

TALLINN UNIVERSITY OF TECHNOLOGY  
School of Economics and Business Administration  
Department of International Relations  
Chair of International Relations and Political Science

Galina Gavrilova

**OLIGARCHY AND DEMOCRACY IN THE UNITED STATES:  
A PLURALISTIC INTERPRETATION**

Master's Thesis

Supervisor: Associate Professor Holger Mölder

Tallinn 2016

I declare I have written the master's thesis independently.

All works and major viewpoints of the other authors, data from other sources of literature and elsewhere used for writing this paper have been referenced.

Galina Gavrilova .....

Student's code: 141794

Student's e-mail address: [galinagavrilova1@gmail.com](mailto:galinagavrilova1@gmail.com)

Supervisor Holger Mölder

The thesis conforms to the requirements set for the master's theses

.....

(Signature, date)

Chairman of defence committee:

Permitted to defence

.....

(Title, name, signature, date)

# CONTENTS

LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS .....	6
ABSTRACT .....	7
INTRODUCTION .....	8
1. RESEARCH METHODOLOGY .....	11
1.1 Literature review .....	12
1.2 Theoretical discussion.....	13
2. INTERPRETATION OF FINDINGS .....	19
2.1 Foreword .....	19
2.2 Pluralism view .....	25
2.3 Elitism and Liberal democracy .....	26
2.4 Theories of political democracy.....	28
2.4.1 Federal Election Commission v. Wisconsin Right to Life (2007); Citizens United v. Federal Election Commission (2010) cases.....	32
2.4.2 Electoral manipulation .....	33
2.4.3 Why People Vote? .....	35
2.4.4 Why People don't Vote?.....	36
3. OLIGARCHY .....	38
3.1 Wealthy Americans and Policy Preference .....	40
3.1.1 Campaign Money i.e. Resources .....	43
4. CONTROL OVER INFORMATION.....	48
4.1 Media Resources.....	48
4.1.2 Newspaper.....	49
4.1.3 Media and new media .....	51
CONCLUSION .....	56
REFERENCES .....	59

## **LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS**

CRP	Center for Responsive Politics
FEC	Federal election Commission
PAC	Political action Committee
Super PAC	Independent-expenditure only committees
SMD	Single-member district
PR	Public relations
CNN	Television channel
BBC	Television channel

## **ABSTRACT**

This paper is attempting to make an interpretation of a linkage that presumably exists between American democratic practices, the process of democratisation and the perceived involvement of the oligarchy in the process. In a perfect scenario for democracy, one could place an inquiry on incentives for oligarchy to initiate a democratic transition. In our case, this research is to focus on circumstances under which business elites could and would try to influence the outcome of the democratic process in the United States. The context of ‘one person, one vote’ exists side-by-side with the legitimate use of money for political needs. This could, with necessity, lead to a number of socio-political misinterpretations and misunderstandings between the country’s powerful middle class and the perceivably even more powerful upper level of the social ladder. The middle class can always count on their vote, fully protected by the country’s Constitution, but the hidden role of the oligarchy-driven power of money could easily turn the legislative decisions to be made in favors of the upper-class. Therefore, it could be argued that the oligarchy and democracy are interdependent to the extent that could have many different interpretations. Another perspective suggests that with the spreading of democratic ideology there is great pressure for the country that has been an example of democracy and democratic form of government for so long, dispersion of power in pluralist theory keeps government from taking rushed, conceivably hasty activity, however it likewise can keep any activity if important power centers oppose this idea. Despite the fact that decentralization of force mirrora American government, some institutional elements have a tendency to centralize force, empowering government to act even while lacking widespread concession to strategy. In a panel analysis, changes in political democracy are found to be negatively related to the elite’s control, however, not to the extent that nothing could be done.

**Key words:** elections, campaign, billionaire, democracy, wealth, oligarchy, pluralism

## INTRODUCTION

Back in the first half of XX century, John Calvin Coolidge noted that “the chief business of the American people is business” (Calvin Coolidge, 1975).

Centuries have passed since the appearance of democracy in America and since then the country has set an example to others. Democracy in America must always continue to be a compelling and constantly increasing interest to citizens of the United States as the first rational and liberal view of American society, institutions, and future. Nobody can raise a clearer understanding and more enthusiastic valuation for the favors of freedom ensured by law, nor without support for the strength and interminability of the public.

The progress of the first developers formed by a relatively self-contained profit-oriented class lessened the political power held by the traditional governing elite. As elite power become more apparent because even despite liberal democracy oligarchy gained influence over elections. The American model of democracy and pluralist democracy, has various advantages over the majoritarian model. Majoritarian model implies that government should take into consideration majority of people and adopt legislations for majority of the people. Pluralist vote based system requires government power to be scattered and authority to be decentralized, democracy exists when power of the government is divided between numerous different groups—for instance, work v. administration, agriculturists v. nourishment stores, industrial organizations v. farms.

The economic gains of the profit-oriented class led to demands and gaining of a larger distribution of political power. The minimal role of the government in the economic development of the first developers appeared suitable for the enlargement of democracy in the political sphere.

The hypothesis of the paper is: Despite being a pluralist democracy, the American system is still dependent on oligarchy.

The aim of the research is to examine American democracy dependent on the upper class society and could the American government at the same time be influenced by oligarchy and be considered as pluralist democracy. The objective of the present paper is to understand how legislative decisions could be turned against people and show that elections are more an exception and courtesy. More simply, pluralism is a theory of the conveyance of political force. It holds that power is generally and uniformly scattered in the society. But combination of pluralism and democracy may not be the firm one. As it were, the arrangement of tenet by numerous minorities may basically have been an arranged to keep them from practicing political power. Elites view same as liberal democracy subsequently centers upon the innate pressure amongst vote based system and free enterprise; that is, between the political correspondence that liberal popular government announces and the social imbalance that an industrialist economy unavoidably creates.

The connection between political democracy and capitalist form of growth could be argued to be as pluralistic has been recognised. A focused and public fight for authority in democracies is predictable with the competitive and free trading of a market economy. Since power is so decentralized among government institutions, the U.S. framework can be said to miss the mark concerning the most elevated standard of majoritarian democracy. Due to the decentralization of force, notwithstanding, the United States honorably satisfies the best quality level of pluralist vote based system, which accept various centers of power. The United States political framework is interested in contending on many groups that want to be heard in the fair democratic process, and ostensibly yields strategy results that, after some time, all the more successfully consider the interests and worries of various groups than do frameworks established on the strict majoritarian principle.

In the political field, the vote may be considered related to the dollar as a recognisable currency that, instead of supporting economic development, is spent on the careful choosing of the ruling elites. America's swift economic growth influenced the development of all the countries that were to follow it. It set the example of economic development that influenced France, Turkey, Germany and Japan.

What makes America so different from other countries is that traditional liberalism makes people believe that anyone can get ahead. Without that, the assumption of today's economic expandable gaps seems much less pleasing.

American electoral politics is more and more a matter of money. Election coverage on television and other media brings as much attention to the candidates' fund raising success as to their policy positions. Legal decisions have gained attention by the breakdown of campaign financing laws and the Supreme Court's Citizens United decision allowing unlimited contributions, from businesses and independent donors, to political groups. Contributors have high hopes for the candidates, expecting to gain flexibility in certain areas of business decision-making. Donors have no guarantee of the success of the campaign; there is no protection for investors. To democrats, however, the potential for open financing and different procedures to keep the corruption at bay otherwise accompanying campaign donations is made even more remote. The power of money is no longer the only powerful factor in Washington. Billionaires are starting to understand that notwithstanding the election results, money could not be recovered and campaign consultants still earn significant party coffers.

It not only helps us to understand what a difference billionaires and a wealthy society make but also how the American democracy is divided by power and money. Until people cease to see everything in the legislative side through the perspective of the presidential elections and the different model of campaign with different rules, the power of money will be underestimated.



# 1. RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

The present theoretical research is largely based on secondary literature and previous studies providing a wide range of material and information for the specific area. Secondary data is collected from the Internet, bibliographic sources and newspapers with a respective table of references of the collected material created. The research does not include quantitative and qualitative research methods such as statistics and groups and it does not study human behavior. Qualitative Research will capture and discover meaning once the research becomes focused on data. Theory can become causal or non-causal and is often challenging and proceeds by extracting themes or obtaining statement from evidence and organizing data to present a coherent, consistent meaning of the research.

Bibliographic research gives us background for hypothesis and preparation for formulating future work. Using primary and secondary sources will give essential meaning of the research. Figures used in the present research are based on the data provided on the Federal Election Commission web-portal. Some data will also be taken from the materials provided by *The New York Times*. The analysis of CRP includes only the contributions to the candidate, party and leadership committees. Following the gathering of all information and the analysis of the material, a full research is provided, giving my opinion and view on the matter. In the end, the conclusions made shall be compared to those made by other researches.

The main issues arising in our research include the assumption that people holding power in economic area and organizations that represent different businesses have a significant influence on the U.S. government policy, while the working class and average income groups have no say in the given matters. The theory of the domination of the elite is easily understood and can be seen in daily life. While studying the American policy and the theory of Biased Pluralism, (Gilens and Page 2014) claim that states “tend to tilt towards the wishes of corporations and business and professional associations”. Thus, it could be suggested that democracy is not meant for the ordinary working people as is should be but instead takes a completely different perspective.

In the research conducted the author presumes that the standpoints of the average American and the rich American are comparable, consequently resulting in the conviction of regular people that their political views are taken into consideration due to politicians' claim of improving the situation of the working class. As long as wealth benefits from politics, the middle class will benefit from wealth.

## **1.1 Literature review**

For research, I used a comprehensive number of sources in an attempt to write the most accurate and extensive discussion possible. I am going to compare the pros and cons, two different points of view from various people and sources about the American democracy and to make sense of the various forms of political democracy, I will look into (Bollen 1980; Bollen and Grandjean 1981; Bollen 1986; Bollen and Jackman 1989). A consideration of the definitional and conceptual issues and of the measurement problems besetting political democracy is followed by recommendations for future research. It will consider how the money is raised, where and how it is spent, and what kind of control there is over the information. Last but not least, some aspects of campaign manipulations – the arrangement of practices including stuffing polling booths, purchasing votes, and threatening voters or candidates – disregard fundamental political flexibilities, undermine the capacity of races as components of responsibility, decimate trust in constituent and majority rule organizations and may even prompt social strife, to list just a few of its harming impacts. It is all part of the democratic process that cannot be avoided.

Research books by John Nichols and Robert W. McChesney, Darrell M. West give an accurate overview of the topic, explaining how politicians see democracy today in the age of money and accounting for the rise of billionaires and wealth in modern America. Secondly, the scholarly articles by Jeffrey A. Winters and Benjamin I. Page, Martin Gilens will support the theories of economic elite domination and theories of pluralism, but not majoritarian electoral democracy, also the possible influence of tools such as lobbying, elections and the US Constitution are tackled. Thirdly, I will consider the personal opinions of judges (Chief Justice John Roberts; Justice John Paul Stevens; Justice Antony Kennedy) and senators (Senator Christopher Murphy; Senator Sanders). I will also refer to Alberto Simpser's book

*Why Governments and Parties Manipulate Elections*, discussing his theory about the motives that make electoral manipulation possible and testing some of the theory's basic distinguishable implications using a variety of empirical sources and Presidential elections: strategies and structures of American politics argue that the institutional rules of the presidential campaign and election processes at the same time connected with mass voters, predicted aims and interests of powerful politicians. The author can make sense of the decisions made by differently situated political actors – scholars and writers, Democrats, Republicans, party officials, elite (billionaires), journalists, and voters – by understanding their role in the decision-making process.

Also refer to the handbook series for democracy and party funding in America. Some further sources come from special investigations conducted by top-media sources – *The New York Times*, *POLITICO*, *CNN*) and non-profit organisation such as *Sunlight Foundation* that uses open data and real-time information.

Looking into all facts and see who and how explores this problem. Will compare all views, pro and cons, and the main differences. The conclusions will be summarised at the end of the research.

## **1.2 Theoretical discussion**

In order to explain recent developments in politics a consistent pattern of the present situation will be explored. In 2010, all attention was turned to Supreme Court's stirring decision in the case of *Citizens United v. FEC and Federal Election Commission v. Wisconsin Right to Life* (2007), however, in his book *Dollarocracy* John Nicholas (2013, 196-197), presents an example of the case of *James L. Buckley, et al. v. Francis R. Valeo, Secretary of the United States Senate* in 1976 in which Supreme Court "rejected federal limitations on campaign expenditures, on expenditures by a candidate from personal funds, and on independent expenditures by individuals and special-interest groups" and thus the case began a dismantling of the law. This decision not only opened the door to contributions but also gave the impression that money is speech stating:

*The Act's contribution and expenditure limits operate in an area of the most fundamental First Amendment activities. Discussion of public issues and debate on the qualifications of candidates are integral to the operation of the system of government*

*established by our Constitution. The First Amendment affords the broadest possible protection to such political expression in order to assure unfettered exchange of ideas for the bringing about of political and social changes desired by the people* (Buckley v. Valeo 1976).

