

WHO'S THE LOSER?

The Emergence of Donald Trump and the Ever Changing Look of Presidential Campaign Politics

Bruce Chadwick, Professor of English

THIS was in the 1980s. A television interviewer was talking to Donald Trump about his luxurious mansion, Mar-A-Lago, in sun-soaked Florida. Trump suddenly stunned him by saying, "It would make a great summer White House, wouldn't it?" The next day, there was talk all over the nation that Donald Trump might run for president because of what he said. The day after that, I was sitting in his office in New York interviewing him about the casino business. Part of my job as a reporter at the *New York Daily News*, where I then worked, was to cover the Atlantic City casino and entertainment industry. That office was smaller than the one he currently occupies. It was a clear, sunny day and he looked good. He sat down, leaned forward and folded his hands in front of him as he looked at me. I asked him about his comment on the summer White House. "Are you thinking of running for president?" I asked.

"I don't know. I don't know. If I did, though, everybody would vote for me. That's for sure," he said.

"I think a lot of people would study your positions on policy before they voted for you, if they vote for you," I said, or something like that.

"Come on, everybody would vote for me. I mean everybody," he said, revealing no doubt about the vote outcome in his voice.

It is now about thirty years later. The self-confident, bold as brass Donald has not changed one bit.

And now, indeed, he is running for president.

He announced his candidacy and shook up American politics like nobody has before and might not ever do again. He's an original? He is the factory mold for the original.

Trump shocked everybody twice when he decided to run. He surprised them when he announced his candidacy, and then again, right after that, when he said, "When Mexico sends its people, they're not sending the best...."

continued on page 28

IN THIS ISSUE

LETTER FROM THE EDITOR

3

Time for Some Traffic Problems...

Steven Haber, Editor, *The Academic Forum*
Professor of English as a Second Language

ARTICLES

COVER

WHO'S THE LOSER?

The Emergence of Donald Trump and the Ever Changing Look of Presidential Campaign Politics:

Bruce Chadwick, Professor of English

6

OPTING OUT OF HALLOWEEN

Donna M. Farina, Professor of Multicultural Education

10

IN THE SHADOW OF DEBS

Bernie Sanders and the 2016 Presidential Election

Jason D. Martinek, Associate Professor of History

13

THE DISENFRANCHISEMENT
OF THE AMERICAN ELECTORATE

Guillermo "Will" de Veyga, Assistant Vice President
for Academic Affairs

17

SOCIAL CLASS, DEMOCRACY
AND AMERICAN POLITICS

The Ascendancy of the Billionaire Club.

Godwin Ohiwerei, Professor of Sociology and Anthropology

20

IMMIGRANTS' PARTICIPATION
IN AMERICAN ELECTIONS

Where is their Voice?

Grace Wambu, Assistant Professor of Educational Leadership
and Counseling

Zandile P. Nkabinde, Associate Professor of Special Education

ACADEMIC AFFAIRS ANNOUNCEMENTS

35

New Faculty/Staff Appointments

42

Separately Budgeted Research

44

Call for Papers

45

Academic Forum Masthead

LETTER FROM THE EDITOR

Time for Some Traffic Problems...

WILFREDO LAGARES © 2016

Dr. Steven Haber

As we are in the thick of the presidential primaries at the time of this writing, I am thinking back to another election. On November 5, 2013, I found myself in a voting booth in New Jersey about to do something I had never done before. I had been a lifelong Democrat, raised by parents who were lifelong Democrats, who were in turn raised by Russian Jewish immigrants

whose trade unionism and pre-McCarthy era socialism flowed naturally into the party of FDR and JFK. So the decision to pull the lever for a Republican governor was not an easy one. It seemed to be an affront to my political DNA. But this was no ordinary election.

Exactly one year and two weeks before that election, on October 22, 2012 New Jersey, along with New York City and the entire Northeast faced the most destructive hurricane to hit the region in recorded weather history. Thousands of homes, businesses, and cars were underwater. Half of Manhattan was dark. Power failures affecting millions of people in the region lasted not days but weeks. Entire neighborhoods along the shoreline had been washed away. At least 233 people had died of storm related causes. And in the midst of this devastation, on October 31, one week after the storm had hit, and one week before the national election that would put President Obama back in the White House for a second term, Governor Christie did something that was quite unexpected. He invited the president to New Jersey to tour the worst of the flooded areas to get assurance that the federal government would provide the funds, supplies, and manpower to clean up and rebuild the devastated communities. After the tour, the president pledged that not only would the full force and resources of the federal government be directed to the cleanup and rebuilding effort, but that he personally would guarantee that this would be done as expeditiously as possible.

It is not easy to adequately emphasize the political significance of this moment. After all, it is not unusual for a governor to invite the president to tour a devastated area after a natural disaster. What made this visit so unusual was the timing. Here a Republican governor was offering the Democratic president an extremely valuable media opportunity almost guaranteed to enhance Obama's reputation and popularity just six days prior to the election for his second term of office. Even though in hindsight most analysts would say that Obama

would have beaten Mitt Romney regardless of whether he had come to New Jersey or not, at the time, six days before the election, the president's victory was by no means a foregone conclusion. Christie's decision to invite the president to the state took considerable courage and political will as many of his fellow Republicans would later blame the governor for helping propel their opponent into a second term.

Yet the gamble paid off for Christie in many ways. First, the president, recognizing a quid pro quo when he saw one, was as good as his word, expediting the transfer of needed funds, personnel, and material to New Jersey and the storm damaged region. But for Christie's political career, there could be no better catapult. In an atmosphere of toxic partisanship in Washington where the government in October of 2013 would literally shut down for 16 days due to partisan politics, Governor Christie had not just stepped, but leapt over party lines. By reaching out to the Democratic president on the eve of his re-election, Christie proved that he was more than willing to put the needs of his state above the rancor of partisan politics. And it is not an exaggeration to say that it was this singular act that all but guaranteed his re-election as governor in 2013, winning over not only many independent voters, but even many Democrats, myself included, who saw in Christie's gesture, a moment of courage and integrity that has become all too rare in contemporary politics. It is also safe to say, that not only New Jerseyans, but the entire nation had taken notice of this moment, and that the governor, whose popularity was growing and who seemed destined for a presidential run, if not in 2012, then surely in 2016, would be able to capitalize on this moment for years to come.

But then something almost unbelievable happened. It was September 9, 2013. I had just moved to Fort Lee to a building only a few blocks from the George Washington Bridge. As I drove to work that morning, fortunately heading against the rush hour traffic, I was puzzled as to why the police were directing cars away from the local entrance ramp to the bridge. As I drove up onto the opposite ramp and headed south on the Turnpike, I could see that traffic had backed up for miles as those seeking an alternate route onto the bridge were now jamming all the highway approaches. And as I later learned, all the local roads in Fort Lee had become so impassable with the backed up traffic that not even emergency vehicles could get through. To make matters worse, this was the first day of school for many children adding to the morning rush, the traffic forcing many schools to delay opening. None of this would have seemed that out of the ordinary as traffic jams approaching the GW Bridge are fairly common. But when this scenario repeated itself the next day, and the next day, and the next, and

that there had been no accidents or construction reported, it became clear that something had gone very wrong. The official explanation from the Port Authority was that the ramp closures were part of some mysterious traffic study, the purpose of which nobody seemed able to explain. It would be almost 14 months after Christie's re-election that a federal investigation indicted the governor's then deputy chief of staff, Bridget Kelly along with Christie-appointed Port Authority officials Bill Baroni and David Wildstein for ordering the local bridge access shut down in a deliberate effort to cause traffic jams in the town of Fort Lee. The reason, as suggested by emails subpoenaed by the investigation, was to punish the Democratic Fort Lee mayor Mark Sokolich for his refusal to endorse Christie for re-election.

Although Christie initially denied that this was the reason for the shutdown, or that he had anything to do with it, he later spent more than eight million dollars of the State's money to hire a law firm ostensibly to do a thorough internal investigation. However the results of the report seemed more like a legal brief to clear Christie of any wrongdoing as opposed to getting to the bottom of what actually happened. The report, which was later heavily criticized by the US District Court, failed to include the testimony of key witnesses, including Kelly, Baroni, and Wildstein, or any other Port Authority employees, nor did the attorneys conducting the investigation preserve their original notes of interviews.

Flash forward to the presidential primaries of 2016. In June of 2015, Christie embarked on a nine month run for the Republican nomination. But after embarrassingly weak showings in Iowa and New Hampshire, he ended his campaign on February 10, 2016. Perhaps he had thought that in a national election, not many people outside of the state of New Jersey would take much notice of, nor care about, the scandal now known as Bridge-gate. As he said while campaigning in Iowa, "Let us remember one thing everybody: This was a traffic jam. This was not a murder." Or he believed that he would not be held personally responsible for that debacle. Yet, in both Iowa and New Hampshire, Christie only managed to finish in tenth and sixth places respectively. Christie's poor showing may not have been due to Bridge-gate alone. The New Jersey governor might have seemed too socially moderate for the Conservative wing of the Republican Party. Or perhaps despite Christie's cutting of taxes and spending, there had been no stellar economic recovery or employment boom in New Jersey. But when push came to shove, whether Christie was directly involved or not, neither the big PAC donors nor the public would forget those four days in September when three of his high ranking appointees in a juvenile and reckless act of political revenge took such delight in engineering a traffic jam designed to cripple the streets of a town.

"Time for some traffic problems in Fort Lee," Bridget Kelly wrote to David Wildstein in an e-mail. Time indeed.

While the rise and fall of the governor's political star might read as a cautionary tale to would-be candidates and

their appointees, the larger issue of accountability and trust in our elected officials, and in fact, the entire political process looms large as we enter the 2016 presidential campaign. Public and media cynicism triggered by scandals, distrust in candidates who re-draft their policy positions to pander to whatever group they hope to attract, outrage at the undue influence of wealthy PACs and lobbyists, emotional appeals to xenophobia and prejudice, and the tactics of character assassination, incivility, and mudslinging seem to have taken the electoral process and politics in general to a point where many people have simply thrown up their hands in disgust. But even before the presidential campaigns began, perhaps what has been most offensive to the voting public is the general atmosphere of stagnation in Congress.

Younger voters may not realize that prior to the 1990s, bipartisan support for legislation used to be the norm rather than the exception. If we look back at one of the most significant pieces of legislation of the 20th Century, the Civil Rights Act of 1964 which effectively ended Jim Crow segregation, it is remarkable to see the degree of bipartisanship that went into the passage of that law. In the House 153 Democrats and 136 Republicans voted for the bill. In the Senate 46 Democrats and 27 Republicans voted yes. It is almost impossible to imagine a major bill moving through Congress today with that kind of bipartisan support. Consider, by comparison, the vote on the Affordable Care Act (ACA) which passed in the Senate 60 to 39 with virtually all Democrats and two Independents voting for it and all Republicans voting against it. The House passed the Senate bill with a 219–212 vote on March 21, 2010, with 34 Democrats and all 178 Republicans voting against it. Consider also the government shutdown in October of 2013 when a group of House Republicans, in a desperate attempt to defund provisions of the ACA, refused to pass a budget, virtually holding the government hostage for 16 days until public outrage finally forced a concession. It is estimated that the shutdown cost the U.S. economy 55 billion dollars in lost wages, productivity, and tax revenues, and nearly compromised the government's credit rating.

Perhaps the biggest beneficiary of the voting public's general disgust with the sclerotic atmosphere in Washington and distrust in politicians in general is none other than Donald Trump, who, at the time of this writing, has won early primaries in 18 states and seems poised to win many more. A big part of his appeal, as Bruce Chadwick points out in this issue, is his outsider status. Not a professional politician, not beholden to billionaire PAC donors, Wall Street bankers, or lobbyists, not in lockstep with the GOP faithful on policy issues, not associated with political gridlock, and totally uncensored when it comes to saying what he thinks, Trump's charismatic persona and candor seem to many of his supporters like a fresh wind blowing away not only the toxic smog of gridlock, but also the smoke and mirrors around Washington. It is not so much what Trump has to offer policy wise. His proposals, often outrageous, such as deporting all illegal aliens, banning all

Muslims from immigration, and replacing Obamacare are conspicuously lacking in specifics. Yet none of that seems to matter to his supporters. The perception by many voters is that a charismatic outsider, no matter how inexperienced, racist, sexist, xenophobic, or crude, will be a better choice than the establishment candidates that the party leaders and their financial backers might choose. The perception by many voters is that Trump seems to care about the interests of the working and middle class as opposed to the establishment candidates whose promises to cut taxes, shrink government, and protect trade seem to benefit only the rich. Like customers in Mr. Trump's gaming establishments, a growing number of people seem ready to roll the dice on "The Donald" in the hope that if we just give him a chance, maybe he really can somehow "make America great again" meaning actually making the lives of working class people better as opposed to Mitt Romney who in his 2012 campaign seemed to write off nearly half of the American electorate. Yet whether Trump wins or loses, his growing appeal should remind us that there is great disaffection and distrust in our political system and its leaders, and that needs to be addressed no matter who steps into the Oval Office in 2017.

In this issue of *The Academic Forum*, we examine the landscape of politics, ideology, and the American electorate from a variety of perspectives. Bruce Chadwick, who can trace his personal history with Donald Trump back to the 1980s when he covered Atlantic City as a reporter for *The New York Daily News*, has written on Trump's improbable rise as a serious presidential contender. Jason Martinek writes about the

equally improbable rise of Bernie Sanders to political prominence as a democratic socialist in an era of political conservatism. Donna Farina writes about the risks to American democracy resulting from the circus-like atmosphere of political campaigns. Godwin Ohiwerei writes on the outsized influence of private wealth influencing the political arena. Will de Vega analyzes the disenfranchisement of large segments of the electorate as more than half of those who are eligible either exclude themselves or are excluded from the voting process. In a similar vein, Grace Wambu and Zandile Nkabinde examine barriers to voter participation among recent immigrants who have become naturalized citizens.

The Fall 2016 issue of *The Academic Forum* is seeking articles on the theme of personal possessions and identity. Contributors are invited to select a specific possession, groups of possessions, or artifacts and reflect on their significance in the development of a personal, professional, or cultural identity.

Special thanks to Provost Daniel Julius for his support in bringing back *The Academic Forum* after a three year hiatus. Thanks also to Ellen Quinn for her outstanding work in layout and design. As always, we express our deepest appreciation to all of our contributors for their efforts in producing an outstanding collection of articles. Thanks also to the editorial board: Nurdan Aydin, Alberto Barugel, Gloria Boseman, John Donnellan, Corey Frost, Jimmy Jung, Siyu Liu, Sherrie Madia, Karen Morgan, Wanda Rutledge, Lourdes Sutton, and Deborah Woo. On behalf of the editorial board, we wish the NJCU community a restful and productive summer.

OPTING OUT OF HALLOWEEN

Donna M. Farina, Professor of Multicultural Education

*There's nothing in the streets
Looks any different to me
And the slogans are replaced, by-the-bye
And the parting on the left
Are now parting on the right
And the beards have all grown longer overnight
—The Who, Won't Get Fooled Again*

6 Recently, a well-informed friend wryly commented that this election season in the U.S. is really no different from any other. It is a ritual, a cultural phenomenon like American Halloween—no more significant than that. As is often the case, the most perceptive comments on life in the U.S. come to me from people like my friend, who was not born here and whose experiences elsewhere give her that critical and perceptive eye. My friend's comment reinforced my own serious and considered decision to ignore this election season completely, as the only recourse left open to a concerned global citizen. I had to choose to do the most responsible thing I could to get ready to vote in November. So I am opting out of Halloween.

The world came into my consciousness for the first time with the closing of the Suez Canal at the beginning of the 1967 Six-Day War between faraway and unknown Egypt and Israel. As a ten-year-old who read the *Chicago Sun Times* daily, I thought most about the amount of sand that was filling the Suez Canal. A year later I began to think more about war when Soviet tanks rolled in to crush Prague spring. I had begun to have vague ideas about oppression and racism before Prague. In 1966, I was nine and apparently not reading the newspaper yet, but I remember watching on TV when protesters from the Congress of Racial Equality (CORE) marched on Cicero, Illinois (Film Group, Inc., 1966). Back then I didn't connect Cicero with *the world* because it was such a familiar place—where my aunt lived. Now I understand that these disparate world events, the first three of my memory, were a bellwether of my current concerns as an adult voter. While certainly a lifetime of events shapes any person's political consciousness,

today my main voting interests revolve around things that struck me as a child: the waste and destruction that results from war, the oppression of peoples, and the hope that people everywhere stubbornly try to maintain as they strive to make a difference and improve their own reality.

In the 1981 French version of Halloween, Francois Mitterrand was elected and I watched how, from the windows of Strasbourg apartments, people expressed hope by blasting the *Internationale* from stereo speakers: *Foule esclave, debout, debout / Le monde va changer de base* (Stand up, enslaved crowd/ the world will fundamentally change). Barack Obama's 2008 "Yes, We Can" Halloween shared the same hopeful note. However, these respective political campaigns told us almost nothing about the hard work of either presidency, about the world problems these leaders would encounter and how they would address them. In 1989, on my way home after nine months in the Soviet Union, I stopped off in Europe to visit



A scene from the film, *Cicero March* (Film Group, Inc., 1966).
Courtesy: Chicago Film Archives: used with permission.



Photo by Kremlin.ru, CC BY 4.0,
<https://commons.wikimedia.org/w/index.php?curid=5377898>

friends. Having been completely cut off from current events while in Leningrad, I was unaware of the protests taking place in Beijing and elsewhere in China. As we watched the TV, my French friends echoed the hope expressed by the Chinese students, a hope that my freshly gained Soviet experience told me would not be realized. By the time I was back on American soil, the tanks had rolled into Tiananmen Square and up to 800 civilian lives had been lost. Halloween does nothing for those of us who want to vote our understanding of Tiananmen Square.

Two years later American TV news broadcasted the attempt of Communist Party hardliners to oust Soviet president Mikhail Gorbachev. Gorbachev became a virtual prisoner of the KGB while a state of emergency was declared in Moscow; 250,000 pairs of handcuffs had been ordered a few days prior to aid in the anticipated arrests (Garcelon, 2005; Sebestyen, 2011). The conspirators, it turns out, did not have the support they thought they would—it is impossible to forget the image of Boris Yeltsin, then president of the Russian Federation, standing on a tank in front of the Russian Parliament (“White House”) as he addressed the thousands of

people gathered. But this optimistic beginning did not lead to the fulfillment of my own hope for the Russian people. Almost twenty-five years later, Russia has “no mass participation in political life and a news media that is far from free” (Sebestyen, 2011). And the post-Soviet world is a place where nationalism—the antonym of hope—thrives. Putin has successfully turned Russian public opinion as he positioned his nation against the U.S. and Europe.

