I'm not a robot



```
Silhouettes of people are seen on an American flag as President Joe Biden speaks on July 6, 2022, in Cleveland. Evan Vucci/AP What do we call the system of government in the U.S.? Are we a democracy or a republic? The conundrum is, well, as the common expression goes, "as old as the republic itself." But it's not just a question for scholars and
semanticists any more. Since the election of 2020, supporters of former President Donald Trump have become notably more willing to assert their belief that voting in America is suspect. That Trump won an election he lost. That "millions of ballots" were uncounted or miscounted. That voting by mail was fraught with abuse. Despite the lack of
evidence, and the judgments of election officials from both parties and judges appointed by presidents from both parties, election deniers respond by saying the U.S. is not a democracy, it is a republic. Robert Draper of The New
York Times published a piece on Republicans who say this in August. He cited a GOP candidate for the Arizona state legislature, Selina Bliss, saying: "We are not a democracy. Nowhere in the Constitution does it use the word 'democracy.' I think of the Democratic Republic of the Congo. That's not us." But a democracy. But a democracy. I think of the Democracy.
Throughout our history we have functioned as both. Put another way, we have utilized characteristics of both. The people decide, but they do so through elected representatives working in pre-established, rule-bound and intentionally balky institutions such as Congress and the courts. The government seated in Washington, D.C., represents a
democratic republic, which governs a federated union of states, each of which in turn has its own democratic and republican government for its jurisdiction. The relationship between the democratic and republican government for its jurisdiction. The relationship between the democratic and republican government for its jurisdiction.
between them has become yet another flashpoint in our partisan wars. Going to war over weaponized words We regularly hear people on the left speak of conservatives destroying democracy, and just as regularly we hear conservatives destroying democracy, and just as regularly we hear conservatives say Democrats have no respect for the Constitution. To add to the confusion, the two camps often swap their lines
of attack and defense. Republicans call Democrats enemies of democracy, Democrats rail against what they see as Republican disrespect for the Constitution, and to advertise themselves as such to the voters. Yes, as a polity, we think
we are and can be both. We aspire to be both. But in practice that can prove difficult. And in our time, when so much of the public discourse happens on Twitter and cable TV news, the terms have become increasingly weaponized. "Equality and democracy are under assault," said President Biden on the steps of Independence Hall last week. "We do
ourselves no favor to pretend otherwise." Biden at Independence Hall used the word democracy 31 times, including three times in one sentence. He used the republic and its restraint on democracy. Sen. Mike Lee of Utah, an outspoken Republican
but hardly an outlier, got considerable attention for saying bluntly on Twitter in October 2020: "We are not a democracy." Lee then posted online an explanation of what he meant. It said, in part: "Our system is best described as a constitutional republic [where] power is not found in mere majorities, but in carefully balanced power." Lee went on to
catalog how difficult it was for majorities in Congress to pass legislation, get it signed by a president and watch it undergo judicial review. Lee's point was that he was OK with all that. It was the intent of the founders. "In the absence of consensus," Lee wrote, "there isn't supposed to be federal law." Writing in 2020 in The Atlantic, George Thomas,
the Wohlford Professor of American Political Institutions at Claremont McKenna College, found "some truth to this insistence" on calling the U.S. a republic but added: "It is mostly disingenuous. The Constitution was meant to foster a complex form of majority rule, not enable minority rule." This is not just a quibble over terms. It is a fundamental
battle over what American government aspires to be. Are we a democracy where the voice of God? Or are we a republic? That is to say, a government of laws not of men, deriving its authority not by divine right of inheritance or strength of arms but by
reason and by adherence to the mechanisms of the Constitution. Calling things by their proper names It's also not a coincidence that those names tend to suggest which end of the democratic-republican bargain they favor. Our current parties trace their roots to a common ancestor in a party begun by Thomas Jefferson and James Madison in the early
decades of nationhood. That party formed in opposition to the original party of George Washington and John Adams, known as the Federalists because they emphasized the central authority of the combined 13 states (the original party of George Washington and others who rose in opposition were called,
naturally enough, anti-Federalists. Jefferson liked the word republican and used it a lot, in part for the anti-monarchist emphasis. Others thought the term had less meaning because so many different kinds of viewpoints claimed it. The party eventually took on the label of Democratic-Republicans. That moniker might have been too much of a mouthful
to enunciate, and its coalition may have been too wide to sustain. At the time, there were also voters and candidates who preferred calling themselves National Republicans, especially in New England. That element morphed into the Whigs, while the Democratic-Republicans dominated in the South and eventually became simply Democrats — the
preference of President Andrew Jackson. In the 1850s, exhausted by the North-South tensions that were leading to the Civil War, the Whigs gave way to a new party's biggest issue was abolition, but they adopted (perhaps at the suggestion of journalist Horace Greeley) the previously orphaned half
of the old Democratic-Republican Party name. They have since been known simply as Republicans. But both terms have far deeper origins in the ancient world The Athenian democracy in Greece around 500 BCE denoted the right of the people (demos) to personify power (kratos) and meant it to include an entire polity - or at least its males.
Something like 5,000 citizens were enfranchised to participate, and when they chose to delegate some of the governing task to a smaller body they still had 500 members of that council (boule). Thomas says "the founding generation" in the U.S. never considered the Greek model workable beyond a limited area (idealized perhaps by the New England
town hall). Thomas says that generation was "deeply skeptical of what it called 'pure democracy' and defended the American experiment as 'wholly republican." That is, it was a government of the people not of royalty. It also incorporated some of the inspiration referenced in the Latin word republic, a hearkening back to the Romans who established
the first Senate around 750 BCE. Thomas says the American experiment has been about harmonizing democratic and republican models, two "popular forms of government," each of which "drew its legitimacy from the people and depended on rule by the people." The essential difference was the role of representatives to substitute for the gathering of
all the people at one point in time and space. "To take this as a rejection of democracy misses how the idea of government by the people, including both a democracy and a republic, was understand the idea of democracy today." One way to understand
that idea was articulated by Jefferson himself way back in 1816, when he wrote: "We may say with truth and meaning, that governments are more or less of the element of popular election and control in their composition." [emphasis added] It is hard to imagine a better statement of the two concepts as they may
be comingled and act in concert. It falls to our generation to renew that understanding in the context of our own time, two full centuries later. Politics of the United StatesPolity typeConstitutional federal republicFormationMarch 4, 1789; 236 years ago (1789-03-04)Legislative branchNameCongressTypeBicameralMeeting placeCapitolUpper
houseNameSenatePresiding officerJD Vance, Vice President & President of the SenateAppointerDirect ElectionLower houseNameHouse of RepresentativesPresiding officerMike Johnson, Speaker of the House of RepresentativesAppointerDirect ElectionLower houseNameHouse of RepresentativesPresiding officerMike Johnson, Speaker of the House OfficerMike Johnson 
TrumpAppointerElectoral CollegeCabinetNameCabinet of the United StatesCurrent cabinetSecond cabinet of the United StatesCourts of the United States of
RobertsSeatSupreme Court Building This article is part of a series on the United States Federal government Constitution of the United Stat
districts (list) Non-voting members Senate President JD Vance (R) President Pro Tempore Chuck Grassley (R) Majority Leader John Thune (R) Minority Leader Chuck Schumer (D) Executive President of the United States Donald Trump (R) Vice President of the United States JD Vance (R) Cabinet Federal agencies Executive Office Judiciary Supreme
Court of the United States Chief Justice John Roberts Thomas Alito Sotomayor Kagan Gorsuch Kavanaugh Barrett Jackson Inferior Courts of the United States Courts of the United States Courts of International Trade Alien Terrorist Removal Court Judicial Panel on Multidistrict Litigation Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Court Foreign
Intelligence Surveillance Court of Review Other tribunals Elections Presidential elections Presidential elections Presidential elections Presidential elections Presidential primary Elections Presidential elections Presidential elections Presidential primary Elections Presidential elections Preside
Kentucky Louisiana Maine Maryland Massachusetts Michigan Minnesota Mississippi Missouri Montana Nebraska Nevada New Hampshire New Jersey New Mexico New York North Carolina South Dakota Tennessee Texas Utah Vermont Virginia Washington West Virginia
Wisconsin Wyoming American Samoa Guam Northern Mariana Islands Puerto Rico U.S. Virgin Islands Elections in the District of Columbia (List of elections) Political ideologies Conservatism Black Fiscal Liberal Neo- Paleo- Social Traditionalist Trumpism
Liberalism Classical Conservative Modern Neo- Third Way Progressivism Abolitionism Constitutionalism Environmentalism Feminism Libertarianism Monarchism Conservative Paleo- Minarchism Constitutionalism Protectionism Republicanism Protectionism Republicanism Constitutionalism Protectionism Constitutionalism Conservative Paleo- Minarchism Co
Federalism State and territorial government Governors Legislatures (list) Courts Local government District of Columbia government District of Columbia government District Council Mayor Superior Court Foreign relations Department of State Secretary of State: Marco Rubio Diplomatic missions of / in the United States Nationality law Passports Visa requirements Visa policy United
States and the United Nations United Nations United Nations Security Council P5 NATO G20 G7 Russia China India Japan Canada United States, politics functions within a framework of a constitutional federal democratic republic with a presidential system.
The three distinct branches share powers: Congress, which forms the legislative branch, a bicameral legislative branch, which is headed by the president of the United States, who serves as the country's head of state and government; and the judicial branch, composed of
the Supreme Court and lower federal courts, and which exercises judicial power. Each of the 50 individual state government nor denied to the states in the U.S. Constitution. Each state also has a constitution following the pattern of the federal
constitution but differing in details. Each has three branches: an executive branch headed by a governor, a legislative body, and a judicial branch. At the local level, governments are found in counties or county-equivalents, and beneath them individual municipalities, townships, school districts, and special districts. Officials are popularly elected at
the federal, state and local levels, with the major exception being the president, who is instead elected indirectly by the people through the Electoral College. American politics is dominated by two parties have run candidates. Since
the mid-20th century, the Democratic Party has generally supported left-leaning policies, while the Republican Party has generally supported right-leaning ones. Both parties have no formal central organization at the national level that controls membership, elected officials or political policies; thus, each party has traditionally had factions and
individuals that deviated from party positions. Almost all public officials in America are elected from single-member districts and win office by winning a plurality of votes cast (i.e. more than any other candidate, but not necessarily a majority). Suffrage is nearly universal for citizens 18 years of age and older, with the notable exception of registered
felons in some states. Main article: Federal government of the United States See also: United States federal executive departments, United States federal judiciary of the United States federal judiciary of the United States federal executive departments, United States federal political system.
of government), Congress, and judiciary share powers reserved to the national government is divided into three branches, as per the specific terms articulated in the U.S. Constitution: The executive branch is headed by the president and is
independent of the legislature. Legislature power is vested in the two chambers of Congress: the Senate and the House of Representatives. The judiciary's function is to interpret the United States Constitution and federal laws and
regulations. This includes resolving disputes between the executive and legislative branches. The federal government's layout is explained in the Constitution. Two political parties, the Democratic Party and the Republican Party, have dominated American politics since the American Civil War, although other parties have existed.[1][2] There are major
differences between the political system of the United States and that of many other developed countries; a Supreme Court that also has a wider scope of power than is found in most countries; a separation of powers
between the legislature and the executive; and a political landscape dominated by only two main parties. The United States is one of the world's only developed countries where all additional parties have minimal or nonexistent influence and almost no representation at the national and state level. Causes for this mainly focus on the plurality-based
first-past-the-post voting system, used in most elections, which encourages strategic voting and discourages vote splitting. This also results in both major parties having multiple internal factions. [citation needed] The federal entity created by the U.S. Constitution is the dominant feature of the American governmental system, as citizens are also
subject to a state government and various units of local government (such as counties, municipalities, and special districts). New York State Senate chamber US state and territory governments (governor and legislature) by party control Democratic control Republican control NPP control Split control US state and territorial legislatures by party
control Democratic control Republican control NPP control State government nor denied to the federal government nor denied to the federal government, which only
has those powers granted to it in the Constitution, a state government has inherent powers allowing it to act unless limited by a provision of the state or national constitution. Like the federal government, state government, state government, state government, state government, state government, and judicial. The chief executive of a state is its popularly elected governor, who
typically holds office for a four-year term (although in some states the term is two years). Except for Nebraska, which has unicameral legislature, all states have a bicameral legislature, with the upper house usually called the Senate and the lower house and the lower house usually called the Senate and the lower house and the lower house and the lower house and the lower house and the 
local level, the process of initiatives and referendums allow citizens to place new legislation on a popular primary elections, are signature reforms of the Progressive Era; they
are written into several state constitutions, particularly in the Western states, but not found at the federal level. See also: Initiatives and referendums in the United States vote for political offices. (Shown is San Francisco City Hall
commemorating the occasion.) Main articles: Local government in the United States and Urban politics in the United States Census Bureau conducts the Census of Governments every five years, categorizing four types of local governments every five years, categorizing four types of local governments.
governments Municipal governments Special-purpose local governments, including 5,033 counties, 16,500 townships, 13,000 school districts, and 37,000 other special districts. [4] Local governments directly serve the
needs of the people, providing everything from police and fire protection to sanitary codes, health regulations, education, public transportation, and housing. Typically local elections are nonpartisan — local activists suspend their party affiliations when campaigning and governing.[5] Main article: County (United States) The county is the
administrative subdivision of the state, authorized by state constitutions and statutes. The county equivalents in Louisiana are called parishes, while those in Alaska are called boroughs. The specific governmental powers of counties vary widely between the states. In some states, mainly in New England, they are primarily used as judicial districts. In
other states, counties have broad powers in housing, education, transportation and recreation. County government has been eliminated throughout Connecticut, Rhode Island, and in parts of Massachusetts; while the Unorganized Borough area of Alaska (which makes up about a half of the area of the state) does not operate under a county-level
government at all. In areas that do not have any county governmental function and are simply a division of land, services are provided either by lower level townships or municipalities, or the state. Counties may contain a number of cities, towns, villages, or hamlets. Some cities—including Philadelphia, Honolulu, San Francisco, Nashville, and Denver
 —are consolidated city-counties, where the municipality and the county have been merged into a unified, coterminous jurisdiction—that is to say, these counties, such as Arlington County, Virginia, do not have any additional
subdivisions. Some states contain independent cities that are not part of any county; although it may still function as if it was a consolidated city-county, an independent cities that are each coterminous with a
county. In most U.S. counties, one town or city is designated as the county seat, and this is where the board of commissioners or supervisors meets. In small counties, boards are chosen by the county seat, and this is where the board of commissioners or supervisors meets. In small counties, boards are chosen by the county seat, and this is where the board of commissioners or supervisors meets.