After 1976 decision for First Amendment will disappear, revised in favor of democratic views.

Over the next thirty-five years, the Court would revise and make changes in favor of wealth in the United States. In 2010, when Supreme Court ruled in favor of *Citizen United*, Jimmy Carter declared “a major victory for big oil, Wall Street banks, health insurance companies and the other powerful interests that marshal their power every day in Washington to drown out the voices of everyday Americans” (Nicholas 2013). He marked that the United States has the most horrible election process and now besides that it is influenced by money. Robert F. Kennedy Jr. describes the *Citizens United* ruling as announcing the process of ‘a hostile takeover of our government’ by corporations and billionaires (Robert, R.W. 2013) thus mirroring the utterance made by Carter above. Kennedy said that America is moving towards a free fall toward old-fashioned oligarchy; noxious, thieving and tyrannical, he writes. “America, the world’s premier template for democracy and a robust middle class, is now listing toward oligarchy and corporate kleptocracy” (Nicholas 2013). “The day before *Citizens United* was decided,” Lawrence Lessig writes, “our democracy was already broken. *Citizens United* may have shot the body, but the body was already cold (Nicholas 2013).” America looks like colonial economy with the rich and wealthy forming one percent of the people who are more concerned with corporation, money and gain than anything else. But some do not see contributing as buying elections. *Christian Science Monitor* declared, “Despite concerns that huge amounts of money spent by political action committees would skew the results, many candidates backed by large PAC-financed advertising campaigns did not win their races. Money was less influential than expected. Voters thought for themselves (Nicholas 2013).” But the case of *Speechnow.org v. FEC.* involved “super PACs, put down limits on contributions to groups that only make independent expenditures, but upholding the requirement that they disclose donors (Watson 2016)”.

In “Debating Democracy”, Justice John Paul Stevens and Justice Anthony Kennedy discuss corporate spending. Stevens argues that there is no evidence that the makers of the Constitution wanted no distinctions between corporations and individuals. Clearly, Stevens

argues, corporations are different from individuals and more dangerous to democracy; Congress has every right to regulate corporate expenditures.

Stevens argues that (Stevens 2013:60) “[u]nlimited expenditures by nonvoters in election campaigns . . . impairs [sic] the process of democratic self-government by making successful candidates more beholden to the nonvoters who supported them than to the voters who elected them (Miroff 2013). Kennedy emphasizes that Constitution does not allow “government to make a distinction between different types of speakers, regulating some and not regulating others. He sees no evidence that independent corporate expenditures will corrupt politicians (Miroff 2013)”.

Stevens points out that The First Amendment underwrites the freedom to experiment and to create in the realm of thought and speech. Citizens must be free to use new forms, and new forums for the expression of ideas. The civic discourse belongs to the people, and the Government may not prescribe the means used to conduct it (Miroff 2013).” The First Amendment provides that “Congress shall make no law...abridging the freedom of speech” says Kennedy. The First Amendment is the one that makes American democracy, freedom of speech and self-expression. The First Amendment “‘has its fullest and most urgent application’ to speech uttered during a campaign for political office.” Kennedy states that any American can claim any member of Congress as his or her own and can direct his or her campaign contributions accordingly (Miroff 2013). Winters characterized American governance in 2012 as follows, “Democracy appears chronically dysfunctional when it comes to policies that impinge on the rich. In 1997, Associated Press covered Betsy’s statement:

*[My] family is the largest single contributor of soft money to the national Republican Party. . . . I have decided, however, to stop taking offense at the suggestion that we are buying influence. Now, I simply concede the point. We expect to foster a conservative governing philosophy consisting of limited government and respect for traditional American virtues. We expect a return on our investment; we expect a good and honest government. Furthermore, we expect the Republican Party to use the money to promote these policies, and yes, to win elections.*

Kennedy filed a concurring opinion to underscore his conviction that the Constitution creates “two orders of government, each with its own direct relationship, its own privities, its own set of mutual rights and obligations to the people who sustain it and are governed by it (Miroff 2013)”. As can be seen, there is a different opinion on corporate spending. John

Robert supports a ban on judges personally soliciting campaign contributions, and if it is applied to its own members, it can bring “dialing for dollars” to a decisive end (Miroff 2013). According to Wright, the interplay of money and politics enables rich people to use their financial resources to gain special advantages (Wright 2013). Rich people are more concerned about taxes, budget cuts and social benefits. Similarly, they are more interested in decisions that will favor economic growth. Senator Bernie Sanders said at a presidential debate in March, “top 0.1 percent now owns almost as much wealth as the bottom 90 percent. Is it acceptable that while the average American works longer hours for lower wages, 58 percent of all new income is going to the top 1 percent. Is it acceptable that Wall Street and billionaires are spending hundreds of millions of dollars trying to buy elections? Is that democracy or this that oligarchy? Which is why I believe we’ve got to overturn Citizens United and move to public funding of elections” (New York Times 2016).

Kenneth Bollen in ‘Issues in the comparative measurement of Political democracy’ (1980) researches the development of political democracy. It is an open argument if democratic forms of government are compatible with the different social and cultural systems of these countries. For instance, Cutright (1967) finds that political democracy reduces income difference, while Jackman (1975) finds no impact once economic development is controlled. Hewitt (1977:460) concludes that it is "plausible to assume that the apparent relationship between democracy and equality is indeed a spurious one." On the other hand, Stack (1978) finds that democratic performance reduces income inequality even after controls for economic development and dependency. Jackman (1975:86-7), Hewitt (1977:456), and Stack (1979:168-9) argue that the main reason for these conflicted findings is the difference between the measures of political democracy used (Bollen 1970). As de Schweinitz (1964:13) observed: “Democracy is one of those troublesome words which means all things to all people. Like motherhood and patriotism, it is thought to be a noble condition and is evoked by politicians, publicists, preachers, and demagogues to prove their unsullied intentions and just claim to popular support“ (Bollen 1980).

Lipset (1963:27) defines democracy as a “political system which supplies regular constitutional opportunities for changing the governing officials, and a social mechanism which permits the largest possible part of the population to influence major decisions by choosing among contenders for political office” (Bollen 1980). Downs (1957:23-4) states “a democratic society must have periodic elections, decided by majority rule, in which each

voter casts only one vote. In addition, he suggests that there must be two or more parties competing for control, and a single party (or coalitions of parties) chosen to run the government” (Bollen 1980).

A second group of writers has focused not on the democratic view and democratic beliefs, but instead, on the political elite and the given perspective is still upheld today. Mosca (1939), Michels (1962), and Mills (1956), among others, have argued that in all nations there exists a group which holds a disproportionate degree of political power. Michels formulated his "iron law of oligarchy" in the belief that it is functionally necessary for power to be centered, eventually, in an elite of any organization or society. Similarly, Bachrach (1967: 1) argues, "the exigencies of life in the industrial and nuclear age necessitate that key and crucial political decisions in a democracy, as in a totalitarian society be made by a handful of men" (Bollen 1980). Huntington (1968:89) argues, "Popular participation in politics does not necessarily mean popular control of government. Constitutional democracies and communist dictatorships are both participant polities."

Dahl's (1971:3) definition proposes that political democracies must have eight "institutional guarantees": (1) freedom to join and form organizations, (2) freedom of expression, (3) right to vote, (4) eligibility for public office, (5) fight of political leaders to compete for support and votes, (6) alternative sources of information, (7) free and fair elections, and (8) institutions for making government policies depend on votes and other expressions of preference. Hewitt (1977:456-457) argues that political democracy exists only when (1) the executive is elected and responsible to an elected assembly, (2) there is universal manhood suffrage, and (3) elections are fair as indicated by a secret ballot. It highlights the significance of a hypothetical meaning of the political democracy system. Fulfilling alternate models relies upon it. A portion of our plan ought to be to fabricate an accord around a working definition that plainly recognizes and characterizes its real measurements.

As we highlighted elections and secret ballot that no one can see or manipulate with, it all comes to how ballots can be monopolized even if said otherwise. As one of Joseph Kennedy's (Kennedy 1985: 672) sons said about his father, "he was willing to buy as many votes as necessary to win, but he was damned if he would buy a single extra one ” (Simpser 2013). Simpson proposes the argument that *electoral manipulation can potentially yield substantially more than simply winning the election at hand* (Simpser 2013). By and large, these and comparable impacts decrease the quality of resistance and extend the occupant's

opportunity of activity and haggling power. At the end of the day, constituent control should be comprehended not only as a minor vote-getting procedure but rather like an essential apparatus for combining and hoarding political force.

The direct effects of electoral manipulation refer, loosely speaking, to its contribution to winning the election at hand. In addition, electoral manipulation can have indirect effects, which refer to the influence of electoral manipulation on the subsequent choices and behavior of a wide range of political actors (Simpser 2003, 2005, and 2008, 2013).

Magaloni argues that “electoral fraud is...a relevant factor for authoritarian survival only inasmuch as it can make a difference between the hegemonic party’s losing or winning” (2006, 21). Levitsky and Way, in their formidable analysis of the trajectories of “competitive authoritarian” regimes around the world, note that elections in such regimes “are often hard fought contests” and winning them can require fraud (2009, chapter 2, 42/ Simpser 2013). Schedler, for example, speaks of “the introduction of bias into the administration of elections” (2002, 44) and Minnite and Callahan of “corruption of the process of casting and counting votes” (2003, 14). But “bias” and “corruption” are too general. In a memorably-titled article, “The Menu of Manipulation, Schedler lays out a “chain of democratic choice” based on Robert Dahl’s classic body of work on democratic theory, such that an election is considered acceptable if and only if all seven links in the chain remain “whole and unbroken” (Schedler 2002, 39–43). Birch (2007) argues that legislative elections in single-member districts (SMD) are more likely to be manipulated than those under PR because, in tight races, a few votes can yield a much greater benefit in the former than in the latter (Birch 2007, 1540; Simpser, 2013).



## **2. INTERPRETATION OF FINDINGS**

### **2.1 Foreword**

America has taken the first place in the world with approximately 536 billionaires. With a growing list of Forbes and finding new ways of gaining more wealth, it seems that the number will grow. The tax reform conducted under Bush in 2011, benefited billionaires over the working class. With the growing influence of oligarchy it can be seen that billionaires like politics. It may be assumed that the recent years show that American politics tend to incline to be more oligarchic than anything. Oligarchy and democracy are not incompatible, oligarchs do not have to be high rank officials or be congressmen, there is no need to scheme together or be active in the political life themselves in order to succeed, the wealth that they gained can pretty much allow them to be informed of any major changes in politics and, in turn, influence them if needed. Only one percent can actually manipulate decision-making process in certain areas. It is therefore important to establish whether or not oligarchy plays a significant role in American democracy and its survival.

Some say that oligarchy cannot exist in democratic countries, as it will just be pushed down by the electoral democracy. It could be said that as wealthy people belong to one group and the working class to another, the groups also divide into further subgroups, like business and financial lobbies, unions and trade associations. Every group controls some part of the governance, not the people and this could be called pluralism. In his article about pluralism, H.T Reynolds refers to Robert Dahl, who says that “politics is a sideshow in the great circus of life” (H.T Reynolds 1996). Winters writes that pluralist democracies cannot have oligarchy but the given statement may be debatable. As some see it, pluralism could be a solution for oligarchy. The United States government is unique as its government has separated blocks. The United States Constitution is structured in a way that every political institution is separated from one another and as such the concentration of power only in one institution can be avoided. Pluralist democracy has its advantages, for instance, decisions that can have an

impact on the country are measured and balanced. However, even with this kind of a system there is no certainty that decentralization cannot happen. Large corporations have the power and means to take action in certain areas. The same happens when divided groups interact with one another – there will be centralization and the decisions are made without bystanders.

It is stated that one of the greatest achievements of democracy is voting. Pluralism shows that direct democracy is meaningless. Voters can vote but most of them have no understanding of the forces behind those votes. Campaigns consist of declarations and promises and most voters vote for people who they know in their district or county. Reynolds states, “President Reagan received approximately 51 per cent of the ballots cast in 1980, but his total constituted only about a quarter of the votes of all potential voters, since only 55 per cent of those eligible to participate actually went to the polls”. Majority rule governments in which the selected few are picked by the numerous mass have been condemned as oligarchies.

Electoral impact and lobbying are two of the many accusations that wealthy people have to deal with on daily basis. The given accusations grow increasingly louder as the elections near. Some of the observations may be supported by facts. Lobbying has been defined as something “broadly construed to include all efforts outside of elections to influence government policy, through contact and communication with government officials (Winters 2009)”. An especially encouraging area for oligarchic impact may include what have been portrayed as policy planning. The proprietors of incredible riches are well arranged to put a lot of cash in policy-oriented establishments and research organizations, approaching policy makers with these ideas. We all know the strategies that lobbyists and politically associated law offices use to attempt to have an impact on enactment, regulations, court decisions, and official activities: setting up individual connections and imparted points of view to authorities through commitments, trips, working out itemized strategy positions. If small groups of rich people try to influence someone through lobbying, wealthier people can donate to political parties and campaigns.

