



Name of the student:

Instructor's name:

Course code:

Date:

Revel for Living Democracy

The *Revel for Living Democracy* is one of the significant political books which offers the students and other readers an insight into the government's policy processes and the democratic rights of the citizens. It is shown in the book how the government of the United States impacts the daily lives of the citizens. The contents of the resulting book can be used in analyzing some of the complex and critical policies in contemporary American society. In this concern, this paper will be aimed at applying the argument indicated by the authors of the above book to provide guidance and solve some of the recent legislation issues in America.

The New York Times: Supreme Court to Hear Abortion Case from Louisiana

The issue of abortion has emerged to be one of the controversial topics, not only in the United States but globally in the new century. The debate surrounding abortion concerns the moral and ethical side of the question whether it is right or wrong for women to terminate their pregnancies before the child is born (Harper et al. 501). Nevertheless, the United States is one of the countries in the world where abortion is legal (Harper et al. 502). In 1973, the federal government passed the abortion legislation in all of the U.S. states after the famous *Roe vs Wade* landmark ruling (Harper et al. 505). However, each of the states in the country is allowed to limit or regulate cases of abortion by enforcing trigger laws.

According to the reviewed New York Times article, the enactment of the medical trigger law has resulted in a huge debate among the proponents and opponents. The opponents of the idea argued that the law was a scheme aimed at preventing women from opting for abortion by limiting the number of medical practitioners allowed to do the procedure. For instance, the opponents indicated that only one doctor in the entire State of Louisiana had been cleared by the state to execute abortion since the policy enactment in 2014. Resultantly, this adversely affected the rights of women to opt for abortion at their will. The opponents of the legislation believe that abortion is a legal intervention as per the federal constitution, and therefore, all women should be allowed to opt for it.

In this regard, the opponents of the policy have presented their case before the Supreme Court to challenge the implementation of the law in Louisiana. However, while the case is yet to be heard by the judges, it is crucial to note that despite state governments having the mandate to regulate abortion, they should also consider public opinion on the matter. For instance, as indicated by Shea et al. in *Revel for Living Democracy*, citizens of the United States, regardless of their ethnicities and races, have privileges to protest against any legislation enforced by the government, which adversely affects their wellbeing through judicial amendments (6). Nevertheless, realistically, it is expensive and complicated for an average citizen to file a lawsuit in courts, notwithstanding the urgency level of the claim (Shea et al. 7). In this concern, it is mandatory for the opponents of Louisiana abortion law, who include members of public and various human rights activists, to opt

for the assistance of qualified legal professionals with adequate knowledge and experience. Typically, the American judiciary often rules against the lawsuits undermining freedoms and rights of the citizens (Shea et al. 8). Since the current legal claim involves women's right to abortion, the opponents of this legislation have the upper hand for the verdict to be in their favor.

How a Shadow Foreign Policy in Ukraine Prompted an Impeachment Inquiry

The politics of the United States, as one of the biggest economies in the world, have for a long time been subject to foreign influences. Due to this, the federal government enacted critical laws to prevent politicians and other state officers from making vulnerable alliances with influential foreign organizations and governments that can undermine the security of the country (Diehm, 399). Typically, the resulting policies are deemed significant for protecting the government and the state secrets from being leaked to the outsiders. Therefore, any politician elected into the public office, including president and civil servants, should be impeached or forced to vacate their offices if found guilty of threatening national security by making alliances with state enemies.

The current article reviewed potential presidential impeachment by legislatures if President Donald Trump is found guilty of exposing significant information or sharing government secrets with Ukrainian politicians. In this case, President Trump is accused of mixing business and politics, in which he is alleged for using foreign political influence to hurt his political rival, Mr. Biden, to undermine the latter's future campaign at 2020 presidential election. It is also suspected that President Trump backed Ukraine against its long-term enemy, Russia, as a strategy to enhance his chances for re-election in 2020.

Although legislators have the necessary constitutional privileges to impeach the president, the judiciary can also intervene. According to Shea et al., any state officer who is wrongfully indicted by the lawmakers, regardless of their positions in the government, can be reinstated through the court order, if the jury found them innocent (7). Therefore, despite the legal power of legislators to probe the claims and impeach the president, Trump can seek judicial protection. Moreover, citizens have the democratic power to intervene in the rulings of the policymakers (Shea et al. 10). Thus, members of the public can veto the legislators' decision to impeach President Trump.