Back in the West, lots of positioning is also going on. *The Economist* recently wrote “Anti-Immigrant Populism: The March of Europe’s Little Trumps” (2015), about movements in Sweden, France, the Netherlands, Germany, and Italy. In Hungary, on the surface there is a seemingly easy historical explanation for the anti-refugee popularity: the legacy of the Soviet bloc and Hungary’s alliance with the Nazis gives them a lack of experience with democratic values. But what about Sweden where the anti-immigrant Sweden Democrats, with roots in the country’s neo-Nazi movement, is now the country’s largest party (Groll, 2015)? Demagogues have always existed, but why are they so popular right now? While the refugee crisis in Europe has played a role, is that the only reason?

A vote is a very weighty matter, and time is finite. Recently, at New Jersey City University’s 27th Annual Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr. Celebration Luncheon,¹ keynote speaker Ryan Haygood asked, “What time is it? And what are we supposed to do with this time?” He elaborated, “The stakes are too high to sit on the sidelines in the democratic process.” Dostoevsky wrote *Crime and Punishment* and *The Gambler* because he had a gambling addiction and owed money; most of us are Dostoevskys of time, behind on getting ready for our next class or providing students with feedback, having gambled our time away on something we considered either equally important—or possibly just more entertaining, like Halloween. Opting out of Halloween should never mean sitting on the sidelines if one is committed to achieving an informed vote in November. When time is freed up—from not reading news articles on U.S. politics, from not watching debates, from not listening to the morning recap of the most recent politician’s comment on the radio, and from not listening even to the State of the Union address or to the results from Iowa and New Hampshire—then can we prepare our vote with this time?

What time is it in Aleppo, and what are we supposed to do with Aleppo? This is a place where, as I write, 300,000 people are in danger of being cut off from food by Syrian government forces that have been newly empowered by Russian bombings. What time was it in the U.S. and in Europe before and during the unfolding of Aleppo? How did the U.S. and Europe gamble with their time? If there was no time available for Aleppo over the past few years will there now be time for the refugees?

*A vote is a very
weighty matter,
and time is finite.*



Copyright The Jersey Journal: used with permission.



Courtesy: Joseph Passantino, Bayonne Community News: used with permission.

8

Do you know what time it is in Donetsk, a city that a few years ago had a vibrant and busy metropolitan area of over two million people, once the fifth largest city in Ukraine? Where is Ukraine? (Educated Americans sometimes ask me.) Will there ever be any time for Ukraine? What time is it, for that matter, in Abkhazia?

What time is it in Bayonne, New Jersey? I recently attended the Zoning Board of Adjustment meeting in my city of residence, to support a Muslim group trying to receive permission to open a community center, despite intense local opposition.² The local opposition group proclaimed in a circulating flyer: “Remember 9/11” and “Don’t let the city council turn our beloved East Side into the next Dearborn, MI.” After the meeting I engaged with Gene Woods, a high school teacher who really knows what time it is. He has incorporated these local events as well as other aspects of diversity education into the social studies curriculum for his students, some of whom I also met at the Zoning Board meeting. I can’t wait until Mr. Woods’ students are old enough to vote, because they are learning *the world*.

During a world language model program evaluation for the New Jersey Department of Education, I met more young people who know what time it is. Students as young as nine years old explained to me why they needed to be fluent in a world language, so that they could “make friends” with people who don’t know English and so that they could visit other countries. These children will go to college one day and one day they will vote. They will be privileged over New Jersey City University students because of their opportunities to learn language. At NJCU, *our watch is running slow*—we do not yet have a foreign language requirement for graduation.

Those of us who are lucky enough to be in the profession of educating others can find time to teach *the world*, inside and outside of the classroom. Education may be the only real antidote to the civic irresponsibility and international ignorance that leads people to vote according to Halloween. The education we provide must give students the capacity, through a global perspective, to examine the silly things and the serious

things that happen in that part of the world called the U.S., as well as elsewhere. Since I am not a political science professor or a history professor, in the classroom I won’t be analyzing Putin’s latest law fining people who participate in demonstrations. Since I am not a business professor, I won’t be discussing the parameters of consumer attraction to the 100 ml, sleek black bottles of “Leaders Number One,” a new perfume inspired by Putin that went on sale in December (Walker, 2015).

As a professor of multicultural education who helps train ESL, bilingual, and world language teachers, I can talk about my recent sabbatical experiences to help my graduate students become global citizens. Today I had the time to mention in class the salaries and working conditions of teachers of language in the public schools of Tbilisi, Republic of Georgia; next week I’ll remember to mention what teachers in Tbilisi do to assist children with disabilities. Or, I might find a little time to explain why the Republic of Georgia has gotten serious about bilingual education on its eastern borders, where citizens of Azerbaijani or Armenian ethnicity do not speak the national language (i.e., Georgian).

Discussions such as these with my graduate students have everything *in the world* to do with the definition of and development of democratic values, and with the preparation for casting a vote. Dialoging with present or future teachers at New Jersey City University helps them maintain a more nuanced perspective on what happens in their own school, in Jersey City, Union City, or New Brunswick. Potentially, such discussions might help teachers make explicit the cultural values surrounding schooling and teaching in this country. I might also find the time, perhaps after class, to talk about how upheaval in a country like Syria will affect efforts to educate immigrant children right here in New Jersey. These interactions are important on another level, because my students must receive the message that information about their or their parents’ home countries is not just significant but absolutely necessary for those committed to intelligent, informed voting. If I don’t know anything about a student’s home country, I can listen or ask questions and learn something new, to improve my own global perspective.

The well prepared vote demands continuous engagement—inside and outside of the classroom—in the development of an imperfect, incomplete, and constantly changing international awareness. This is the only counterpoint I have to Halloween.

REFERENCES

- Anti-immigrant populism: The march of Europe's little Trumps. (2015, December 12–18). *The Economist*, 52-53.
- Film Group, Inc. (1966). *Cicero March*. (Available from Chicago Film Archives, http://www.chicagofilmarchives.org/collections/index.php/Detail/Object/Show/object_id/2873)
- Garcelon, M. (2005). *Revolutionary passage: From Soviet to post-Soviet Russia, 1985-2000*. Philadelphia: Temple University Press.
- Groll, E. (2015, August 20). Shock poll rates Sweden's anti-immigrant right-wing party as country's largest. *ForeignPolicy.com*. Retrieved from <http://foreignpolicy.com>

- [/2015/08/20/shock-poll-rates-swedens-anti-immigrant-right-wing-party-as-countrys-largest/?wp_login_redirect=0](http://foreignpolicy.com/2015/08/20/shock-poll-rates-swedens-anti-immigrant-right-wing-party-as-countrys-largest/?wp_login_redirect=0)
- Sebestyen, V. (2011, August 20). The K.G.B.'s bathhouse plot. *New York Times Sunday Review*. Retrieved from http://www.nytimes.com/2011/08/21/opinion/sunday/the-soviet-coup-that-failed.html?_r=0
- Walker, S. (2015, December 24). Put on some Putin: Russian president inspires new perfume. *The Guardian*. Retrieved from <http://www.theguardian.com/world/2015/dec/24/vladimir-putin-perfume-leaders-number-one>

NOTES

- 1 The Bayonne Zoning Board hearing will be continued on March 14.

IN THE SHADOW OF DEBS

Bernie Sanders and the 2016 Presidential Election

Jason D. Martinek, Associate Professor of History

Eugene V. Debs¹, an outspoken Socialist Party leader of the early 20th century, casts a shadow over the 2016 presidential election. A recording of a documentary that Bernie Sanders made in 1979 has made its rounds among pundits and politicians. If you haven't listened to the documentary, it is worthwhile if for no other reason than Sanders cast himself as the voice of Debs. On the one hand, right-wing pundits have played up Sanders' "hero worship" of Debs, using it to stress the extent of the threat that Sanders poses to the status quo. On the other, left-wing pundits have downplayed it, emphasizing the chasm between Sanders' progressive but reformist agenda and Debs' truly revolutionary one. Sanders, as we will see, is no Debs.

IO It's refreshing to see an American politician unabashedly embrace the word socialism—yes, the “S” word, whose name like Voldemort could not for a long time be uttered for fear of dire consequences. Yet, as Sanders' campaign team has noted, they have had a harder time getting media attention than the other candidates, thus limiting the extent to which socialism is the central issue of this election cycle, at least thus far [February, 2016]. If Sanders gains momentum following early caucus victories, this will certainly change. Indeed, the close contest between Hillary Clinton and Sanders in Iowa has made winning over the hearts and minds of the party's progressives a campaign priority for Clinton. She is now trying to sell herself as an economic populist.

The “S” word is coming out of the shadows. Sanders said in his autobiography *Outsider in the White House*, “[Debs] remains a hero of mine.... A plaque commemorating him hangs on the wall in my Washington office.”² Sanders doesn't hedge on this potentially controversial admission. Nor does Sanders try to explain away his admiration for Debs in the revised edition of the autobiography. As even his political opponents recognize, Sanders is a man of great conviction.

For conservatives, redbaiting Sanders has become a kind of national pastime. Donald Trump, with his usual bluntness, recently told listeners of Michael Savage's radio show, a Sanders victory will “destroy the fabric of what we are.”³ Rush Limbaugh is also quick to red bait Sanders, but sees his threat to the established order as minimal. “He's a nice old codger, and he's an honest but

insignificant little socialist from Vermont.... He's wrong about everything, but he's harmless.”⁴ Ann Coulter argues that Sanders has a better shot at winning the White House than Clinton in the general election, and if that happens it will usher in a liberal-leftist apocalypse. Trump is her antidote to this end-of-days prophecy.

In an October 2015 article published in the *National Review*, Ethics and Public Policy Center fellow Stanley Kurtz argues that everything you need to know about Sanders can be learned from his documentary on Debs:

Given that Sanders holds out Debs as a hero in this documentary, given the complete harmony between the documentary's point of view and Debs' own point of view, given Sanders' failure to create any distance between the documentary itself and Debs' most controversial statements and actions, and given Sanders' proud invocation of the documentary and his admitted hero-worship of Debs twenty years after the film was made, it seems fair to say that this documentary offers an important window onto Bernie Sanders' socialism.⁵

Kurtz highlights Debs' support for the Bolshevik Revolution as being particularly prescient of Sanders' America. Sanders, he continues, seems to relish repeating Debs' most inflammatory lines such as:

“[W]hile there is a lower class I am in it, while there is a criminal element, I am of it, and while there is a soul in prison, I am not free.”

"Why should working people support the Socialist Party? Because it is the only party unequivocally committed to their economic interests, to the abolition of the wage system, and the freedom of the workers from exploitation and every other species of servitude."

"I am not a capitalist soldier. I am a proletariat revolutionist."⁶

For Kurtz, Sanders is Debs incarnate.

However, Sanders' rhetoric sounds downright tame compared to Debs'. If conservatives like Kurtz knew Debs' writings better, they would link Sanders to the Socialist Party leader's most incendiary statements. None were more inflammatory than his articles written in response to the 1906 extradition and arrest of Industrial Workers of the World founder William "Big Bill" Haywood for his alleged role in the murder of former Idaho governor Frank Steunenberg. The article "Arouse, ye Slaves!" culminates with the threat that if Haywood and his co-defendants are murdered, then "a million revolutionists, at least, will meet them [the murderers] with guns." He continues:

They have done their best and their worst to crush and enslave us. Their politicians have betrayed us, their courts have thrown us into jail without trial and their soldiers have shot our comrades dead in their tracks. ...Let them dare to execute their devilish plot and every state in this union will resound with the tramp of revolution.⁷

Even as Sanders talks tough about Wall Street, his rhetoric does not come near the axis-of-evil, fire-and-brimstone view that Debs presented. Sanders focuses on raising the minimum wage whereas Debs focused on overthrowing the entire wage system. Debs would have derided the wage adjustment strategy as a palliative that did little to deal with the root cause of inequality and poverty. Evolution, not revolution.

Debs minced no words when it came to reformers posing as socialists, "They are 'Socialists' for no other purpose than to emasculate Socialism."⁸ Debs often butted heads with Milwaukee socialist Victor Berger, the first socialist elected to the U.S. Congress in 1910. Sanders, like Berger, believes in a step-at-a-time approach to socialism. The transformation would occur gradually within the framework of a mixed economy, part capitalist, part socialist. Debs described this kind of approach as "sewer socialism," and risked being co-opted and undermined by those in the corridors of power.

There is a significant point upon which Debs and Sanders agree. Both place class above race and gender as the central axis of political action, claiming that class equality will bring racial and gender equality. They embody the "coalition-building" approach to politics with class serving as the unifying issue that brings everyone together. As Sanders puts it:

It's refreshing to see an American politician unabashedly embrace the word 'socialism.'

Imagine. Black and white, Hispanic and Asian, straight and gay, middle class and low income, native and immigrant coming together to create an economy that worked well for the majority, not just the rich; a health care system that guaranteed health care for all, not huge profits for insurance and pharmaceutical companies; federal funding for education, not B-2 bombers; a tax system that favored workers, not the wealthy and multinational corporations. People coming together for the common good.⁹

In both their minds, plutocrats (Debs' favorite term) and oligarchs (Sanders') pose the greatest danger to democracy. Even at his angriest, Sanders' rhetoric does not reach the emotional fury of Debs'. Nonetheless, Sanders' frustration and anger with the system are unambiguous:

"Today, America is in danger of becoming an oligarchy. ... It seems clear that a smaller and smaller number of citizens are determining our nation's future. The poor are disenfranchised, not by law, but in fact. The young think that voting has little to do with them or their prospects. Ordinary citizens have decided the political process is likely to fail them, and so they vote in ever smaller numbers."¹⁰

The first stage of Sanders' political revolution is actually quite modest. It is to get out the vote. Like a character from a feel-good Frank Capra film, he believes that the future of democracy is too important to squander by failing to vote on Election Day. For him, increased voter participation, especially among working and lower middle-class voters, is the make-it-or-break-it factor in his campaign for the Democratic nomination and the future of progressive politics in the United States.

Debs, unlike Sanders, did not get bogged down by policy discussions. He was a dreamer who believed that when the best impulses of the human spirit were unleashed, cooperation would replace competition, equality would replace exploitation, and yes, the "S" word would replace capitalism. Debs shared William Morris' goal of socialism, that it should seek the "completest physical, moral, and intellectual development of every human being as the highest form of social state, as the best and truest happiness for every individual and for every class, where, as none need overwork, so none shall be able to force others to work for their profit."¹¹

Sanders is, by contrast, a pragmatist. He has an idealistic vision of the future to be sure, but he also understands the frustrating realities of Washington politics. He knows that ending corporate welfare, creating a single-payer health care system, breaking media monopolies, and offering free higher education

are not easily implemented in a divided government such as we have today. But it is possible for change to occur—slowly perhaps—but possible.

Marxian socialists are just as quick to reject Sanders' links

II

to the Debsian tradition as conservatives are to link them together. The Democratic Party is too much a part of the established order to become the political arm of the American Left, so the gist of the Marxian argument goes. Only independent political action via a third party will ensure that the interests of the people themselves prevail. Sanders, by contrast, will not radicalize the Democratic Party. Instead, the Democratic Party will serve as a moderating force on him. Activist Howie Hawkins in the *Socialist Worker* writes that, “Sanders has now gone into coalition with the billionaire class he professes to oppose and that finances the Democratic Party.” The Debsian socialist tradition is one of independent political action, Hawkins continues, where voters’ full discontent with the status quo can be registered.¹²

Perhaps it is telling that Sanders’ November 2015 speech in which he explains his democratic socialist vision for America does not make mention of Debs. Instead, it invokes President Franklin D. Roosevelt several times, highlighting the ways in which democratic socialism represents the fulfillment of FDR’s New Deal for the American people. Indeed, unlike Debs, the concept of the mixed economy is key to Sanders’ understanding of American development. For Debs, there was capitalism or socialism. For Sanders, capitalism and socialism co-exist in a mixed economy where each shapes aspects of our current system. Sometimes the pendulum swings more in the capitalist direction and at other times more in the socialist. Sanders thinks it is time for the pendulum to swing a little bit to the left of center.

12

Sanders’ speech on democratic socialism asks Americans to think more consciously about how socialist ideas have made positive contributions to our nation’s development. Democratic socialism is not a European import, but part and parcel of the American experience. In this view, a new New Deal represents America’s salvation. Instead of working to dismantle what’s left of it, Sanders argues, the time has come to build on it and better ensure that government is, and remains, responsible and accountable to the people themselves.

Socialism—as manifest in labor legislation, unemployment insurance, and strong business regulations—has, Sanders writes, “...become the fabric of our nation and the foundation of the middle class.”¹³ Wealth redistribution through greater progressive taxation will serve as a corrective to the extreme imbalance between the haves and have-nots, but by no means eradicate it.

Thus, compared to Debs, Sanders’ democratic socialist propositions are transformative—progressive, but not revolutionary. Sanders himself frames his social-democratic vision as building much more on the legacy of Roosevelt than Debs. He is not a leftwing extremist. Yet, in this political climate where centrists are cast as extremists, Sanders becomes the very embodiment of the greatest threat to the so-called American way of life.

In case you’re wondering, so far I’ve donated \$3.00 to the Bernie Sanders campaign. I did so when the campaign was offering copies of *Outsider in the White House* in exchange for donations. With a \$16.95 list price and free shipping, I think I made a deal of which Trump would be proud.

