

DOWNLOAD PDF AMERICAS SIGNATURE EXCLUSION : HOW DEMOCRACY IS MADE SAFE FOR THE TWO-PARTY SYSTEM

Chapter 1 : The Two-Party System, Part II

Gore and the judicial assault on democracy -- The people have no right to vote and no right to rule -- Unequal protection: the Supreme Court's racial double standard in redistricting -- America's signature exclusion: how democracy is made safe for the two-party system -- "Arrogant Orwellian bureaucrats": how the electoral-industrial complex.

As such, the arrangement of the parties became an essential aspect of the betrayals of associated with the Reconstruction of the post-war South. Over the 67 years from the murder of Abraham Lincoln to the election of Franklin D. Roosevelt, most participating voters cast Republican ballots. In fact, over this long expanse, only two Democrats won the presidency, Grover Cleveland and Woodrow Wilson, both victories the result of splits among the Republicans. Despite the dominance of a Republican Party, very little happened over these years to extend the idea of representative government beyond the limitations it had for generations. While the Republicans prevailed throughout, Americans experienced two distinct phases in the evolution of the party system. Prior to the turn of the 20th century, the reunited national government established a great deal more power over almost everything, and used it to foster industry and business almost relentlessly. Later, the resulting social turmoil — crime and disease as well as popular discontent — required a different, more intense government regulation to keep capitalism sustainable. This regulatory authority gave the two-party system an opportunity to expand popular participation in electoral politics, while slowly making the Democrats the only respectable alternative to the dominant Republicans.

Reconstructing the Two-Party System The fate of post-Civil War Reconstruction dashed hopes that a federal union might emerge from the war grounded in freedom and equality. This did not simply betray the promise of freedom and equality to the freed people coming out of slavery, whose constitutionally guaranteed rights were never secured. The process began with the Native peoples, who faced the application of the Anglo-Canadian reservation policy. And it ended with turning over the poor whites to the leadership of the old secessionists. More accurately, denial of citizenship to any part of the population fundamentally denies the entire people a representative government. The outcome severely constrained the extent to which the government would take on a general reconstruction of how it did things in the past. An essential if often neglected feature of this would be another Reconstruction — of the two-party system. The bipartisan abandonment of Reconstruction reflected the assumption that what was good for privately owned industry was good for the nation. In the aftermath of the Civil War, government concerns focused on the development of industry, particularly the railroads. By , the national and state governments gave land equivalent to the size of Texas to the railroads. The emergence of news syndicates and services along with rising costs were beginning to restrict diversity of perspective. Through the first decades of this period, the machine leadership of Marcus Hanna in Ohio dominated the Midwestern and national Republican Party. Democratic leaders appealed to the tried and true agrarian values, coupled to the concerns of small scale industry and those larger economic enterprises disadvantaged by government policy. Insofar as this base impelled the Democrats to formulate some alternative ideology, it centered on an old-fashioned agrarianism, tinged at times with some pro-regulatory reformism. Major party identification had far less to do with platforms or ideas than demographics. Rural and small-town white Protestants supported the Republicans in the North and the Democrats in the South. While African Americans overwhelmingly voted Republican where they could, immigrant and Catholic voters cast Democratic ballots, as did many under the influence of big city political machines. In short, each of the parties won elections not based on what they had delivered or promised to voters but out of fear of the alternative. Democrats continued to use explicit appeals to white supremacy. The Republicans promised high protective tariffs that would encourage national industry, ensuring business prosperity that would trickle down to the workers as higher wages. The Democrats insisted that they, too, favored tariffs, though only to bring more revenue into the treasury. Either way you were going to have a tariff. What the parties did offer voters were their claims to favor honest, clean government. In the critical election of , both parties essentially ignored the issues of Reconstruction to campaign as reformers —

DOWNLOAD PDF AMERICAS SIGNATURE EXCLUSION : HOW DEMOCRACY IS MADE SAFE FOR THE TWO-PARTY SYSTEM

Rutherford B. Hayes running as an advocate of civil service reform, against a Democratic opponent who had gained national prominence taking on the notorious Tweed Ring in New York City. The attempt of each party to charge the other with corruption and fraud had merit on both sides. As the many critics of the political system of the day pointed out, it suited Republicans to permit a grotesque level of Democratic vote fraud in the South because they had abandoned any hope of carrying those states, and the fraud " along with its largely racial character " gave Republican orators something to discuss in the North. At the same time, Democrats complained of the overt Republican vote fraud in Northern factory towns where the bosses gave their workers part of the day away from the machines to ferry them in wagons to the polls for a supervised vote. This practice, too, did the Democrats no damage and gave them a counterargument to the fraud in the South. Pressures for Change This striving for stability by the elite inspired insurgent concerns, rooted in an abiding popular fear of unaccountable authority exercised in support of wealth and power. Massive numbers joined the local granges of the Patrons of Husbandry, which admitted women and had female officers. While this organization deferred to white Southerners by excluding African Americans, some local groups simply admitted them anyway and a number launched their own Industrial Brotherhood. The latter merged into the regionally important Sovereigns of Industry and the Knights of Labor. Organizations of African-Americans and women also appeared, their concerns focused increasingly on their civic exclusion. These efforts engaged hundreds of thousands of Americans who learned how to organize meetings, make collective decisions, organize mass demonstrations, conduct strikes, and confront employers and the government with their demands. Their efforts to form cooperatives that would gradually displace capitalism, and the insistence of these workers on their rights to govern their own affairs in the workplace, caused no end of trouble. Mass strikes occurred regularly after the insurrectionary railroad walkout. Many of these active citizens repeatedly tried to follow the example of the Republican Party in constructing a new, responsive third party. With the great national railroad strike of , which became general strikes in places, the Greenbackers took a more explicitly pro-labor stance and the WPUS entered local politics, all gaining some success. These converged in the presidential campaign, which raised not only the grievances of farmers and workers, but advocated woman suffrage and protested the increasing exclusion of African-Americans from civic life in the South. A resurgent labor movement offered other alternatives. Anarchists, with large followings at New York and Chicago, generally " though not always " avoided electoral politics. Although the Democrats won that election " they counted the ballots " the United Labor candidate outpolled the Republican, a police commissioner named Theodore Roosevelt. The persistent insurgency in those western centers of electoral independence " Texas and Kansas " pitted farmers against, respectively, Southern Democrats and Northern Republicans. Although derailed and crushed after , parts of the movement contributed directly to the emergence of a new mass socialist party. Why Third Parties Stumbled All these movements remained weakened by the fact that Reconstruction had imploded, which excluded legions of working people and farmers from politics, but even more fundamental problems plagued them. All third-party efforts entered a game whose rules virtually assured their marginalization. Part of nationalizing the two-party rivalry established the national faith that the system had evolved to represent the will of the voters. As we have seen, it never actually did so, but all politicians and virtually all pundits implicitly and explicitly turn every election into a well-practiced celebration of that faith. To this day, of course, the academic, educational and journalistic industries ritually convey the litanies of this faith as part of their daily functions. As with all faiths, those unwilling to step outside of it, even temporarily, will not be able to examine the mechanics of this process critically. In his Greenback-Labor campaign, James B. Weaver got considerable coverage in the early weeks. However, when he tried to make an issue of the ballot and Black exclusion in the South, Democratic sources broke an entirely fictional story that he was in the pay of the Republicans. The Democratic press across the country replicated the story, announcing that there was no need to cover more than one Republican contender. And the Republican papers saw no further need to discuss the third party campaign if the Democrats were not doing so. While all of this assured that third parties would find success elusive, it accorded them an important role in permitting the further stability of two-party

