Volume 24, Number 1 January 2001

Legislative Studies Section Newsletter is published at the Carl Albert Center, University of Oklahoma, Norman, Oklahoma, under the authority of the Legislative Studies Section of the American Political Science Association. The LSS and APSA are non-profit educational associations. The *Newsletter* is mailed at bulk, non-profit mailing rates from Norman, Oklahoma, twice yearly: in January and in July.

Chair
Professor John Hibbing
Department of Political Science
P.O. Box 880328
University of Nebraska
Lincoln, NE 68588-0328
(402) 472-3220
jhibbing@unlserve.unl.edu

Secretary/Treasurer
Professor Wendy J. Schiller
Department of Political Science
Brown University
Box 1844
Providence, RI 02912
(401) 863-1569
Wendy_Schiller@brown.edu

Editor, LSS *Newsletter*
Professor Ronald M. Peters Jr.
Carl Albert Center
University of Oklahoma
Norman, OK 73019
(405) 325-6372
rpeters@ou.edu

Editor, "Extension of Remarks"
Professor Burdett A. Loomis
Department of Political Science
504 Blake Hall
University of Kansas
Lawrence, KS 66045-2157
(913) 864-3523
b-loomis@ukans.edu

LSS Program Chair, 2000-2001
Professor William T. Bianco
Department of Political Science
Penn State University
Burrows 107
University Park, PA 16803
(814) 865-0700
wtb3@pspu.edu

Member-At-Large, 1999-2001
Professor Sarah Binder
Department of Political Science
George Washington University
2201 G Street N.W.
Washington, DC 20052
(202) 994-2167
binder@gwu.edu

Member-At-Large, 1999-2001
Professor Joseph Cooper
Department of Government
Johns Hopkins University
3400 N. Charles, Room 331
Baltimore, MD 21218
(410) 516-8070
jcooper@jhuvm.hcf.jhu.edu

Member-At-Large, 1999-2001
Professor Rick Wilson
Department of Political Science
6100 Main St., MS-24
Rice University Houston, TX 77005
(713) 348-3352
rkw@rice.edu

Preceding LSS Chair
Professor Wayne L. Francis
Department of Political Science
University of Florida
Gainesville, Fl 32611
(352) 375-0633
wlf@nervm.nerdc.ufl.edu

From the Chair

John R. Hibbing
University of Nebraska

The years come and go and two-year terms do, too. Next December, this page will be filled with words from another Legislative Studies Section Chair. Probably the main duty of the Chair is to fill committee slots and I can only hope my successor is accorded the same cooperative spirit that you, the members of the Section, have me. The selection committee members in 1999-2000 did a wonderful job of choosing three deserving prize winners. And for 2000-01 another stellar group has agreed to serve. (For details on prize winners and this year's committees, please see Section News of this newsletter.) The supportive ethos of the community of legislative scholars has never been more apparent to me.

In addition to our three existing awards - the Richard F. Fenno Prize for best book, CQ Prize for best APSA paper, and the Carl Albert Dissertation Award - the new Jewell-Loewenberg Prize will be given to the author of the best article appearing in the *Legislative Studies Quarterly* during the 2000 calendar year.

Members will also notice that, as is the case every other year, a nominations committee has been constituted. This committee is charged with formulating a slate that will include nominations for the next Section Chair, for the next Secretary-Treasurer, and for three Executive Committee members. Section members are encouraged to provide suggestions to any of the members of this year's nominations committee.

Finally, the Section is in the process of moving the Newsletter to an exclusively on-line publication. This is a change that will make things easier for the fine people at the Carl Albert Center who produce (and sometimes subsidize) the *LSS Newsletter*, and it was widely supported by those section members attending the last business meeting. But we realize that most section members are not at the business meetings and we are eager to obtain as much feedback as possible from all LSS members. Please contact me or, probably even better, Ron Peters, editor of the newsletter. We are sincerely interested in the sentiments of the members regarding this important change.

From the Editor

Ronald M. Peters, Jr.
Carl Albert Center, University of Oklahoma

The full contents of this newsletter can be accessed electronically on the World Wide Web at **http://www.apsanet.org/~lss/**. The LSS web page also includes basic citation information on recent journal articles dealing with legislatures and a list of papers in the area of legislative studies that have been presented at professional conferences in recent months.

Based on discussion at the annual business meeting, we expect that this issue of the *LSS Newsletter* is the last one that will be distributed in print form. Beginning with the Summer 2001 issue, we will mail to each member of LSS a printed copy of the table of contents with a reminder that the entire newsletter can be viewed on the LSS web page. We trust that this will meet the needs of the section, but we always welcome your comments and suggestions.

| Back to Top of This Page |

| Front Page | Section News | Research & Teaching | Legislative News |
| Papers Presented | Journal Articles | Book Notes | Extension of Remarks |

| Other Editions of the LSS Newsletter |
| Legislative Studies Section Home Page | APSA Home Page |

Volume 24, Number 1 January 2001

Against Long Odds: Citizens who Challenge Congressional Incumbents. **James L. Merriner and Thomas P. Senter. Praeger, 1999. ISBN 0275966429, $35.00, paper, 216 pages**.

Merriner, a former journalist, and Senter, a physician, have put together a collection of fourteen case studies that detail the personal experiences of ordinary citizens who run against incumbents in both the House and the Senate in the decade of the 1990s. They document how "incumbents win through intimidation of their challengers' supporters, an institutionalized near-monopoly on money, local media and other establishment resources, and outright dirty tricks" (p.xxii).

The case studies encompass a wide range of challengers. The authors draw upon interviews with the challengers and people active in their elections. Most, but not all, are those with little political experience. Two profiled races drew former representatives in challenges to an incumbent, one successful and one not. Both primary and general election races are represented in the case studies, as are Democratic and Republican challengers. In two instances, the profiled challenger actually defeats the incumbent.

In their closing chapter, the authors sum up the lessons to be gleaned from their case studies: money generally determines the outcome of races and incumbents have many institutional advantages. The authors conclude with a call for reform, specifically a constitutional amendment

requiring term limits for members of Congress. This argument is based on their evidence that would-be citizen legislators are being denied their rights to elections that are free and open because of the advantages accorded to incumbents.

Donna R. Hoffman
Ph.D. Candidate
University of Oklahoma

Conflict Amid Consensus in American Trade Policy. Martha L. Gibson. Georgetown University Press, 2000. ISBN: 0878407944, $17.95, paper, 224 pages.

One of the paradoxes of American trade policy has been that, for decades, a consensus has existed in Congress that free trade is in American interests. However, there has also been strong opposition to free trade policies in both dominant parties. While there have been a number of theories posited to account for this paradox, Gibson believes nested games theory, with its synthesis of rational choice and institutional contextual variables, best explains why congressional actors accede to the idea of free trade, yet often propose and vote for more protection-oriented policies. While members' actions may appear irrational from a unidimensional perspective, placed in the context of multiple dimensions, they suddenly take on a whole new logic.

In the case of trade policy, two dimensions are of great importance: competitive electoral politics and the institutional context of Congress itself. A number of variables are at work here: the degree of separation between parties' base constituencies on the issue of trade, the demand for protection from various constituencies, and the degree of centralization of power in the House. Gibson creates a matrix model that analyzes interactions between variables along the two dimensions, and a fascinating set of propositions are the result. These are then placed in detailed historical context, revealing that indeed, the balance between free trade and protection does seem to fit the pattern she describes. Interestingly enough, the configuration of variables conducive to bipartisan trade exists only in the 1960s and early 1970s. Far from consensus being the norm, as is commonly thought, Gibson argues convincingly that this period is an anomaly. Conflict is the much more likely outcome.

This work is useful, both as institutional ethnography and an insightful contribution to the theoretical analysis of American policy-making in general. Given the contentious quality of the debates over NAFTA, U.S. membership in the WTO, and the ongoing trade conflicts between the U.S. and its trade partners (the EU in particular), this volume is quite timely in its focus.

Mark D. Gismondi
Visiting Assistant Professor of Political Science
University of Oklahoma

Congress at the Grassroots: Representational Change in the South, 1970-1998. Richard F. Fenno, Jr. University of North Carolina Press, Chapel Hill, 2000. ISBN 0807848557, $16.95, paper, 170 pages.

The latest work from Richard Fenno, one of the foremost scholars in congressional representational style, is a valuable addition to his extensive body of work and the literature as a whole.

In this text, Fenno builds upon his theories of district style and fit and provides a superb case study of the Second Congressional District of Georgia. The district has changed during this time period from one that was rural, homogeneous, and Democratic to one that is more suburban, heterogeneous, and Republican leaning. The maps and tables are very helpful and acquaint the reader with the district and the Representatives discussed in the text.

Fenno examines the representational styles of Jack Flynt and Mac Collins and the evolutionary changes in this district. He surmises that the representational style of these two politicians mirrors the changes in the district and, indeed, across the south. Flynt, who represented the district from 1954 to 1978, was a "down-home" politician who thrived off his friends' and neighbors' political support and cultivated personal relationships with his mostly rural constituency. Collins, who has represented the district since 1992, is a local businessman, who utilizes a representational style based upon policy issues, which well serves his suburban and more Republican constituency. Fenno concludes that as the district changes, the type of representation the district requires also changes.

This book is a significant addition to our body of knowledge regarding the representation of the U.S. Congress and is especially useful to southern politics scholars.

Aleisha Karjala
Carl Albert Undergraduate Fellow
University of Oklahoma

Congress, The President, and The Federal Reserve: The Politics of American Monetary Policy-Making. Irwin L. Morris. The University of Michigan Press, 2000, ISBN 0472109952, $39.50, cloth, 165 pages.

Considered primarily an independent body, is the Federal Reserve influenced by political actors such as Congress and the president? If so, how is this influence exercised, and is existing theory sufficient to paint the broader picture of the political dynamics that exist? Or, are the institutionalist theories more appropriate when examining monetary decision-making? These questions are addressed by Irwin L. Morris in *Congress, The President, and The Politics of American Monetary Policy-Making.*

Irwin argues that it is a mistake to view the Federal Reserve from an apolitical perspective as has been the case traditionally. Though previous research regarding the Federal Reserve over the past 30 years has focused on its political dynamics, the theories that have been posited and empirically tested have fallen short. Thus, Irwin argues that a new theory is needed to bridge the gaps that exist. He proposes a new theoretical framework that combines the institutional approach and the environmental approach in order to paint a more complete picture, resulting in the multi-institutional theory.

This theory essentially holds that "both the institutional relationship within which the Federal Reserve exists and the preferences of significant

actors in that environment must be considered when attempting to theorize about the political dimensions of monetary policy" (126). Irwin claims that no single actor, the Congress or the president, dominates in terms of influence over the Federal Reserve. His theory does not recognize one approach at the expense of omitting another; rather, he utilizes previous literature as a foundation on which to outline a more comprehensive theory.

Congress, The President, and the Federal Reserve offers not only insight into monetary policy-making, but also serves as an illustration of the interplay between politics and administration. It offers the reader an opportunity to think outside the bounds of traditional theories. The author pushes one to consider a variety of perspectives to provide a more holistic picture of the interaction between what was once thought to be an almost dichotomous relationship: the Federal Reserve and the major political actors, Congress and the president.

Edward Long
Ph.D. student in political science
University of Oklahoma

Designing Judicial Review: Interest Groups, Congress, and Communications Policy. Charles R. Shipan. University of Michigan Press, 2000. ISBN 0472087037, $18.95, paper, 192 pages.

Shipan draws upon a growing body of rational choice literature that shows that political actors use other institutions instrumentally to achieve preferred policy outcomes. In doing so, these political actors often attempt to constrain the choices of future participants in the policy-making process.

In *Designing Judicial Review*, Shipan adds to these insights when he argues that interest groups and Congress will act strategically to design control mechanisms that will influence the types of actions that can be taken later on by the courts; thus, the design of judicial review is open to manipulation by political influences who pay careful attention to procedure and structure. In a process that Shipan calls front ending, interest groups and Congress will carefully design judicial review provisions in such a way that will enable them to receive favorable outcomes from the courts in the future. In developing this strategy, these political actors will make several calculations to mitigate the uncertainty of how later courts will act. According to these calculations, these political actors will sometimes attempt to curtail possible judicial involvement, while at other times invite sweeping judicial intervention.

