Jackson Janes

Elections – American Style

The United States is a busy, complicated and often contradictory democracy. It is perhaps not so different from other democracies, yet it is full of its own peculiarities, particularly when it comes to elections. A country that can look back on more than two consecutive centuries of a democratic system of government has reason to be proud of that accomplishment.

One of the major measurements of the health of a democracy is the citizen's right to vote, as well as the degree to which citizens make use of that right. The strengths and weaknesses of American democracy are reflected in both the intensity and the detachment of Americans when it comes to casting their votes. Millions of Americans engage in elections, while millions more choose not to partake. How and why that happens is the subject of this essay.

Part 1

Each year Americans go to the polls in thousands of elections at multiple levels and for wide ranging purposes. While the drama of the presidential elections every four years overshadows the many other electoral races at the federal, state and local levels, Americans are constantly debating and deciding the results of political contests in a noisy, confrontational, but also continuous manner. This is a process that has now stretched over almost two and a quarter centuries.

The election year of 2012 offers another opportunity to examine the unique environment of American electoral politics. This includes an assessment of the challenges which continue to pose problems and opportunities to a system that has successfully elected forty four successive Presidents, as well as one hundred and twelve consecutive congresses – even bridging the interruption of a civil war that threatened to end the Republic one hundred and fifty years ago. The record is an impressive one, albeit one that was, and still is, constantly in need of improvement.

Although the traditional narrative of American history stresses the exceptional nature of the American democratic revolutionary experiment, the real story is that of an evolutionary system of government constantly exploring how to apply the lofty rhetoric of announcing the birth of a new nation. The Constitution of the United States begins with the words "We the People...," and Americans have spent the time since those words were written figuring out how to make sure that the "We" is as inclusive as it was intended to be.

The establishment of the United States in 1776 did not recognize all those living within its borders as equal in their capacity to vote, be those categorized as slaves, Native Americans or women. The electoral system of the U.S. has evolved from some forty thousand white men who elected George Washington as the nation's first President, to over one hundred and thirty million Americans casting their vote for the President of their choice in 2008. Along the way, laws were passed, a civil war was fought, and amendments to the Constitution were continually added to enable the vote to be available to ever more citizens for ever more offices of government – a government meant to be of, by and for the people, so the aspirations and declarations said.

Nevertheless, it is important to recall that some groups had to wait, and fight, for that right to select a government. Women did not get the national right to vote until 1919 – one hundred and thirty years after the words "We the People" were written. It wasn't until 1924, with the passage of the Indian Citizenship Act – in which Congress granted citizenship to all Native Americans born in the United States – that Native Americans began exercising their right to vote. And, it took a century after the end of the Civil war to secure full voting rights for African Americans in the U.S.[1]

Today, in addition to the presidential race every four years, millions of Americans are continually asked to vote their preferences for a wide variety of other things: for Judges and Sheriffs, Senators and Congress members, governors and state legislators, school officials, Dog Catchers, referendums, and propositions. There are fifty states each with its own government consisting of a governor and (with one exception) two legislative chambers, which have over seven thousand elected legislators in them.

Furthermore, there are over three thousand municipal counties throughout those fifty states, each with their own governing body, as well as the cities and towns of each county with their mayors, Council members or other representatives. All in all, this brings the total number of types of government offices at all levels in the U.S. to almost ninety thousand. Behind every one of those offices, thousands of Americans are working and campaigning to get elected. Americans do not only vote often. Many also seek election with equal intensity.

While the Presidential and Congressional elections usually draw the most attention, the thousands of local governmental districts demand voters make continual choices about those people they wish to grant the responsibilities of governing. In America, no office is too small to not merit a vote.

Alexis de Tocqueville, who authored *Democracy in America,* commented during his tour of the United States some one hundred and seventy years ago how Americans approached elections:

> *"Long before the appointed moment arrives, the election becomes the greatest and so to speak sole business preoccupying minds.… The entire nation falls into a feverish state; the election is then the daily text of the public papers, the subject of particular conversations, the goal of all reasoning, the object of all thoughts.… As soon as fortune has*

1 See the Civil Rights Act of 1964 (http://www.ourdocuments.gov/doc.php?flash=true&doc=97) and the Voting Rights Act of 1965 (http://www.ourdocuments.gov/doc.php?doc=100.).