DOWNLOAD PDF AMERICAS SIGNATURE EXCLUSION : HOW DEMOCRACY IS MADE SAFE FOR THE TWO-PARTY SYSTEM

rule. At the most basic level, either of the parties, under the right circumstances, could find partisan uses for an ostensibly independent bid for power. After the implosion of Reconstruction, Republicans in the South found their condition hopeless, as did Democrats in New England. Factions of both episodically gave strong support to independent politics in hopes of breaking down the locally dominant parties, though the national leaderships remained ambivalent about such ventures. Those extensive third party efforts in the Reconstruction and its aftermath redirected one or both of the major parties to issues and concerns that required attention. Mere protest, then, permitted an ongoing renewal of the legitimacy of the existing power structure. Beyond this, the more agrarian Democrats had some very traditional mild interest in Latin America, while the more commercially concerned Republicans tended to look towards Asia. The Spanish-American War at the close of the century addressed these bipartisan ambitions, waging wars to finally secure U. The American people had never gone to the polls and elected pro-war candidates to take power. Rather, the decisions to launch the conflict took place behind closed doors. Those who wanted war leaked disinformation about the sinking of the USS Maine, in this case, shaping public perceptions in such a way as to where the people would permit waging the war, and then went to war claiming that public had insisted upon it. On the home front, the Panic of had plunged the country into a depression. The armed resistance of Native Americans came to an end and Frederick Jackson Turner, of the new historical profession, read his influential paper declaring an end to the frontier. The Midwest, which had supplied most of the presidents since the Lincoln, faded in importance before New York and the centers of financial capital in the northeast. Progressive Reform “ Moving Forward? The presidential election illustrates how the politicians themselves acknowledged the deep desire of the American public: That is, no one party would take up the idea of greater government involvement in the economic and social life of the nation and triumph at the polls over a more conservative position taken by the other party. Taft and Woodrow Wilson “ reshaped the role of government. The older rules that informed how the economy and government functioned had permitted the chaotic phase of industrial expansion, but that process had run its course and became an obstacle to its future, fuller development. Capitalist rule now required change. Unsanitary conditions in the cities not only affected the working poor but interfered with production. Once germinated, diseases growing from the slums did not stay there. Access to cheap child labor discouraged investment in new technologies requiring more skill, experience and strength “ nor did it fuel the kind of mass public education then permitting Germany to leap forward industrially and scientifically. However, backed by a virtually monopoly over the media, they marked the extent to which this or any modern government could twist the truth to its own purposes and their people would accept it. Despite serious losses, the United States emerged from the war as the only industrial power essentially unscathed. Neither major party objected to the war, nor to the treatment that waging it imposed on the people. So too, by the s “ under the Republican administrations of Warren G. Harding, Calvin Coolidge and Herbert Hoover “ American capitalism entered the age where fortunes could be made through a consumer economy. Yet the prosperity associated with the period always remained very restricted to certain sectors. The white middle class prospered and many skilled workers with them. Industrial workers and people of color did not fare so well. The difference turned largely on the question of creditworthiness, determining who could participate in a better life that had to be bought on an installment plan. New innovations in finance extended the kind of credit business got to private individuals. It permitted workers and citizens generally to behave as consumers.

DOWNLOAD PDF AMERICAS SIGNATURE EXCLUSION : HOW DEMOCRACY IS MADE SAFE FOR THE TWO-PARTY SYSTEM

Chapter 2 : Project MUSE - Latin American Democracies

Borrow it Toggle Dropdown Albert D. Cohen Management Library; Architecture/Fine Arts Library; Archives and Special Collections; Biblioth que Alfred-Monnin (Universit  de Saint-Boniface).

On March 30, at 6: Support for democracy is declining in two-party countries like the US also called majoritarian countries, they are almost exclusively former British colonies , which are caught in bitter partisan battles and unable to address the pressing problems of inequality, lack of opportunity, social justice, and social safety nets. In contrast, parliamentary democracies with Proportional Representation elections and stable multiparty coalition governments, typical of the Nordic region, generate a broader consensus about welfare policies addressing inequality, exclusion, and social justice, and this avoids the adversarial winner-take-all divisive politics and social inequality more characteristic of majoritarian systems. Sky-high housing costs in jobs-rich areas are driving inequality in the US. In short, with more elastic housing supply, the United States would be richer on average, and the gains would be disproportionately concentrated among poorer people and poorer states. It takes a village, but there are no villages. Eric All over the world, teenagers are doing less fighting and drinking, and are less likely to get pregnant. Clear your calendar this weekend because you are about to binge-watch all six episodes of Wild, Wild Country on Netflix. Harvard Business Review describes new research showing that smart phonesâ€”even if turned off and lying face downâ€”impair our cognitive abilities: Attempts to block or resist this pull takes a toll by impairing our cognitive abilities. Aven Have you ever wondered why capitalism is so hard to escape, even though it seems like so many people are disillusioned with it to say the least as the dominant human social paradigm? It may be because of our similarity to leaf cutter ants. Scientists have finally found some good news about coral reefs. Scientists have also come up with an interesting way to think about the climate impacts of car use: The researchers also calculated the relationship between greenhouse gas emissions and glacier mass loss. They found that under current climatic conditions, every kilogram of carbon dioxide emissions will eventually result in the disappearance of In other words, for every meters you drive a car, you lose a pocket glacier roughly the size of a large guinea pig. For the record, meters is roughly feet, or less than one third of a mile. The epitome of Big Oil just released a radical decarbonization scenario , outlining the steps it sees as necessary to fulfill the objectives of the Paris agreement: And for a little levity, ever heard of an egg spoon? So now you know. Ed The New York Times released its annual diversity report this week , detailing the gender and racial breakdown of its overall staff and in its leadership positions. Though this was painful to look through, both as a person of color and as a former journalist who worked there once upon a time, I remain appreciative of the fact that the company is willing to be this transparent about the makeup of its staff. First, how has your perspective of gender changed throughout your life? As a Tacoma kid, I was raised in the norms of a cis, hetero, white, Hispanic Catholic household. I had to wear a skirt at school, and was only allowed to wear pants after 4th grade if it was winter. It was, as many of you might relate to, strictly binary and unyielding. I constantly seek a new understanding of gender to confront that upbringing. My favorite line was this: One of the photo captions sums up the massive amount of work we have to do to achieve gender equality: Second, how could your perspective of gender change in the future? Seattle tech company Tableau was just announced as the official data visualization software for United Nations. And I assure you that tech is not neutral â€” it matters who designs it. Find this article interesting? Please consider making a gift to support our work. The Sustainable Development Goal I like to focus on is 5 for gender equality, of course. And yet, most of the global gender data is only binary. And third, how does your understanding of gender influence policy? A week later, Ms. In a related item, for readers looking for the next opportunity to march, the March for Science is planned on April 14, in Washington D. Barbara Clabots is a Sightline Daily editor. John Abbotts is a former Sightline research consultant who occasionally submits material for Weekend Reading and other posts.