While interest groups and Congress do indeed attempt to influence the subsequent actions taken by the courts, as Shipan shows with his careful analysis of the development of the Communications Act of 1934, the question as to whether these endeavors actually impact court decisions is inconclusive. As Shipan admits, a more thorough examination of the relationship between these institutions may be in order.

For students of American politics, Shipan's book illustrates that institutions do not operate cut off and segregated from one another. Political decisions are not made in a vacuum; therefore, political actors will act strategically, taking into account how other institutions will react, in the policy-making process.

Ben Arnold
Ph.D. student in political science
University of Oklahoma

Elections to Open Seats in the U.S. House: Where the Action Is. **Ronald Keith Gaddie and Charles S. Bullock, III. Rowman & Littlefield, 2000. ISBN 0742508617, $26.95, paper, 239 pages**.

The literature on congressional elections has largely focused on contests involving incumbents. Gaddie and Bullock seek to illuminate the dynamics of open seat races to the U.S. House. Using extensive quantitative data since 1982 along with case studies, the authors investigate these uniquely competitive races. Although these contests are more competitive than the alternative, they are not as competitive as may commonly be assumed. During the period under study a little more than one-third of the open seats were won by narrow margins (15, 170).

Why are open seats important? First, most new members enter the House through this type of election. In addition, open seat contests are the generators of partisan change in the institution. Finally, they give a less distorted picture of the national partisan landscape than do races dominated by incumbents. Throughout their analysis, the authors focus on distinctions between the South and the non South, between candidates of the two parties, and also the differences that the 1994 election exhibited when compared with the 1982-1992 period and with 1996 and 1998. Who wins in open seat elections is affected by candidate characteristics, partisan mood of the district, the characteristics of the district's constituents, and spending by candidates. In the end, money and prior political experience largely determine success.

Gaddie and Bullock establish the differences between open seat races and races where there is an incumbent. They examine how candidates emerge and the role that money plays. Special attention is given to the behavior of corporate, trade, and labor PACs. One chapter is devoted to women's experience with open seats, and another is dedicated to special elections. A final chapter is devoted to judging 1994 as an anomalous election regarding open seat outcomes and looking toward the future, where a model is presented for predicting the outcomes of open seat elections in 2000.

Donna R. Hoffman
Ph.D. Candidate
University of Oklahoma

Legislative Entrepreneurship in the U.S. House of Representatives**.** Gregory Wawro. The University of Michigan Press, 2000. ISBN 0472111531, $39.95, cloth.

Wawro examines a special breed of entrepreneurs in Congress who take on the task of building and maintaining legislative coalitions in the institution. The examination of the origins and consequences of this kind of extraordinary legislative behavior, sheds light on member goals, relationships, and behavior fundamental to the success of the institution.

Focusing on the opportunity-rich environment of the House for each

member of the 94th through the 103rd Congresses, Wawro employs a broad rigorous empirical approach derived from rational choice theories to study the ambitions behind members who behave extraordinarily and the consequences of their behavior. He defines legislative entrepreneurship as a set of activities, combining various legislative inputs and issues, that a legislator engages in to form coalitions of other members for the purpose of passing legislation. Accordingly, such legislative entrepreneurs are aggressive in four activities: acquiring information, bill drafting, coalition building, and pushing legislation.

Having identified entrepreneurs, Wawro searches for the incentive for their behavior. He examines the relationship between entrepreneurial activity and the reelection imperative and finds that such activity does not directly help members at the polls, and he also finds there is no relationship between entrepreneurial activity and PAC contributions. Having removed these outside incentives for extraordinary activity, Wawro looks within the institution to discover a positive statistical relationship between members of the major party who engage in entrepreneurship and their career advancement within the House. He concludes that members become energized actors within the chamber in order to pursue leadership positions. Unable yet to employ a similarly broad quantitative approach for the Republican 104th and 105th Congresses, Wawro instead employs a more qualitative approach to find some support that entrepreneurship is tied to career advancement for the Republicans as well.

While Wawro ultimately argues that members pursue legislative entrepreneurship for simple advancement in House position, this rational choice conclusion seems to sidestep other possible explanations, which might include members' genuine concern for public policy outputs, public service, and comity within the institution without much regard for career advancement. *Legislative Entrepreneurship in the U.S. House of Representatives* extends our understanding of members ambitions, incentives, and behavior within the House and returns our attention to the critical actors who behave extraordinarily to make the House of Representatives run.

Craig Williams
Ph. D. Candidate
Carl Albert Fellow
University of Oklahoma

Mike Mansfield, Majority Leader: A Different Kind of Senate. Francis R. Valeo. M. E. Sharpe, 1999. ISBN 0765604507, $34.95, cloth, 296 pages.

This book is a highly insightful insider's look into the world of the U.S. Senate during a very tumultuous and transitional time. The author, Frank Valeo, served on Mike Mansfield's staff in the early sixties and then was elected as secretary of the Senate. His personal and professional relationship with the majority leader makes this biography a valuable asset to students of the inner-workings of Congress and to political historians of the sixties and seventies.

By telling the story through the perspective of Mansfield during the time he served as Senate majority leader, the reader is given a first-hand

glance at the senator's role in the events of the sixties and seventies and how his influence was crucial in shaping the legislation that was produced. As the deliberative, more cautious body, the Senate was the appropriate venue for Mansfield's leadership style to manifest itself. Showing a strong contrast with the style of the previous majority leader, Lyndon B. Johnson, Valeo demonstrates that Mansfield's personality and manner of executing his job appropriately fit the design and function of the Senate.

The true value of this book lies neither in its academic quality nor in its objectivity - Valeo clearly has a very positive, and rarely critical, assessment of Mansfield - but in its point of view. The author witnessed all the events he reports in the book and offers a unique insight to what was going on inside the beltway during such monumental events as the Great Society legislation of the Johnson administration, the role of the United States in Vietnam, and President Nixon's initiation of amiable relations with China. This book would be a valuable supplement to a study of the Senate and the period described.

Lynsey Morris
Carl Albert Fellow
University of Oklahoma

National Insecurity: U.S. Intelligence After the Cold War. Craig Eisendrath. Temple University Press, 2000. ISBN 1566398487, $21.95, paper, 241 pages.

During the Cold War era, the U.S. intelligence community justified its existence by containing Soviet expansion. Now that the Cold War has ended, extensive reevaluation of the role of U.S. intelligence is being conducted. *National Insecurity: U.S. Intelligence After the Cold War*, a project of the Center for International Policy, contains a collection of essays written by ten foreign policy experts who have advanced recommendations regarding the current mission and purpose of U.S. intelligence. The central question raised in the book is the following: In the post-Cold War world, what kind of intelligence system is essential for our security and appropriate to our democratic society?

The authors draw their experiences from diverse backgrounds, but they agree that the current intelligence system is designed for the Cold War world. While intelligence is still important, they argue that systematic reforms are necessary to reduce intelligence scandal and failure. More specifically, they raise the controversial topic of balancing secrecy with openness and ask whether espionage and covert actions associated with the Cold War intelligence system remain justifiable.

The authors conclude with recommendations to reform the intelligence community by increasing reliance on open sources, encouraging further involvement by Congress in their oversight function, upholding privacy rights, reducing secrecy, and decreasing levels of expenditures. They envision an intelligence system more appropriate to an open, democratic society and contend that in the post-Cold War world the option of espionage should be limited and covert action should be regarded as a weapon of last resort.

National Insecurity provides an excellent contribution to the literature on intelligence reform. Moreover, it raises a moral dimension of statecraft operating in a democratic society and whether the current intelligence

apparatus is compatible with such democratic principles.

Angela Rogers
Ph.D. Candidate
University of Oklahoma

Nine and Counting: The Women of the Senate. Barbara Mikulski, Kay Bailey Hutchison, Dianne Feinstein, Barbara Boxer, Patty Murray, Olympia Snowe, Susan Collins, Mary Landrieu, Blanche Lincoln, and Catherine Whitney. William Morris and Co., 2000. ISBN 0060197676, $25.00, cloth, 238 pages.
Biographical Dictionary of Congressional Women. Karen Foerstel. Greenwood Publishing Group, 1999. ISBN 0313302901, $65.00, cloth, 320 pages.

Two new books on women in the U.S. Congress offer scholars interesting details and rich narratives about the personal and political struggles of women serving in the nation's legislature. While neither book breaks new ground nor offers important theoretical insights, both are likely to be valued additions to a congressional scholar's bookshelf.

Nine and Counting: The Women of the Senate is jointly authored by all of the women serving in the U.S. Senate as of 2000. The book weaves together first-person narratives and a text by Catherine Whitney of the various experiences, challenges, and triumphs of these members. The book retells the many sexist slights they encountered, e.g., the closed doors of law firms that Kay Bailey Hutchison encountered after graduating from the University of Texas School of Law, or the criticism of maternal neglect heaped on Blanche Lincoln and Mary Landrieu who have raised small children while serving in the Senate. The book also offers tales of triumph over personal tragedy, e.g., Olympia Snowe who grew up as an orphan, was widowed as a young woman, and later lost a stepson who at the age 20 to an undetected heart problem, and Dianne Feinstein who became acting mayor of San Francisco in the wake of the assassination of two city officials. Their policy initiatives are recounted, e.g. Patty Murray's work on education reform, and Susan Collins' efforts to promote consumer protection against deceptive mail fraud. The book also recalls the ups and downs of political victories and defeats, e.g. Barbara Boxer's confession of feeling "shredded" by her first electoral loss. Perhaps most importantly, the book offers examples of these women trying to forge a different style of politics, e.g. Barbara Mikulski's efforts to reach out to her newly elected female colleagues in both parties. Through bipartisan efforts among the women, they advance breast cancer research and treatment as well as a host of other issues.

The book at first blush may sound like the typical political memoir, but its purpose is quite different. With all proceeds from the book being donated to the Girl Scout Organization, the intent is clearly to inspire future generations of young women to consider the pursuit of politics with all of its trials and rewards. That goal transforms the last chapter of "lessons learned" from what might otherwise be trite homilies into a call to arms. Appropriately so, the book ends with the words of Rebecca Latimer Felton, the first woman ever to serve in the U.S. Senate: "There's work to be done, and we need *you* to do it."

Karen Foerstel's *Biographical Dictionary of Congressional Women* is an

invaluable compendium of biographical information on the 200 women who have served in the U.S. Congress. Again, much of the material is not new, but by bringing together both the oft-told as well as the little-known biographical details, Foerstel has provided a valuable service. The book includes the number of women in each Congress as well as lists of women who have chaired full committees of either chamber. In addition, the book has a selected bibliography of books written by and about women in Congress. Foerstel has produced a valuable reference guide for both scholars of women in politics and of Congress.

Cindy Simon Rosenthal
Assistant Professor of Political Science
University of Oklahoma

Partners and Rivals: Representation in the U.S. Senate Delegations. Wendy J. Schiller. Princeton University Press, 2000. ISBN 0691048878, $17.95, paper, 199 pages.

Sizing Up the Senate: The Unequal Consequences of Equal Representation. Frances E. Lee and Bruce L. Opperheimer. University of Chicago Press, 1999. ISBN 0226470067, $17.00, 288 pages.

The passage of the Seventeenth Amendment in 1913 to allow for the popular election of the Senate did more than simply increase the potential for democratic representation in the elite upper chamber. It raised doubts about the nature of our bicameralism achieved by the Great Compromise. In *Federalist 62*, Madison claims that the necessity of a more removed body that is less subject to the ebb and flow of public opinion is necessary to check the potential for factious influence in our primary law-making organ. These two books highlight some of the most important questions regarding both the ability of the Senate to actually serve its function as the counterbalance to the House as well as the legitimacy the Senate's representational function under the current institutional structure.

Schiller argues that it is shortsighted to view the representational function of the Senate as one would any other representative body. The much overlooked allotment of two senators for each state is vital to understanding the way senators behave. She argues that because the district is *shared* by two individuals, they have to vie for media coverage in their state, campaign resources, and constituency support. As a result, scholars of the Senate can best understand the "home-style" of senators by examining the way they behave as *contrasted* with the other senator from their state. Regardless of whether or not the two senators belong to the same party, they will follow different paths once they are in office.

