Citizens had full legal rights, were able to participate at the *prytoria* and even be elected into higher political positions (like becoming a *strategoi*). The democratic system of Athens was built on the concept of empowering the Athenian citizens politically. However, the rules for being a citizen were very selective, requiring things like; being male, being over 18 and registered with your local *deme*, having at least 2 years military service under your belt, and being the child of two married Athenian citizens. This meant that a huge section of Athens population was cut off from participating in democracy, as they weren't considered citizens. For example: women, slaves, or metics (non-Athenians/foreigners) were not considered citizens and therefore not allowed democratic power, despite providing a lot towards the upkeep and general success of Athens (women by providing new citizens, slaves by doing the vast majority of heavy work in Athens, and metics still having to pay taxes towards the state). So while individual *citizens* could influence democracy, a lot of the population of Athens and wider Attica could not participate in the politics of their country, a country some had lived in their entire lives.

Citizens also could have an individual impact on democracy through various political jobs. For the most part, roles like being in the *Strategoi* (who controlled military affairs) was randomly selected from the citizens. One general was selected from each of the 10 *demes* (tribes of Attica) ensuring good and equal representation throughout the council. While elected, the *strategoi* were also under different rules to make sure that they still served Athens first - for example there was a battle which Athens lost so badly it was decided that all 10 *strategoi* were to be executed as punishment. So there were opportunities for citizens to influence democracy through random promotion into higher political ranks, while still having those ranks being kept loyal to Athens and its message of democracy first.

Candidate 2 evidence

TWO. (B – Delian League)

Athenians benefitted greatly from acting as the leaders of the Delian League, though there were still a couple of disadvantages to their amount of control.

One benefit the Athenians had in being Delian leaders was that the core community received a notable social boost – which may have allowed them to work harder against enemies and feel particularly untouchable.

Another benefit the Athenians got was that they gained a lot more money with the taxes coming in from the fellow states involved and were able to afford lengthy repairs to their temples and homes with that money.

A third benefit the Athenians got was that they were able to manipulate the other states in their favour with the transfer of democracy, and the ability to control their court sessions in Athens.

Another benefit the Athenians got was that they, due to being the leaders, were set at the back of every military fight – meaning many Athenian soldiers remained untouched as they continued to declare wars.

Another benefit the Athenians got was that they gained great military protection – as with a much larger ‘army’ to control, any state or area that posed a threat could be taken out with a declaration of war and collection of the state armies.

A sixth benefit the Athenians got was that their ships were given materials and help above any other, allowing them to be used more, and allowing Athens to collect more money.

Another benefit the Athenians got was that, in being leaders, they were able to declare war on any state and easily add them into the Delian League, or gain a multitude of slaves, money and properties in taking over other states.

An eighth benefit the Athenians got was that they controlled the Delian League’s overall money, and could break their own rules without much challenge due to the fear they instilled on the other states – giving themselves the ability to spend hefty money on a lot of things without trouble.

However, one disadvantage the Athenians got was that – due to their ability to easily win military pushes – the state became egotistical and punished other states within the league – causing the league to slowly dislike them as leader.

Another disadvantage the Athenians got was that, if they connected enough states that may have disliked them or been unrightfully punished by them, they would easily be overturned in the form of a possible revolution. (?)

Overall, the Athenian state gained a mass of advantages, from monetary aid to political confidence, yet it’s not easy to ignore the few disadvantages that came from the state’s new power and ego – however, they still stayed in complete power for years, gaining the control of many in that time.