

4. The Red and the Blue: A Divided America

One legacy of the 2000 election is a system of new voting machines that could be even more dangerous to democracy than the old ones. Another is a national political deadlock—the Red States vs. the Blue States.

During the 2000 election, as results trickled in from across the country, networks showed Republican-won states as red and Democratic-won states as blue. The map filled up in a clear pattern, with coastal and Great Lakes states in the Blue camp and the central and southern states falling in the Red camp. George W. Bush won a higher number of states, but Al Gore won populous states with a high value in the electoral college, the somewhat mysterious system which ultimately determines the presidency. It all came down to Florida, a state with one of the most interesting demographic mixes in the country.

Parts of Florida are highly urban, and parts are extremely rural. Parts are mainly white, mainly black, or mainly Latino. Some sections have a high youth population; others have a concentration of senior citizens. But the most important factor in determining the virtual electoral deadlock in Florida is money. Out of all the states in America, Florida comes the closest to giving the same amount of money to the federal government as it gets back.

Why does that matter? The best way to tell a Red state from a Blue state is not its location in the country but how much federal tax residents pay versus how much they get back from the federal government. People in the Red states tend to believe in smaller government; people in the Blue states tend to support (prudent) government spending. You would think, then, that Red Staters are pissed because they pay more than their share of taxes to the federal government. In fact, the exact opposite is true. Blue Staters pay more taxes to the federal government than their states get back in return. As one person on the conservative Free Republic website put it, decrying the Blue States, “We have those who work vs lazy slobs. We have morality vs immorality. Representative republic vs tyrantical [*sic*] communism.” Given that the Red Staters are sucking up federal dollars, who exactly is immoral?¹

Rural farm subsidies and pork barrel public work projects give the Red States a distinct fiscal advantage. But the myth that the Blue States are “takers” and the Red States are “givers” is one of the most pernicious and persistent in politics. By playing the “taker” card, conservative politicians have been able to cut back on popular programs including preschoolers’ Head Start. The programs that serve Red Staters are rarely subjected to such scrutiny. The Blue States either have a bad political strategy or extremely bad P.R.

Or perhaps it’s that the Blue Staters are perceived as “other,” and the Red Staters are perceived as “we.” Blue States are more urban and have a higher concentration of immigrants and people of color. Red States tend to be more rural, more white, and less first-generation immigrant. The fight over Red and Blue states, in this sense, is not just about taxes or ideology. It’s about who is perceived as a “real” American.

A 2004 O’Leary/Zogby poll on American values described the Red and Blue State divide this way: “the Blue States have fewer Republicans, 55-69 year olds (the most conservative age cohort), rural dwellers, conservatives, Born-Again Christians, daily or weekly attendees at a place of worship, local sports fans, gun owners, investors, military veterans, and married voters. All of these differences portend a harder sell for Republican candidates. On the other hand, the Red States have fewer younger voters, single voters, college graduates, liberals, Catholics and Jews, union members, and non-prayers. In short, the two regions think and vote differently because they are different.”²

By focusing on factors like religion, the Zogby report reinforces the electorate’s split over social conservatism (for example, being against legalized abortion) versus social liberalism (for example, being for the hot button social issue of 2004, same-sex marriage). But “conservatism” and “liberalism” are complicated and often fuzzy labels in American politics. Social conservatives can be fiscal liberals—for example, Midwestern union members who support labor protection but decry abortion rights. Social liberals can be fiscal conservatives—for example, suburban “office park dads” who support gun control and also support tax cuts. The Red and Blue divide is not just a case of conservatism versus liberalism. It’s also a study in how, over the past forty years, many voters have chosen politicians based on social issues rather than their economic interests. This has helped produce an increasingly bitter partisan politics. A 2004 study by the Pew Research Center for the People and the Press found that “Republicans and Democrats

have become more intense in their political beliefs.”³ Adherents of the two parties are split on issues ranging from military/security policy to abortion, differences that have often deepened in the past four to ten years.