While we might assume that representative behavior is determined in large part by the make-up of, and salient issues within, their constituency, Schiller finds evidence that supports a different argument. Senators will adopt agendas that are very different from one another, even though they represent the same people. They will take on different issues, will have different constituency bases, and will try to separate themselves from their colleague, regardless of party, because they want to share as little of the state's resources as possible with the other senator. By minimizing their points of similarity, each can claim to constituents that he or she provides a unique service to the public.

Lee and Oppenheimer argue that representation in the Senate needs to be reexamined. They take issue with the malapportionment of the Senate and assert that we need to reconsider why we allow each state, regardless of size, to have an equal voice in the upper chamber. They argue that, in some ways, the Seventeenth Amendment was a mistake because it has had consequences unforeseen to the founders on both the competitiveness of the races and the problems initiated by campaign fund-raising. Apportionment is not something to be dealt with lightly. The authors demonstrate how it affects several aspects of the Senate as an institution, namely representation, election, strategic behavior, and policymaking.

While the Senate was designed to counterbalance the House, in many ways the Senate's ability to be more distant and therefore reserved is challenged by the current system of apportionment. People in small states have more access to their senator than people from large states, when House district constituencies are relatively equal in size. Furthermore, senators from large states remain somewhat anonymous to most of their constituents, while citizens from small states tend to feel a closer bond with their senator. This allows for small-state senators to seek greater control and power within the institution. The virtue of fair and equal representation must be reexamined in light of the findings of Lee and Oppenheimer.

Both of these books examine the Senate from a fresh perspective. By highlighting aspects of the Senate that are missed by current literature, or by challenging conventional wisdom, they both provide a fascinating turn on our understanding of the upper chamber.

Lynsey Morris
Carl Albert Fellow
University of Oklahoma

Polarized Politics: Congress and the President in a Partisan Era. Jon R. Bond and Richard Fleisher. CQ Press, 2000. ISBN 1568024940, $24.95, paper, 226 pages.

Eight congressional-presidential scholars collaborate with Jon R. Bond and Richard Fleisher in an effort to examine the rivalry between the president and Congress during a new era demarcated by heightened partisan conflict. These delightful essays cover a variety of subjects such as elections, agenda setting, committee decision making, and developments on the floor.

One theme of this book is how polarized politics affect congressional interactions and relationships. First, Gary Jacobson argues that congressional polarization is a reflection of more homogenous and more dissimilar electoral coalitions. Thus, congressional electoral coalitions reflect electorate coalitions; yet, simultaneously, voters orient themselves in response to the alternatives presented by the two major parties. Nonetheless, Jacobson concludes that elite polarization is pacing mass polarization. In explaining why, John Aldrich and David Rohde argue that congressional polarization is the consequence of "conditional party government." The parties become more homogenous in order to provide leaders with the power and resources to achieve the policy goals of individual members. If the party is not homogenous, then the party

becomes fragmented and will be unable to control the floor, rules of debate and amendment, and the timing of votes. Hence, polarization in Congress is a byproduct of party government. Not only does intense partisanship affect elections and voting, it affects civility. Kathleen Hall Jamieson and Erika Falk seek to explain the brief resurgence of uncivil speech in the first session of the 104th Congress. They identify four possible causes: one, the change in party control; two, the Democrats' loss of majority status; three, Republicans' adjustment to majority status; four, increased ideological polarization of the two parties.

The second major theme of this book is how polarized politics affect the interaction between the president and Congress in policy formulation. George C. Edwards III and Andrew Barrett find that, under unified government, presidential initiatives are two-thirds more likely to be successful than congressional initiatives. Under divided government, presidential initiatives garner less advantages and more opposition, while congressional initiatives, especially those of the majority party, pass at a much higher rate. Barbara Sinclair looks at the relationship between Congress and the president at other points in the policy process. Sinclair concludes that partisan growth has made legislating more difficult, and explains how and why the legislative process has changed at different stages. The final essay, by the co-editors, finds that increased partisanship has changed presidential support, causing the president to receive fewer votes from his/her own party and from the opposition. Consequently, increased partisanship has not led to a greater certainty of outcomes.

This collection of essays corrals the major themes regarding congressional-presidential interactions into one book, and they collectively demonstrate how partisanship plays a crucial role in congressional-presidential relationships.

Josh Stockley
Ph.D. student in Political Science
University of Oklahoma

Race, Redistricting, and Representation: The Unintended Consequences of Black Majority Districts. David T. Canon. The University of Chicago Press, 1999. ISBN 0226092712, $18.00, paper, 304 pages.

Majority-minority districts lie intersection of many fundamental questions about representation, equality, protection of minority rights, constitutional interpretation, and legislative politics. While other scholars have focused principally on one or two of these topics, David T. Canon in *Race, Redistricting, and Representation* attempts to weave together an analysis of not only electoral outcomes and legal debates but also the campaign, constituency service, and policy consequences of majority-minority districts.

Canon's book employs various methods to try to both understand and explain racial representation in Congress. The scope of the research is prodigious; Canon utilizes almost 80 elite interviews, participant observation, legal analysis, content analysis of more than 11,000 newspaper stories of the activities of House members in the 103rd

Congress, statistical analysis of 11 different data sets of voter attitudes, roll call voting analyses, and analysis of cosponsorship of some 14,560 bills. The data collection effort focuses primarily on 53 members, including all members of the Congressional Black Caucus (CBC) and other members who represent districts with a total black population of at least 25 percent.

In his review of normative theory, Canon draws upon debates from minority politics and feminist scholarship that contrast "politics of difference" against the "politics of commonality." He adds a "balancing" approach to this continuum of perspectives on race representation. While some political observers see majority-minority districts as an embodiment of difference, Canon argues and supports with rich empirical data the view that the balancing perspective is the more common form of representation provided in those districts.

Instead of focusing on the "demand-side" factors of racial representation (e.g. such variables as district demographics, racial bloc voting, and electoral system factors), Canon proposes a "supply-side" theory of representation that focuses on candidate emergence and candidate representational styles. Canon argues that racial representation (and its subsequent substantive content in terms of legislative activities) is very much the product of candidates, campaigns, and discourse that cannot be captured solely by regression analyses assuming district characteristics as the sole causal link.

In the end, Canon concludes that the race of the representative matters and that black members of Congress "do a better job of walking the racial tightrope and balancing the distinctive needs of black voters and the general interests of all voters, black and white alike" (244). He also acknowledges, however, that these members produce a "balancing biracialism" more than a "color-blind biracialism." Canon's analysis and argument contain serious implications and research challenges for those interested in minority politics, legislative politics, redistricting law, and representation theory.

Cindy Simon Rosenthal
Assistant Professor of Political Science
University of Oklahoma

Senates: Bicameralism in the Contemporary World. Samuel C. Patterson and Anthony Mughan. Ohio State University Press, 1999. ISBN 0814250106, $19.95, paper, 360 pages.

Patterson and Mughan discuss the origins and continued existence of bicameralism in terms of democratic theory and function. Their introductory chapter contains a table which compares the nine bicameral case studies which are undertaken in this book. In the table, Patterson and Mughan describe each upper house by its governmental system, the length of each Senate's terms, the method by which seats are selected, and the constitutional powers of each upper house.

The first case study pertains to the U.S. Senate, and is written by Barbara Sinclair. The second case study is written by Werner J. Patzelt and is concerned with the German Bundesrat. Next, John Uhr discusses the Australian Senate, and in chapter five, C. E. S. Franks takes an in-depth look at the Canadian Senate. Jean Mastias and Donald Shell,

respectively, examine the French Senate and the British House of Lords in chapters six and seven. The Italian Senato, as observed by Claudio Lodici, the Spanish Senado, as explained by Carlos Flores Juberias, and the Polish Senat, as analyzed by David M. Olson, complete the substantive case studies. In addition to the senate characteristics that are described in the aforementioned table, each chapter also examines internal structure and decision-making, party structure and leadership, and the capacity for change within senates. These case studies provide a depth of insight from which Patterson and Mughan are able to draw their conclusions.

Patterson and Mughan culminate this book by placing the study of senates into a comparative perspective. They argue that senates are an important and overlooked institution within democratic nations. Further, they conclude that these upper houses have significant democratic ramifications for the legislative process in terms of redundancy and representation. This is a timely book which underscores the importance of further senate studies.

Melody Huckaby
Carl Albert Fellow
University of Oklahoma

Term Limits in State Legislatures. John M. Carey, Richard G. Nieni, Lynda W. Powell. University of Michigan Press, 2000. ISBN 0472066994, $19.95, paper, 174 pages.

The term limits movement spread across the country like a wildfire in the early 1990s. By the middle of the decade, the movement had cooled slightly, but state legislatures began to feel its effects. Carey, Niemi, and Powell investigate the effects of term limits on state legislatures using data collected from a survey of nearly 3,000 legislators from all 50 states. The survey data are complemented by interviews conducted with legislative leaders in four states where term limits have kicked in. This is the first rigorous study of the effects of term limits across several states.

The authors use a comparative approach to gauge the effects of term limits. An examination of changes in the composition of state legislatures, the behavior of legislators, institutional processes and procedures, and the electoral arena form the core of the book. Possible changes are evaluated using two dichotomies. The first distinguishes between the states that have adopted term limits and those that have not. The second dichotomy identifies legislators based on when they were elected: in 1992 or before, or in 1993 and after.

The authors uncover mixed effects of state legislative term limits. The demographic composition of state legislatures has not changed significantly after terms limits are adopted. The data do suggest that women may benefit from term limits, however, but the difference between the two types of state legislatures is very slight. Term limits have affected legislative behavior. The authors found that term-limited state legislators appear to work for the interest of the entire state. In terms of institutional behavior, term limits appear to shift the power away from traditional leaders. Finally, the data exhibit a trend of state legislators seeking other offices.

While the obvious strength of this book is the survey data, the personal

interviews with legislative leaders bring a clear voice to the narrative. The leaders largely agree that term limits will lead to an increased reliance on information and expertise from lobbyists and the state's executive branch.

John David Rausch, Jr., PhD
Assistant Professor
West Texas A&M University
(Former Carl Albert Fellow)

Veto Bargaining: Presidents and the Politics of Negative Power. Charles M. Cameron. Cambridge University Press, 2000. ISBN 0521625505, $18.95, paper, 288 pages.

Veto Bargaining is an excellent academic piece that examines the role of inter-branch negotiation that occurs in the eras of divided government. Arguing against the idea that divided government is a new occurrence, Cameron examines the institutional consequences of divided government, such as disagreement of policy and possible gridlock. Cameron ties examinations of presidential vetoes, the formal structure of bills in Congress, and the policy position of the president in the framework of interbranch negotiations. Interbranch negotiations assume that the two branches of Congress informally negotiate over the language of legislation in order to assure passage and prevent gridlock.

Cameron asserts the study of the veto should also focus on "negative power". Understood properly, according to Cameron, the veto should be viewed as a tool that can end legislation, as well as a tool of the president to force concessions in the language of a bill from Congress. The negotiations occur due to the threat of a Presidential veto. Thus, the final draft of legislation from Congress reflects a compromise between the two institutions, rather than a competition.

Cameron bases the work in a rational choice perspective applied to institutions. There is an emphasis on formal modeling and prediction. Mixed in with the data are two case studies the author uses as examples. All data and models are presented in a straightforward, easily understandable fashion that even readers unfamiliar with rational choice will grasp. The two case studies as examples of the theoretical modeling enrich Cameron's work.

With the frequency of divided government, interbranch relations deserve attention. While many perceive the division of government as ineffective, Cameron examines the processes that allow for consensus and progress. This book offers new insight and understanding both to the role of the President, as well as the role of Congress. Cameron's book has appeal to scholars across political science and offers new insights into governmental institutions.

Anders Ferrington
Ph. D. student in political science
University of Oklahoma

New books related to legislative studies are generally acquired directly from the publisher for inclusion in Book Notes. In addition, any author who wishes to have a new book featured in Book Notes may send the request with a copy of the book to: Book Review

Editor, *LSS Newsletter*, Carl Albert Center, University of Oklahoma, 630 Parrington Oval, Norman, OK 73019. *2*

BACK TO TOP

| Front Page | Section News | Research & Teaching | Legislative News |
| Papers Presented | Journal Articles | Book Notes | Extension of Remarks |

| Legislative Studies Section Home Page | APSA Home Page |

Volume 24, Number 1, January 2001

This section is meant to provide LSS members with the basic citation information about journal articles dealing with legislatures. Numerous journals were searched in compiling this list. The major sources for this information are Current Contents and ABC POLI SCI.