DOWNLOAD PDF AMERICAS SIGNATURE EXCLUSION : HOW DEMOCRACY IS MADE SAFE FOR THE TWO-PARTY SYSTEM

Chapter 3 : Democracy – Global Issues

Overruling democracy: the Supreme Court versus the American people/ CHAPTER FIVE America's Signature Exclusion How Democracy Is Made Safe for the Two-Party System.

Democracy, with all its problems, also has its paradoxes. Regular elections lead to short government life-time. This seems to result in more emphasis on short term goals and safer issues that appeal to populist issues. It also diverts precious time toward re-election campaigns. Anti-democratic forces may use the democratic process to get voted in or get policies enacted in their favor. Communism economic preferences, and liberal vs authoritarian political preferences may allow for non-democratic policies under the guise of democracy. Democracies may, ironically perhaps, create a more effective military as people chose to willingly support their democratic ideals and are not forced to fight. Some of these are discussed further, here: Voting in non-democratic forces. Two examples of this paradox are the following: Hitler and his party were voted in. He then got rid of democracy and started his gross human rights violations and genocidal campaigns as a dictator. Hamas was also recently voted in by Palestinians. The lack of aid, upon which the Palestinians have been quite dependent contributed to friction amongst Palestinians who support Hamas and those that do not and this has been amplified by the worsening economic situation there. The Hitler example highlights the importance media and propaganda play and the need for continued open self-criticism to guard against these tendencies. Minorities losing out to majorities. Another criticism of democracy is that sometimes what the majority votes for or prefers, may not necessarily be good for everyone. A common example plaguing many countries which have diversity in race and religion is that a dominant group may prefer policies that undermine others. Some quick examples include Nigeria which has large Christian and Muslim populations; some Muslims there, and in other countries, want Sharia Law, which not all Muslim necessarily want, let alone people of other faiths. If only a very slight majority can override a very large minority on such an important issue as how one should live, then there is a real chance for tension and conflict. Another example is India, often help us an example of pluralism throughout the ages, despite all manner of challenges. Yet, unfortunately an Indian government report finds that its claims to religious integration and harmony are on far shakier grounds than previously believed. This can come through various outlets, including, a diverse mainstream media, institutions such as religious and legal ones, schooling, family upbringings, etc. Equally important are the underlying economic conditions and situations of a country. Generally, it seems, where economically people are generally doing well, where the inequality gap is not excessive, people have less of a reason to opt for more defensive, reactionary or aggressive policies that undermine others. The fear of the public and disdain of democracy from elites while publicly claiming to supporting it. People often see democracy as an equalizing factor that should not allow the elite or wealthy in a society to rule in an autocratic, despotic, unaccountable manner. Instead they have to respond to the will of the people, and ultimately be accountable to them. Furthermore and ideally, it should not only be the wealthy or elite that hold the power. There should be some form of equality when representing the nation. However, this has also meant at least two accompanying phenomena: Interestingly, leading up to the US mid-term elections, amidst all sorts of allegations of corruption coming to light, in an interview by Democracy Now! Karl Rove, the influential, but controversial, advisor and strategist for President George W. What people do not realize about [Karl Rove] is that everything about him is political utility. When he looked at what was going on with the megachurches Karl decided he was going to take these gigantic churches on the Christian right and to turn them into a gigantic vote delivery system. This is not a man who has deeply held religious faith. This is just one example, where parties have simply targeted people to get votes for power. And yet, many in the religious right believe that Bush represents them and some even see him as an instrument of God, showing just how effective political utility and manipulation has been. Noting that different people refer to, and think of democracy in different ways, even some despots have called themselves democratic! For such volatile ingredients can at times be unstable unless in carefully measured and

DOWNLOAD PDF AMERICAS SIGNATURE EXCLUSION : HOW DEMOCRACY IS MADE SAFE FOR THE TWO-PARTY SYSTEM

monitored combinations. John Stuart Mill whose *Essay on Liberty and Considerations on Representative Government* are two of the great books of the modern world, came to believe that every adult yes, women too should have the vote, but only after compulsory secondary education had been instituted and had time to take effect. In some countries, healthy cynicism has given way to outright contempt or excessive cynicism at anything a government official promises! What this does mean, however, is that those with ambitions of power and ulterior agendas have to therefore resort to even more propaganda and media savvy manipulation, as Crick notes: For both autocrats and despots depend in the main on a passive population; they had no need to mobilize en masse Napoleon was to say: Long before the Soviet Union broke up, a group of Russian writers touring the United States were astonished to find, after reading the newspapers and watching television, that almost all the opinions on all the vital issues were the same. We tear out their fingernails. Here you have none of that. How do you do it? The buildup to the Iraq invasion is also an example of the lengths that governments of two democracies, the US and UK, would go to to gain support for their cause. Limited time in power means going for short term policies Many democracies have rules that elections must be held regularly, say every 4 or 5 years. The short life span of governments is there for an important reason: Yet, at the same time, the short-termism that results has its problems too. Today, the politics of the United States and Great Britain become more and more populist: Some governments find this opposition has foreign support, or, because of their own failures has created a vacuum either a power vacuum, participation vacuum or some other failure that has allowed people to consider alternatives seriously. When a legitimate government is then deliberating, or taking, stronger actions, that government can easily be criticized for rolling back democracy, acting dictatorially or in some way undermining the rights of their people. This can then strengthen the non-democratic opposition further. There are unfortunately countless examples of such foreign and domestic interference with potential and actual democracies to be listed here. It is common for example, to hear of say the former Soviet Union doing this. Unfortunately, while less common to hear about it in the mainstream, western governments have also been complicit in overthrowing and undermining democracies in other parts of the world in favor of puppet regimes, be they dictatorships or pseudo democracies. Two useful resources to read more about these include J. One recent example worth highlighting here is Venezuela, where Hugo Chavez managed to reverse a coup against him. This coup was aggressively supported by many in the Venezuelan elite media and also by the US. After the coup, news channels that actively supported the coup in to oust Chavez, were still allowed to remain in operation which many democracies would not usually tolerate. The main media outlet, RCTV, aggressively anti Chavez, was denied a renewal license in , not because it was critical of Chavez policies, but because a pre-Chavez government law did not look too kindly on broadcasters encouraging coups after all, what government would! RCTV and their supporters tried to insist otherwise; that this was an issue of free speech. The US mainstream media has generally been hostile to Chavez as has been the Bush administration itself , and this was therefore added to the other mis-characterizations often presented , lending credence to the view that Chavez is a dictator. In essence a law enacted during the previous dictatorial regime backed by the US and others is now being turned around and used against Chavez as another example of power-grabbing. Chavez is not helping his own cause by his often vocal and inflammatory antics, but it should not be forgotten how much foreign influence may be contributing to the undermining of democracy tendencies. Venezuela has been through a succession of dictatorships and many supporters of the previous regimes are in the anti-Chavez groups. Regardless of whether one is pro- or anti- Chavez, it certainly seems that democratic participation has increased during his tenure, given all the increased political activity, both pro- and anti-Chavez. On this particular issue, the point is not to ban stories on Creationism; they are better taught in religious classes, not science classes. Yet, often missed from that is that scientific theories are usually based on a well-substantiated explanation that gets tested whenever possible, whereas religious ideas usually are required to be accepted on faith. More generally in the United States, there is however, a growing concern at the rise in an extreme religious right that wants to replace the democratic system with a Christian State. Although we are accustomed to hear about Muslim extremists pushing for religious-based states in

