Q: “In a political system where nearly every adult may vote but where knowledge, wealth, social position, access to officials, and other resources are unequally distributed, who actually governs?” In one paragraph, explain HOW Larry Bartels answers this question in The New Gilded Age reading. In another paragraph, explain ONE PIECE OF EVIDENCE Bartels provides for his conclusion.

A:

Bartels answers this question by explaining the economic inequality and how it has been ignored all these years. Bartels uncovers that financial disparity isn't only an issue of the market but much more than that. Economic inequality is a political issue and has been obviously attached to politics, especially presidential politics. Bartels has also presented statistical data to prove his claims. Notwithstanding, as opposed to just accepting that each constituent's opinion gets equivalent weight, he analyzed the perspectives of rich, working class, and helpless constituents. The outcomes recommended that the perspectives on rich constituents are genuinely powerful, particularly for Republican legislators. The perspectives on working class constituents matter rather less, while the perspectives on constituents in the base third of the pay dispersion have no clear impact on their representatives' roll call votes. In a nutshell, he argues that the upper or wealthier social class or interest groups belonging in that class govern as the economically advantaged groups unleash their greater resources in the political sphere. To shed some more light on how they manage to do so, he says, “These groups lobby for tax loopholes, hire lawyers and accountants to maximize their benefit from tax laws, and then deduct the costs.” (Bartels, 6)

I believe that Bartels has quite a pessimistic view in answering Dahl’s question. He basically argues that social and economic imbalances have developed so much in the United States, and particularly under the administration of Republican presidents, that political correspondence has been diminished completely. To prove that, Bartels uses the theory presented by economists Piketty and Saez and others on salary imbalance in the United States and indicates that in 1970 in the United States, most of the total generated wealth has gone to the smaller and smaller percentage of wealthy people (Bartels, 11). He conveys the stunning news to support his argument that throughout the most recent 25 years, for instance, while the genuine pay of families at the 20th percentile has become just 0.4% and the pay of families at the 60th percentile has become under 1% every year, the genuine salary at the 99.9th percentile has almost significantly increased and the pay of those at the 99.99th percentile expanded five-overlap (Bartels, 9).