BRITISH JOURNAL OF POLITICAL SCIENCE

"Does Campaign Length Matter? Testing for Cross-National Effects," R. Stevenson and L. Vavreck, 30(2) (2000): 217-236.

CANADIAN PUBLIC ADMINISTRATION

"Democracy and the Canadian House of Commons at the Millennium," J. Smith, 42(4) (1999): 398-421.

GOVERNMENT AND OPPOSITION

"Parliamentary Elections and the Prospects for Political Pluralism in North Africa," B. Dillman, 35(2) (2000): 211-236.

INTERNATIONAL POLITICAL SCIENCE REVIEW

"Women's Representation in Legislatures and Cabinets in Industrial Democracies," A. Siaroff, 21(2) (2000): 197-216.

LEGISLATIVE STUDIES QUARTERLY

"Measuring the Ideologies of U.S. Senators: The Song Remains the Same," B. Burden, G. Caldeira, and T. Groseclose, 25(2) (2000): 237-258.

"Reexamining the Filibuster and Proposal Powers in the Senate," A. Alter and L. McGranahan, 25(2) (2000): 259-284.

"Divided Government and the Legislative Productivity of Congress. 1945-1994," W. Howell, S. Adler, C. Cameron and C. Riemann, 25(2) (2000): 285-312.

"Television Markets and the Competitiveness of the U.S. House Elections," D. Levy and P. Squire, 25(2) (2000): 313-326.

"Changes in Professionalism in U.S. State Legislatures," J. King, 25(2) (2000): 327.

PARLIAMENTARY AFFAIRS

"Labor and the House of Lords: A Case Study in Constitutional Reform," 53(2) (2000): 290-310.

PARTY POLITICS

"How Much Change? An Analysis of the Initial Impact of Proportional Representation on the New Zealand Parliamentary Party System," 6(2) (2000): 131-154.

POLITICAL RESEARCH QUARTERLY

"Interest Group Lobbying and U.S. House Decentralization: Linking Informational Focus to Committee Hearing Appearances," V. Heitshusen, 53(1) (2000): 151-176.

POLITICAL SCIENCE QUARTERLY

"Republican Gains in the House in the 1994 Elections: Class Polarization in American Politics," J. Stonecash and M. Mariani, 115(1) (2000): 93-114.

PRESIDENTIAL STUDIES QUARTERLY

"Theodore Roosevelt, Congress, and the Military: U.S. Civil-Military Relations in the Early Twentieth Century," M. Oyos, 30(2) (2000): 312-330.

"The Law: The Clinton Impeachment: Untangling the Web of Conflicting Considerations," N. Kassop, 30(2) (2000): 359-373.

PUBLIC CHOICE

"Interest Group Competition over Policy Outcomes: Dynamics, Strategic Behavior, and Social Costs," J. Boyce, 102(3-4) (2000): 313-340.

"Proportional Representation in the Welsh Assembly," Y. Altunbas and S. Chakravarty, 103(1-2) (2000): 85-94.

"Proportional Representation with Citizen Candidates," A. Hamlin and M. Hjortlund, 103(3-4) (2000): 205-230.

"Sorting Out the Seeking: The Economics of individual Motivations," A. Schram, 103(3-4) (2000): 231-258.

"Legislator Turnout and the Calculus of Voting: The Determinants of Abstention in the U.S. Congress," L. Rothenberg and M. Sanders, 103(3-4) (2000): 259-270.

"Political Shirking, Opponent Quality, and Electoral Support," D. Figlio, 103(3-4) (2000): 271-284.

"Two-Stage Rent-Seeking Contests with Carryovers," K. Baik and S. Lee, 103(3-4) (2000): 285-296.

"Multicandidate Equilibrium in American Elections," J. Adams, 103(3-4) (2000): 297-326.

"Valence Politics and Equilibrium in Spatial Elections Models," S. Ansolabehere and J. Snyder, Jr., 103(3-4) (2000): 327-336.

"The (Un)predictability of Primaries with Many Candidates: Simulation Evidence," A.

Cooper and M. Munger, 103(3-4) (2000): 337-356.

SCANDINAVIAN POLITICAL STUDIES

"Comparing Class-Related Opinions between MP Candidates and Party Supporters: Evidence from Finland," P. Forma, 23(2) (2000): 115-138.

WOMEN AND POLITICS

"Women Candidates in Kenya: Political Socialization and Representation," J. Lawless and R. Fox, 20(4) (1999): 49-76.

"Gender and Roll Call Voting in the New York State Assembly," M. Barnello, 20(4) (1999): 77.

BACK TO TOP

| Front Page | Section News | Research & Teaching | Legislative News |
| Papers Presented | Journal Articles | Book Notes | Extension of Remarks |

| Other Editions of the LSS Newsletter |
| Legislative Studies Section Home Page | APSA Home Page |

Volume 24, Number 1, January 2001

Instant Democracy for Everyone

There are groups out there that are trying to co-opt representative democracy.
Their plan is to use technology and the Internet to make legislatures a thing of the past.

By Brian Weberg

Look out now. Here it comes. It's called direct democracy (DD), and it's coming soon to a city and a state near you. It's not just the popular initiative, like 24 states already have. DD, as envisioned by many who promote it, is the initiative on steroids. Move over, you old institutions of representative democracy (RD), there's a new game coming to town. Well, really, an old game with a shiny new look made possible by technology and the Internet.

Dick Morris, former sidekick of President Clinton, is so convinced about the coming age of direct democracy that he's written a book about it and opened a Web-based portal called vote.com (the name of his book, too). It's a sure sign that DD is coming into vogue when wily insiders like Morris line up to cash in on the trend. Just as the Web has opened up commerce in new and accelerated ways, so too, proponents say, will the Internet open up democracy. We will name our own price on priceline.com, then click our own public policy on vote.com.

A hundred years ago, the Populists and Progressives promoted reforms to a system of representative democracy that they said had been subverted by special interests and cronyism. They offered solutions such as the direct election of U.S. senators, recall of elected officials and, of course, the initiative. Today, those reforms are taken-for-granted elements of many states' political landscapes. And in the recent past, a significant new reform has been added to the mix - term limits.

Our nation is about to engage again in a philosophical debate and probably a few political skirmishes about the future of its democratic principles, processes and institutions. America's tradition of representative democracy, so carefully crafted by the founding fathers, might be in the balance. Those who believe in and see the virtues of representative democracy will be on the defensive from the start. Those who promote direct democracy will have technology, and probably public opinion, on their side. And maybe fate. As Morris glibly asserts, "Whether direct Internet democracy is good or bad is quite beside the point. It is inevitable."

Direct Democracy Movement

Direct democracy means many things to many people. It is a movement that is both grassroots and, as the vote.com example demonstrates, inhabited by seasoned strategists.

To some devotees, it is the ultimate expression of personal and collective political freedom where each member of society participates fully in public decision making. An almost utopian aura pervades some of the literature. The Web-based Direct Democracy Online Project predicts "a superior form of government, in which the freedom and the happiness of all the citizens will be more secure than eve. . ." In radical and Web-gadabout Aki Orr's Direct Democracy Manifesto, he sees "a new system where every citizen can propose and vote on every political decision," which will "raise humanity to a higher level and will change not only society but also the individual."

Most direct democracy advocates are a bit more pragmatic. Generally, they call for the expanded use of the initiative at the local, state or federal levels (and a few call for global direct democracy). Many enthusiasts also support proportional representation. Stephen Neitzke's Direct Democracy League says there are "four functional parts" of DD: direct election of representatives, civic initiative, referendum and recall of elected officials. When all of these are in place, as they are in 11 states, according to Neitzke, citizens enjoy what he calls "modern authentic democracy."

Ted Becker is a political science professor at Auburn University and the voice of the Global Democratic Movement whose "explicit goal is to maintain a Web site that will help inform and synergize those who are interested in finding new and better ways to empower the citizens of modern, high-tech nations so that they may influence, or better yet, direct the major agendas, priorities and policies of their polities." Becker says that reforms like term limits "are the equivalent of new patches on a worn out tire." He advocates something called teledemocracy where communications technology merges with "citizen power" to "transform democracies into the next phase of their evolution."

The Initiative & Referenda Institute has a more mainstream and limited agenda on DD, and perhaps because of that, more relevance to what is happening in politics today. The institute aims "to inform and educate the public about the [initiative] process and its effects on the political, fiscal and social fabric of our society; and to provide effective leadership in litigation-defending the initiative process and the right of citizens to reform their government from career legislators who want to take it away." Its Web site offers a wealth of information on the status of initiatives and referenda in the states. The institute offers talking points in which it asserts that I&R are not a replacement for representative democracy, nor is it direct democracy. "It is simply an additional check and balance on those who are in power."

Former Alaska U.S. Senator Mike Gravel and his group Philadelphia II are pushing a direct democracy initiative that would, according to their Web site, "enable ordinary citizens to make laws and legislate policy in every government jurisdiction of the United States." Their plan would allow popular initiatives to qualify for the ballot in three ways: by legislative resolution, by citizen petition and by public opinion poll. In the latter method, a new federal agency called the Electoral Trust would oversee the management of the polling process. According to Gravel, "The Direct Democracy Initiative does not change representative governments - it seeks to bring people into a legislating partnership with their representatives in all government jurisdictions."

Over at Dick Morris' vote.com, visitors vote up or down on a slate of public policy issues. For example, on one day the lead question was: Should Same-Sex

Couples Be Banned from Adopting Children? Voters are offered background information on the questions, including pro and con arguments. Vote.com then promises to send the results of the poll to relevant lawmakers. "When you vote on a topic listed on our site, we'll send an immediate e-mail to significant decision makers like your congressional representative, your senators and the president telling them how you feel." Morris believes that Internet-based opinion gathering and distribution is the wave of the future. He sees the Internet replacing traditional media-dominated information sources and becoming "the driving force in American political life, and the result is nothing short of a cultural revolution."

Although Dick Morris traditionally works the federal angles of government, he sees the Internet revolution coming to states, too. State legislatures, which Morris writes are "notoriously insensitive to the will of their constituents," will find that "voters will seize the right to make their own decisions through the Internet, just as they will do in national politics."

Also making a somewhat mainstream direct democracy-related play at the congressional level is USADemocracy, which counts among its advisory board the eclectic likes of James Carville, Ralph Reed, Geraldine Ferraro and Richard Galen, the executive director of GOPAC. At www.usademocracy.com visitors sign up for free membership that allows them to vote on congressional bills and also monitor their own member's voting record. Running tabulations compare on-line voting results to those taken in Congress and also break down the vote according to the user's state and district. And if you like, USADemocracy will forward your vote to your congressman.

VotingOnline Inc. takes the USADemocracy concept to the state level in Florida, and, funding permitting, perhaps to other states. Visitors to their site at www.statelegislator.com can see Florida bill summaries, chat about pending legislation and vote their preference on those bills. James Chapman, president and CEO of the two-person start-up operation, says he developed the site because "there never is a clear way to communicate with a legislator." Compared to the more radical direct democracy enthusiasts, Chapman's dream is pretty basic. According to his Web site's mission statement, his goal is to 'provide a vehicle for constituents and legislators to discuss legislation over the Internet through the use of discussion boards and surveys."

The site opened with a media splash at the beginning of the recent session, and more than 500 users quickly signed on. Then the press coverage quieted down, and so did site registrations. During the entire session, only about 825 users joined. Chapman says he will do things a little differently next session. He has plans for developing statelegislator.com into a 50-state site where legislators and constituents compare thoughts and votes on pending legislation. He also has high hopes for bringing his concept to the county level.

Chapman and his Web site did not make a big impact on the 2000 Florida session. He admits he missed some opportunities and did not have enough money behind the effort. But the concept of www.statelegislator.com, with modifications and enhancements, could foreshadow one way that direct democracy passions and representative democracy traditions might merge effectively in the future.