for state and local governments; borrows and appropriates money; fixes the salaries of county employees; supervises elections; builds and maintains highways and bridges; and administers national, state, and county welfare programs. In very small counties, the executive and legislative power may lie entirely with a sole commissioner, who is assisted
by boards to supervise taxes and elections. Main article: Civil township Town or township governments are organized local governments authorized in the state constitutions and statutes of 20 Northeastern and Midwestern states, [3] established as minor civil divisions to provide general government for a geographic subdivision of a county where
there is no municipality. In New York, Wisconsin and New England, these county subdivisions are called towns. In many other states, the term town does not have any specific meaning; it is simply an informal term applied to populated places (both incorporated municipality. In New York, Wisconsin and New England, these county subdivisions are called towns. In many other states, the term town is equivalent
to how civil townships are used in other states. Like counties, the specific responsibilities to townships vary based on each state. Many states grant townships are used in others, survey townships are non-governmental. Towns in the six New
England states and townships in New Jersey and Pennsylvania are included in this category by the Census Bureau, despite the fact that they are legally municipal corporations, since their structure has no necessary relation to concentration of population, [3] which is typical of municipalities elsewhere in the United States. In particular, towns in New
England have considerably more power than most townships elsewhere and often function as legally equivalent to cities, typically exercising the full range of powers that are divided between counties, townships, and cities in other states. [6] Township functions are generally overseen by a governing board, whose name also varies from state to state.
Main articles: Municipality, City, Town § United States), and Plantation (Maine) Municipal governments are organized local governments authorized in state constitutions and statutes, established to provide general government for a defined area, generally corresponding to a population center rather
than one of a set of areas into which a county is divided. The category includes those governments designated as cities, boroughs (except in Minnesota and Wisconsin), and villages.[7] This concept corresponds roughly to the "incorporated places" that are recognized in by the U.S. Census Bureau, although the Census Bureau
excludes New England towns from their statistics for this category, and the count of municipal governments excludes places that are governments vary widely across the nation. Almost all have a central council, elected by the
voters, and an executive officer, assisted by various department heads, to manage the city's affairs. Cities in the West and South usually have nonpartisan local politics. There are three general types of municipal government: the mayor-council, the commission, and the council-manager. These are the pure forms; many cities have developed a
combination of two or three of them. Main article: Mayor-council government. This is the oldest form of city government in the United States and, until the beginning of the 20th century, was used by nearly all American cities. Its structure is like that of the
state and national governments, with an elected mayor as chief of the executive branch and an elected council that represents the various neighborhoods forming the legislative branch. The mayor appoints heads of city departments and other officials (sometimes with the approval of the council), has the power to veto over ordinances (the laws of the
city), and often is responsible for preparing the city's budget. The council passes city ordinances, sets the tax rate on property, and apportions money among the various city departments. As cities have usually come to represent more than a single neighborhood. This combines both the legislative and executive functions in
one group of officials, usually three or more in number, elected city-wide. Each commissioner supervises the work of one or more city departments. Commissioners also set policies and rules by which the city is operated. One is named chairperson of the body and is often called the mayor, although their power is equivalent to that of the other
commissioners.[8] The city manager is a response to the increasing complexity of urban problems that need management ability not often possessed by elected public officials. The answer has been to entrust most of the executive powers, including law enforcement and provision of services, to a highly trained and experienced professional city
manager. The council-manager plan has been adopted by a large number of cities. Under this plan, a small, elected council makes the city ordinances and sets policy, but hires a paid administrator, also called a city manager, to carry out its decisions. The manager draws up the city budget and supervises most of the departments. Usually, there is no
set term; the manager serves as long as the council is satisfied with their work. Some states contain unincorporated areas only need to pay taxes to the county, state and federal governments as opposed to the municipal
government as well. A notable example of this is Paradise, Nevada, an unincorporated area where many of the casinos commonly associated with Las Vegas are situated. [9] Main articles: Special district (United States) and School district In addition to general-purpose government entities legislating at the state, county, and city level, special-purpose
areas may exist as well, provide one or more specific services that are not being supplied by other existing governments. [10] School districts are organized local entities providing public elementary and secondary education which, under state law, have sufficient administrative and fiscal autonomy to qualify as separate governments.
are authorized by state law to provide designated functions as established in the district's charter or other founding document, and with sufficient administrative and fiscal autonomy to qualify as separate governments;[11] known by a variety of titles, including districts, authorities, boards, commissions, etc., as specified in the enabling state
legislation. Main article: Unincorporated territories of the United States The United States possesses a number of unincorporated territories, including 16 island territories across the globe.[12] These are areas of land which are not under the jurisdiction of any state, and do not have a government established by Congress through an organic act
Citizens of these territories can vote for members of their own local governments, and some can also elect representatives to serve in Congress—though they only have observer status.[12] The unincorporated territories of their own local governments, and some can also elect representatives to serve in Congress—though they only have observer status.[12] The unincorporated territories of their own local governments, and some can also elect representatives to serve in Congress—though they only have observer status.[12] The unincorporated territories of their own local governments, and some can also elect representatives to serve in Congress—though they only have observer status.[12] The unincorporated territories of their own local governments, and some can also elect representatives to serve in Congress—though they only have observer status.[13] The unincorporated territories of their own local governments, and some can also elect representatives to serve in Congress—though they only have observer status.[13] The unincorporated territories of their own local governments, and some can also elect representatives to serve in Congress—though they only have observer status.[13] The unincorporated territories of their own local governments are served in the congress of the congress 
the U.S. Virgin Islands; as well as minor outlying island, Jarvis Island, Howland Island, Johnston Atoll, Wake Island, Johnston Atol
act was not passed in Congress, American Samoa established its own constitution in 1967, and has self governed ever since.[13] Seeking statehood or independence is often debated in US territories, such as in Puerto Rico, but even if referendums on these issues are held, congressional approval is needed for changes in status to take place.[14] The
citizenship status of residents in US unincorporated territories has caused concern for their ability to influence and participate in the politics of the United States. In recent decades, the Supreme Court has established voting as a fundamental right of US citizens, even though residents of territories do not hold full voting rights.[15] Despite this
residents must still abide by federal laws that they cannot equitably influence, as well as register for the national Selective Service System, which has led some scholars to argue that residents of territories are essentially second-class citizens.[15] The legal justifications for these discrepancies stem from the Insular Cases, which were a series of 1901
Supreme Court cases that some consider to be reflective of imperialism and racist views held in the United States. [12] Unequal access to political participation in US territories, as such an action requires forfeiting the full voting rights that they would have held in the 50 states
[15] Further information: Elections in the United States Voters cast ballots for the 2020 elections at Roosevelt High School in Des Moines, Iowa. Women's suffragists parade in New York City in 1917, carrying placards with the signatures of more than a million women[16] As in the United Kingdom and in other similar parliamentary systems, in the
U.S. Americans eligible to vote, vote for an individual candidate (there are sometimes exceptions in local government, officials are elected at the federal (national), state and local levels. All members of Congress, and the offices at the state and local levels are
directly elected, but the president is elected indirectly, by an Electoral College whose elected by popular vote. (Before the Seventeenth Amendment was passed, Senators were also elected by popular vote.)
modern practice, though, the electors are chosen by their party and pledged to vote for that party's presidential candidate (in rare occurrences they may violate their pledge, becoming a faithless elector). Both federal and state laws regulate elections. The United States Constitution defines (to a basic extent) how federal elections are held, in Article
One and Article Two and various amendments. State law regulates most aspects of electoral law, including primaries, the eligibility of voters (beyond the basic constitutional definition), the running of each state's electoral law, including primaries, the eligibility of voters (beyond the basic constitutional definition), the running of each state and local elections. Main articles: History of civil rights in the United States and Voting rights in
the United States Who has the right to vote in the United States is regulated by the Constitution and federal and state laws. Suffrage is nearly universal for citizens 18 years of age and older. Voting rights are sometimes restricted as a result of felony conviction, depending on the state.[18] The District, and other U.S. holdings like Puerto Rico and
Guam, do not have the right to choose any political figure outside their respective areas and can only elect a non-voting delegate to serve in the House of Representatives. All states and the District of Columbia contribute to the electoral vote for president. Main article: Campaign finance in the United States Political donations by major donors in the
US 2020 elections Successful participation, especially in federal elections, often requires large amounts of money, especially for television advertising.[19] This money can be very difficult to raise by appeals to a mass base, [20] although appeals for small donations over the Internet have been successful, [21] Opponents of campaign finance laws allege
they interfere with the First Amendment's guarantee of free speech. Even when laws are upheld, the complication of compliance with the First Amendment requires careful and cautious drafting of legislation, leading to laws that are still fairly limited in scope, especially in comparison to those of other developed democracies such as the United
Kingdom, France or Canada. Main article: Political parties in the United States This section does not cite any sources. Please help improve this section by adding citations to reliable sources. Unsourced material may be challenged and removed. Find sources. Unsourced material may be challenged and removed. Find sources. Please help improve this section by adding citations to reliable sources.
(Learn how and when to remove this message) The 2017 Women's March in Washington, D.C., protested the 2016 election of President Donald Trump Background The United States Constitution never formally addressed the issue of political parties, primarily because the Founding Fathers opposed them. Nevertheless, parties—specifically, two
competing parties in a "two-party system"—have been a fundamental part of American politics since shortly after George Washington's presidency. In partisan elections, candidates are nominated by a political party or seek public office as independents. Each state has significant discretion in deciding how candidates are nominated and thus eligible too.
appear on a given election ballot. Major party candidates are typically formally chosen in a party primary or convention, whereas candidates from minor parties and Independent candidates from minor parties and Independent candidates from minor parties and Independent candidates from minor party system in the United States is made up of the Democratic Party and the Republican Party. These two
parties have won every United States presidential election since 1852 and have controlled the United States presidential election since at least 1856. From time, a third party, such as the Green and Libertarian Parties, has achieved some minor representation at the national and state levels. Since the Green and Libertarian Parties, has achieved some minor representation at the national and state levels.
since the 1960s, the Democratic Party has generally positioned itself as a center-left party, while the Republican Party has generally positioned itself as center-right; there are other factions within each. See also: Political party strength in U.S. states Control of the Senate, Presidency, and House since 1855, with blue for Democrats and red for
Republicans. Any column where all three sections show the same color is a government trifecta; the other periods are divided government. Unlike in many other countries, the major political parties in America have no strong central organization that determines party positions and policies, rewards loyal members and officials, or expels rebels. A
party committee or convention may endorse a candidate for office, but deciding who will be the party's candidate in the general election is usually done in primaries open to voters who register as Democrats or Republicans. Furthermore, elected officials who fail to "toe the party line" because of constituent opposition said line and "cross the aisle" to
vote with the opposition have (relatively) little to fear from their party. Parties have state or federal committee and Republican National Co
their campaigns. In presidential elections, the party's candidate serves as the de facto party leader, whose popularity or lack thereof helps or hinders candidates further down the ballot. Midterm elections are usually considered a referendum on the sitting president's performance. [22][23] Some (e.g., Lee Drutman and Daniel J. Hopkins before 2018)
argue that, in the 21st century, along with becoming overly focused on national issues and "nationalized" that even local offices, formerly dealing with becoming overly focused on national issues and "nationalized" that even local offices, formerly dealing with becoming overly focused on national issues and "nationalized" that even local offices, formerly dealing with becoming overly focused on national issues and "nationalized" that even local offices, formerly dealing with become overly focused on national issues and "nationalized" that even local offices, formerly dealing with becoming overly focused on national issues and "nationalized" that even local offices, formerly dealing with become overly focused on national issues and "nationalized" that even local offices, formerly dealing with become overly focused on national issues and "nationalized" that even local offices, formerly dealing with become overly focused on national issues and "nationalized" that even local offices, formerly dealing with become overly focused on national issues and "nationalized" that even local offices, formerly dealing with become overly focused on national issues and "nationalized" that even local offices, formerly dealing with become overly focused on national issues and "nationalized" that even local offices, formerly dealing with become overly dealing wi
time to time in American history but seldom lasted more than a decade. They have sometimes been the vehicle of an individual (Theodore Roosevelt's "Bull Moose" party, Ross Perot's Reform Party); had considerable strength in particular regions (Socialist Party, the Farmer-Labor Party, Wisconsin Progressive Party, Conservative Party of New York
State,[note 2] and the Populist Party); or continued to run candidates for office to publicize some issue despite seldom winning even local elections (Libertarian Party, Natural Law Party); or continued to run candidates for office to publicize some issue despite seldom winning even local elections (Libertarian Party, Natural Law Party); or continued to run candidates for office to publicize some issue despite seldom winning even local elections (Libertarian Party).
candidate with the most votes wins (known as the "first-past-the-post" system), which according to Duverger's law favors the two-party system. This is in contrast to multi-seat electoral districts[note 3] and proportional representation found in some other democracies. The 19th-century innovation of printing "party tickets" to pass out to prospective.