A lot elections take place in United States- local, congressional and state, smaller part of Americans will usually vote no matter what election is held than the citizens of most other democracies, but Americans together vote much more often, and on more affairs, than anyone else. Voting preference is one of the most interesting researches not only for political science but also in human psychology.

Americans usually do not express very negative feelings toward government. On more measures than not, Americans actually report more positive attitudes about government than citizens of other democratic nations (Nelson W. Polsby [et al.] 2013).

As Stanley Kelley (Kelly, June 1967) and his collaborators observed, turnout may have declined . . . *“not because of changes in the interest of voters in elections, but because of changes in the interest demanded of them. . . . [Not only are] electorates . . . much more the product of political forces than many have appreciated. But also, . . . to a considerable extent, they can be political artifacts. Within limits, they can be constructed to a size and composition deemed desirable by those in power”*.

Michael P. McDonald has estimated the number of ineligible voting-age residents as roughly 20 million people as of 2008, or nearly one-tenth of the adult population of the United States (Nelson W. Polsby [et al.] 2013). Strangely, the more votes being totaled in a race and the more voters anticipated at the surveys, the bigger is the extent of those qualified who really show up, so that presidential decisions consistently motivate higher turnout than midterm races for Congress.

Political parties in which interest groups and activists are the main actors, and unions of people develop common agendas and search candidates for party nominations based on loyalty to their goals. E.E. Schattschneider’s said that “modern democracy is unthinkable save in terms of parties” (Bawn [et al.] 2012). According to Gary Cox and Mathew McCubbins, party leaders control the legislative agenda, overwhelming proposals that might split the party and promoting the party program. The policies thus enacted create a “brand name,” valuable for winning elections. John Aldrich goes further, arguing that parties, while emerging from legislative politics, solve many problems legislators face as they attempt to win re-election and build stable careers (Bawn [et al.] 2012). Yes, long coalitions are significant to officials for their regions. Be that as it may, they are additionally significant for approach demanders assigning hopefuls. The rationale of long coalitions rises above the administrative connection, and Americans should utilize it underneath in our record of gatherings as coalitions of concerning gatherings and activists.

There can be little uncertainty that the well off apply more political impact than the less wealthy do. In the event that they have a tendency to get their way in a few territories of open strategy, and on the off chance that they have approach inclinations that vary fundamentally from those of generally Americans, the outcomes could be upsetting for vote

based approach making (Page [et al.] 2013). these particular strategy inclinations may represent why certain open arrangements in the United States seem to stray from what the dominant part of US residents needs the legislature to do. In the event that this is along these lines, it raises major issues for vote based hypothesis. Thomas Ferguson, William Domhoff, Fred Block, and others have long argued that “major investors” or business elites dominate the making of public policy and the agendas of both the Republican and the Democratic parties (Page [et al.] 2013). Jeffrey Winters maintains that the top one-tenth of 1 percent of US wealth-holders constitute an “oligarchy” with decisive power over certain key policy areas related to what he calls “income defense.” Jacob Hacker and Paul Pierson describe how Washington has “made the rich richer (Page [et al.] 2013). Wealthy Americans have a tendency to be more liberal than others on religious and good issues, counting fetus removal, gay rights, and petition in school, however a great deal more traditionalist than the non-prosperous on issues of expenses, monetary regulation, and social welfare. For orderly confirmation on the approach inclinations of truly affluent Americans, for example, the main 1 percent or the main one-tenth of 1 percent of riches holders—it is important to outline unique reviews that expressly target those groups. The in the first place, and most difficult, issue is recognizing the number of citizens that are wealthy. On the off chance that one had an extensive rundown of affluent Americans it would be a straightforward matter to choose an arbitrary example of names from that rundown. Be that as it may, no such freely accessible rundown exists. In the United States, salary and riches are exceptionally private matters (Page [et al.] 2013).

There are many resources that, at any given time, may be used available to Democrats and Republicans, or to different candidates. Possession of the presidential office, skill in organization, knowledge of substantive policies, a reputation for integrity, facility in speechmaking, ability to devise appealing campaign issues, personal wealth, stamina, and so forth—all can be drawn on to good advantage in a presidential campaign.

Increasing of wealth has been intense for businessmen from Wall Street, where once investors managed money for others now, they managing it for themselves. Since 1979 according to tax return study and Income Inequality,” the one-tenth of 1 percent of American taxpayers who work in finance has roughly quintupled their share of the country’s income. Sixty-four of the families made their wealth in finance (New York Times 2015)”. In 2016 many of them are supporting campaign for president election.

As was mentioned by Brookings Institution, in 2015 was the year when David Koch made statement to spend \$889 million on the 2016 election. It was the start point for other contributors to look forward for 2016 and support their candidates (Darre, M.W. 2015).

In book *Billionaires: Reflection on the Upper Crust*, year 2012 was not successful. Many donated that time to see Barack Obama's defeat and win of Mitt Romney but that didn't happen. Putting all they faith in criticizing Obama care but they lost. Contributors for Barack Obama's campaign worth were \$314, 927, 45. Republicans nominated candidate that was different from all and appealed for general public and minorities.

Year 2014 was more successful, billionaires were able to support Republicans, and they gained control of state legislature in 23 states and 31 governorship.

Looking for 2016 and Citizen United 6 years after, signs that money still could influence outcome of the elections. It's been six years since Supreme Court ruled on *Citizen United v. FEC*. From that time Citizen United has become shorthand for the issues with the state of campaign finance within the U.S.: unlimited company disbursement, lack of revealing and also the influence of rich people. It all comes to be more necessary than ever within the 2016 elections.

Case from 2008, when film made by nonprofit corporation Citizen United, about Hillary Clinton was banned from airing on TV during presidential campaign. During that time "Supreme Court ruled in a 5-4 vote that the ban on political spending by corporations and unions was unconstitutional because it violated the First Amendment's protection of free speech (Watson, L. 2016)". Court came to conclusion that if spending is not agreed before hand with campaign, then there is little to corruption. Second decision that was important and effected today elections is *Speechnow.org v. FEC*. This is the case involved to "super PACs, put down limits on contributions to groups that only make independent expenditures, but upholding the requirement that they disclose donors (Watson, L. 2016)". Those two cases gave push of creating super PAC – group that may raise money then spend contributions on candidates or against them. Spending doesn't have to be regulated but they have to communicate with Federal Election Commission once a month during election year.

Conservative Solutions has spent millions on Marco Rubio, whose donors wanted to remain anonymous. Jeb Bush's super PAC Right to Rise has received \$100,000 from an LLC and in January PAC spent 145 million dollars on candidates. The 2016 will show big spending from wealth and organizations. Comparing previous years and now, we can see some

similarities in donors and candidates. Hillary Clinton in the beginning of the year presented her campaign budget; even then it was supported by Super PAC and big donors known as "Political One Percent of the One Percent" staunchest supporters in every election.

People like Donald Sussman and George Soros who are hedge fund managers, banker Herbert Sandler. All of them have donated quite big sums to Priorities USA, they are trying to approach Jeb Bush, Donald Trump and Scott Walker (Yeager, M. 2015). Thru super PAC donors can control candidate's movements the whole time.

Michael Toner explained the new techniques employed by Obama and other campaigns

in 2008: *“A decade ago, if someone was impressed with what a candidate said at a debate or a rally and wished to make a contribution, he or she needed to find their checkbook, figure out the payee, determine where to send the check, and get the check in the mail. Today, if someone likes what a candidate says, he or she can make an online contribution on [an] iPhone in a matter of minutes. Moreover, presidential campaign websites today provide donors with the option of making recurring monthly contributions on their credit cards in \$25, \$15 or even \$5 amounts. . . . In this way, the Internet facilitates the making of political contributions separate and apart from public interest in presidential races. Which may partially account for the record-breaking amounts of money that presidential candidates have raised in recent years”.*

Every election time it could be observed consistent pattern in candidates and donors. Some of them of course can change palaces form time to time but still rotation remain same. Small number of people with commitments to multiple Republican circles donated more than one candidate. Many candidate supporters are not only business partners but also friends and family who gather in Palm Beach or Hampton Bay. Most of them live in New York, Dallas, Florida and California.

Even though America is considered to be oligarchic, it is still have democratic views and believes. Many Americans vote because they hope that something change and their voice will be heard. However, wealthy people who are financially set, still vote for tax reduce and cutting back social programs, helping in that case only themselves. It is not surprising because all Americans are paying them; of course different social classes have different opinions. It is understandable why billionaires raising this issue, they have to pay most of the taxes for people who can't afford to pay them. True, it is burden that wealthy class does not want to

deal with and the same time loosing they money. Billionaires had many ways to speak up freely but still most of them remain quite, preferring to be more discreet. Since it can't be close to see what U.S. extremely rich people think or do, it can't be beyond any doubt what number of them purposely seeks. Can't really tell how they monopolize with the public policy in way that working class can't feel the benefits of policy. But as from all the material before that could be so.

Still many of billionaires engage in politics. Even then most "(82%) made financial contributions to political parties or candidates in a recent election cycle. A remarkable one third of them (33%) "bundled" contributions from others and/or hosted political fundraisers (Page,I.B.,2015)". Favoring someone's campaign brings billionaire perhaps one step closer to candidate. It is risk; money that could be lost can't be taken back. Even if candidate loses race, favors always can be collected.

## **2.2 Pluralism view**

Idea of pluralism can be followed back to Lock when liberal political philosophy was intervened between culture, ethical values and politics. It is suggested that purpose of pluralism is liberty of promote freedom of speech. More simply, pluralism is a theory of the conveyance of political force. It holds that power is generally and uniformly scattered in the society. America is seen as confederation country, Madison's particular fear was the 'problem of factions'(Heywood 2013). Unchecked democratic rule may basically prompt majoritarianism, to the devastating of people rights and to the dispossession of property for the sake of the people. Romney said that "society was divided between a small group of productive people who build companies and contribute to society and a larger set of unproductive moochers who create nothing and take money through government programs (Darrell 2014)". The most interesting is that variation of groups in society can express their opinion in various ways, if groups are unable to express political voice then balance and order would be impossible. The resulting system of rule by multiple minorities is often referred to as 'Madisonian democracy'. In society such variety is necessary, Madison is the first who have shown pluralist behavior. Dahl had shown that eve though wealth is economically privileged and they are quite powerful and have influence, they are not able to control

political process fully. The key element of such an arrangement of pluralist majority rules system is that opposition between parties at election time, and the capacity of interest or pressure groups to express their perspectives openly, sets up a solid connection between the government and the representative. While this may fall far way from self-government, its supporters contend that it guarantees an adequate level of responsibility and mainstream responsiveness for it to be viewed as democratic. But combination of pluralism and democracy may not be firm one. As it were, the arrangement of tenet by numerous minorities may basically have been an arranged to keep them from practicing political power. Organizations that have same economic interest can become so powerful that it could create government affliction and create so called 'pluralist stagnation' (Heywood 2013) but this system in the future can impossible to control or govern, such as A Preface to Economic Democracy (1985) notably, "that the unequal ownership of economic resources tends to concentrate political power in the hands of the few, and deprive the many of it" (Heywood 2013).

### **2.3 Elitism and Liberal democracy**

Elitism evolved from believing in the principle that only ruling class whose power in concentrated in one hands. Gaetano Mosca (1857–1941) and Robert Michels (1876–1936), for them idea of democracy was lacking good sense of judgment, because no matter how you look, power is always handled by elites (Heywood 2013). Mosca ([1896] 1939) proclaimed that, in all societies, 'two classes of people appear – a class that rules and a class that is ruled' (Heywood 2013). In his view, the resources that are essential for rule are dependably unequally circulated, and, facilitate, a cohesive minority will dependably have the capacity to control and control the masses, even in a parliamentary majority rule government. Elites view same as liberal democracy subsequently centers upon the innate pressure amongst vote based system and free enterprise; that is, between the political correspondence that liberal popular government announces and the social imbalance that an industrialist economy unavoidably creates. Liberal popular governments are in this manner seen as "industrialist" or "middle class" majority rule governments that are controlled and controlled by the settled in force of a wealth.