Whether radical, moderate or mainstream, those who support various forms of direct democracy share common views on three key matters. First, most harbor dissatisfaction with or distrust of representative democracy. Says Becker, "All modern representative democracies have their arteries clogged. What is needed is quadruple bypass surgery." Second, direct democracy proponents look to the Internet as both the enabler and motivator of long suppressed public desire to participate in politics. Writes Neitzke, "The utility of computer nets for democracy is stark, simple and elegant." Finally, almost everyone in these camps agrees with

Morris that the trend toward direct democracy is inevitable.

Practical Matters

James Madison, in his Federalist Paper No. 10, wrote the classic argument for representative democracy. His words serve as the foundation on which all defenders of our legislative institutions rest. In this discourse on the potentially destructive nature of "powerful factions", Madison concludes that "a pure democracy . . . can admit no cure for the mischiefs of faction." He adds that "such democracies have ever been spectacles of turbulence and contention; have ever been found incompatible with personal security or the rights of property; and have in general been as short in their lives as they have been violent in their deaths."

Representative democracy, argues Madison, "opens a different prospect, and promises the cure for which we are seeking." Under a republican form of government, writes Madison, an "improper or wicked project will be less apt to pervade the whole body of the Union than a particular member of it; in the same proportion as such a malady is more likely to taint a particular county or district, than an entire State."

An equally spirited defense of representative democracy appeared recently on the bookshelves - Pulitzer Prize-winning columnist and political reporter David Broder's *Democracy Derailed: Initiative Campaigns and the Power of Money*. Although primarily an exposé on the initiative movement in America, Broder is clear with readers when he writes, "The argument of this book is that representative government is not something to be discarded quite so casually. We need to examine what really happens in direct legislation by initiative. And we must ask ourselves about the implications of a weakening of our republican form of government."

Broder minces no words in his concern about the popular initiative as it is used in contemporary politics. "No sooner had the concept of popular sovereignty been implanted in the political system than clever politicians realized that the key to power now lay in the manipulation of public opinion," he writes. Broder warns, "The initiative process . . . threatens to challenge or even subvert the American system of government in the next few decades."

Broder echoes concerns raised by Alan Rosenthal in his book, *The Decline of Representative Democracy*. Rosenthal takes a more institutional look at state legislatures, but his conclusions are similar. In his introduction, Rosenthal writes, ". . . participatory democracy (which is not quite 'direct democracy') has been growing in strength at the expense of representative processes. Government no longer is conducted with the consent of the governed, according to the Federalist plan. It is conducted with significant participation by the governed, and by those who claim to speak for the public's interest, according to a more populist plan. Representative democracy, as the states had experienced it for several centuries, is now in decline."

No doubt, activists at the various direct democracy institutes and centers and movements find cause to rejoice at Broder's and Rosenthal's words. From their perspective, these authors are only confirming what direct democracy activists work for-the weakening or supplanting of the legislature and its processes.

On the other hand, those who seek to defend representative institutions and traditions have much to ponder. If Madison, Broder and Rosenthal are right, and if Morris and others also are right about the inevitability of certain trends, then state legislators, legislative staff and their small legion of defenders need to put on their reality hats and get to work. The representative democracy defenders need a strategy and realistic goals. As a practical matter, this may require state legislatures to adopt new ways to conduct their work and develop new ways to

interact with the public.

Some Ideas About the Future

There seems to be little doubt about these things: The public doesn't have high confidence in their institutions of representative government. The public also is intrigued by more direct or participative forms of lawmaking, especially the initiative. As Broder points out in his book, "In every state I visited in my reporting, the initiative process was viewed as sacrosanct. In most of them, the legislature was in disrepute." Further, the Internet poses new opportunities and expectations for expanded public input into lawmaking and governance. Finally, there is a growing community of individuals and organizations ready to make good or evil out of the possibilities made available by this novel confluence of technology and changing public perspectives about democracy.

It also seems clear that the best and most effective advocates for and protectors of representative democracy will be the institutions themselves - the state legislatures, city councils and others. Neither Broder, Rosenthal nor the ghost of James Madison can carry this responsibility, although their roles are essential. Other champions of legislatures like former Wyoming U.S. Senator Alan Simpson, Maryland U.S. Senator Paul Sarbanes and former Indiana Congressman Lee Hamilton have, through their actions and words, played a role, too. But now it is time for legislatures to take a stand and adopt a strategy.

Who could have imagined only a few years ago that on-line, citizen "day traders," empowered by the Internet, would mobilize in such numbers that they would influence the rise and fall of major financial markets? We have seen how the passions of these investors have transformed Wall Street and contributed to sometimes radical swings in market indices. Does it take much, then, to imagine a future where public policy and government programs are whipped to and fro by similarly passionate yet fleeting factions?

The future probably will disappoint those who dream of a world without legislatures. And it also will come up short for advocates of Madison's ideal. We will land somewhere in the middle - a point where the public finds a comfortable balance of direct and representative routes to governance. State legislatures must take steps to help ensure that the balance is struck at a point that preserves key institutional values like deliberation, compromise and trust, and that allows citizens meaningful ways to practice their civic responsibility and express their political passions.

Brian Weberg directs NCSL's Legislative Management program.

How Legislatures Can Co-opt Direct Democracy

By Brian Weberg

Just as legislatures must strive to "change the public," as political scientist Alan Rosenthal says, so must they acknowledge and embrace, in practical and strategic ways, the public's real expectations and apparent zeal about technology and participation.

Legislatures should be willing to undertake internal reforms that make them more accessible and identifiable to the public. Here are some ideas about what those strategies might include:

- Expand legislative Web sites to become on-line policy voting centers, like James Chapman's statelegislator.com. Such interactive legislative Web sites would connect citizens to legislators and legislation in political ways and provide more than the traditional elements, like bill status, committee schedules and member rosters. They might include legislator chat rooms, pro and con bill analyses, subject matter research links, voting records analysis, district-level customization options, and ticklers to users about impending legislative deadlines, bill introductions and other procedural matters.
- Endorse and promote on-line voting systems for legislative elections. Public demand for this innovation is likely to swell. By taking the lead on this election reform, state legislatures will demonstrate a commitment to public participation and responsiveness.
- Provide the public with legislative information. Make available voting records, meeting schedules, calendars, social events and other legislative records and activities.
- Offer TV or Web-based access to committee meetings, floor sessions and other government events. These efforts are in place in many states, perhaps most notably through www.tvw.org in Washington.
- Develop strong leaders who are recognized as spokesmen for the institution. It might be time to get past the fear of strong legislative leadership. The public connects with individual personalities, not institutions. Legislatures need visible leaders who carry, and are identified with, a positive institutional message.
- Maintain a "high touch" legislature. High tech and its Internet too are keys to connecting with citizens. But too much technology between legislatures and the public can be detrimental. The lure of technological solutions to citizen involvement is intoxicating. But virtual legislatures will fail. Citizens need personal contact with legislators, and legislators need personal contact with citizens. It is at this level of personal contact that legislatures establish their authenticity and best demonstrate their democratic virtues.
- Extend the length of severe term limit provisions. This idea might stir some trouble. However, it is becoming clear that draconian term limits that allow only a few years of service do no service to anyone except those who wish to weaken the legislative institution. The public is beginning to get this message, too.
- Develop a strong institutional ethic, not just strong ethics laws. No amount of citizen education can overcome the damage done by scandal or the ugliness of campaign-motivated attacks on people or the legislature. Legislatures should communicate to the public their position and commitment on the ethical conduct of members and staff. This does not require new laws, just new kinds of communication.

Brian Weberg directs NCSL's Legislative Management program.

Task Force Concludes:

Task Force Concludes:
Direct Democracy Is the Future

An NCSL task force recently completed a two-year project on the future of the state legislature. It concluded that direct democracy was a crucial variable in how state legislatures will look 25 years from now. The group developed four scenarios of the future, two in which direct democracy was heavily practiced by the public and two where direct democracy was not used very much. Almost everyone who has seen the scenarios, from legislative leaders to staff to lobbyists, agree that those with high direct democracy usage are most likely to reflect the world we will live in.

The New Political Parity

It took an excruciating amount of time to decipher what the American people said when they voted Nov. 7. But when the final tally was made, state legislatures are more competitive than any time in recent memory.

By Karen Hansen

When Americans tuned in to watch election returns Nov. 7, little did they expect to witness the unprecedented series of events that makes this election one for the history booksùa president elected by a narrow electoral majority, a Congress that for only the second time this century is so closely divided and state legislatures poised to redraw the lines that will affect the party in power for the first decade of the new century.

Even as Americans put history on hold in one of the tightest presidential elections ever, the votes they cast in state legislative races brought the partisan balance closer than at any time in the past 50 years. The political landscape of the states in 2001 will reflect as even a match as has been seen in the last half century.

"We now truly have American political parity," says pollster Frank Luntz, "an equal number of Republicans and Democrats. That showed itself in the House, the Senate and the presidency."

But is this new political parity the result of a deeply divided electorate? CNN political analyst William Schneider doesn't think so. "You got the impression from looking at the electoral map and the results in Congress that Americans were deeply polarized. But that simply wasn't the case," Schneider says. "You could have very nearly a 50-50 split in the Senate, a narrow majority in the House just got narrower. The presidential vote could hardly be more closely divided than it is.

"But when I looked at the exit polling there wasn't much evidence that the people were deeply divided - not nearly as much as they were over Nixon and McGovern or Johnson and Goldwater."

Like a baseball game that goes into extra innings, the presidential race hung in the balance for a nerve-wracking several days. And, just as in the national elections, there were few home runs for either party in state legislative contests. Going into the election, Democrats controlled 19legislatures, Republicans held 17, and 13 were split (Nebraska is nonpartisan.) On Nov. 8, Democrats held 16, Republicans still controlled 17, and in 16 others control was split. (At the time of this story, Washington was undeclared.)

Dead Center

The astounding ambivalence of voters in the presidential election, that ultimately hinged on the recount of a mere 1,800 votes and absentee ballots in Florida, was

mirrored in congressional races which gave Democrats a net gain of six seats. A scant 1 percent of state legislative seats went to the other party. In this case, the Republicans. Nationally, the GOP picked up a net of some 70 seats in state chambers.

"Everything is dead center," says Luntz. "It is a balanced election; it is a central election; it is a compromise election."

"A close split has become closer in state legislatures," says Schneider. "The same thing has happened in Congress."

For politicians looking for a message in this election, Schneider believes it is the same it's always been.

"The people always want government from the middle," he says. "That's been true forever. The question is what kind of change do they want? And what they want, to put it very precisely, is a change in leadership, but not a change in direction."

Only 51 Percent Voted

On Nov. 8, the voting was over but the election was not - nationally and in some state legislative contests. The perception that the closest election in a generation was the result of a huge turnout was, in fact, a misperception. Only some 51 percent of the approximately 200 million eligible voters cast ballots, according to Curtis Gans, director of the Committee for the Study of the American Electorate. It was a slim increase over the 49 percent who voted in the 1996 presidential election, which had been the first time since 1925 that less that half the electorate bothered to go to the polls. Voter turnout has been steadily declining since the last presidential cliffhanger, the 1960 Nixon-Kennedy race when 62.8 percent of eligible voters cast ballots.

The slight upturn this year probably doesn't affect the downward trend "at all," according to Gans, and is primarily attributable to "the mobilization effects in the battleground states."

"Several of the non-battleground states had lower turnout," he says.

And, as everywhere in this nail-biting election where margins were razor thin, the issues that drove the voters were local. And every vote counted.

Take Vermont. There will be a Republican speaker in the Vermont House for the first time in 16 years. The election gave Republicans a 21-seat advantage over the Democrats. Observers believe that at least some of the GOP gains this year were attributable to a backlash against the state's controversial law legalizing civil unions between same-sex couples.

In New Hampshire, Republicans broke the 12-12 tie in the Senate to take a two-seat majority and likely thwart a statewide income tax some Democrats had proposed to finance court-ordered education funding. The state Supreme Court ruled that the current school finance formula that heavily relies on the property tax is unconstitutional. In the 1998 election, Democrats won control for the first time since 1912 with a 13-11 margin, only to lose it when a member died and was replaced in a special election by a Republican. One candidate won by only 85 votes, another contest is within 1 percent. Recounts are expected in both. Republicans attribute their success to a massive grass roots campaign in which 1,000 volunteers contacted tens of thousands of registered Republicans and independents on election day.