NOTES

- 1 Outspoken leader of the labor movement, Eugene Debs opposed Woodrow Wilson as the Socialist Party candidate in the 1912 Presidential Election. Later, he would continue to rally against Wilson and his decision to take America into war and be jailed for it under the Espionage Act. (http://www.pbs.org/wgbh/amex/wilson/peoplevents/p_debs.html)
- 2 Bernie Sanders, *Outsider in the White House* (London: Verso Press, 2015), 27.
- 3 Donald Trump, “‘Communist’ Bernie Sanders Will Destroy the Fabric of What We Are,” *Right-Wing Watch*, 27 January 2016, <http://www.rightwingwatch.org/content/donald-trump-communist-bernie-sanders-will-destroy-fabric-what-we-are>.
- 4 Rush Limbaugh, “Bernie Sanders, Phenomenon?,” *The Rush Limbaugh Show*, 11 August 2015, http://www.rushlimbaugh.com/daily/2015/08/11/bernie_sanders_phenomenon.
- 5 Stanley Kurtz, “Bernie Sanders’ Documentary on Eugene Debs,” *The National Review*, 20 October 2015, <http://www.nationalreview.com/corner/425839/bernie-sanders-documentary-eugene-debs>.
- 6 Bernie Sanders, “Eugene V. Debs: Trade Unionist, Socialist, Revolutionary, 1855-1926” (New York: Folkways Records, 1979), 2, 5.
- 7 Eugene V. Debs, “Arouse, Ye Slaves,” *Debs: His Life, Writings, and Speeches* (Girard, KS: Appeal to Reason Publishing, 1908), 310-1.
- 8 Debs, “Socialists Who Would Emascuate Socialism,” *Social Democratic Herald*, 3, no. 45 (April 1901):1.
- 9 Sanders, *Outsider in the White House*, 163.
- 10 Ibid, 279.
- 11 William Morris and H. M. Hyndman, *A Summary of the Principles of Socialism* (London: Modern Press, 1884), 56.
- 12 Howie Hawkins, “Bernie Sanders Is No Eugene Debs,” *Socialist Worker*, 26 May 2015, <http://socialistworker.org/2015/05/26/bernie-sanders-is-no-eugene-debs>.
- 13 Sanders, “Senator Bernie Sanders on Democratic Socialism in the United States,” *Bernie 2016*, 19 November 2015, <https://berniesanders.com/democratic-socialism-in-the-United-states/>.

THE DISENFRANCHISEMENT OF THE AMERICAN ELECTORATE

Guillermo “Will” de Veyga, Assistant Vice President for Academic Affairs

“Fifty percent of Americans don’t vote; fifty percent don’t read newspapers... Let’s hope they are the same fifty percent.”

– Gore Vidal

INTRODUCTION

As another election draws near, many questions arise again. But beyond the obvious question of who may win and who may lose, in the United States there is a larger issue that deals with voter turnout. The 2014 midterm elections marked a sad point in American history when voter turnout was the lowest it had been in over seven decades. In fact, the last time numbers this low were registered was during the Second World War. Voter turnout in 2014 across the U.S. averaged 36 percent (United States Election Project). In all but seven states, less than half of the eligible population voted, and not one state reached 60 percent of voter participation. While some may argue that voter participation tends to be lower in midterm elections (since the stakes are not as high), one can look at the results from New York State in the 2014 midterm election, where voter turnout was below 29 percent, even though there were three state-wide races in play, including the gubernatorial one, as well as 27 house races (The Worst, 2014). These numbers are low, even by standards of midterm elections, where the percentage of voters (in the last 45 years) has remained around 40 percent (United States Election Project).

13

For a variety of reasons, the United States has consistently ranked among the lowest in voter participation of those countries in the Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development (OECD). Countries at the higher end of the scale such as Belgium and Turkey are reported as having voter participation rates of 87 and 86.5 percent respectively. This paper attempts to clarify some of the reasons for the low voter turnout in the U.S. and outline some potential solutions that have been identified in order to increase it.

VOTER REGISTRATION

In the United States many people believe that one of the main reasons associated with low voter turnout has to do with the fact that citizens are required to register in order to vote. Personally, as someone who has lived in three other (democratic) countries around the world, I found this to be a shocking practice. In other democracies, citizens do not have to register in order to vote. Registration is something that occurs automatically. The government has a list of all eligible citizens and

their polling locations, thus allowing any eligible voter to simply show up and vote.

France, for example, registers all citizens automatically when they turn 18 years old. The simplification of this process makes the process of voting effortless and more appealing. In the United States, voters must register in advance before they can cast a vote. When voters do not register, they often cannot vote, since not every state offers the ability to register at the polling station.

Some may argue that it should be a citizen's civil duty to register (as it should be a citizen's responsibility to keep abreast of political candidates and issues in order to vote); however, this paper aims to evaluate the issue of low voter turnout and identify solutions. It can be argued that more citizens would vote if the required steps for this process were simplified or eliminated.

The Brennan Center for Justice, a non-partisan public policy and law institute, ranked countries based on what level of responsibility they took for registering their voters. At the higher end of the spectrum were the European democracies and countries such as Australia, New Zealand, Argentina, and Peru; and at the lower end were countries such as The Bahamas, Belize, Burundi, and the U.S. It should be mentioned that even Iraq, in its very first election, created a voter registration system (Gerken, 2013).

14

So why does the U.S. require voter self-registration? Alexander Keyssar (2009) explained that the practice dates back to the early 19th century when the United States was a magnet for world immigration. Keyssar explained that this practice was implemented due to the fact that there needed to be a measure in place to ensure that only U.S. citizens were voting during elections. But Keyssar also showed that the practice served another purpose, and that was to diminish the level of voter participation (among those who were eligible to vote) "...Many poor citizens were not included on the voter rolls; since they were often not home when the assessors came by, which was typically during the work day."

Heather Gerken (2013) explained that one of the major problems with the U.S. registration process is a vastly-inefficient and antiquated paperwork process. In most states, registration applications are still filled out via hard-copies leading to excessive and tedious paperwork that needs to be processed by hand. Between 2006 and 2008 alone, for example, states processed 60 million voter registration applications, most of which were in paper form. Paper applications must be manually entered into a database, inevitably introducing human-error into the process, and thus, resulting in lost entries and inaccuracies. All of these problems create further complications which need to be remedied. A Massachusetts Institute of

Technology study estimated that in the 2008 election, 5.7 million voters had registration problems which they needed to resolve before being able to vote, and 2.2 million voters were unable to vote due to such registration problems. Considering the volume of tasks that we currently perform online, why can't this process be streamlined and be done via the Internet? If this was done, many issues in terms of voter registration would automatically be solved.

HOW SINGLE-MEMBER DISTRICT-PLURALITY AFFECTS VOTER TURNOUT

The United States uses the Single-Member District-Plurality (SMDP) system, or "Winner Takes All." What this basically means is that voters cast their votes for one of the candidates running, and the candidate who receives the highest number of votes wins the entire district. Problems with this system include the discouragement of minority political parties (and with that, often, their followers as well) in the electoral process, as well as the fact that all voices within a district are

ultimately represented by one person, even when that person may not have won the majority of votes in the constituency. In fact, most democracies in the world do not exercise SMDP and instead prefer a proportional representation model, where seats in an election are allocated based on the percentage of votes that a party or candidate receives. To further illustrate why SMDP can be problematic, one can

The most common response ... Americans provide when asked why they do not vote is that they are "too busy."

look at the 1992 presidential election, when Ross Perot (running as an Independent) received almost 20 million votes (approximately 8 percent of the total population), yet neither he nor his party received any representation (Schlesinger and Israel, 2011).

SMDP can not only disenfranchise minority voters, but also those who do not identify themselves with any of the parties. In 2012, a *USA Today* poll showed that 42 percent of people who did not vote said that this was due to a lack of differences between the two parties (Democratic and Republican). These differences can include everything from gender and race to political stances and beliefs. To this effect, Leighley and Nagler (2013) noted that voters who can see a greater difference between candidates are more likely to vote. If the United States looked to implement proportional representation, new parties would appear to represent the interests of the many constituencies that live in the U.S. (e.g. African-Americans, Evangelicals, Methodists, Hispanics, etc.) This would most likely increase voter participation, especially as it pertains to minority groups; however, there would be consequences to consider for this benefit, in that governing would become more difficult due to coalitions being needed (with more political parties arising and getting into power).

THE DISENFRANCHISEMENT OF FELONS

The United States and its treatment of felons is peculiar to say the least. The U.S. is the only country where states can have their felons barred for life from voting. Procedures vary from state to state, and are often related to the type of crime that the felons were convicted of (Taylor, 2014). Moreover, many states do not allow felons to vote from prison with the exceptions being Maine and Vermont. Uggen et al (2012) found that approximately 2.5 percent of the eligible voting population of the United States was disenfranchised due to a conviction. Approximately half of this group, 1.2 percent (2.6 million), were no longer in prison but lived in states that did not allow voter registration for those previously convicted of a felony.

Uggen et al (2012) showed how felon disenfranchisement is more prominent in the U.S. than in other democracies, especially on the basis of region and race. In terms of the regional disparity, their study was able to demonstrate that more than three million citizens (convicts and ex-convicts), who were yet to regain their rights to vote, were concentrated in six contiguous southern states: Virginia, Mississippi, Alabama, Kentucky, Tennessee, and Florida. In addition, felon disenfranchisement further affects racial inequality. For example, 23 percent of African-Americans in Florida, 22 percent in Kentucky, and 20 percent in Virginia are currently ineligible to vote due to prior felony convictions. Moreover, the rate of disenfranchisement for African-Americans, when compared to the non-African-American population, was four times higher. The national incarceration rate for whites is 412 per 100,000, for African-Americans it is 2,290 per 100,000, and for Hispanics it is 742 per 100,000 (Harrison and Beck, 2005). This is problematic since the United States incarcerates more people than any other democracy in the world, and as shown, minorities are incarcerated at a much higher rate.

In 2007, Mauer and King (2007) showed that there were 2.2 million inmates in the United States; the staggering statistic was that of those 2.2 million, 900,000 were African-Americans. This represented almost 41 percent of the population inside the nation's prisons. Moreover, data from the Bureau of Justice Statistics showed that one in six black men had been incarcerated by 2001, and that if the current trend were to continue, one in three black children born in 2003 should expect to spend time in prison during their lifetime (Bonczar, 2003). This is a problem that does not solely affect African-Americans. Mauer and King (2007) explained that in 2005 Hispanics comprised 20 percent of the population in the nation's prisons. This meant that among Hispanic children born in 2003, one in six males and one in 45 females would expect to go to prison in their lifetime (Bonczar, 2003) with these rates being more than twice those of non-Hispanic whites.

As felons continue to struggle to retain or regain their voting rights, and as long as minorities (particularly African-Americans) continue to be incarcerated at a higher rate than any other group in the United States, how can the nation ever expect to have a fair and balanced electorate?

AMERICANS ARE TOO BUSY TO VOTE...

The most common response that many Americans provide when asked why they do not vote is that they are "too busy." People who say they are too busy often mean that they cannot afford to miss work to be able to vote. Why can't this problem be solved in order to increase voter participation? The notion that Election Day has to remain on the first Tuesday after the first Monday in November is an archaic concept. This custom started back in 1845 when many Americans lived in rural areas and Tuesday was chosen because Sunday was accepted to be a day of worship, and Monday was a day that could be used as the travel day to get to the polling station. However, nowadays people do not need an entire day to travel in order to vote. Therefore, why can't Congress move Election Day to the weekend? It would not necessarily need to be a Sunday if the notion of a "universal worship day" is to be maintained. Could holding Election Day on a Saturday, for instance, potentially help in increasing voter turnout? In the United States, doing away with some aspects of its past history has proven difficult to say the least. Consequently, instead of going this route, what if Congress decided to make Election Day a national holiday? The main argument against doing this would be the cost to employers who would be required to pay employees for a day off. However, probably the best argument as to how this could and should be done was put forth by Martin Wattenberg (1998) when he explained that Election Day could potentially be moved to a day in November which is already a national holiday—Veterans Day (often celebrated on November 11). The reasoning behind this would be that our veterans fight (and fought) for the democratic rights of this country, and this would be a good way to honor them. The new national holiday could become Veterans' Democracy Day, and this would show the citizens of the United States that the country places a strong value on voting (Wattenberg, 1998).

Furthermore, the idea of having Election Day named as a national holiday, or simply holding Election Day on a weekend, is something which is already implemented by other democracies—New Zealand, Austria and Germany to name a few—all of which have significantly higher voter turnouts than the United States.

IS COMPULSORY VOTING A SOLUTION?

The idea of compulsory voting is by no means a new one. It basically means that every citizen is expected and obliged to vote in elections. In fact, Belgium, the country with the highest voter turnout according to the Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development, introduced compulsory voting back in 1892. The next countries to do so were Argentina in 1912 and Australia in 1924. In Argentina, President Roque Saenz Peña was concerned that there were two majorities growing in the voting population, the workers and the anarchists. Thus, by instituting this law, he hoped to ensure that all minorities would be fairly represented in government.

Australia instituted compulsory voting after voter turnout fell below 58 percent in the 1922 election. Since compulsory voting was instituted, Australia's voting rate has never fallen below 90 percent, even though the maximum fine for not voting is 30 dollars, and judges accept basically any excuse to miss a vote (Wattenberg, 1998). Then there are countries like the Netherlands and Venezuela which at one time implemented compulsory voting, but have since done away with it. There is also the case of France, where voting is only compulsory for the midterm (senate) elections, since the assumption is that people's interest tends to be lower for the mid-cycle election than for the presidential one.

Still, there are two main arguments against compulsory voting. The first is that when everyone is forced to vote, people who have no knowledge of the candidates or issues, or do not care about an election, would now be forced to cast a ballot. This can be problematic for candidates because they need to find a new way to engage this constituency, and also because uneducated voters can swing the result of an election. The other argument is that not voting is a choice, and forcing people to vote is infringing on their civil liberties. However, there is a simple solution for this. If a citizen does not want to vote (assuming that they do not like any of the candidates), then they can cast a null or spoilt vote, which would be their way of expressing dissatisfaction or even disinterest with the establishment.

CONCLUSION

16

Not every idea introduced in this paper can (or should) be tackled immediately, but these suggestions represent progressive steps that the United States could take in order to increase its voter turnout. As things stand, the electorate is disenfranchised due to a variety of reasons: the requirement that citizens must self-register, the paper-based registration process which can be complicated and flawed, single-member district-plurality that excludes the representation of minor political parties, the disenfranchisement of felons and ex-felons, the belief among citizens that there is no difference among the candidates, and finally the inconvenience of having to vote only on Election Day.

However, certain initiatives can be explored in order to increase the number of people who show up to vote, ranging from fairly easy and straightforward solutions (e.g. changing the date of Election Day to a weekend or naming Election Day as a national holiday, thus allowing even more people access to the polls when they would have otherwise been working) to considerably more intricate solutions; e.g. transitioning from a paper-based registration system to a modern and much-needed electronic system, or introducing compulsory voting, and implementing the stipulations that would

accompany it. Overall, U.S. voter turnout is remarkably poor when compared to other democratic nations around the world, but implementing some of the policies that those countries have in place and/or employing new practices would undoubtedly improve voter turnout rates.

REFERENCES

- Bonczar, T. P. (2003). Prevalence of Imprisonment in the US Population, 1974-2001.
- Clement, S. (2015). Why Don't Americans Vote? We Are Too Busy. *The Washington Post*. Retrieved from: <https://www.washingtonpost.com/news/the-fix/wp/2015/07/17/why-dont-americans-vote-were-too-busy/>
- Gerken, H.K. (2013). Make It Easy: The Case For Automatic Registration. *Democracy, a journal of ideas*. Number 28. Retrieved from: <http://democracyjournal.org/magazine/28/make-it-easy-the-case-for-automatic-registration/>
- Harrison, P. M., & Beck, A. J. (2006). Prison and jail inmates at midyear 2005 (NCJ 213133). *US Department of Justice, Bureau of Justice Statistics*, Washington, DC.
- Jankowski, L. W. (1992). Correctional populations in the United States, 1990. *Bureau of Justice Statistics*, 86.
- Judis, J. B., & Teixeira, R. (2004). *The emerging democratic majority*. Simon and Schuster.
- Leighley, J. E., & Nagler, J. (2013). *Who Votes Now?: Demographics, Issues, Inequality, and Turnout in the United States*. Princeton University Press.
- Mauer, M., & King, R. S. (2007). *Uneven justice: State rates of incarceration by race and ethnicity* (pp. 1-23). Washington, DC: Sentencing Project.
- Schlesinger, A. M., & Israel, F. L. (2011). *History of American presidential elections, 1789-2008* (4th Ed). Chelsea House Publishers, in association with McGraw-Hill.
- Taylor, S. L., Shugart, M. S., Lijphart, A., & Grofman, B. (2014). *A different democracy: American government in a 31-country perspective*. Yale University Press.
- The Worst Voter Turnout in Years [Editorial] (2014). *The New York Times*
- Uggen, C., Shannon, S., & Manza, J. (2012). *State-level estimates of felon disenfranchisement in the United State, 2010*. Sentencing Project.
- United States Elections Project (2014). *National General Election VEP Turnout Rates 1789-Present*. Retrieved from: <http://www.electproject.org/national-1789-present>
- Wattenberg, M. P. (1998). Should Election Day Be A Holiday? *The Atlantic Online*. Retrieved from: <http://www.theatlantic.com/past/issues/98oct/electday.htm>

SOCIAL CLASS, DEMOCRACY AND AMERICAN POLITICS

The Ascendancy of the Billionaire Club.

Godwin Ohiwerei, Professor of Sociology and Anthropology

The political climate of 2016 defies traditional politics as we know it. Changes in political trends beg for a critical analysis and raise important questions about democracy. An important question is—Can the United States of America be considered a democracy? Or has it become an economic elite dominated by an oligarchy? The legislative and the executive branches of government are now highly influenced by Wall Street and billionaires. The pride of having a representative government and the balance of power between the executive, legislative, and judicial branches is seriously threatened by the growing influence of these oligarchs (Gilens and Page, 2014).

The economic and political system of the United States is often conceptualized in an idealistic framework. It is often described as a capitalist democracy rather than viewed as a capitalist constitutional republic. Democracy is majority rule and in so many ways tends to be antithetical to the exercise of individual rights. The issue with democracy is that it is a tyranny of the majority. The United States of America prides itself as being one of the few countries where the constitutional republic defends and safeguards the rights of individuals. An oligarchy on the other hand consists of a small group of powerful individuals with tremendous influence and economic power. When the oligarchs become highly influential and then exert pressure and control over the political system and politicians, they destroy the soul of representative government and economic/political freedom suffer.

The next question is—how did we get to the growing problem of the powerful billionaire gaining control of the political system. The more conservative Supreme Court of the United States is often blamed for the creation of the super Political Action Committee (PAC). The controversy argued before the Supreme Court in *Citizens United v. Federal Election Commission* dealt with the issue of excessive influence caused by unlimited corporate donations to political campaigns versus the protection of free speech. The Supreme

Court in its judgment ruled that corporations, like individuals, have the right to contribute to campaigns as an expression of free speech which is protected under the first amendment. The problem with the judgment was that there was no concern regarding the tremendous influence of capital in terms of flooding the airwaves with negative advertisement. Without the control of capital, the opposition is voiceless and marginalized (Kroll, 2013).