The map of Republican and Democratic states used to be very different, and showed how Americans voted based on economic issues. Before the New Deal, the Blue States were generally southern; the Red States, northern. But as the New Deal began attracting poor, working-class, immigrant and black voters to the Democratic Party, it dominated both North and South. Then, as the battle over civil rights heated up, more white Southerners turned to the Republican Party, favoring their conservative social values over their fiscally liberal, working-class economic interests. The South hasn't been prime territory for Democrats since. Carter and Clinton, both Democratic Southerners, were able to take more of that region by highlighting economic themes. But Gore, also a Southerner, did not fare well. Thus today's Blue/Red divide is largely a coastal/southern-central split.⁴

Today's political landscape is the result of a forty-year movement by social and fiscal conservatives to claim political power and reshape intellectual debate. One of the main funders of this movement is billionaire Richard Mellon Scaife, who gave \$2.3 million to the *American Spectator* magazine to find any scandalous material possible on President Bill Clinton. In total, Scaife and his family's charities have given over \$300 million to conservative media, think-tanks, and organizations.⁵ And it's paid off. Fiscal conservatives have wooed the strong voting bloc of social conservatives, particularly evangelical Christians, in order to win elections—even though fiscal and social conservatives don't necessarily have that much in common. As (fiscal) conservative strategist Grover Norquist, head of Americans for Tax Reform, gloated in a 2001 interview, “I don't want to abolish government. I simply want to reduce it to the size where I can drag it into the bathroom and drown it in the bathtub.”⁶ Remember, however, that the Red States gain more from government than the Blue States. To the extent that the Democrats can reclaim an advantage in national politics, they will have to point out that Red Staters have as much or more to gain from reforming the federal government's faulty economic policies than Blue Staters. In other words, Democratic success relies on uniting fiscal liberals and social liberals, who may have divergent views and alliances, in the way that conservatives have united their fiscal and social believers.

Or to put it bluntly, a smart politician would say, “Screw (social) liberal and conservative labels. Those of you who support abortion rights may never agree with people who don’t. But both of you have common economic interests, and neither of you are being served by government today. I’m going to change that. I’m speaking to you as a populist, someone who can deliver real healthcare and education and jobs growth and make sure that work in America pays.” Of course, the politician—Democrat, Republican or third-party—would have to mean it, or risk alienating voters further.

The only recent presidential candidate who’s come close to being a real populist is Chris Rock, playing a D.C. alderman-turned-unlikely-candidate in the 2003 comedy *Head of State*. The candidate’s big speech comes as he ignores his handlers’ advice and decides to speak truth to power to a Chicago crowd:

How many of you workin’ two jobs just to be broke? Let me hear you say “That ain’t right!” . . . How many schools have old books but they have brand new metal detectors? Now, that ain’t right! . . . How many of you workin’ in cities you can’t afford to live in? Cleaning up hotels you can’t afford to stay in? We got nurses working in hospitals they can’t afford to be sick in. . . . That ain’t RIGHT!⁷

The fact that it’s laughable that a politician could run on a populist platform . . . well, that ain’t right.

Sure, the ideological differences between Americans make true populism a risky proposition, but I’d wager that the prospect of losing big corporate political contributions inspires just as much fear. America needs enterprising politicians who are willing to acknowledge the ideological differences dividing America, but not give in to them; people who put serving citizens ahead of serving campaign contributors. These politicians could unite unlikely political constituencies, and reach many of the hundred million missing voters.

Partisan Nation, Dirty Politics

Many Americans don’t trust the government because they don’t feel they can change it. Three-quarters of Americans believe politicians quickly lose

touch with their constituents, and only 40 percent believe that “most elected officials care what people like me think.”⁸ The number of Americans who identify as Republican has been rising; the number who identify as Democrats, dropping. You would think that the Democrats would see dissatisfaction with the political system as an opportunity to reach new voters. But the structural nature of politics—how expensive it is and how hard it is to run a campaign—plus a healthy dollop of fear seem to prevent the Democrats from making bold moves.

In fact, even though America is increasingly divided along partisan lines, there isn’t as much competition between Democrats and Republicans as you’d think. Our system tends to concentrate power in the hands of those who already have it: incumbents. *Spoiling for a Fight* author Micah Sifry points out that 99 percent of U.S. House of Representatives incumbents won re-election in 1998, and 98 percent won in 2000. Many ran without any major-party opposition, and most incumbents handily beat their opponents at fundraising. States Sifry:

How has our country achieved such stunning stability? Are Americans so happy with politics as usual? Or is something else at work? Only rarely, as in the state of Louisiana, where the top eight Democratic and Republican officeholders recently made a public pact to not campaign against each other, do the two parties let voters in on their dirty little secret. The truth is, the major two parties don’t like competition, and they’ll do many things, even avoid attacking each other’s turf, to keep themselves comfortable and unchallenged.⁹

In other words, instead of us having much choice about whether or not we re-elect politicians, they often have virtual jobs-for-life. (After all, Strom Thurmond was re-elected even when he was so decrepit and disoriented that he couldn’t cast a vote without help.) One of the United States’ biggest criticisms of the Soviet Union was that a one-party state couldn’t serve the needs of its people. Well, folks, in some ways, much of America has become a one-party state.