The GOP fought back an effort by Democrats to wrest control of the Pennsylvania House, tied at 100-100 going into the election after three Republicans left in a cloud of controversy, one convicted of a fatal hit-and-run accident. Five legislators in all were sentenced for criminal acts this year, and another faces a drunk driving charge. The GOP gained four seats for a 104-99

margin.

Missouri Democrats' 53-year dominance of the state Senate was broken by a Republican challenge that put the chamber in a tie. There will be three vacancies, two Democrat and one Republican, created by members who won other offices. One, the Democratic lieutenant governor-elect, could cast the tie-breaking vote in leadership races, tilting the chamber to Democratic control.

Further Inroads in the South

For the first time since Reconstruction, Democrats are no longer in control in the now-tied South Carolina Senate. The Republicans' one-seat gain may give them effective control of the chamber because the Republican lieutenant governor casts the tie-breaking vote. The Republicans increased their majority in the House, continuing their inroads into the South that have whittled away at the Democratic dominance of state legislatures over the past two decades.

In Maine, Republicans gained three seats in the Senate to pull even with the Democrats. A lone independent could determine which party is the effective majority, and there is talk of a shared-power arrangement.

The Arizona Senate is now tied after voters gave Democrats the seat from a conservative Republican district where the term-limited House speaker was seeking election. Former Speaker Jeff Croscost had crafted a controversial alternative fuels law that is predicted to drain $500 million from the state treasury. After the election, he resigned from his post as speaker. Democrats also inched their numbers up in the House by three seats where the GOP majority is now 37-23.

In Colorado, where negative campaign ads in primaries and term limits forced some moderate Republicans out of office, Democrats won control of the Senate for the first time in 40 years, splitting control of that legislature, and increasing their seats in the GOP-dominated House. Democrats conducted a massive get-out-the-vote drive that included registering 80 percent of the state's union members. Voters were also focused on such issues as growth and gun safety following the Columbine school killings that Democrats believe helped propel them into the majority.

Uncertainty in Washington

In Washington, where the House has been tied the last two years, the election is still up in the air at press time. Democrats are claiming a one-seat lead, but with a third of the voters casting absentee ballots (and those ballots did not have to be certified until Nov. 22) and four seats requiring a mandatory recount, it could be weeks until the outcome is known. Charges of negative campaigning came from both parties, and some four to five races are so close recounts are likely.

These shifts give Republicans a slight edge in the partisan balance in states. In fact, not since 1952 - the last year Republicans controlled both houses of Congress and the presidency - have the Democrats controlled so few legislatures. Following the 1980 election, the GOP started to change the political landscape in legislatures. Although winning at the national level long before then, the decade of the æ80s saw Republicans moving into the South and by 1990 the GOP was competitive throughout the country.

"And in 2000 people feel as comfortable voting Republican on a local level as they do on a national level," says Luntz. "Even if there is an even balance between Republicans and Democrats in the 2001 legislatures, I believe the Republicans are in a stronger position in redistricting nationwide."

Eye on Redistricting

Redistricting is one of the most important prizes of the election, and both parties

believe they held their own in their battleground states. The GOP held on to the Michigan House, the Pennsylvania House and the Texas Senate. The Democrats kept control of the Illinois House, the Texas House and the Indiana House. Each chamber is critical to that party's goals for congressional redistricting. And in each, a shift of three or fewer seats would have changed the majority in the chamber or split control of the legislature.

Both parties spent millions of dollars in key races in their focus on redistricting. Although 5,918 seats were up for election, it boiled down to some 75 critical state races, according to Kevin Mack, executive director of the Democratic Legislative Campaign Committee.

"Redistricting will make or break either party in terms of long-term control of the U.S. House of Representatives," says Mack. "We fought this thing hard, and we fought it to a draw."

"It's pretty much a push," agreed Tom Hofeller of the Republican National Committee.

So while Democrats made inroads in the U.S. House and Senate, state GOP lawmakers are in a stronger position than 10 years ago - when most of the maps were drawn with Democrats in control - to affect the makeup of Congress in the decade to come. And some analysts believe they could increase Republican congressional seats by several in the 2002 election. Where could those seats be?

- Pennsylvania, where Republicans are optimistic they can gain several seats.
- Texas, where the GOP could gain one to two seats.
- Florida, where the GOP could pick up one or two seats, and the Legislature and governor are Republican. But the new political alignment could also benefit Democrats in certain states.
- With Democrats at the table for the first time in decades in Colorado, Republicans likely will not be able to improve on their current 4-2 advantage.
- Holding on to the Texas House was a big win for Democrats. The state may gain a Republican seat or two, but the Democrats will have a major role in the process.
- California Democrats, who control both houses of the Legislature and the governorÆs office, believe redistricting will be good to them. The current congressional map was adopted by the courts. This time around, the Democrats believe they could pick up a couple of seats.

The handful of Republican gains in the states have pushed the nation squarely into the middle.

"Republicans are in the strongest position nationwide they have been in decades because they are now able to win in areas that were unreceptive to Republicans in the past," says Luntz.

Schneider cautions that party balance may be interpreted differently by the voters and the people they elect.

"The problem is that in the electorate, party balance reflects one thing - no great commitment to one party or the other, government from the center, less bickering and partisanship," he says. "But among politicians, a close party balance produces more bickering, more ideological hardlining. It produces trench warfare in legislatures, whereas the voters want something else."

Nevertheless, state legislatures clearly reflect the political balance of the country, according to William Pound, executive director of the National Conference of State Legislatures.

"They are more competitive than at any time in memory-both in control of chambers and the nearly even numerical balance between Democrats and Republicans.

"Legislatures in recent years have been the primary innovators in public policy in

the United States, and I see no indication that this will change."

Karen Hansen is editor of *State Legislatures*. Nancy Rhyme contributed to this story.

LEGISLATIVE CONTROL							
Republicans		**Democrats**		**Split**		**Undecided**	**Nonpartisan**
Alaska	Florida	Alabama	Arkansas	Arizona	Colorado	Washington	Nebraska
Idaho	Iowa	California	Connecticut	Delaware	Illinois		
Kansas	Michigan	Georgia	Hawaii	Indiana	Kentucky		
Montana	New Hampshire	Louisiana	Maryland	Maine	Minnesota		
New Jersey	North Dakota	Massachusetts	Mississippi	Missouri	Nevada		
Ohio	Oregon	New Mexico	North Carolina	New York	South Carolina		
Pennsylvania	South Dakota	Oklahoma	Rhode Island	Texas	Vermont		
Utah	Virginia	Tennessee	West Virginia	Wisconsin			
Wyoming							

CHANGES BETWEEN 1998 AND 2000 ELECTIONS (INCLUDES 1999 ELECTIONS)			
Republican Gains (Losses)	**House**	**Senate**	**Total**
Nation	45	20	65
South	35	11	46
East	5	2	7
Midwest	5	8	13
West	0	1	1
Source: NCSL			

BACK TO TOP

| Front Page | Section News | Research & Teaching | Legislative News |
| Papers Presented | Journal Articles | Book Notes | Extension of Remarks |

| Other Editions of the LSS Newsletter |
| Legislative Studies Section Home Page | APSA Home Page |

Volume 24, Number 1 January 2001

This section contains a listing of papers in the area of legislative studies that have been presented at professional conventions in recent months. Entries were taken either from preliminary or official convention programs. The following meetings are represented:

APSA: Papers presented at the annual meeting of the American Political Science Association in Washington, DC, August 31 - September 3, 2000.

SPSA: Papers presented at the annual meeting of the Southern Political Science Association, Atlanta, Georgia, November 9-11, 2000.

APSA Papers

"Accounting for Major Restructuring of State Legislative Committee Systems: The Impact of Executive Branch Reorganizations," K. Hamm, R. Hedlund, L. Delgado.

"Agenda Power in the Senate," A. Capmbell, G. Cox, M. McCubbins.

"Analyzing Institutional Change: Bill Introduction in the U.S. Senate, 1789-1890," J. Cooper, E. Rybicki.

"Appropriations Committee Earmarks and Vote-Buying in the U. S. Senate: DO Both Parties Do It?" D. Evans.

"As Good as it Gets? Public Support in a Partisan Climate," D. Kimball.

"Assessing Congressional Performance," R. Davidson.

"Campaign Fundraising and Political Ambition in Congress: The Influence of Member-to-Member Contributions," E. Heberlig.

"Congress, Legislative Performance, and American Political Development," J. Lapinski.

"Congressional Leaders and the Winnowing of Legislation," G. Krutz.

"Congressional Staff as Members of Congress: Standing for Election, the Congressional Career," S. Hammond, C. M. Jorstad.

"Controlling the House Appropriations Agenda: 1953-1994," G. Bovitz.

"Conventional Politics in Exceptional Times: Representation, Impeachment, and the Power of Money," I. Morris.

"Developing Measurements of Congressional Leadership: A Proposal and Initial Report," C. Rhodes.

"The Distributive Politics of Federal Grants: Some Empirical Tests," H. W. Maddox.

"The Dynamics of Senate Campaign Strategies," P. Kenney, K. Kahn.

"The Effects of Divided Government on the Ideological Content of Legislation," C. Covington, A. Bargen.

"The Electoral Basis of Partisan Polarization in Congress," G. Jacobson.

"The Electoral Consequences of Position Taking in Congress: Exploring the Relationship Between Roll Call Behavior and House Election Results," G. Bovitz.

"Explaining Congressional Provocation of Presidential Vetoes," J. Gilmour.

"Female Legislators and the Women's Rights Agenda," C. Wolbrecht.

"Floor Decision Making in the U.S. Senate," L. Evans.

"From the Sidelines to the Trenches: Senate Careers Since WWII," L. Arnold.

"Geographic Politics in Bicameral Perspective: The Politics of Distributing Federal Funds for Transportation," F. Lee.

"Going Public and Staying Private: House Leaders' Use of Media Strategies of Legislative Coalition Building," D. Harris.

"How Strong Should Our Party be? Party Member Preferences Over Party Strength," E. Bergman.

"How to Make Legislatures Popular with the Public," J. Hibbing.

"The Impact of Money on Congressional Elections," G. Copeland.

"Incrementalism and Single Issue Politics: Abortion Policy in the U.S. Congress (94th-105th Congresses)," S. Ainsworth.

"Institutional Evolution and the Rise of the Tuesday-Thursday Club in the House of Representatives," B. Sala, T. Nokken.

"Intra-Party Voting in the House of Representatives and Public Opinion: A Time Series Analysis," D. Hogberg.

"Invisible Power: Congressional Staff and Representation Behind the Scenes," C. Simon Rosenthal, L. Bell.

"Leadership and Followership in the U.S. Senate: Rational Behavior or the Norm of Cooperation," L. M. Overby, L. Bell.

"Legislative Perspectives on Direct Democracy: A Three Nation Study, " T. Donovan, J. Karp.

"The Localization of House Politics? Incumbency Disappearance of Partisan Vote Shifts," B. Tamas.

"Making Lemonade out of Lemons: Institutional Responses to Term Limits in State Legislatures," T. Little.

"Making Public Policy or Making the Trains Run on Time: A Comparison of the Information

Sources of Policy and Process Oriented Leaders," T. Little, J. Clark.

"Minorty Politics, National Implications: Representing Minority-Majority Districts," S. Friedman.

"More Than Reelection: Media Events in the U.S. Senate, 1979-1998," P. Sellers.

"New Members of the House: First Year Legislators in COngress," M. Potoski, T. Rice.

"PAC Contributions as Signals to Legislative Agents," R. Hall, K. Miler.

"Party Effects in the Senate," E. Lawrence, F. Maltzman, S. Smith.

"Party, Gender, and Racial Influences on Candidates in Congressional Elections," F. Gilliam, Jr., K. Whitby.

"Party Leadership and Committee Jurisdictions in the U.S. House," W. Hixon, A. Wicks.

"Party Registration Laws and Voter Partisanship, 1892-1908," A. Harvey.

"The Politics of Asking: House Member Committee Requests in the Early 20th Century," E. Lawrence, F. Maltzman.

"The Politics of Public Pressure and the Pendleton Act of 1883," S. Theriault.