voters to cast in ballot boxes (originally, voters went to the polls and publicly stated which candidate they supported) "consolidated the power of the major parties".[26] Printed party "tickets" (ballots) were eventually replaced by uniform ballots provided by the state when states began to adopt the Australian Secret Ballot Method. This gave state
legislatures—dominated by Democrats and Republicans—the opportunity to hinder new rising parties with ballot access laws requiring a large number of petition signatures. See also: Lobbying in the United States and Advocacy group K Street in Washington
D.C., has become a metonym for the American lobbying industry. Special-interest groups advocate the cause of their specific constituency. Business organizations, for example, will favor low corporate taxes and restrictions on the right to strike, whereas labor unions will support minimum wage legislation and protection for collective bargaining
Other private interest groups, such as churches and ethnic groups, are more concerned about broader policy issues affecting their organizations or beliefs. One type of private interest groups, are more concerned about broader policy issues affecting their organizations or beliefs.
or set of issues, which contribute money to political campaigns for United States Congress or the presidency. PACs are limited in the amounts they can contribute directly to advocate a point of view or to urge the election of candidates to office
As of 2008, 4,292 PACs were operating in the U.S..[27] The number of interest groups has mushroomed, with more and federal agencies. Many organizations that keep an eye on Washington seek financial and moral support from ordinary
citizens. Since many of them focus on a narrow set of concerns or even on a single issue, and often a single issue, and often a single issue, and often a single issue of enormous emotional weight, they compete with the parties for citizens' dollars, time, and passion. [28] The amount of money these special interest groups spend continues to grow as campaigns become increasingly expensive. Many
Americans feel that these wealthy interests, whether corporations, unions, or PACs, are so powerful that ordinary citizens can do little to counteract their influences. [citation needed] A survey of members of the American Economic Association (i.e., the Association of Professional Economists) found the vast majority—regardless of political affiliation—
felt the prevalence and influence of special interest groups in the United States, Religion in the United States, Religion in the United States, Freedom of religion in the United States, and
Religious discrimination in the United States Despite the First Amendment of the constitution's Establishment Clause ("Congress shall make no law respecting an establishment of religious groups) have frequently become political pressure groups and they have also
become parts of political coalitions.[30] In recent decades, conservative evangelicals have been particularly active within the broader Republican Party.[31] State alcohol and gambling laws, for example, are more restrictive in states with a higher
percentage of conservative Christians.[31] Main articles: Colonial history of the United States and Thirteen Colonies were unique within the European world for their (relatively) widespread
 suffrage which was granted to white male property owners, and the relative power and activity of the elected bodies which they could vote for.[32] These dealt with land grants, commercial subsidies, taxation, the oversight of roads, poor relief, taverns, and schools. Courts, (private lawsuits were very common) also provided Americans with experience
in public affairs and law,[33] and gave interest groups such as merchants, landlords, petty farmers, artisans, Anglicans, Presbyterians, Quakers, Germans, Scotch Irish, Yankees, Yorkers, etc. control over matters left to the royal court, aristocratic families and the established church in Great Britain. Finally, Americans were interested in the political
values of Republicanism, which celebrated equal rights, civic virtue, and abhorred corruption, luxury, and aristocracy. [34] The Statue of Liberty, a symbol of American freedom and openness to immigration Two pivotal political ideas in the establishment of the United States were Republicanism and classical liberalism. Central documents of American
thought include: the Declaration of Independence (1776), the Federalist and Anti-Federalist and Anti-Federalist Papers (1787-1790s), the Bill of Rights (1791), and Lincoln's "Gettysburg Address" (1863). Among the core tenets were: Consent of the government is dependent upon the assent of the
people as expressed in free and fair elections Civic duty/"Positive liberty"/"republican virtue": the responsibility to understand and support the government, participate in elections, pay taxes, oppose political corruption, and perform military service.[35] Democracy: government answerable to citizens, who may change who represents them through
elections. Equality before the law: laws that attach no special privilege to any citizen and hold government that neither supports nor suppresses any or all religion. Freedom of speech: government that restricts neither through law nor action the non-violent speech of a
citizen; a marketplace of ideas. At the time of the United States' founding, the economy was predominantly one of agriculture and small private businesses, and state governments left welfare issues to private or local initiative. As in the UK and other industrialized countries, laissez-faire ideology was largely discredited during the Great Depression
Between the 1930s and 1970s, fiscal policy was characterized by the Keynesian consensus. [37][38] After the "Reagan revolution" in the early 1980s, laissez-faire ideology once more became a powerful force in American welfare state expanded more than threefold after WWII, it held at 20% of GDP from the late 1970s
 to late 1980s.[40][41] In the 21st century, modern American liberalism, and modern American conservatism are engaged in a continuous political battle, characterized by what The Economist describes as "greater divisiveness [and] close, but bitterly fought elections."[42] Since 2016, the United States has been recognized as a flawed democracy in
the Democracy Index by the Economist Intelligence Unit, partially due to increased political polarization. [43][44] According to the V-Dem Democracy indices the United States were 2023 the 27th most electoral democracy indices the United States generally pursued a
noninterventionist policy of "avoiding foreign entanglements" before World War II. After the war, when America became a superpower, for many decades the country embraced internationalism, seeking allies to contain Communism and foster economic cooperation. See also: History of the United States Republican Party and History of the United
States Democratic Party The United States Constitution never formally addressed the issue of political parties, primarily because the Founding Fathers—Alexander Hamilton, James Madison, [46] George Washington—opposed them as domestic political factions leading to domestic conflict[47] and stagnation. [48] Nevertheless, the beginnings of the
American two-party system emerged from Washington's immediate circle of advisers, including Hamilton and Madison. By the 1790s, different views of the new country's proper course had already developed, with those holding the same views banding together. The followers of Alexander Hamilton (the "Federalist") favored a strong central
government that would support the interests of commerce and industry. The followers of Thomas Jefferson, ("Democratic Republicans") preferred a decentralized agrarian republic. By 1828, the Federalists had disappeared as an organization, replaced first by the National Republican Party and then by the Whigs, while the Democratic Republicans
evolved into the Democrats led by Andrew Jackson, and known for celebrating "the common (white) man" and the expansion of suffrage to most of them. In the 1850s, it was the Whigs' turn to disappear, undone by the issue of whether slavery should be allowed to expand into the country's new territories in the West. The Whigs were eventually
replaced by the Republican Party which opposed slavery expansion and whose first successful candidate for the presidency was Abraham Lincoln. In the 150+ years since the Democratic and Republican parties have been America's two major parties, though their policies, base of support and relative strength have changed considerably. Some eras in
American politics include: Reconstruction era (1865—1877) and Gilded Age (1870s—1900s). After the defeat of the Union and often known as "the Grand Old Party", became the dominant party in America. [49] The Democrats were dominant in the "Solid South"
(i.e. solidly Democratic) where "repressive legislation and physical intimidation" of Jim Crow prevented the "newly enfranchised African Americans from voting". They celebrated "state's rights", a key principle of segregationists. Nationwide democrats supported cheap-money, and opposed banking and tariffs.[50][51] Another element in its coalition
were mostly urban Catholics. Main article: Third Party System The Progressive Era (1896—1917). Progressive programs —municipal reforms, civil service reform, corrupt practices acts, and presidential primaries to replace the power of politicians at national conventions—strove to clean up politics, revitalize democracy, bringing to bear scientific
solutions to social problems. Progressive leaders included Republicans Theodore Roosevelt, Robert M. La Follette, and Charles Evans Hughes; Democrats William Jennings Bryan, Woodrow Wilson, and Al Smith. Main article: Fourth Party System The New Deal (1933—1938). These progressive leaders included Republicans Theodore Roosevelt designed to
deal with the disruption and suffering of the Great Depression — raising of the minimum wage, the establishment of the Social Security and other federal services — created a dramatic political shift in America. Roosevelt "forged a broad coalition—including small farmers, Northern city dwellers, organized labor, European immigrants, liberals,
intellectuals, and reformers". The Democratic party became the dominant party—retaining the presidency until 1952 and controlling both houses of Congress for most of the period until the mid-1990s. [50] Main article: Fifth Party System The Break up of New Deal coalition. The Civil Rights Act of 1964 and Voting Rights Act of 1965—driven by
Democratic president Lyndon B. Johnson—began the breaking off of the white segregationist Solid South from the Democratic party. Richard M. Nixon's "Southern strategy" began the process of winning white Southern strategy became victorious
with the 1980 victory of Ronald Reagan, who campaigned on a theme of smaller government, free trade and tax cuts. These would stimulate economic growth which would then "trickle down" to the middle and lower classes (who might not benefit initially from these policies). The Republican party was now said to rest on "three legs" of Christian
right/Social conservatism, fiscal conservatism, fiscal conservatism/small government, and strong anti-communist military policy. One year after the election of Donald Trump as U.S. president, American Facebook users on the political right and political left shared almost no common interests. Political polarization in the United States (1990s—present). Since the 1990s
the U.S. has experienced more "partisan sorting" (i.e. liberal Republicans and conservative Democrats began to disappear);[52] as well as a greater surge in ideological polarization, and affective polarization than comparable democracies, [53][54] with a shift away from focus on political success, toward the abhorrence and domination ("owning") of
supporters of the opposing party.[55] This move away from the center and change in ideology has not been symmetrical, with Republicans moving farther to the right than Democrats have moved to the left (based on rankings of congressional roll-call votes).[56] [note 4] Republican strategist Newt Gingrich introduced a "Take No Prisoners" [58] or
"no-holds-barred" style in congress, [59] that abandoned the norm whereby Democrats were opponents in elections but primarily colleagues to negotiate with in making good legislation. Gingrich taught that elections but primarily colleagues to negotiate with in making good legislation.
party "base" (core supporters), not reaching out to the persuadable or swing voter in the middle; attacking opponents strong points (for example running ads implying decorated veterans—Max Cleland and John Kerry—were actually treasonous).[60] Conspiracy theories also began to become mainstream among Republicans during this time (for
example accusing then Secretary of State Hillary Clinton of ordering the military to not protect Americans at the U.S. compound in Benghazi). [60] Presidency of Donald Trump (2017—2021). After decades of dominance, "Reagan Revolution" rhetoric and policy, began to be replaced by new themes Reaganism had not emphasized, (cultural/attitudinal
conservatism such as opposition to gay marriage, transgender rights). Themes it had not objected to (immigration from non-European countries) or had unequivocally supported (economic globalization and especially big business) were abandoned or attacked. Populism replaced gentility, [61] and prudent Edmund Burke conservatism. [62] In the party
base, not only had conservative (white) blue collar workers migrated to the Republican Party, but a business class that had been part of the Republican Party since the post-Civil War Gilded Age, began to leave. [note 5] Added to the louder and growing number of conspiracy theories [note 6] were "alternative facts". The "bedrock principle of
democracy, that losing candidates and their supporters accept the results" was no longer supported by the majority of Republicans. [66] Not only did white southerners leave the Democratic party but eventually a large majority of rural and working class whites nationwide became the base of the Republican Party. [67] Whereas for decades the college
educated voters skewed heavily toward the Republican party, eventually high educational attainment was a marker of Democratic support, (leading Donald Trump to proclaim to supporters, "I love the poorly educated!"). Post-2012 has also been characterized by even political division and a lack of a dominant political party, [68] In pre-colonial and
post-revolutionary American times, voters went to the polls and publicly stated which candidate they supported, rather than voting secretly, which was considered "cowardly" and "underhanded".[26] Originally, state laws required voters to be property owners, but "by the time Andrew Jackson was elected President, in 1828, nearly all white men could
vote".[26] Later in the 19th century, voting was done by written paper ballot. A broadened franchise where many voters were illiterate or misspelling disqualified a vote, led to the use of printed ballots. Each political party would create its own ballot—preprinted "party tickets"—give them to supporters, and who would publicly put the party's ballot
into the voting box, or hand them to election judges through a window. [26] The tickets indicated a vote for all of that party's slate of candidates, preventing "ticket splitting". [26] (As of 1859 "nowhere in the United States ... did election officials provide ballots", i.e. they all came from political parties.) In cities voters often had to make their way
through a throng of partisans who would try to prevent supporters of the opposing party from voting, a practice generally allowed unless it "clearly" appeared "that there was such a display of force as ought to have intimidated men of ordinary firmness."[26] The practice was dangerous enough that in "the middle decades of the nineteenth century,
several dozen (89) were killed in Election Day riots. [26] It was not until the late nineteenth century that states began to adopt the Australian secret-ballot method (despite fears it "would make any nation a nation of scoundrels"), [26] and it eventually became the national standard. The secret ballot method ensured that the privacy of voters would be
protected (hence government jobs could no longer be awarded to loyal voters), and each state would be responsible for creating one official ballot. U.S. presidential election popular vote totals as a percentage of the total U.S. population grew from 1-2% in the first American elections to over 40% by the 21st century. Note the surge in 1828 (extension
of suffrage to non-property-owning white men), the drop from 1890 to 1910 (when Southern states disenfranchised most African Americans and many poor whites), and another surge in 1920 (extension of suffrage expansion are: 1792-1856: Abolition of property qualifications for white men were abolished.[69]
1868: Citizenship was guaranteed to all persons born or naturalized in the United States by the Fourteenth Amendment, although Jim Crow laws prevented most African Americans from voting. 1920: Women are guaranteed the right to vote in all US states by the Nineteenth Amendment. 1964-66: Civil Rights laws and Supreme Court rulings eliminate
tax payment and wealth requirements and protect voter registration and voting for racial minorities. 1971: Adults aged 18 through 20 are granted the right to vote by the Twenty-sixth Amendment. Ongoing concerns include lack of representation in the U.S. territories and the District of Columbia; fear that the interests of some are overrepresented,
while others are underrepresented; a fear that certain features of the American political system make it less democratic, a fear that a small cultural elite has undermined traditional values, and whether policy and law-making is dominated by a small economic elite molding it to their interests. Greater representation given to small states in the Senate
and the Electoral College, "first-past-the-post" voting, gerrymandering, etc.—have in recent years had a more extreme effect and have begun to create a disconnect between what the majority of Americans want.[70] In an August 31, 2022, poll by Quinnipiac University, 69 percent of
Democrats and 69 percent of Republicans replied yes to the question "Do you think the nation's democracy" by the Bennett Institute for Public Policy at the University of Cambridge, found that for the first time on record, polls show a majority of Americans dissatisfied
with their system of government—a system of government—a system of which they were once famously proud. Such levels of democratic dissatisfaction would not be unusual elsewhere. But for the United States, it marks an "end of exceptionalism"—a profound shift in America's view of itself, and therefore, of its place in the world.[72] Concerns about the American political
system include how well it represents and serves the interests of Americans, Native 
states); whether policy and law-making is dominated by a small economic elite molding it to their interests; [73][74] whether a small cultural elite has undermined traditional values; [67] lack of a universal or single payer healthcare system, instead of the current system of reliance on employer provided for-profit private healthcare More recently,
concerns have included: a significant disconnect between what the majority of Americans want and what its government does (in supreme court rulings, legislation, etc.). This has expanded since the 1990s due to systemic issues such as gerrymandering, the United States Electoral College, first-past-the-post voting, etc. "a growing movement inside
one of the country's two major parties—the Republican Party—to refuse to accept defeat in an election"; a belief (without evidence) that voter fraud is "being committed by minority voters on a massive scale" preventing Republicans from being elected.[75] Observations of historical trends and current governmental demographics have raised concerns
about the equity of political representation in the United States. In particular, scholars have noted that levels of descriptive representation—which refers to when political representation in the United States. In particular, scholars have noted that levels of descriptive representation is
noted to be beneficial because of its symbolic representative benefits as a source of emotional identification with one's representatives. [77] Furthermore, descriptive representative and functional representatives.