On the other hand, when the two parties really decide to rumble, it’s like Godzilla versus Mothra—many, many people get trampled during an indis-

criminate show of force. The nastiness, duplicity, and disregard for the needs of citizens further endanger Americans' faith in our political system. Take, for example, the tortured birth of the controversial Homeland Security Act and the corporate reform Sarbanes-Oxley bill. Through deft political maneuvering, Republicans were able to divert attention from scandals over 9/11 and corporate corruption, screw Democratic candidates, and threaten the job protections of ordinary working Americans—all in one fell swoop.

Shortly after the terrorist attacks of September 11, 2001, Senator Joseph Lieberman proposed a Homeland Security Agency to coordinate the antiterrorist work of several government agencies.¹⁰ Some critics worried that creating a new agency of this type could compromise individual privacy rights. But the president, who might have been expected to support the bill, actually opposed it.¹¹

Flash forward to the summer of 2002. FBI Special Agent Coleen M. Rowley went public with shattering allegations. Did her agency ignore leads that could have helped prevent the terrorist attacks of September 11? Her memo to the FBI director read in part:

I feel at this point that I have to put my concerns in writing concerning the important topic of the FBI's response to evidence of terrorist activity in the United States prior to September 11th. . . . I have deep concerns that a delicate and subtle shading/skewing of facts by you and others at the highest levels of FBI management has occurred and is occurring. . . .

At the heart of Rowley's memo is the case of Zacarias Moussaoui. The French citizen of Moroccan descent was arrested a month before the attacks on an immigration violation. He'd been training to fly planes—but not land them—at a Minnesota flight school, and concerned instructors contacted the FBI. French officials had a long record on Moussaoui, who had trained with al Qaeda in Afghanistan.

Local FBI agents wanted to search Moussaoui's computer, but top brass denied the request. In Rowley's words:

[T]he agents in Minneapolis who were closest to the action and in the best position to gauge the situation locally, did fully appreciate the terrorist risk/danger posed by Moussaoui and his possible co-conspirators even prior to September 11th. . . . [T]he FBI Supervisory Special Agent (SSA) who was the one most involved in the Moussaoui matter . . . seemed to have been consistently, almost deliberately thwarting the Minneapolis FBI agents' efforts.

Then, to add insult to injury, after 9/11 Rowley watched the FBI's director, Robert Mueller, defend the agency's handling of events. States Rowley:

In the day or two following September 11th, you, Director Mueller, made the statement to the effect that if the FBI had only had any advance warning of the attacks, we (meaning the FBI), may have been able to take some action to prevent the tragedy. . . . I and others in the Minneapolis Office, immediately sought to reach your office . . . so that your public statements could be accordingly modified. When such statements from you and other FBI officials continued, we thought that somehow you had not received the message and we made further efforts. Finally when similar comments were made weeks later . . . we faced the sad realization that the remarks indicated someone, possibly with your approval, had decided to circle the wagons at FBIHQ in an apparent effort to protect the FBI from embarrassment and the relevant FBI officials from scrutiny.¹²

At considerable risk to her own career, Rowley ensured that the FBI *would* be scrutinized. Rowley pointed out that the agents at FBI headquarters who missed the chance to track Moussaoui were never reprimanded for their inaction and stayed on in key positions after September 11. *Time* magazine made this a cover story, and it was front-page news across the nation.

In June, Rowley was scheduled to testify in front of a Senate panel. The very same day, the Bush administration announced their support for the Homeland Security Act. Some in the media even called it the president's

plan.¹³ The administration timed the announcement to shift the focus from Rowley's testimony on 9/11 to the president's support for Homeland Security. And it worked: newspapers made Rowley coverage a secondary story, and some television networks interrupted Rowley's testimony to go to the Homeland Security Department announcement.¹⁴ (Of course, in spring 2004, the incredible revelations of the 9/11 Commission put the Bush administration in the hot seat again.)

