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Abstract

As evidenced by the government shutdown of 2013, the regular order of the appropriations process in the House of Representatives is diminished, threatening government oversight and resulting in the dereliction of constitutional duties given solely to Congress. This study uses institutional and statistical data beginning with the 1974 liberal post-Watergate elections, through the 1994 Republican Revolution, and culminating with the 2010 Tea Party Wave, to analyze how and why the appropriations process has deteriorated to its current state of disarray. This study finds that both institutional changes, in the form of House Rule and party rule changes, as well as changes in membership vis-à-vis increased partisanship and polarization have created an appropriations process that has deteriorated into a state of disrepair. The true cause of this deterioration is the role of increasing and hyperpartisanship and asymmetric polarization as a result of the Republican Revolution of 1994 and made worse by the Tea Party Wave of 2010. There are few immediate fixes to the appropriations process due to the partisanship and polarization that have doomed it in the first place, as many fixes would require an Act of Congress, a possibility unlikely under the gridlock fostered by increased levels of partisanship and polarization. Instead, this study finds that the appropriations process in the House is dead, leaving a weakened system crippled by hyperpartisanship and asymmetric polarization and shirking the oversight of government funds and the enumerated powers of Congress, threatening government operations and operability.
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Introduction

In 2011, with days before the federal government reached its spending limit, President Obama signed the Budget Control Act, effectively instituting some of the most radical cuts to federal spending ever enacted. This deal, however, was not a bipartisan success, but rather a hijacked appropriations process, taken over by ideological extremists. Rather than enacting across-the-board cuts to federal spending, President Obama and Speaker John Boehner (R-OH) had proposed a so-called “Grand Bargain” that would enact major tax increases so as to attract liberal support, while also working to cut federal spending, a priority that would attract conservatives. Together, the Speaker and the President hoped to address America’s long-term deficit problem. Instead, then-Majority Leader Eric Cantor (R-VA), House leadership’s liaison with its new freshman class of “Tea Party” legislators, convinced Speaker Boehner to reject the deal, arguing that it was simply not conservative enough\(^1\). The Grand Bargain died at the hands of maintaining political ideology in the face of enacting real, bipartisan compromise. In lieu of a grand bargain, under the Budget Control Act, federal government spending was slashed across the board over a decade-long period to attempt to get Congress to the negotiating table again for another Grand Bargain. Instead, Washington has now lurched from crisis to crisis, a precedent set by the failure of the Grand Bargain and the need to bow to ideology over policy. Thomas Mann and Norm Ornstein explored this failure in their seminal work *It’s even Worse Than It Looks: How the American Constitutional*

---

\(^1\) Lizza, Ryan. "The House of Pain: Can Eric Cantor, the Republican Majority Leader, Redeem His Party"
Rather than a grand policy plan to govern taxing and spending for the next ten years, Washington can hardly figure out how to spend federal tax dollars for six months, and, in 2013, couldn’t figure out how to appropriate funds to keep the government open. To this end, the practice of appropriating funds and the appropriations process in Washington truly is broken. It is much, much worse than it looks.

A broken appropriations process results in government shutdowns like those in 1995 and 2013, but also spells trouble for the functionality of the government as a whole, the oversight of federal funds and federally-funded programs, and the fulfillment of Constitutional duties or the lack thereof. The Constitution specifically grants Congress the “power of the purse,” the power to appropriate funds and to manage the tax code, powers certainly not granted to the executive branch. In maintaining the appropriations power, Congress, by tradition, takes up appropriations bills in the House of Representatives first, which has proven to be quite problematic as of late. Changes to House Rules and intra-party procedure regarding the appropriations process have affected the ability of appropriators to engage in proper oversight of federal spending. Poison pill amendments to appropriations bills allowed under new changes to procedure often derail months of regular appropriations work and force appropriators to rely on continuing resolutions. These continuing resolutions, or “CRs”, only continue federal funding at previously-approved levels rather than taking into account new numbers from the

---


Appropriations Committee. Often times, these CRs can and have been put in place for years. A federal program can be funded at the same level for years without additional oversight or revised funding levels⁴.

Under a regular appropriations process, the Appropriations Committee hears from different federal Departmental leaders about how different programs are performing, and appropriates funds accordingly. This important oversight function helps ensure that federally-funded programs are performing, but also helps fund potential new problems, something that would be impossible under continued CRs⁵. Under CRs, Congress is unable to fulfill this important oversight duty, a power that has been ceded to no other branch in the absence of Congressional oversight, leaving a tremendous void. If there is no oversight of federal spending and Congress is unable to appropriate funds to new programs as a result of the reliance on CRs, the government is left unable to adapt to new developments, threatening government functionality. Additionally, the reliance on CRs and other non-regular appropriations, like omnibus bills, is specifically a Congressional issue. No executive or court order can return the appropriations process to its normal order. The power of the purse is solely granted to Congress, leaving the government and the nation as a whole little recourse in today’s gerrymandered, partisan, and polarized political world⁶. Overall, the deterioration of the appropriations process threatens the oversight and spending of federal funds, and thus the functionality and adaptability of the

---

⁵ Ibid.
⁶ Ibid.
federal government, especially as no other branch of government may step in to balance out the deteriorating Congressional appropriations process.

This study uses multiple data points and primary Congressional sources to draw conclusions about the sources of the deterioration of the appropriations process, including examination of House Rules, statistical measures of partisanship and polarization, analysis of appropriators’ constituent correspondence, and assessment of the impact of campaign donations and campaign statements. Overall, these diverse data points serve to provide an across-the-board approach to studying the appropriations process by looking at institutional changes to the appropriations process across the years, the views of top appropriators across party, and the intra-party differences among appropriators elected in different wave election years. This data focuses only on the House, as it is traditionally where appropriations measures originate, and its large and diverse membership of 435 Representatives compared to 100 Senators provides diverse data to properly compare across all demographics. Much of the data presented is done so as a comparison across two to three key time points so as to isolate not only the impetus for the dissolution of the appropriations process, but also on specific changes over time that have collectively led to its downfall. The major focus of this study is on the 1994 Republican Revolution and the 2010 Tea Party Wave electoral waves and the changes they brought to the appropriations process to discern whether things truly are “even worse than it looks.”

This study’s first chapter, “Appropriations Malaise: Thirty-Five Years of Partisanship, Polarization, and Politicization” focuses on three different time periods, the

7 This is not to say that the Senate does not suffer from the same appropriations problems as endured in the House. Though this study focuses solely on the House, it must be acknowledged that the Senate is not entirely dissimilar in its appropriations process and problems.
1974 liberal “Watergate babies,” the 1994 Republican Revolution, and the 2010 Tea Party Wave. Though the only chapter to focus on the 1974 Watergate elections, the chapter gives important historical and political background to later reforms to the appropriations process in 1994 and 2010. The latter two chapters, “The End of Earmarks: The Manifestation of Partisanship and Polarization in Changing Institutional and Political Attitudes” and “Money, Power, and Politics: Reconciling Political Campaign Identities with Congressional Power as Appropriators from the Republican Revolution the Tea Party Wave” focus specifically on 1994 and 2010, looking at Members’ constituent correspondence, campaign statements, and campaign donations, to explore the ways in which the two political parties have changed their views on the appropriations process as well as how specifically the Republican Party has changed over time in regards to dealing with appropriations. This study’s chapters also purposefully narrow in focus as the study goes on so as to provide background across time, ideology, and party to pinpoint the deterioration of the appropriations process. Specifically, the first chapter contains information across nearly forty years of institutional and partisan changes. The second chapter specifically seeks to cross-compare how key appropriators from both parties have changed their approach to the appropriations process between 1994 and 2010 and in conjunction with institutional changes, a comparison meant to derive meaning relative to the Appropriations Committee and the House chamber as a whole. Finally, the third chapter compares only Republican appropriators from the classes of 1994 and 2010 so as to not only analyze the current state of play in the appropriations process, but also to further analyze the statement that the appropriations process is “even worse than it looks”
under the Tea Party Wave. Overall, this study seeks to analyze numerous data points on the appropriations process in the House to better understand the origins of the changes in the process, its major players and parties, and its hope for the future.

The first chapter of this study, “Appropriations Malaise” seeks to understand the historical and institutional background of the appropriations process and how institutional changes and changes in membership have helped create the beleaguered appropriations process of today. The only chapter to address pre-1994 data, this chapter found that many institutional changes and intra-party governing rules in the House evolved from changes made by the 1974 liberal Watergate babies. For example, these Watergate babies, elected in the wake of the Watergate scandal, pushed for increased transparency in the House, leading to committee hearings being open to the public and eliminating the ability of Members to vote by proxy, either in committee or on the House floor, specifically in the Committee of the Whole. Perhaps more important, however, were the changes made to intra-party rules governing the Democratic Caucus, pushed for by Watergate babies, who, with the sheer size of their voting bloc, were able to change longstanding party rules. The Watergate babies pushed to limit the power of the Chairman of the Appropriations Committee by requiring that all Subcommittee heads be approved by the Caucus. Additionally, the Chairman of the Appropriations Committee and Subcommittee Chairs could no longer ascend to their post based on seniority alone, but instead were subject to approval by majority votes in the caucus, allowing newer, more liberal Members to

---

8 According to the Rules of the House, procedurally, the House often resolves itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union which allows the chamber to act like a committee in that it can amend sections of measures dealing with revenue, including appropriations measures. The Committee of the Whole has the same membership as the House itself, 435 Members, but conducts itself as a grand committee in order to expeditiously handle complex legislation.
quickly ascend to positions of power. Though these Rules only pertained to the Democratic Caucus, they were later instituted under the 1994 Republican Revolution and Speaker Gingrich (R-GA), leading to incredibly increases in partisanship and polarization within the once-nonpartisan appropriations process. Statistical data models in this chapter also found drastic increases in partisanship scores for individual appropriators after 1974, meaning that the Democratic appropriators became more liberal, while Republican appropriators became more conservative, essentially doing away with any heterogeneity amongst appropriators across party lines. The study of polarization scores amongst appropriators yielded the most interesting and relevant data to help analyze why the appropriations process is even worse than it looks: polarization. Since the 2010 Tea Party Wave, Republicans have become twice as more conservative as Democrats are liberal, meaning that the parties are much further away from each other and less likely to be able to form bipartisan consensus on appropriations. These polarization scores are unlike anything seen in either the 1974 Watergate babies or the 1994 Republican Revolution, though the data sees a gradual uptick after 1994 in increasing conservative ideology. Overall, the first chapter of this study finds that the historical background for the change in the appropriations process is much longer than merely looking at the 1994 Republican Revolution, and that many of the institutional changes began in 1974. However, the change in Member ideology and the distance between the parties rapidly grew after the 2010 Tea Party Wave, having a clear nullifying effect on any possible bipartisan collaboration and truly threatening the appropriations process.
The second chapter of this study, “The End of Earmarks” seeks to understand the ways in which institutional changes put in place as a result of the 1994 Republican Revolution affected the appropriations process today as a trickle-down effect as well as when and how the political parties’ ideologies began to diverge, as reflected in their constituent correspondence regarding earmarks. The chapter focuses specifically on tracing institutional and party rule changes that trickled down from 1994 to 2010, leading to the implementation of a ban on earmarks in 2011. This ban on earmarks and the changing rhetoric regarding earmarks is especially important to the overall deterioration of the appropriations process in that earmarks, money appropriated to specific projects within a congressional district, were often used as *quid pro quo* bargaining chips to grease the wheels of the appropriations process. This chapter uses the constituent correspondence, also known as “franked mail” of two key appropriators, current Chairman of the Appropriations Committee, Hal Rogers (R-KY) and the current Ranking Member, Nita Lowey (R-NY). These two Members once both fervently supported earmarks during their time on the Committee, especially prior to the 1994 Republican Revolution. However, their constituent correspondence regarding earmarks drastically changed in the wake of the Republican Revolution and the partisan rhetoric and institutional changes it brought with it. The two former pro-earmark appropriators who once sent equivalent amounts of positive news home to their constituents about earmarks secured for building bridges and roads, enhance military operations in their district, and increase funding for public education now diverge heavily on the use of earmarks, with Chairman Rogers supporting their outright ban and Ranking Member Lowey supporting
an open and transparent earmark process with public disclosure, though only with hesitation. These two appropriators also reflect the larger trend among the House, as appropriators and rank-and-file Members alike have been drawn to the conservative right when it comes to earmarks and how they communicate with their constituents. These changing attitudes over time also reflect changing institutional rules regarding the earmark process, and have formed a symbiotic relationship wherein the increasing conservatism after the 1994 Republican Revolution and through the 2010 Tea Party Wave has created a more anti-earmark House and along with it, enacted minor institutional changes that, over time, have led to the end of earmarks and the inability of legislators to appropriate funds without a quid-pro-quo system.