Michels developed an alternative theory, based on the inclination that behavior within all organizations, regardless of how democratic they might seem to be, for power to be focused in the hands of a small group of elite and privileged figures who can make arrangements and control decisions. Michels ([1911] 1962) formulated his 'the iron law of oligarchy' (Haywood 2013, 232) inescapable propensity for political organizations, and by suggestion that all organizations, to be oligarchic. Participatory or just structures can't check oligarchic propensities; they can just hiding them. There are some distinguish facts: elites are more organized than non elites, they have more resources and knowledge, they are leaders of groups because it helps them stay in power the ordinary members of an organization as opposed to its leaders tend not to show any interest and are, therefore, generally willing to accept subordination. While traditional elitists endeavored to demonstrate that majority rules system was dependably a myth, present day elitist scholars have tended to highlight how far specific political frameworks miss the mark regarding the popularity based perfect. Rather than the pluralist thought of a wide and extensively vote based dispersal of force Mills, in *The Power Elite* (1956), offered a theory that United States is lead by elites, big business and Wall Street have some influence over military, economic and health economy. Drawing on a blend of monetary force, bureaucratic control and access to the most elevated amounts of the official branch of government, the force tip top can shape key 'history-production' choices, particularly in the fields of defence and foreign policy, and in addition vital financial approach. Elitists have, in addition, contended that observational studies have upheld pluralist conclusions simply because others have overlooked the significance of non-decision making leadership as an appearance of force, in any case measure of vote based responsibility is reliable with elite rule. Joseph Schumpeter's 'realistic' model of democracy outlined in *Capitalism, Socialism and Democracy* (1942): The democratic method is that institutional arrangement for arriving at political decisions in which individuals acquire the power to decide by means of a competitive struggle for the people's vote''(Heywood 2013). Whereas the power-elite model portrays the elite as a characterize organisation, bound together by common or overlapping interests, competitive elitism sometimes called 'democratic elitism' highlights the significance of elite rivalry. In other words, the elite, consisting of the leading figures from a number of competing groups and interests.

## 2.4 Theories of political democracy

The shift toward democratic political systems in many nations in the 1980s has renewed interest in measurement of political democracy and regard for the issues that involve both the definition and evaluation of political majority rules system. The fundamental theoretical issues include the inability to build up a sufficient hypothetical meaning of this idea, the linking of the idea with others, and regarding majority rules system.

There is extensive variety of results describing, for example, democracy. Similar great variety will follow other research of the causes and consequences of political democracy until some of the given issues are addressed. Thus, the development of research in this area requires that greater attention should be paid to the measurement of political democracy.

Today, one only needs to look at the various nations in the world considering themselves democracies. It is understandable that various "People's Democracies" (e.g., East Germany) have a form of government which many people living in market economy (e.g., the United States) do not consider democratic. Likewise, the "Bourgeois Democracies" in capitalist economies are not considered true democracies by the People's Democracies (Bollen 1979). Dahl (1956:67-90), similarly to Lipset, emphasizes the electoral processes in his definition of democracy. He also suggests various more particular criteria to assess. For instance, he suggests, among other things, that a democracy should have elections in which every vote is weighted similarly, every individual has indistinguishable data about the choices exhibited for choice, and the requests of authorities are executed. Beyond any doubt the premier, president, or dictator all have significantly more control over a country's choices than do the masses of the population. Political elites conclude from this observation little variation across societies in the concentration of political power. However, it does not as a matter of course take after that the political power of the elite, relative to that of the non-elite, is the same in each country. In some countries the political framework may consider a more grounded world class than in other nations. In Spain during Franco's rule, for instance, political power was far more concentrated than in Britain or Canada. Similarly, the elites of Saudi Arabia hold more political power than the elites of Australia (Bollen 1990). The vital

point to perceive is that the political power of the elite, relative to the non-elite, differs from nation to nation. It is these differences in the political power held by the elite, relative to the non-elite, that distinguishes how majority rule a country is. I characterize political vote based system as the degree to which the political force of the first class is minimized and that of the non-elites top is great. Distinguishing these distinctions in political force is greatly troublesome. The significant trouble is that there is no broadly acknowledged unit of measure for political power. Unlike in a study of the distribution of income, the number of "dollar-like" units of political power held by the various groups in a country cannot be evaluated (Bollen 1990). Political liberties allude to the privileges of all people and gatherings to dissent or backing unreservedly government arrangements or choices. In that capacity, political freedoms give extra political energy to the non-elite, permitting them to sort out restriction to the elites and their arrangements. A citizen having the freedom of speech, a free press, and flexibility of resistance has a more noteworthy potential for impacting the choices of elites than does a nation where these liberties do not exist. These political freedoms likewise permit the arrangement of vested parties and support in political gatherings that can rival and potentially supplant the current elites. In nations where political meetings are not permitted, one or more parties banned, or the press is under pressure, the non-elites' political force is lessened, and the political force of the elites is more secure. It is once in a while imagined that meanings of political majority rules system, as just talked about, are generally meanings of middle class vote based system. This definition of political democracy also shows that a communist or socialist country may be more democratic than a capitalist one (Bollen 1990). Many of the Scandinavian countries with a socialist position are at higher levels of political democracy than are a number of capitalist nations. Along these lines, this definition, while assessing the level of political majority rules system, does not consider the sort of financial arrangement of a nation.

Political rights and liberties are two measurements of political vote based system: Political battles exist to the degree that the national government is responsible to the overall public and every individual is qualified for partake in the administration specifically or through agents. Political liberties exist to the extent that the people of a country have the freedom to express any political opinions in any media and the freedom to form or to participate in any political group. (Bollen 1986:568)

Political rights and political liberties as parts of political majority rule government. I could envision these as moving in the light of changes in vote based system. Case in point, if popular government decreases in a country, I would anticipate that this will prompt decreases in political freedoms and rights. Then again, a great case could be made that these two measurements commonly fortify each other. That is, it is troublesome for a framework to keep up political freedoms without political rights being set up and the other way around. This proposes a positive criticism connection connecting the two measurements. It is not known which, assuming either, of these relations is substantial. In whole, political popular government to be the degree to which the political force of the top is minimized and that of the non-elite is expanded. Political rights and political freedoms are two noteworthy measurements of the idea and these incorporate the vast majority of the qualities more often than not ascribed to equitable frameworks. Practically as essential as characterizing what is political majority rules system is portraying what it most certainly is not. This raises the second theoretical issue: the jumbling of different ideas with political majority rules system. The numerous intentions of vote based system have driven it to be connected with an assortment of marvels. Maybe the most predominant routine of perplexing ideas is consolidating political popular government with strength. It is common to discover analysts alluding to the idea of "stable democracy" or the "fair democracy" of a country.

Measures of political democracy rule government endure both calculated and estimation issues. The primary applied issues are the inability to build up a satisfactory hypothetical meaning of political majority rules system, the frustrating of this idea with others, and regarding popular government as a parallel as opposed to a persistent idea. Four issues of estimation are invalid pointers, subjective markers, ordinal or dichotomous pointers, and the inability to test unwavering quality or validity.

There are two perspectives, one saying that the American democracy exists for wealth and the other that the American democracy is only for its people. The opinions of Justice Kennedy and Justice Stevens on corporate spending highlight an excellent point why and why not spending must be regulated, how democracy becomes a tool of manipulation and deception and how the Constitution has a major role in the decision-making processes. Kennedy (2015, 111) says that "[p]olitical speech is indispensable to decision making in a democracy, and this is no less true because the speech comes from a corporation rather than an individual. Funds may have little or no correlation to the public's support for the

corporation's political ideas". In essence, Kennedy is supporting the freedom of speech and in case this is somehow suppressed, the main essence of democracy will be shaken.

Justice Paul Stevens and Justice John Roberts uphold regulations against funding. Clearly, Stevens seconds, companies are not quite the same as people, they are less safe to the majority rule system; and the Congress has the privilege to control corporate payment. Constrained uses by non-voters in elections, the procedure of equitable self-government by making successful competitors more under obligation to the non-voters who back them than to the voters who vote for them.

Improved media time and advertisement helps the campaign to get the desired reaction from voters and provide a debating ground on local channels. If some of the topics are quite provocative, they public attention may last for days. This, in turn, will get further attention and money for the candidate's campaign and will not let the candidate go unnoticed. However, the airtime alone cannot lead to success today.

The race between district assembly members can turn democratic rule government over to the highest bidder. To democrats, however, the potential for open financing and different procedures to keep the corruption at bay that naturally accompanies campaign donations is made even more remote. The factor of big money providing for access to big power in Washington is no longer considered valuable argument. It is interesting to note how rich people give away their money for campaigns, but when they actually succeed in buying the whole arrangement for a few thousand of dollars and fixing presidential campaign for their benefit. Unless people cease to see everything in the legislative side through the perspective of the presidential elections, the different model of campaign with different rules, the power of money will be underestimated.

The given topic needs to be researched more closely due to the growing public realization about billionaires and their attempts to buy elections and use their influence to manipulate decisions, as they put it, in order to make the country more stable in a positive way. Democracy is one of the forms of freedom and self-expression. If the opportunity to choose is taken from people, there is no democracy. The illusion of more open and transparent government is questionable and as long as companies and large corporations can buy politicians, there will be no open government.

Other exploration inquiries are concerned with the approaches that the rich people take, how the given stands identify with the general population's policy preferences, and also the suggestions for vote-based on legislative issues.

The research object includes billionaires, businesses and large influential companies who/which can directly and indirectly be involved in political campaigns that similarly, democracy as a political regime.

#### **2.4.1 Federal Election Commission v. Wisconsin Right to Life (2007); Citizens United v. Federal Election Commission (2010) cases**

In *Federal Election Commission v. Wisconsin Right to Life* (2007), the Supreme Court also altered the campaign finance law for presidential fund-raising. The dispute in the Wisconsin case concerned BCRA restriction on independent group promote mentioning candidates by name and a BCRA claim that such group ads running within sixty days of an election must be paid for by hard money with contributors disclosed. The Court ruled that such advertisements could only be ruled election ads and therefore subject to FEC adjustment if that was the only possible way to judge the ad's content. Writing for the court, Chief Justice John Roberts held, "Discussion of issues cannot be suppressed simply because the issues may also be pertinent to an election (Nelson W. Polsby . . . [et al. 2012]). Where the First Amendment was involved, the corporations, unions, and interest groups were permitted to resume the airing of issue ads that were banned in the 2004 election cycle. Even so, such changes proved to be a small share of the campaign advertising universe in 2008.

A more significant Supreme Court decision was *Citizens United v. Federal Election Commission* (2010), which overturned the portion of the Court's 2003 ruling in *McConnell v. Federal Elections Commission* upholding BCRA's restrictions on campaign spending by corporations and unions (Nelson W. Polsby . . . [et al. 2012]). The argument involved a documentary movie called "Hillary: The Movie", a negative description produced by Citizens United, a conservative nonprofit corporation, and released during the Democratic presidential primaries in 2008. Citizens United lost a suit that year against the FEC, which held that such spending violated the 2002 law. The Court struck down a procurement of the law that restricted all companies, both for benefit and not for benefit, and unions from TV

“electioneering communications.” In his majority opinion, Justice Anthony Kennedy wrote, “When government seeks to use its full power, including the criminal law, to command where a person may get his or her information or what distrusted source he or she may not hear, it uses censorship to control thought. This is unlawful. The First Amendment confirms the freedom to think for ourselves” (Nelson W. Polsby . . . [et al. 2012]). Twenty-four states with laws prohibiting independent expenditures by unions and corporations had to amend their campaign finance statutes because of the ruling. Congressional Democrats promptly incubated authoritative arrangements to contract the decision's degree. Whether the Citizens United choice will create a torrential slide of corporate and union spending in presidential decisions will get to be clear soon enough.

#### **2.4.2 Electoral manipulation**

Controlling elections unnecessarily and glaringly can make the controlling party seem solid, while neglecting to control in this way can pass on as a shortcoming. A party that is seen to be capable and clever will appreciate more prominent haggling power, ampler extension for administering, a lesser need to share leases and to bargain in strategy, and less difficulties to its hold on office, than a party that is seen to be feeble and defenseless. Manipulating elections unnecessarily and glaringly can make the controlling party seem solid, while neglecting to control in this way can pass on shortcoming. Under this perspective, we do not expect that just disliked pioneers will cheat in decisions. Rather, prevalent pioneers with a solid record and a huge store of goodwill and authenticity will regularly control races considerably as well.

A recent review piece, for example, concludes that “manifestly fraudulent behaviors...are things that only its victims want publicized” (Lehoucq 2003). The rationale of cheapness and mystery lays on the idea that discretionary control is an immoderate and unsafe political methodology. In particular, intemperate and conspicuous control has a progression of proposed impacts that incorporate, in addition to other things: to debilitate resistance supporters from ending up voting or to dissent; to persuade bureaucrats to remain loyal to the government; to influence potential money related sponsor of parties and possibility to abstain from supporting the controller's adversaries to stop political elites from restricting the decision

party or from entering the political fight; to expand the controller's post-constituent dealing influence up close and personal with other political and social gatherings, for example, worker's guilds and other political gatherings; to lessen the need to share the rents and riches of government with elites and associations; and to upgrade the profession prospects of legislators at sub-national levels of government.

Decisions and conduct of an extensive variety of political actors must be considered. The issues listed in the previous section constitute a fraction of the principle sorts of aberrant impacts of appointive control. As they propose, circuitous impacts can be very gainful to the controller. All the more for the most part, the potential for constituent control to inspire aberrant impacts ups the ante of decisions by gatherings and governments about whether, how, and to what degree to control. Notwithstanding perhaps affecting who wins the current decision, constituent control can, by means of its roundabout impacts, have outcomes for the estimation of office-holding, and for the future probability of holding office.