with matching policy views and power in the political system. [76] [78] Serving as a congressional committee chair is considered to be a good example of this relationship, as chairs control which issues are addressed by committees, especially through hearings that bring substantial attention to certain issues. [76] Though minorities like African
Americans and Latinos have rarely served as committee chairs, studies have shown that their presence has directly led to significantly higher likelihoods of minority issues being addressed. [76] Given that racial and ethnic minorities of all backgrounds have historically been marginalized from participating in the US political system, their political
representation and access to policymaking has been limited.[76] Similarly, women lack proportional representation in the United States, bringing into question the extent to which women's issues are adequately addressed.[79] Other minority groups, such as the LGBTQ community, have also been disadvantaged by an absence of equitable
representation—especially since scholars have noted their gradual shift from originally being perceived as more of a moral political issue to being considered an actual constituency. [80] Political issue to being considered an actual constituency.
into account.[77] For women and minorities, this issue can occur even in the levels of government that are meant to be closest to constituents, such as among members of Congress in the House of Representatives. Scholars have noted that in positions such as these, even close proximity to constituents does not necessarily translate to an
understanding of their needs or experiences and that constituents can still feel unrepresented.[77] In a democracy, a lack of faith in one's representatives can cause them to search for less-democratic alternative forms of representatives can cause them to search for less-democratic alternative forms of representatives.
```

representation is especially acute, as lived experiences often lead to different political perspectives that can be difficult for white representatives to fully understand or adequately address. [76] Moreover, studies have begun to increasingly show that people of all races and genders tend to prefer having members of Congress who share their race or

```
gender, which can also lead to more engagement between constituents and their representatives, as well as higher likelihoods of contacting or having descriptive representation can help sustain an individual's positive
perceptions of government. When considering women in particular, it has been suggested that broader economic and social equality could result from first working toward ensuring more equitable political representation for women, which would also help promote increased faith between women and their representatives.[81] There are 57 African
American members of the US House (blue), 47 Hispanics and Latinos (red), 5 Native Americans (green), and 314 Whites (gray).117th Congress (2021-2023) There are 3 African Americans (green), and 88 European
Americans(gray). 117th Congress (2021-2023) See also: African Americans in the United States CongressAlthough African Americans have begun to continually win more elected positions and increase their overall political representation, they still lack proportional representation across a variety of different levels of government.[82] Some estimates
indicate that most gains for African Americans—and other minorities in general—have not occurred at higher levels of government, but rather at sub-levels in federal and state governments.[82] Additionally, congressional data from 2017 revealed that 35.7% of African Americans mationwide had a congressperson of the same race, while the majority
of black Americans were represented by members of Congress of a different race. [77] Scholars have partially explained this discrepancy by focusing on the obstacles that black candidates face. Factors like election type, campaign costs, district demographics, and historical barriers, such as voter suppression, can all hinder the likelihood of a black
candidate winning an election or even choosing to enter into an election process. [82] Demographics, in particular, are noted to have a large influence on black candidate success, as research has shown that the ratio of white-to-black voters can have a significant impact on a black candidate's chance of winning an election and that large black
populations tend to increase the resources available to African American American American Americans, other factors have been found to increase the likelihood of a black candidate winning an election. Based on data from a study in Louisiana
prior black incumbency, as well as running for an office that other black candidates had pursued in the past, increased the likelihood of African Americans in politics that other black candidates had pursued in the past, increased the likelihood of African Americans in politics that other black candidates had pursued in the 2010 US Census, Hispanic and Latino
Americans have become an increasingly important constituting 15% of the population in at least a quarter of House districts, Latino members of Congress only represented about
one-quarter of the total Latino population in the US.[77] While there are many potential explanations for this disparity, including issues related to voter suppression, surveys of Latino voters have identified trends unique to their demographic—though survey data has still indicated that descriptive representation is important to Hispanic and Latino
voters.[83] While descriptive representation may be considered important, an analysis of a 2004 national survey of Latinos revealed that political participation and substantive representation were strongly associated with each other, possibly indicating that voters mobilize more on behalf of candidates whose policy views reflect their own, rather than
for those who share their ethnic background. [78] Moreover, a breakdown of the rationale for emphasizing descriptive representation reveals additional factors behind supporting Latino candidates, such as the view that they may have a greater respect and appreciation for Spanish or a belief that Latinos are "linked" together, indicating the
significance of shared cultural experiences and values.[83] Although the reasons behind choosing to vote for Latino candidates are not monolithic, the election of Latinos to Congress has been identified as resulting in benefits for minorities overall. While it has been argued that unique district-related issues can take equal or greater precedence than
Latino interests for Hispanic and Latino members of Congress, studies have also shown that Latinos are more likely to support African American members in United States elections and Native American PoliticsSimilar to other
minority groups, Native Americans often lack representation due to electoral policies. Gerrymandering, in particular, is noted as a method of concentrating Native voters in a limited number of districts to reduce their ability to influence multiple elections. [84] Despite structural efforts to limit their political representation, some states with large
Native American populations have higher levels of representation. South Dakota has a Native population of about 9% with multiple federally recognized tribal nations, and it has been used as a case study of representation. [84] A 2017 study that conducted interviews of former state elected officials in South Dakota revealed that even though many felt
that they were only able to implement a limited number of significant changes for tribal communities, they still considered it to be "absolutely essential" that Native Americans had at least some descriptive representation to prevent complete exclusion from the political process. [84] Moreover, formerly elected state and local government officials
asserted that ensuring that the issues and concerns of tribal nations were addressed and understood depended on politicians with Native backgrounds. [84] Historically backed suspicion and skepticism of the predominantly white US government was also considered to be an important reason for having representatives that reflect the histories and
views of Native Americans.[84] See also: Asian Americans in politicsRelative to other, larger minority demographics in the United States, Asian Americans and Pacific Islanders (AAPI) face different challenges related to political representation. Few congressional districts have a population that includes over 50% Asian Americans, which can elevate
the likelihood of being represented by someone of a different race or ethnicity.[77] As with other minorities, this can result in people feeling unrepresented by their member of Congress.[77] See also: Gender and politics, Women in the United States House of Representatives, and Women in the United States Senate There are 122 women members of
the US House (blue) and 319 men (gray).117th Congress (2021-2023) There are 24 women members of the US Senate (blue) and 76 men (gray).117th Congress (2021-2023) Women have made continual socioeconomic progress in many key areas of society, such as in employment and education, and in comparison to men, women have voted at higher
rates for over forty years—making their lack of more proportional representation in the political system surprising. [79][81] Some scholars have partially attributed this discrepancy to the electoral system in the United States, as it does not provide a mechanism for the types of gender quotas seen in other countries. [81] Additionally, even though
gerrymandering and concentrated political representation can essentially ensure at least some representation for minority racial and ethnic groups, women—who are relatively evenly spread throughout the United States—do not receive similar benefits from this practice.[77] Identifying the source of unequal gender representation of individuals can
be predicted along party and ideological lines. A survey of attitudes toward women candidates revealed that Democrats are more likely to attribute systemic issues to gender inequalities in political representation, while Republicans are less likely to attribute systemic issues to gender inequality may ultimately prove unlikely.
some recent studies have suggested that the political ambitions of women may be influenced by the wide variety of proposed factors attributed to the underrepresentation, political party has also been identified as a way of predicting if a woman running for office is
more likely to receive support, as women candidates are more likely to receive votes from members of their party and Independents. [79] See also: Sexism in American political elections and Gender inequality Social inequality and sexism have been noted by scholars as influencing the electoral process for women. In a survey of attitudes toward women
candidates, women respondents were far more likely to view the process of running for office as "hostile" to women than men, especially when considering public discrimination.[79] Political fundraising for candidates is also an area of inequality, as men donate at a higher rate than
women—which is compounded by gender and racial inequalities related to income and employment.[81] Recent increases in woman-focused fundraising groups have started to alter this imbalance.[81] Given that disproportionate levels of household labor often become the responsibility of women, discrimination within households has also been
identified as a major influence on the capability of women to run for office.[81] For women in the LGBTQ community, some scholars have raised concern about the unequal attention paid to the needs of lesbians compared to transgender, bisexual, and queer women, with lesbian civil rights described as receiving more of a focus from politicians.[80]
Social pressures are another influence on women who run for office, often coinciding with sexism and discrimination. Some scholars have argued that views of discrimination have prompted a decrease in the supply of women willing to run for office, though this has been partially countered by those who argue that women are actually just more
 "strategic" when trying to identify an election with favorable conditions.[81] Other factors, like the overrepresentation of men, have been described as influencing perceptions of men as somehow inherently more effective as politicians or leaders, which some scholars argue could pressure women to stay out of elections.[81] Others contend that the
overrepresentation of men can actually result in "political momentum" for women, such as during the Year of the Woman.[81] Within some racial and ethnic groups, social influences can also shape political engagement. Among Latinos, Latinas are more likely to partake in non-electoral activities, like community organizing, when compared to men.
[83] Despite differences in political activity and social pressures, elected women from both political parties have voiced their support for electing more women to Congress to increase the acceptance of their support for electing more women to Congress to increase the acceptance of their support for electing more women from both political parties have found that increasing the descriptive representation of women can provide positive social
influences for democracy as a whole, such as improved perceptions of an individual's political efficacy and government's responsiveness to the needs of people. [77] When women can vote for a woman candidate of the same party, studies have also found that these influences can be magnified. [77] See also: LGBTQ people in the United States The
White House illuminated in the colors of the rainbow flag after the Obergefell v. Hodges ruling legalized same-sex marriage nationally Although some scholars have disputed the benefits of descriptive representation, only a small number have argued that this form of representation actually has negative impacts on the group it represents. [85] Studies
of bills relating to LGBT rights in state legislatures have provided a more numbers when more LGBT bills tend to be introduced in higher numbers when more LGBT representatives are elected to state legislatures, which may also indicate an increased likelihood of substantive representation. [85] Increases in openly LGBT state lawmakers have also
been hypothesized to inadvertently result in more anti-LGBT legislation, potentially as the result of backlash to their presence of the
Congressional LGBTQ+ Equality Caucus has been identified as improving the ability of Congress to address the intersectional issues faced by the LGBT community, as well as provide a source of pressure other than constituency on members of Congress to address LGBT issues. [80] Additionally, non-LGBT members of the caucus have been criticized
for not sponsoring enough legislation, emphasizing the value of openly LGBT members of Congress.[80] While descriptive representation has provided benefits overall, scholars have noted that some groups in the community, such as transgender and bisexual people, tend to receive less focus than gays and lesbians.[80] Main article: Democratic
backsliding in the United States At least two "well-regarded" global democracy indices — V-Dem Democracy indices — V-Dem Democracy indices — V-Dem Democracy indices — Index (The Economist)[87] — "show an erosion of American democracy indices — Index (The Economist)[87] — "show an erosion of American democracy indices — Index (The Economist)[87] — "show an erosion of American democracy indices — Index (The Economist)[87] — "show an erosion of American democracy indices — Index (The Economist)[87] — "show an erosion of American democracy indices — Index (The Economist)[87] — "show an erosion of American democracy indices — Index (The Economist)[87] — "show an erosion of American democracy indices — Index (The Economist)[87] — "show an erosion of American democracy indices — Index (The Economist)[87] — "show an erosion of American democracy indices — Index (The Economist)[87] — "show an erosion of American democracy indices — Index (The Economist)[87] — "show an erosion of American democracy indices — Index (The Economist)[87] — "show an erosion of American democracy indices — Index (The Economist)[87] — "show an erosion of American democracy indices — Index (The Economist)[87] — "show an erosion of American democracy indices — Index (The Economist)[87] — "show an erosion of American democracy indices — Index (The Economist)[87] — "show an erosion of American democracy indices — Index (The Economist)[87] — "show an erosion of American democracy indices — Index (The Economist)[87] — "show an erosion of American democracy indices — Index (The Economist)[87] — "show an erosion of American democracy indices — Index (The Economist)[87] — "show an erosion of American democracy indices — Index (The Economist)[87] — "show an erosion of American democracy indices — Index (The Economist)[87] — "show an erosion of American democracy indices — Index (The Economist)[87] — "show an erosion of American democracy indices — Index (The Economist)[87] — "show an erosion democracy indices — Index (The Economist)[87] — "show an erosio
commentators and scholars (such as David Leonhardt).[89] The United States is "far and away the most countermajoritarian democracy in the world," according to Steven Levitsky.[90] Before the 2000 election, only three candidates for president won "while losing the popular vote (John Quincy Adams, Rutherford Hayes and Benjamin Harrison), and
each served only a single term", while as of 2022 "two of the past four presidents have taken office despite losing the popular vote" [89]. George W. Bush in 2000 and Donald Trump in 2016. [91] Leonhardt points out that in one branch of the federal government—the Supreme Court—conservative legal decisions "both sweeping and, according to polls
unpopular" were delivered in 2022, what is likely the beginning of a reshaping of "American politics for years, if not decades" to come by the court's "Republican appointees". This is despite the fact that the president appointees to come by the court's "Republican appointees".