Finally, the third chapter of this study, “Money, Power, and Politics,” addresses the changes specifically within the Republican Party in the House regarding the appropriations process, dissecting the differences between the 1994 Republican Revolution and 2010 Tea Party Wave when it comes to political rhetoric and campaign donations regarding the appropriations process. This chapter cross-compares pre-election, campaign rhetoric of two Republican Revolution appropriators, now former-Rep. Tom Latham (R-IA) and Rep. Rodney Frelinghuysen (R-NJ) as well as their campaign funding sources, to two Tea Party Wave appropriators, the late-Rep. Alan Nunnelee (R-MS) and Rep. Jaime Herrera Beutler (R-WA). This chapter specifically looks at how campaign rhetoric of Republican Revolution and Tea Party Wave Members differs, with Tea Party campaigners espousing fervent anti-government rhetoric, on top of the anti-government spending rhetoric it shares with Republican Revolution Members. However, in looking at
these Members once they gained seats on the Appropriations Committee, this study found that many of them became targets of large campaign donations by companies under their jurisdictions on the Committee, and have actually moderated their views. Both Republican Revolution Members held Subcommittee Chairmanships at the conclusion of the study in 2014, earning them vastly increased campaign donations and leading to a much more moderate voice regarding the appropriations process. The most interesting finding of the chapter, however, is the moderation of the Tea Party appropriators, whose seat on the Appropriations Committee and the power it brings led both Members to moderate their views, especially regarding earmarking and the stringent anti-government spending that tied them into the Tea Party in the first place. The moderation of Tea Party Members creates hope for the future of the appropriations process, but the fact of the matter is that not all Tea Party Members can be appropriators, and the fact that many of these Tea Party Members have yet to moderate their anti-government, anti-government spending message speaks to the deterioration of the appropriations process.

Overall, this study seeks to understand how and why the appropriations process is like it is today. Like a bridge to nowhere, the current state of the appropriations process leaves the federal government and its operations hanging in the balance, with a partisan, polarized Congress unable to build bipartisan bridges to traverse this impasse and perform its constitutional duty to provide proper oversight of federal funds and federally-funded programs. The data used by this study is vast, but only so as to properly address a process as complicated and convoluted as the appropriations process. After twenty years of institutional and party changes after the 1994 Republican Revolution and through the
2010 Tea Party Wave, the appropriations process is clearly broken, as it careens from brink to brink, from disaster to disaster. Broken down into three parts, this study looks at the overall changes made to the House as an institution and within the parties from 1974 to present that have trickled down to affect the appropriations process, including the increased partisanship and polarization among Members and between parties, the quickly-diverging beliefs of each party when it comes to earmarks, the grease that kept the wheels of the appropriations process moving, and how changes within the Republican Party, especially in the wake of the 2010 anti-government Tea Party Wave, have pushed the appropriations process off the bridge to nowhere and into free-fall. This study finds that the appropriations process truly is even worse than it looks due to a combination of trickle-down institutional changes, increased partisanship and polarization, particularly when it comes to earmarks, and the inability to moderate the anti-government, anti-government funding voices within the Tea Party to which there is currently little to no recourse.
Appropriations Malaise: Thirty-Five Years of Partisanship, Polarization, and Politicization
INTRODUCTION

The power to appropriate funds is one unique to the legislative branch, stemming from power specifically delegated by the Constitution\(^9\). This unique power allows Congress to set policy priorities via funding levels for agencies and programs. In controlling these expenditures, Congress and the Appropriations Committee in particular provide necessary oversight of federally-funded programs from year to year, and also seek to root out waste, fraud, and abuse in federal spending. The appropriations process is one of the oldest in Congress, dating back to 1789, when $639,000 was expended\(^10\). As one of Congress’ most storied processes with a direct hand in influencing policy, membership on the Appropriations Committee was long considered a plum assignment. Furthermore, membership on the Committee was characterized by comity, bipartisanship, and a respect for the appropriations process despite party affiliation or personal ideology\(^11\). However, as evidenced by the October 2013 government shutdown, the regular order of the appropriations process has been disrupted. As such, the questions of how partisanship and polarization have permeated the appropriations process under the Tea Party Wave as well as whether or not these changes can be attributed solely to the Republican Revolution, a common finding in previous literature, arise.

The influx of extremely conservative members during the Tea Party Wave has undoubtedly changed the nature of Congress, but it is important to put these changes in

---

\(^9\) U.S. Constitution, art. 1, sec. 9, cl. 7.


historical perspective. This chapter provides a brief overview of previous literature surrounding partisanship and polarization in appropriations as well as a breakdown of the data analysis for this chapter and its limitations. This chapter will include three key time periods as comparative tools to illuminate the changes of partisanship and polarization over time in the appropriations process, and will focus specifically on partisanship and polarization separately across key time periods as well as including institutional House Rule and party caucus rule changes that reflect the influx of these new members. The following table serves as a reference point for better understanding the size and scope of these new members on the institution for each election throughout this chapter.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Number of Democratic Members</th>
<th>Number of Republican Members</th>
<th>Net Seat Gain</th>
<th>New Members in Majority Party (retirement, seat loss, etc.)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1974¹²</td>
<td>291</td>
<td>144</td>
<td>+49 Dems</td>
<td>+76 Dems</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1994¹³</td>
<td>204</td>
<td>230</td>
<td>+54 Dems</td>
<td>+73 Dems</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010¹⁴</td>
<td>193</td>
<td>242</td>
<td>+63 Dems</td>
<td>+86 Dems</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

First, this chapter will use the 1974 influx of so-called “Watergate babies”, whose election ushered in a period of liberalism to levels not yet seen, to serve as a comparison to the ultra-conservatism of the Tea Party Wave in terms of partisanship and polarization on the Appropriations Committee, its leadership, and on the House chamber as a whole.

Next, this chapter will consider the role of partisanship and polarization after the Republican Revolution of 1994, which scholars have noted as the supposed turning point for the injection of partisanship into the appropriations process and on the Committee in particular. Finally, this chapter will focus on the rising levels of partisanship and polarization after the Tea Party wave of 2010 and how these levels have affected the Appropriations Committee, its leadership, and the House as a whole, though data is relatively limited. Taken together, these comparisons across key time periods provide a backdrop for analysis of the role of partisanship and polarization in the Tea Party Congress, and also serve to pinpoint the beginning of this upward trend on the Committee, its leadership, and the House chamber as a whole. Finally, this chapter will provide analysis and consequences of its findings on the appropriations process and Congressional oversight as well as previous literature’s claims that the Republican Revolution of 1994 was the genesis for the increases in polarization and partisanship.

**PRE-REPUBLICAN REVOLUTION APPROPRIATIONS COMMITTEE OPERATIONS AND CHAPTER APPROACH**

Predominant literature on the subject of partisanship in the appropriations process generally points to the role of the 1994 Republican Revolution, its subsequent rule changes and influx in extremely conservative membership as the genesis of the move away from bipartisanship in the appropriations process. Prior to the Republican Revolution, scholars generally saw appropriations decisions as being more consensus-

---

oriented in nature\textsuperscript{16}, not partisan. However, it is important to put the reforms of Speaker Gingrich (R-GA) in 1995 into historical perspective. Just how much of a role did these reforms and the change in membership profile have on the decision-making process of appropriations and what sort of environment did the Republicans inherit from the Watergate babies? 

The predominant literature surrounding power in the appropriations decision-making process is split into two camps: the bipartisans and the partisans. The bipartisans saw decisions as being made not on party lines, but as a result of coalition-building so as to protect the status of the Appropriations Committee. According to Fenno, Committee members recognized that their power was only realized if appropriations measures pass and become law, and thus were incentivized to stick together regardless of party affiliation to retain their power\textsuperscript{17}. On the other hand, the partisans saw decisions as a result of party ideology and adherence to the party line\textsuperscript{18}\textsuperscript{19}. These two camps form consensus, however, on the role of the 1994 Republican Revolution in shifting decisions to not only be made in a partisan manner, but as being controlled by the central party leadership instead of the Appropriations Chair\textsuperscript{20}. However, just as the Republicans had their revolution in 1994 with an influx of extreme membership, so too did the Democrats in the 1974 elections after the Watergate scandal. The influx of so-called “Watergate

\textsuperscript{17} Ibid.
\textsuperscript{20} Ibid.
“babies” serves as an important comparative tool for the rise in partisanship and extreme ideology, as the Watergate babies insisted on changes to House Rules and party caucus rules that remain in place today. Data from the Watergate babies and the Republican Revolution also serve as comparative tools for analyzing the influx of Tea Party membership and allow for a broader perspective on the overall changes in partisanship and polarization in the appropriations process, as well as the changing nature of power in appropriations over the span of roughly thirty-five years.