pronounced [the victor], this ardor is dissipated, everything becomes calm, and the river, one moment overflowed, returns peacefully to its bed."[2]

Today, de Tocqueville might see a different America. Now, the "feverish state" is more of an ongoing enterprise and the "river" is constantly flowing at a rapid pace, closely monitored by an insatiable twenty-four hour a day media. The entire process is driven by ambitious office-seekers supported by a growing number of political organizations and interest groups financed by an enormous amount of money. Elections are a full-time enterprise embedded in a never ending campaign. Yet, there are gaps in the river. Despite all this engagement, there is a widespread feeling in the United States that the election system underlying that democracy is not working as well as it should be. That is the case among those who vote, as well as those who choose to abstain.

While the evolution of the politics of U.S. elections has generated a constant campaign mode for those engaged in them, there is a simultaneous loss of confidence in the system and its ability to maintain high standards of execution. How has this contradictory development happened?

Part 2

There are many factors shaping these current trends in U.S. elections. They include the appearance of new tools of political mobilization, the increasing penetration of media (old and new), the rising importance and amount of money involved in political campaigns, the changing demographic picture of American society, and the sharpening clash of political ideologies and their adherents within it. All these developments drive some Americans to the polls, while others are dismayed by them.

Demographic changes

American society is anything but static. The population is changing, growing and recalibrating the influences of voter groups by their size and engagement in the American election system.

In 1965, the United States was 89% white and 11% black, about the same as it had been during the previous century. Today, America is 66% white and 33% "people of color," a tripling of the minority population in only four decades. For the first time in U.S. history, a president of mixed race resides in the White House. According to current projections, non-whites will grow from 33% of the population today to as much 50% by 2042. There will also be a rapid increase in the "mixed race" population of voters. Who will be voting for each candidate may be more difficult to project in such a changing mixture, in which voters are aligning themselves differently or not at all.

2 See *Democracy in America* by Alexis de Tocqueville.

One particular example of this trend is the emergence of the largest, most diverse generation in American history. Born from 1978-2010, this cohort makes up the biggest and most important new voting bloc in America. There are about 95 million "Millennials," also known as "Generation X" or "Y", half of whom are now of voting age. One out of four eligible voters in 2012 will come from this generation. How they will look, think and behave as voters remains to be seen.[3]

As these populations grow, a new political reality will take hold in areas most immediately affected by these voters, especially in the Southwest and coastal areas of the country where the majority of the country's population is located.

Religious affiliation

The changing roles of the institutions which have served as intermediaries and anchors for voters, be they churches, synagogues, mosques, labor unions, political parties, or interest groups, are also of importance in understanding voting behavior. Labor union membership has declined significantly in the last three decades, while some religious affiliations of various types have been on the rise.

According to the latest Survey of the Pew Forum on Religion and Public Life, more than one-quarter of American adults (28%) have left the faith in which they were raised in favor of another religion – or no religion at all.[4] While the United States is still a country in which over three quarters of the population declare themselves to be Christian, the picture of religious affiliation shows an enormous amount of diversity and fragmentation. All of this is part of the landscape of a very mobile country, in which religious affiliations are reflections of life style and geography, while also carrying political importance. Despite the traditional reference to the divisions between church and state in the United States, there is no question that religion serves as a mobilizing institution for political purposes. The current presidential campaigns illustrate that role again.

Labor union

Labor unions have declined dramatically in membership in the last four decades, now representing less than 12% of the American labor force – down from a third in the Fifties. In the private sector, unionization has fallen from a quarter of all workers to less than seven per cent today.[5]

3 See the Pew Research Center's report on the Millenials, http://pewresearch.org/millennials/.

4 See the Pew Forum on Religion and Public Life's report on religion in the United States, http://religions.pewforum.org/reports.

5 See the Bureau of Labor Statistics report on union membership (http://www.bls.gov/news.release/union2.nr0.htm) for current data and a 2004 Congressional Research Service report for historical data (http://digitalcommons.ilr.cornell.edu/cgi/viewcontent.cgi?article=1176&context=key_workplace.).

While their mobilization power is still strong in the public sector, labor unions do not have the same impact as they did when close to a third of Americans were members of labor unions.