elections (from 1992 to 2020).[89] In the 2020 U.S. Senate, "50 Democratic senators effectively represent 145 million Americans, while the 50 Republican senators effectively represent 145 million (i.e. less populated states),
formerly voted more or less similarly to the large states and urban areas that were granted less power. Thus "the small-state bonus" giving disproportionate power in "the Senate and Electoral College had only a limited effect on national results". This is no longer the case. Rural areas are more uniformly conservative and urban areas liberal.[89] More
important is "the winner-take-all nature of the Electoral College" (all states except Maine and Nebraska), which gives greater bias to Republicans.[89] The state with the largest population in 1790 was Virginia with approximately 13 times as many residents as the smallest
(Delaware). Today, "California, which consistently votes for liberal candidates statewide, "has 68 times as many as Alaska; and at least 20 times as many as another 11 states". When a candidate wins a statewide election in California (or New York) by a landslide, these large numbers of popular votes mean
nothing in the tally of Electoral College votes or Senate seats.[89] while the House of Representatives would seem to have "a more equitable system for allocating political power"—dividing the country "into 435 districts, each with a broadly similar number of people" (760,000 as of 2022)—Leonhardt argues two features distort this equity:
gerrymandering, i.e. the drawing of district boundaries by State legislatures for partisan advantage, something Republicans have been "more forceful" about in recent years.[89] the phenomenon of "wasted votes", whereby the increasing concentration of Democratic voters in large metro areas means Democrats often win elections in these districts by
 "landslides", leading to the overall nationwide proportion of votes for Democrats significantly less than the proportion of seats for Democrats in the United States § Effects on democracy and society In 2014, United Press International reported that the political structure of the United States has
become an oligarchy, where a small economic elite overwhelmingly dominate policy and law.[73] Some academic researchers suggest a drift toward oligarchy has been occurring by way of the influence of corporations, wealthy, and other special interest groups, leaving individual citizens with less impact than economic elites and organized interest
groups in the political process. [74][92][93][94] An April 2014 study by political scientists Martin Gilens (Princeton University) and Benjamin Page (Northwestern University) concluded that the U.S. government does not represent the interests of the majority of its citizens but instead is "ruled by those of the rich and powerful". [95] The researchers
after analyzing nearly 1,800 U.S. policies between 1981 and 2002, stated that government policies tend to favour special interests and lobbying organizations, and that whenever a majority of citizens disagrees with the economic elites, the elites tend to prevail in getting their way.[74] While not characterizing the United States as an "oligarchy" or
"plutocracy" outright, Gilens and Page give weight to the idea of a "civil oligarchy," in which the wealthiest citizens—even in a 'civil oligarchy,' like the United States—dominate policy concerning crucial issues of wealth- and income-protection." In their
study, Gilens and Page reached these conclusions: When a majority of citizens disagrees with economic elites and/or with organized interests, they generally lose. Moreover, because of the strong status quo bias built into the US political system, even when fairly large majorities of Americans favor policy change, they generally do not get it. ... [T]head to status quo bias built into the US political system, even when fairly large majorities of Americans favor policy change, they generally do not get it. ... [T]head to status quo bias built into the US political system, even when fairly large majorities of Americans favor policy change, they generally do not get it. ... [T]head to status quo bias built into the US political system, even when fairly large majorities of Americans favor policy change, they generally do not get it. ... [T]head to status quo bias built into the US political system, even when fairly large majorities of Americans favor policy change, they generally do not get it. ... [T]head to status quo bias built into the US political system, even when fairly large majorities of Americans favor policy change, they generally do not get it. ... [T]head to status quo bias built into the US political system, even when fairly large majorities of Americans favor policy change in the status quo bias built into the US political system.
preferences of the average American appear to have only a minuscule, near-zero, statistically non-significant impact upon public policy. [96] E. J. Dionne Jr. described what he considers the effects of ideological and oligarchical interests on the judiciary. The journalist, columnist, and scholar interprets recent Supreme Court decisions as ones that allow
wealthy elites to use economic power to influence political outcomes in their favor. In speaking about the Supreme Court's McCutcheon v. FEC and Citizens United v. FEC decisions, Dionne wrote: "Thus has this court conferred on wealthy people the right to give vast sums of money to politicians while undercutting the rights of millions of citizens to
cast a ballot."[97] Nobel Prize-winning economist Paul Krugman wrote: The stark reality is that we have a society in which money is increasingly concentrated in the hands of a few people. This threatens to make us a democracy in name only.[98] A November 2022 study by Pew Research Center showed that majorities in both the Republican and
Democratic parties held increasingly negative views of major financial institutions and large corporations. [99] Main article: Gerrymandering in the United States Gerrymandering in the United States
census, i.e. every ten years. Gerrymandering involves what's commonly called "cracking" is the process of moving the boundaries of districts to spreads opposition voters thinly across many districts to
dilute their power. "Packing" is the process of concentrating opposition voters in one or more (but always a minority of) districts, to "waste" opposition votes.[100] Used almost since the founding of the United States (the term was coined in 1810 after a review of Massachusetts's redistricting maps of 1812 set by Governor Elbridge Gerry noted that
one of the districts looked like a salamander),[100] in the 21st century it has "become a much more effective tool".[100] Since 2010, detailed maps and high-speed computing have facilitated gerrymandering by political parties in the redistricting process, in order to gain control of state legislation and congressional representation and potentially to
maintain that control over several decades, even against shifting political changes in a state's population. It allows the drawing of districts "with surgical precision".[100] According to Julia Kirschenbaum and Michael Li of the Brennan Center In 2010, Republicans—in an effort to control the drawing of congressional maps—forged a campaign to win
majorities in as many state legislatures as possible. It was wildly successful, giving them control over the drawing of 213 congressional districts. The redrawing of maps that followed produced some of the most extreme gerrymanders in history. In battleground Pennsylvania, for example, the congressional map gave Republicans a virtual lock on 13 of
the state's 18 congressional districts, even in elections where Democrats won the majority of the statewide congressional vote. [101] Attempts to appeal to the Supreme Court to disallow gerrymandering in cases such as Vieth v. Jubelirer in 2004 and its passing up of "numerous opportunities" in 2017 and 2018 "to decide upon the constitutional
legality or illegality of gerrymandering has "emboldened ever more partisan gerrymandering" has been criticized for weakening the political power of minority voters by concentrated them into district(s) (though this process can also help ensure the election of a
representative of the same race).[84] Main article: Political polarization in the United States has grown more polarization during the 2000s onward.[102] As a general rule, urban areas and suburbs have become more "blue", Democratic or liberal, while agricultural rural areas have
become more "red", Republican or conservative. Since many states in the south and Midwest, while coastal states which contain extensive urbanized areas tend to be "blue." Rural areas with a recreational focus such as ski resorts are an exception to the general rule
[103][104] The polarization has been both more ideological (differences between the policy positions) and affective (i.e. a dislike and distrust of opposing political groups), than comparable democracies. [105][54] Polarization among U.S. legislators is asymmetric, as it has primarily been driven by a substantial rightward shift among congressional
Republicans, alongside a much smaller leftward shift among congressional Democrats. [106][107][108] New Democrats advocated for neoliberal policies including financial deregulation and free trade, which is seen to have shifted
significantly to the left on social, cultural, and religious issues.[112] According to the Pew Research Center, members of both parties who have unfavorable opinions of the opposing party are at record highs as of 2022.[114] Further information:
 Republican reactions to Donald Trump's claims of 2020 election fraud Signs reading "Stop the Steal" and "Off with their heads", photographed on the day of the January 6 attack Many commentators and scholars (such as David Leonhardt) have expressed alarm at the "growing movement inside one of the country's two major parties—the Republican
Party—to refuse to accept defeat in an election".[89][115][116] In a survey by journalists (of the Washington Post) less than two months before the 2022 congressional election, a "majority of Republicans" in "important battleground" election campaigns, refused "to say they will accept the November election outcome".[117] Six key Senate and
gubernatorial Republican party nominees refused to commit to accepting the results of the November election: Blake Masters in Arizona, JD Vance in Ohio, Rep. Ted Budd in North Carolina, Kelly Tshibaka in Alaska, Tudor Dixon in Michigan and Geoff Diehl in Massachusetts.[118] While the claim by a losing candidate that they won "despite clear
evidence he lost", may have started with Donald Trump after his loss in 2020, during primaries leading up to the November 2022 general election, "candidates across the country have refused to concede—even in races that are not remotely close".[119] This trend has been manifested in the violent January 6, 2021 attack on the US Capitol to prevent
the certification of Joe Biden as president and the hundreds of elected Republican officials throughout the United States that would oversee future elections, potentially putting them in position to overturn an election in 2024 or beyond".[89]
According to Yascha Mounk, "There is the possibility, for the first time in American history, that a legitimately elected president will not be able to take office".[89] In part the phenomenon is international, democracies are struggling in other parts of the world led by the forces of "digital media, cultural change, and economic stagnation in affluent
countries".[89] Leonhardt states that "many experts point out that it is still not clear how the country will escape a larger crisis, such as an overturned election, at some point in the coming decade."[89] In the 2022 elections observers have noted lack of participation in debates between candidates, and in the "retail politicking" that has been a political
"cliché ... for generations" in American politics: pressing the flesh at "diners and state fairs ... town-hall-style meetings are "safer spaces" for candidates, "partisan news outlets, fund-raisers with supporters, friendly local crowds", as the
number of competitive House of Representative districts and "swing voters" grows smaller, and candidates concentrate on mobilizing the party loyalists rather than appealing to undecided voters (appeals touching on compromise and bipartisanship angering party hardliners). Observers see a danger in candidates avoiding those tougher interactions,
[120] Under the campaign and presidency of Donald Trump, observers (such as political scientist Brendan Nyhan) noted some erosion of political norms and ethics, including: acceptable background for high level officials. (Jeff Sessions was rejected by the U.S. Senate in 1986 for a federal judgeship because his history on racial issues was considered
to be disqualifying, but served as U.S. attorney general from February 9, 2017, to November 7, 2018.)[121] intolerance of criticism[121] is evident in statements such as "Trump Threatens White House Protesters With 'Vicious Dogs' and 'Ominous Weapons'"[122] tolerance for conflicts of interest in government. Public officials who are also
businessmen (Donald Trump) accepting money for their business (Trump hotel in Washington) from foreign governments with interests before the U.S. Constitution that is supposed to ensure that foreign governments can'
buy favor with federal officials.")[121] partisan abuse of power. After a Democratic candidate for governor won, Republican majorities in the legislatures of North Carolina, and Wisconsin voted in 2018 to "strip the legislatures of newly elected Democratic governors" while the "defeated or outgoing Republican incumbents are still around to sign
the bills".[123] Applying the rule of "Because we can". Announced on February 13, 2016, the Republican controlled senate refused to hold hearings on the appointment of Merrick Garland (a Democratic nominee) for the Supreme Court,[124][125] maintaining it was too close to the November 8, 2016 election (almost nine months away at the time),
and would deny the American people a "voice" in the selection of the next justice. Four years later, with a Republican now president, a ceremony was held for the nomination of a conservative justice for Supreme Court (Amy Connell
claiming, "I think it's very important that we have nine Justices." [124] [126] The US doesn't recommend its own political system to its allies creating new constitutions. [127] Democratic backsliding concerns have led to some academics on the other hand to warn that thanks in part to the rulings of the Supreme Court that exacerbated the flaws in these
ancient institutions, the U.S. is already a one-party state, and no longer meets the minimum requirements to be considered a democracy. [128] See also: Campaign finance reform in the United States, and Tort reform in the U
States With an implementation of term limits and holding elections for Supreme Court proposals would fade away if an election was going to decide the outcome. Thirty-three states already elect their state
supreme courts. William Watkins Jr., a constitutional scholar from the Independent Institute on National Public Radio, stated his proposal for 8 to 10-year one-time term limits, he also said justices are supposed to be like umpires calling bit and
runs. Local district attorneys and county sheriffs are elected[129] and so could Supreme Court justices. The United States Senate used to be appointed by state legislatures before the 17th Amendment was passed in 1913 for them to
proceed.[130][131] [132] [133] [133] [134] Main articles: Term limits in the United States and Second Constitutional Convention of the United States Average Age of Congress was a movement that gained a lot of traction in the early 1990s. 23 State Governments passed
 legislation that term limited US Congress representatives from each respective state. The Supreme Court decision U.S. Term Limits, Inc. v. Thornton in 1995 invalidated the term limit legislation found in those 23 states. Newt Gingrich's Contract with America promised legislation in the first 100 days for a constitutional amendment for term limits.
However, the Term Limits Constitutional Amendment bill did not pass the 2/3 majority to move the bill forward and only passed with a simple majority of 227-204. It would have limited the House and Senate to 12 years total, six terms in the Senate.[135][136][137][138] Today, U.S. Term Limits campaigns for 34 states to
call for a Convention to propose amendments to the United States Constitution to create a Term Limits amendment. Culture of the United States History of the United States Human
rights in the United States History of civil rights movement Politics of India Politics of the United States Civil rights movement Politics of the United States Conservatism in the United States Civil rights movement Politics of the United States Civil rights in the United States Civil rights movement Politics of India Politics of Ind
politics#United States Radical right (United States) ^ Such as in elections of members of boards where voters are asked to select more than one candidate for an office[17] and in those few but growing number of areas where ranked choice is used in the United States ^ In 1970 a candidate of the Conservative Party of New York State (James L.