In making comparisons across these three key time periods, consistent metrics allow for a more robust comparison. As such, analysis of institutional House Rule and party rule changes, measures of partisanship, and polarization allow for not only consistency, but also help demonstrate how different institutional reforms affect partisanship and polarization over time. In analyzing House Rule and party caucus changes at the beginning of each time period (1975, 1995, and 2011), specific changes made by House party leadership allow for comparisons of power grabs by central leadership as well as for the decreasing power of the Appropriations Committee Chair, indicating the increased role of partisanship in the appropriations process. Partisanship scores, by way of party unity scores, serve to measure adherence to party line, which is a sign of centralization of power in party leadership. Partisanship scores also help show larger patterns over time in seeking to explain how Congress has reached the level of hyper-partisanship it presents today and its historical origins. Partisanship scores in this study are based off party unity scores and are used to determine specifically how the
Appropriations Subcommittee Chairs, on average, have changed over time\textsuperscript{21}. In addition, partisanship of the full Appropriations Committee and the House chamber help put the partisanship on the Committee in perspective. Party ideology scores, measured using DW-NOMINATE\textsuperscript{22} data, demonstrates individual member ideologies and also serve as a function to measure party polarization once aggregated. In this study, the DW-NOMINATE score focuses specifically on Subcommittee Chairs over time, as well as measures for the full Appropriations Committee and House chamber so as to provide for a broader comparative change in polarization and how the polarization has permeated the Appropriations Committee and its Chairmen over time. Taken together, these measures provide for historical comparison across the three key time periods and also help illuminate the permeation of polarization in to appropriations process and the origins of their escalation over the last thirty-five years.

As this chapter seeks to explore the changing nature of the appropriations process over time, especially that of the Tea Party Wave of 2010 (for which there is a relative dearth in literature), it is important to recognize its limitations. First and foremost, this study does not seek to understand why partisanship and polarization have increased, but rather to understand not only whether the Republican Revolution was the true genesis of such increases, how the Tea Party Wave has impacted these levels, and how partisanship and polarization have permeated the appropriations process under this new regime. Furthermore, this chapter also seeks to illuminate how both partisanship and polarization have permeated the leadership of the Appropriations Committee, in both its Chair and its

\textsuperscript{21} Poole, Keith and Howard Rosenthal. 2012, “Party Unity Scores for Democrat and Republican Members of Congress 35-112 (1857-2012).”

\textsuperscript{22} Poole, Keith and Howard Rosenthal. 2013, “DW-Nominate Scores with Bootstrapped Standard Errors.”
Subcommittee Chairs over time, and whether these measures are consistent with a Committee more and more beholden to centralized party leadership in the House. Finally, in studying data that is so recent and limited in that of the Tea Party Wave, it is important to recognize that such new and limited data may not always provide the full and complete picture for historical perspective. However, the limited data available on the Tea Party Wave provides ample opportunity for analysis and comparison to previous wave elections and is thus included in this chapter.

**HOUSE AND PARTY RULE CHANGES**

Changes to House Rules and party caucus rules that affect the appropriations process provide an example of institutional changes created by the influx of new members for the aforementioned three key time periods. These Rule changes indicate the ability of new members to lobby for and create change in how the House and their respective political parties operate. Departures from previous operating procedure also indicate the attempts of these new members to affect the appropriations process. In amending House Rules and party rules, these new members were able to ensure gradual or immediate changes to the appropriations process that match their ideological and party identities. These institutional changes are a reflection of the desires of these new members, as well as party leadership to accommodate them, and help serve as an example of the permeation of partisanship and polarization into the appropriations process throughout the past thirty-five years. The table below serves to summarize and cross-compare the changes made across time and party control.
### Party and House Rule Changes, 1974-2010

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1974</th>
<th>1994</th>
<th>2010</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>House Rules: Democrats in majority</strong></td>
<td>- Committee hearings made public</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Proxy voting in committee eliminated</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Appropriations Committee had to justify funding levels</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>House Rules: Republicans in majority</strong></td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>- Term limits on Committee Chairs</td>
<td>- Earmarks disallowed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Elimination of proxy voting on floor (Committee of the Whole)</td>
<td>- 3 day waiting period before bill comes to the floor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Open amendment process for appropriations</td>
<td>- Cut-as-you-go spending limits</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Top line spending requirements</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Party Rules: Democrat-instituted</strong></td>
<td>- Secret ballot to select Committee chairs</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Subcommittee ratios left to party leadership</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Party Rules: Republican-instituted</strong></td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Subcommittee chairs to swear loyalty to the Speaker</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Seniority no longer main criterion for selecting Chairmen</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Limits on number of subcommittees a Member could serve on</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**The Watergate Babies’ Rules Changes**
In 1975, House Rule changes included provisions pushing increased government transparency in the form of open committee hearings, an elimination of proxy voting on committees, and also specifically required the Appropriations Committee to submit justifications for its funding allocation levels. First, the requirement for Committees to hold open hearings unless they threaten national security interests made these hearings a part of political spectacle. Members’ statements in Committee hearings were a part of the record. So too were their votes on amendments to measures as well as on the measures themselves. Due to the new Rule changes, members were no longer able to vote by proxy at the Committee level, which forced them to be present for debate and the amendment process. By forcing members to participate further in the Committee processes, Rules changes created an avenue for partisanship to permeate the process just by sheer additional inclusion. As these votes within Committee were a part of the public record, members were also held accountable to their constituencies as well as to their party. Finally, the 1975 Rules package included language that required the Appropriations Committee to justify spending levels for its appropriations measures. By enacting this regulation, House leadership wrestled power away from the Appropriations Committee and inserted partisanship in the process by effectively requiring the Committee to justify its every move, opening it up to criticism and further power siphons from those who disagree with their funding allocations and policy choices.

In terms of party rule changes, the 1975 Congress was marked by the effects and final implementation of the 1973 Subcommittee Bill of Rights on Democrats, which saw two drastic changes that politicized the once independent, bipartisan appropriations process to a degree not yet seen: the democratic selection of the Committee Chair as well as the ratio of membership subcommittees. Though instituted one Congress prior to the Watergate influx, the Subcommittee Bill of Rights was not fully implemented by all Committees until the next Congress, including the Appropriations Committee. The Subcommittee Bill of Rights made the selection of Committee Chairmen up to a secret vote by the entire House Democratic Caucus if twenty percent of members requested such a vote. Essentially, this made the Chairman beholden to the Caucus and its leadership for his position, meaning that he had to adhere to the party line as well as be more responsive to members seeking funds for projects in their districts. By making the Chairman of the Appropriations Committee beholden to his party, he could no longer be as independently powerful, and was also forced to put the wishes of his party over the bipartisan needs of his Committee in order to maintain his position. Second, the Subcommittee Bill of Rights required that each individual subcommittee ratio favor the majority party; no subcommittee could have more minority members than majority members. This action added an obvious level of partisanship and politicization into the Appropriations Subcommittees, whose history was marked by bipartisan leadership. Rather than having Subcommittee members work together to achieve a majority of votes irrelevant of party affiliation, majority members now had an automatic majority on the
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Subcommittee level, which negated the need for bipartisan efforts. These rule changes by the Democratic Caucus under the Subcommittee Bill of Rights injected additional partisanship into the appropriations in two clear ways: forcing once-independent Committee Chairmen to answer to the party as a whole, and ensuring that all subcommittee membership be clearly biased towards the majority party, which negated the need for bipartisan cooperation and replaced it with an adherence to the wishes of the Caucus and its leadership.

**The Republican Revolution’s Rules Changes**

The 1994 Republican Revolution ushered in not only a more conservative Congress, but also the first Republican majority in the House for forty years and with it, House Rules that reflected the centralization of power in party apparatus as well as further open government and transparency measures consistent with Speaker Gingrich’s “Contract with America.” These new House Rules not only centralized power within party leadership, but injected new levels of partisanship into the appropriations process through membership restrictions as well as changes in floor processes. First, the most major institutional reform in House Rules was a limitation on the number of terms that a Committee Chairman may serve, which was capped at three terms. By limiting the number of terms the Appropriations Chair may serve, Republican leadership further entrenched appropriations power within the party apparatus and siphoned power away from the once-powerful Appropriations Chair, who was only able to amass individual
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power by long tenure and ability to shepherd appropriations legislation through the 
floor\textsuperscript{29}. Second, Republican leadership did away with proxy voting on the floor in the 
Committee of the Whole, which required members to be present to vote on appropriations 
measures and their numerous amendments. By requiring members to be present for these 
votes, not only did it elongate the appropriations process, but it also made members more 
accountable in attending the debate surrounding the amendment or final passage of the 
bill. Finally, Republican leadership altered House Rules to permit an open amendment 
process on appropriations measures, which removed the previous institutional shelter for 
these measures on the floor from poisonous amendments. Rather than the Committee 
Chair marshalling support for legislation, party leadership assumed this task and could 
thus organize support for amendments pushing more conservative funding levels or 
priorities\textsuperscript{30}. However, it is important to note that these changes occurred in addition to the 
1975 reforms, so while they too may have increased partisanship and polarization on an 
institutional level, they did so by building on existing Rules instituted after the Watergate 
influx. The institutional Rule changes implemented after the Republican Revolution 
represented a further departure from the standard operating procedure of the 
appropriations process, injecting partisanship into the process on an institutional level on 
top of Watergate Rules, as well as clearly wrestling control from the Committee itself, 
thus lessening the need for Committee members to work across the aisle and increasing 
the adherence to party ideology to maintain membership on the Committee.

\textsuperscript{29} Maltzman, Forrest. "Maintaining Congressional Committees: Sources of Member Support." \textit{Legislative 
Studies Quarterly} 23: 201-218. 
\textsuperscript{30} U.S. House of Representatives. Committee on Rules. \textit{Survey of Activities of the House Committee on 
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Republican leadership under Speaker Gingrich undertook numerous extra-legislative rule changes that pertained specifically to the House Republican Conference and its governance of Committee procedure and leadership tradition. Like with institutional Rule changes, it should be noted that many of these party rule changes simply mirrored or were built off the Democratic Caucus’ reforms after the 1973 Subcommittee Bill of Rights. First, Republican leadership made extra-legislative rule changes regarding their party caucus’ selection of Subcommittee leadership, a task formerly reserved for the Committee Chair. Leadership went as far as to require the Appropriations Subcommittee Chairs to swear and sign loyalty to Speaker Gingrich, which not only separated them from the Appropriations Chairman, but also tied their continued leadership positions on the Committee to their fealty to the party line, undoubtedly politicizing their positions. Furthermore, Republican Conference rule changes also stopped relying on seniority to select the Committee Chair, and instead relied on adherence to the party line and loyalty to the Speaker, which clearly made sure that both the Chair and Subcommittee leadership followed the party line rather than seeking compromise. These changes matched those of the Democratic Caucus after the 1973 Subcommittee Bill of Rights, which also reinforced party adherence as a characteristic necessary for achieving the Chairmanship rather than independent individual power. Finally, Republican leadership altered Caucus rules to limit the number of subcommittees on which an individual member could serve\(^\text{31}\). By limiting the number

of subcommittees a member could serve on as well as controlling the committee assignments and subcommittee leadership decisions, party leadership made members beholden to their wishes. In exerting control over subcommittee leadership, full Committee chairmanship, and limiting subcommittee assignments, party leadership used the Conference rules to inject partisanship into the appropriations process by forcing Appropriations Committee members to answer to party leadership to maintain their position on the Committee rather than work with minority members to usher bills through the floor to maintain Committee power.