DOWNLOAD PDF AMERICAS SIGNATURE EXCLUSION : HOW DEMOCRACY IS MADE SAFE FOR THE TWO-PARTY SYSTEM

various Middle East countries, this example is one in a democracy where despite the principle of a separation of Church and State, Christian religious extremists push forward with their agenda, anyway. Those with money are more likely to be candidates. It is a common concern in many democratic countries that those with sufficient funds, or fund-raising capability are the ones who will become the final candidates that voters choose from. Others, who may be more democratic, but are either poor, or lack the finances of the leading contenders, or will not likely support policies that influential mega donors support, will often lose out. Yet, one would think in a democracy, time should be afforded to make all popular voices heard, not just the leading four from the two main parties, as that just results in the leading four becoming unfairly popular at the expense of the rest, and makes the concern they raise into a self-serving argument. Understandably, finding time for all candidates might not be practical if there are many, but always limiting it to the four from the two leading parties results in the same choices people have to choose from each time, limiting diversity especially when many feel the two leading parties are quite similar on many issues. Attempts to suggest caps on finances of any sort to address this undue influence are met with support from those who have little, but ferocious resistance from those who stand to lose out. Newspapers and other media outlets are often less than impartial in election campaigns. The high concentrated ownership of major media outlets does not always bode well for democracies as it puts a lot of influence into a handful of owners. In the US, it can be argued that the differences between some Democrats and Republicans are quite small in the larger context, and the media owners come from the same elite pool, thus reinforcing the impression of vast differences and debate on major issues. The result is that many get put off and the remaining who do want to vote have access to just a few voices from which to make any notion of informed decisions. In summary, democracy does not automatically require free markets and free markets does not automatically require democracy. Leading up to World War II, a number of European nations saw their power determined by fascists, often via a democratic process. Today, many European democracies attempt a social model of economic development ranging from socialist to somewhat managed markets. In the Indian state of Kerala, for example, a party was voted in that has put communist practices in place with some reasonable success. Of course, many communist regimes in reality have also been accompanied by dictatorships and despots in an attempt to enforce that economic ideology. And during the beginnings of free markets, the major European powers promoting it were themselves hardly democratic. Instead they were dominated by imperialist, racist, colonialist and aristocratic views and systems. The point here is that by not making this distinction, policies can often be highlighted that appear democratic, or even could undermine democracy depending on how it is carried out as many African countries have experienced, for example. As a recent example, as South Africa came out of apartheid, it was praised for its move to democracy, its truth and reconciliation approach and other political moves. Less discussed however, were the economic policies and conditions that followed. A report describing a conference celebrating 10 years of South African independence from Apartheid noted how difficult a democratic system is to establish when combined with factors like regional and international economics. The question of how the international world relates to and indeed is responsible for some of the problems was also deliberated at the conference. While the consensus was on Africans. Indeed, some of the economic problems of the countries in the region can be traced back to their relationships with former colonial masters. More recently, the structural adjustment programmes of the 1980s continue to affect the economic stability of SADC countries. The link between globalisation and democratisation was further debated in the economic session of the conference. Suffice to say, democracy is threatened when a state cannot determine its own budget. The conditionality cripples the development of a socially transformative democracy. A number of the debt rescheduling agreements have fostered cutbacks on social spending, and have created conditions of further economic marginalisation and social exclusion of the poor. In the long term, the consolidation of democracy is threatened because the conditions have the effect of fostering social unrest.

DOWNLOAD PDF AMERICAS SIGNATURE EXCLUSION : HOW DEMOCRACY IS MADE SAFE FOR THE TWO-PARTY SYSTEM

Chapter 4 : America as a One-Party State

Gore and the judicial assault on democracy --Reading democracy out: the citizen has no right to vote and the majority doesn't rule --Unequal protection: the Supreme Court's racial double standard in redistricting --America's signature exclusion: how democracy is made safe for the two-party system --"Arrogant Orwellian bureaucrats": how.

Thu Aug 18, 6: I do think the House should be vastly enlargedâ€”at least members, possibly more, and Senators back to being appointed by state legislatures which would bring some balance back. Also, Congress needs to return to its place as the government and the President back to be an administrator of the executive rather than most important person on the planetâ€”silly. To your comment about political parties, the saddest thing about "political parties" is that no one party can really truly represent all of a persons views. So what happened is people got lazy Hmmm No, probably more accurate to say: People are often lazy by nature so , instead of having their own view and thoughts, they outsourced it to a political party. Now many lazy people "identify" as one party or the other. Thankfully there is a growing population of independent voters. Politics is actually hard, and getting thoughtful, insightful discussion on topics where people have widely differing views is not easy for many people. I too believe this is where we should go. They are just going along in order to remain in office and to be able to pass some things they do want. The GOP has fractures just like the Democrats do. For what it is worth, we do in a way have a balancing system in play right now. Everyone vying for independents in the middle keeps candidates from straying too far left or right. But, that would happen in a multi party system too. At the heart of this is the fact that people are best governed at the most local level as possible. Leaving the least amount of power at the national level. Which is why we have the 10th amendment. When someone complains about some sort of federal over reach, or expansion of policy, just remember that your party does it too when in power. Personally, your local school board should be the most powerful government you are subjected to. Simply because you have the most direct influence over them. Sadly, hardly anyone pays attention to those elections. On another note, gridlock in congress is honestly best for us all. It slows things down and prevents bad legislation from being rammed through.