The tactic worked; for the moment, 9/11 was last week's news. But the Republicans didn't stop there. The two parties had one major difference in the homeland security bill: labor laws. The Republican version of the bill removed civil service protections from employees moving from other federal agencies to the Homeland Security Department, a move widely interpreted as union busting. "It was completely gratuitous," says law professor Peter P. Swire of Ohio State University. "If the central challenge was homeland security, then getting it passed and into operation was the priority. Changing a century's worth of civil service laws was a choice that Bush and [presidential strategist Karl] Rove made. Compared to the overall importance of responding to terrorism, you think this would be a third-tier issue. But Rove made it a first tier issue."

In the weeks leading up to Congress's August recess, Senator Lieberman tried to compromise with the Republicans. They wouldn't. In order to preserve labor laws, Democrats repeatedly voted against a version of the bill that would have removed civil service protections from workers.

Meanwhile, another hot piece of legislation, the Sarbanes-Oxley bill on corporate reform, was also facing passage. The impetus: the failed multibillion dollar energy company Enron. When Enron went bankrupt, so did thousands of employees. Executives including Bush's friend Ken Lay, however, were able to sell millions of dollars in stock before it crashed. Enron gave \$1.4 million to the president's 2000 campaign. In turn, Bush rewarded the company by fighting proposed California price controls. (Remember California's energy crisis?) Enron also participated in a secret meeting with Vice President Dick Cheney to help craft the administration's energy policy. The fight to require the release of notes from that meeting went to the Supreme Court, who referred it back to a lower court.

Republicans steadfastly opposed the Sarbanes-Oxley bill. Then, on June 25, telecommunications company and Bush donor WorldCom discovered “improper accounting” of \$3.8 billion and planned to cut 17,000 jobs. In testimony before a congressional committee, the former CEO, Bernard Ebbers, said he had done nothing wrong. (In 2004, Ebbers was indicted on fraud and conspiracy charges. His deputy agreed to testify against him. And WorldCom’s total fraud has now reached an astonishing \$11 billion, enough to pay each of the 17,000 laid-off workers a tidy sum of nearly \$650,000 apiece.)¹⁵

WorldCom put the fear into Republicans who intended to defend corporations from stricter regulation. So, presto, the Republicans gave the Democrats nearly everything they wanted on Sarbanes-Oxley. It passed before Congress’s August recess. But the Homeland Security bill, with its anti-labor provisions, still was up for debate. Congressmen and senators went back to their home districts with Homeland Security undecided.

So what became the big issue in the November 2002 midterm elections? The refusal of Democrats to support the Homeland Security Act, which they had in fact sponsored. “It’s clear that the Republicans didn’t want to settle that issue in July when they could have,” says Swire. “They wanted an issue for the election. And they also decided they didn’t want corporate reform debated in the fall.”

During the 2002 midterm elections, in a tight race, Republican challenger Saxby Chambliss ran an astounding advertisement against his opponent, Georgia senator Max Cleland. Cleland was a first-term senator who had lost an arm and both legs in Vietnam. He was also a co-author of the Homeland Security Act. Chambliss, on the other hand, used the excuse of a trick knee to keep from going to Vietnam.

One Chambliss television advertisement pictured Osama bin Laden, Saddam Hussein, and Max Cleland. “As America faces terrorists and extremist dictators, Max Cleland runs television ads claiming he has the courage to lead. He says he supports President Bush at every opportunity, but that’s not the truth. Since July, Max Cleland voted against President Bush’s vital homeland security efforts eleven times!”

Cleland lost his re-election bid. Even prominent Republicans, including Senator John McCain, decried the advertisement. But voters still rewarded Chambliss for his mixture of lies and false patriotism. If Americans won’t hold a politician accountable for an advertisement this

manipulative, then what will we hold our officials accountable for? The Republicans' success in turning the Homeland Security Act into a weapon against Democrats shows just how nasty and dishonest politics has become. It is no surprise that so many Americans are utterly turned off.