**The Tea Party Wave’s Rules Changes**

The Tea Party Wave of 2010 and its subsequent House Rules changes instituted in 2011 reflect further pushes for transparency in the legislative process as well as the importance of fiscal responsibility to House leadership, a clearly partisan goal. First, House leadership under Speaker Boehner (R-OH) instituted policies under House Rules that required public availability of legislation prior to its consideration on the floor. This new three day waiting period gave greater time for the public to express their views on the legislation as well as outside groups and the party apparatus, putting further pressure on members to toe the party line. Furthermore, Republican leadership used the House Rules of the 112th Congress to institute new spending limits and procedures, extending leadership governance over the Appropriations Committee and further entrenching partisanship. House Rules included a provision that required appropriations amendments and provisions to “cut-as-you-go”, meaning each new dollar spent must be offset elsewhere. These new restrictions clearly showed the influence of party leadership on the
appropriations process by injecting further rules on how appropriations are made. This also injected immediate partisanship into the appropriations process, as, in order to bolster their own policy priorities and their respective budgets, Republicans would inevitably have to cut Democratic priorities. In addition, House leadership placed further restrictions on the Appropriations Committee by refusing to allow the Committee to report an appropriations measure to the floor if it exceeded the funding allotment. Essentially, Republican leadership forced the Appropriations Committee to abide by its top-line funding number for all measures, thus further controlling the process and causing further tension between the parties, as they no longer had wiggle room in appropriating\textsuperscript{32}. Unlike the Watergate babies and Republican Revolution, the Tea Party Wave did not institute the same magnitude of caucus-level rules that affected the institutional partisanship of the appropriations process\textsuperscript{33}. It is important to note once again, however, that the Tea Party wave maintained the same Conference rules instituted under the Republican Revolution, which mirrored Democratic reforms instituted under the Watergate influx in 1975. Further analysis of the institutional outlawing of earmarks will be discussed in further chapters. However, the Tea Party Congress did institute further institutional changes in the form of House Rules that further entrenched partisanship in the appropriations process, including the three day rule, the cut-as-you-go provision, and the top-line funding requirement for appropriations measures, which existed on top of the already partisan policies set by the Republican Revolution.


Throughout both House Rule and party caucus rule changes, a clear pattern emerges after the Watergate babies influx in which both House Rule and party caucus changes allowed for a clear permeation of partisanship and polarization into the appropriations process after Committee members and leadership became increasingly beholden to party leadership. Similarly, under the Republican Revolution, institutional and Conference reforms mirrored those of the Watergate babies, including the changing nature of the Appropriations Chairman and Subcommittee Chairmen, who became more and more beholden to centralized party leadership for their leadership positions on the Committee, and thus were more incentivized to act in a partisan manner. Indeed, powerful Committee Chairmen often hailed from the South, conservative Democrats whose seniority allowed them to remain in power despite the changing nature of the Democratic Caucus. This rule change mirrored the Democratic Caucus’ change under the Subcommittee Bill of Rights, which left Committee Chairman selection up to the secret ballot of the Caucus and its leadership, forcing the Chairman to be more in line with party wishes. The Republican Revolution also inherited institutional rule changes from the Watergate babies, like that of outlawing proxy voting on the committee level, and extended the change to apply to the full House chamber, forcing members to be more accountable for their votes and thus more beholden to the party and its wishes. Finally, the Tea Party Wave inherited all of these institutional and party changes, including term limits on Chairmen, selection of Subcommittee leadership, and funding justification levels. On top of the partisan changes by prior regimes, the Tea Party regime instituted further reforms that served to entrench polarization and partisanship into the
appropriations process, including “cut-as-you-go” restrictions. These restrictions implemented by the Tea Party served to further widen the gap between the two political parties as well as politicize the appropriations process on top of reforms instituted by the Republican Revolution, mirroring those of the Watergate babies. As such, while the Republican Revolution and Tea Party each instituted their own institutional and party reforms that served to inject partisanship and polarization into the appropriations process, many of these reforms were based on and instituted on top of reforms instituted by the Watergate babies.

**PARTISANSHIP IN THE HOUSE, 1973-2011**

Though changes in House Rules and party rules may provide the framework for institutional changes in the decision-making attitudes in the appropriations process, whether or not Appropriations Committee members and leadership were affected by these institutional changes must be measured quantitatively to provide a more robust picture of the permeation of polarization and partisanship in the appropriations process. As such, quantitative data measuring partisanship and polarization provides additional analysis of the effect of these institutional reforms as well as serving as a comparative measurement for change over time. Using quantitative data also allows for comparison across individual Subcommittee Chairs and full Committee Chairs, the Appropriations Committee as a whole, and the House chamber over time, which helps measure the permeation of partisanship and polarization into these groups. In addition, quantitative measurements of partisanship and polarization reflect the nature of power within the
appropriations process, and especially the centralization of power within the party leadership apparatus.

Partisanship scores for members, Committees, and the House chamber measure not only adherence to party lines, but also to central party leadership. These scores range from 1 to 100, with a score of 100 indicating complete party loyalty, meaning that the member votes with their party 100% of the time when the parties split along party lines in party-line voting situations\textsuperscript{34}. The table below serves to summarize the findings of this section and as a comparative reference across time and party.

**Partisanship Among Appropriators and in the House of Representatives, 1973-2011**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Appropriations Chair Partisanship Score (%)</th>
<th>Appropriations Leadership Partisanship Score (%)</th>
<th>Full Appropriations Committee Partisanship Score (%)</th>
<th>Full House Partisanship Score (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1973</td>
<td>40.6</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>73.35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1975</td>
<td>40.1</td>
<td>59.27</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1981</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1993</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>92.81</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>87.66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1995</td>
<td>93.92</td>
<td>91.88</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>87.66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>91.04</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>92.37</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Key:

**Bold=Democrats in the Majority**

**Italic=Republicans in the Majority**

**Watergate Babies Partisanship**

\textsuperscript{34} Ibid.
In 1973, one Congress prior to the influx of the Watergate babies, the Appropriations Committee Chair voted with his party only 40.6% of the time, and the leadership in the Appropriations Committee on average of 61% of the time. In contrast, the first Congress of the Watergate babies saw a slight decrease in the partisanship of the Appropriations Committee leadership, down to 59.27% from 61%. The Chair, Rep. Mahon (D-TX), also decreased from 40.6% to 40.1%. Even though the Watergate babies represented a huge influx in liberal ideology, Appropriations Committee leadership did not immediately feel the effects of this influx. However, once the Watergate babies moved into Subcommittee leadership positions, greater shifts in partisanship can be seen. By 1981, there were three members elected during or after the initial Watergate wave serving as Subcommittee Chairmen and the average partisanship score rose to 81%. By 1993, the Congress immediately prior to the Republican Revolution, the average partisanship score for subcommittee leadership increased further, up to 92.81%, a 33% increase from when the Watergate babies were first elected. Not only does this increase in partisanship show the increased adherence to party-line votes, it also shows how quickly partisanship permeated the appropriations process, and, most importantly, how partisan the process was prior to the Republican Revolution.

It is important to note that the full House was significantly more partisan in nature than the Appropriations Committee and its leadership during the early years of the Watergate influx. In 1973, partisanship in the House chamber stood at 73.35% indicating that the average voting member voted with his party roughly 75% of the time. For the full Appropriations Committee, partisanship was similar to that of Appropriations leadership,
at 59%, which indicates that partisanship had not yet permeated the process or the Committee compared to the House as a whole. Once the Watergate babies entered Congress, the overall House partisanship remained about the same, at 75%, while partisanship on the full Committee decreased slightly, to 57%, which mirrored trends in Committee leadership. Once the Watergate babies came into leadership positions on the Committee, full Committee partisanship increased to 79%, which is slightly lower than the average for Committee leadership at 81%. The full chamber also showed large increases in partisanship, with a rate of 87.94% by 1993, which was similar to the average member of Appropriations leadership, indicating that even prior to the Republican Revolution, partisanship had permeated the appropriations process to levels similar to that of the full House, though partisanship on the Committee remained lower relative to the House as a whole. Overall, the full Committee and chamber followed the same increasing patterns as Committee leadership after the influx of the Watergate babies, with partisanship gradually increasing across parties over time and clearly saturating the appropriations process, especially after the Watergate babies came into leadership positions on the Appropriations Committee.

**Partisanship Post-Republican Revolution**

The first Congress of the Republican Revolution reversed the upward trend in partisanship scores for Committee leadership, albeit slightly. The average Subcommittee Chairman held a partisanship score of 91.88%, compared to the 92.81% partisanship average in 1993. The Appropriations Chair, Rep. Livingston (R-LA), also recorded a lower partisanship score than the previous Chairman, Mr. Obey (D-WI), at 93.92%,
whereas Mr. Obey recorded a 96%. However, while Mr. Livingston’s partisanship score may have been lower than the previous Chairman’s score, it still represents a huge increase from the 40.6% score recorded by the Chair prior to the influx of Watergate babies. This increase in partisanship among key appropriators also reflects the party caucus and House Rules changes implemented by both the Democratic Caucus and the Republican Revolution, in choosing leadership based on party ideology rather than seniority or appropriations expertise. The Republican House from 1995 to the Democratic takeover in 2007 was marked by swings in partisanship scores for the leadership of Appropriations Committee, though the swings were relatively minor compared to the drastic increase after the Watergate babies. The Republican regime’s lowest score came in 1999, with an average of 86.96%, but rebounded to its highest score in 2001 at 94.04%, which is still only a 1.23% increase over the average of the Democratic Appropriations leadership from 1993.

The full Appropriations Committee and House chamber under the Republican Revolution saw similar swings in partisanship scores as Appropriations leadership, though scores remained very high relative to those of the pre-Watergate babies and show the clear permeation of partisanship into the appropriations process. The full Appropriations Committee maintained an average partisanship score of 90% in 1993, which is just slightly less than the average leadership score of 92.81%. In addition, the full House maintained a similar score, at 87.94%. All in all, the Appropriations Committee actually had higher partisanship scores than the House as a whole prior to the Republican Revolution, showing the clear permeation of partisanship in the
appropriations process. This is also reflective of House and party rule changes governing appointments to the Appropriations Committee and its leadership, that partisan ideology would be weighted higher than seniority or appropriations expertise. In 1995, the Appropriations Committee averaged a score of 91%, a very slight increase from the previous Congress. Partisanship in the full chamber fell slightly in this first Republican Revolution Congress, down to 87.66%. Similar to the growing partisanship scores on the Appropriations Committee and its leadership under the Watergate wave, the Republican Revolution saw the same trend of not only increasingly partisan members of the Committee and its leadership, but these levels of partisanship mirroring the partisanship in the chamber as a whole.