Buckley) defeated the Democratic and Republican party candidates for U.S. Senate. ^ not to be confused with the American systems of having two senators representing each state are staggered and do not run at the same time. ^ see also Sahil Chinoy: the Republican Party "leans much farther right than
most traditional conservative parties in Western Europe and Canada", based on its party in the Trump era remained a mostly pro-business party in its policies but its
constituencies and rhetoric have tilted more working class and populist ... much of corporate America has swung culturally into liberalism's camp. ... accelerated by anti-Trump backlash, the more left-leaning commitments of big business's younger customers and (especially) younger employees, ... As a consequence, today's G.O.P. is most clearly now
the party of local capitalism—the small-business gentry, the family firms.... Much of the party's base regards corporate institutions—especially in Silicon Valley, but extending to more traditional capitalist powers—as cultural enemies ... In the words of Republican Senator
Marco Rubio: "Big Business is not our ally. They are eager culture warriors who use the language of wokeness to cover free-market capitalism." Journalist David Brooks argued that "the information age is transforming the American right. Conservatives have always inveighed against the cultural elite—the media, the universities, Hollywood. But in the
Information Age, the purveyors of culture are now corporate titans".[64] ^ When conspiracy theories started appearing after the intruder attack with a hammer of 82-year-old Paul Pelvis, Chris Cillizza of CNN described them as "unfortunately, ... par for the course for the former president and the movement that he leads. The embrace of conspiracy
theories sits at the very heart of Trumpism. Remember that Trump once suggested, without evidence, that Texas Sen. Ted Cruz's father might have been involved in the assassination of John F. Kennedy. And that the FBI search at Mar-a-Lago might have been involved in the assassination of John F. Kennedy. And that the FBI search at Mar-a-Lago might have been involved in the assassination of John F. Kennedy.
have really been an effort to reclaim Hillary Clinton's email server. Conspiracy theories have a special appeal to Trump because they speak to the underlying appeal he has to his followers: The elites in the country are always up to something nefarious and they are trying to keep that fact from you. They want to keep you in the dark, but you are too
smart for that, so you see through the stories they are telling you."[65] ^ Cohen, Alexander (March 2, 2020). "The two-party system is here to stay". The Conversation. Archived from the original on January 14, 2021. Retrieved January 22, 2021. ^ Byron E. Shafer and Anthony J. Badger, eds. Contesting Democracy: Substance and Structure in
American Political History, 1775-2000 (2001) a b c "2012 Census of Governments". United States Census Bureau. Archived from the original on December 20, 2012. Statistical Abstract: 2010 p. 416. Ann O'M. Bowman and Richard C. Kearney, State and Local Government: The Essentials (2008) p. 78 Osborne M. Reynolds, Jr., Local
Government Law, 3rd ed. (St. Paul: West, 2009), 30. ^ Reynolds, 24. ^ "Mayor and City Commission". Talgov.com. Archived from the original on September 3, 2011. ^ "Paradise". Paradise". Paradise Bureau (2002). 2002 Census of Governments, Vol 1, Number 1, Government Organization
GC02(1)-1 (PDF) (Report). Washington, D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office. pp. vii-viii. Retrieved July 5, 2017. Retrieved J
July 27, 2020. ^ Guthunz, Ute (1997). "Beyond Decolonization and Beyond Statehood? Puerto Rico's Political Development in Association with the United States". Iberoamericana. 21 (3/4 (67/68)): 42-55. ISSN 0342-1864. JSTOR 41671654. ^ a b c Kömives, Lisa M. (2004). "Enfranchising a Discrete and Insular Minority: Extending Federal Voting
Rights to American Citizens Living in United States Territories". The University of Miami Inter-American Law Review. 36 (1): 115-138. ISSN 0884-1756. JSTOR 40176588. "Suffragists Parade Down Fifth Avenue - 1917". The New York Times. 1917. ^ in this ballot voters are asked to vote for two school board candidates, "My Ballot". Office of the
Minnesota Secretary of State Steve Simon. Retrieved April 8, 2021. ^ Wolf, Zachary B. (November 28, 2020). "The Electoral College, explained". CNN. Retrieved April 8, 2021. ^ "Public funding of presidential elections". ^ Mishak, Michael (September 28, 2009). "Recession means there's less money for political campaigns". Las Vegas Sun.
 "Connect with America". ^ Baker, Peter; VandeHei, Jim (November 8, 2006). "A Voter Rebuke For Bush, the War And the Right". The Washington Post. Retrieved May 26, 2010. Bush and senior adviser Karl Rove tried to replicate that strategy this fall, hoping to keep the election from becoming a referendum on the president's leadership. ^ "Election
'98 Lewinsky factor never materialized". CNN. November 4, 1998. Americans shunned the opportunity to turn Tuesday's midterm elections into a referendum on President Bill Clinton's behavior, dashing Republican hopes of gaining seats in the House and Senate. ^ Daniel J. Hopkins (2018). The Increasingly United States: How and Why American
Political Behavior Nationalized. University of Chicago Press. ^ Lee Drutman (May 31, 2018). "America has local politics. This is a problem". Archived from the original on September 27, 2022. Retrieved September 27, 2022. ^ a b c d e f g h Lepore, Jill (October 6, 2008). "Rock, Paper, Scissors". The New Yorker.
Retrieved September 26, 2022. ^ "Number of Federal PACs Increases". FEC. Retrieved March 11, 2022. ^ Michael Schudson in his 1998 book The Good Citizen: A History of American Democracy Is Working? Econ Journal Watch 6(2): 195-202. Econjwatch.org ^
b BERNSTEIN, ELIZABETH; JAKOBSEN, JANET R (2010). "Sex, Secularism and Religious Influence in US Politics". Third World Quarterly. 31 (6): 1023-1039. doi:10.1080/01436597.2010.502739. ISSN 0143-6597. JSTOR 27896595. PMID 20857575. S2CID 39112453. ^ a b Fairbanks, David (1977). "Religious Forces and "Morality" Policies in the
American States". The Western Political Quarterly. 30 (3): 411-417. doi:10.2307/447941. ISSN 0043-4078. JSTOR 447941. ^ Patricia U. Bonomi, A Factious People: Politics and Society in Colombia U.P., 1971) pp 281-2 ^ Anton-Hermann, The Rise of the legal profession in America (2 vol 1965), vol 1. ^ Bonomi, A Factious People
pp. 281-286 ^ Robert P. Kraynak (2015). "THE AMERICAN FOUNDERS AND THEIR RELEVANCE TODAY". Intercollegiate Studies Institute. ^ "Creating the United States". Library of Congress. April 12, 2008. ^ Weeks, J. (2007). Inequality Trends in Some Developed OECD Countries. In J. K. S. & J. Baudot (Eds.) Flat world, big gaps: Economic
liberalization, globalization, poverty & inequality (159-176). New York: Zed Books. ^ Thomas, E. (March 10, 2008). "He knew he was right". Newsweek. Archived from the original on April 5, 2008. Retrieved April 19, 2008. ^ Clark, B. (1998). "Is there a crisis of
the welfare state? Crossnational evidence from Europe, North America, and Japan". European Sociological Review. 4 (3): 181-205. doi:10.1093/oxfordjournals.esr.a036484. Sarr, N. (2004). Economics of the welfare state. New York: Oxford University Press (US).
Economist. Retrieved June 3, 2008. ^ Francis, Ellen (February 10, 2021). "Global freedoms have hit a 'dismal' record low, with pandemic restrictions making things worse, report says". The Washington Post. ISSN 0190-8286. Retrieved February 16, 2022. ^ "Democracy Index 2021: the China challenge". Economist Intelligence Unit. Archived from the
original on November 8, 2022. Retrieved February 16, 2022. ^ V-Dem Institute (2023). "The V-Dem Dataset". Retrieved October 14, 2023. ^ In Federalist Papers No. 9 and No. 10, respectively ^ "Political Parties". Shmoop. Archived from the original on January 12, 2019. Retrieved February 25, 2022. ^
Washington's Farewell Address ^ Lewis L. Gould, The Republicans: A History of the Grand Old Party (Oxford University Press, 2014). ^ a b "Democratic party". Britannica. Retrieved September 28, 2022. ^ Jules Witcover, Party of the Democratic party". Britannica. Retrieved September 28, 2021. ^ Jules Witcover, Party of the People: A History of the Democratic party". Britannica. Retrieved September 28, 2022. ^ Jules Witcover, Party of the Democratic party". Britannica. Retrieved September 28, 2021. ^ Jules Witcover, Party of the Democratic party.
June 12, 2014. ^ Boxell, Levi; Gentzkow, Matthew; Shapiro, Jesse M. (2022). "Cross-Country Trends in Affective Polarization" (PDF). The Review of Economics and Statistics. 106 (2): 557-565. doi:10.1162/rest a 01160. ISSN 0034-6535. S2CID 246583807. ^ a b Draca, Mirko; Schwarz, Carlo (May 11, 2021). "How Polarized Are Citizens? Measuring
 Ideology from the Ground-Up". Social Science Research Network. SSRN 3154431. Sinkel, Eli J.; Bail, Christopher A.; Cikara, Mina; Ditto, Peter H.; Iyengar, Shanto; Klar, Samara; Mason, Lilliana; McGrath, Mary C.; Nyhan, Brendan; Rand, David G.; Skitka, Linda J. (October 30, 2020). "Political sectarianism in America". Science. 370 (6516): 533-
536. doi:10.1126/science.abe1715. ISSN 0036-8075. PMID 33122374. ^ Desilver, Drew (March 10, 2022). "The polarization in today's Congress has roots that go back decades". Pew Research Center of Gravity?". The New York Times.
Retrieved November 5, 2022. ^ Krauss, Clifford (March 17, 1992). "The House Bank; Gingrich Takes No Prisoners in the House's Sea of Gentility". The New York Times. Retrieved November 9, 2022. Newt Gingrich Takes No Prisoners in the House's Sea of Gentility". The New York Times. Retrieved November 9, 2022. Newt Gingrich Takes No Prisoners in the House's Sea of Gentility". The New York Times. Retrieved November 9, 2022. Newt Gingrich Takes No Prisoners in the House's Sea of Gentility.
militant style of Republican leadership that the House has not seen for decades. ^ Beauchamp, Zack (July 6, 2022). "How conservatism conquered America — and corrupted itself". Vox. Retrieved November 5, 2022. ^ a b c "How the Republican Party came to embrace conspiracy theories and denialism [Interview by Terry Gross of Dana Milbank].
author of The Destructionists: The Twenty-Five-Year Crack-Up Of The Republican Party". NPR. August 9, 2022. ^ "The Republican Party has lurched toward populism and illiberalism". The Economist. October 31, 2020. Retrieved November 9, 2022. ^ "The Republican Party has lurched toward populism and illiberalism". The Economist. October 31, 2020. Retrieved November 9, 2022. ^ "The Republican Party has lurched toward populism and illiberalism". The Economist. October 31, 2020. Retrieved November 9, 2022. ^ "The Republican Party has lurched toward populism and illiberalism". The Economist. October 31, 2020. Retrieved November 9, 2022. ^ "The Republican Party has lurched toward populism and illiberalism".
Burke". The New Yorker. Retrieved November 9, 2022. The Burkeans have been losing ground in the Republican Party for a while now. Too often their old conception of conservatism strikes others in the G.O.P. as a form of surrender or, at the very least, an acceptance of the liberal status quo. ^ Ross Douthat. "What Does the Right Do When Big
Business Turns Against Republicans?" New York Times April 27, 2022 ^ Brooks, David (November 1, 2021). "Data shows GOF and Conspiracy caucus". CNN. Retrieved November 2, 2022. ^ Benen, Steve (November 2, 2021). "Data shows GOF and Conspiracy Caucus". CNN. Retrieved November 2, 2022. ^ Benen, Steve (November 2, 2021). "Data shows GOF and Conspiracy Caucus". CNN. Retrieved November 2, 2022. ^ Benen, Steve (November 2, 2021). "Data shows GOF and Conspiracy Caucus". CNN. Retrieved November 2, 2022. ^ Benen, Steve (November 2, 2021). "Data shows GOF and Conspiracy Caucus". CNN. Retrieved November 2, 2022. ^ Benen, Steve (November 2, 2021). "Data shows GOF and Conspiracy Caucus". CNN. Retrieved November 2, 2022. ^ Benen, Steve (November 2, 2021). "Data shows GOF and Conspiracy Caucus". CNN. Retrieved November 2, 2022. ^ Benen, Steve (November 2, 2021). "Data shows GOF and Conspiracy Caucus". CNN. Retrieved November 2, 2022. ^ Benen, Steve (November 2, 2021). "Data shows GOF and Conspiracy Caucus". CNN. Retrieved November 2, 2022. ^ Benen, Steve (November 2, 2021). "Data shows GOF and Conspiracy Caucus". CNN. Retrieved November 2, 2022. ^ Benen, Steve (November 2, 2021). "Data shows GOF and Conspiracy Caucus". CNN. Retrieved November 2, 2022. ^ Benen, Steve (November 2, 2021). "Data shows GOF and Conspiracy Caucus". CNN. Retrieved November 2, 2022. ^ Benen, Steve (November 2, 2022). "Data shows GOF and Conspiracy Caucus". CNN. Retrieved November 2, 2022. ^ Benen, Steve (November 2, 2022). "Data shows GOF and Conspiracy Caucus". CNN. Retrieved November 2, 2022. ^ Benen, Steve (November 2, 2022). "Data shows GOF and Conspiracy Caucus". CNN. Retrieved November 2, 2022. ^ Benen, Steve (November 2, 2022). "Data shows GOF and Conspiracy Caucus". CNN. Retrieved November 2, 2022. ^ Benen, Steve (November 2, 2022). "Data shows GOF and Conspiracy Caucus". CNN. Retrieved November 2, 2022. ^ Benen, Steve (November 2, 2022). "Data shows GOF and Conspiracy Caucus". CNN. Retrieved November 2, 2022. ^ Benen, Steve (November 2, 2022).