Looking back over the years, politics in America during the 1960s centered on pocketbook issues such as taxes and the performance of the economy and not on class divisions. The deciding factor in terms of presidential politics was which candidate had the best economic plan for America and not which candidate had the best plan for the corporate class, the middle class, or special interest groups. The political change began with the election of Ronald Reagan as president. Reagan's fixation on growth through tax cuts, also known as trickle down economics, appealed more to the privileged class than to the low earners. This corporate elite benefitted tremendously from the tax advantages of the trickle down economy and increased the power of the privileged class (Fisher 2015, Boundless, 2015). Simply stated, wealth was appropriated for the upper class in the hope that it would trickle down to the working class and the needy thereby creat-

ing new opportunities for the economically disadvantaged.

A report by the International Monetary Fund questioned and rejected the trickle down economic theory which is still celebrated by the Republican Party and most of the Republican presidential candidates of 2016 using Ronald Reagan as their role model. The argument of the IMF is that if the income share of the top 20% increases, the GDP growth actually declines over the medium term suggesting that the benefits do not trickle down. On the other hand, increasing the income share of the bottom 20% of citizens by a mere one percent results in a 0.38% jump in GDP growth in the following year. Critical to the analysis is that countries looking to boost economic growth should concentrate their efforts on the lower segment of the society rather than creating tax breaks for the top economic class with the excuse of job creation. (Keller, 2015) It is interesting to note that Pope Francis also denounced trickle down economics in a scathing statement, saying that the theory expresses a crude and naïve trust in the goodness of those wielding economic power. It is also significant to note that the findings by the IMF about the top 20% adverse effect on GDP growth was significant at the 90% confidence interval which is a strong statistical indicator of reliability despite the fact that it does not meet the 95% gold standard of social science research (Fisher, 2015, Dabla Norris et al, 2015).

What is becoming obvious is that the top 10% are pulling away economically. Trickle down economics increases inequality through the special benefit for the upper classes. When one considers growth and development, income and education are critical variables. A high level of education tends to be associated with greater occupational prestige and autonomy, but getting these rewards is becoming very expensive considering the high cost of education and burgeoning student loans. Student loans for a large segment of the population can now be described as life time debt. It is hardly a surprise that members of the upper middle class and corporate class tend to have a higher level of education and are more likely to believe in the American dream ethos that hard work gets you ahead.

In 15 states, the top 1% captured 50-89% of all income growth between 1979 and 2007. Some of those states are Arizona with 84% of all income growth captured by the top 1%; Oregon (81.8%), New Mexico (72.6%), and Connecticut (63.9%). From 1979 to 2011, the average income of the bottom 99% of U.S. tax payers grew by 18.9% while the average income of the top 1% grew 10 times as much by 2005. The top 20% of earners in the U.S. in 2010 earned 50% of the total income while the bottom 15% earned less than 4%. In 1979, most American households (59.5%) had earnings that qualified them as middle class. In 2012, the percentage of

middle class families had fallen to 45.1% indicating that the income of American households had become more concentrated at the top. Another way to think about it is that the middle class is migrating to the lower level classes due to income stagnation and increases in the cost of living (Common Dream, 2016).

Poverty and income inequality are different. What is clear from the above data is that it is not directly related to the issue of poverty, which is the lack of basic needs like food and clothing. Rather disproportionate income inequality leads to higher levels of exploitation and alienation of the lower classes. In 2013, the medium household income for whites was

\$58,270, for Latinos, \$40,963, and for African Americans, \$34,598. Asian household income rose above the tide with an average income of \$67,035 surpassing the median income of all households (The Atlantic, Dec 2014). The political environment of 2016 is quite different from that of 2012 or even that of 2008. The political issues before 2016 were about the usual Republican and Democrat ideological and partisan issues. Issues of social class

were not as visible nor was the issue of billionaires influencing politics. In 2012, Governor Mitt Romney's personal wealth of \$250 million and how he accumulated it were well publicized by his opponents during the Republican primaries and his wealth became a central issue when he became the nominee of the Republican Party. The fear was that Mitt Romney could outspend all of the Republican candidates during the primaries wielding undue influence of wealth in the political process.

Four years later, the political climate is quite different due to unlimited donations to super PACs and politically oriented nonprofits. The billionaires are becoming inextricably linked to the political process and exerting tremendous influence. 2016 can now be referred to as the "Billionaire Primary." When in 2012, Mitt Romney's \$250 million was seen as extreme wealth for a presidential candidate, in the 2016 presidential primaries, we are introduced to Republican candidate Donald Trump who has an estimated net worth of \$4.5 billion. The 2016 primary began with what has been called the "Sheldon Adelson Primary." Sheldon Adelson is the eighth richest American and a member of the Republican Party. Adelson granted audience to the 2016 Republican presidential candidates at a spring meeting of the Republican Jewish Coalition in Las Vegas in 2014. Adelson is a casino and hotel magnate. Among his special interests are to stop internet gambling and to protect the profit margin of his casinos. It is interesting to note that Adelson contributed \$15,600 to Senator Lindsey Graham's campaign and Senator Graham is reportedly preparing a bill to ban internet gambling (Heath, 2015)

*Trickle down economics
increases inequality
through the special benefit
for the upper classes.*

A look at the 2016 candidates' net worth shows Donald Trump (\$4.5 billion), Carly Fiorina (\$58 million), Hilary Clinton (\$45 million), Ben Carson (\$26 million), Jeb Bush (\$22 million), John Kasich (\$10 million), Ted Cruz (\$3.5 million), Chris Christie (\$3 million), Bernie Sanders (\$700,000), and Marco Rubio (\$100,000).

The lineup of billionaires supporting presidential candidates and their net worth is as follows:

Robert Mercer (net worth \$12 billion) is supporting Ted Cruz.

Sheldon Adelson (net worth \$26.3 billion) is supporting Marco Rubio.

George Soros (net worth \$26 billion) is supporting Hillary Clinton.

Alice Walton (net worth \$34.4 billion) is supporting Hillary Clinton.

Others like Rupert Murdoch (net worth \$11.5 billion) supports the Republican Party but did contribute to Hillary Clinton's 2006 Senate race. Robert Mercer is a Tea Party supporter. Paul Singer (net worth \$2.1 billion) is a socially liberal Republican who supports gay rights. Michael Bloomberg (net worth \$50 billion) is an advocate for gun control and supports bipartisan candidates.

What is now called the "Billionaire Primary" is also referred to as patrimonial capitalism where a wealthy few control the core issues of the economy and use their wealth to influence the political system.

Thanks to the biggest wealth transfer in U.S. history, the rich are richer than ever. Also, thanks to the Supreme Court's Citizen's United decision, there is no limit to what super PACs can spend. The fact that trickle down economics did not trickle down to the working class does not mean that there was no trickle down at all. What is clear is the wealth of the corporate and billionaire class is now trickling down into and affecting all sectors of the political system.

Most Americans never heard of the Koch brothers (\$100 billion net worth) but the wealth of the Koch family is trick-

ling down into both national, state, and local politics. The Koch brothers plan to spend \$300 million in the 2016 election. Their goal is to support the Republican Party by embedding staff members in a community, giving conservative advocacy a permanent local voice through field workers who live in the neighborhood year round and who can influence the nuances of local politics. It is interesting to note that the billionaire political activists are the new American oligarchs. Political parties may still be influenced by the public, voters and constituencies, but American oligarchs act in their own self interest without concern for the public sentiment or well-being. They are accountable to no one, and the law makers on their payrolls are more accountable to their billionaire political bosses than to the public.

REFERENCES:

- Gabriel Fisher (2015). "A Rising Tide: Trickle Down Economics is Wrong," Quartz.
- Keller, Jared (2015). "The IMF Confirms That 'Trickle Down' Economics is, indeed, a joke." Pacific Standard. June 18, 2015.
- Norris-Era Dabla, Kochhar Kalpana, Suphaphiphat Nujin, Ricka Frantisek, Tsounta Evridiki (2015). Causes and Consequences of Income Inequality: A Global Perspective. *International Monetary Fund*.
- Lopez, Ian Haney (2016). "Race and economic Jeopardy for All: A framing Paper for Defeating Dog Whistle Politics." *AFL-CIO*.
- Skidmore-Hess, Daniel (2014) "Ballots for Equality: An Approach to the Radical Tradition in U.S. Electoral Politics." *Class, Race and Corporate Power: Vol. 3: Iss 1, Article 2*.
- Source: Boundless. "Politics." *Boundless Sociology*. Boundless, 21 Jul. 2015. Retrieved 05 Feb. 2016.
- Terrence Heath (2014). "The Billionaire's primary: Meet America's New Political Bosses." *Common Dreams*.

IMMIGRANTS' PARTICIPATION IN AMERICAN ELECTIONS

Where is Their Voice?

Grace Wambu, Assistant Professor of Educational Leadership and Counseling
Zandile P. Nkabinde, Associate Professor of Special Education

20 **E**lections in America are held once every four years, and every citizen including naturalized immigrants are eligible to vote. Because citizenship is such a crucial element of electoral engagement, this paper will examine voter participation among minority immigrants and their native-born children. The number of naturalized citizens has been increasing dramatically over the last few decades (Wang & Kim, 2011). For example, the U.S. Census Bureau's 2010 American Community Survey as cited in Wang and Kim (2011) shows that the foreign-born population now stands at nearly 40 million, a historic high, representing 12.9 percent of the US population. The report further mentions that between 2009 and 2010, the foreign-born population increased by more than 1.4 million, or by 3.7 percent, compared to 1.5 percent from 2008-09. In terms of naturalized citizens, in 2009 there were an estimated 38.5 million immigrants living in the United States of which 44 percent were naturalized U.S. citizens (Wang & Kim, 2011). According to DeSipio, Masuoka, and Stout (2008), nearly 70 percent of adults are immigrants. Therefore, the social incorporation of minority immigrants is directly related to rates of naturalization and citizenship status in ensuring their participation in American elections. This paper examines immigrant political behavior and voter participation of minority immigrants and its impact on the American political process. In addition, the paper will discuss the electoral behavior of these new Americans and the potential impact on the election outcome.

INTRODUCTION

The aim of this paper is to explore voter participation of naturalized citizens and its potential implications on American election outcomes. Research studies indicate that immigrants and their children are becoming more influential in American elections (Ewing & Cantor, 2014). According to a special report by the American Immigration Council (Ewing and Canter, 2014), these "new Americans" who are recently natu-

ralized citizens and children born of immigrants since 1965 are becoming powerful in elections as their numbers grow. Major demographic transformations in the U.S. have seen a tremendous increase in native-born children of immigrants, especially among Latinos and Asians, as well as immigrants from other countries. Conversely, the report further indicated that the number of the native-born white voters is on the decline (Ewing & Canter, 2014).

Voting matters to all immigrants since it is part of being an American. Lawn, Mcmillan, Comley, Smith, and Brayley (2014) described the role of being a citizen as follows:

A citizen is a person who is “entitled to enjoy all the legal rights and privileges granted by a state to the people comprising its constituency and who is obligated to obey its laws and to fulfill his or her duties as called upon” In America this includes the right and duty to vote (p.290).

THE VOTING PROCESS AND THE VOTING RIGHTS ACT

First, one has to be eighteen years of age in order to be eligible to vote. The person must be a native or naturalized citizen if not born in the United States. Second, one must be registered to vote. A report by the NAACP describes the voting rights as follows:

The right to vote is the cornerstone of American democracy. Our votes affirm the legitimacy of our democracy. The right to vote is so essential because we use it to preserve and protect all other Constitutional rights. It serves as a check on our political leaders and as a source of power for their constituents. In this way, the vote is both a tangible measure of what we are as a nation, and of what we aspire to be (p.2).

Historically, many people of color particularly African-Americans were denied the right to vote. The Voting Rights Act of 1965 was passed as a way to prevent discrimination in voter registration and voting especially against African-Americans. However, other vulnerable members of society have become beneficiaries of the same Act, including the poor, the elderly, immigrants, and the disabled. According to a report by the NAACP, the Act was passed in order to combat the widespread and persistent discrimination in voting. The report stated that the Voting Rights Act not only guarantees the right of all citizens to participate in the electoral process, but also provides a legal framework to prevent and/or remedy a wide array of barriers that are used to threaten that right. Several steps are involved in the voting process as identified in the How to Register to Vote in the United States: 8 Steps document:

1. Citizens must check for their eligibility.
 - Eligibility is that of citizenship; at least 18 years of age on election day (in some states you may vote in a primary election at 17, provided you'll turn 18 by the general election)
 - A resident of the state in which you register (each state has its own residency requirements)
 - Not currently on parole or other post-release supervision
2. People can register online if they can
3. National Voter Registration form can be mailed if the state does not allow people to register online
4. People can register in person at designated locations in their states
5. People need to check their state's deadline before the election

6. One must fill out the Federal Postcard Application to vote absentee
7. The voter's card is mailed in
8. Consider registering with a national political party or organization (p.1-4)

Clarke (2007) suggested that Congress' recent reauthorization of the expiring provisions of the Voting Rights Act of 1965 makes clear that both African American and Latino voters continue to experience significant levels of discrimination that impair their ability to meaningfully exercise their right to vote and equally access the ballot box on Election Day. Immigrants who have become naturalized citizens may view such discriminatory practices as attempts to silence their voices and consequently stay away from participating in elections.

REASONS WHY PEOPLE VOTE

Political behavior for immigrants is also affected by the degree to which these communities are assimilated into American society (Taylor, 2015). Immigrant communities, once they are granted citizenship, are often encouraged to exercise their fundamental rights to vote and to participate in the American political process. Voting in America is meant to provide all citizens an equal voice in the decision-making process of the country and in their local communities (Wang & Kim, 2011). According to these authors, it is how citizens ensure that their elected leaders truly represent the will of the people. Wang and Kim (2011) reported that in the United States, there is a significant gap in the voter participation rates of native-born and naturalized American citizens. Wang and Kim (2011) made the following observation with regards to voter turnout among naturalized citizens:

Voter turnout among naturalized citizens is much lower overall than that of native-born citizens, consistently around 9 to 12 percentage points less during at least the past four elections. In the last general election of 2012, almost 1 in 2 native-born citizens turned out to vote, while less than 2 in 5 naturalized citizen did. Even in 2008, a year of historic turnout among many constituencies, just over half of naturalized Americans voted, compared to a little less than two thirds of native-born citizens (p.3).

Some factors that contribute to variations in political participation include resources and rootedness, political context, and group context of participation. Although fewer in numbers, blacks register and vote at higher rates than whites in terms of their proportion of the population; Latinos register and vote at higher rates than Asians; Immigrant Latinos register and vote at higher rates than either whites or Asians, and almost as much as blacks (Logan, Darrah, & Oh, 2012)

Immigrants with lower income and education levels are said to have a lower rate of political participation. For example, Wang and Kim (2011) stated that in 2008, only 65 percent of citizens in households making less than \$25,000 per year were registered to vote compared to 85 percent of those in house-

holds making \$100,000 or more. These authors noted that naturalized Latinos are disproportionately in the low-income and lower level of education strata of American society and therefore, less likely to vote than their native-born counterparts. However, socioeconomic factors seem to play an insignificant role among Asian American immigrants (Wang and Kim, 2011). Asian Americans are generally well educated and tend to have higher income than other immigrant groups, yet they have lower rates of political participation.

Research studies have identified four major influences on individual decisions to engage in the voting process: 1) social and demographic traits, 2) psychological resources, 3) electoral rules, and 4) the mobilization efforts of parties and their candidates (Harder & Krosnick, 2008; Stein & Vonnahme, 2008). Furthermore, Harder and Krosnick (2008) cited the following demographic factors in voter turnout:

1. Education: Citizens with more formal education are more likely to vote; each additional year of education is associated with higher turnout.
2. Income: Wealthier people vote at higher rates.
3. Occupation: There is little evidence that working in an authoritative or high-status job substantially increases an individual's turnout. Workplace authority might be expected to create a greater feeling of social entitlement, which often translates into political participation.
4. Age: People appear to become increasingly likely to vote as they progress from early adulthood through middle adulthood; after about the age of 75, people become less likely to vote.
5. Gender: The effect of gender on turnout has changed dramatically over the years. From the beginning of women's suffrage until the 1980s, women voted less than men. Women then felt less efficacious and were less informed and politically interested than men and often had less power and responsibility in the workplace. Since the mid-1980s, though, women have voted at the same rate as men, and sometimes at even higher rates.
6. Mobility: Residential mobility seems to depress turnout. Just after moving, people are less able to vote, because they must learn how to register with a new address and must make time to do so amidst an inevitably busy post-move life.
7. Residency: People who live in rural areas are more likely to vote than are people who live in urban areas. And farmers vote at substantially higher rates than would be expected based on their levels of education and income.
8. Race: Whites have voted at higher rates than some other racial groups. Compared to whites, turnout among African Americans has been relatively low. Latinos have lower turnout rates than Whites, even after controlling for socio-economic status. Asian Americans turn out at lower rates than Whites when controlling for socioeconomic status (p.530-534).

In addition to demographic factors social and psychological factors also have a significant impact on electoral participation. Living in a high status neighborhood will encourage a person to identify with the political affiliation of that neighborhood. According to Harder and Krosnick (2008) living in a neighborhood with close to evenly balanced party affiliations could increase political participation of the people. Political participation is generally motivated by the citizen's belief that his or her vote will actually influence the outcome of local elections. Other factors are political efficacy, group solidarity, civic duty, and habit. Harder and Krosnick (2008) describe voting as a habitual exercise, meaning that voting once increases the likelihood of voting again. Voting is also a vehicle for social inclusion. Bevelander and Pendakur (2011) defined social inclusion as follows:

A process which ensures that those at risk of poverty and social exclusion gain the opportunities and resources necessary to participate fully in economic, social and cultural life and to enjoy a standard of living and well-being that is considered normal in the society which they live. It ensures that they have a greater participation in decision-making which affects their lives and access to their fundamental rights (p.71-72).

THE IMPORTANCE OF IMMIGRATION AS AN ELECTION ISSUE

Immigration policies are at the center of electoral decision making for new Americans (Ewing & Cantor, 2014). As people of color become an even larger share of the electorate, the political implications come into sharp focus (Oakford, 2015). Although demographic changes in the general population do not automatically translate into electoral votes by the same margin, it is naïve to assume that such changes have no implications in terms of election outcomes (Oakford, 2015). In some states such as California, the electorate of color makes up the majority of all eligible voters. While these demographic changes are occurring at different paces in different states, one trend is also noticeable, the number of non-Hispanic white voters is shrinking (Oakford, 2015). The impact of minority voters on the outcome of presidential elections is increasing, and in order to win elections, both major political parties will require significant support among this growing segment of the electorate. Neither Republicans nor Democrats can afford to ignore the powerful force of the minority voters in this year's election (Oakford, 2015).