**Partisanship Post-Tea Party Wave**

The first Tea Party Congress saw similar patterns in the permeation of partisanship into the appropriations process at all levels, as well as levels of partisanship that clearly continued the trend that began after the influx of Watergate babies. The first Congress of the Tea Party Wave in 2011 saw another decrease in party unity scores for Appropriations leadership, down to 91.04%, which is still comparatively very high. The Committee itself averaged a partisanship score of 92%, which is slightly up from the score at the beginning of the Republican Revolution. It is important to note that these scores are already extremely high, and represent a more than 30% increase in the scores prior to the Watergate influx. Under the Tea Party Wave, the full House chamber recorded a partisanship score of 92.37%, which is on par with not only Appropriations Committee leadership, but also the Appropriations Committee as a whole, suggesting that
partisanship has continued to become a part of the appropriations process, both inside the Committee and in the chamber as a whole.

In analyzing the partisanship of Appropriations leadership, Committee membership, and full House chamber averages over time, a clear pattern emerges after the election of the Watergate babies: steady increases in partisanship levels across both parties, leadership, and on the Appropriations Committee to the point where partisanship levels were equally high across all three metrics. Despite minor declines after the Republican Revolution in Committee leadership partisanship, levels remained high compared to the levels before the influx of Watergate babies, whose election saw a clear impact on partisanship levels over time, especially once these Watergate babies ascended to leadership on the Subcommittee level. Though the Republican Revolution and the Tea Party did not see the same marked increase and intensity as in the Democratic majorities of the late 1980’s and 2000’s, it is also important to note that the level of partisanship was already incredibly high at the beginning of each regime, only continuing the earlier pattern set under the Democratic majority after the Watergate babies. That is to say, partisanship in the appropriations process certainly existed at high levels prior to both the Republican Revolution and the Tea Party Wave. That is not to say that the two Republican regimes did not increase partisanship in the process or were not beholden to party leadership in the same way Democrats were. It is a clear reflection, however, of the influence of the House and party rule changes that led to the change in leadership on the Appropriations Committee, placing partisan ideology above seniority or policy expertise as an appropriator. As a whole, regardless of regime or party affiliation, the
appropriations process has moved towards partisanship since the Watergate elections in 1974, with levels in the House as a whole mirroring levels on the Committee and in Committee leadership, suggesting that partisanship has permeated the appropriations process overall, and has pervaded the process to the point of hyper-partisanship.

**POLARIZATION IN THE HOUSE, 1973-2011**

While party unity scores reflect the partisanship of the appropriations process, ideology scores in the form of DW-NOMINATE scores denote polarization, or how far apart the two parties are from the ideological center. In studying polarization and ideology, one can ascertain not only the ideological distance between parties, but also the ideological intensity of one party. As such, comparisons across time and party can be made, which is especially important in the cause of the Tea Party Wave of 2010. By comparing the polarization levels of the appropriations process during the Tea Party Wave to that of the Watergate babies and the Republican Revolution, not only does it allow for a comparison of change over time, but also puts the dysfunction of the current appropriations process and its lack of ideological middle ground in perspective. Finally, as Mann and Ornstein have hypothesized, the asymmetric polarization of the Republican Party after the Tea Party wave has made the state of the appropriations process, and Congress as a whole, “even worse than it looks.” Studying polarization over time also helps put that claim in perspective for Committee leadership and members, as well as the House chamber as a whole, and also seeks to determine whether the Republican
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35 Additional guidance on the scope and minutia of DW-NOMINATE scores and their collection can be found here in Poole and Rosenthal’s *Ideology and Congress* and *Congress: A Political-Economic History of Roll Call Voting.*

36 Ibid.
Revolution was truly the turning point for the appropriations process, as scholars have suggested.

Polarization scores for members, Committees, and the House chamber measure not only adherence to party beliefs, but also intensity of beliefs. These scores range from -1 to 1, with a score of -1 indicating complete ideological liberalism, 1 indicating complete ideological conservatism, and 0 serving as the ideological center\textsuperscript{37}. The table below serves as a comparative tool across Appropriations Committee Members, the House as a whole, party, and time period.

\begin{center}
\textbf{Polarization Among Appropriators and in the House of Representatives, 1973-2011}
\end{center}

\begin{center}
\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|c|c|}
\hline
 & Polarization in Appropriations Leadership & Full Appropriations Committee Polarization & Full House Polarization & All Democrats Polarization & All Republicans Polarization \\
\hline
1973 & -0.2245 & -0.058 & -0.064 & -0.299 & 0.231 \\
1975 & -0.2346 & -0.114 & -0.126 & -0.298 & 0.217 \\
1981 & -0.344 & -0.102 & -0.044 & -0.289 & 0.265 \\
1993 & -0.389 & -0.250 & -0.035 & -0.355 & 0.405 \\
1995 & 0.351 & 0.300 & 0.160 & -0.404 & 0.464 \\
2011 & 0.419 & 0.531 & 0.205 & -0.394 & 0.675 \\
\hline
\end{tabular}
\end{center}

Key:
-1=Most liberal ideology (Democrats)
1=Most conservative ideology (Republicans)

Polarization of the Watergate Babies

\textsuperscript{37} Ibid.
In the Congress immediately prior to the influx of Watergate babies, polarization of the leadership of the Appropriations Committee was relatively low, with a score of -.2245. The Appropriations Committee as a whole was moderate, with an average score of -.058. In the Watergate babies’ first Congress, polarization levels nearly doubled to -.114, though committee leadership remained relatively stagnant at -.2346, a marginal increase from -.2245. Unlike with partisanship scores, however, the influx of Watergate babies into Committee leadership positions did not have the same overall effect on polarization, with the first Congress of Watergate baby leadership actually showing a decrease in the overall polarization of the Committee, down from -.114 to -.102. Though the Committee as a whole saw a decrease in polarization, the influx of Watergate babies led to a predictable jump in polarization scores of committee leadership, up to -.344 from -.2346. Similar to partisanship scores, polarization scores under the Watergate babies were marked by an increase over time, indicating not only adherence to party line, but also to a growing intensity of ideological beliefs. Not only were Appropriations leaders adhering more and more to the party line and thus to central party leadership, they were also coalescing upon economic liberalism, meaning that the ideological differences between the two parties were steadily increasing as the central, middle ground for compromise was steadily decreasing. Not only were Appropriations members more and more beholden to centralized party leadership, they were also increasingly moving further away from consensus points, beginning after the influx of Watergate babies.

It is also important to put the changing nature of polarization on the Appropriations Committee in perspective as compared with the House chamber as a
whole, as ultimately, it takes a majority of the chamber, not just appropriators, to pass an appropriations measure. Prior to the Watergate influx, the entire House tilted slightly liberal, with an overall polarization of -.064. Democrats in particular clocked in at -.299 and Republicans at .231, both of which are similarly equidistant from the ideological middle. Like polarization levels on the Appropriations Committee, the first Congress of the Watergate babies saw and overall doubling of polarization scores, with the House averaging -.126, which is similar to the polarization on the Committee as a whole. In addition, the distance between the parties as a whole and the ideological center remained relatively stagnant, with Democrats averaging -.298 and Republicans .217. The overall polarization of the House once the Watergate babies came into power on the Committee level also saw a similar decrease, down to -.044. The polarization of the Democratic Party also actually slightly decreased, down to -.289, though the Republican Party’s polarization score increased to .265. Overall, the full House saw similar levels of polarization as that of the Committee and its leadership, and similar trends in the increasing polarization of the parties, with the Republican Party in particular increasing. This increase in Republican polarization essentially meant that, though each party was essentially equidistant from the ideological center, they were both growing further from the center, from moderation, and from compromise, on par with the Committee and its leadership.

**Polarization of the Republican Revolution**

In the Congress immediately preceding the Republican Revolution, polarization scores of the House Appropriations Committee and its leadership in particular saw a
similar increase to that of partisanship, indicating not only the centralized control of the process in party leadership, but also an increased ideological intensity of and distance between the two parties. Prior to the Republican Revolution, polarization in Appropriations Committee leadership reached a high of -.389, reflecting the average of -.386 among Committee Democrats and .344 among Republicans. After the Republican Revolution, polarization scores of both Democrats and Republicans rose, with Democrats scoring at -.404 and Republicans at .365, following the upward trend set with the influx of Watergate babies. However, the polarization scores of Republican Committee leadership after the Revolution actually decreased slightly down to .3505 from .365, which mirrors the partisanship scores, which also saw minor decreases at the outset of the Republican Revolution. Also similar to partisanship measures overall, polarization averages of committee leadership oscillated, from a low of .3492 in 1997, to a high of .4996 in 2003. Committee Democrats as a whole, on the other hand, did not follow this increasing polarized trend, and in fact, saw declines over the same time period. Committee Democrats saw a high in 1997 in their polarization average of -.428, and a low of -.388 in 2005. Conversely, Republicans on the Committee saw a marked increase in polarization, with a low of .365 in 1995, to a high of .511 in 2005. Though the Republican Committee leadership followed the same oscillating patterns as with partisanship scores, the polarization scores of both Republicans and Democrats hint at a larger theme of growing asymmetric polarization between the two parties, with Republican members increasing in ideological intensity, while Democratic members saw a gradual decline. While there is no doubt that the Appropriations Committee leadership
followed the upward trend in polarization started by the Watergate babies during the Republican Revolution, a new trend also emerged after the Republican Revolution—asymmetric polarization.

For the House as a whole under the Republican Revolution, a similar rise in asymmetric polarization also emerged as an overarching trend, though the House was much more polarized relative to the Committee or its leadership. Prior to the Republican Revolution, overall polarization at the chamber level stood at -.035, with Democrats averaging -.355 and Republicans already more polarized at .405. Unlike the Appropriations Committee, Democratic polarization increased marginally over time, from a low of -.362 in 1995 to a high of -.381 in 2005. However, the polarization of the Republican Party was much more intense, from a low of .464 in 1995 to a high of .596 in 2005. This is slightly higher than the level of polarization on the Committee, indicating that Committee members were slightly less polarized than the average Republican member. The opposite is true for Democrats, whose Appropriations Committee members maintained a higher polarization score in 2005 at -.388 than the average Democrat in the House, at -.381. However, Republicans on all levels still displayed a more intense level of polarization than Democrats, despite differing trends in polarization on the Committee level and the House chamber as a whole. Compared to Committee leadership and the Committee as a whole, the House chamber displayed intense polarization levels and levels of asymmetric polarization far beyond levels on the Committee, though it is clear that asymmetric polarization permeated the appropriations process on all levels. This distance between the parties, while in line with the emerging asymmetric polarization on
the Appropriations Committee, also indicated the decline of moderates in the chamber, of compromise, and of the ideological middle ground.

**Polarization of the Tea Party**

In looking at the role of the Tea Party Wave on the polarization of the Appropriations Committee, it is important to note that there is only one Congress worth of data, which does not provide for broad generalizations, though a significant pattern does emerge. The Appropriations Committee during the first Tea Party Congress was actually less polarized compared to the House as a whole, which is similar to patterns under the Republican Revolution. Though Appropriations leadership averaged .531, Republicans on the Committee as a whole averaged .419, which is significantly less, and less than levels seen during the Republican Revolution regime. Comparatively, Republicans in the House as a whole averaged .675, a large shift rightward in overall polarization from the Watergate levels. The trend of increasing asymmetric polarization was realized in the chamber as a whole, though not on the Committee, as Democratic polarization reached an all time high at -.465, showing the increasing permeation of polarization on the Committee, regardless of party affiliation. Compared to the Republican appropriator average of .419, the Committee retained high levels of polarization, though trended downward in terms of asymmetric polarization.