DOWNLOAD PDF AMERICAS SIGNATURE EXCLUSION : HOW DEMOCRACY IS MADE SAFE FOR THE TWO-PARTY SYSTEM

Chapter 5 : Overruling democracy : the Supreme Court versus the American people (eBook,) [blog.quintoa

Overruling Democracy. The Supreme Court vs. The American People. By Jamin B. Raskin. Reviews. The Supreme Court has recently issued decisions announcing that citizens have neither a constitutional right to vote, nor the right to an education.

The United States could become a nation in which the dominant party rules for a prolonged period, marginalizes a token opposition and is extremely difficult to dislodge because democracy itself is rigged. This would be unprecedented in U. In past single-party eras, the majority party earned its preeminence with broad popular support. Today the electorate remains closely divided, and actually prefers more Democratic policy positions than Republican ones. Yet the drift toward an engineered one-party Republican state has aroused little press scrutiny or widespread popular protest. We are at risk of becoming an autocracy in three key respects. First, Republican parliamentary gimmickry has emasculated legislative opposition in the House of Representatives the Senate has other problems. House Majority Leader Tom DeLay of Texas has both intimidated moderate Republicans and reduced the minority party to window dressing, rather like the token opposition parties in Mexico during the six-decade dominance of the PRI. Second, electoral rules have been rigged to make it increasingly difficult for the incumbent party to be ejected by the voters, absent a Depression-scale disaster, Watergate-class scandal or Teddy Roosevelt-style ruling party split. What once was a slender and precarious majority -- Republicans to Democrats including Bernie Sanders of Vermont, an independent who votes with Democrats -- now looks like a Republican lock. In the Senate, the dynamics are different but equally daunting for Democrats. As the Florida debacle of showed, the Republicans are also able to hold down the number of opposition votes, with complicity from Republican courts. And the latest money-and-politics regime, nominally a reform, may give the right more of a financial advantage than ever. Third, the federal courts, which have slowed some executive-branch efforts to destroy liberties, will be a complete rubber stamp if the right wins one more presidential election. Taken together, these several forces could well enable the Republicans to become the permanent party of autocratic government for at least a generation. Take a close look at the particulars. There were national Democrats, mostly liberals; "Dixiecrats," who often voted with Republicans Congressional Quarterly called this the conservative coalition and tabulated its frequent wins ; conservative Republicans; and moderate-to-liberal "gypsy moth" Republicans, who selectively voted with Democrats. Ad hoc coalitions shifted with issues. Back-benchers and committee chairs alike often defied both the leadership and the party caucus. Party loyalty was guaranteed only in the biennial election of the speaker, to give the dominant party formal majority status and perquisites. Infrequently, there were other moments of centralized leadership and relative party unity, among them the th Congress under Democratic Speaker Jim Wright and the tenures of two autocratic Republican speakers, Thomas Reed and Joe Cannon, back in the Gilded Age. A famous report by the American Political Science Association argued that more responsible parties would make for more effective democracy. Along with shifting coalitions and weak party discipline, there was usually reasonable comity between majority and minority party. Major legislation was the product of lengthy committee hearings. Both parties could call witnesses. On most bills except tax legislation in the House there could be floor amendments, with extensive debate. Recorded floor amendments allowed members to be held accountable by constituents. House-Senate conference committees included majority and minority party conferees, and their final product was a compromise between the House and Senate bills. Go to the official congressional Web site and you will learn that this is supposedly how a bill becomes a law. All that has radically changed. Seeds of the change began appearing during the speakerships of both Democrat Jim Wright and Republican Newt Gingrich , which produced more centralized leadership and party discipline. But the more radical changes, at the expense of democracy itself, have occurred since under Tom DeLay. The power to write legislation has been centralized in the House Republican leadership. Hastert is seen in some quarters as a figurehead, but his man Palmer is as powerful as DeLay. Drastic revisions to bills

DOWNLOAD PDF AMERICAS SIGNATURE EXCLUSION : HOW DEMOCRACY IS MADE SAFE FOR THE TWO-PARTY SYSTEM

approved by committee are characteristically added by the leadership, often late in the evening. Under the House rules, 48 hours are supposed to elapse before floor action. But in , the leadership, 57 percent of the time, wrote rules declaring bills to be "emergency" measures, allowing them to be considered with as little as 30 minutes notice. On several measures, members literally did not know what they were voting for. DeLay has used the rules process both to write new legislation that circumvents the hearing process and to all but eliminate floor amendments for Republicans and Democrats alike. The Rules Committee, controlled by the Republican leadership, writes a rule specifying the terms of debate for every bill that reaches the House floor. When Democrats controlled the House, Republicans complained bitterly when the occasional bill did not allow for open floor amendments. In , Republicans pledged reform. Gerald Solomon, the new Republican chairman of the committee, explicitly promised that at least 70 percent of bills would come to the floor with rules permitting amendments. Instead, the proportion of bills prohibiting amendments has steadily increased, from 56 percent during the th Congress to 76 percent in . This comparison actually understates the shift, because virtually all major bills now come to the floor with rules prohibiting amendments. DeLay has elevated votes on these rules into rigid tests of party loyalty, on a par with election of the speaker. A Republican House member who votes against a rule structuring floor debate will lose committee assignments and campaign funds, and can expect DeLay to sponsor a primary opponent. How does this undermine democracy? As the recent Medicare bill was coming to a vote, a majority of House members were sympathetic to amendments allowing drug imports from Canada and empowering the federal government to negotiate wholesale drug prices. But by prohibiting floor amendments, DeLay made sure that the bill passed as written by the leadership, and that members were spared the embarrassment or accountability of voting against amendments popular with constituents. The Senate still allows floor amendments, but Senate-passed bills must go to conference with the House. Democratic House and Senate conferees are increasingly barred from attending conference committees, unless they are known turncoats. Republican House and Senate conferees work out their intraparty differences, work their respective caucuses and send the nonamendable bill back to each house for a quick up-or-down vote. On the Medicare bill, members had one day to study a measure of more than 1, pages, much of it written from scratch in conference. Before the DeLay revolution, drafting new legislation in conference committee was almost unknown. But under DeLay, major provisions of the Medicare bill sprang fully grown from a conference committee. Republicans got a conference to include a weakened media-concentration standard that had been explicitly voted down by each house separately. Though both chambers had voted to block an administration measure watering down overtime-pay protections for workers, the provision was tacked onto a must-pass bill in conference. The official summary of House procedures, written by the Republican-appointed House parliamentarian and updated in June , notes: Consequently, they may not strike out or amend any portion of the bill that was not amended by the other House. Furthermore, they may not insert new matter that is not germane to or that is beyond the scope of the differences between the two Houses. Appropriations bills are must-pass affairs, otherwise the government eventually shuts down. Traditionally, substantive legislation is enacted in the usual way, then the appropriations process approves all or part of the funding. There has long been modest abuse in the form of earmarked money for pet pork-barrel projects and substantive riders being tacked onto appropriations bills. But since Gingrich, a lot of substantive bill drafting has been centralized in House leadership task forces appointed by the majority leader. And under DeLay, Appropriations subcommittee chairs must now be approved by the leadership, as well as by the Appropriations chairman. The legislation written by stealth in the Rules Committee and in conference, and the exclusion of the minority party from conferences, are new. In , Speaker Jim Wright occasionally used closed rules restricting floor amendments, but DeLay has made the railroading systematic. Before , conservative Democratic committee chairs often blocked liberal legislation, despite nominal Democratic House majorities. In , rules changes supported by the large and idealistic "Watergate class" allowed the caucus to elect committee chairs, overturning the system of seniority. As speaker, Wright gained control of the Rules Committee and occasionally used his powers to frustrate floor amendments. He devised complex rules that