Immigrants from Africa make up a relatively small number of the total immigrant population, but the numbers are steadily growing—doubling since 1970 (Pew Research Center Analysis of U.S. census). In 2013, there were 1.8 million African Immigrants living in the U.S. as compared to only 80, 000 in 1970. They accounted for 4.4 % of the immigrant population in 2013, up from 0.8% in 1970. Africans are a rapidly growing segment of the black immigrant population in the U.S., increasing by 137% between 2000-2013. Foreign born blacks

sometimes get lost in the mix when people fail to distinguish between U.S. born blacks of several generations (Race Files, 2013). Most studies have focused on Latino and Asian community participation in elections. There is little to no research conducted to demonstrate the impact of African immigrant participation on American elections. Most studies have lumped black voters together regardless of their country of birth, whether they are recent arrivals or their ancestors were brought here as slaves. (Race Files, 2013).

The current rhetoric on immigration on the campaign trail is likely to have some far reaching effects on how immigrants vote in the 2016 elections. According to Taylor (2015), Democrats are beginning to be more cautious as to how they address immigration reform and refugee policies. For voters who have been politically conservative or moderate, the tone of the ongoing debate may be the impetus they need to make their voices heard. Consequently, it is projected that there may be an increase in voter turnout among the immigrants who have been complacent in the past (Taylor, 2015).

BARRIERS TO MINORITY VOTER PARTICIPATION

Voter participation is tied to an individual's social location, his/her psychological dispositions, the procedures involved in voting, and events that occur at the time of each election (Harder, & Krosnick, 2008). If voters are subjected to strict registration requirements, then these potential voters are less likely to register and to vote. These strict requirements include but are not limited to: annual registration, literacy tests, and early cutoff dates for registering before an election (Harder & Krosnick, 2008). In the past poll taxes, and literacy tests were also used as requirements for voter registration in the United States aimed at restricting immigrants (including legal ones and newly naturalized citizens), non-white citizens, Native Americans, and any other locally "undesirable" groups from exercising voting rights granted under the Constitution (Voting Rights Act, 1965).

States with restrictive voter registration laws are much more likely to pose a substantial barrier to voter turnout of minority groups. Stein and Vonnahme (2008) believe that the cost of voting is significantly tied to the time and inconvenience associated with the act of voting. The cost of access and inconvenience as described by Stein and Vonnahme (2008): include time that must be expended to vote, waiting in long lines to vote, inaccessible voting places (distance to travel, limited parking, etc.), and unfamiliar voting technology (p.488). Other factors which may contribute to lower voter turnout among naturalized citizens as cited by Wang and Kim (2011) are: socioeconomic factors, length of time in the United States, variations based on country of origin, location of the immigrant community (e.g., does it comprise a majority-minority electoral district and is it an established community or a new immigrant destination), the extent of voter mobilization by political parties and candidates, language bar-

riers, and the persistence of discriminatory practices (p.3). Section 203 of the Voting Rights Act requires jurisdictions with large numbers of language minority voters to provide translated voting materials including registration forms and instructions (Wang and Kim, 2011). A report by the Pew Hispanic Center on the 2004 election as cited by Logan et. al (2010) stated that:

A high percentage of Hispanics are either too young to vote or are ineligible because they are not citizens. As a result, a population increase of 5.7 million Latinos between 2000 and 2004 yielded only 2.1 million new eligible voters. In addition, Hispanic voter participation rates lag those of whites or blacks so that the number of Hispanic voters increased by just 1.4 million (p. 1203).

Some common factors that inhibit immigrants' political participation include low levels of income and educational attainment (Barretto, 2005; Le, 2009). The immigrants who were more politically active in their home countries are more likely to participate in America's politics (Eckstein, 2006). The immigrant's country of origin has an influence on his/her ability to participate fully in the host country's political affairs. For example, immigrants tend to have a weaker political predisposition to American politics if they emigrated from undemocratic states (Tam Cho, 1999). The length of stay in the host country also affects immigrants' participation in the election process. The longer immigrants have lived in the United States, the more likely they will be to have learned and formed preferences about American politics (Alvarez & Bedolla, 2003; Tam Cho, 1999; Wong, 2000). Failure to participate in the political process of the country would mean that the interests of the minority are not well represented. (Klofstad & Bishin, 2014).

FACTORS INFLUENCING IMMIGRANTS' AND THEIR CHILDREN'S PARTICIPATION IN THE ELECTORAL PROCESS

Immigrant children who have positive experiences with their host country in addition to being assimilated are more likely to become politically active. Additionally, some studies have found other contributing factors to being politically active are language acquisition, personal resources, and political engagement (Klofstad, & Bishin, 2014). Another critical factor influencing children of immigrants is the process of socialization into the political system. Lim, Barry-Goodman, and Branham (2006) explained the propensity for immigrants to be Democrats due to experiences with discrimination after arriving in the United States. They have watched one or both parents navigate a new society and culture and witnessed how U.S. society reacts and treats immigrants. In addition, the academic rigor of the courses taken in high school is reported by Humphries, Muller, and Schiller (2013) to have a significant impact on the likelihood of registration and party identification for Latino children of immigrants compared

to white third-plus-generation young adults. Moreover, different minority groups experience discrimination differently. Lim et al. (2006) reported that discrimination experienced by Latinos is economic (dealing with issues like getting a job or getting an apartment) and therefore more devastating and in need of political action; discrimination against Asians, on the other hand, is more likely to be discrimination faced in a social situation (insults, jokes, etc.), and therefore does not warrant immediate political action. In the case of African immigrants, the assumption is that discrimination against them is both economic and social. Therefore, political engagement for this group demands immediate political action.

Some measures that can be taken to encourage immigrant youth to engage in political participation are: a) informing them about the voting process; b) removing barriers to the voting process and thus making it easy for youth to participate; c) encouraging the youth to volunteer in varied activities related to the election process; d) encouraging the youth to hold their elected officials accountable at all times by their activism.

THE ELECTORAL POWER OF THE “NEW AMERICANS”

According to Ewing and Cantor (2014), “New Americans” refers to the immigrants who are naturalized U. S citizens together with native-born Americans who were born not earlier than 1965 to at least one foreign-born parent. These new Americans, Latinos, and Asians are the fastest growing segment of the electorate (Ewing & Cantor, 2014). This rising force is one that political candidates cannot afford to ignore. Alienating these voters will have significant repercussions on results in both national and state elections, especially in a closely contested race (Ewing & Cantor, 2014). In 2012 there were 18.1 million new Americans registered to vote totaling 11.8% of all registered voters. In some states such as California, new Americans account for over one third of registered voters, the highest percentage in the nation. This is followed by New York where a quarter of registered voters are new Americans. In Nevada, New Jersey, and Florida new American voters make up one fifth of all registered voters (Ewing & Cantor, 2014).

Moreover demographic projections indicate that by the year 2043, America will be a majority-minority country. In 2014 California became a majority-minority state. There are more non-whites than whites in California. Despite the increase in the number of eligible minorities in the electorate, low voter turnout among Latinos and Asian Americans has been evident in the last elections, with non-participation numbers above 40%. It is clear that minority voters are participating below their potential (Oakford, 2015). Immigrants are less politically active than native-born citizens. Consequently this lack of participation presents a challenge to the strength of participatory democracy because

the needs of this population might not be recognized by the government (Klosfard & Bishin, 2014).

According to naturalization data from the U.S. Citizen-ship and Immigration Services, if the majority of residents who came to the United States after 1985 were naturalized and registered to vote, their numbers would have been large enough to change the results of the 2008 election (Persaud, 2012). Given the potential of immigrant voters to impact election outcomes, it is worth investigating

the best ways to reach out to this group and motivate them to get fully involved in the electoral process.

The changing demographics of the U. S. is equally tipping the electoral balance of power (Charney, 2009). Targeting the votes of minorities and immigrants is no longer just a choice but a priority for any party or candidate to win an election.

The big challenge is how to reach the minority and immigrant voters, bridge the cultural barriers, and motivate them to register as voters amid the growing dissen-

sion with regard to immigration reform. (Charney, 2009). Both parties need to take this data seriously and give attention to this voting bloc (Persaud, 2012). Furthermore, the unrealized voting potential of the children of immigrants makes the power of the combined eligible voters even greater (Persaud, 2012). The challenge for political organizers is to persuade all the immigrants who are eligible to become citizens to do so and then to take advantage of their voting rights. No party or candidate can afford to ignore the immigration reform agenda without having some political repercussions.

EFFECTIVE STRATEGIES TO INCREASE IMMIGRANT MINORITY VOTER PARTICIPATION?

Research has shown that foreign-born voter turnout has always been lower than for native-born citizens. In particular, Latino immigrant voters have demonstrated low levels of political participation, owing to the lower levels of education, low incomes, low English language skills, and lack of exposure to the American political institutions (Barreto, 2005). In addition to a lack of resources, naturalized citizens are rarely the target of voter mobilization drives, further limiting their participation (Barreto, 2005). Given the rising number of naturalized citizens and the power inherent in their votes, political parties on both sides need to have an understanding of how to reach out to this population and bring them to the

Immigration policies are at the center of electoral decision making for new Americans

voting booth. Failure to do so will constitute major implications on election outcomes.

Harder and Krosnick (2008) concluded that allowing Election Day registration, simplifying ballots, and permitting absentee or online voting make turning out easier. Other methods which may improve voter turnout are: voter registration drives or campaigns; relaxed absentee voting; vote by mail; use of bilingual ballots; and in-person early voting (Stein & Vonnahme, (2008). The application of these electoral reforms is more likely to remedy the inconvenience of voting and in turn will motivate the infrequent voters. Voters need to be educated about the electoral process and be motivated by canvassing face to face and minimizing hardships by permitting Election Day registration (Harder & Krosnick, 2008).

Voter participation especially for infrequent participants is increased when more opportunities to vote are made available. These opportunities include but are not limited to simplifying voter registration by allowing individuals to register to vote when renewing their driver's license or at the polls on Election Day (Stein & Vonnahme, 2008). Since voter motivation and interest in the political process are tied to voter participation, Stein and Vonnahme (2008) suggest that attempts must be made to reconnect Americans to politics with the focus especially on ways to encourage psychological involvement in politics and promote a sense that the government is responsive to the ordinary citizen. This in turn might increase voter turnout among immigrants and minority groups.

Allowing individuals to vote at multiple locations according to Stein and Vonnahme, (2008) will allow them to choose the site that is most convenient and might increase their probability of turning out to vote. The authors cite three benefits to multiple voting centers:

- a) First, by affording voters a choice about where they can vote, it allows them to vote at a time and place that is most convenient for them.
- b) Second, Election Day vote centers might also better distribute voter arrival times throughout Election Day.
- c) Open polling locations might also lower the informational costs of voting, as individuals do not need to have specific information as to their voting district and the polling place that has been established for their particular voting district. Rather, individuals will only need to know which sites are available for county-wide voting (p.490).

Naturalized citizens still lag behind native-born citizens in their overall voter participation. Wang and Kim (2011) cited structural barriers to registration such as restrictive requirements and lack of language access as key factors in why naturalized citizens remain registered at lower rates. In order to close the voter turnout gap between naturalized citizens and the native-born citizens, Wang and Kim (2011) suggested the following recommendations:

9. United States Citizenship and Immigration Services (USCIS) should fully implement its newly adopted policy

of ensuring that new American are provided with a voter registration application at all administrative naturalization ceremonies, and ultimately should be designated as a full voter registration agency under the National Voter Registration Act so that every newly naturalized American is automatically and systematically given the opportunity to register to vote.

10. Nongovernmental voter mobilization groups should focus a good portion of their efforts on unregistered naturalized citizens including, if possible, in "new destination" states.
11. The donor community should fund year-round activities around voter registration, including in immigrant communities wherever they may be.
12. State and local elections officials should be active in registering new citizens to vote by reaching out to these communities through a variety of means and working with USCIS to provide voter registration services at naturalization ceremonies. These officials should also provide as much material as possible in alternative languages spoken prevalently in their jurisdictions, whether required to by federal law or not.
13. Political parties should be much more pro-active in reaching out to naturalized citizens, tapping into a huge potential pool of new voters. The parties also have a role to play in civic education especially regarding the electoral process in immigrant areas.
14. Candidates must appeal to and speak to the issues of concern to immigrants. Having paid advertising in Spanish is insufficient.
15. The civic education and civic skill-building process must start early on upon an immigrant's arrival in this country so that by the time they are eligible to register and vote they understand the process and the importance of participating. This means more government resources for such services, including English as a Second Language instruction.
16. Every means possible must be explored for eliminating administrative practices and legal requirements that discriminate against eligible immigrant voters. These include certain types of database matching policies, laws unduly restricting the means of confirming citizenship for purposes of registering to vote, and unnecessarily restrictive voter identification laws. Swift and serious action must be taken against any election administrator or other actors who engage in discriminatory practices (p.26).

The language provision under the Voting Rights Act passed in 1965 and which has been recently amended in 2007 is said to have had a significant and positive effect on the voting rates of covered linguistic minorities (Jones-Correa, 2005). It is reported that by 1996, Spanish language assistance was provided in all or part of the states of Arizona, California, Colorado, Connecticut, Florida, Illinois, Massachusetts, Michigan, New Jersey, New Mexico, New York, Pennsylvania, Texas, and Wisconsin. Chinese language

assistance was provided in six counties, Tagalog assistance in four counties, and Japanese and Vietnamese assistance in two each (p.553). Recognizing the inherent power in the immigrant vote and its potential impact on election outcomes is something that political parties should be cognizant of, especially in the on-going political campaigns.

CONCLUSION

America is known as a nation of immigrants and therefore must allow its newcomers, especially its naturalized citizens, to have an equal voice in how the country is governed. These newcomers must be incorporated into the democratic process by being encouraged to participate in the electoral process. Immigrants who are accepted into their newly adopted communities and have developed stronger ties with them are more likely to participate in the political process. According to Davis (2010) voting is yet another contributor to empowerment, and it is an important factor in community membership.

REFERENCES

- Alvarez, R. M., & Bedolla, L. G. (2003). The foundations of Latino voter partisanship. *Journal of Politics*, 65, 31-49
- Anderson, M. (2015). *African immigrants in US steadily climbs*. Retrieved from <http://www.pewresearch.org/fact-tank/2015/11/02/african-immigrant-population-in-u-s-steadily-climbs/>
- Barreto, M. A. (2005). Latino immigrants at the polls: Foreign-born voter turn-out in the 2002 elections. *Political Research Quarterly*, 58, 79-86.
- Bevelander, P., Pendarkur, R. (August 2011). Voting and social inclusion in Sweden. *International Migration*, 49 (4), 67-92.
- Charney, C. (2009, January). The new electorate has arrived: So how do you target it? *Politics*, 30 (1), 55-56
- Callahan, R. M., Muller, C., Schiller, K. S. (May 2010). Preparing the next generation for electoral engagement: Social studies and the school context. *American Journal of Education*, 525-556.
- Clarke, K. (2007). Burdening the right to vote: Assessing the impact of mandatory photo identification requirements on minority voting strength. *Harvard Journal of African American Public Policy*, 13; 9-16
- Davis, J. K. (2010). Voting as empowerment practice. *American Journal of Psychiatric Rehabilitation*, 13: 243-257.
- Defending democracy: Confronting modern barriers to voting rights in America. *A Report by the NAACP Legal Defense and Educational Fund, Inc. & the NAACP*
- DeSipio, L., Masuoka, N., Stout, C. (2008). Asian American immigrants as the new electorate: Exploring turnout and registration of a growing community. *Asian American Policy Review*, 17: 51-71.
- Eckstein, S. (2006). Cuban Émigrés and the American dream. *Perspectives on Politics*, 4 (2) 297-307.
- Ewing, W. A., & Cantor, G. (2014). New Americans in the Voting booth: The growing electoral power of immigrant communities. *American Immigration Council, Special Report*. Retrieved from <http://www.immigrationpolicy.org/special-reports/new-americans-voting-booth-growing-electoral-power-immigrant-communities>
- Harder, J., & Krosnick, J. A. (2008). Why do people vote? A psychological analysis of the causes of voter turnout. *Journal of Social Issues*, 64 (3), 525-549.
- How to Register to Vote in the United States: 8 Steps. the-United-States. Retrieved from www.wikihow.com/Register-to-Vote-in-America , Retrieved 2/1/16.
- Humphries, M., Muller, C., Schiller, K. S. (2013). The political socialization of adolescent children of immigrants, *Social Science Quarterly*, 94 (5), 1260-1282.
- Jones-Correa, M. (2005). Language provisions under the voting rights act: How effective are they? *Social Science Quarterly*, 86 (3), 549-564.
- Klofstad, C. A., & Bishin, B. G. (2014). Do social ties encourage immigrant voters to participate in other campaign activities? *Social Science Quarterly*, 95(2), 295-310.
- Lawn, S., Mcmillan, J., Comley, Z., Smith, A., & Brayley, J. (2014). Mental health recovery and voting: why being treated as a citizen matters and how we can do it. *Journal of Psychiatric and Mental Health Nursing*, 21: 289-295.
- Lim, P. S., Barry-Goodman, C., Branham, D. (2006). Discrimination that travels: How Ethnicity affects party identification for Southeast Asian immigrants. *Social Science Quarterly*, 87 (5), 1158-1170
- Logan, J. R., Darrah, J., & Oh, S. (2012). The impact of race, ethnicity, immigration and political context, on participation in American political elections. *Social Forces*, 90(3). doi:10.1093/sf/sor024
- Logan, J. R., Oh, S., & Darrah, J. (2009). The political impact of the new Hispanic second generation. *Journal of Ethnic and Migration Studies*, 35 (7), 1201-1223.
- Oakford, P. (2015). The changing face of America's electorate. Political implications of the shifting demographics. Center for American Progress, Retrieved from <https://www.americanprogress.org/issues/immigration/report/2015/01/06/101605/the-changing-face-of-americas-electorate/>
- Persuad, F. (2012, September). The latent power of eligible immigrant voters. *The New York Amsterdam News*, 103(39),18.
- Race Files (2013). Asian Americans are the same as other Americans, but not in the way Frank Wu Seems to think we are. 1-8.
- Stein, R. M., Vonnahme, G. (2008). Engaging the unengaged voter: Vote centers and vote turnout. *The Journal of Politics*, 70 (2), 487-497).

