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# Power, Politics and Government

Big Sky, Big Money presents to its viewers the vandalism that had been playing a role in the electioneering of the Montana elections. The journalist Kai Ryssdal has been presented as a patient, who guides the Supreme Court of the United States, that how the political action committees had been the parts and parcels in the electioneering of the Montana elections. He shows how the political action committee had also been the part in intensifying the battle of the most important election contest between the Jon Tester, the Democrat and Denny Rehberg the Republican. After the completion of hearing in the Supreme Court of the United States, the Supreme Court announced in his judgement in the famous *Citizens United* case that the government is not allowed to limit the political spending by corporations and Unions(McConnell). Some believe that this decision had paved the way for the free and unlimited spending from different unions and organizations into the American political activities, which in one way or another undermines the transparency mechanism which is in place in the US.

 Since a “Say” in the election process in any way brings much authority for anyone. Also, the grasp on power is assured by becoming the part of the World’s strongest Congress, therefore each US national wants to become the part of it. Considering the Citizens United decision, one thinks that if such is the weak ladders to the Congress of the United States, one must then work in a soberer way to earn the respect, and not the timely Congressman ship. The oldest democracy of the world, where we live cannot retain such loopholes in it. As these are malpractices, they can, therefore, be part of such a transparent democracy. As the people in the United States are now more actively the part of the political processes- they will pull out such chances of electioneering in the future.
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