"Position-Taking versus Fence-Straddling in the U.S. Congress: Does a Diverse Constituency Promote Legislator Obfuscation?" D. Jones.

"Post-Congressional Lobbying and Legislative Sponsorship: Do Members Reward Their Future Employers?" A. Santos.

"The President's Lieutenants: Clinton's Use of Political and Career Executives to Advocate Presidential Priorities on Capitol Hill," J. Dolan.

"The Public's Need for Ethical Lawmakers," R. Herrick, M. Moore.

"Racial Gerrymandering and Minority Representation: Theory and Evidence on When," A. Szarawarski.

"Redistricting and the Future of Minority Representation," C. Menifield.

"The Redistricting Cycle and the Importance of National Factors in House Races," B. Larson, S. Globetti.

"Representation in State Legislatures: Higher Education Policy in Arizona," L. Richardson, B. Russell

"Representation versus Self Interests in U.S. Politics: The Case of Tobacco," B. Burden.

"The Rise to Power and Turnover Among Leaders in Congress," S. Ahuja.

"Running on Empty: Exogeneous and Endogeneous Explanations of Turf Control in Energy Policy," J. Worsham.

"Of Shotguns, Rifles, and Hoppers: The Strategic Determinants of Bill Sponsorship and Legislative Effectiveness in the U.S. House of Representatives," J. Box-Steffensmeier, V. Sincalir Chapman.

"Sources of Partisan Competition in State Legislative Elections," R. Hogan.

"Speakership Contests: The Problem of Strategic Voting Under Plurality Rule," C. Stewart, J. Jenkins.

"State Electoral Structures and Party Control of the House of Representatives from 1840 to 1940," S. Kernell, E. Engstrom.

"Static Ambition in a Changing World: Legislators, Preparations for Redistricting," R. Boatright.

"Strategic Leadership in Congress: The Use of Senate Rules to Shape Intra-Chamber and Inter-Chamber Legislative Behavior," W. Schiller.

"Transforming Congress from the Inside: Women in Committee," N. Norton.

"Voting Scared? The Impact of Going Public on Electorally Vulnerable Members of Congress," R. Powell, D. Schloyer.

"When to Risk It? How Office Holders Decide to Run for the U.S. House," C. Maestas, L. S. Maisel.

"Where Have All the Moderates Gone, Long Time Passing? The Disappearance of Cross-Pressured in Congress," J. Bond, R. Fleisher.

"Which Senators Receive Media Coverage and Why?" S. Theriault, D. Brady.

"Will the Triangle Be Unbroken? Interest Group Perceptions of the Effects of Term Limits," G. Moncrief, J. Thompson.

"Women, Committees, and Power in the Senate," L. Arnold.

SPSA Papers:

"1998 Florida House Election and Campaign Contributions: Year of the Woman At Last," J. Corey, University of Miami.

"Agency, Autonomy, and Party Leadership in the U.S. House: The Politics of the Rules Process," R. Wike, Emory University.

"Asa Hutchinson and Lindsay Graham: Principle or Pragmatism in the Impeachment of President Clinton?" A. Snyder, Regent University.

"The Benefits of Costs and Party Switching: The Electoral Fortunes of Legislators Who Switch Parties," C. Grose and A. Yoshunaka, University of Rochester.

"Canceling Each Other Out: Determinants of Vote Disagreement in Bipartisan Senate Delegations," T. Veercellotti, University of North Carolina, Chapel Hill.

"Candidates, Strategy, and Recruitment in the 2000 House Elections," S. Roberds, Southern utah University and P. Bridgmon, University of Alabama.

"Caucuses and Deliberation in the House of Representatives," C. Carroll, Emory University.

"Completing Goals: Theories of Legislative Organization and Legislative Rules of Procedure," N. Martorano, Rice University.

"Congressional Authorization of the General Agreement on Tariffs and trade, 1993-1994: Reevaluating Consistency in Roll Call Voting," T. Nokken, University of Houston.

"Congressional Voting on Constitutional Amendments," J. Clark, Western Michigan University.

"Debunking the Myth: Carter, Congress, and the Politics of Airline Deregulation," C. Dolan, University of South Carolina and D. Cohen, University of Akron.

"Diverging the Interpretations of House Elections," J. Stonecash, Syracuse University.

"Divisive Primaries and Congressional Elections," C. Goodman, University of Houston.

"The Effect of Committee Assignments on Electoral Success and Party Loyalty," J. Bernstein, Eastern Michigan University.

"Electoral and Partisan Dynamics in the Roosevelt Era: Exploring the Outcome of the 1938 Congressional Elections," J. Carson, Michigan State University.

"The Emergence of the U.S. House Speaker as Policy Leader, 1789-1825," M. Gunning and R. Strahan, Emory University.

"Fighting for Women's Issues on the House Floor: An Analysis of Floor Amending Behavior in the 103rd and 104th Congress," M. Swers, Mary Washington College.

"'Follow the Leader' Revisited: Understanding Presidential Success in Congress," M. Eisenstein, Purdue University, Calumet and M. Witting, Purdue University.

"Gender Differences in Political Campaigns for the State Legislature," R. Hogan, Louisiana State University.

"Gubernational and Senatorial Campaign Mobilization of Voters," R. Jackson, Washington State University.

"Hazardous Waste Management: A View from the State Legislatures," T. Bowen, University of North Florida.

"Hear No Evil, See No Evil, Speak No Evil? Congressional Committee Hearings, Framing, and Bias," E. O'Brien and S. Hammond, American University.

"How Did Bucking the Party Line on Impeachment Affect Members' Re-Election Bids?" D. Jacobsen, Texas Tech University.

"How Legislators Decide: The Impact of Committee Restructuring," K. Maslin-Wicks, Hendrix College and M. McDonald, Binghampton University.

"Ideological PAC Contributions to Female Congressional Candidates," J. Deitz, University of Georgia.

"Impeachment Debate Votes: Did They Affect1998 Mid-Term Election Results?" R. Bentley, Georgia State University.

"I'm Giving at the Office: Member to Member Contribution Strategies in the U.S. Congress," E. Heberlig, University of North Carolina, Charlotte.

"Incrementalism and Single Issue Politics: Abortion Policy in the U.S. Congress from the 94th

to the 105th Congress," T. Hall and S. Ainsworth, University of Georgia.

"The Influence of the NRA in House Elctions," C. Kenny, Louisiana State University, M. McBurnett, Abacus Direct, and D. Bordus, University of Illinois.

"The Institutional Sources of Divided Government in the United States," D. Rickman and D, Franklin, Georgia State University.

"Isolating the Origins of the Incumbency Advantage: An Analysis of House Primaries, 1956-1990," J. Alford and K. Arcenaux, Rice University.

"Leadership and Innovation in Senate Committees," V. Moscardelli, University of Massachusetts, Amherst.

"Legislating Morality: Gay Rights Issues and the Legislative Process," E. Oldmixon, University of Florida.

"Life in the "Cheap Seats": An Update on Applying the Campbell Operationalization of Partisan Bias to U.S. State Lower House Elections," K. Wink, University of Texas, Tyler and R. Weber, University of Wisconsin, Milwaukee.

"Media Coverage of Female State Legislative Candidates," M. Thomas, University of Georgia.

"One Dimension or Two? An Analysis of Roll-Call Voting on Women's Issues," J. Roberts, Purdue University.

"Party and Ideological Voting in the Florida Legislature: 1961-1999," A. Jewett, University of Central Florida.

"Party Defectors on Roll Call votes in the U.S. House of Representatives: Who They Are and Why They Do It," K. Conway, American University.

"Parties, Leaders, and Committee Jurisdictions," W. Hixon, College of William and Mary, A. Wicks, University of Rochester.

"Planning Legislative Careers Under Term Limits: A Longitudinal Analysis of Michigan Legislators," J. Penning, Calvin College.

"The Policy Implications of Special Rules: A Cross-Chamber Assessment of Legislation from the 97th, 98th, 104th, and 105th Congresses," B. Marshall, University of Missouri, St. Louis.

"Political Sophistication and Economic Voting in Congressional Elections: A Heterogeneous Theory of Attribution," B. Gomez, University of South Carolina and J. M. Wilson, Southern Methodist University.

"Purchasing Support or Rewarding Loyalty? Roll Call Behavior and the Distribution of Campaign Funds by National Party Organizations," T. Nokken, University of Houston.

"Senate Committees: Preference Outliers or What?" P. Roach and W. Gillespie, University of Georgia.

"Southern Congressional Candidates' Strategic Reaction to Realignment," J. Williamson, Emory University.

"State and Congressional Electoral District Characteristics: Aggregate Effects of Redistricting

on Voter Behavior," R. Engstrom, University of Wyoming.

"The Strategic Impact of Procedural Reforms in the U.S. House: An Analysis of Committee Behavior Under Republican Rule," C. Finocchiaro, Michigan State University.

"Suburbanization and State Policy Making," K. Boeckelman, Western Illinois University.

"Surge and Decline in the 1990s: Evidence from the 1992-1994 Electoral Cycle," D. Putz, University of Houston.

"The Suspension of Rules and Extreme Committees: Explaining the Defeat of Bills on the Floor," O. Takeda, Princeton University.

"Voters, Parties, and Representatives: Why the House of Representatives is So Partisan," D. Lucas, Hobart and William Smith Colleges.

"What Role Does the Marriage Gap Play in Congressional Elections?" C. Owens, Southern Illinois University.

"Women in Congress: A Positive Influence on Outcomes in Social Welfare Policy," R. Russ-Sellers, University of South Carolina.

BACK TO TOP

| Front Page | Section News | Research & Teaching | Legislative News |
| Papers Presented | Journal Articles | Book Notes | Extension of Remarks |

| Other Editions of the LSS Newsletter |
| Legislative Studies Section Home Page | APSA Home Page |

Volume 24, Number 1, January 2001

Joint Project on Legislative Term Limits

In October 2000 Alan Rosenthal of the Eagleton Institute of Politics at Rutgers University convened a conference on Using Legislative Research at the Eagleton Institute. The conference was a joint gathering of political scientists who do state legislative institutional research and representatives of the National Conference of State Legislatures and Council of State Governments and a number of legislative staff who are consumers or brokers of that research. The Carnegie Corporation provided financial support for the conference.

The participants in the conference established the following agenda for future communication and cooperation between producers and users of legislative research:

1. A joint project on legislative term limits and their effects.

2. Development of databases on state legislatures.

3. Encouraging young scholars to study state legislatures.

4. Making political science research more accessible and understandable to legislative practitioners.

A task force has been formed to follow up on this agenda. Members of the task force include Alan Rosenthal and Susan Carroll, Rutgers University; Gary Moncrief, Boise State University; Bruce Cain, University of California Berkeley; Richard Niemi, University of Rochester; Gary Copeland, University of Oklahoma; Rick Farmer, University of Akron; Karl Kurtz and Rich Jones, National Conference of State Legislatures; Bob Silvanik and Keon Chi, Council of State Governments; Tom Little, State Legislative Leaders Foundation.

The task force will meet January 5-6, 2001 in Denver to begin planning the joint project on legislative term limits. Part of the agenda for that meeting will be finding ways to open the project up to all interested political scientists.

For further information contact Karl Kurtz at NCSL (karl.kurtz@ncsl.org).

Topics for Legislative Research

By Karl T. Kurtz, National Conference of State Legislatures

The following outline of topics and questions for institutional legislative research was

generated by NCSL staff for a conference of political scientists and practitioners on Using Legislative Research at the Eagleton Institute of Politics in October 2000. The questions are ones that NCSL is asked regularly by legislators, legislative staff and the media. They are intended to be suggestive rather than exhaustive. Term limits affect a great many of the topics, so we have noted "Term limits impact?" at the end of the questions where term limits are relevant in addition to the separate topic for term limits at the end.

The questions are listed without regard to how well the political science literature has answered (or can answer) them. A key reason for this is that practitioners generally do not know much about the findings of institutional research by political scientists. We believe that one of the priority topics for discussion between political scientists and legislative practitioners should be how practitioners can more easily access political science research in formats that are understandable to lay readers.

I. Legislators

Districts and redistricting

- What is the impact of redistricting on competitiveness of districts?

