I. How the parties are organized in Congress
   A. Party organization in the Congress
      Box, p. 250
      1. Changes in House party leaders’ power
         a. The revolt against “Czar” Cannon
            (1) Appointment of committees, chairs, and staffs
            (2) Rules committee control of floor debate
         b. Growing party coordination
            (1) The seniority rule and autocratic committee chairs 1911 to 1960s
            (2) Committee-chair appointments
               (a) Democratic chairs are subject to Democratic-party-caucus secret-ballot challenge;
               (b) Republican chairs are subject to a 6-year term limit
            (3) Committee-member assignments made by party steering committee chosen by party caucus
            (4) Rules Committee membership Democratic Speaker, subject to party caucus approval
         c. Policy leadership (through ideologically cohesive and polarized party caucuses)
         d. The Gingrich revolution (new powers to choose committee and subcommittee chairs)
         e. ... and its aftermath (charges of ethics violations and loss of 5 seats in 1998 midterm election)
      2. Parties in the “individualist Senate”
         a. Erosion of the old “club” rules of reciprocity, specialization, and apprenticeship with powerful committees to a much more individualistic body
         b. Increased filibustering and non-germane amendments
   B. Parties in the state legislatures
      1. Great diversity in party cohesion and polarization
      2. Great diversity in balance between leadership & party-caucus influence

II. Methods of party influence
   A. Carrots and sticks
      1. Pork-barrel legislation
      2. Committee assignments
      3. Office staff
      4. Office location and space
      5. Campaign support
      6. Committee chair or member assignment
   B. Limiting factors
      1. Constituent influence
      2. Primary-election system
      3. Committee system
      4. Seniority rule
      5. Personal ambition

III. Party influence on legislative voting
   A. How unified is each legislative party
      Figure 13.1, p. 258; Figure 13.2, p. 260 % of roll-call votes on which a majority of one party opposed a majority of the other party for both sessions combined
      1. Party voting
         a. 1800s: high
         b. 1910-1930s: decline
         c. 1930: increase
         d. 1940s-1960s: decline
e. 1970s-present: increase

2. Party support (unity or cohesion): Figure 13.3, p. 262; Box, p. 261 average % of members voting in agreement with a majority of the party on party votes
   a. 1961-1970 decrease
   b. 1970-present increase – especially after Voting Rights Act & Southern conservative realignments

3. Greater polarization of the Congressional parties Figure 13.4, p. 263

4. When are the parties most unified
   a. On issues that touch the interest of the legislative parties
      (1) Votes to organize chambers
      (2) Awarding disputed seats
      (3) In state legislatures (redistricting & election regulations)
   b. On the executive’s proposals Figure 13.5, p. 264
   c. On policies central to the party system (classic realignment issues)
      (1) Party voting and cohesion highest around realignment election
      (2) Tend to decline as the prevailing party system ages and dealignment sets in

5. Does party competition promote party unity?
   a. Party unity is inversely related to level of party competition in individual districts (higher party voting and cohesion scores for legislators from “safe” compared to “marginal” districts
   b. Party unity is directly related to level of party competition in the legislature chamber (large majority parties are more subject in internal divisions – regional and personal)
   c. When constituency interferes with party unity
      (1) “Blue Dog” Democrats: Southern conservatives
      (2) Progressive Republicans: northeastern moderates

IV. Comparing party power in Congress and state legislatures
   A. Party polarization and cohesion: greater political homogeneity (of constituents) results in higher levels of intra-party homogeneity at state level
   B. Greater inter-party competition: leads to greater pressure for party unity
   C. No competing centers of power
      1. Committee system stronger and more autonomous in Congress
      2. Seniority system less important in states because less careerism
   D. Other needed resources (when party organization leaders are also legislative leaders as well)
      1. Control legislative agenda (and pork)
      2. Offer greater election campaign financing in many states with weaker campaign-finance laws
      3. Control of nominations stronger at state and local level
      4. Availability of patronage and preferences bigger factor in control of state legislatures
   E. Lesser legislative professionalism
      1. Length of career: 30% average turnover per term in state legislatures
      2. Length of legislative sessions: part-time job in most states
      3. Staff and budget resources extremely limited in most states
      4. Compensation, benefits and perks of office quite low in most states
   F. Styles of individual leaders: varies at both levels, state and federal

V. The power of legislative parties Box, p. 269
   A. Because of fragmentation of power and representation in the U.S.
   B. U.S. legislators are far more influenced by their constituents than by party leaders
   C. However, party identification is still the best predictor of votes in state legislatures and Congress