Political parties

While they remain dominant in the political landscape, the strength of the two main political parties, in terms of registered members, has been declining during the last few decades. Currently, around a third of Americans identify themselves as Democrats, with slightly less identifying themselves as Republicans. However, close to forty percent claim they are independents. Both Democrats and Republicans have been losing members consistently and are now at historically low numbers, with independents increasing in strength.

The two main parties are losing dominance in their central role as political mobilizers to other organizations, as well as in the wake of a more fragmented society. The rise of political action committees, known as PACs, has increasingly absorbed the energy and support of voters. According to the Center for Responsive Politics, 412 Super PACs have been formed for the 2012 elections to date, with a combined funding of over 155 million dollars.[6] Their reach in elections will be hard to miss.

The role of money

The increasing amount of money involved in the American election system has been the source of both concern and efforts to constrain it. Current projections for election spending in 2012 suggest that nearly ten billion dollars might be reached. That includes statewide, congessional and municipal races, as well as the presidential election. Spending by PACs, national political party committees, and now the so-called super PACs is projected to be $4.76 billion, or half of all spending. Super PACs were created by the Supreme Court's 2010 Citizens United decision, in which it determined that spending by corporations and unions can't be restricted.[7]

The impact of fundraising on both the candidates and their campaigns remains a central point of controversy, as well as a source of cynicism among voters. Concerns over this exorbitant level of funding have contributed to suspicions about the fairness and competitiveness of the election system.

These changing equations of power and influence among the aforementioned organizations reflect the transitions of both issues and their salience for the voters. All of these aspects play a role in the further evolution of the American style of elections.

6 See the Center of Responsive Politics' overview of PAC spending (http://www.opensecrets.org/pacs/superpacs.php?ql3.).

7 See the Oyez Project page on *Citizens United* (http://www.oyez.org/cases/2000-2009/2008/2008_08_205#opinion.).

Part 3

Following the high drama over the presidential race in 2000 between George Bush and Al Gore, millions of Americans were left with unanswered questions about the number of votes not counted due to mismanagement, malfeasance, partisanship, the lack of effective equipment, and competence of those in charge of the administration of elections. Indeed, the decision of the Supreme Court, which effectively handed the election to George W. Bush, left many wondering about the fairness of the U.S. election system.

Nevertheless, when the election was over, Americans, as de Tocqueville suggested, returned to their river beds. George Bush achieved re-election four years later in 2004 with more Americans casting their votes than ever before. An even greater number of Americans turned out in the elections of 2008. Frustrated as some had become with the election system, it had not prevented millions of Americans from participating in it.

One upshot of the 2000 election controversy was a series of studies conducted to examine how to improve the election procedures. The findings of this research resulted in the passing of the Help America Vote Act in 2002.[8] The Act mandated that all states and localities upgrade many aspects of their election procedures, including their voting machines, registration processes and poll worker training. However, the specifics of implementation have been left up to each state, which allows for varying interpretations of the Federal law.

A decade later, battles continue to rage over the process of procedural reform for elections. The current fierce debate about new requirements for monitoring voter registration is generated by accusations of voter fraud by some, while others counter by labeling such requirements as an effort to disenfranchise voters. Such rancor is a reflection of continuing mistrust and uncertainty among voters.

There are many efforts to explain American behavior regarding the right to vote. Traditionally, in American political science literature, the explanations revolve around the decentralized nature of the voting system, which makes local governments responsible for voter registration. In a country that is marked by a significant mobility, that system makes it more difficult for voters to meet the qualifications needed to register to vote.

During the last decade of the twentieth century, an average of forty million Americans moved from one residence to another annually. The vast majority moved within one state, but almost nine million moved across state lines or out of the country entirely. The younger cohorts between eighteen and thirty years of age are three times as mobile as the rest of the population.[9] Keeping track of all those people to make sure they are registered to vote is a difficult challenge. States do not communicate well with each other

8 See the United States Election Assistance Commission's page on the Help America Vote Act (http://www.eac.gov/about_the_eac/help_america_vote_act.aspx.).