voters skeptical of 'bedrock principle of democracy'". MSNBC. Retrieved November 9, 2022. When looking ahead to the 2024 presidential election, it is remarkable that a bedrock principle of democracy'". MSNBC. Retrieved November 9, 2022. When looking ahead to the 2024 presidential election, it is remarkable that a bedrock principle of democracy''.
results if their candidate does not win. (pollster Lee Miringoff) a b Bauman, Anna; Clayson, Jane (August 28, 2020). "Tracing The Path Of The Modern GOP, From Reagan To Trump". On Point. WBUR. Retrieved September 28, 2022. A Jamelle Bouie (November 11, 2022). "A Shock to the System Is Coming. Which Party Will Be Ready for It?". Opinion
The New York Times. ^ Stanley L. Engerman; Kenneth L. Sokoloff (February 2005). "The Evolution of Suffrage Institutions in the New World" (PDF). pp. 16, 35. Archived from the original (PDF) on March 10, 2016. Retrieved September 29, 2022. By 1840, only three states retained a property qualification, North Carolina (for some state-wide offices
only), Rhode Island, and Virginia. In 1856 North Carolina was the last state to end the practice. Tax-paying qualifications were also gone in all but a few states by the Civil War, but they survived into the 20th century in Pennsylvania and Rhode Island. ^ "America's new exceptionalism". The Economist. July 7, 2022. Retrieved October 17, 2022. ^
"Biden's Approval Rating Surges After Hitting Low Mark In July, Quinnipiac University National Poll Finds; Half Of Americans Say Trump Should Be Prosecuted On Criminal Charges Over His Handling Of Classified Documents. 21. Do you think the nation's democracy is in danger of collapse, or don't you think so?". Qinnipiac University poll. August
31, 2022. Retrieved September 20, 2022. ^ Thomas B. Edsall (September 28, 2022). "Seven Years of Trump Has the Right Wing Taking the Long View". The US is not a democracy but an oligarchy, study concludes" UPI ^ a b c Martin Gilens & Benjamin I. Page
(2014). "Testing Theories of American Politics: Elites, Interest Groups, and Average Citizens". Perspectives on Politics. 12 (3): 564-581. doi:10.1017/S1537592714001595. Newkirk, Vann R. II (December 14, 2021). "When the Myth of Voter Fraud Comes for You". The Atlantic. Retrieved October 2, 2022. a b c d e f Ellis, William Curtis; Wilson,
Walter Clark (2013). "Minority Chairs and Congressional Attention to Minority Issues: The Effect of Descriptive Representation in Positions of Institutional Power". Social Science Quarterly. 94 (5): 1207-1221. doi:10.1111/ssqu.12023. ISSN 0038-4941. JSTOR 42864138. ^ a b c d e f g h i j k l English, Ashley; Pearson, Kathryn; Strolovitch, Dara Z.
(2019). "Who Represents Me? Race, Gender, Partisan Congruence, and Representational Alternatives in a Polarized America". Political Research Quarterly. 72 (4): 785-804. doi:10.1177/1065912918806048. ISSN 1065-9129. JSTOR 45223003. S2CID 158576286. ^ a b c Jeong, Hoi Ok (2013). "Minority Policies and Political Participation Among
Latinos: Exploring Latinos' Response to Substantive Representation". Social Science Quarterly. 94 (5): 1245-1260. doi:10.1111/j.1540-6237.2012.00883.x. ISSN 0038-4941. JSTOR 42864140. ^ a b c d e f Dolan, Kathleen; Hansen, Michael (2018). "Blaming Women or Blaming the System? Public Perceptions of Women's Underrepresentation in Elected
Office". Political Research Quarterly, 71 (3): 668-680, doi:10.1177/1065912918755972. ISSN 1065-9129. ISSN 106
Underrepresentation in the U.S. Congress". Daedalus. 149 (1): 40-55. doi:10.1162/daed a 01772. ISSN 0011-5266. JSTOR 48563031. S2CID 209487865. ^ a b c d e Shah, Paru (2014). "It Takes a Black Candidate: A Supply-Side Theory of Minority Representation". Political Research Quarterly. 67 (2): 266-279. doi:10.1177/1065912913498827
ISSN 1065-9129. JSTOR 24371782. S2CID 155069482. ^ a b c d e Wallace, Sophia J. (2014). "Examining Latino Support for Descriptive Representation: The Role of Identity and Discrimination". Social Science Quarterly. 95 (2): 311-327. doi:10.1111/ssqu.12038. ISSN 0038-4941. JSTOR 26612166. ^ a b c d e f Schroedel, Jean Reith; Aslanian, Artour
(2017). "A Case Study of Descriptive Representation: The Experience of Native American Elected Officials in South Dakota". American Indian Quarterly. 41 (3): 250-286. doi:10.5250/amerindiquar.41.3.0250. ISSN 0095-182X. JSTOR 10.5250/amerindiquar.41.3.0250. ISSN 0095-182X. JSTOR 10.5250/amerindiquar.41.3.0250/amerindiquar.41.3.0250/amerindiquar.41.3.0250/amerindiquar.41.
Backlash: The Positive and Negative Influence of Descriptive Representation". Legislative Studies Quarterly. 32 (1): 107-133. doi:10.3162/036298007X202001. ISSN 0362-9805. JSTOR 40263412. ^ A Luhrmann et al., Autocratization Surge-Resistance Grows: Democracy Report 2020 (Lindenberg: Varieties of Democracy (V-Dem), 2020)
•• [permanent dead link]. ^ Democracy Index 2020 (The Economist Intelligence Unit, 2020): . ^ Levitsky, Steven; Ziblatt, Daniel (Fall 2020). "The Crisis of American Democracy". American Educator. Retrieved October 19, 2022. ^ a b c d e f g h i j k l m n o Leonhardt, David (September 17, 2022). "DEMOCRACY CHALLENGED 'A Crisis Coming': The
Twin Threats to American Democracy". The New York Times. Retrieved September 20, 2022. ^ A professor of government at Harvard University and a co-author of the book How Democracies Die, with Daniel Ziblatt. Quoted in Leonhardt, David (September 17, 2022). "DEMOCRACY CHALLENGED 'A Crisis Coming': The Twin Threats to American
Democracy". The New York Times. Retrieved September 20, 2022. ^ "Did Clinton win more votes than any white man in history?". BBC News. December 12, 2016. Retrieved September 9, 2018. ^ Piketty, Thomas (2014). Capital in the Twenty-First Century. Belknap Press. ISBN 067443000X p. 514: *"the risk of a drift towards oligarchy is real and
gives little reason for optimism about where the United States is headed." ^ (French economist's grim view of wealth gap, Accessed April 26, 2014, "...The main problem to me is really the proper working of our democratic institutions. It's just not compatible with an
extreme sort of oligarchy where 90 percent of the wealth belongs to a very tiny group ... Alan Wolfe (book reviewer), October 24, 2010, The Washington Post, Review of "The Mendacity of Hope," by Roger D. Hodge, Accessed April 26, 2014, "... Although Hodge devotes a chapter to foreign policy, the main charge he levels against Obama is that, like
Benjamin I. (2014). "Testing Theories of American Politics: Elites, Interest Groups, and Average Citizens". Perspectives on Politics. 12 (3): 564-581. doi:10.1017/S1537592714001595. When the preferences of economic elites and the stands of organized interest groups are controlled for, the preferences of the average American appear to have only a
minuscule, near-zero, statistically non-significant impact upon public policy." ^ E. J. Dionne Jr., April 6, 2014, The Washington Post, Supreme oligarchy, Accessed April 26, 2014. "...Thus has this court conferred on wealthy people the right to give vast sums of money to politicians while undercutting the rights of millions of citizens to cast a ballot."
Gerrymandering Is Getting Worse". UMBC Magazine. Retrieved September 27, 2022. ^ Li, Michael; Kirschenbaum, Julia (August 12, 2021). "Explainer. Gerrymandering Explainer. Ger
Perspectives on Politics. 16 (2): 416-435. doi:10.1017/S153759271700425X. ISSN 1537-5927. ^ Jacob R. Brown; Ryan D. Enos; Enrico Cantoni; Vincent Pons; Emilie Sartre (January 25, 2023. Retrieved January 26, 2023.
Thomas B. Edsall (January 25, 2023). "The Resentment Fueling the Republican Party Is Not Coming From the Suburbs" (opinion). The New York Times. Retrieved January 26, 2023. A Boxell, Levi; Gentzkow, Matthew; Shapiro, Jesse M. (2022). "Cross-Country Trends in Affective Polarization" (PDF). The Review of Economics and Statistics. 106 (2).
557-565. doi:10.1162/rest a 01160. ISSN 0034-6535. S2CID 246583807. A Hacker, Jacob S.; Pierson, Paul (2015), Persily, Nathaniel (ed.), "Confronting Asymmetric Polarization", Solutions to Political Polarization in America, Cambridge University Press, pp. 59-70, ISBN 978-1-107-45191-9, retrieved February 4, 2021 Bonica, Adam,
                                                              Journal of Economic Perspectives. 35 (1): 97-118. doi:10.1257/jep.35.1.97. ISSN 0895-3309. Benkler, Yochai; Faris, Robert; Roberts, Hal (October 18, 2018). Polarization in American Politics. Vol. 1. Oxford University Press. doi:10.1093/oso/9780190923624.003.0010. ISBN 978-0-19-092362-4
 Sen, Maya (2021). "Estimating Judicial Ideology"
Hickel, Jason (2016). "Neoliberalism and the End of Democracy". In Springer, Simon; Birch, Kean; MacLeavy, Julie (eds.). The Handbook of Neoliberalism. Routledge. p. 144. ISBN 978-1138844001. ^ Marangos, John; Astroulakis, Nikos; Dafnomili, Maria (2013). "Beyond US Neoliberalism and the Washington Consensus: The Challenge of Development
Ethics for the USA". In Karagiannis, Nikolaos; Madjd-Sadjadi, Zagros; Sen, Swapan (eds.). The US Economy and Neoliberalism: Alternative Strategies and Policies. Routledge. p. 58. ISBN 978-1138904910. ^ Scheidel, Walter (2017). The Great Leveler: Violence and the History of Inequality from the Stone Age to the Twenty-First Century. Princeton
University Press. p. 416. ISBN 978-0691165028. ^ Zengerle, Jason; Metz, Justin (June 29, 2022). "The Vanishing Moderate Democrat". The New York Times. ISSN 0362-4331. Retrieved July 20, 2022. Over the last decade, the Democrat". The New York Times. ISSN 0362-4331. Retrieved July 20, 2022. Over the last decade, the Democrat".
issues, particularly those related to criminal justice, race, abortion and gender identity, the Democrats have taken up ideological stances that many of the college-educated voters who now make up a sizable portion of the party's base cheer... ^ Doherty, Carroll (June 17, 2014). "Which party is more to blame for political polarization? It depends on the
measure". Pew Research Center. Retrieved August 14, 2022. ^ "How Democrats and Republicans see each other". The Economist. August 17, 2022. ISSN 0013-0613. Retrieved August 14, 2022. ^ "How Democrats and Republicans see each other". The Economist. August 17, 2022. ISSN 0013-0613. Retrieved August 17, 2022. ^ "How Democrats and Republicans see each other". The Economist. August 17, 2022. Autocratization Changing Nature?" (PDF). V-Dem. Retrieved August 18, 2022. ^ "How Democrats and Republicans see each other". The Economist. August 18, 2022. ^ "Democrats and Republicans see each other". The Economist. August 19, 2022. ^ "Democrats and Republicans see each other". The Economist. August 19, 2022. ^ "Democrats and Republicans see each other". The Economist. August 19, 2022. ^ "Democrats and Republicans see each other". The Economist. August 19, 2022. ^ "Democrats and Republicans see each other". The Economist. August 19, 2022. ^ "Democrats and Republicans see each other". The Economist. August 19, 2022. ^ "Democrats and Republicans see each other". The Economist. August 19, 2022. ^ "Democrats and Republicans see each other". The Economist. August 19, 2022. ^ "Democrats and Republicans see each other". The Economist. August 19, 2022. ^ "Democrats and Republicans see each other". The Economist 19, 2022. ^ "Democrats and Republicans see each other". The Economist 19, 2022. ^ "Democrats and Republicans see each other". The Economist 19, 2022. ^ "Democrats and Republicans see each other". The Economist 19, 2022. ^ "Democrats and Republicans see each other". The Economist 19, 2022. ^ "Democrats and Republicans see each other". The Economist 19, 2022. ^ "Democrats and Republicans see each other". The Economist 19, 2022. ^ "Democrats and Republicans see each other". The Economist 19, 2022. ^ "Democrats and Republicans see each other". The Economist 19, 2022. ^ "Democrats and Republicans see each other see
the Steal' Captured the American Right". The New York Times. Retrieved September 20, 2022. September 19, 2
Accept 2022". The New York Times. Retrieved September 22, 2022. ^ a b Lerer, Lisa; Ulloa, Jazmine (October 19, 2022). "As Campaign Norms Erode, Even Debates Are Under Debate". The New York Times. Retrieved
October 19, 2022. ^ a b c Foran, Clare (November 22, 2016). "'An Erosion of Democratic Norms in America'". The Atlantic. Retrieved October 19, 2022. ^ Packer, George
(December 14, 2018). "The Corruption of the Republican Party". The Atlantic. Retrieved October 19, 2022. ^ a b Cox, Chelsey (October 20, 2020). "Fact check: Senate Republicans moving to confirm Trump's Supreme Court nominee but blocked Obama's". USA Today. Retrieved October 19, 2022. ^ Totenberg, Nina (September 6, 2016). "Politics 1706"."
Plus Days And Counting: GOP Unlikely To End Supreme Court Blockade Soon". NPR. Retrieved October 19, 2022. ^ "America's electoral system gives the Republicans advantages over Democrats". The Economist. ISSN 0013-0613.