DOWNLOAD PDF AMERICAS SIGNATURE EXCLUSION : HOW DEMOCRACY IS MADE SAFE FOR THE TWO-PARTY SYSTEM

permitted nonbinding preliminary votes to be overridden by the final vote. This maneuver, bitterly criticized by Republicans at the time, was the germ of the rules abuses that DeLay has taken to dictatorial levels. To enforce party discipline, the DeLay operation has also perfected a technique known as "catch and release. When the leadership gets a final head count and determines just how many votes are needed, some will be reeled in and others let off the hook and given permission to vote "no. Basically, Republican moderates are allowed to take turns voting against bills they either oppose on principle or know to be unpopular in their districts. On the Medicare bill, 13 Republican House members voted one way on the House-passed bill and the other way on the conference bill. That way they could tell constituents whatever they needed to. On the Medicare bill, the final roll-call vote was held open a full three hours well after midnight so that the leadership could keep pressuring Republican legislators who wanted to vote "no. Why is there no revolt of the Republican moderates? They are split along issue lines, too intimidated and too few to mount a serious challenge, and almost never vote as a bloc. The only House Republicans who openly challenge DeLay as a group are those to his right, almost all of whom voted against the Medicare bill as too expensive. And why has this anti-democratic revolution aroused so little general attention or indignation? First, Democrats are ambivalent about taking this issue to the country or to the press because many are convinced that nobody cares about "process" issues. The whole thing sounds like inside baseball, or worse, like losers whining. If they complain that big bad Tom DeLay keeps marginalizing them, as one senior House staffer puts it, "It just makes us look weak. Press investigation and popular outrage toppled him. In the Senate, Democrats still have the filibuster as a weapon of last resort, though the Republicans want to abolish it for judicial nominations. The Senate also continues to permit recorded floor amendments. But there is far less unity among Senate Democrats than among House Democrats, and Senate Republicans are learning anti-democratic tactics from the House. Most notably, they are complicit in the abuse of conference committees. A Permanent Legislative Majority It may feel like an eternity, but wall-to-wall one-party government has been in place only since Republicans took control of the Senate briefly during -- they lost it when Vermont Senator Jim Jeffords quit the party that May -- and again since January Clinton himself practiced bipartisan "triangulation," which further weakened the Democrats. In one sense, parliamentary discipline is good for democracy: It enables voters to hold the party of government accountable. But today, it has become far more difficult to oust the congressional in-party. One big reason is the vanishing swing district. If the current abuse of parliamentary processes were operating in ordinary times, the opposition party would soon be returned to power and a cycle of reform would ensue. But since the early s, the number of contestable House seats has come down and down.

DOWNLOAD PDF AMERICAS SIGNATURE EXCLUSION : HOW DEMOCRACY IS MADE SAFE FOR THE TWO-PARTY SYSTEM

Chapter 6 : Should there be a Multi Party System in American Democracy? - blog.quintoapp.com

There was a time, several decades ago, when America's two-party system was praised for its moderation. Unlike European parliamentary democracies where "dogmatic ideological parties" of.

Transcript This is a rush transcript. Copy may not be in its final form. I think the American people deserve to know what we would do different. Everyone who is watching this knows health insurance premiums are through the roof. We need to talk about what we will do that they have not done. They have blocked allowing prescription drugs in the country from Canada. They would not allow the government to use this negotiating power to get discounts for seniors. You have 30 seconds to respond to that, Mr. The fact of the matter is, the most important and significant change in health care in the last several years was the Medicare Reform Bill this year. The fact is that when that came up, Senator Kerry and Senator Edwards voted against it. It will provide prescription drug benefits to 40 million senior citizens. They had a choice of allowing prescription drugs into this country from Canada, of being with the American people or with the drug companies. They were with the drug companies. They had a choice on negotiating discounts in the Medicare Prescription Drug Bill, being with the American people or with the drug companies. John Kerry and I will always fight for the American people. John Edwards and Dick Cheney debating in their first and only vice presidential debate. For years she was a radio talk show host, former Green Party candidate for governor of Maine where she was the first woman in the history of Maine, where she became the first woman in the history of Maine to gain ballot access for a political party through her candidacy. Welcome to Democracy Now! Thanks for having me. Can you respond on the issue of health care. Clearly, the whole system is corrupt, and where the Bush administration wants to do absolutely nothing except make the insurance companies and the drug companies wealthier, the Kerry administration would provide a bunch of Band-aids on the problem. I used the word Band-Aid on purpose. The Medicare drug coverage bill that Vice President Cheney spoke of is an absolute ruse and a joke. It almost makes lives worse for the poor. Then if they sign up for it, they cannot sign out of it if they found out that the drug company plan that they particularly picked, if they get a new prescription and that prescription is not favorably priced in the drug bill, then they cannot change for like a year. And they pay the exorbitant price on the new prescription. We need to revamp this corrupt drug system that we have, the corrupt insurance company system that we have. We need universal health care. There is not a nation in the world that has it that has people rioting in the streets to get rid of it. Just in general, and this particular issue, really, as it relates to all of the issues, the current so-called mainstream candidates literally, as we have stated before, almost look like two heads of the same corrupt, sloppy centralized monster. And our response again to health care issues, education issues, and issues all across the board is that we so desperately need another approach, both an approach in governing, administering, and literally just an approach that can be brought to the American people. We seek privatization, individualization, and alternative medicine and prescription approaches. In fact, it seems to be, and this is a general concern and gripe we have with the administration, which is they oftentimes speak out of one side of their mouths, and pretty much govern in virtually the exact opposite way. Your response to Pat LaMarche, universal health care. Well, the choices in the debate, the fact that you cannot hear from any candidate like Pat LaMarche or Ralph Nader or myself or anybody who would be for universal health care like every European country has. We spend for every dollar we spend on medical care, 25 cents goes to the insurance companies. This is money that could go to health care. We have 45 million people without health care in America. I would add to all of the wonderful points that Pat LaMarche made, our health care system should be focused on preventative. We should be trying to prevent people from getting ill, not just developing an industry that basically waits for people to get ill and then sells them something to cure them, which is the way our medical profession has focused. These are all issues that just cannot be heard in these debates because both Cheney and Edwards start from a framework of agreement that the insurance companies will continue to dominate, control, and be the people who run health care in America. Pat