- Tam Cho, W. K. (1999). Naturalization, Socialization, Participation: Immigrants and (Non-) voting. *The Journal of Politics*, 61(4), 1140-1155.
- Taylor, R. (2015). Immigrant communities finding their voice in US elections. Voice of America. Retrieved from <http://www.voanews.com/content/immigrant-communitiesfinding-voice-united-states-election/3087313.html>.
- Wang, T. A., & Kim, Y. B. (2011, December). From citizenship to voting: Improving registration for new Americans. Report. Retrieved from <http://www.demos.org/publication/citizenship-voting-improving-registration-new-americans>
- Wong, J. S. (2000). "The effects of age and political exposure on the development of party identification among the Asian American and Latino Immigrants in the United States." *Political Behavior*, 22, 341-71

continued from page one
 WHO'S THE LOSER?
Bruce Chadwick

They're bringing drugs, they're bringing crime. They're rapists... ." Liberal America just blew a gasket. Everybody piled on him for his political incorrectness. I saw him make that comment on television while sitting in the bedroom with my wife.

"He's finished now," she said, as did so many.

"I don't know," I said. "A lot of Americans just don't like Mexicans."

A week later, jaws dropped when national polls showed Trump leading in popularity after the Mexican quip. Then, in rapid succession, there were all of his other blasts against (pick anybody or anything). After each denouncing salvo was fired, his poll numbers went up. He became the center of attention within a week. Marco who? Ted who? Jeb who? All the media talked about was Donald Trump, the billionaire, casino owner, reality television star, and general Prince of Bombast. Because of relentless, non-stop television press coverage, late night comedians said that now everybody was watching the Donald Trump Show.

The experts in the media, and there are thousands of them, said he would never last. These are the same people who did not think Lady Gaga would last and that nobody would watch the Kardashians on television. These are the same people who bet heavily against the Mets ever making the World Series. The media experts all said that The Donald's non-stop mouth would sink him. He did not know how to give speeches; he just hurled insults. He did not know how to run a campaign. He did not know how to raise money, put together a staff, engineer primary victories or talk to voters. He did not know how to do this or do that. He was an inexperienced, untalented shooting star. He and his fiery orange hair would never last.

They both did. Why?

1. He is an "outsider." Americans have sought the beloved "outsider" since that noted outsider, the farmer from Virginia, George Washington, ran in 1789. How about rail splitter Abraham Lincoln, college professor Woodrow Wilson, general Dwight Eisenhower, peanut farmer Jimmy Carter, actor Ronald Reagan? The public wants to get rid of the establishment that has failed in its efforts to run the country efficiently and embrace the latest "outsider."
2. He is a businessman. We are finally creeping out of the 2008 recession that crippled the country. All the government does is lose money, people say. Trump is a businessman who made nearly \$10 billion. His supporters think he can fix the economy of the country.
3. He is not a politician. Anyone who is simply "not a politician" enjoys a huge poll boost on day one of his or her campaign. Trump will not wind up hog-tied in red tape in the halls of Congress. Since he is "not a politician" he can

get things done without sinking in the political quicksand of Capitol Hill.

4. He speaks his mind. Now, everybody speaks his or her mind, but when The Donald *speaks* his mind, he speaks his mind. People like that.
5. Finally, he embraces Richard Nixon's Great Silent Majority. Remember them? The Silent Majority's children now vote. They, like their parents, are furious about the failures of the country, genuinely annoyed at the crooked path the nation is taking and want a man who has the nerve to say what they want to say but cannot. Trump does that. The members of the Great Silent Majority cannot publicly denounce any ethnic group because of today's runaway political correctness. Trump can. Remember his proposed ban on the Muslims? That was the last straw, the media experts said. He is finished now. What happened? His poll numbers not only went up yet again, but climbed over the 40% barrier and doubled those of any of his Republican opponents.

Trump is the best thing that ever happened to political television. The networks and cable stations were surprised in the 1990s and 2000s when they discovered that an interesting presidential campaign translated into high viewer ratings. The networks always saw politics as boring and unpopular with the viewers, but necessary for democracy. They were wrong. Ratings climbed during recent presidential campaigns. So naturally, the networks devoted much time to the campaigns and tried to make television personalities out of the candidates. Sometimes this worked (Clinton) and sometimes it did not (Bush 2). It certainly worked and worked well in 2008 because the campaign offered the possibility of either the first African-American or woman President in Obama and Mrs. Clinton. Trump, though, gives the television industry a brand new Great Orange Hair Hope. The ratings for the very first GOP debate staggered the nation. Twenty four million people tuned in, three times the previous record. Trump, of course, claimed all responsibility for that record, and he was right. Subsequent debates also hit high numbers. Even the Democrats, swimming along in Trump's wake, drew 15 million viewers for their first debates.

By the summer of 2014 Trump had become a superstar. People all over the nation and the world were talking about him. Trump, now 69, started out in his father's real estate business after graduation from college. One of five children, he graduated from the Wharton School of Business at the University of Pennsylvania. Earlier, he had obtained a private school education at the New York Military Academy. He moved to Manhattan in the early 1970s and used loans and tax breaks to become a prominent real estate developer. He

took the old Commodore Hotel on 42d Street and turned it into the lavish Grand Hyatt. He started the Trump Organization. He plunged into Atlantic City in the 1980s and at one point owned three casinos. Along the way he started an airline and bought, and sold, a 280 foot luxury yacht. He completed Trump Tower, the famous mid-town office and residential building in 2001. He was the host of *The Apprentice* reality television show (“You’re fired!”) and had his name put on a number of golf courses, food items, and building complexes. He hosted *The Apprentice* for 14 seasons from 2004 to 2015 and that brought him much fame. Throughout all of these years some of his companies went into bankruptcy, some were discontinued, and some came under fire from the federal government. By 2015, though, despite financial setbacks and investigations, he was worth over \$8 billion. He had put together quite a career.

He drew substantial headlines for his business triumphs and even larger ones for his marital woes. He has been married three times. His first wife was Ivana, who worked with him on his Atlantic City casinos. They divorced in 1992. The second wife was Marla Maples, an actress he met while married to Ivana. They married in 1993 and divorced in 1999. Number three, his current bride, is Melania who rarely appears with him in public. He is father to five children. His sons Donald Jr. and Eric are businessmen. He also has a teenage daughter, Tiffany, and a young son, Barron, 9. His daughter Ivanka works with him in his real estate business, television enterprises, and appears frequently with him on the campaign trail.

No matter where Trump goes, people wonder about him. He is great on bombast but short on policy, wonderful on promises but late on delivery. He can’t possibly do what he says he can — a 2,000 mile wall between the U.S. and Mexico? The Mexicans will pay for it? Kick eleven million illegal aliens right out of the country? Ban the Muslims from entering the country? Some of these things are just not doable (wall) and others unconstitutional (Muslims). Trump does not care about that. He just yells and screams. And people listen. His popularity with so many people was not politically correct, historically sustainable nor, well, possible. Yet there he was, first in the polls week after week, tough guy candidate in primary after primary.

Trump is not textbook politics; he is American politics. Anything can happen in American politics and usually does. The image of the outsider and a man who has little to do with politics and runs a business for a living has worked and worked well often in American elections. Perhaps the most successful outsider/non-politician was Abraham Lincoln, an outsider from the far western state of Illinois in 1860, a rail splitter who worked with his hands all of his life and a man who when elected President in 1860 had been out of national politics for many years. Lincoln said of the way the people saw him, “Public sentiment is everything. With public sentiment nothing can fail; without it, nothing can succeed.”¹

There is great irony in the Trump – Lincoln comparison, though. Trump is constantly in trouble with today’s immigrants, but in 1860 it was a large immigrant vote that pushed Lincoln over the top and put him in the White House.

“Without the vote of the foreign born, Lincoln could not have carried the Northwest, and without the Northwest...he would have been defeated,” wrote historian Donnal Smith.²

One interesting sidelight in the Lincoln vs. Trump comparison is their rather comical appearances to the public. All the world has made fun of Trump’s rather remarkable orange hair and bouffant style. He makes fun of it himself and constantly has people come up to touch it to prove that it isn’t a wig. Other jokes have focused on his heavy weight and the sneer on his lips during televised debates. Lincoln faced the same criticism concerning his awkward appearance and, as Lincoln himself said, rather ugly face. “He is the most ungainly figure I have ever seen upon a platform,” said Hugh McCulloch, who attended a Lincoln speech in Indianapolis in 1859. “Plain, dull looking man...ungraceful in his movements.”³

Lincoln, like Trump, was very conscious of the enormous press he received when he made a speech. Stories would be printed in the newspaper where the speech was delivered, but re-printed all over the U.S. He estimated that twenty or thirty times as many people read the newspaper articles as were actually in attendance at his talks. Trump keeps track of the people in his audiences and the numbers of viewers of his television debates, and then brags that his appearance drew the record number of people.⁴

Oddly, throughout the Trump campaign, there was little comparison to his “outsider/businessman/no politician” run and the “outsider/businessman/no-politician” run of Ross Perot in 1992. Perot jumped into the George H. Bush vs. Bill Clinton race that year in the middle of the spring primaries. He pushed his “outsider” and successful businessman image and shot to the top in most of the three way race polls. Perot, the head of Electronic Data Systems (EDS) in Texas was a millionaire many times over. “Once you have money, life changes,” he joked.

Perot was seen as a stellar businessman and electronics expert in a year when, as often happens, polls showed a lack of loyalty to either sitting president George Bush or Arkansas governor Bill Clinton. The media set up Perot as a “can do” guy and a man who speaks his mind and doesn’t hide within the mumbo-jumbo speeches and pledges of politicians. The press liked Perot. “He was good theater and good copy from the start,” said one of his EDS executives.⁵

There are many similarities between Perot and Trump. Perot, like Trump, enjoyed being on television and seemed to crave the cameras. He was a TV star, too. His infomercials, speeches, and ads drew huge numbers of viewers. Trump, of course, was the long time star of his own network reality show. He loved the attention of the media from the first day he ran for president, always bragging of the intense coverage of his campaign.⁶

Perot did well in the 1992 race too, getting just over 20 million votes (19% of those cast). He was actually ahead of both Bush and Trump in the early summer, when he stunned all by dropping out of the race (He said he could not beat Clinton). Then, America was shocked when he jumped back in. It was too late, though, and Perot never caught up to his pre drop-out poll numbers.

The people who back Trump seem like the same type of people who backed Perot. A detailed study of voting statistics from the 1992 campaign by Albert Menendez showed that Perot's voter base came from people who did not have a college degree, were considered middle class or working class, and did not make much money. Many claimed they were economically distressed. Polls last summer and fall showed that those characteristics lined up pretty closely with Trump's basic supporters.⁷

The 1992 election also drew more voters than in several previous elections and most of the new people casting their ballots voted for Perot. (Statistically, in any American election where more people vote, the new voters tend to vote for third party candidates or Republicans or Democrats with radical views).

• • •

The non-politician candidates extend all the way back to George Washington. Just before the initial Presidential election in 1789, a year after the Constitution was ratified, Washington told friends, family, and colleagues that he certainly was not inside the system. He told his son-in-law David Stuart and friend James Madison that he was just a farmer from Virginia, with no political connections, and just read about political events in newspapers like everybody else.⁸

After he was elected president, Washington said that he had no interest in politics and just served "for the public good." Two centuries later, General Dwight D. Eisenhower did the same thing, saying that he only ran for president because the people wanted him to do so. He, like Washington, was no politician.⁹

One of the great "outsiders" in presidential campaign history was Senator Barry Goldwater from Arizona. He was not only a part of the political system as a senator, but an accomplished politician. Yet, the conservative Republican convinced his supporters that he was the original man on the outside looking in at the mess in Washington. He won his party's nomination because the delegates at the convention were angry over the liberal turn the nation had taken under John F. Kennedy and Lyndon B. Johnson. Goldwater, to them, embraced a conservative philosophy that was well outside the mainstream, making him the "outsider." While many Republicans saw him as a policy genius, others saw him as a fool. "What we were looking for was (something) that would put the nation and the rank and file of our party on alert to the fact that our leading candidate was impetuous, irresponsible and slightly stupid," said one delegate at the 1964 Republican convention.¹⁰

Goldwater was not a student of history either. Radicals simply do not win. "By simple definition, a winning political

party cannot be ideological or tightly disciplined to a narrow aim. Its machinery cannot be captured by a faction, however demanding or deserving," said a Republican at the time.

Goldwater made that mistake. He found out, too, that one large faction, such as the conservatives, is riddled with smaller factions within it, often at war with each other. Those wars helped to bring Goldwater down. Trump understands that and refuses to let conservative Republicans put him into their tent. He insisted that he saw each issue differently and was not a conservative.¹¹

Trump is also seen as a non-politician who can make some headway between the warring Democratic and Republican parties. Many political theorists contend that someone from either party cannot do that; someone not connected to either can because he/she has no history in congressional battles and goes to battle against both with the support of the public.¹²

Trump is also easy to describe—the tough guy, take-no-prisoners fighter out for a new America to be achieved by wars against groups A,B,C (pick a letter). New sheriff cleans up Dodge. Many outsiders have not been easy to define. Barack Obama seemed to be the perfect outsider. He was just a two year U.S. Senator and long term Illinois state senator with little or no administrative experience. He campaigned on a promise of "change" and was elected. Who was Barack Obama, though? He spent his first term mired in the wars of Iraq and Afghanistan and the worst economic crisis since the Great Depression. People could not define him at all and he suffered politically because of that.¹³

Even in his second term, Obama was not easily defined. Political analysts say that starting with Richard Nixon, presidents have tried to attract supporters from outside their own party to become more representative of the people and gain more power. Obama stuck with the Democrats and disdained the Republicans and that was part of his political identity problem and why he did not have as much success as he might have as an "outsider" and "non-politician."¹⁴

President Obama admitted that about himself. "Some powerful interests who had been dominating the agenda in Washington for a very long time...they're not always happy with me. They talk about me like a dog. That's not in my prepared remarks, but it's true," he said midway through his first term.¹⁵

• • •

No one took Trump seriously when he jumped into the race for the Republic nomination. He was a sideshow. He was a loud sideshow, full of color and bombast, but nobody in the political arena or the media gave him much of a chance. His early remarks on Mexicans being criminals and rapists drew scorn from the political and media establishment. Cities that had contracts with him for housing ended them. Univision, a Spanish language television network, canceled one of his beauty pageant shows. There was a movement to take his name off a state park that sat on land he donated to New York

State. He was derided from coast to coast. He claimed that Senator John McCain was not a war hero, despite spending years in a Vietnamese POW camp. The nation was aghast at that remark. His subsequent poll numbers? They rose. He argued that the United States should no longer allow Muslims into the United States. Politicians and media pundits were stunned—discrimination, persecution, unfairness. And his poll numbers rose yet again.

Why did they rise? Because many Americans just do not like Muslims. It does not matter if they should; they don't. "I'm for him on that," said Bonnie Stickley of Iowa. "They shouldn't be letting these people into the country."¹⁶

He was belligerent in the first TV debate and asserted that he would run as a third party candidate if he did not win the nomination. He also demeaned most of his fellow candidates. He did everything he was not supposed to do. The result—his poll numbers rose yet again. The establishment political groups and national media could not understand it. How could they not? What Trump was doing was appealing to the new angry-at-any-cost electorate that is simply fed up with the failure of American policy both foreign and domestic. Why were we permitting thousands to die and spending billions of dollars on wars against Iraq and Afghanistan that we were losing? If unemployment had dropped so low, why did so many people have friends and relatives still out of work? Why can't Johnny and Susie read and write very well? Somebody needs to solve these problems.

Critics and scholars charged most of the Trump supporters were nowhere near as informed about politics and history as they should be to serve as solid citizens (study groups contend that only about one third of America's high school graduates have proficient history and political science skills). As a result they are not responsible, educated voters. Kevin Mahnken, an associate at the Thomas B. Fordham Institute, wrote in the *New York Daily News* that "the rudiments of responsible citizenship anywhere lie in a basic awareness of national customs, politics and government. When deprived of this general background, voters are way more likely to fall for the policy free ramblings of a man who promises to replace Obamacare with 'something terrific.' With an impoverished understanding of executive powers and America's posture towards its neighbors. They might similarly buy into the notion that a President Trump could simply mandate that Mexico helpfully pay for a partition along our southern border."¹⁷

Trump understood all of that.

Former Pennsylvania governor Ed Rendell seemed to understand it, too. The experienced politician said that, "a lot of what he (Trump) says resonates with what you and I would call 'reasonable, thinking' people. That's the part that I think is important for Hillary or any Republican running, or Bernie Sanders, or anybody. That's the part that I think is important for them to realize."¹⁸

President Obama did too. The president, a frequent tar-

get of Trump, told National Public Radio that in order to win the White House, Trump was exploiting the job and wage frustrations of blue collar workers. "Blue collar men have had a lot of trouble in this new economy, where they are no longer getting the same bargain that they got when they were going to a factory and able to support their families on a single paycheck," the president said. "... [I]t means that there is going to be potential anger, frustration, fear – some of it justified, but just as directed. I think somebody like Mr. Trump is taking advantage of that. That's what he's exploiting during the course of his campaign."¹⁹

Around Christmas of 2015, people who had chuckled at the mention of Trump's name began to take the candidate seriously. Hillary Clinton was one. She finally said that Trump represents "prejudice and paranoia" and that his plan to keep Muslims out of the U.S. was, "...not only shameful; it's dangerous."

Clinton had been laughing at or attacking Trump for months. "I think it's shameful for our country to have people running around to be President of the United States saying those things, demonizing people," she said in early December. She added that "I no longer think he's funny" and that he had "gone way over the line."²⁰

Another problem for Clinton and the other Republican candidates was that all of them kept saying that there was no chance in the world that Trump could win the nomination. "In the long run..." they started many of their sentences. How could someone like that actually win the nomination? Impossible. Well, how did someone like Barack Obama win? John F. Kennedy? Abraham Lincoln? By refusing to believe Trump might actually be the nominee, the rest of the Republican field planned their strategies against him badly.