Retrieved February 6, 2023. ^ Hug, Aziz Z. (January 2022). "The Supreme Court and the Dynamics of Democratic Backsliding". The Annals of the American Academy of Politics 101: The Role of a District Attorney". ^ "Op-Ed:
Supreme Court Justices Should be Elected". NPR. ^ "Should we restructure the Supreme Court?". March 2, 2020. ^ "A Role for the People in Judicial Selection | William J. Watkins, Jr". ^ "17th Amendment to the U.S. Constitution: Direct Election of U.S. Senators (1913)". September 15, 2021. ^ "Term Limits Convention Progress Map". June 16, 2018
 ^ "H. Rept. 104-67 - TERM LIMITS FOR MEMBERS OF CONGRESS". ^ "Term limits in the United States". ^ "Final Vote Results for Roll Call 277". Office of the Clerk. March 29, 1995.. ^ "U.S. Term Limits, Inc. V. Thornton, 514 U.S. 779 (1995)". The Almanac of American Politics 2022 (2022) details on members of Congress, and the governors: their
records and election results; also state and district politics; revised every two years since 1975, details; see The Almanac of American Politics American Politics American National Biography (20 volumes, 1999) covers all politicians no longer alive; online at many academic libraries and at Wikipedia Library. Brewer, Mark D. and L. Sandy Maisel, Parties and Elections in
America: The Electoral Process (9th ed. 2020) excerpt Edwards, George C. Martin P. Wattenberg, and Robert L. Lineberry. Government in America: People, Politics, and Policy (16th Edition, 2011), short essays by scholars Greene, Jack P., ed.
Encyclopedia of American Political History: Studies of the Principal Movements and Ideas (3 vol. 1984), long essays by scholars Hershey, Marjorie R. Party Politics, and Public Politics in America (18th Edition, 2021) excerpt Hetherington, Marc J., and Bruce A. Larson. Parties, Politics, and Public Politics in America (18th Edition, 2021) excerpt Hetherington, Marc J., and Bruce A. Larson. Parties, Politics, and Public Politics in America (18th Edition, 2021) excerpt Hetherington, Marc J., and Bruce A. Larson. Parties, Politics in America (18th Edition, 2021) excerpt Hetherington, Marc J., and Bruce A. Larson. Parties, Politics in America (18th Edition, 2021) excerpt Hetherington, Marc J., and Bruce A. Larson. Parties, Politics in America (18th Edition, 2021) excerpt Hetherington, Marc J., and Bruce A. Larson. Parties, Politics in America (18th Edition, 2021) excerpt Hetherington, Marc J., and Bruce A. Larson. Parties, Politics in America (18th Edition, 2021) excerpt Hetherington, Marc J., and Bruce A. Larson. Parties, Politics in America (18th Edition, 2021) excerpt Hetherington, Marc J., and Bruce A. Larson. Parties, Politics in America (18th Edition, 2021) excerpt Hetherington, Marc J., and Bruce A. Larson. Parties and P
Rebecca Edwards, and Adam Rothman, eds. The Princeton Encyclopedia of American Political History (2 vol 2009) Kazin, Michael. What It Took to Win: A History of the Democratic Party (2022) excerpt Magleby, David B. et al. Government by the People: Structure, Action, and Impact (2020 Presidential Election Edition; Pearson, 27th Edition, 2022)
overview Maisel, L. Sandy, ed. Political Parties and Elections in the United States: An Encyclopedia 2 vol (Garland, 1991). (ISBN 0-8240-7975-2), short essays by scholars Maisel, L. Sandy, American Political Parties and Elections: A Very Short Introduction (2007), 144 pp O'Connor, Karen, Larry J. Sabato, and Alixandra B. Yanus. American
Government: American Government: Roots and Reform (11th ed. 2011) Osnos, Evan, "Ruling-Class Rules: How to thrive in the power elite - while declaring it your enemy", The New Yorker, 29 January 2024, pp. 18-23. "In the nineteen-twenties... American elites, some of whom feared a Bolshevik revolution, consented to reform... Under Franklin D
Roosevelt... the U.S. raised taxes, took steps to protect unions, and established a minimum wage. The costs, [Peter] Turchin writes, 'were borne by the Americans ruling class.'... Between the nineteen-seventies, a period that scholars call the Great Compression, economic equality narrowed, except among Black Americans...
But by the nineteen-eighties the Great Compression was over. As the rich grew richer than ever, they sought to turn their money into political power; spending on politics soared." (p. 22.) "[N]o democracy can function well if people are unwilling to lose power - if a generation of leaders... becomes so entrenched that it ages into gerontocracy; if one of
two major parties denies the arithmetic of elections; if a cohort of the ruling class loses status that it once enjoyed and sets out to salvage it." (p. 23.) O'Toole, Fintan, "Eldest Statesmen", The New York Review of Books, vol. LXXI, no. 1 (18 January 2024), pp. 17-19. "[Joe] Biden's signature achievements as president [are] securing large-scale
investment in infrastructure and in the transition to a carbon-free economy... [But t]here has been a relentless decline in absolute [economic] mobility from one generation to the next..." (p. 18.) "With the promised bridge to a new generation as yet unbuilt, time is not on Biden's side, or on the side of American democracy." (p. 19.) Rosenfeld, Sam,
"The Cracked Foundation: Steven Levitsky and Daniel Ziblatt explained How Democracies Die. But the problems went deeper than they thought" (review of Steven Levitsky and Daniel Ziblatt, Tyranny of the Minority: Why American Democracy Reached the Breaking Point, Crown, 2023, 384 pp.), The New Republic, December 2023, pp. 48-54. "In the
name of jettisoning the system's counter-majoritarian vestiges, [the authors] advocate such modest reforms as the end of equal representation of states in the Senate filibuster; sweeping new voting rights legislation under the aegis of a new constitutional amendment affirming a
positive right to vote; and term limits and regularized appointment schedules for Supreme Court justices. Having documented the... difficulty of enacting constitutional change under the U.S. amendment process (the reform of which is also on their prescriptive wish list), [the authors] acknowledge the steep odds that such an undertaking faces.
(p. 54.) Wilson, James Q., et al. American Government: Institutions and Policies (16th ed. 2018) excerpt Wikimedia Commons has media related to Politics of the United States. Wikiquote has quotations related to Politics of the United States.
Web Site Official Democratic Party Web Site Official Republican Party Web Site Officia
of a prevailing constitution that specifies the powers and limits of government. One fundamental principle of a constitutional republic is the protection of minority rules could potentially ride roughshod over minority interests. The U.S.
Constitution outlines various checks and balances intended to prevent any single branch of government from gaining absolute power, thereby protecting individual rights from being infringed upon by majority vote. Submit Final Answer Another key element of this government from gaining absolute power, thereby protecting individual rights from being infringed upon by majority vote.
system meant to foster a balance of power. The legislative branch makes laws, the executive branch enforces these laws, and the judiciary interprets them. Each branch operates independently from the others to prevent any accumulation of power, adhering to the principles laid out by the framers of the Constitution. Donald Trump - 45/47th
President (2017-2020 / 2025-present) Joe Biden - 46th President (2021-2024) George W. Bush - 43rd President (1977-1981) John F. Kennedy - 35th President (1961-1963) John F. Kennedy - 35th President (1961-1963)
Lyndon B. Johnson - 36th President (1963-1969) Richard Nixon - 37th President (1969-1974) Barack Obama - 44th President (2009-2017) Ronald Reagan: IQ - 111 #8. Richard Nixon: IQ - 112 #7. Jimmy Carter: IQ - 113 #6. George W. Bush: IQ - 114 #5. Bill
Clinton: IQ - 115 #4. John F. Kennedy: IQ - 117 #3. Franklin D. Roosevelt: IQ - 118 #2. Thomas Jefferson: IQ - 120 The electoral process distinctly forms the basis of the U.S. as a republic. Citizens do not vote directly for laws and policies but instead elect representatives who make these decisions on their behalf. This filter theoretically places an
informed decision-making body between the populace's desire and the law, which aligns with the characteristics of a republic. Unlike monarchies of the past where rulers were law unto themselves, in a constitutional republic such as the U.S., every citizen, irrespective of their
status or authority, is subject to the law. This adherence to codified laws confirms the U.S. attachment to the abstract principles of democracy and to a rational legal framework that governs society's functioning. The continuous impact of these foundational elements helps ensure the function of the U.S. governance is not driven by transient popular
sentiments but steered through established, systematic laws and practices. This tempers swaying populist whims and meshes well with democratic ideals—where every voice has a chance to be heard through elected representation. Herein lies the synthesis of republican principles with democratic values, helping shape policies that reflect both
collective will and measured, constitutional guidelines. In the United States, the role of democracy within the republic is crucial, embodying the very essence of the electoral process and the engagement of the citizenry in governmental decisions. Although the U.S. Constitution does not embody a pure form of democracy where laws and policies are
directly decreed by citizen vote, it enshrines the democratic principle through the election of representatives who, in turn, influence legislation and governance. The democratic principle through the election of representatives who, in turn, influence legislation and governance. The democratic principle through the election of representatives are elected to make decisions, these decisions are deeply influenced by public opinion. Citizens express their
preferences through voting, which is a civic duty, emphasizing the democratic spirit within the framework of a constitutional republic. This process secures a pathway for public sentiment to guide the legislative agenda, thereby reinforcing the notion that government derives its power from the consent of the governed. Public opinion in America often
shapes legislative decisions through other mechanisms such as referendums, initiatives, and recalls which, although not universally available in all states, add a direct democratic dimension to the republican system. 1 These tools allow voters to propose or reject laws and policies directly, bypassing the representative filter when needed, which
provides a direct check on elected officials and ensures that crucial matters can be addressed head-on by the populace. These democratic mechanisms within the constitutional republic of the United States highlight how deeply interwoven democratic mechanisms within the constitutional republic of the United States highlight how deeply interwoven democratic mechanisms within the constitutional republic of the United States highlight how deeply interwoven democratic mechanisms within the constitutional republic of the United States highlight how deeply interwoven democratic mechanisms within the constitutional republic of the United States highlight how deeply interwoven democratic mechanisms within the constitutional republic of the United States highlight how deeply interwoven democratic mechanisms within the constitutional republic of the United States highlight how deeply interwoven democratic mechanisms within the constitutional republic of the United States highlight how deeply interwoven democratic mechanisms within the constitutional republic of the United States highlight how deeply interwoven democratic mechanisms within the constitution of the United States highlight how deeply interwoven democratic mechanisms within the constitution of the United States highlight how deeply interwoven democratic mechanisms within the constitution of the United States highlight how deeply interwoven democratic mechanisms within the constitution of the United States highlight how deeply interwoven democratic mechanisms within the constitution of the United States highlight how deeply interwoven democratic mechanisms within the constitution of the United States highlight how deeply interwoven democratic mechanisms within the constitution of the United States highlight how deeply interwoven democratic mechanisms within the constitution of the United States highlight how deeply interwoven democratic mechanisms within the constitution of the United States highlight how deeply interwoven democratic mechanisms within the consti
prism of constitutional constraints and representative governance. This blend ensures that the nation adheres to the desires of its citizens and to a larger, enduring legal and ethical framework designed by the founding fathers to quide generations toward a fair and just nation. When the founding fathers convened at the Constitutional Convention in
1787, their aim was to establish a framework that would endure and stabilize a nascent nation. The atmosphere was saturated with a diversity of ideologies and experiences, mirroring the complexity of ideologies and experiences, mirroring the complexity of the endeavor they had undertaken. The deliberations, fraught with contention and compromise, drew heavily upon historical precedents and
philosophical thought that dated back to classical antiquity, Enlightenment philosophy, and the recent experiences of the American and British governments. Key figures such as James Madison, often referred to as the "Father of the Constitution," brought a wealth of knowledge about historical forms of government and their pitfalls. His preparation
included a detailed study of ancient and modern confederacies, which was instrumental during debates and discussions. Madison, along with his contemporaries, was particularly influenced by the political instability they observed under the Articles of Confederacion, where a lack of central authority led to inefficacy and interstate discord. The
philosophical motives driving the structure of the U.S. government owe much to Enlightenment thinkers like John Locke and Montesquieu. Locke's principles of life, liberty, and property found a strong echo in the American ethos of liberty and individual rights. Montesquieu's admiration for the separation of powers influenced the Constitution's
architecture significantly; his idea that liberty depended on the balancing forces within government can distinctly be seen in the separation of powers among the legislative, executive, and judicial branches as defined in the Constitution. 2 The historical perspective on desiring a republic over a pure democracy was clear: the founding fathers feared the
potential for tyranny in both majority rule and monarchy. They sought a form through which liberty could be preserved and prevented from descending into licentiousness—an unbridled freedom that tramples societal order. This apprehension is reflected in the Federalist Papers, a series of essays penned by Alexander Hamilton, James Madison, and
John Jay under the pseudonym "Publius" to advocate for the ratification of the Constitution. Federalist No. 10, written by Madison, argued that a large republic could best guard against the dangers of factionalism and preserve individual freedoms against majority tyranny. Reflections on historical antecedents like the Roman Republic were influential
```

The founders considered Rome's model concerning elected representatives and mechanisms averting tyranny. The system was not purely democratic as in ancient Athens, where all eligible citizens participated directly in legislative decisions. Every system they regarded offered insights into creating stability while ensuring that governance by consent

was not compromised by transient popular pressures. In drafting the Constitution, delegates knew they were preparing a document for future generations. Their acute awareness of history, coupled with a pragmatic understanding of current and future challenges, drove them to forge a balanced republic. They aspired for a system that safeguarded against rapid erosion through faction or tyranny while embodying Enlightenment ideals that assured progress and ethical governance. In modern political all scourse, misunderstandings surrounding the terms 'republic' and 'democracy' and 'republic' in contemporary usage of election for the citizeny in legislative decisions. While democratic, this approach was deemed impractical and potentially volatile by the framers of the U.S. Constitution, leading them to form a constitutional republic. This system combines representative denoracy with republic acute in media portrayals and political phenomentators and political phenomentators and political phenomentators and political phenomentators. This assertion, some in media portrayals and political phenomentation and political phenomentation and political phenomentation in the majority. During recent political phenomentations and political phenomentation and political phenomentation in the majority purpose of the majority purpo