While it is clear that asymmetric polarization levels on the Committee were much higher than those after the Watergate influx, the Tea Party wave thus far has shown a decrease in asymmetric polarization on the Committee level compared to previous years, as well as being much less polarized than the chamber as a whole. Compared to the
Republican score of .675, the Democratic Party as a whole in the House chamber was almost half as liberal as the Republican Party was conservative, at -.394. Put another way, the Republican Party was almost twice as ideologically intense as the Democratic Party. This overall asymmetric polarization continued the larger trend from the Republican Revolution, and is in line with the argument proffered by Mann and Ornstein that Republicans have polarized faster than Democrats\(^3^8\). In addition, the House as a whole was much more intensely and asymmetrically polarized than the Committee. The average Republican member in the chamber held a polarization score of .675, whereas the average Republican Committee member stood at .419, a very significant difference. Overall, the Tea Party regime seems to have continued the upward swing in asymmetric polarization on the chamber level, the slight decreases in asymmetric polarization on the Committee level, though still intensely polarized, also suggests that polarization may continue to permeate the appropriations process but is less obvious at the Committee level.

**FURTHER ANALYSIS**

In analyzing both partisanship and polarization of the appropriations process, clear patterns emerge that diverge from previous literature surrounding partisanship in that most of the trends surrounding increasing polarization and partisanship in the appropriations process actually began with the Watergate babies, not the Republican Revolution. However, the institutional reforms under Speaker Gingrich and the influx of conservative members in 1995 undoubtedly played a role in exacerbating the distance

\(^{3^8}\) Ibid.
between the parties in the form of asymmetric polarization, which occurred not only in the chamber as a whole, but also permeated the Committee as well, though to a lesser degree\(^{39}\). Furthermore, the limited data available on the Tea Party shows a vast disparity between the two parties as a whole on an ideological level, as the hyperpolarized Republican Party was clearly affected by the influx of Tea Party members, who, though they have not yet permeated the Committee, have certainly wreaked havoc on the appropriations process as a whole.

It is also important to analyze how these changes in both partisanship and polarization manifest themselves in the Appropriations Committee and its effectiveness. While Fenno noted that the Committee derived its power from passing bills and members were therefore incentivized to collectively act so as to retain power\(^{40}\), the Appropriations Committee and its leadership has seen increasing levels of partisanship and polarization permeate, severely impacting its ability to pass appropriations measures. The Committee's rising partisanship and polarization levels also correspond with increasing partisanship and polarization for the average voting member, whose support is necessary to pass appropriations measures on time. The Committee has failed to pass all of its appropriations measures by the October 1 deadline for more than fifteen years, since 1996\(^{41}\). Appropriators often have trouble passing their bills on the House floor, as contentious provisions inserted by extremely conservative non- appropriators have forced

\(^{39}\) Ibid.
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House Republican leadership to pull these bills from consideration\textsuperscript{42}. As further evidenced by the government shutdown of October 2013, the increasing polarization and partisanship has permeated the appropriations process to the point of complete breakdown, despite the fact that polarization and partisanship levels on the Committee are on par or below levels in the chamber as a whole. From 1973 to 1993, including the Watergate influx but prior to the Republican Revolution, there were a total of fifteen government shutdowns resulting from funding gaps. Nine of the fifteen resulted in partial government shutdown due to funding lapse, the longest of which was the five-day shutdown in 1990. The average length of government shutdown prior to the Republican Revolution lasted an average of two days. In contrast, after the Revolution, there were only two government shutdowns, with the longest being the twenty-one day shutdown in 1995-1996, the longest in appropriations history. Finally, under the Tea Party regime, there has been one government shutdown, the sixteen-day shutdown of 2013\textsuperscript{43}.

Though there were only two shutdowns after the Republican Revolution, they were much longer, and also were a clear product of the growing polarization and partisanship between the two parties, and especially in the case of the Tea Party, a clear manifestation of this distance between the two parties in the chamber as a whole. In addition to the length and intensity of these government shutdowns, the polarization and partisanship of the appropriations process has manifested itself in the role of the continuing resolution, and the dissolution of regular order in the appropriations process.

Between 1997 and 2009, only sixteen of a total 186 appropriations measures passed prior

\textsuperscript{42} Ibid.

\textsuperscript{43} Matthews, Dylan. "Here is every previous government shutdown, why they happened and how they ended." \textit{The Washington Post}, September 25, 2013.
to the October 1 deadline for the new fiscal year\textsuperscript{44}. To avoid funding gaps, leadership has relied on continuing resolutions, which simply fund all jurisdictions at the previous year’s level without adjustment. The Tea Party Wave has been characterized by numerous continuing resolutions, as well as very public failures to pass appropriations measures without Tea Party support on the floor. The failure of party leadership to bring the appropriations bill for Transportation, Housing, and Urban Development up for a vote in 2013 even after floor consideration\textsuperscript{45} is representative of a larger problem with partisanship and polarization: appropriations measures that garner Tea Party support stand no chance in the Democratic Senate, and measures that are not conservative enough to garner Tea Party support may still be too conservative to garner minority Democratic votes. The appropriations measures that passed both chambers required support from the majority of House Democrats and merely a minority of quasi-moderate House Republicans to pass, bypassing the Tea Party altogether. Two such measures, funding for Hurricane Sandy-affected areas\textsuperscript{46} and an omnibus spending bill after the government shutdown passed only with majority support from the minority party\textsuperscript{47}.

It is clear that both partisanship and polarization have permeated the Appropriations Committee and the process as a whole since the election of the Watergate babies in 1974. The upward swing in both polarization and partisanship levels on the Committee and its leadership was also due in part to House Rules and party rules changes.

\footnotesize{\textsuperscript{44} Ibid.}  
\footnotesize{\textsuperscript{45} Rogers, David. “THUD bill is pulled as GOP budget frays.” http://www.politico.com/story/2013/07/thud-bill-pulled-from-house-floor-94992.html}  
\footnotesize{\textsuperscript{46} U.S. House Journal. 2013. 113\textsuperscript{th} Cong., 1\textsuperscript{st} sess., 15 January.}  
\footnotesize{\textsuperscript{47} U.S. House Journal. 2014. 113\textsuperscript{th} Cong., 2\textsuperscript{nd} sess., 15 January.}
undertaken under the Subcommittee Bill of Rights\textsuperscript{48}. The Republican Revolution not only inherited these high levels of partisanship and polarization as well as polarizing Rules changes, it also increased these levels through Rules changes of its own that mirrored and built upon the changes made after the Watergate influx\textsuperscript{49}. These institutional and party rules changes as well as the influx of more conservative members led to a steadily high level of partisanship, but more importantly, led to an increase in asymmetric polarization in the chamber as a whole, indicating the steady decline of middle ground between the parties. Finally, the Tea Party Wave saw a drastic increase of this asymmetric polarization due to the highly conservative wave that was swept in. In addition, the Tea Party Wave instituted its own House Rules that contributed to the consistently high levels of partisanship and polarization in the appropriations process. However, the Appropriations Committee and its leadership saw a downward trend in asymmetric polarization compared to the House chamber as a whole. Even though the Appropriations may be less asymmetrically polarized, it is still incredibly polarized and partisan, showing the permeation of these two measures into the process as a whole. However, though the Appropriations Committee and its leadership may seek to pass appropriations measures, the overall asymmetric polarization in the chamber as a whole has stymied these efforts, causing the 2013 government shutdown as well as a reliance on continuing resolutions, jeopardizing the goals of the appropriations process as a whole\textsuperscript{50}.

\textsuperscript{48} Ibid.
\textsuperscript{49} Ibid.
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CONCLUSION

The appropriations process in the House after the Watergate influx saw marked increases in partisanship and polarization compared to levels prior to the 1974 elections, leading to increased centralization of power in party leadership and increased politicization of the appropriations process due to institutional and party rule changes as well as an influx of new liberal members. Unlike previous literature suggests, increases in partisanship and polarization under the Republican Revolution and the Tea Party Wave were actually just a continuation of trends started after the influx of Watergate babies and their institutional and party rule changes. What sets the Tea Party Wave apart is the intensity of the partisanship and the asymmetry of the polarization on top of the rule changes it has inherited. Members of the Tea Party Wave also have not supported leadership and committee-backed appropriations legislation, leading to the need for continuing resolutions and a government shutdown. This suggests that, despite a slight downward shift in asymmetric polarization on the Committee level, the asymmetric polarization in the chamber as a whole is preventing appropriations progress. Both the asymmetry of polarization levels and the shifting nature of power in the appropriations process pose serious concerns for the future of the appropriations process, namely in the dearth of compromise, power concentration, and leadership.

The consequences of asymmetric polarization have already manifested themselves in the inability of the House to find compromise on appropriations measures, and also in the reliance on continuing resolutions, which imperils Congressional oversight of federal

51 Ibid.
funds. If Congress cannot execute the regular normal order of the appropriations process due to the great ideological distance between the parties as well as the far rightward swing of the Republican Party, and instead relies on extending funding at previous levels, a key measure of Congressional oversight is essentially lost. Furthermore, as appropriating funds is a responsibility borne solely by Congress, and cannot be exported to other branches this increasing asymmetric polarization also puts clear burden on federally funded entities, who cannot develop strategic plans for future years due to the lack of stability under current appropriations practices. Though continuing resolutions provide similar, or the same levels of funding, agencies may still see funding cuts or be subject to restrictive policy measures included in the resolution.

Asymmetric polarization, increased hyper-partisanship, and the changing nature of power in the appropriations process also call into question the role of committee specialization and power in the appropriations process. In general, the committee system is predicated on the belief that these subgroups can specialize in policy arenas, and that deference should be given to Committee members and their recommendations based on their specialized knowledge. As power coalesced under party leadership due to increasing partisanship and polarization after the Watergate wave, the role of specialized committee members was weakened, as members became beholden to leadership for their Committee slots and leadership within the Committee. Though Committee members may display a lower level of asymmetric polarization under the Tea Party Wave than the House chamber as a whole, the Committee has been forced to defer to these new members and their highly polarized policies, leaving no room for compromise and essentially dooming
the appropriations process. Under the Tea Party Wave, both the Committee and party leadership have seemingly become beholden to these new Tea Party members and their wishes.