Politicians probably think about holding office, as well as about how far they can propel their objectives while they administer – by actualizing the strategies they incline toward, appropriating rents for individual or divided purposes, or generally making use of the machinery of the apparatus of government in the administration of their targets. To represent the potential impact of constituent control on the estimation of office, consider the requests for strategy concessions, or for sharing leases, that a business association or a labor union may make on a ruling party. To start with, under the right conditions, the results to individual natives, government officials, civil servants, and associations of their political decisions and activities today depend firmly on which party winds up holding control tomorrow, and on how capable such a gathering ends up being. Second, electoral manipulation passes on data to the aforementioned actors unequivocally on these focuses.

The degree of discretionary control is adversely connected with GDP per capital and grown-up education, and decidedly connected with destitution and newborn child mortality. The connections with populace size and imbalance are not factually huge, despite the fact that there is barely any disparity. Electoral manipulation is likewise connected with normatively worse governance outcomes. More discretionary control connects with lower levels of admiration for honesty, a weaker rule of law, lower bureaucratic quality, more debasement, lower levels of common freedoms and media flexibility, and less and fewer daily newspapers. Electoral control is likewise connected with normatively more regrettable administration



results. More constituent control associates with lower levels of appreciation for physical trustworthiness, a weaker guideline of law, lower bureaucratic quality, more corruption, lower levels of civil liberties and media opportunity, and fewer daily papers.

### **2.4.3 Why People Vote?**

U.S. presidential elections are longer and more complex: they require voting for president and vice president, members of the House of Representatives, senators in various state and local offices, ballot propositions, and so on. American ballots subsequently request a considerable amount of knowledge from voters. By and large, Americans do not put their time and vitality in getting to be educated about every one of the decisions they are required to make. In any case, American voters do turn out for presidential races more honestly than for midterm congressional races, so the many-sided quality of presidential decisions is obviously not an obstruction to voting (Nelson W. Polsby . . . [et al. 2012]). Despite what might be expected, the additional reputation of a presidential campaign clearly helps turnout, as do the more prominent sum of cash spent by applicants and the expanded level of crusade movement in presidential decisions by political activists and vested parties. A regularly heard clarification of low turnout in the United States is that Americans are bizarrely estranged from legislative issues and that abstention from voting is their technique for demonstrating their objection to, or distance from, the political framework. While most other democratic rule countries either consider the majority of their subjects to be naturally enlisted to vote, requiring no exceptional activity with respect to the imminent voter, or consolidate voter enlistment with enlistment for all inclusive government advantages, for example, medical coverage or benefits programs, each American state aside from North Dakota obliges natives to apply to their city, town, or area government particularly so as to partake in races, including presidential races.

In many states, enrollment must be finished no less than thirty days before the race, when political enthusiasm among general society has yet to crest. Additionally, American subjects must enlist once more every time they change address, notwithstanding when they move inside the same state or city. Since the United States is an uncommonly mobile country— in any given two-year period, approximately 33% of the Americans will have

moved at least once — a great deal of reregistering is required so as to keep up voting rights (Nelson W. Polsby . . . [et al. 2012]). Be that as it may, even after the social equality time, state laws shifted significantly on such subtle elements as the length of home required before one could lawfully vote, and enrollment may well require an excursion to the district courthouse a while before the election. In a country noted for the geographic versatility of its populace, a major share of states required, as of late as 1972, a hometown (America) of no less than one year inside the state, three months inside the region, and thirty days inside the area to vote in any elections, including for president (Nelson W. Polsby . . . [et al. 2012]).

Still, numerous potential voters are kept out of the electorate. Non-citizens are not permitted to vote, whether legitimate or displaced people. Most states strip the indicted of their voting rights while detained or on parole; in eight expresses, this disappointment may remain forever regardless of the possibility that the sentence is finished.

There is no convincing proof that the American voting preferences are different from other democratic countries. The United States has sorted out itself in an unexpected way — state by state instead of as a unitary country — to do political business. The privilege to vote is regulated in a more decentralized manner than in many majority rules systems, and its activity requires more activity with respect to the planned voter. That appears to be superior to whatever other clarification to represent a significant part of the distinction in turnout between American presidential decisions and parliamentary races in other equivalent countries.

#### **2.4.4 Why People don't Vote?**

Considering human inspiration has contended that voting must somehow or other make individuals feel great, maybe in the light of the fact that they see the demonstration of voting as a metro obligation or as an open door for individual political expression. Some political researchers contend that voters infer that the advantages of turning out — which might be mental instead of instrumental — surpass the expenses.

It is believe that the act of voting is all in all presumably not rationally calculated in this fashion but is instead a more or less standing choice or habit that citizens fall into as they embrace different types of public participation when becoming incorporated into the normal

social life of their communities. Basically, voting appears to make generally sense as a demonstration of social interest.

There are at this point a considerable number investigations of voting and nonvoting, and all in all voters are individuals associated in different approaches to the larger society or to their local community, and nonvoters are most certainly not. Subsequently, individuals who are settled in one area vote more than individuals who move around.

People who have a place with civic associations or interest groups vote more than non joiners. Citizens who take after current occasions and have solid suppositions on strategy matters vote more than the politically impassive. Voting interest for the most part increments with age until late in life when social cooperation of various kinds drops away — oftentimes as the aftereffect of declining health or the loss of a spouse. The young, a large portion of whom are unsettled and unmarried, vote significantly less than their elders.

The better educated vote more than the less educated because people mostly have no idea about politics or general knowledge in politics. And people who identify with one or another political party vote more than those who claim no party connection or loyalty. Residence, family ties, education, civic participation in general, and party identification all create ties to the larger world, and these ties apparently make social habits that include ending up voting.

Families of government workers is a special interest group who participate in voting based on familial closeness to party preferences. Maybe these voters are voting since they see a financial impetus to do so. Commonly, be that as it may, their votes have practically no immediate effect on their compensations but they feel the centrality of civic involvement in their lives. Most Americans vote as indicated by their constant party affiliation (Nelson W. Polsby . . . [et al. 2012).

In other words, because they consider themselves Democrats or Republicans, many people will have made up their minds how to vote in an election before the candidates are even chosen. These party identifiers are likely to be more interested and active in politics and have more political knowledge than people who call themselves political “independents” (Nelson W. Polsby . . . [et al. 2012). They have a tendency to listen for the most part to their own side of political contentions and to concur with the approaches upheld by their gathering. They even go so far as to overlook data that they seem to be unfavorable to the party.

### 3. OLIGARCHY

It is highly difficult to surrender the old model of power, with its suspicions of a majority of free, generally equivalent and clashing gatherings of the adjusting society. All these guesses are explicit to the point of insensible takeoff in recent statements of 'who rules America.' According to Mr. David Riesman, for example, during the past half century there has been a movement from 'the power hierarchy of a ruling class to the power dispersal' of 'veto groups.' Now no one runs anything: all is undirected drift. 'In a sense,' Mr. Riesman believes, 'this is only another way of saying that America is a middle-class country ... in which, perhaps people will soon wake up to the fact that there is no longer a "we" who run things and a "they" who don't or a "we" who don't run things and a "they" who do, but rather that all "we's" are "they's" and all "they's" are "we's" (Jeffrey A. Winters 2012)

Jeffrey A. Winters describes "Oligarchs are actors who command and control massive concentrations of material resources that can be deployed to defend or enhance their personal wealth and exclusive social position (J.A. Winters 2011)". This statement reflects the true fact of the things and the explanation can be traced back to the "Greek word *oligarkhia* (government of the few)" (J.A. Winters 2011,2) as even then people had distinguished classes of influence. When comparing now and then, it may be noted that there have been no real changes. There is an assumption that postcolonial and postcommunist countries had more oligarchs than developed industrial countries. Despite everything, oligarchy is and oligarchs are an important part of politics, there is no separating one from another. Oligarchs are people who have means to manage large amounts of assets that can be used for strengthening their position in society and secure inherited wealth. The assets must be accessible and used for personal regard even if the resource belongs to someone. Jesse Unruh, a leading Californian politician of the 1960's, describes money as "the mother's milk of politics (A. Reginald 2003)". As mentioned earlier, the U.S. is a country that sells, builds and buys, with money as the main focus point of everything. Money connects people and businesses, capitalism rules

politics. Winters calls America's oligarchy the Income Defense Industry when rich can buy service. Taxes are reduced for wealth. American oligarchs "as a *donor class*, whose campaign contributions can be very influential" (J.A. Winters 2011, 213,249).

In his article "Oligarchy and Democracy", Winters brings out some of his observations from his book "Oligarchy" connecting them with American democracy. He starts with simple things such as the extension of civil rights, equal rights between men and women, bringing up economic and democratic values and extending American cultural beliefs. Then again, majority rules system seems incessantly defective with regard to the rich who can dodge policies. Regardless of polls reliably demonstrating that extensively greater parts support expanding taxes on the wealthiest Americans, policy has been moving the other way for quite a long time. Decreased assessments on the ultra-rich and the large corporations and banks they command have moved financial weights descending even as they have strained the administration's ability to look after people. Less well understood is that this rising disparity is not the result of something financially sound, for example, a surge in productivity or value-added contributions from investments and hedge-funds, but rather an immediate reflection of redistributive policies that have helped the wealthiest to get wealthier. The given small proportion of wealthy people surrounded with simple voters cannot represent the enormous political capability needed to continue winning these policies. While persuaded and activated minorities — organised on the basis of some issue such as gay marriage — can sometimes have legislative victories in spite of strong opposition from the electorate. The total number of influential people cannot be too large. They never gather for rallies or join petitions or public campaigns. So are they so convincing and get their way? It may be stated that the answer is simple as America is more oligarchic than democratic. As mentioned above, one cannot live without the other and so they co-exist. Oligarchy is fixated on material power, while democracy on the dispersion of non-material power. As Adam Garfinkle points out, "the chronic problem is not just that electoral democracy provides few constraints on the power of oligarchs in general, but that American democracy is by design particularly responsive to the power of money (Plutocracy and Democracy 2011)".

It thus shows that wealthy people are engaged in political life, (Page 2015,39) said that "financial contributions may represent an important mechanism by which wealthy Americans exert disproportionate political influence".

It is easy to see how such parties might serve democracy. Voters can give more effective direction to government by supporting a team's program rather than an individual's. By holding entire parties rather than individual politicians accountable for what government does, voters create an incentive for responsible governance that might not otherwise exist. The coalition of policy-demanding groups develops an agenda of mutually acceptable policies, insists on the nomination of candidates with a demonstrated commitment to its program, and works to elect these candidates to office. In this group-centric view of parties, candidates will, if the coalition has selected them well, have as their paramount goal the advancement of the party program.

It is important to know what wealthy Americans seek from politics and how their policy preferences compare to those of other citizens. There is good reason to believe that the wealthiest Americans exert more political influence than their less fortunate fellow citizens do. Recent quantitative evidence tends to point in a similar direction. Larry Bartels and Martin Gilens, for example, have shown that senators' roll-call votes and actual federal government policy correspond much more closely with the policy preferences of "affluent" Americans. On the other hand, if the wealthy have very distinctive preferences that conflict with the interests of other citizens, their disproportionate influence would seem to create a serious problem for the democracy in the United States.

### **3.1 Wealthy Americans and Policy Preference**

Indeed, even without having the capacity to gauge the actual political power of wealthy citizens can unquestionably dismiss the perspective that broad political influence by the affluent would be of minimal down to earth significance at any rate on the grounds that their strategy inclinations are much the same as everyone else's. On many important issues, the inclinations of the rich seem to vary extraordinarily from those of the overall population. In this way, if policy makers do measure people's inclinations differentially in light of their salary or wealth, the outcome will not only fundamentally disregard democratic ideals of political equality, but will likewise affect the substantive forms of American public policy. There is good reason to believe that the wealthiest Americans apply more political impact than the less wealthy citizens. Significant speculators or business elites rule the making of

public policy and the agendas of both the Republican and the Democratic parties. In any case, the ramifications of unequal political impact depend vigorously upon precisely what rich Americans really need the government to do. If the policy preferences of the rich were much the same as everybody else's, then their unequal impact would have minimal practical effect. Then again, if the rich have very clear preferences that conflict with the interests of other citizens, their unbalanced impact would appear to create a significant problem for the working of democratic rule in the United States. Moderately wealthy Americans have a tendency to be more liberal than others on religious and moral issues, including abortion, gay rights, yet substantially more conservative than the non-affluent on issues of taxes, economic regulation, and social welfare. Nor is it feasible to combine rich respondents across surveys; in view of earnings it is not for the most part possible to distinguish who they are. The wealthiest representatives are generally lumped into an expansive, top-wage class that includes 10 per cent or a greater amount of the population. Within that group it is difficult to make certain who does and who does not belong in the top 1 percent of Americans.