DOWNLOAD PDF AMERICAS SIGNATURE EXCLUSION : HOW DEMOCRACY IS MADE SAFE FOR THE TWO-PARTY SYSTEM

LaMarche, who are you voting for for president? Well, I live in a district of Maine where we are the only other state besides Nebraska where we split our electoral votes. But we are very sensitive this year. The Green Party is very sensitive to the fact that George Bush is the worst president in the history of time. He has serious competition for that title. He needs to go. I think the world is looking for us to do that. But if I thought that Mr. Kerry could do a good job of articulating what is important to people for the United States of America, I would not have run. And certainly, we want to hit the ground running November 3, making the Green Party, bigger, better, stronger. More local candidates need to be elected on the 2nd. This time, the spoiler may not be Ralph Nader, but a man whose name most voters have never heard. That is the presidential nominee of the libertarian party on the ballot in 48 states. Your response and who are you telling people to vote for? Well, let me ask Peter Camejo this question, Ralph Nader vice presidential running mate. Your response on this issue of swing states, vote for another candidate, safe states, vote for Ralph Nader and yourself. I think to look at this issue one has to think about how we live in a political prison; how these two parties, very deliberately, do not allow run-offs, so that people are not free to listen to what a Pat LaMarche has to say, or a Ralph Nader or a Libertarian, and say, well, do I agree, and vote for who they agree with. John Kerry is a man who gave George Bush 18 standing ovations in January. He gave him 18 standing ovations. You go around in circles, and what you end up doing is voting for war, for the Patriot act against the Kyoto Protocol, against everything that you believe in, by falling into this trap of saying that you have to choose between these two. At one point, the Abolitionist movement made a decision they would no longer do this. They would no longer interview the candidates and say which one is the least pro-slavery. Pat LaMarche, your response. We need instant runoff voting, and we need ballot access law changed. We need to do that by getting more legislators elected, more local representation. There many cities now adopting instant runoff voting, which allows you to vote your preferences, which I believe would have made Ralph Nader president in the year. There are many things that would allow us to have a better system, but I cannot on the same token close my eyes to the fact that George Bush operates on a system where we have gotten in one year, more kids living in poverty. So, while I completely agree with the fact that these guys are not savory and not what we want, the ability to take the sting out of George Bush, plus he deserves to be fired. He has gathered evidence that was erroneous. He went off the deep end over Dan Rather possibly having misinformation about Alabama in the National Guard, but then he used misinformation to get us into war. This is Democracy Now! More in a minute. Right now, talk with the three third party candidates about their views on issues. That things are going to be better if we elect a democrat. That is the myth that has perpetuated the two-party system, and which continues to have working people and the mass of the American people, the environmentalists, voting against everything they believe in with the illusion let us not forget, it was the democrats that brought us the war in Vietnam; they sent half a million soldiers, killed 2 million Vietnamese. But, Peter Camejo, this point that the most vulnerable people in this country will be the most affected. Even interviewing Ralph Nader the other day, he was saying of the two candidates, yes, John Kerry is better, and the question of whether Supreme Court Justices matter, whether even small degrees of difference around health care will matter. The democrats is what makes a Bush possible. By people arguing to vote democrat is what makes Bush be able to win. That is, Bush is not a byproduct of some special circumstance. They set it up. The job of the democrats is to find out how to implement it and continue to have the public support the government. In the time that they have been in office, in the last four years, 1. One out of almost two children in Cleveland are now living in poverty. During the time that the vice president and the president have been in office, 4 million more Americans have fallen into poverty. We have to do better. We have a plan. I want to make sure people hear that, the fundamental difference with us. The administration says over and over that the outsourcing of millions of American jobs is good. We want to get rid of tax cuts for companies sending jobs overseas. We want to balance this budget, get back to fiscal responsibility. And we want to invest in the creative, innovative jobs of the future. The Democrats promised prescription drug benefits. They never got it done. The president got it done. We also dropped 5 million people totally off the federal income tax rolls, so they no longer have to pay any federal income tax at all. So

**DOWNLOAD PDF AMERICAS SIGNATURE EXCLUSION : HOW
DEMOCRACY IS MADE SAFE FOR THE TWO-PARTY SYSTEM**

the story, I think, is a good one. Dick Cheney and John Edwards.

DOWNLOAD PDF AMERICAS SIGNATURE EXCLUSION : HOW DEMOCRACY IS MADE SAFE FOR THE TWO-PARTY SYSTEM

Chapter 7 : Weekend Reading 3/30/ - Sightline Institute

Gore and the judicial assault on democracy -- Reading democracy out: the citizen has no right to vote and the majority doesn't rule -- Unequal protection: the Supreme Court's racial double standard in redistricting -- America's signature exclusion: how democracy is made safe for the two-party system -- "Arrogant Orwellian bureaucrats": how.