9 For more detailed information, see the Census Bureau's Current Population Survey Data on Geographical Mobility/Migration, (http://www.census.gov/hhes/migration/data/cps.html.).

about their respective registration processes, and the control of registration is regulated primarily at the local levels of government.[10]

A second factor often cited in American voting is the two-party system dominated by the Republican and Democratic parties. Voters who see little difference between the two parties are often either unable or unwilling to make a decision among the candidates. Lacking an attractive, or indeed a viable, third party choice, many voters simply choose to abstain.[11]

This two-party dominance has resulted in the appearance of third parties or movements, which tend to rally groups of voters around specific issues or individual candidates, such as the so-called Tea Parties, the current Republican Presidential candidate Ron Paul, or past candidates like Ralph Nader. Yet, these trends are largely generated by Presidential or Congressional races and have only a limited shelf life on the national political stage. The Tea Party movement exerted substantial influence on the Congressional elections in 2010, giving the Republican Party a large boost in the House of Representatives. Whether they will repeat that same level of impact on the races in 2012 remains to be seen.

Alternative parties and candidates can and do appear at the local level of elections, but the state and federal election field remains dominated by the two-party system. Given the enormous amount of money required to run for office at the national level, third party candidates remain at a substantial disadvantage to those candidates supported by the two major parties and their affiliated organizations responsible for raising campaign funds.

A third factor in the voting process draws on the indifference of Americans to politics in general, reflected in low expectations from politics and politicians. There is a well established skepticism and suspicion of political parties going back to the founding of the Republic, despite the fact that we have had to live with parties for almost our entire history. Our first President, George Washington, in his farewell address warned of the "baneful effects of the spirit of party." James Madison, in his famous essay in the *Federalist Papers – Federalist 10* – warned of the dangers of factions undermining democracy in the young American Republic.[12] Factions became a symbol of the partisan bickering that today is exemplified in the confrontation between the Democrats and Republicans in the Congress. The fact that the Congress is currently seeing its public image at historically low levels is a present tense depiction of a long history of negative attitudes toward government and Washington, DC as its apotheosis.

It is often pointed out that voters will express their negative attitudes toward Washington, DC while maintaining their support for their own Congressional representative. The fact is that in the 2006 Congressional elections, over 90% of the incumbent candi-

10 See the Federal Election Commission's report on Building Confidence in U.S. Elections (http://www1.american.edu/ia/cfer/.).
11 See *Parties and Politics in America*, by Clinton Rossiter.
12 See the Federalist Papers (http://thomas.loc.gov/home/histdox/fedpapers.html).

dates were re-elected in their districts.[13] Nevertheless, it is ironic how often a long-term member of the House or the Senate will campaign for re-election by railing against the very town in which she or he has spent years in office.

Overall, the picture of the American electorate is a portrait of a society full of cleavages and conflicts, yet still in constant debate over the control of the political system which governs it. Millions of Americans do engage in their civic right to vote, but there are still millions of Americans who choose not to participate at whatever level elections are held.

Americans are divided by race, geography, class, religion, and education, among the primary variables. Yet there remains the constant drum beat of those who strive to organize political action to achieve political office by forging majorities in elections. There is a continuous and constant, as well as expensive, campaign in American society to gain and maintain power over the decisions and directions of government.

That does not make the American democracy unique, but the environment in which the democratic process unfolds in the U.S. does make for an exceptional combination of factors

The Main Metric – presidential elections

The Presidential elections that occur every four years are one of the major benchmarks used to measure the political pulse of the nation. Furthermore, these elections help to take a snap shot of the political divisions, arguments and policy directions of the nation. Each election cycle is x-rayed from all possible angles to detect continuity and changes. By some measures, there is a great deal of continuity demonstrated by the battle between two major parties for control of the White House and the Congress. Who controls either end of Pennsylvania Avenue determines the course of legislative choices and the agenda of the debate about them.

Americans tend to fall into three groups of voters – those that turn out regularly, those that vote primarily in the presidential election year and those who simply choose not to vote at all.

Turn out for presidential elections is deemed to be good when it passes the sixty per cent mark. In 2008, of the total population of 310 million Americans, an estimated two hundred and six million are eligible to cast a vote. Of that group, 146 million were registered to vote in 2008. And of that group, 132 million actually voted in that year's presidential election. That represented an increase of almost five million voters over the 2004 election, which translates into a turnout of 61.6% – a record showing for voters in the U.S.