The culmination of thirty-five years of increasing polarization and partisanship in the appropriations process after the Watergate wave has led to an appropriations process increasingly controlled by members more concerned with advancing party ideology than passing legislation, and the death of regular order due to asymmetric polarization. Thanks to the culmination of highly politicized House rule and party caucus changes started by the Watergate babies, the current appropriations process under the Tea Party Wave is marked by members whose once-plum Committee assignment is dependent upon their adherence to the party line, a clear permeation of partisanship and polarization into the appropriations process. Furthermore, the increase in asymmetric polarization after the Republican Revolution, though less intense at the Committee level, has put power in the hands of these new Tea Party members, leading to a failure in the appropriations process and the numerous Congressional responsibilities that accompany it. To conclude: the trends started by the Watergate babies in partisanship and rules changes and the Republican Revolution in asymmetric polarization have clearly permeated the Appropriations Committee and the process as a whole to the point of the collapse of the process, seriously endangering Congressional responsibilities and the efficacy of Congress as a whole.
The End of Earmarks: The Manifestation of Partisanship and Polarization in Changing Institutional and Political Attitudes
INTRODUCTION

Congressional earmarking, broadly defined as the direction of federal funds to specific projects by Members of Congress through appropriations measures, has undergone a massive transformation over the last twenty years in terms of institutional and political attitudes. Once a measure of an individual’s ability to be effective in Washington for his constituency by securing projects for his district, earmarks are now banned by House Rules, decried as corrupt measures, products of backroom deals without transparency and a misuse of taxpayer funds. Before their eventual ban, earmarks became much more widespread leading some to suspect abuse. Between 1990 and 2009, spending for earmarks grew 432%, with the number of earmarks growing even more rapidly at 1572%. In that same time period, overall discretionary spending increased only 128%, meaning that not only was earmark spending increasing, earmarks were also taking over a larger percentage of overall spending, both a vertical and horizontal increase.

As the political rhetoric surrounding earmarks has changed, so too have institutional rules. Once an informally sanctioned tool to logroll votes, support vulnerable members, and entice members to stay in line with the party, earmarks are now explicitly banned by both chambers of Congress. The massive change in attitude towards earmarking is reflective of the larger trends of increasing partisanship and polarization in
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the appropriations process since the 1994 Republican Revolution, and the recent earmark
ban reflects the hyper-partisan, asymmetrically polarized Congress ushered in by the Tea
Party Wave of 2010\textsuperscript{56}.

Both the Republican Revolution and the Tea Party Wave of 2010 ushered in huge
changes to the institutional attitudes and public messaging towards earmarking. In
investigating the changing attitudes towards earmarking, this study seeks to examine the
change in stances over time in the House as well as how these changes exemplify the
growth in hyper-partisanship and asymmetric polarization that has come to define the
current Congress. This study seeks to compare the Republican Revolution to the Tea
Party Wave as many congressional scholars point to the rules implemented by then-
Speaker Gingrich as having snowballed effects on today’s Congress. As there is a relative
dearth in literature on the subject given the newness of the Tea Party Wave, this study
seeks to fill the gap. In order to do so, first, this study will explore what little previous
literature there is comparing the two time periods and their views on earmarking. Next, in
order to further examine the change in institutional attitudes towards earmarking, this
study will examine both House and party caucus rule changes at the outset of the
beginning of each Congress immediately after the electoral change. In measuring the
changing nature of political sentiment and the influence of partisanship and polarization
regarding earmarks, this study will then focus on the use of the franking privilege to
message earmarks by two members who sat on the Appropriations Committee in 1994
and who now lead it. Finally, this study will offer analysis as to the consequences of these

\textsuperscript{56}Ibid.
changes in institutional and attitudinal attitudes regarding earmarks for Congress, its members, and the separation of powers.

**THE POST-1994 DEARTH OF EARMARKING LITERATURE AND CHAPTER APPROACH**

Previous literature surrounding the changing institutional and political attitudes towards earmarking in the post-1994 House is few and far between. Instead, much literature focuses on the increasingly partisan\(^{57}\) and polarized nature of the House, especially after the 1994 Republican Revolution\(^{58}\). The recent ban on earmarks has produced additional literature on the downfall of earmarks, which points to the so-called “Bridge to Nowhere”\(^{59}\) and other earmarking scandals as the impetus for the change in institutional and political beliefs\(^{60}\). Additional issues like the increase in overall portion of earmark-related federal spending, the federal debt, and the deficit are also directly proportional to the lack of public support for earmarks, according to previous literature. However, previous literature mostly looks at the causation of the earmarking ban, but not the trickle-down effects of changes in institutional and political attitudes towards earmarking that undoubtedly mirror the increase in partisanship and polarization in the House after the 1994 Republican Revolution. Therefore, this chapter provides a unique perspective in its holistic approach towards understanding how both the institutional and
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membership changes have, over time, led to the deterioration of the earmarking process and the grease that kept the wheels of the appropriations process moving.

In seeking to study the manifestation of partisanship and polarization in the attitudes towards earmarking over time, this chapter will focus on the 104th Congress, the Congress immediately following the 1994 Republican Revolution, and the 112th and 113th Congresses, the Congresses immediately following the 2010 Tea Party Wave. The 104th Congress represented a massive shift in the House in particular, as Republicans won control of the House for the first time in nearly fifty years after winning a historic fifty-four seats just two years into President Clinton’s presidency. The Tea Party Wave of 2010, however, ushered in one of the largest Republican majorities in the House for a century, with Republicans picking up sixty-three seats just two years into President Obama’s presidency. In focusing on these two time periods in particular, this study will highlight the dramatic shift in rhetoric and institutional and party rules, especially by the Republican Party, over the span of less than twenty years. Specifically, this study will look at the trickle-down and direct effects of House and party caucus rule changes on earmarking, and will seek to contrast the two time periods so as to highlight the quick shift in attitudes within the Republican Party. In addition, this study will compare the franked files, or official mailings sent by a member’s congressional office, of the two most powerful members of the Appropriations Committee: the current Chairman and the Ranking Member, both of whom also served on the Committee during and after the Republican Revolution. These franked files will serve as a comparative tool between both
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the Members individually, their respective parties, and, most importantly, the changing political attitudes towards earmarking among individual members from the Republican Revolution through the Tea Party Wave.

It is important to note that this study is not without its limitations. Though this study does seek to explore the manifestation of increased partisanship and polarization in the earmarking process over time, it is important to note that this study does not seek to identify the causes of this increase, only to examine its manifestation. Furthermore, this study is limited to the public availability of franked files, which are only made available if they are a mass mailing, and were sent to more than 500 constituents. However, the overarching trends seen in those files that are publicly available are worth studying, and are an important tool in examining the changing political attitudes towards earmarks. Finally, while franking files certainly do not constitute the entirety of a member’s political communications with their constituents, these franked files represent the conscious effort of a member to communicate with constituents, and are often much more expensive and time-consuming than press releases, news appearances, or floor speeches. As such, though the limitations of using franked files to study political communications is noted, it is also not without merit.

**EARMARKS-RELATED PARTY AND HOUSE RULE CHANGES**

In examining the changes in institutional attitudes towards earmarking, a review of changes in House and party caucus rules provides for an in-depth look at the change in attitudes over time as well as how these changes show the increase in partisanship and polarization after the Republican Revolution of 1994 and through the Tea Party Wave of
2010. The chart below serves as a reference point for tracing the changes and their effects on the institution, both the Democratic and Republican Party, and on the appropriations process as a whole.

_Earmarks-related House and Party Rule Changes from the Republican Revolution through the Tea Party Wave_  

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Earmarks-related House Rule Changes</th>
<th>Impacts</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Term limits on Committee Chairmen</strong></td>
<td>→ Concentrated power in party leadership</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>a. Members more beholden to leadership than Committee process; Chairmen no longer drivers of action</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Open Rule for amending appropriations measures</strong></td>
<td>→ Opened up participation in appropriations process to non- appropriators</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>a. Entire House decides who gets what</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>b. Forces partisan amendments from both sides of the aisle, increasing partisanship and polarization in appropriations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>c. Committee loses control over the process</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Elimination of proxy voting on the House floor in the Committee of the Whole</strong></td>
<td>→ Increase in transparency and accountability on votes, also helped concentrate power in leadership over Committee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>a. Leadership can more easily twist arms on partisan amendments if a Member is physically present to vote</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Make earmark requests public</strong></td>
<td>→ Attempts to create transparency but keep the process as is</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Ban earmarks outright</strong></td>
<td>→ Removes grease that kept the process moving</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>a. No more bargaining chips to entice Members to support appropriations measures</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Post-Republican Revolution Rules Changes

The House Rules implemented under Speaker Gingrich (R-GA) in 1995 did not directly deal with earmarks, but made obvious changes to the appropriations process that trickled down to earmarking procedures and institutional attitudes. Though there is no stated reason why the Republicans under Speaker Gingrich did not attempt a ban on earmarks, it is possible that public sentiment was not yet aware of them or against them, and that the Speaker may have needed them to institute to wrangle members to support his other priorities. Regardless, Republicans under Speaker Gingrich after the Revolution of 1994 instituted numerous House Rule changes that had a trickle-down effect on earmarks and the appropriations process overall.

First, House Rules after the Republican Revolution limited the number of terms any member could serve as the chair of a committee to six years. In limiting the number of terms for committee chairmen, House leadership ensured that any individual member would not wield large amounts of power for long periods of time, concentrating power within party leadership. As committee chairmen could no longer hold such power, the center of power of the earmarking process was shifted from the committee to party leadership, forcing members to become more and more beholden to the wishes of the party apparatus in order to receive earmarks for their district. Next, House leadership under Speaker Gingrich allowed for an open rule process to amend appropriations
measures, which greatly affected the earmarking process by opening up participation in
the decisions of who would receive earmarks to the entirety of the chamber. Rather than
the Appropriations Committee Chairman or other Committee Members deciding earmark
recipients in Subcommittee and Full Committee markups, the entire House chamber
could now partake, leaving logrolling power up to party leadership. Not only did this
limit the power of the Appropriations Committee over the appropriations process, it
further injected partisanship and polarization into the process by allowing any member,
from the most liberal to the most conservative, to propose amendments, forcing partisan
votes on the record about funding. Finally, an additional House Rule change eliminated
the ability for Members to vote by proxy on the floor in the Committee of the Whole,
forcing increased transparency and accountability on appropriations votes. With an
increasingly limited role of the Appropriations Chairman, the increase in appropriations
amendments, and increased voting transparency and accountability, the process of
earmarking was indirectly affected by the institutional changes put forth by the
Republicans after the Republican Revolution, though the increase in partisanship and
polarization in the appropriations process was much more direct.