To collect evidence of the rich Americans, for example, the top 1 per cent or the top one-tenth of 1 per cent of wealth holders — it is important to conduct specific surveys that expressly focus on those groups. The words "contact" and "win the collaboration of" hide a world of troubles inherent in considering the wealthy. It is highly difficult to reach rich Americans as a large portion of them are exceptionally occupied. Similarly, they fence themselves security services. Nevertheless, the assembled data give a first methodical look at the policy preferences of wealthy Americans — and shed suggestive light on the potential ramifications of unequal responsiveness to those policy preferences. When contrast well off Americans' reactions in our survey with the reactions that the overall population has given in different surveys and studies, discover a variety of significant contrasts in policy preferences. Evidence indicates that the wealthy are significantly more worried than other Americans about budget deficits. The wealthy are considerably more favorable toward cutting social welfare programs, particularly Social Security and medical services. They are also less supportive of several occupations and pay programs, including an above poverty level, the lowest pay permitted by law, a decent standard of living for the unemployed. Rich Americans are considerably less eager than others to give wide broad educational opportunities, by spending whatever is important to guarantee that all children have good public schools they can go to or to ensure that everybody who needs to go to college can do. They are less ready

to pay higher taxes to provide healthcare for everybody, and they are considerably less supportive of tax-financed national health insurance. The wealthy tend to support lower estate tax rates and to be less eager to increase income taxes on high income people. They express concern about economic inequality and support to some degree more egalitarian wages than they see at present existing, however — to a much more prominent degree than the overall citizens — the rich oppose the government activity to redistribute income or wealth.

The wealthy are significantly less favorable to expanding government control of Wall Street firms, the health care industry, small business, and large corporations in particular. A hefty portion of these differences appear to be clear impressions of the distinctly economic interests of wealthy citizens. Financial control, for instance — regardless of the possibility that it gives net advantages to consumers and society overall — may impose net costs on some wealthy investors. Under the American tax system — in which effective rates remain mildly progressive or at least relative to income — a wealthy American can be forced to pay a large amount of money in taxes to fund programs that he or she sees as yielding just little personal benefits. By the same token, with regards to managing budget deficits, the wealthy may have less to lose from spending cuts than from tax increases, and wealthy bond owners might be especially careful about the increase in prices that would undercut bond values. Obviously ought to consider also an altogether different interpretation that the unmistakable policy preferences of wealthy Americans may reflect better information, more profound thinking about the issues confronting the country, and a clearer-headed understanding of economic and social reality than most people have — including the possibility that government may be unable for accomplishing what Americans might want it to accomplish. Maybe the American wealthy class is right when they say that employment programs do not work, that education could be improved by market-oriented changes than by spending on government funded schools or school grants, that citizens can pay for their own medicinal services, that economic markets can generally direct themselves efficiently, and that the current financial shortages present a more serious risk to the United States than joblessness does. However, any predominant information among the wealthy may have a tendency to be one-sided. Affluent Americans seem, by all accounts, to be intensely mindful of marginal tax rates and the inconveniences of economic regulation, however, they may know no more — maybe less — than ordinary citizens do about the advantages of controls or of spending programs that require tax revenue. This might be especially true in connection with social



welfare programs. Few of the well-off Americans — and few of their friends, partners or relatives — are prone to need unemployment insurance.

Indeed, the expanding economic disparity itself increased the influence of the rich, delivering considerably stronger obstacles to egalitarian policies. Unfortunately, the preferences of the American wealthy class at a specific point in time cannot answer these inquiries — yet it might give a starting point for future work on the difficult relationship between economic and political change. Here can't be determine and differentiate the interpretations of rich Americans and their policy preference. Nor, so far as that is concerned, would be able to determine debate about the amount of policy makers should pay to the preferences of ordinary citizens. Finally, present policy makers still do not understand what the working class needs and cannot seem to come to a common opinion.

### **3.1.1 Campaign Money i.e. Resources**

According to New York Times, 158 families, along with companies they own or control, contributed \$176 million in the first stage of the campaign. The donor's contribution reflects the greatest economic elite and their shifting position in business. Most of them built up their own business and some of them have inherited wealth and trust funds. Many of them are CEOs of large companies in sectors such as pharmacy, engineering, weaponry, oil, banking, hedge-funds. Most of them were born outside of the United States, migrant from the Soviet Union, Israel, Pakistan and India. No matter what business families are in, they contribute millions of dollars for presidential campaign, tending to support Republicans whose attention lies in cutting taxes on income, capital gains and inheritances; and lower government subsidized support programs. But at the same time billionaires and working class are observing Democrats and their economic policies. According to June New York Times/CBS News poll, “two- thirds of the Americans support higher taxes for wealthy people who earn \$1 million per year or more (New York Times 2015)”. According to Federal Election Commission “158 families each contributed \$250,000 or more in the campaign through June 30 and additional 200 families gave more than \$100,000 (New York Times 2015)” with most of them supporting Republicans. Received donations were made anonymously, as Citizens United made it possible for the wealthy donors to look for new

ways for donations. More than 50 billionaires are listed in Forbes 400, for them giving away certain a sum of money seems insignificant. For the entire 2015-2016 election, the cumulative totals will no doubt range from \$10 to \$15 billion. But the actual totals will have to wait even longer, until June 30, 2017. But even then it will reflect only what is officially reported, as more “dark money” flows into elections in increasingly opaque system that grows progressively “darker” as the mountains of election money provided by billionaires, corporations, and bankers grow ever higher (New York Times 2015, 2016).

“Making a big bet on something before anyone else really grasps it. That is what success has in common in energy and in equities,” said Tim Phillips, the president of Americans for Prosperity, a conservative advocacy group with ties to Charles G. and David H. Koch (New York Times 2015)”. The Kochs are the most effective rich people in the side of United States, and hence may be the most politically powerful non-government officials in America. Libertarians Charles and David Koch run one of the world's biggest industries. At the point when democratic government joins with oligarchy, the outcome is a particular combination of imbalance. The present spotlight on oligarchs is distinctive. Differently from elites, who are enabled in differing ways and situated toward assorted closures, oligarchs are characterized all the more consistently by the influence of cash. Wealth serves as both the source of oligarchic influence and the inspiration to practice it. Differently from whatever other influence asset, riches join oligarchs politically only when their views are similar on the matter. Whatever their political contradictions, oligarchs in America, as anywhere else, are interested only in minimizing any risk to their wealth. Being arranged positively expands the impact of oligarchs; however, coordination is not the essential source of their political force. With several billions of dollars in question every year, the battle is politically charged for a little number of ultra-rich Americans.

Campaign funding and contributions are some of the means to participate in politics. Parties are trying to fund themselves by finding financial sources that imply disproportion and illegality. The search for funds may induce politicians to listen more to those who give to their campaigns than to those who vote for them, or for their party (Austin, R. 2003. Paltiel 1981,138). But politicians did want to know what kind of important actions may affect the outcome of an election. If so, then elections are the motivating spring of responsive and accountable government, and money becomes a significant influence on democratic

government. It was Abraham Lincoln who said that “government of the people for the people by the people (i.e., democracy) is a regime of political elites”.

The use of cash as an asset in politics essentially imports the unequal distribution of financial gain and wealth among members of present day society into the political procedure. A way to manage this monetary downside is to create profit accessible from completely different sources. Political interest in building up vote based systems is a way to shape or form a general movement of all citizens. Despite what might be expected, it is by all accounts worth seeing political support as a minority action. For whatever length of time the elite remains moderately open to any person who claims access, and the length of people can practice the freedom to drop out of giving or taking an interest and have the chance to replace elites, elitism does not jeopardize representative democracy.

Outside funds always come with risk that can put democracy promotion into a bad spot and successful deals. So in the U.S., political parties are not allowed to have money of suspicious origin. In case donations are taken from corporations and governments and that kind of support is in government, it is believed that political decisions will be in jeopardy and foreign vision will be taken into consideration more than domestic ones. Campaign donations are most of all coming from Wall Street. It is concerning that political action committee has no effect on donations for congress roll and has little effect on member’s party or its views. But that does not mean that money has no effect at all. It merely shows that any impact by money tends to work predominantly by selecting authorities with ideologically inviting stands, as opposed to by influencing authorities to conflict with their beliefs once in office. Ferguson’s investment theory of political parties “rests on the assumption that both parties in a two-party system require large amounts of cash in order to be viable and that this need forces them to round up major investors, who in turn insist upon a measure of policy (Welt 2011)”.

In any case, a few assets are clearly going to be more essential than others, and the significance of various assets shifts from event to event. It is sensible to view as particularly vital those assets that one side corners, for example, the administration—and those assets that can be effectively changed over into different assets, or specifically into open office, for example, cash, which can be utilized to purchase a skillful staff, TV time, etc. Although political assets are on occasion circulated unequally between the gatherings, in a focused two-party framework, for example, our own the imbalances once in a while run all in the same

course. Now and then Republican hopefuls profit; infrequently Democrats. One aftereffect of these imbalances in access to various assets is that distinctive methodologies are more favorable to each of the two gatherings, as it seen when look at the impacts on race techniques of three assets usually held to be critical: cash, control over data, and the presidential office. Presidential crusades are unpleasantly costly. Radio and TV promoting, going for the competitor and crusade staff, mailings of battle material, the pay rates of specialists and counselors, office space and hardware, yard signs and bumper stickers, taking surveys, enrolling and assembling voters, and raising money.

According to Sunlight Foundation “Ted Cruz, who has at least four super PACs supporting him, had \$37.8 million raised for his campaign, the result of an \$11 million donation by New York hedge fund manager Robert Mercer, a \$10 million donation by Toby Neugebauer, a Texas private equity giant, and \$15 million from the Wilks family (Kahloon, I. 2015)”. Jeb Bush's main super PAC, Right to Rise, collected millions of dollars, donations from 24 people and corporations. Francis Rooney, a former ambassador to the Vatican, who gave more than \$2 million; and Helen Schwab, wife of the investor Charles R. Schwab, who gave \$1.5 million for Bush campaign. Hillary Clinton's main super PAC, Priorities USA Action, raised most of its \$15.7 million from nine donors who gave \$1 million each, director Steven Spielberg and billionaire George Soros. Soros also contributed \$1 million for Clinton support. Marco Rubio's super PAC, Conservative Solutions, raised \$16 million, plus \$5 million from Miami auto dealer and Rubio friend, Norman Barman and \$3 million from Larry Ellison. Toby Neugebauer, a private investor in Puerto Rico who moved there from America due to taxes— gave \$10 million for Rubio. Donald Trump who claimed that he is going to self- financing presidential campaign took loan from his father in amount of \$1,000,000 dollars but as he loaned money for his campaign that means he can get them back later. The \$3 million of money went to his companies like TV channel (Fox) or companies that have ties with Trump. Fro last time Trump used \$2 million of his own money he also accepted nearly \$4 million in “unsolicited donations. It means that more than 67 percent of his campaign money was donated from outside. Never mind the fall campaign when he talked about “corrupt” money system and manage to rise \$1 billion for himself and the Republican house (Doggett 2015). According to a *New York Times*, billionaire business magnate and big GOP donor Sheldon Adelson also plans to invest money to help elect Trump – over \$100 million – than he has for any Republican campaign in the past (Colorossi 2016).

Now Trump trying to stay alive and spending money for various events and advertisement. While Trump has raised \$5.8 million through June 30 this not including the loans to his campaign that have grown numerous, he's already spent \$5.6 million. While other candidates meet pole and connect with voters, Trups sells hats and shirts spending on them \$500,000. "Make America Great Again," the hats and shirts, over \$25 or \$30 each. In 2016 Trump is still trying to raise money, campaign has raised \$25m, but only \$7.5m is from individual donors (Colorossi 2016). Mostly his supporters are from health industry and real estate. Thought Trump wanted to spend more money he took decision back when polls outcome was quite positive. In the statement he said that: "While our original budget was substantially higher than the amount spent, good business practices and even better ideas and policy have made it unnecessary to have spent a larger sum," Trump said. "To be number one in every poll, both state and national, and to have spent the least amount of dollars of any serious candidate is a testament to what I can do for America" The he added that "This is what our country's leaders should do for the United States — spend money wisely and win!"

Overall over 100 largest contributors in the 2016 cycle have spent \$195 million trying to influence the presidential election — more than the \$155 million spent by the 2 million smallest donors combined — according to a POLITICO analysis of campaign finance data (Sunlight Foundation 2016).

## **4. CONTROL OVER INFORMATION**

### **4.1 Media Resources**

Political information is so natural to procure during presidential elections that it is difficult to distinguish anyone in control of its spread. In any case, there are components of the general framework by which data is fabricated and dispersed in the United States that substantially influence the fortunes of hopefuls and the routes in which they are seen by electorates.