The Democrats' Chances in 2004

The presidential election is a series of winner-take-all statewide contests. To win in 2004, the Democrats will either have to capture southern and central swing voters who can tip Red States into Blue States, or entice new voters to the polls. (Both would be nice.) Democratic pollster Mark Penn found that only 31 percent of Americans identified as Democrats, down from 49 percent in 1958. (Only 30 percent of Americans identify as Republicans, but Republicans vote at higher rates than Democrats.) "Exciting the Democratic base alone will not bring enough voters into the Democratic fold," said Penn. He recommended going after "office park dads," the more fiscally conservative husbands of suburban "soccer moms."¹⁶ But the Republican-lite themes that appeal to "office park dads" probably won't attract many nonvoters, many of whom are struggling economically. Democrats may have to make a tough choice: become more like Republicans to capture swing voters, or take a risk and become more populist to attract new voters and nonvoters.

What would it mean for the Democrats to return to the populist politics they espoused during the New Deal and Great Society eras? For one, they would have to convince working- and middle-class Americans, not just poor ones, that economic reform will benefit them. You don't have to be poor to struggle economically. You just need to be in a position where your financial needs overwhelm your ability to meet them, and that includes much of the working, middle, and even upper middle classes. The Democrats have traditionally been the party of choice for working-class voters, but recently that support has eroded. Many voters, including young working-class voters without strong partisan affiliations, see Democrats as the party of financial losers and Republicans as the party of financial winners. As author David Brooks put it in an op-ed for the *New York Times*:

Why don't people vote their own self-interest? Every few years the Republicans propose a tax cut, and every few years the Democrats pull out their income distribution charts to show how much of

the benefits of the Republican plan go to the richest 1 percent of Americans or thereabouts. And yet every few years a Republican plan wends its way through the legislative process and, with some trims and amendments, passes. . . .

People vote their aspirations.

The most telling polling result from the 2000 election was from a Time magazine survey that asked people if they are in the top 1 percent of earners. Nineteen percent of Americans say they are in the richest 1 percent and a further 20 percent expect to be someday. So right away you have 39 percent of Americans who thought that when Mr. Gore savaged a plan that favored the top 1 percent, he was taking a direct shot at them.¹⁷

True. Give people a choice between feeling like they have futures and feeling like they're failures, and they'll pick the future any time. And it's no use telling people that they're stupid, that their dreams of hitting the earnings lottery are unrealistic. We're talking about the American Dream here. Hope springs eternal.

The fact is most Americans will never hit the 1 percent jackpot. But the Democrats haven't figured out how to break the news to us. Instead they, like the Republicans, play to our get-rich-quick hopes in order to win votes.

There is an alternative: building a bridge between the interests of middle- and upper-middle-class Americans and those of poor and working-class Americans. Because the fact of the matter is, those groups of Americans have more in common with each other than they do with the (largely Republican) One Percent. They share a sense of anxiety about the country's future and how they'll earn a living. They also share common interests on many political issues.

One example is Social Security, implemented in 1935. Middle- and upper-middle-class Americans rely on Social Security to help fund their retirement. (You better believe that rich folks cash their checks, too!) Today, without Social Security benefits, nearly half of American seniors would live in poverty.¹⁸ Nonetheless, in February 2004, Federal Reserve Chairman Alan Greenspan suggested cutting Social Security benefits, but keeping the Bush administration's tax cuts for the rich.

Middle- and upper-middle-class Americans also share a need for real education reform. Because school funds are linked to property taxes, poor Americans tend to attend the nation's worst schools. But middle- and upper-middle-class Americans are increasingly overextending their budgets to try to live in wealthier school districts. In *The Two-Income Trap: Why Middle-Class Mothers & Fathers Are Going Broke*, Elizabeth Warren and Amelia Warren Tyagi paint a picture of middle-class families stretched to the financial breaking point. Why? Many of them get the most expensive mortgages that they can, ones that they can't afford if one of two working parents loses a job or takes a pay cut. They do it for the sake of their kids' educations, but they're taking a terrible risk. Four times as many families are declaring bankruptcy today as they did twenty-five years ago. Parents with young children are the most likely to go bankrupt, and 90 percent of Americans in bankruptcy are middle class.

With real education reform, these families could live in neighborhoods they can afford without putting their children's education at risk. Instead, cued by our consumer culture, they try to individually buy their way out of the problem rather than advocating for systemic change. But for the families depicted in *The Two-Income Trap*, it's just not working.