Additional Information In lieu of an abstract, here is a brief excerpt of the content: The Maintenance of Liberal Democracy in Colombia, Costa Rica, and Venezuela 3 96 Latin American Democracies WE SAW in the preceding chapter that there are important similarities as well as many differences in the processes by which liberal democracies emerged in these countries. This chapter will analyze the manner of functioning of the liberal democratic regimes after their establishment, and will suggest that the regimes are fundamentally similar to one another, in spite of some important differences. Given the 90 percent literacy rate of contemporary Costa Rica, however, the restriction is not numerically very important. Average voting turnout in presidential elections varies from more than 90 percent in Venezuela, to about 80 percent in Costa Rica, to 50 percent or less in Colombia. These differences reflect contrasting orientations of the systems toward voting participation. Moreover, liberal residence requirements and the simple processes of voting in Venezuela and Costa Rica make voting relatively easy. The number of separate elections has also been minimized in these two countries: Those who have made the laws and regulations want high voter turnout, which will enhance the democratic legitimacy of the system by involving most adult citizens in this symbolic act of consent see Figure i. The current leaders of Colombia can still remember a time when citizens were politically mobilized beyond elite control. The National Front was set up explicitly to demobilize the population by eliminating interparty competition. Demobilization was further served by separating presidential and legislative elections and by making voting voluntary and the procedure itself difficult and cumbersome. Months before the election prospective voters must assure that their national identification cards are in order. If they wish to vote anywhere other than the place where the card was issued, they must go through a separate procedure. On election day all roads are closed, so that persons who need to vote in their hometowns must take three days off in order to vote. Furthermore, the actual casting of the vote is an elaborate procedure. In short, the Colombian authorities prefer apathy to a mobilization they may not be able to control. Other forms of political participation vary similarly. The Venezuelan parties make use of far larger numbers of activists, with more elaborate and institutionalized organization and much more ample financing, than do those of Costa Rica or Colombia. This is the case even though the Colombian parties have deep and durable roots in the party identification of the citizenry. That the Colombian parties are almost immutable social institutions does not necessarily mean that they are effectively organized as political forces. It is a commonplace of Costa Rican politics that only the Partido Liberación Nacional has even a semblance of continuing organization and capacity for mass mobilization, and by comparison with either of the dominant Venezuelan parties it is indeed a semblance. Nevertheless, during the period of stable liberal democracy, all three systems have achieved a certain balance between the levels of mass participation and the capacities of the parties to organize and channel that participation. On one hand, the parties engage in competitive mobilization of voters and organization of activists for the purpose of winning elections. On the other hand, the party systems work to define, structure, and limit voter choice to a narrow range of options which are mutually acceptable to competing elites. In each case this party system has evolved, rather than simply being created. In Colombia the two-party rivalry was limited and safeguarded by formal power-sharing and the legal exclusion of other parties under the National Front. You are not currently authenticated. View freely available titles:

DOWNLOAD PDF AMERICAS SIGNATURE EXCLUSION : HOW DEMOCRACY IS MADE SAFE FOR THE TWO-PARTY SYSTEM

Chapter 8 : Left Out in Cleveland: Three VP Candidates Speak Out on the Two-Party System | Democracy

To a lesser extent, it is also true in the UK, which, while a Parliamentary Democracy, also operates a first-past-the-post, winner-takes-all system. In , David Cameron won a parliamentary majority with 36% of the vote.

Posted 28 April - Speaking at the opening session, Nicaraguan President Daniel Ortega noted that while a large majority of the heads of states of the Americas were present, "there are two major absentees". The first was "Cuba, whose crime has been to fight for its independence, for the sovereignty of the peoples; lending solidarity, without conditions, to our peoples, and for that it is being sanctioned, for that it is being punished, for that it is being excluded. In his April 4 column, "Why is Cuba being excluded? Arguing that there were "a great number of inadmissible concepts", he said that the summit would be a "litmus test for the peoples of the Caribbean and Latin America". Part of the reason was the exclusion of Cuba and the refusal of the US to lift its nearly five decade-long economic blockade. Venezuelan President Hugo Chavez proposed the next summit be held in Havana. This is a long way from previous decades, when only a handful of regional governments kept links and the OAS backed US anti-Cuba policy. In light of this hemispheric shift, the Obama administration recently moved to lift travel restrictions to Cuba for Cubans living in the US. It also eased restrictions on remittances from Cuban immigrants in the US sent home. However, Obama remains firm on keeping the US blockade, despite speculation of more changes to come.. On April 20, the Washington Post reported Obama as saying: The real cause of continued US hostility is that "Cuba remains a solid source of pride" for the continent. Cuba achieved impressive social gains, including an extensive and completely free education system and a lower infant mortality rate than the US. It has achieved these gains despite the US blockade and the economic crisis caused by the collapse of the Soviet Union in the early s. The US government and its apologists accuse Cuba of a lack of democracy. I have no doubt that there is more democracy in Cuba than in the United States. Bay of Pigs invasion [in] while remaining fiercely independent in a region dominated by U. This profound break from U. The foundation of the Cuban economy is arranged in such a way that it threatens the most basic philosophic principle shared by the two-party system:

DOWNLOAD PDF AMERICAS SIGNATURE EXCLUSION : HOW DEMOCRACY IS MADE SAFE FOR THE TWO-PARTY SYSTEM

Chapter 9 : Overruling democracy : the Supreme Court vs. the American people (eBook,) [blog.quintoapp.

The lowest-priced brand-new, unused, unopened, undamaged item in its original packaging (where packaging is applicable). Packaging should be the same as what is found in a retail store, unless the item is handmade or was packaged by the manufacturer in non-retail packaging, such as an unprinted box or plastic bag.

The Supreme Court vs. Raskin Reviews The Supreme Court has recently issued decisions announcing that citizens have neither a constitutional right to vote, nor the right to an education. Conservative judges have continually disavowed claims to any rights not specifically mentioned in the Constitution. In *Overruling Democracy*, celebrated law professor Jamin B. Raskin, argues that we need to develop a whole new set of rights, through amendments or court decisions, that revitalize and protect the democracy of everyday life. Detailing specific cases through interesting narratives, *Overruling Democracy* describes the transgressions of the Supreme Court against the Constitution and the people—and the faulty reasoning behind them—and lays out the plan for the best way to back a more democratic system. Gore, the Supreme Court determined the American people have "no federal constitutional right to vote. In *Overruling Democracy*, Meantime, the judiciary has interfered with democracy by wiping out majority-African American and Hispanic congressional districts; inventing "rights" for private corporations to spend unlimited funds in public initiative and referendum campaigns; upholding discriminatory ballot access laws that exclude third parties; and denying the existence of a right to equal spending on public schools. Raskin argues that defending civil liberties is insufficient to deal with the current judicial "reactivism" because today the minority is stifling the rights of the majority. What needs to be defended is democracy. Arguing for a new "constitutional patriotism," Raskin urges a series of constitutional amendments to protect the democratic rights the Court has read out of the document. Taking fellow liberals to task for being afraid of constitutional politics, Raskin argues it is time to take the issue of overruling democracy directly to the people. This brilliantly argued and meticulously researched book both alarms and inspires. Raskin shows how the Supreme Court has used its own perverse version of judicious activism to attack our fundamental constitutional rights -- and he offers a vision for how to restore democracy to America. *Overruling Democracy* belongs on the reading list of anyone who takes citizenship serious. Not a counsel of despair, *Overruling Democracy* also explains how we the people--with a little courage--can reclaim our democracy. You may disagree with some of his ideas, as I do, and still come away refreshed and even electrified. The old issue was liberal judicial activism. The new issue is a conservative judicial activism that could constrain the ability of the democratic branches of our government to solve public problems. In *Overruling Democracy*, he offers a critique of American law and politics that is impassioned yet thoughtful, polemical yet informative. Even those who take a more restrained view of the role of judges will benefit from his powerful arguments and moral fervor. This book is required reading for every citizen who cares about the fate of our democracy. Michigan, Democratic leader on the House Judiciary Committee.