Campaign experts buy and large separate sources of data into free media and paid media. Candidates do not need to pay for free media or "earned media" as a result of news scope. Examples of news scope matter hugely to competitors, and they spend extraordinary exertion acclimating their crusades to the expert practices of the news media, whether print, TV, or on the web. In this manner, notwithstanding getting free scope for the most part requires cash, and some of the time a considerable amount of cash, since columnists frequently judge the relative remaining of presidential hopefuls amid the early phases of the battle by the measure of their crusade war mid-sections. TV predominantly covers debates among candidates. Showing up in public deliberations is one great route for possibility to get reputation while holding costs down, and being incorporated into level headed discussions is a characteristic of credibility for candidates, a sign that they should be considered important.

Paid media refers for the most part to TV and radio ads, which applicants must create and place on air much as regular business promotion. Publicizing is a type of data that uninvolved observers, for example, an ordinary American electorate, every now and again find believable. Particularly amid the presidential election season, when numerous competitors contend inside every significant gathering for the gathering's assignment, competitors must buy promotion time keeping in mind the end goal to help their name acknowledgment and favorability among potential voters. In all these matters, the news media for the most part keep up a somewhat close agreement about who is serious about their

campaign, who is ahead, and which issues are imperative and what topics are covered. This agreement arises from the strongly aggressive conditions under which singular news association's work, from the common point of view that emerges on the grounds that writers from various associations stay nearby together as they cover the goes of crusading hopefuls, and on the grounds that they monitor each other's item. Since television producers follow other networks and read the daily papers, and print media keep an eye on what is on TV and the Internet, there is a propensity for their stories to cover.

#### **4.1.2 Newspaper**

In spite of the fact that the electronic media age has radically diminished the readership of most daily papers, bankrupting many media businesses, print journalism remains the country's main recourse for Americans. Daily paper scope of current news has kept up its significance even in the Internet period; the sites by the New York Times, Washington Post, and USA Today and Los Angeles Times rank among the most prevalent online hotspots for information, while the news stories shown on CNN.com, BBC, Fox News etc, and popular Internet pages destinations are mainly supplied by daily paper wire administrations, for example, Reuters and the Associated Press. Competitors understand the impact of daily paper scope of their exercises and give careful consideration to the treatment they get from print journalist (Nelson W. Polsby . . . [et al.] 2012). In any case, it is allowed under standard journalistic standards to entertain a general professional underdog predisposition. Columnists value their calling to be objective and not to be readjusted. Comforting any sizable group of distressed persons might be well past the limits of the news media. It is far less demanding to harrow the agreeable, since this just involves keeping up an expert formal distrust about the probably self-intrigued claims of occupants of high office. Getting away from this assumption just once in a while. In the early phases of a foreign emergency, when there is a rally-round-the-banner impact, office holders are allowed the advantage of being portrayed as talking in the interest of all the general people.

Along these lines, the very issues our pioneers are approached to illuminate may vary from period to time as indicated by back and forth movements of open consideration regarding them. Legislators endeavor to seize control of this open plan and considerably affect its substance. Similarly, writers give and withhold validity to pioneers as their own

particular aggregate judgments about issues and the earnestness with which legislators are tending to them. Generally as standards of appropriate journalistic practice as a rule keep plain inclination from shading effort scope, different contemplations debilitate the inclining of straight news stories. In a period of declining dissemination and mounting costs for the daily paper industry, proprietors can sick stand to annoy a large portion of their potential readership. Financial plan limitations have likewise prompted combination among daily papers and have constrained the lessening of assets committed to the scope of current undertakings. Today, most daily papers do not maintain their own particular news departments in Washington or create a lot of unique scope of national legislative issues. They increasingly depend on stories supplied by wire administrations for example, the Associated Press and Reuters or buy content from the news administrations kept up by larger daily papers, for example, the New York Times, Washington Post, and Los Angeles Times.

These news-gathering offices serve a wide customer base with an expansive range of assessment and in this way try to plan stories that seem objective and unprejudiced. While each story will not be completely reasonable to all sides, the last item is much nearer to the standards of lack of bias than would be the situation if every paper inclined news articles as per its own particular publication positions. The potential impact of journalistic predisposition, ideological or something else, on the states of mind of peruses has diminished after some time, essentially in light of the fact that the volume of political scope in daily papers is itself on the decay. The period of crusading editors who utilized their papers basically as a vehicle for progressing political causes has offered a route to a cutting edge industry overwhelmed by enterprises gave essentially to augmenting shareholder benefit. Broad regard for the universe of governmental issues pulls in less supporters than does scope of wrongdoing, games, human-interest stories, and the antics of big names; particularly outside the real metropolitan territories, political news, however it has a spot, is given optional thought basically in light of the fact that most daily paper peruses are not unpleasantly interested.

Regardless of the fact that a specific news source or scope in a specific race is one-sided, are customary citizens really affected in their conclusions and voting decisions by the daily papers that enter their homes? The way that a daily paper touches base on the doorstep is no assurance that its political news and articles will be perused. A great many people give careful consideration to legislative issues; they frequently read nothing or simply filter the



features without diverting a lot of an impression. Regardless of the possibility that the substance is scrutinized with some give it a second thought, a pursuer's impression of what has been composed may contrast notably from the essayist's goals. An article may not be clear in goal, especially in the event that it is supported by capabilities or diluted to minimize offense, as it regularly may be. Peruses with existing feelings on the subject may well reason that the thing underpins their perspectives, whether it was intended to or not.

Since Americans tend to view writers with impressive suspicion, news stories or publications might be deciphered accurately and still rejected as invalid. Party distinguishing proof is powerful to the point that for some peruses it would overpower nearly anything a paper says. Clearly, a huge number of citizens have no trouble voting Republican while perusing Democratic daily papers or the other way around. Numerous individuals get their political feelings from sources other than the news media; the impact of relatives, companions, collaborators, ethnic and religious associations, and other social strengths can conventionally be required to far exceed anything written in a daily paper.

#### **4.1.3 Media and new media**

Since the 1960s, television has eclipsed newspapers as the most important and influential news medium in the United States. A 2008 survey by the Pew Research Center (Pew Research Center for the People and the Press, 2008) for the People and the Press found that 72 percent of respondents named television as a primary source for news about political campaigns, compared to 33 percent for the Internet, 29 percent for newspapers, and 21 percent for radio (Nelson W. Polsby . . . [et al.] 2012).

The influence of television on presidential elections extends well beyond the coverage of campaigns by journalists. Expenditures for television advertising dependably constitute the largest single budget item of any serious presidential campaign. To competitors, strategists, intellectuals, and media faultfinders alike, the lesson of the 1960 level headed discussions is clear: television coverage can essentially impact the result of races, furthermore, the medium tends to remunerate triviality over substance. The fact of the matter is presumably more complicated. Television moving pictures and sound give it a quickness that print news-casting needs. The medium is likewise more qualified to covering legislative issues as a clash of

identities than of thoughts; inside and out talks of strategy tend to not have the fundamental visual pictures to make convincing television.

In the meantime, the same variables that point of confinement the impact of daily papers on the course of constituent crusades oblige the impacts of electronic media too. TV scope of governmental issues is regularly purposefully dull keeping in mind the end goal to minimize contention; numerous viewers hold fast to their previous political convictions and assessments even notwithstanding the conflicting sentiments of TV talking heads; and most Americans won't get even solid, convincing political messages in first place.

Evaluations for current issues programming routinely could not hope to compare to those for prime time amusement, television shows, wearing occasions, and different staples of the medium; even "news" telecasts are committing increasingly thoughtfulness regarding human-interest stories, big name tattle, and other, more mainstream subjects to the detriment of political issues or occasions. All the more exceptionally enhanced link news programs have a tendency to draw in little groups of onlookers of similar viewers.

Similarly as with daily papers, the impact of television seems to top amid the presidential essential season. Most contenders for gathering assignments are at first substantially less natural to the national electorate than occupant presidents or real gathering chosen people, permitting media scope to shading the general population's impression of the applicants. Since essential races are challenged by various applicants inside the same party, substantive contrasts among them on significant open arrangement issues have a tendency to be generally minor, further reassuring communication scope to concentrate on the contrasting individual lives, styles, identities, and procedures of the applicants.

Veteran campaign reporter David Maraniss of the Washington Post describes the campaign bubble that includes the candidates, their advisers, and accompanying reporters:

“The bubble” is what surrounds the traveling road show of any presidential campaign. I includes the candidate, the staff, the press, the plane, the bus and all the electronic gear of the hustle—after all, even in the television era, someone’s still got to get out there and do the job—yet it is not so much a tangible phenomenon as a metaphysical one, a way of looking at things, at once cynical and cozy, but mostly just weird. It is where you find both the real story and yet an utterly false one, a picture of a very large country. The bubble is addictive yet debilitating”

There is a technique in the perpetual across the nation go of the presidential applicants through the span of a battle. In particular, their conduct is directed by the key ramifications of the constituent school. Hopefuls realize that discretionary votes, allotted on a state-by-state premise, decide the result of the decision, not the national popular vote. Daily papers and television news programs require features and leads. Disregarding a demonstration can be as unsafe as taking care of it, since hopeful under-and overexposure might be clear just by and large. Since they have a consistent requirement for news, individuals from the media are cleared along by the tide of occasions to which they contribute and in which they swim, especially like whatever is left of us. A significant part of the programming publicized on link news channels does not constitute as news by any meaning. These media outlets regularly dedicate less time to unique political reporting than to examination and conclusion. Political researcher have a tendency to be fundamentally inspired by depicting what's more, expounding effort methodology; talking about the aftereffects of popular sentiment surveys and different measures of the hopeful steed race; and making forecasts about the result of races and other major political events.

Reporters frequently speak to a specific ideological point of view that to a great extent decides their translation of the competitors and crusades. Political addicts may tune into fulfill their specific enthusiasm for the subtle elements of the battle or to hear support of their political perspectives, yet most Americans have a tendency to be less intrigued, constraining the potential impact of such proclamations on popular sentiment or voting conduct in the mass electorate.

A developing number of Americans get noteworthy measures of news about candidates what's more, battles from the Internet by means of computers, tablets and smart phones. Young people are particularly prone to search online for political data, but only in special accessions like: countries elections, economic news and international news. This pattern will just proceed to increase after some time, making political substance on the Web an essential section of news media scope in future elections.

The most generally went to websites for data about current affairs are kept up news associations, for example, CNN and the New York Times. The context on these pages mirrors that of the organizations on televisions scope, albeit extraordinary web components are turning out to be more regular. While the expanding notoriety of the Internet as a source for news has further strengthened the developing interest for political news initially incited by the

digital TV's 24-hour news cycle, putting a lot of weight on organization to be the first to report competition news up request to scoop news, most web depend on the locales of prestigious daily papers and television channels to supply them with data about political improvements.

Intensely trafficked entry locales, for example, Yahoo, Face Book, Twitter and America Online additionally highlight top news stories on their front pages, generally courtesy of wire administrations that supply stories to newspapers. For someone, in this manner,

the Internet serves as a helpful carrier for data transfer, however the substance expended online is not one of a kind to the web; it to a great extent mirrors the scope accessible somewhere else in daily papers or on TV.

Since the late 1990s, in any case, sites without print or television, have assumed an inexorably conspicuous part in American governmental issues. The online-just Drudge Report picked up a lot of consideration amid the period paving the way to the indictment of President Bill Clinton in 1998 for being the principal source to break a few stories about autonomous counsel Kenneth Starr's examination of Clinton—reports that were later affirmed by standard media outlets. The online magazine Salon initially reported a tale about past individual indiscretions of House legal administrator Henry Hyde amid his board of trustees' consultation of reprimand articles against Clinton for lying under promise about his own association with White House assistant Monica Lewinsky. While numerous sites movement in bits of gossip and theory that frequently end up being unwarranted or level out false, some have been legitimized frequently enough that even columnists for customary news associations, regardless of their expressed hatred for the individuals who neglect to watch traditional models of journalistic practice, once in a while confess to checking them routinely for any indications of a sensation new story (Nelson W. Polsby . . . [et al.] 2012).

All the more as of late, the Internet has seen a rise of web logs, or web journals, dedicated to legislative issues and current occasions. Web journals are sites those component consistent diary style sections that may be called posts written by one or more people. Most political sites contain a blend of unique critique and hypertext connections to different sources, including news stories, archives, video and audio files, and posts on different online journals.

Some of the most popular political blogs are maintained by journalists (such as Mickey Kaus, Andrew Sullivan, and Joshua Micah Marshall), opinion columnists (such as Michelle Malkin and Eric Alterman), academics (such as law professor Glenn Reynolds and political scientist Daniel Drezner), and other decorated writes and journalist (Nelson W. Polsby . . . [et al.] 2012).

Online journals serve as something of a supplement to conventional media outlets. While a few sites are adequately prevalent to give their proprietors a full-time salary from publicizing income, none as of now appreciates the assets to work as a far reaching news-gathering organizations on the size of daily papers or broadcasting companies. Every so often, writes will break a unique story.