Many Americans who laughed at Trump at the start of his campaign changed their minds as time went on and events unfolded. As an example, Trump's hard-nosed stand on foreign policy and his contention that the United States has to keep out Moslems because they might be terrorists was hailed after the tragic shooting of fourteen people in San Bernardino, California in December 2015. Around the country, a lot of people began to say that they might think Trump was flamboyant, but they agreed with some or many of his positions. The public did not mind his endless personal attacks on Republican opponents or even name-calling of his opponents. Jeb Bush was "low energy" and "Dumb as a rock." Lindsey Graham was referred to as "an idiot." In early January, he began referring to Senator Cruz as "a nasty guy, a very nasty guy" and "a whack job." Trump made fun of Rick Perry's glasses. He often turned his name calling guns on the Democrats, stating again and again that Hillary Clinton was a "liar" and that she might be in the "clink" (prison) by the time the fall campaign started. In the middle of January he fired off his cannons at Democratic contender Senator Bernie Sanders, calling him a "wacko." Trump has repeatedly referred to Mrs. Clinton and his Republican opponents as "stupid" and "losers." He has often deemed them "the worst" in reference to any number of issues.²¹

Towards the end of December, Jeb Bush shook his head when talking about Trump and said, “Donald Trump is a chaos candidate and he would be a chaos President.”²² To defend themselves, other Republicans began to engage in name calling, too. Jeb Bush, wounded so often by Trump’s sharp barbs, fired back in December. “Just one other thing—I gotta’ get this off my chest—Donald Trump is a jerk,” Bush said to a crowd in New Hampshire. The crowd roared its approval.²³

Name calling just hurts the party, top Republicans said. They reminded Trump and voters, again and again of Ronald Reagan’s famous quote that the eleventh commandment of politics is never to speak ill of other Republicans. Sean Spicer, the

chief strategist for the Republican National Committee, told the CNN show *Reliable Sources* as early as July 2015 that, “I understand that it is going to be the nature of any primary for folks to discuss the differences between themselves on policy issues and I think that’s fine. The name calling, though, has got to stop.” He later said that, “We

*Anything can happen
in American politics
and usually does.*

have to remember that calling each other names is not helpful in the long term.”²⁴ Spicer’s boss, Republican party chairman Reince Priebus, went farther. “It needs to stop from whatever source, from every place,” he said.²⁵ Trump has also been accused of lying. Blogger Michael Russnow compared Trump to Nazi propagandist Joseph Goebbels who said, “...if you tell a lie big enough and keep repeating it, people will eventually come to believe it.”²⁶

Many pundits charged Trump with dealing in base American hatreds towards immigrants and citizens of other countries. “The danger right now is allowing him to legitimize the hatred that he so skillfully exploits and to revive the old American tendency, in frightening times, toward vicious treatment of the weak and outsiders,” said a *New York Times* editorial. The writer backed up his point by asking readers to remember that in World War II, fear of others caused the U.S. government to set up internment camps for Japanese-Americans, and the public, for the most part, approved.²⁷

The new year of 2016 found Trump blasting Bill Clinton as well as Mrs. Clinton and charging that when the general election campaign began, he would assail former President Clinton frequently for what he said, in veiled language, was his extramarital relationship with Monica Lewinsky and other women. Then it was off on another attack, this time GOP rival Senator Ted Cruz of Texas, who had inched ahead of him in local Iowa public opinion polls. Trump tried to malign Cruz as he had tried to malign President Obama a few years earlier by challenging the validity of his Hawaiian birth certificate. In similar fashion Trump challenged Cruz’ eligibility to run for president because he had been born in Canada, conveniently

ignoring the fact that Cruz’ mother was an American citizen thereby invalidating the ineligibility claim. Nonetheless, Trump went on television from one network to the other, posing the question about Cruz and suggesting that the U.S. would have a constitutional nightmare on its hands if, after Cruz was elected president, he could not serve because he was not born in the country. A few weeks later, he started to say that Cruz should run for prime minister of Canada and every time he did so, he elicited a huge, loving roar of approval from his crowd. He jumped on Cruz again in January when it was revealed that the Texas Senator had failed to reveal significant loans to his Senate campaign from large New York banks, those same types of banks Cruz always criticized in his campaign speeches and, as a Senator, was supposed to regulate. Many saw Cruz as not only dishonest, but hypocritical.

Trump promised to spend money too, to appease his critics who claimed that thanks to massive media coverage, he was campaigning for president for free while he kept bragging that he was worth nearly \$10 billion. He promised to spend \$8 million on a television advertising campaign with a signature ad. That ad was dark and threatening. In it, as always, Trump says, “I want to make America great again,” his rallying cry. There are dark images of attackers, ISIS fighters and protestors. He reiterated his pledge to keep Muslims out of the U.S. on a temporary basis and halt immigration from Mexico. “He’ll stop illegal immigrants by building a wall on our southern border that Mexico will pay for,” the ad narrator intones ominously. As the narrator said that, the film shows hundreds of immigrants racing towards what appears to be the U.S. border. Researchers at an online network checked out the commercial, though, and declared that those were not Mexicans racing towards the U.S., but unhappy people in Morocco trying to flee across its border. “I mean, the man owns a plane. Surely he must know Mexicans can’t sneak into the U.S. by running into Morocco,” laughed a columnist at the *New York Daily News*.²⁸

As the pre-primary campaign rolled into the middle of January and the first primary, the Iowa caucus loomed, Trump’s foes, Democratic and Republican, increased their criticism of him. Hillary Clinton continually charged that he was “first a Democrat, then a Republican” to undercut his Republican support. Several Republicans repeated Jeb Bush’s charge that Trump was a “chaos” candidate who would be a “chaos President.”²⁹ Trump’s ride through the Republican primaries this spring followed the pre-primary campaign that stirred up so much controversy. No matter where he campaigned, whether in the early primaries in Iowa and New Hampshire or on Super Tuesday, his outsider/non-politician image served him well and drew impressive vote totals. He tweeted constantly about Bill Clinton’s extramarital troubles and kept calling Hillary Clinton a “liar.” He took turns hammering Jeb Bush, Marco Rubio, Ted Cruz, and all the other Republican candidates. Every week, every day, it seemed, Trump was on the offensive against his Republican challengers, Mrs. Clinton, President Obama and former President Clinton.

There was no let up. No matter what he said and no matter how nasty his attacks became, his poll numbers remained high or climbed even higher.

The establishment wing of the Republican Party campaigned against him to the last minute. In the Republican response to the president's State of the Union address on January 12, South Carolina Republican governor Nikki Haley, a rising GOP star, slammed Trump. "Today we live in a time of threats like few others in recent memory. During anxious times, it can be tempting to follow the siren call of the angriest voices. We must resist that temptation. No one who is willing to work hard, abide by our laws and love our traditions should ever feel unwelcome in our country," Haley said.³⁰

Trump of course, slammed Governor Haley right back. Of her charges that he was an angry voice, he snorted, "I am! I am very angry because I hate what's happening to my country," he said.³¹

All agreed that Haley's comments were a direct attack on Trump on the part of the party hierarchy, although Republican leaders denied it. "Haley did it in a big, public way," said NBC News political editor John Dickerson.³²

And then, just a few days later, Ted Cruz bashed Trump by stating that he just represented 'New York values' in a derogatory way. When Cruz repeated that charge in the televised debate from Charleston, South Carolina on the evening of January 14, Trump did not lash back full of bombast and vitriol as he usually did against any charges against him. He paused and became very emotional in his response. He started to talk about the terrorist attacks on New York on September 11, 2001 in which nearly 3,000 New Yorkers were killed and the twin towers of the World Trade Center were destroyed. His response to Cruz, in defending New Yorkers in that story, applauding the first responders, fire and policemen and all New Yorkers, was not only laudatory, but eloquent, very emotional and even poetic. It brought a solemn, dignified moment to the lives of all those people watching the debates, and all who would read about them the next day. It was a personality change and triumph for Trump that no one expected. It might alter people's view of him.

• • •

Just before the Iowa caucuses, the direction of the national polling changed. Trump continued to lead all Republicans by a wide margin, two to one in some national polls (at the end of January his popularity kicked up to 41% among Republicans). In Iowa, Cruz was just behind him, but Trump was way ahead of Cruz, and everybody else, in New Hampshire. It became possible, pundits said, that Trump would lose in Iowa but win in New Hampshire, making the primary campaign more of a race than predicted in late December. All of the Republican candidates lost to Mrs. Clinton in national matchups, and Trump did, too, trailing her by ten or more percent in those polls. Mrs. Clinton though, had her hands full trying to fend off surprisingly strong rival Senator Bernie Sanders. She ran slightly ahead of

him or tied with him in Iowa and New Hampshire polls while running well ahead of him in national polls, setting up the possibility that he could upend her in the early primaries and, if he did so, undermine her national strength and make the Democratic race a close one.

Then, suddenly, there was a mammoth Trump bombshell announcement—former Alaska governor and vice presidential candidate Sarah Palin was going to endorse him. She was applauded wildly by Republicans when she endorsed Trump in her well-known, blowsy style, telling the crowds and television audience that Trump was "ballsy" and was going to win. "Stump for Trump!" she kept shouting, big smile on her face, as the Donald stood to her side, delighted.

And then, less than a week after that, as three feet of snow fell on the East Coast, former New York Mayor Michael Bloomberg said that he was thinking of running for president too, as an independent, and that he would spend one billion dollars out of his \$37 billion fortune to seek the White House. That announcement rattled all in the presidential sweepstakes already, but the pundits said Bloomberg would not hurt Trump. He would hurt the Democrats. Trump had out-trumped them all once again.

That is how The Donald, businessman and reality television star, marched into the primary season, Sarah Palin at his side, his orange hair flopping in the breeze, a copy of *The Art of the Deal* under his arm, the media trailing, and Mexicans and Muslims nowhere to be found.

Donald Trump created his own political world and in primary after primary, showed that he was the new American politician. He may not get elected President, now or ever, but he has sent American politics spinning off in a new and memorable direction.

And if you don't like it, you loser, he'll fire you...

33

NOTES

- 1 Richard Norton Smith, *Abraham Lincoln and the Triumph of Politics*, Gettysburg: Gettysburg College Press, 2007, 21.
- 2 Donnal Smith, "The Influence of the Foreign Born of the Northwest in the Election of 1860," *Mississippi Valley Historical Review*, XIX (1932), 193, 202, 204.
- 3 Allen Thorndike Rice, Ed., "Reminiscences of Lincoln by Distinguished Men of his Time," New York: *North American Review*, 1888, 414.
- 4 Gary Ecelbarger, *The Great Comeback: How Lincoln Beat the Odds to Win the 1860 Republican Nomination*, New York: St. Martin's Press, 2008, 212.
- 5 Gerald Posner, *Citizen Perot: His Life and Times*, New York, Random House, 1996, 47, 48.
- 6 Posner, *Citizen Perot*, 260
- 7 Arthur J. Menendez, *The Perot Voters*, Amherst, N.Y.: Prometheus Books, 1996, 27, 31.

- 8 George Washington to David Stuart, November 30, 1787, to James Madison, December 7, 1787, John Fitzpatrick, Ed, *The Writings of George Washington*, 39 Vols, Washington, D.C., 1939, Vol. 29: 323-324, 331-334.
- 9 Geoffrey Perret, *Eisenhower*, New York: Random House, 1999, 408-411.
- 10 Theodore White, *The Making of the President*, 1968, New York: Atheneum, 1965, 197.
- 11 Harold Faber, Ed., *Road to the White House*, New York: New York Times, xiii, 273.
- 12 Gillian Peele, Chris Bailey, H. Guy Peters, *Developments in American Politics*, No. 7, New York: Palgrave, Macmillan, 2014, 16-17.
- 13 Stanley Renshon, *Barack Obama and the Politics of Redemption*, New York: Routledge Press, 2012, 27.
- 14 Renshon, *Barack Obama and the Politics of Redemption*, 28.
- 15 *The Hill*, September 6, 2010.
- 16 *New York Times*, December 11, 2015.
- 17 *New York Daily News*, January 6, 2016.
- 18 Ibid., December 11, 2015.
- 19 National Public Radio interview, December 19, 2015, *New York Times*, December 21, 2015.
- 20 Ibid., December 11, 2015.
- 21 Various sources and CNN News, January 12, 2016.
- 22 *New York Times*, December 19, 2015.
- 23 CNN newswire, December 19, 2015.
- 24 Sean Spicer, CNN newswire, July 26, 2015.
- 25 Ibid.
- 26 Russnow blog, www.ramproductoininternational.com
- 27 *New York Times*, December 10, 2015.
- 28 *New York Daily News*, January 6, 2016.
- 29 CNN newscast, January 12, 2016.
- 30 Governor Nikki Haley in Republican response to the State of the Union speech, CNN, January 12, 2015.
- 31 Donald Trump, NBC.com, January 13, 2015.
- 32 John Dickerson, NBC News, January 13, 2015.

ACADEMIC AFFAIRS ANNOUNCEMENTS

New Faculty & Staff

ROBERT ASLANIAN, PhD

Assistant Professor of Chemistry

Dr. Aslanian received his undergraduate degree from Rutgers University and the PhD from the State University of New York at Stony Brook. Before joining NJCU in 2012, he worked in the pharmaceutical industry for Schering-Plough and Merck where he held positions of increasing responsibility including Senior Director and Site Scientific Operations Lead. Dr. Aslanian is co-inventor on 55 U.S. patents and co-author on 88 scientific articles and reviews. He is also co-editor of the book *Case Studies in Modern Drug Discovery and Development*. Dr. Aslanian's research interests include medicinal chemistry, in particular the preparation of compounds to treat African sleeping sickness, organic methodology, and the development of new organic laboratory experiments for undergraduate organic chemistry labs.

ANTHONY AVILLO, MS

*Assistant Professor and Chair
of Fire Science*

Mr. Avillo has a Bachelor of Science degree in Fire Science and a Master's Degree in National Security Studies from New Jersey City University. Retired in 2015 after a 30 year career in the fire service, Avillo was a deputy chief in North Hudson, New Jersey Regional Fire & Rescue, assigned as 1st Platoon regional tour commander. He is also an instructor at the Monmouth County Fire Academy. He has lectured at conferences across the United States and is a member of the executive editorial advisory board of *Fire Engineering* magazine. He is the author of *Fireground Strategies, 3rd edition* (Pennwell, 2015) and *Fireground Strategies Workbook Volumes I, II, and III* (Pennwell, 2002, 2010, 2016). He was a contributing author to *Fire Engineering's Handbook for Firefighter I and Firefighter II* (Pennwell, 2009) and is co-author of its Study Guide (Pennwell, 2010). Avillo was a collaborator in the *Tactical Perspectives* DVD series (Pennwell, 2011) and the DVD *Forging a Culture of Safety* (Pennwell, 2013). An additional textbook, *Full Contact Leadership*, is under contract (Pennwell) and awaiting publication. Avillo was recipient of the 2012 Fire Engineering/ISFSI George D. Post Fire Instructor of the Year Award.

35

MERIEM BENDAOU, PhD

Assistant Professor of Biology

Dr. Bendaoud earned her PhD in biomedical sciences from Rutgers Graduate School of Biomedical Sciences and a BS degree in biology and mathematics from New Jersey City University. Her teaching experience includes a wide variety of biology courses at several institutions, ranging from Hudson County Community College to Rutgers University. Dr. Bendaoud's research interests include *in vitro* studies of bacterial competitive interactions as well as identification and characterization of natural compounds which inhibit biofilm formation of pathogenic bacteria. The main focus of her laboratory is the development of new biofilm-specific pharmacologic strategies against biofilm forming bacteria such as *Staphylococcus aureus*.

BARBARA BLOZEN
EdD, RN, MA, BC, CNL
Associate Professor of Nursing

Dr. Blozen earned her EdD in Higher Education from Seton Hall University and Master's degree in Nursing from NYU. In Sept. 2014 she was appointed to the New Jersey State Board of Nursing by Governor Chris Christie. Her published work has appeared in many issues of *The American Nurse Today* and has been a presenter at conferences throughout the world, including, the International Nursing Research Congresses of Sigma Theta Tau International in Prague and Brisbane. Dr. Blozen was recently awarded a Robert Wood Johnson Foundation Grant and has been the recipient of numerous nursing awards including the GEM (Giving Excellence Meaning) Award where she progressed to become a national finalist, she was also honored by the Institute for Nursing with the Diva award. The chair of the New Jersey State Nurses Association Review Team III since 2010 and vice president of The Institute for Nursing region 6 through 2016, Dr. Blozen was appointed to the organization's Committee on Continuing Education and was also competitively selected as a reviewer for the American Association of Colleges of Nursing's Khan Academy NCLEX-RN Competition. She has served as an accreditation appraiser for the American Nurses Association since 2013 and as a manuscript reviewer for Nurse Education in Practice since 2011. Barbara is a volunteer for Ocean of Love, a charitable organization dedicated to helping children with cancer and their families. She leads a monthly bereavement group for parents who have lost children. She holds certification from the American Nurses Credentialing Center.

REED CARROLL, PhD
Associate Professor of Biology

Dr. Carroll received a BA in cell biology from Cornell University and a PhD in biochemistry from Harvard University. Following postdoctoral studies at UCSF and Stanford, Dr. Carroll joined the Neuroscience Department faculty at Albert Einstein College of Medicine. At Einstein he served as an Assistant then Associate Professor teaching neuroscience and leading a research laboratory for twelve years. Dr. Carroll's area of research interest is in the cellular mechanisms that are responsible for learning and memory. In particular his published investigations have examined how activity in the brain affects the expression and subcellular targeting of molecules that regulate the communication between neurons.

DEBANANDA CHAKRABORTY, PhD
Assistant Professor of Mathematics

Dr. Chakraborty earned her PhD in applied mathematics from the State University of New York at Buffalo. Prior to joining NJCU, she was an assistant professor at Virginia Intermont College. Her research interests include: applied mathematics, partial differential equations, computational mathematics, stochastic methods, nonlinear optics, financial mathematics, and high performance computing. She has worked on problems in a broad range of fields including nonlinear dynamics, linear and nonlinear waves, pattern formation, population dynamics models, and waves in random media. Fields of applications include optical communication systems (in optical fibers and in the atmosphere), optical wave guide devices, and materials science.

JOHN DONNELLEN, DPS, MBA

Assistant Professor of Business

Dr. Donnellan earned his doctorate in international business from Pace University Lubin School of Business. His research focuses on financial and economic trends as well as critical thinking in business. His recent publications include “How expert judgment reacts to a major financial crisis: An analysis of the 1925-1933 bond ratings of John Moody” and “The Technology of Ratings Then and Now; Hiding in Plain Sight.” Dr. Donnellan also has a long history of working on Wall Street having spent over 20 years at J.P. Morgan within the treasury research space and Prudential Financial within the investments public relations space. He continues to provide economic views on the global market to Wall Street and is a contributor to *The Street* publication. Dr. Donnellan is currently part of The Presidents Faculty Fellows Program researching critical thinking at NJCU and Changzhou University, Changzhou, China.

