

## Evolution and Interpretation of Government Power

Political voting in America has declined today since the level of elite and mass political behavior changed. However, this has not always been the case in American politics. For most of the voters, the physical sense of casting a ballot was the juncture of an extended period of campaign activity. Election Day was a day of excitement during which American voters participated in countless political meetings, parades and bonfires. American sense of public minded self-government emerged when people felt dominated by government officials. In that epoch, voting was defended openly while placing a premium on the practice of independent citizenship. It was this sense of independence that implied the right to serve in the militia with a consequence of the corollary of 'voting alone' in the military service deep-rooted in the public's mind that in 1791, criticism began on the national government's prolonged debates over the whole question of exemptions from military service (Cultice 17). This practice, if adopted, would mean that apprentices and miners should be debarred from the privilege of bearing arms in defense of their country. The selection of officers was conducted as it had been done during the American Revolution, and various governors were induced to appoint those who would do well in the next election. The importance of elections outweighed all other considerations to such an extent that the governors succeeded in forcing the government to let the military men get back home to vote. However, a common man at that time felt alone in the voting booth for the military and officials were engaged in a war.

The sense of public mindedness can be recaptured if people are given the freedom to politicize or control the uncertainty in American politics. Uncertainty arises

when the same president is reelected, as well as with respect to the president's ability to achieve public policy goals. One of the political problems facing the nation was the fact that too many members of Congress became impatient when something they wanted to be done was not achieved at once. To get an instant action, they sought ways to circumvent the Constitution and were convinced that the proposal sent by Senator Kennedy to each member of the Senate was a clear evasion of the Constitution and an attempt to circumvent the Constitution. Getting away from constitutional government was just like opening the door to the loss of individual liberty. Therefore, government frame-setters created a representative system in order to protect individual democracy not limited to the government but to the public-minded character. In the course of creation, the government later realized that through this fragmentation the power only shifted from the frame-setters to the office-holders, therefore a reflection of more fundamental transformations in economic structures and social relationships began to shape up the pivotal arena where the battles over the future of the republic were started. The representative system they had created draw distinct lines between the defenders of equality and injustice and the forces of privilege and self-interest, i.e. between moral democracy and dishonest politicians. But this picture dominated accounts of the political history of the old age where parliamentary and presidential systems supported autocracy. American government powers had never been as corrupted as they were at that stage, and reformers, professional administrators and technical experts always had significant authority and impact on decision-making processes (Goebel 25). Hence, the party mobilization and the fragmentation provided efficient but dominant means for developing and institutionalizing democracy, after

which it became evident that fiscal and economic policies conducted by machine politicians and upper-class officials did not greatly differ from each other.

The fragmentation of the government framework led divisions and uncertainty in the American politics but remained unable to immediately form political parties. However, the exercise of public power by the end of eighteenth century emerged in political differences concerned with the Federal role of the Government. Thus, by 1800, when the first national parties, the Federalists and Republicans, were organized in Congress, the politicians who organized those parties realized that being democratic, the Constitution fragmented political power within and among the institutions of government perceive parties as a mechanism for organizing political choices (Lees et al 70).

By fragmenting the government structure, the framers of our Government initiated a new transformation that was hindered by the executive and judicial power. This transformation profoundly disoriented formerly successful party leaders and activists entrenched in the “old” politics and acting under the rules of the old electoral order (Libey 50). It should have been proven disastrous, shunned by leaders and voters alike, but instead, through these strategies, it was gained a place on the democratic ticket. At first being dismissed by some people as anomalies, these achievements became models for the future American politics. Thus, the world of American elections changed.

Nowadays our youth is so much fatigued by the contemporary political scenario and in the name of democracy is no longer alone in the voting booth. What we witness is the political interest supporting elections. Besides, every new elections have their own

economic interests. Representative elites argue that the federal courts are also capable of threatening the individual's liberties. However, Congress and the president have ample disciplinary powers over the federal judiciary. Thus, the American political system represents a careful balance between democratic norms and constitutional limitations on authoritarian impulses. Rather than existing as a deviant institution, the federal courts appear to be an essential element in the liberal democracy. Even if a due process does not guarantee an access to a federal court in order to vindicate constitutional claims, the legislation that alters or threatens the delicate balance of governmental power is constitutionally suspect (Keynes and Miller 7).

We have been in a deadlock where recapturing the sense of public mindedness is difficult but not impossible. The political corruption for which we have witnessed has not only focused on fraudulent acts that distorted election results but also on electioneering techniques such as campaign expenditures, vote buying and so on. These campaign practices are responsible for distorting the image in public eyes because these practices have offended observers who thought that voters should cast their vote strictly on the basis of the issues involved in a campaign. There is a need to regain public confidence, i.e. the confidence in seeing a successful democracy, but we are unable to move because an impartial judiciary stands ready to enforce the rules of the political game and restore equilibrium to the political system, a powerful task for the least dangerous branch of government.

## Works Cited

- Cultice, Wendel W. *Youth's Battle for the Ballot: A History of Voting Age in America*. New York: Greenwood Press, 1992.
- Goebel, Thomas. *A Government by the People: Direct Democracy in America, 1890-1940*. Chapel Hill, NC: University of North Carolina Press, 2002.
- Keynes, Edward, and Randall Miller. *The Court vs. Congress: Prayer, Busing, and Abortion*. Durham, NC: Duke University Press, 1989.
- Lees, John D., Richard Maidment, and Michael Tappin. *American Politics Today*. Manchester: Manchester University Press, 1985.
- Libey, David M. *The Triumph of Campaign-centered Politics*. New York: Chatham House Publishers, 2000.