

-
- 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
1. Party voting 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
 - 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