

POLITICAL PARTICIPATION OF 18–24 YEAR OLDS, 2018 AND 2020 ELECTION CYCLE

Tried to convince other youth to vote



Donated money to a campaign



Attended a march or demonstration



Registered others to vote



Volunteered for a political campaign



2018 (Midterm) 2020 (Presidential)

Source: CIRCLE/Tisch College, 2020

2. Use the bar graph to answer the following questions.

- A. Identify the form of political participation that saw the largest change between the 2018 and 2020 elections, as shown in the bar graph.
- B. Describe the difference in overall participation between the midterm and presidential elections, as shown in the bar graph.
- C. Draw a conclusion about how linkage institutions might have contributed to the difference in political participation between the midterm and presidential elections, as shown in the bar graph.
- D. Explain how the different levels of political participation, as shown in the bar graph, might demonstrate the concept of political efficacy.

Begin your response to this question at the top of a new page in the separate Free Response booklet and fill in the appropriate circle at the top of each page to indicate the question number.

This question requires you to compare a Supreme Court case you studied in class with one you have not studied in class. A summary of the Supreme Court case you did not study in class is presented below and provides all of the information you need to know about this case to answer the prompts.

Cantwell v. Connecticut (1940)

3. Newton Cantwell and his sons, who were Jehovah’s Witnesses, went door-to-door in a New Haven, Connecticut, neighborhood to distribute pamphlets about their religion and encouraged people to join their church. The men did not have a permit to solicit door-to-door. A Connecticut state court convicted the Cantwells of violating an ordinance that stated “[n]o person shall solicit money, services, subscriptions or any valuable thing for any alleged religious, charitable or philanthropic cause. . . unless such cause shall have been approved by the secretary of the public welfare council.”

Cantwell and his sons challenged the conviction, arguing that they did not need to obtain a permit because their activities were protected by the United States Constitution. The Connecticut Supreme Court upheld the conviction, finding that the statute was in the public interest and that it protected against fraud. The Cantwells appealed to the United States Supreme Court.

In a unanimous decision, the Supreme Court ruled in the Cantwells’ favor, holding that the United States Constitution prohibited states from making laws like the one in question in New Haven. The Court reasoned that the First Amendment gives citizens the right to believe, as well as the right to act on those beliefs, and regarding the right to act, laws may not deny or limit the right to preach or disseminate religious views.

- A. Identify the First Amendment clause that is common to both *Wisconsin v. Yoder* (1972) and *Cantwell v. Connecticut* (1940).
- B. Explain how the facts in *Wisconsin v. Yoder* and *Cantwell v. Connecticut* resulted in the Supreme Court issuing similar holdings in both cases.
- C. Explain how the facts of *Cantwell v. Connecticut* (1940) illustrate the Court’s need to balance government power and the rights of citizens.

Begin your response to this question at the top of a new page in the separate Free Response booklet and fill in the appropriate circle at the top of each page to indicate the question number.