

Us government : campaign spending - dissertation example

[Politics](#)



US government : campaign spending

US Government There are several reasons that it would be extremely difficult to effectively limit campaign spending and some of them shall be explained in this paragraph. The motives behind most political campaigns are to persuade voters and this is done with huge spending. Politicians seeking to be voted for need to travel across different states of the country in order to attract more voters to their candidates and they need to spend much in order to meet their target. The impression that these politicians have are that the more they spend, the more voters they have and in this case, it would be very difficult to effectively limit campaign spending. It is not possible to stop people campaigning to hold their political rallies as it would be like they are not given the opportunity to make their manifestoes known to the people. In the cases mentioned above, it would be extremely difficult to effectively limit campaign spending (Schmidt et al, 2009). There have been debates on whether the politicians in the U. S and especially Texas have much incentive to protect and defend the interest of the poor. However, one important question to be asked is: what is the background of these so called politicians? The answer to this question would be seen if one considers the fact that majority of these politicians are people that live above the poverty line. The politicians are people that have good academic background and most of them are not from poor backgrounds. Thus, a politician that does not know what it feels like to be poor would never have the interest of the poor at heart and would never have much incentive to represent the interest of the poor the way they should. Texas as a state supported the institutionalization of slavery and it is a state where we have

the rich oppressing the poor. Thus, the politicians in Texas would not have the incentive to represent the poor as they would prefer to defend and protect the interest of themselves and the people of their social status. Thus, the politicians in the U. S and especially Texas do not have much incentive to represent the interest of the poor (Schmidt et al., 2009). The result you get when you make it compulsory for people to come out en masse and vote for the best candidates is that it would have an effect on the types of candidates that run for public office. This is due to the fact that candidates that know that they are not popular with the people would not even make attempt to contest for primaries in the first place. Mandatory voting would also have an influence on the positions the candidates take as candidates that have less popularity would prefer to go for lesser positions than candidates that are more popular with the people. Mandatory voting would also change public policies as candidates that eventually win the election or take certain positions are the ones that the majority of the people voted for and their choice is in line with the agenda of these candidates. Thus, mandatory voting would ultimately change public policies (Schmidt et al., 2009). A city that has a youth commission should select only from a list of candidates that has been approved by the commission into the city council. This is due to the fact that the student that would be appointed to the city council should go there and defend the interest of the students and the body that represents the students is the youth commission. Thus, the student that would be appointed into the city council has to be a student that other students prefer to defend their interest in order to prevent any rancor and in order to ensure that the interests of the students and the youths alike are adequately

protected and defended in the council (Schmidt et al., 2009). Reference

Schmidt, S. W., Shelley, M. C., Bardes, B. A., Maxwell, W., & Crain, E. (2009).

American Government & Politics Today. Central Texas College 2009-2010

Edition. New York: Cengage Learning