## CONCLUSION

Political stability can be achieved by a permanent acceptance of government right to rule, and by supporting the government authority over its people. Legitimacy may be based on long-established, strong and reasonable authority. Even so, a lack of proportion or relation between corresponding things in modern society may make more and more effort to maintain legitimacy. Dysfunction in organization of leadership and incapability to maintain structure may arise from the disagreement between the enforcement for social and economic obstruction caused by democracy on the one hand, and the pressure caused by market economy on the other.

In this perspective, political power cannot be seen barely as far as appointive rights, or regarding the capacity of groups to express their interests by campaigning. Rather a more profound level, political influence mirrors the dispersion of financial influence and, specifically, the unequal responsibility for wealth. There are various models of democracy, every model offering its own particular rendition of well rule. Research showed that United States democracy is pluralist system not majoritarian system because simply, pluralist democracy is a theory of the conveyance of political force. It holds that power is generally and uniformly scattered in the society. Pluralistic system shows that all people are more or less equal and state balancing between people and government. Nevertheless pluralism have shown that business have special rights in relation to government that other organizations clearly cannot compete as the major, business is bound to carried out remarkable sway over any government. Elite, composed of seniors, judges, police chiefs, military leaders and hedge found directors, may be seen to pursue either the bureaucratic interests of their state.

Liberal democracy subsequently centers upon the innate pressure amongst vote based system and free enterprise; that is, between the political correspondence that liberal popular government announces and the social imbalance that an industrialist economy unavoidably creates. Liberal popular governments are in this manner as capitalist or middle class majority

rule governments that are controlled and controlled by the settled in force of a wealth. Power is eventually gathered in the hands of the few, the primary distinction being whether the few is considered as a 'force tip top' or as a 'decision class'. Be that as it may, noteworthy contrasts can likewise be recognized. Case in point, though elitists recommend that influence get from an assortment of education, societal position, bureaucratic position, political association and wealth, another perspective underscore the unequivocal significance of financial elements; quite, the proprietorship and control of the method for production. There is extensive debate about how liberal frameworks work practically speaking. Pluralists supported the framework's ability to ensure prevalent responsiveness and open responsibility. Elitists highlight the propensity for political energy to be amassed in the hands of an advantaged minority. Since power is so decentralized among governmental institutions, the U.S. framework miss concerning the most elevated standard of majoritarian democracy. Due to the decentralization of force, notwithstanding, the United States honorably satisfies the best quality level of pluralist vote based system, which accept various centers of power. The United States political framework is interested in contending on many groups that want to be heard in the fair democratic process, and ostensibly yields strategy results that, after some time, all the more successfully consider the interests and worries of various groups than do frameworks established on the strict majoritarian principle. While traditional elitists endeavored to demonstrate that democracy was dependably a myth, present day elitist have tended to highlight how far specific political frameworks. Elitists have, in addition, contended that observational studies have upheld pluralist conclusions simply because others have overlooked the significance of non-decision making leadership as an appearance of force, in any case measure of vote based responsibility is reliable with elite rule.

This research have been able to find some interesting findings, one is the possible total failure of Majoritarian Electoral Democracy. In the United States, it could be seen, the majority does not rule not in the sense of actually deciding policy outcomes. Our findings also point toward the need to learn more about exactly which economic elites have how much impact upon public policy, and to what extend their influence can impact people and policy. Moreover, the preference of elites has much more free impact on policy than average citizen. But it doesn't mean that average people always have to give up, they often get suitable policies but only when their interest matches interest of economy elite who influenced exact policy.

Same could be said about interest groups and their supporters. And there is need to understand more about the policy preferences and the political influence of various actors and groups, involving political party activists, bureaucratic office, and other noneconomic elites. Hope that our work will encourage further study of these issues. Despite the research in majoritarian democracy, elitism and pluralism it is still much to learn about those theories and how they influence United States. Founding of this thesis suggest that bigger part of the American public actually have little influence or no influence at all over the policies United States government adopts and passes. Americans do enjoy many benefits that American government promotes, such as regular elections, freedom of speech, association, equal rights, domestic and international business support. Oligarchy is and oligarchs are an important part of politics, there is no separating one from another. Oligarchs are people who have means to manage large amounts of assets that can be used for strengthening their position in society and secure inherited wealth. Despite even if policymaking is dominated by powerful business organizations and a small number of powerful Americans, still America claims to being a democratic and follow democratic path but society are clueless about how democratic ideology is under consideration.



## REFERENCES

A Carter Center Conference (17-19, 2003). *Financing Democracy In The Americas: Political parties, Campaigns, And elections*, OneCopenhill

Baker, T. (2011). The ACE Encyclopaedia: Parties and Candidates, The electoral knowledge network

Bawn Kathleen, Cohen Martin, Karol David, Masket Seth, Noel Hans, and Zaller John, (September 2012| Vol. 10/No. 3), *A Theory of Political Parties: Groups, Policy Demands and Nominations in American Politics* pp:571-597

Benjamin I. Page, Larry M. Bartels, and Jason Seawright, *Democracy and the Policy Preferences of Wealthy Americans*, Vol. 11/No. 1, November 2013, pp. 51 – 73

Bennett T. James (2009). *Stifling Political Competition, How Government Has Rigged the System to Benefit Demopublicans and Exclud Third Parties*, Springer ScienceþBusiness Media, LLC

Bollen, A. Kenneth (1979). Political Democracy and the Timing of Development, *American Sociological Review*, Vol. 44, No. 4 (Aug., 1979), pp. 572-587, Published by: American Sociological Association

Bollen, A. Kenneth (1980). Issues in the Comparative Measurement of Political Democracy, *American Sociological Review*, Vol. 45, No. 3 (Jun., 1980), pp. 370-390, Published by: American Sociological Association

Bollen, A. Kenneth (1990). *Studies in Comparative International Development*, Political Democracy: Conceptual and Measurement Traps, Spring 1990, Vol. 25, no. 1, 7-24, published in Hamilton

Bracking, S. (2009). *Money and Power, Great Predators in the Political Economy of Development*, Pluto Press

Brown, E.- *How the US Became an Oligarchy?*

(<http://www.truth-out.org/news/item/30093-how-america-became-an-oligarchy>)  
(08, April 2015)

Campbell, C. (Business Insider) *Donald Trump just filed an incredible campaign-finance report*, Oct. 16, 2015 (<http://www.businessinsider.com/donald-trump-october-campaign-finance-report>) Can Billionaires Buy Election (Darrell M. West | January 27, 2015) (<http://www.brookings.edu/>)

Carrk, T. (April 2011). *The Koch Brothers :What You Need to Know About the Financiers of the Radical Right*, Center of American Progress Action Fund

Cervantes, Esther, and Amy Gluckman “America 2004: voting for a decent global society.” *Lancet*. 18 September 2004: 1011-1012.. “Who Votes, and How?” *Dollars and Sense: The Magazine of Economic Justice* January/February 2004 (<http://www.dollarsandsense.org/archives/2004/0104cervantes.html>)

Colorossi, S. *The Myth of Donald Trump’s Self-Funded Presidential Campaign Is Officially Dead*, Sun, May 15th, 2016 (<http://www.politicususa.com/2016/05/15/myth-donald-trumps-self-funded-campaign-officially-dead.html>)

Confessore N., Cohen S., Yourish K., (2015). *The Families Funding the 2016 Presidential Election* – Oct.10.2015 ([http://www.nytimes.com/interactive/2015/10/11/us/politics/2016-presidential-election-super-pac-donors.html?\\_r=0](http://www.nytimes.com/interactive/2015/10/11/us/politics/2016-presidential-election-super-pac-donors.html?_r=0))

Confessore, N., Cohen, S., Yourish, K., (2015). *Small Pool of Rich Donors Dominates Election Giving* - Aug. 1, 2015 (<http://www.nytimes.com/2015/08/02/us/small-pool-of-rich-donors-dominates-election-giving.html>)

Coolidge, C. "Address to the American Society of Newspaper Editors, Washington, D.C.," January 17, 1925. Online by Gerhard Peters and John T. Woolley, *The American Presidency Project*. <http://www.presidency.ucsb.edu/ws/?pid=24180>.

Currinder, M. (2009). *Money in the House : campaign funds and congressional party politics*, Westview Press 1.st ed

Doggett, D. (2015). *Donald Trump may be a self-starter, but he's not self-funded*, Nov. 13, 2015 (<http://sunlightfoundation.com/blog/2015/11/13/donald-trump-may-be-a-self-starter-but-hes-not-self-funded/>)

Dworkin, R. (2006). *Is democracy possible here?* United Kingdom: Princeton University Press

Forbes, “*Forbes 400*”, Augustiono Fontevveccia, 2014, ([www.forbes.com](http://www.forbes.com))

Gilens, M., Page, I. B. (2014). *Perspectives on Politics, Testing Theories of American Politics: Elites, Interest Groups, and Average Citizens-* September 2014| Vol. 12/No. 3, pp. 565- 581  
Heywood, A. (2013). *Politics*, pp. 100- 107

Jackman Simon, *Pooling the Polls Over an Election Campaign*, Australian Journal of Political Science, Vol. 40, No. 4, December, pp. 499– 517, Rotledge

John Roberts's Roadmap for Campaign-Finance Reform (*The Atlantic*, Bruce Ackerman, Ian Ayres, May 7, 2015)

Judge Kennedy (2015). *Debating Democracy, Civil Liberties: Is Corporate Spending on Elections the Equivalent of Free Speech?*, pp. 111

Kahloon, I., (2015). *Outside groups' influence on 2016 election grows, super PAC filings show*, Aug. 3, 2015, (<http://sunlightfoundation.com/blog/2015/08/03/outside-groups-influence-on-2016-election-grows-super-pac-filings-show/>)

Leighley E. Jan (2010). *The oxford handbook: of American elections and political behavior*, Oxford University Press

Miroff B., Seidelman R., Swanstrom T., (2015). *Debating Democracy A Reader in American Politics* ,7<sup>th</sup> ed., Wadsworth, Boston Press, USA

Mueller C. Dennis (2012). *The Oxford Handbook of Capitalism*, Oxford University Press  
Palast Greg, Rall Ted, and the Palast Investigative Fund (2012), *Billionaires & Ballot Bandits*,  
How to steal election in easy 9 step, A Seven Stories Press First Edition

Nelson W. Polsby (2012). *Presidential elections : strategies and structures of American politics* [et al.]. — 13th ed, Published by Rowman & Littlefield Publishers, Inc.

Öhman Magnus and Zainulbhai Hani (2009). *Political Finance Regulation: The Global Experience*, IFES - *Political Finance Regulation: The Global Experience US*

Öhman Magnus and Zainulbhai Hani, *Political Finance Regulation: The Global Experience*,  
Year N/A

Page, B.I., Bartels, M.L., Seawright, J. (2013). *Perspectives on Politics, Democracy and the Policy Preferences of Wealthy Americans- March 2013/ Vol. 11/No. 1*, pp. 51-73

Page, I.B., Seawright, J., Lacombe, M.J. (2015). *Stealth Politics by U.S. Billionaires*, San Francisco, Sept. 2-6, 2015, pp. 2- 40

Patrick Healy And Amy Chozick (2016), In *Democratic Debate*, Hillary Clinton and Bernie Sanders Clash on Immigration, March 9.19 (<http://www.nytimes.com/2016/03/10/us/politics/democratic-debate.html>) & Transcript of the democratic debate in Miami (<http://www.nytimes.com/2016/03/10/us/politics/transcript-democratic-presidential-debate.html>)

Serino, S.,(2016). *Follow the 2016 money with Sunlight's Real-Time Campaign Finance tracker*, Aug. 21, 2015, Sunrise Foundation, (<http://sunlightfoundation.com/blog/2015/08/21/follow-the-2016-money-with-sunlights-real-time-campaign-finance-tracker/>)

Simpser, A.,(2013). *Why Governments and Parties Manipulate Elections: Theory, Practice, and Implications*, Cambridge University Press

Tocqueville de Alexis (2002). *Democracy in America*, The Pennsylvania State University

Vogel, P. Kenneth, Arandsdorf, I.,(2016). *The POLITICO 100: Billionaires dominate 2016-* 02.08.16 , (<http://www.politico.com/story/2016/02/100-billionaires-2016-campaign-finance-218862>)

Watson, L. (2016) *6 years later, the impact of Citizens United still looms large* – Jan. 21, 2016, Sunlight Foundation (<http://sunlightfoundation.com/blog/2016/01/21/6-years-later-the-impact-of-citizens-united-still-looms-large/>)

Winters, J.A. (2011). *Oligarchy, U.S.*: Cambridge University Press

Winters, J.A., Page I.B. (2009). *Perspectives on Politics, Oligarchy in the United States?*- December 2009| Vol. 7/No. 4, pp. 731- 751.

Yeager, M. (2015) *Where are the 1% of the 1% ? Big donors of elections already fueling 2016?* , Sept. 11, 2015, (<http://sunlightfoundation.com/blog/2015/09/11/where-are-the-1-of-the-1-big-donors-of-elections-past-already-fueling-2016/>)