13 For more data, see the Center for Responsive Politics (http://www.opensecrets.org/bigpicture/reelect.php).

Approximately seventy per cent of those who can vote are registered, and close to 90 per cent of those registered actually show up at the polls. Still, that leaves many citizens uninvolved in the election process.[14]

In all national elections, turnout in the United States has a history of rising and falling over time. However, it has never risen to levels of turnout in most of the well-established democracies in other nations. After rising sharply from 1948 to 1960, turnout declined in nearly every election until dropping to barely half of eligible voters in 1988. Since 1988, it has fluctuated from a low of 51.7% of eligible voters (and 48.1% of voting age population) in 1996 to a high of 61.6% of eligible voters in 2008, the highest level since 1968. Even at its highest point, the percent of eligible Americans who turned out to vote in Presidential elections never surpassed 65%. This is still substantially lower than in almost all established democracies; turnout is 70-75% in Canada and well over 80% in most other democracies, including 86.8% in the first round of the French presidential election and 91.7% in the 2004 proportional representation election for Luxembourg's legislature.[15]

The turnout for Congressional elections is, in general, about 20% lower than in the more energized presidential race years. Low turnout is most pronounced in off-year elections for state legislators and local officials, as well as primaries. In many cities, for example, mayors of major cities often are elected with single-digit turnout. Congressional primaries have similarly low turnout. Even in this year's presidential primaries there has been single digit turn outs in some states, with a high of only 20% in some instances.[16]

Furthermore, there are enormous disparities that exist in America across income levels in all forms of participation, particularly voting. A study on these disparities found that 86% of people with incomes above $75,000 claim to have voted in presidential elections as compared with only 52% of people with incomes under $15,000. Another measurement shows that Americans making less than $25,000 per year voted at a rate that lagged twenty-five percentage points behind those who earn more than $100,000.[17]

Because of the individual origin of each of the fifty states as members of the national union, election laws and practices can vary widely, as do the issues which move the voters to engage or to ignore the election process. An issue like gun control may be a highly contentious issue in Texas but have no similar echo in Maine. Immigration controversies may be volatile in Arizona but do not play a large role in Vermont. Environmental issues look very different from the view of a West Virginia coal miner than from a ski fan in Washington State. The debate over abortion or evolution looks very different to voters in Kansas than it does in Maryland. Much of these differences have to do with the ways

14 For more data on voter turnout, see http://elections.gmu.edu/voter_turnout.htm.

15 From the Center for Voting and Democracy, http://www.fairvote.org/voter-turnout#.T4ctbmGrjGg.

16 For more data on voter turnout in the 2012 primary elections, see http://elections.gmu.edu/Turnout_2012P.html.

17 See the American Political Science Association's report on inequalities of political votes (http://www.apsanet.org/imgtest/voicememo.pdf) and *Winner-Take-All Politics,* by Jacob Hacker and Paul Pierson.

in which the issues impact the people confronting them. However, a major factor is also the environment created by the voters themselves.

Part of that picture involves a trend in American electoral behavior that has not always been noticed. That trend has to do with a form of self selecting political distribution within American society that has contributed to increased political polarization and segmentation, which is then reflected in the gridlock one sees in Washington, DC.

During the last three decades, America society has been sorting itself into ever more homogeneous clusters of like-minded people. These people have been busy reframing their livelihoods around a way of life that reflects their political persuasions. There has been an increasing confluence of life styles that draws people together around their churches, their associations, and their political leanings. Some of this has to do with increasing prosperity, which enabled more mobility throughout the country. Therefore, the opportunity to choose not only a geographical location but also a social, economic, ethnic, and religious location conforming to personal preferences increased.

Measuring this trend in political terms has been made clearer by examining the degree to which the fifty states can be designated as either "red" or "blue" i.e. Republican or Democratic. Furthermore, by looking at the over 3,000 individual counties in the U.S., one gets a much better picture of how Americans are sorting themselves out politically.[18]What ones see's in that picture described above is a country in which the majority of individual counties represent an increasing majority of supporters for one political party, with fewer people representing the minority political point of view. What that suggests is that even though Presidential elections can be closely competitive, the country is clustering itself ever more around the two sides of the political equation. Such a process is leaving an ever smaller slice of those in the middle as independent voters. That layout is enhanced by the fact that two thirds of American voters live in counties which have not changed their presidential party preferences during the last twenty years.[19]

Interesting to note in this development is the interplay between cultural clustering vs. political segregation. In past decades and centuries in the US, the lack of mobility led to cultural concentrations of people in certain regions of the country. For example, the southern states had traditionally maintained the vast majority of African Americans, until the middle of the twentieth century when black migration drew them to northern industrial centers where jobs were available and when mobility became more accessible. Now, only have of the almost forty million African Americans live in the southern states. At the same time, we have seen more mobility and affluence lead to clustering of people according to religion and life style choices, which has resulted in a cluster of political majorities in both counties and states. In the meantime, the majority of the Republican Party's core white voters are now concentrated in the southern states, whereas the African American population is now more dispersed in the Northeast and the Midwest.