The lesson of *The Two-Income Trap* applies to issues ranging from healthcare to national defense. When I moderated the second Democratic Presidential Debate in Baltimore in September 2003, I asked a variety of people if they had questions for the candidates. I couldn't ask every question I received, but the suggested issues included:

Being self-employed, I pay my entire health insurance premium out of my own pocket—and my premiums have doubled in the last three years. If this continues, I will be unable to afford health insurance at all by the end of the decade. How do you propose to make health care affordable for those of us who are not insured through employers?

—From a freelance writer in San Francisco

I work in a teaching hospital here in Oregon. We serve the poorest and the people who are either entirely uninsured or insured by the welfare medical insurance plan put in place by the state. I just received word that one hundred of my cowork-

ers will be laid off in six weeks. A company based in Germany will take over their positions, and will now be answering the complicated medical insurance problems of Oregon's poor with the aid of its software and telephone support staff. The support staff is itself outsourced by this German company to India. . . . It saves the companies money in healthcare, salaries, and benefits, but it also means that they put hundreds of workers out of jobs here, in favor of near slave-labor from third world nations. How do you plan to address this issue?

—A healthcare professional in Oregon

Both of the last two OB-GYN practices I used have closed because their malpractice insurance premiums more than doubled in the last year. Hospitals in Pennsylvania and Arizona have discontinued their obstetrics services, making women have to travel many miles to give birth. And many doctors in Florida are considering avoiding services with high legal risks (such as mammogram reading), according to the Tampa Tribune. New York, PA, AZ, Delaware, Mississippi, Nevada, New Jersey, North Carolina, Ohio, Oregon, South Carolina, Texas, Washington and West Virginia have been among the hardest hit states. In a recent Harris Interactive poll, 76% of the 300 physicians surveyed felt that concern about malpractice suits was hurting their ability to provide quality care, and 94% felt that extra tests, referrals and procedures resulting from their fear of liability contributed in a significant way to health care costs. How will you deal with this?

—A writer and mother in New York

Nearly 44 million Americans, or 15 percent of the population, don't have health insurance. During the economic downturn of George W. Bush's presidency, millions lost their insurance because they lost their jobs. At the same time, many state Medicaid programs are so squeezed by cuts that they are dropping adults from their coverage. The biggest new group of uninsured in 2003 was among households earning \$25,000 to \$49,999 a year. Next came households earning \$75,000 or more. Seventy-five thousand dollars is four times

the federal poverty level for a family of four.¹⁹ In other words, the healthcare crisis among the middle- and upper-middle-class is rapidly approaching that of the poor.

National defense is seen as a Republican issue. President Bush calls himself the “war president.” But who gets hit the hardest when we go to war? Today, wealthy, powerful men commission the war America fights, but the members of the military come from poor, working-class, and middle-class backgrounds. Even in the military, they get nicked and dined, just like so many American workers. In 2003, the Bush administration tried to cut the “imminent danger” pay for the men and women fighting in Iraq and cut spending on veterans’ hospitals. It refused to buy Kevlar body armor for 40,000 active-duty troops in Iraq. And in its absolute cheapest move, it began to charge injured GIs eight dollars a day for food while they were in a Georgia military hospital. (They stopped after protests.)²⁰

Upper-middle-class and wealthy Americans are less likely to serve. But the \$87-billion-and-counting war in Iraq is also decimating the funds available for education, healthcare, Social Security, and jobs. Both directly and indirectly, middle-class issues are tied to national security. If this country can’t make better decisions about when to use our military, neither our soldiers nor U.S. civilians will be safe.

The Democrats need to run on this not-so-radical idea: what’s good for poor and working-class Americans is good for the middle- and upper-middle-class too. What’s touted as good for wealthy Americans—in particular, tax cuts—will not solve most of the problems facing America’s middle class. By building a bridge between the issues of the poor and working class, and those of the middle and upper middle class, Democrats will be able to bring more nonvoters to the polls.

In our current two-party system, however, middle-class voters are the bird in the hand, and poor and working-class voters are the two in the bush. In order to win over poor and working-class nonvoters, politicians will have to demonstrate that they mean business when it comes to economic reform: in other words, that they can be trusted to follow through on campaign promises. But few politicians, Democratic or Republican, want to risk the bird in the hand. They may not do so until the advocates for lower-voting populations organize themselves and demand representation.