

Political science final exam: two questions essay example

[Law](#), [Security](#)



1. There are a few important differences between single-member districts and proportional representation in voting districts. Both are systems that are used for voting, and both have the goal of allowing the population of a voting district to choose an elected official or officials to represent the district.

In a single-member district, the voting system is designed in such a way that it allows the represented population to return only one individual as a representative to a legislative body. For example, a district may vote for an individual to send to the state legislature; this is an example of this type of voting system. It is an efficient system, and it requires significantly less planning and red tape than other type of electoral systems. It is an electoral system that is commonly used in the United States, and has a variety of different advantages. For example, in this type of voting system, every representative that is chosen is a winner. The representative chosen is chosen by the majority of the constituency, and therefore, majority rule is upheld via this system of voting.

Proportional representation, on the other hand, is somewhat different from single-member district representation. In proportional representation systems, voters vote for a party or group, and then the assembly or legislature is filled proportionately based on the votes cast by the constituency. This type of representation is used commonly in parliamentary systems, but is not commonly seen in English-speaking countries. Middle Eastern and North African countries are usually more likely to use this system of representation, as their religious divisions can cause friction if a single-member representation system is utilized.

A proportional representation system is technically more democratic, as the

pure democratic ideal is one vote to one citizen, and the proportional representation system merely transfers that individual's vote into a representative that will act specifically for the individual and his or her constituency.

Both of these types of representation systems have their strengths and weaknesses. However, the single-member district representation system seems to be more fair for countries that operate under the concept of majority rule. Countries with large numbers of minority groups, however, may find that there is less turmoil within the country if a proportional representation system is used. Single-member district representation is more logical in most places, as the majority should be represented in government, while the minority's rights should be protected by the government.

2. In the United States, the demographic shift that is about to take place in the coming decades is going to change the face of the job market for years to come. It will also change the way that Americans receive social benefits; there are many changes imminent, some of which may not even be foreseeable. The Baby Boomers are about to begin to retire; they have worked much longer into their retirement years than those before them, and they are facing an economic downturn (many of them lost their savings in the economic crisis) and rising healthcare costs.

Someone must bear the brunt of these costs. Looking at Japan and Japan's aging population, it seems as though the young will be responsible for bearing the costs of the aging population. Social programs like Medicare, Medicaid, and Social Security have been pointed out as programs that are soon to be in crisis, as the Baby Boomers have not paid enough into the

programs and will begin to eat into the savings for their children and grandchildren, partially as a result of the economic downturn.

The entire Social Security system needs to be overhauled if the system is to survive. First, it is too easy for people who are not qualified for social assistance programs to defraud the system, and fraud costs Social Security and other social assistance programs billions of dollars annually. By limiting the extent to which people can defraud the system, it will begin to stem the flow of capital out of social assistance programs and allow taxes to build the programs back up.

Additionally, taxes should be revisited for those in the upper tax brackets. Although they are unlikely to need to use Social Security and other social assistance programs, it is the social duty of everyone to participate in paying for social assistance programs, as everyone is entitled to use them in case they ever need them. Raising taxes for those in the top tax brackets, even slightly, would do a lot to help build the amount of capital that can be invested in these types of programs.

Many people point to illegal immigration as one of the leading problems facing social assistance programs in the United States. However, this speaks more to the problems with the United States' immigration policies than it does to problems with their social assistance programs. Creating easier ways for immigrants to come to the United States to work legally (and therefore pay taxes) would save the federal government billions of dollars every year, and provide additional taxable income that would be used to build up the social assistance programs that are suffering in the United States.

One thing that should not be done is a benefit reduction program. The

benefits available to people are meager enough as it is, and medical care in the United States is notoriously expensive. Reducing benefits may save money in the short term but would put hospitals and other urgent-care providers under serious amounts of financial strain.