Demographics

- What are the causes and consequences of changing demographics of legislators (occupations, age, gender, minorities, SES)?
- What explains variation in legislator demographics from state to state? Term limits impact? Do ethics laws affect who runs and serves?

Motivations

- Why do people run for the legislature? Why do they stay or leave?

Workload (time requirements of job)

- Is there a measure of legislator workload that is more effective than time in session?
- How does workload vary from state to state and what explains it?
- Does increasing workload (session, interim, constituent service, campaigning) affect the candidate pool over time or across states?

Constituent service

- What explains variation from state to state and over time in amount of constituent service? Term limits impact?
- Do state legislators gain an electoral advantage from constituent service? If so, in which states?

Tenure and turnover

- What explains differences between states in tenure and turnover of members? Term limits impact?

II. Elections

- Are legislators accountable? How does their accountability compare to that of other professions?

Competition

- Why has there been an increase in the number of uncontested elections? What explains variation from state to state and over time? Does it make any difference in the performance of the legislature? Term limits impact?
- Why has there been a decrease in the number of competitive seats? What explains variation from state to state? Does it make any difference? Term limits impact?

Parties and legislative leadership

- How have the roles of state parties and legislative party leaders in candidate recruitment, fund raising and electioneering changed? What explains variation from state to state? Have term limits affected these roles?
- How have increasing electoral roles of legislative leaders affected the institution?
- Which states experience the negative effects of a Congress-style "permanent campaign?" Can anything be done about it?

Party control

- Which states have the most frequent changes in party control? Why? Why do some states with close margins frequently change party control while others that are equally close do not?

Campaign finance

- How has state legislative campaign finance changed? What explains variation from state to state? Term limits impact?
- What have been the effects of campaign finance reforms, especially stronger disclosure requirements?
- Which campaign finance reforms work?
- See also Lawmaking below.

Election laws

- What are the effects of multi-member districts on constituent service, representation?

III. Legislative capacity

- How have legislative branch expenditures changed? How do they vary from state to state? How are they spent? Who controls them? Does it make any difference? (Need to go beyond census data.)

Professionalization

- Are more professionalized legislatures better or worse? By what criteria?

Staffing

- What are the institutional effects of extensive partisan and personal staffing?

Compensation

- What are the effects of differing levels of compensation of legislators? Does compensation make any difference?

IV. Technology

- What have been the internal institutional effects (e.g. distribution of power) of

information technology?
- What have been the external institutional effects (constituent relations, public opinion, balance of power) of information technology?
- Has e-mail changed the relationships between legislators and constituents?

V. Lawmaking

- What factors influence legislators' behavior? In particular, what is the effect of campaign contributions on legislators' decisions compared to other factors?

Committees

- Do large or small numbers of committees make any difference?

Rules

- Do rules designed to prevent end-of-session logjams make any difference? Why do some states have bigger problems with end-of-session logjams than others do?

Session length/workload

- What are the consequences of lengthening/shortening the legislative session? Annual vs. biannual?
- Does effective use of the interim make any difference in the functioning of the legislature?
- How can we measure institutional workload effectively? How does it vary from state to state? Why do states of similar size and complexity vary in legislative workload?

Deliberation

- Do some legislatures deliberate more effectively than others? If so, how? What makes a difference? Term limits impact?
- What are the effects on the legislature of leaving all major issues to negotiations between top leaders and the governor for resolution?

Initiatives

- What is the effect of the proliferation of initiatives on the behavior of legislators and legislatures?
- What is the effect of increasing campaign expenditures on the initiative process?
- Does the growing role of the courts in the initiative process have any effect?
- What difference do various measures designed to mitigate the negative effects of the initiative process make?

VI. Leadership

- See also Elections above.

Selection and tenure

- How do states' leadership selection processes vary? Why do some states have long leadership tenure and others don't? Do the variations make any difference? Term limits impact?

Powers and division of responsibility

- How have the formal and informal powers of legislative leaders changed? Term limits impact? What differences have the changes made for legislatures?

VII. Executive - legislative relations

- See Lawmaking/Deliberation above.
- Have the powers of attorneys-general in relation to legislatures changed? What is the effect on the legislature?
- Term limits impact on balance of power between legislature and executive?

Veto power

Budgeting

- Does expanding the participation of legislators in the budgetary process lead to greater leadership power in the end game?
- What explains variation between the states in the use of pork in the budget? Does it make any difference?
- Do legislatures that have large resources for budget analysis make better decisions and balance executive power more effectively?
- Has performance-based budgeting made any difference?

Oversight

- What constitutes effective legislative oversight? Who does it well and why? Does it make any difference?

VIII. Interest groups and lobbying

- Term limits impact on lobbyist-legislator relations?

Ethics

- What are the institutional and individual impacts of strict gift limitations?
- See also Demographics above.

IX. Legislatures and the public

Public opinion

- What explains differences in public opinion about the legislature over time and across states?
- What can be done to change public opinion about the legislature? What are the practical solutions to breaking down the barriers between legislatures and the public? Do legislatures that have effective public information and education services have a different relationship with the public?
- What is the effect of public cynicism and distrust toward government on the legislature?

Media

- How have changes in how the media cover the legislature affected the institution?
- How does media coverage of the legislature affect the public standing of the legislature?
- How has information technology changed media coverage of the legislature?

X. Term limits

What have been the effect of term limits on:

- Legislator demographics?
- Constituent service?
- Tenure and turnover of members?
- Competitiveness of elections?
- Legislative party leadership--selection and roles?
- Deliberation?
- Balance of power with executive?
- Lobbying?
- Staffing?

XI. General

Many of the questions begin with "what are the effects of…?" or "does it make a difference?" These questions presuppose that there are some criteria against which we can judge effects or consequences. Can political scientists and practitioners agree on criteria by which to evaluate the performance of legislatures? Is there a way to evaluate the performance of one legislature against another in a way that avoids the flaws of the *Sometimes Governments*? Is it time to revive (and improve) comparative legislative ratings?

Many NCSL staff contributed to this list including Bill Pound, Carl Tubbesing, Rich Jones, Brian Weberg, Jennie Drage, Tim Storey, Kae Warnock, Brenda Erickson, Jo Donlin, Corina Eckl, Nancy Rhyme.

Congressional Research Awards Announcement

The Dirksen Congressional Center invites applications for grants totaling $50,000 in 2001 to fund research on the U.S. Congress. The competition is open to individuals with a serious interest in studying Congress. Political scientists, historians, biographers, scholars of public administration or American studies, and journalists are among those eligible. The Center also awards a significant portion of the funds for dissertation research. Organizations and institutions are not eligible.

The deadline for submissions is February 1, a change from previous years. The grant selections will be announced in March. Complete information about eligibility and application procedures may be found at: http://www.pekin.net/dirksen/congreasearch.htm. Frank Mackaman is the program officer (fmackaman@pekin.net).

The Center, named for the late Senate Minority Leader Everett M. Dirksen, is a private, non-partisan, nonprofit research and educational organization devoted to the study of Congress and its leaders. Since 1978, the Congressional Research Awards program has paid out over $450,000 to support more than 250 projects.

Visiting Scholars Program

The Carl Albert Congressional Research and Studies Center at the University of Oklahoma seeks applicants for its Visiting Scholars Program, which provides financial assistance to researchers working at the Center's archives. Awards of $500-$1000 are normally granted as reimbursement for travel and lodging.

The Center's holdings include the papers of many former members of Congress, such as Speaker Carl Albert, Robert S. Kerr, and Fred Harris of Oklahoma, Helen Gahagan Douglas and Jeffery Cohelan of California, and Neil Gallagher of New Jersey. Besides the history of

Congress, congressional leadership, national and Oklahoma politics, and election campaigns, the collections also document government policy affecting agriculture, Native Americans, energy, foreign affairs, the environment, and the economy. Topics that can be studied include the Great Depression, flood control, soil conservation, tribal affairs, and women in American politics.

Most materials date from the 1920s to the 1970s, although there is one nineteenth century collection. The Center's collections are described on the World Wide Web at http://www.ou.edu/special/albertctr/archives/ and in the publication titled *A Guide to the Carl Albert Center Congressional Archives* (Norman, Okla.: The Carl Albert Center, 1995) by Judy Day, et al., available at many U. S. academic libraries. Additional information can be obtained from the Center. The Visiting Scholars Program is open to any applicant. Emphasis is given to those pursuing postdoctoral research in history, political science, and other fields. Graduate students involved in research for publication, thesis, or dissertation are encouraged to apply. Interested undergraduates and lay researchers are also invited to apply. The Center evaluates each research proposal based upon its merits, and funding for a variety of topics is expected.

No standardized form is needed for application. Instead, a series of documents should be sent to the Center, including: (1) a description of the research proposal in fewer than 1000 words; (2) a personal vita; (3) an explanation of how the Center's resources will assist the researcher; (4) a budget proposal; and (5) a letter of reference from an established scholar in the discipline attesting to the significance of the research. Applications are accepted at any time.

For more information, please contact Archivist, Carl Albert Center, 630 Parrington Oval, Room 101, University of Oklahoma, Norman, OK 73019. Telephone: (405) 325-5401. FAX: (405) 325-6419. E-mail: kosmerick@ou.edu.

Elite Interviewing Short Course

Interview data have provided the backbone of many of the most important works in political science, but few graduate programs provide any formal training about how to conduct interviews, especially with elite subjects. For those who would like to learn more, the Political Organizations and Parties section is organizing a short course on elite interviewing that is open to any member of APSA.

The short course will feature an afternoon of advice and pointers from some of the most experience interviewers in the discipline, and is open to any member of APSA. Topics covered will include confidentiality, how to gain access, how to write up interview notes, how to code open-ended responses systematically, and discussions of standard issues of research design (e.g. sampling frames, validity, replicability) as they apply to interview data.

Our panelists come from several different subfields within political science. They have interviewed members of Congress, members of parliaments, civil servants, White House staff, party leaders, interest group leaders, and political activists. They have experience in both standardized interviewing as well as more open-ended, exploratory interviews, and several of them also specialize in survey methodology. Panelists for the course include: Joel D. Aberbach, Jeffrey M. Berry, David Farrell, Ken M. Goldstein, John H. Kessel, Beth L. Leech, H.W. Perry, Bert A. Rockman, and Laura Woliver.

The course will run from 1-5 p.m. on Wednesday, August 29, at the American Political Science Association annual meeting in San Francisco. There is no charge for the course, but participants must pre-register. Registration forms will appear in the summer issue of *PS*.

A limited number of $100 stipends will be available for graduate students attending the course. To apply for one of the stipends, students should send a vita and a one-paragraph

explanation of how they plan to use elite interviewing in their work to: Diana Dwyre, Department of Political Science, California State University-Chico, Chico, CA 95929, phone (530) 898-6041, email Ddwyre@csuchico.edu. The deadline is May 15.

BACK TO TOP

| Front Page | Section News | Research & Teaching | Legislative News |
| Papers Presented | Journal Articles | Book Notes | Extension of Remarks |

| Other Editions of the LSS Newsletter |
| Legislative Studies Section Home Page | APSA Home Page |

Burdett A. Loomis, Editor
University of Kansas
January 2001

Congressional Parity:
Where Do We Go from Here?

After enduring (at least arguably) the most closely divided election in American history, Members of Congress find themselves looking forward to a most uncertain future. After four years of narrow margins in both House and Senate, the 2000 election produced an even more closely divided Congress. Leaders of the legislative parties in both chambers must find ways to be viewed as at least vaguely constructive, all the while scheming to recapture (or defend) majority status. Redistricting has moved more seats into the Sunbelt, but it's unclear - given Democratic performances in Florida and California - if this should be the cause of rejoicing for House Republicans.

What will the next decade bring? Printed below are relatively brief answers of a group of scholars, former senator (and current scholar), a Pulitzer-Prize winning journalist, and a former top staffer of the House Rules Committee. In that the presidential election kept them off balance well into December, my thanks go out to all of them for the quality of their responses.

Contents of this issue:

Contributions to "Extension of Remarks" are encouraged. The total length of such contributions should be four pages, text typed, single spaced, with references following the style of *Legislative Studies Quarterly*. Works may be edited for content or for length. Please send proposed contributions to Burdett A. Loomis, Department of Political Science, 504 Blake Hall, University of Kansas, Lawrence, KS 66045-2157.