Such clustering has also been reflected in measures of education, age, income, and race. The result is that more Americans are living in a world in which they choose their indi-

18 See *The Big Sort* by Bill Bishop.
19 See *The Big Sort* by Bill Bishop.

vidual preferences at the expense of being exposed to differences. As Bill Bishop has put it in his book *The Big Sort:*

> *"Today we seek our own kind in like-minded churches, like-minded neighborhoods, and like-minded sources of news and entertainment.....like-minded, homogeneous groups squelch dissent, grow more extreme in their thinking, and ignore evidence that their position is wrong...we now live in a giant feedback loop, hearing our own thoughts about what is right and wrong bounced back to us by the television shows we watch, the newspaper and books we read, the blogs we visit online, the sermons we hear, and the neighborhoods we live in."*[20]

In such an environment, patterns of voting become an affirmation of a political group rather than an expression of a civic opinion.

The renowned political scientist Robert Dahl wrote that the basic stability of the American political system was based on a pattern of cleavages, marked by race, faith, geography, and class. Dahl warned that as long as those cleavages were mixed up in the larger political arena, conflicts would be controlled. But, as he said, "if all the cleavages occur along the same lines, if the same people hold opposing positions in one dispute after another, then the severity of conflict is likely to increase. The man on the other side is not just an opponent. He soon becomes an enemy."[21]

The danger with that projection in mind is the loss of compromise among differences to sustain a sense of common purposes. The rhetoric of the 2012 Presidential race abounds with references to the common good of the country. Unfortunately, it is also riddled with references to what is essentially presented as a zero-sum battle, in which only one side wins. The trends described in this essay are signals that the river which Alexis de Tocqueville described so long ago remains at flood stage, particularly during a Presidential year. As long as the factors that divide American voters continue to increase in intensity, there are going to be voters who are energized or alienated by a system still in need of reform after more than two centuries of evolution.

Summary

The United States has an election culture characterized among other things by a large number of elections, a high level of media attention, numerous cleavages in voter behavior, and a low rate of voter participation. This unique culture has developed continuously since the earliest days of the United States, expanding the franchise from a limited number of wealthy white males to almost all American citizens. Today, U.S. elections continue to change as Americans reprioritize their affiliations, demographic shifts push voters with different political worldviews into positions of electoral importance, and Americans realign geographically along political lines. Furthermore, U.S. elections suffer from sur-

20 See *The Big Sort* by Bill Bishop.
21 See *The Big Sort* by Bill Bishop.

prising credibility challenges and a paradoxically low level of voter turnout. This article explains the status of the American election culture as it faces shifting foundations and an uncertain future.

Zusammenfassung

Die Wahlkultur der Vereinigten Staaten zeichnet neben anderem durch eine Vielzahl von Wahlen, eine hohe Medienaufmerksamkeit, ein schwer ausrechenbares Wählerverhalten und eine niedrige Wahlbeteiligung aus. Diese Kultur unterliegt indes seit den frühesten Anfängen der Vereinigten Staaten einem kontinuierlich Wandel, wobei das Wahlrecht – das anfangs einer begrenzten Anzahl wohlhabender weißer Männer vorbehalten war – heute fast allen US-Bürgern zusteht. Das Wahlverhalten in den USA wandelt sich permanent, weil US-Bürger ihre politischen Zugehörigkeiten immer wieder neu priorisieren, weil Wählergruppen mit unterschiedlichen politischen Weltanschauungen durch demographische Verschiebungen an Bedeutung gewinnen oder verlieren. Darüber hinaus leiden Wahlen in den USA unter erstaunlichen Glaubwürdigkeitsproblemen sowie einer paradoxerweise niedrigen Wahlbeteiligung. Dieser Beitrag erläutert den gegenwärtigen Stand der amerikanischen Wahlkultur, die gegenwärtig in eine unsichere Zukunft blickt.

Jackson Janes, Wahlen auf amerikanisch