

Introduction  
prominent in the  
government. the two



**ASSIGN  
BUSTER**

## **Introduction**

It is certain that constitutional amendments are crucial when eliminating problems in the original document. Amendment 14, especially section three, outlines that nobody would occupy the lawmaking, executive, or legal office if he or she engages in a revolt. The section further elaborates that no member of the state legislature, administrative or judicial should engage in a rebellion against the state. Consequently, such a person should leave the office. However, the constitution only allows a proportion of congress to remove such a person from the office. It is factual that all the officers in the three arms of the administration come into being when citizens vote. The populace of New Jersey enacted such a constitution for their own good (NJL, n. d).

Citizens, who are the voters, should also participate in the recall of such officers before the expiry of their terms.

## **Consideration of the Current Documents**

Normally, politicians and other public officials pledge what they would deliver when elected to their preferred positions. Citizens should always be able to evict such personalities from the offices when they discover that they are not delivering what they ought to. Citizens should always have a midterm evaluation of the officials in the divisions of the government. Such evaluations ought to gauge what the officers pledged and what the office demands of them as stipulated in the law. If the populace who elected them to the office deems that they perform below the standards, then they should undertake an election that verifies the recall of such officers. Such moves will

eventually clear out unreliable activities, as well as incompetent officers who do not deliver what the office demands (VOP, 2009).

On the other hand, the move would eventually lead to the retaining of honest and performing officers in the three branches of the government. The origin fathers were philosophical about the constitution of the US. They did not desire that a person who behaves rebelliously to the constitution or the country would not be fit to occupy any office. Moreover, they considered any abuse treacherous to the country, as well as the citizens. In a bid to contain such shortcomings, they stipulated some amendments about the modalities of representation and exclusion of such individuals. Fourteenth amendment forms a basis when considering the proposal of eliminating an officer from any branch of the government (Patterson, 2009). Section two of this amendment outlines the appointment procedures.

Furthermore, it elaborates on the number of representatives allocated for an area. Section 3, on the other hand, shuns any person who has been involved in any mischievous activity from becoming prominent in the government. The two sections; therefore, outlines the allocation of representatives, as well as bearing an office in any branch. Although the sections stipulate a prohibition of misconduct in the executive, judicial, or legislative branches, it does not concentrate on the eviction of the voted officers.

## **Good Outcomes of the Amendment**

Adoption of such an amendment has a positive impact on the overall administration of the state. The amendment will enable the officials in the branches of the government to execute their duties in harmony with the

constitution and state decrees (Smith, 2007). The legislative branch would make laws without impunity, but upholding the rights of the citizens.

The executive would enforce the decrees in accordance with the demands of the citizens. Consequently, the judicial branch would judge the laws while respecting the needs of the electorates. In general, the amendment would do away with the laxity among the officers. Another positive outcome of the amendment is that citizens would be proactive in the government affairs, thus keeping watch on it. Having the power to recall an officer would prompt people to be keen on the officers' actions (Patterson, 2009).

### **Bad Outcomes When Amendment is adopted**

Proposal and subsequent ratification of such amendment have some setbacks on various individuals. Since priorities change over time in the running of the state, the officers would have different limits to achieve.

This amendment is; therefore, not universal for the officers in the branches of the government. Secondly, it has a severe impact on the House of Representatives since members would be overcautious on their undertakings. This is factual especially on the decisions they make (Patterson, 2009). Moreover, several politicians would be extra scheming and alarmed in special interest clusters. Consequently, avenues for corruption will erupt since some officers would be interested in money.

The legislative division would be extra democratic thus causing the officials to let down civic trust. The amendment would have several loopholes since some citizens would not be honest with the evaluation process on the performance of the officers. This is factual since some would just vote

against the officers due to other factors other than the performance of the officer.

Enactment of such amendment requires several modalities thus thwarting the effort. This would only lead to brainwash since efforts go in vain without considerable impacts. Another bad outcome is the over concentration of people on the executive they voted. This would lead to officers serving the interests of the electorates, thus prompting them to overstep the constitution or the terms of office (Patterson, 2009). Adoption of such amendment would create uneven execution of duties since each state would have a benchmark for evaluating its officials. The incumbent in any of the three branches would fight at preserving his or her seat instead of tackling the needs of the populace. This would lead to divergent views towards the progress of the state.

This is factual since the officer would always like to hold his or her political life. Voters, on the other hand, nationals would be deliberating on whether the incumbent retains the position or another officer takes over. In a bid to retain the position or the office, the officer would try other mischievous means of convincing the voters. This is particularly factual when the officer did not meet the demands of the citizens. This will eventually lead to issues of corruption and other related behaviors.

## **Conclusion**

It is realistic that such a proposal and successive ratification of the amendment present thorny issues. The officers would be extra hesitant to ratify the proposal.

Some officers have acted treacherously in the past, and some have faced the law while others have escaped the long arms of the law. This owes to the weakness in the constitution, which does not empower citizens to recall such officers. Even though, the amendment may present some setbacks, it has strong pros that it would be positive in the end. The constitution that only empowers a small section of the society, the congress, to recall disloyal officers infringes on people's rights. Citizens should thus be empowered to recall untrustworthy officials serving in any branch of the government.

## References

New Jersey Legislature (NJL). (n.

d). Laws and Constitution. Retrieved on February 22, 2011 from: <http://www.njleg.state.nj.us/lawsconstitution/consearch.asp>

Patterson, T. E. (2009).

The American Democracy, 9th ed. New York, NY: McGraw-Hill Higher Education. Smith, R. (2007). The Bill of Rights: Defining Our Freedoms.

Minnesota, MN: ABDO. Voice of the people (VOP). (2009). Non-Partisan Petition to Recall Federal Elected Officials.

Retrieved on February 22, 2011 from: <http://govote.avoiceofthepeople.com/>.