ALLISON M. FITZGERALD, PhD

Assistant Professor of Biology

Dr. Fitzgerald earned her PhD in Biology (Ecology) from the Graduate Center, City University of New York, M.Sc. from the School of Marine and Atmospheric Sciences, Stony Brook University, and B.Sc. from the University of Maryland. Her research has focused on local estuarine invertebrates, especially molluscs, and the interactions between these organisms and the environment. Dr. Fitzgerald and her lab currently investigate oyster restoration and physiology within the Hudson Raritan Estuary, the effects of various pollutants on invertebrate physiology, and the diversity of invertebrates found in our local waters. Her previous work with local non-profits in the area has provided many research opportunities for undergraduates.

VENESSA GARCIA, PhD

Assistant Professor of Criminal Justice

Dr. Garcia earned her PhD in sociology from the State University of New York at Buffalo. Before joining NJCU, she worked as a research associate with the National Center for State Courts. For the last 13 years, Dr. Garcia taught criminal justice as a tenured faculty member at Kean University where she also served as coordinator of the MPA/CJ graduate program. Dr. Garcia's research interests are in the areas of women and crime justice, and crime and media. She has published in *Police Practice and Research: An International Journal* and the *Journal of Contemporary Criminal Justice*. She also has authored several book chapters and encyclopedia entries. Dr. Garcia's most recent book was, *Gendered Justice: Intimate Partner Violence and the Criminal Justice System* (Rowman & Littlefield, 2011). Dr. Garcia is currently working on three book contracts where she examines women and policing, female offenders, and crime in the media.

JEAN GIORGIOU, EdD

*Assistant Professor
of Counselor Education*

Dr. Georgiou earned her doctorate degree in counseling education and supervision from Argosy University, an MA in psychological counseling from Monmouth University, and a BA in psychology from Thomas Edison University. Dr. Georgiou is a Licensed Professional Counselor in private practice where she works with children, teens, adults, couples, and families. She also supervises LACs and LPCs and has been an active clini-

cian in this setting for almost 15 years. She is also an Approved Clinical Supervisor, a Certified Clinical Trauma Professional, certified in Disaster Mental Health by the American Red Cross, and serves as the vice president of the New Jersey Association for Child and Adolescent Counseling. Her research interests include graduate group work, multicultural issues, the development of a codependency scale (adult and children), and various areas of trauma work. Dr. Georgiou has presented at the state, national, and international levels and is currently working on several writing projects.

JOY A. J. HOWARD, PhD
Assistant Professor of English

Dr. Howard's PhD is in literary studies from Purdue University. She specializes in early American literature, women's narratives, and Native studies. Before coming to NJCU, Dr. Howard held appointments in the English departments at the United States Military Academy at West Point and at Saint Joseph's University in Philadelphia. Her work has appeared in *Religion in the Age of Enlightenment*, the *Journal of Prose Studies*, and *Legacy*, as well as in several edited collections. She presents her work nationally and internationally. Her current manuscript project, *Hearing Silenced Voices: Reimagining Authorship and a Captive's life in the Iroquois Heartlands*, has been supported by fellowships at the Folger Shakespeare Library, the Kislak Center for Colonial Research, Pennsylvania State University Center for American Studies, and the William L. Clements Library in The University of Michigan. Since 2013 she has served as the liaison between the Society of Early Americanists and the national organization of American Society for Eighteenth Century Studies.

38

HUN BOK JUNG, PhD
*Assistant Professor
of Geoscience and Geography*

Dr. Jung earned his PhD from the Graduate Center of the City University of New York. He is an environmental scientist specializing in environmental geochemistry and hydrology. He has conducted research for various environmental projects funded by the National Institute of Environmental Health Sciences and the Department of Energy. His research topics include groundwater contamination, geologic carbon sequestration, hydraulic fracturing, and environmental remediation. Dr. Jung joined New Jersey City University in 2014 and has carried out environmental research projects with undergraduate students. He has published over 20 peer-reviewed research articles.

NING LIAO, PhD
Assistant Professor of Political Science

Dr. Liao joined the NJCU faculty in 2014 following the completion of his PhD in international studies at Old Dominion University. Dr. Liao has offered a wide array of introductory and advanced courses in international relations. He is currently the faculty advisor of the NJCU's delegation to the National Model United Nations. His scholarship largely falls into the thematic fields of the international relations of East Asia, particularly Chinese foreign relations and U.S.-China relations. His research has appeared in refereed journals such as *Asian Politics & Policy*, *East Asia: An International Quarterly*, and *Asian Profile*, as well as an edited volume published by the University of Michigan Press. He is a frequent presenter at national and regional conferences in political science, international studies, Asian studies, and China studies.

TERRY L. KAMPS, PhD

Assistant Professor of Biology

Dr. Kamps earned a PhD specializing in plant genetics from the University of Florida. Her MS degree in plant breeding and genetics and BS degree in horticultural sciences were earned at Michigan State University. Prior to arriving at NJCU, Dr. Kamps had an extensive career as a research scientist working at several major research universities and with the US Department of Agriculture. Her work has been published and frequently cited in some of the most important scientific journals in her field. Her research program at NJCU focuses on implementing transmission and advanced molecular genetic tools to investigate plant reproductive biology and cellular processes.

VIRGINIA OCHOA-WINEMILLER, PhD

*Assistant Professor
of Latin American, Caribbean
and Latino Studies*

Dr. Ochoa-Winemiller received her B.A. in anthropological sciences from Mexico's Universidad Autonoma de Yucatan and both her MA and PhD from Louisiana State University with a combined degree in geography and anthropology. As a Maya archaeologist and cultural geographer, she has conducted research in the Yucatan Peninsula, Belize, and Honduras. Her research interests include production and distribution of clay artifacts with 3D scanning technology, pottery and landscape archaeology, Geographic Information Systems, ethnic and health geography, urbanism, and globalization in Latin America. She is a current member of the Society for American Archaeology and Sigma Xi, the scientific research society. She has presented at international conferences and published articles in Mexico, Guatemala, Germany, and the United States.

EUNSU LEE, PhD

Assistant Professor of Management

Dr. Lee earned his PhD in transportation and logistics and an MS in industrial engineering and management from North Dakota State University, an MBA in production and service management from Hanyang University in Korea, and a BSE in computer science from Kwandong University in Korea. He holds professional credentials of Certification of Production & Inventory Management (CPIM), Certified Supply Chain Professional (CSCP), and Geographic Information Systems Professional (GISP). He has published more than 20 refereed papers and nine technical papers. He delivered over 45 contributed and invited talks at international and national meetings. His interests are in data modeling and analytics and supply chain, logistics, and transportation management. He is an active member of standing committees in visualization in transportation and agricultural transportation at Transportation Research Board, a division of National Academy.

39

JANET PIHLBLAD, MFA

Assistant Professor of Art

Janet Pihlblad earned her MFA from Rutgers University with a major in sculpture and subsequently studied design at Parsons and at Pratt Institute. She has had a dual career as a graphic designer and as an exhibiting artist for 20 years. Her work has been exhibited at the New Museum, PS1/MoMA, the Drawing Center, the Rockford Museum, the Kemper Museum of Contemporary Art, P.P.O.W. Gallery, and the Carrie Secrist Gallery. Her

design practice includes work for *Vanity Fair*, *Art Forum*, Rolex Watch Company, and Penguin Putnam, Inc. She has taught art and design at Roger Williams University, George Washington University, the Corcoran College of Art and Design, and the Maryland Institute College of Art and Design. Her art practice focuses on themes of the human relationship to the natural world using diverse materials and technologies. Currently, her design practice engages typography and interactive media. Last year she exhibited at NJCU's Lemmerman Gallery in a group show entitled *Allegory of Leaves*.

AMY MELTZER RADY, EdD

*Associate Professor of Fitness,
Exercise and Sports*

Dr. Rady is the chair of the Department of Fitness, Exercise and Sports. Prior to coming to NJCU, she served as director of the Physical Education Teacher Preparation Program at Saint Joseph's College of Maine. She has taught at William Paterson University, Barnard College, and SUNY at Stony Brook. Dr. Rady co-authored the book, *Urban Physical Education Instructional Practices and Cultural Activities* in January 2012. She has presented at the National Association of Kinesiology in Higher Education, the American Association for Health, Physical Education, Recreation and Dance, and the New Jersey Association for Health, Physical Education, Recreation and Dance. She has published in *The Chronicle of Kinesiology in Higher Education*, the *Journal of Physical Education, Recreation, and Dance* and *The Journal of Teaching in Physical Education*.

KATHLEEN DONOHUE RENNIE, PhD

*Joint Associate Professor
in Professional Security Studies
and the School of Business*

Dr. Rennie teaches crisis, strategic, and leadership communication for Professional Security Studies, where she serves as director of the doctoral program and department co-chair. Dr. Rennie also teaches marketing communications and public relations in the School of Business. She has more than 20 years of experience successfully researching, developing, and implementing strategic communications campaigns for a broad range of organizations. Dr. Rennie holds a PhD in Leadership, Management and Policy from Seton Hall University. She earned an undergraduate degree in communication and English from Rutgers University as well as a Master of Arts in Corporate and Public Communication from Seton Hall University. She is an accredited public relations counselor and PRSA Fellow.

MICHELLE ROSEN, EdD

*Assistant Professor
of Literacy Education*

Dr. Rosen earned her EdD with a concentration in teacher leadership, a master's degree in reading, and Reading Specialist Certification from Rutgers University. She earned her bachelor's degree in Elementary Education from Rider University. At NJCU, she serves as assistant professor in the Department of Literacy Education where she also directs the America Reads Tutoring Program and co-Directs the Common Core Academy, a professional development initiative for in-service teachers. Dr. Rosen's research interests include developing teacher leaders to be effective professional development providers as well as engaging students in a constructivist learning approach in an effort to increase comprehension for learners. She has presented at the Association for Literacy Educators and Researchers, the Northeast Research

Association, and the New Jersey Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development. Her work has been published in the *NJEA Review*, *Elementary School Journal*, *Highlights for Children* and *The Ed.D and Scholarly Practitioners: the CPED Way* (in press).

YUFENG WEI, PhD

Assistant Professor of Chemistry

Dr. Wei earned his Ph.D. in biochemistry and biophysics from Columbia University and has taught at Hunter College and Seton Hall University. His research focuses on the understanding of the molecular regulations of key biological pathways that determine the death or survival of tumor cells to inform novel therapeutic interventions of cancers. He is a recipient of the National Institutes of Health Academic Research Enhancement Award (2013-2016), and authored numerous publications on high impact journals, including *Nature Structural and Molecular Biology* and *Biochimica et Biophysica Acta (BBA)*.

Separately Budgeted Research Projects Awards 2014-2015

ROBERT ASLANIAN	<i>Green chemistry: A one-pot synthesis of ketones from carboxylic acids: Application to the synthesis of fenofibric acid</i>
NURDAN S. DUZGOREN-AYDIN	<i>Evaluation of Heavy Metal Mobility and Bioaccessibility in Jersey City Community Garden Soils: Should We Be Concerned?</i>
DAVID BLACKMORE	<i>Beyond the literatura de Sodoma scandal: Queering Portuguese modernism</i>
JOHN BRAGG	<i>Anatolian notables and popular resistance during World War I and the Turkish War of Independence (1914-1923)</i>
REED CARROLL	<i>A novel mechanism regulating inhibitory signaling in the brain</i>
NATALIA COLEMAN and WAYNE M. EBY	<i>Mathematical model of cancer cell viability after different regimes of treatment and doxorubicin</i>
DONNA FARINA	<i>What work were they doing on Subbotnik? Translational equivalence and explanation of meaning in 20th Century Russian-English dictionaries</i>
AUDREY FISCH	<i>Using informational text to teach A Raisin in the Sun</i>
ELLEN GARVEY	<i>Back number budd: An African American entrepreneur's role in Nineteenth-Century information management</i>
ANDREW GETZFELD	<i>Writing the first six out of twelve chapters of the second edition of Abnormal Psychology. Revising it for current DSM-5 standards and criteria, and updating the research, treatment modalities, and medications discussed within</i>
JENIFER HARTMAN	<i>Developing a researcher/practitioner collaboration to improve students' college and career readiness and success</i>
TERRY L. KAMPS	<i>Evaluating mitochondrial RNA editing as a cause of cytoplasmic male sterility (CMS) in maize</i>
BUMJUNG KIM	<i>Fabrication of rubrene organic field-effect transistors using crystalline hexatriacontane (C₃₆H₇₄) dielectric layer</i>
TAN LIN	<i>The PowerPoint lectures</i>

Average Award: \$3,855

Separately Budgeted Research Projects Awards 2015-2016

MORTEZA AABDOLLAH *Telecommunication & networking research laboratory*

MAURA ALTAMURA *Absence/Presence: A Photographic Inquiry*

ROBERT ASLANIAN *Organic Chemistry Research in the Undergraduate Curriculum: Synthesis of a new series of compounds useful for the treatment of Human African Trypanosomiasis (HAT)*

ETHAN BUMAS *Nietzsche on His Balcony*

NATALIA COLEMAN *and* REED CARROLL *Molecular mechanism of learning disabilities associated with NF-1*

ALLISON M. FITZGERALD *Mapping the living and hardened shorelines of Jersey City and the Lower Hudson Raritan Estuary: Using physical, chemical, and biological data to create comprehensive habitat and species maps*

EDVIGE GIUNTA *You Were the Girl: A Memoir (Part Two)*

JOY HOWARD *Hearing silenced voices in the archive: Recovering Rebecca Kellogg*

HUN BOK JUNG *Coupled geochemical and hydrological control on the transport and fate of anthropogenic contaminants in the hyporheic zone of urban coastal aquifers*

TERRY KAMPS *Cloning and characterization of flowering time (FT) Genes*

BUMJUNG KIM *Lithography-free fabrication of organic field-effect transistor using 2-D nanomaterials: graphene and hexagonal boron nitride*

TAN LIN *Reading in a Digital Age*

FRÉDÉRIC MYNARD *Measure of compactness, ascoli-type theorems, and exponential objects in CAP*

VANASHRI NARGUND-JOSHI *Developing pre-service teachers' pedagogical content knowledge for teaching science to English Language Learners (ELL)*

SCOTT O'CONNOR *The ontology of aristotelian matter*

ELLEN QUINN *Design research*

SABINE ROEHR *Edition of K. L. Reinhold's Verhandlungen über die Grundbegriffe und Grundsätze der Moralität (The Fundamental Concepts and Principles of Ethics) with an Introduction and Commentary (Final Draft)*

MICHELLE ROSEN *and*
LEONID RABINOVICH *Co-Teaching: Initiate, implement, and sustain professional learning through teacher mentor/student intern partnerships*

CAROLINE WILKINSON *Extending Notions of college-level writing skills in assignment prompts*

Average Award: \$4226

Call for Papers

FALL 2016

PERSONAL POSSESSIONS AND IDENTITY

DEADLINE

September 29, 2016

The Fall 2016 issue of *The Academic Forum* is seeking articles on the theme of personal possessions and identity. Contributors are invited to select a specific possession, groups of possessions, or artifacts and reflect on their significance in the development of a personal, professional, or cultural identity.

Submissions should be between 5,000 to 8,000 words in length, preferably typed on Microsoft Word or saved as an RTF file, and submitted via E-mail. All citations should be in APA style. An honorarium of \$300 will be awarded to authors of articles that are approved for publication.

For further information contact:

Steve Haber
Editor

ESL Office: K-217
Telephone: 201.200.3282 Email: shaber@njcu.edu

New Jersey City University

THE ACADEMIC FORUM

Office of the Provost
Hepburn Hall, H-309
2039 Kennedy Boulevard
Jersey City, NJ 07305-1597

NON-PROFIT ORGANIZATION

U.S. POSTAGE

PAID

PERMIT #88

JERSEY CITY, NJ 07305

THE ACADEMIC FORUM

The Academic Forum is a publication of the Office of the Provost, New Jersey City University.

PROVOST: Daniel J. Julius

EDITOR: Steven B. Haber

EDITORIAL BOARD: Nurdan Aydin, Alberto Barugel, Gloria Boseman, John Donnellan, Corey Frost, Jimmy Jung, Siyu Liu, Sherrie Madia, Karen Morgan, Wanda Rutledge, Lourdes Sutton, Deborah Woo

CONTRIBUTORS: Bruce Chadwick, Donna M. Farina, Jason D. Martinek, Zandile P. Nkabinde, Godwin Ohiwerei, Guillermo "Will" de Veyga, Grace Wambu

DESIGN: Ellen Quinn

The Academic Forum is a publication of the Office of the Provost at New Jersey City University, Hepburn Hall 309, 2039 Kennedy Boulevard, Jersey City, New Jersey 07305. ■ *The Academic Forum* is concerned with publishing creative, scholarly, and research works submitted by the faculty, professional staff, and students of New Jersey City University. The publication is of particular interest to faculty, professional staff, administrators, and students in urban higher education institutions throughout the northeast region of the United States. ■ Original articles or proposals for themes for subsequent issues are welcome and should be addressed to the editor-in-chief Steve Haber by email at shaber@njcu.edu or to the Office of the Provost, The Academic Forum, Hepburn Hall 309, New Jersey City University, 2039 Kennedy Boulevard, Jersey City, New Jersey 07305 or by phone at 201-200-2033 or fax at 201-200-2072. ■ The Academic Forum uses Word 2010 to edit submitted materials. Manuscripts should follow the stylistic guidelines set forth in the Publication Manual of the American Psychological Association, 6th edition (2010) or the most recent edition as published by the American Psychological Association (APA). All references including electronic citations should follow the APA guidelines. ■ Manuscripts are submitted at the sender's risk and no responsibility is assumed for the return of the material. *The Academic Forum* is published during the academic year and is offered at no charge to the recipient.

Copyright ©2016 by *The Academic Forum*, New Jersey City University. No part of this publication may be reproduced or duplicated in any form or by any means, or stored in a database or retrieval system, without prior written permission of the publisher, New Jersey City University and author(s). Permission to reprint articles must be secured by contacting the managing editor of *The Academic Forum* and is contingent upon permission by the author AND inclusion of *The Academic Forum* copyright notice on the first page of the reproduced material.

NEW JERSEY CITY UNIVERSITY
2039 Kennedy Boulevard, Jersey City, New Jersey 07305-1597