The Republican Revolution also ushered in a series of party conference rule
reforms by the Republican Party in that House that had certain trickle-down effects on the
earmarking process, including the discontinued reliance on seniority for committee slots,
selection of subcommittee leadership by leadership, and limiting the number of
subcommittees a member could chair. First, the discontinued reliance on seniority for
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committee leadership positions injected partisanship directly onto the Appropriations Committee and into the earmarking process by making appropriations leaders beholden to party leadership and ideology for their position on the Committee. As such, the Committee Chairman could no longer usher appropriations measures and earmarks through the floor with an iron fist; instead, the Chairman was forced to follow the lead of the party apparatus in order to maintain his chairmanship. Therefore, earmarks were no longer in the hands of the Appropriations Committee, and were instead solely tools of the party leadership, used for partisan reasons rather than ensuring a bipartisan appropriations measure. As with altering the practice of deferring to seniority in selecting committee chairmen, Republican leadership under Speaker Gingrich assumed the power of subcommittee chairmanship appointments rather than deferring to committee chairs. In doing so, Republican leadership further entrenched partisanship and polarization into the process of earmarking by putting a high premium on party loyalty, placing it above appropriating in a bipartisan manner. Appropriations Subcommittee Chairmen now faced removal from their post if their bill did not align with party spending priorities or funding level benchmarks, leaving earmarks up to party leadership’s partisan needs and goals. Additionally, making Subcommittee Chairmen beholden to leadership rather than stewards of their appropriations measures created a greater culture of emphasis on party line and ideology rather than subject knowledge, changing the culture of the appropriations process from the ground up. Members becoming less focused on their appropriations jurisdiction and more on their party’s ideology also decreased federal
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oversight of the appropriations process, as party ideology trumped proper appropriations stewardship. Finally, the move by party leadership to limit the number of subcommittees a member could chair further injected partisanship and polarization into the earmarking process by allowing newer, more hyper-partisan members into committee leadership quicker. Rather than serving policy-oriented apprenticeships before ascending to positions to leadership, Republicans instead earned their leadership positions on committees by following the party line, meaning that many of these members were incentivized to eschew bipartisanship so as to further their careers. Altogether, the new House Rules implemented by the Republicans in the House after the Republican Revolution represented a massive shift in partisanship and polarization, with trickle-down effects on the earmarking process, effectively planting the seed that would doom earmarks.

**Democrats’ Attempts at Rules Changes**

Attempts to reign in earmarks and increase transparency of the earmarking process were undertaken in the Congresses of the mid-to-late 2000’s as a part of specific House Rule changes which exemplified the growing partisan divide and polarized ideological gap between parties. These Rules, instituted by House Democrats after they regained the majority in the House after the 2006 elections, represent the only institutional attempt to reform earmarks prior to their eventual ban. First, the 2007 House Rules specified that the House could not consider any bills unless a list of earmarks and

---

their sponsors were made publicly available. House leadership presumed that by making earmark requests public, members would lose any incentive to request projects like the infamous “Bridge to Nowhere.” However, the sheer number of earmark requests coupled with the changing political tides ultimately forced Democratic leadership to scrap the Rule so as to actually pass appropriations measures on time. By the next Congress, even then-Speaker Pelosi (D-CA) railed against wasteful “special interest earmarks” signifying a massive shift in Congressional ideology against earmarks.

Nevertheless, Democrats used House Rules in 2009 to push for further transparency of the earmark process through the creation of a centralized database for the submission and publication of earmarks. As with previous reform, members had to attach their name to an earmark in a highly public manner, which attempted to once again curb outlandish earmark requests. Furthermore, these Rule changes also attempted to curb floor amendments containing earmarks and instead restore earmarks to the committee’s jurisdiction. In attempting these reforms, even Democrats who opposed earmarks sought to curb highly partisan, divisive floor amendments. However, these attempts at reform were essentially moot as Republicans took the majority in the House after the 2010 elections. That being said, the fact that attempts at increased transparency in the earmarking process and attempts to curb the more unseemly and obviously partisan attempts at earmark requests points to an increase in partisanship, a decrease in
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bipartisanship, and the widening ideological gap between the parties in the form of polarization.

**Post-Tea Party Wave of 2010 Rules Changes**

Finally, the House Rule changes implemented after the Tea Party Wave of 2010 and under the Speakership of John Boehner (R-OH) represent the most major institutional shift on earmarks – an outright, explicit ban.\(^{69}\) Compared to the Republican Revolution that did not dare a direct attempt at changing the earmark process just sixteen years prior, the new Tea Party Congress signified unparalleled levels of partisanship and polarization when it came to earmarks. The fact that even the highly partisan reforms under Speaker Gingrich in 1995 would not touch earmarks as a part of the so-called “Contract with America” speaks to the even more partisan and polarized nature of the Tea Party Wave. By banning earmarks, the Republicans under Speaker Boehner attempted to fulfill campaign promises of reigning in “wasteful spending” and banning earmarks as they were a “symbol of a dysfunctional Congress.”\(^{70}\) The ban on earmarks was overt, as no measure containing “limited tax benefits, limited tariff benefits, or congressional earmarks” could be brought to the floor without a statement in the Congressional Record indicating such,\(^{71}\) making earmarks not only verboten, but explicitly and expressly unwelcome in the new Republican-led House after the Tea Party Wave of 2010. Banning earmarks via House Rule change was a political, partisan move for the new House majority, and showed a level of hyper-partisanship and polarization far above that seen in
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the wake of the 1994 Republican Revolution. Even Newt Gingrich’s Republican Revolution and its membership did not go so far as to remove the grease that sustained the appropriations machinery, while the Tea Party Wave of 2010 quickly decimated the process due to an inherent ideological belief system that earmarks were, by nature, corrupt, when their supposed corruption was a quid-pro-quo mechanism that allowed the appropriations process to work under regular order.2

Throughout these House and party caucus changes as a part of overall institutional attitudes, a clear trend in increasing partisanship and ideological divide between the parties is clear. Starting with Speaker Gingrich’s early House Rule changes immediately following the Republican Revolution, including limiting terms for Committee Chairs and an open-rule amendment process for appropriations measures, resulted in gradual, trickled-down effects on the appropriations process and earmarking in particular. The party caucus rule changes put in place by the Speaker reflected the increase in partisanship caused by the Republican Revolution, partisanship reinforced by caucus rules requiring signed loyalty to the party line in order to attain a position in committee leadership, along with doing away with the reliance on seniority for committee leadership slots. The fact that fealty was required in order to attain committee leadership positions had clearly partisan implications that, when relied upon year after year, account for the hyper-partisan nature of Congress today. Additionally, the fact that Speaker Gingrich did not even attempt to directly reform earmarks during his time as Speaker speaks to the change in partisanship and ideology within the Republican Party over time, as just sixteen
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years later, Republicans under Speaker Boehner did away with earmarks entirely. The contrast between the two parties’ ideologies was clear through their implementation of House Rules affecting earmarks as well, as Democrats tried to reform earmarks, attempting to make the process more transparent in order to reduce waste, while Republicans after the Tea Party Wave simply outright banned them. Through the institutional House Rule and party caucus rule changes, the increasingly polarized and partisan attitudes towards earmarking is clear, as well as the striking changes within the Republican Party in the House in the span of just sixteen years.

**CHANGING POLITICAL ATTITUDES TOWARDS EARMARKING**

In order to further study the changing nature of political communications regarding earmarking on a micro level, this study will focus on a comparison between the franked materials\(^\text{73}\) dealing with earmarks of Representative Hal Rogers (R-KY), the current chairman of the Appropriations Committee, and Representative Nita Lowey (D-NY), the current Ranking Member. Both of these members served on the Appropriations Committee during and after the Republican Revolution, providing continuity within the comparison. Furthermore, both members hail from politically safe districts, with Rep. Lowey’s district voting 72% for President Obama in 2008\(^\text{74}\), while Rep. Rogers’ district voted in favor of Senator McCain with 67% of the vote\(^\text{75}\). Both Members also come from similar career backgrounds, with Rep. Rogers serving as a state’s attorney prior to his
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election to Congress\textsuperscript{76}, and Rep. Lowey serving as an Assistant Secretary of State\textsuperscript{77}. The similar backgrounds and similarly safe districts of these Representatives allows for an easier comparison of the files they send to their constituents. Of course, what is different between the two Representatives is their political party affiliation, which plays a large role in the changing nature of their political communications from the 1994 Republican Revolution through the Tea Party Wave of 2010. The chart below serves as a quick reference for the franking tendencies of both Members across time and throughout institutional changes to the appropriations process and earmarking in particular.

\textit{Earmark-Related Franking Across the Aisle, 1995-2011}

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Rep. Rogers (R-KY)</th>
<th>Rep. Lowey (D-NY)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1995</td>
<td>-50% of total franking earmark-related</td>
<td>-Exact same as franking files of Rep. Rogers (50%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>a. 100% of earmark-related franking was \textit{positive}, announcing earmarks secured for the district</td>
<td>a. 100% positive outlook for federal spending priorities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>b. Included strong language \textit{in favor of government spending} on projects</td>
<td>b. 100% staunchly pro-earmark</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2001</td>
<td>-Became Subcommittee Chair on Appropriations Committee</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>→ 75% of total franking was earmark-related</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>a. 100% of earmark-related franking was \textit{negative}</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>i. Decried “wasteful spending,” “pet projects”</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\textsuperscript{76} Historian for the United States House of Representatives. "Rogers, Harold Dallas (Hal).” http://history.house.gov/People/Detail/20573?ret=True.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Event</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2003</td>
<td>-Became Subcommittee Chair on Appropriations Committee</td>
<td>→80% of total franking was earmark-related</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>a. 100% of earmark-related franking was positive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>i. Announced earmarks secured for NY district</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>b. Positive messaging about spending priorities related to appropriations jurisdiction (foreign aid)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011</td>
<td>-Became Appropriations Committee Chair</td>
<td>→ 100% of total franking was earmark-related</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>a. 100% <em>negative</em> messaging against earmarks</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>i. “pork barrel spending” a “waste of taxpayer dollars”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>b. Used franking to rail against President Obama’s spending agenda, an increase in partisanship</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2013</td>
<td>-Became Appropriations Ranking Member</td>
<td>→ 0% of total franking was earmark-related</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>a. 100% of franking files were partisan shots at Republican funding priorities</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Post-Republican Revolution Franking**

At the outset of the Republican Revolution, both Rep. Rogers and Rep. Lowey had fairly equivalent political communications and attitudes regarding earmarking –
positive messages sent out to constituents regarding earmarks secured, with no mention of the opposing party, the President, or ideological beliefs. Beginning in 1995, both Lowey and Rogers maintained the same level of positive earmark-related franked materials relative to their overall number of franking files at roughly 50% for each member. Immediately following the 1994 Republican Revolution, both Members used their franking privilege relatively equally in favor of the earmarks won for their district without overt partisan tones, but rather instead, a local focus on what those earmarks could do for their relative districts. Both members used their franking privilege to announce earmarks secured for their district, all of which was wholly positive coverage of the funds secured. In addition, both members also used their franking privilege to announce support for larger federally funded programs like highways, research, and job training programs. For both members, earmark-related franked materials accounted for roughly half of their overall franked files, which is not dissimilar from other members of the Appropriations Committee, but is uncommon among the chamber as a whole, though it is entirely possible that this was due to their ability to secure more earmarks as appropriators. At the outset of the Republican Revolution, despite the House and party rule changes put in place, partisanship within franked materials regarding earmarking was nil, as the franking files of both Rep. Rogers and Rep. Lowey focused equally on their ability to secure earmarks for their district, a wholly positive message on earmarks sent to their constituents.

Franking as Appropriations Leaders
In the early 2000’s, the bipartisan nature of Rep. Rogers’ franked files began to change as he ascended to Appropriations Committee leadership as the first Chairman of the Subcommittee on Homeland Security. Upon assuming the Chairmanship in 2003, Rep. Rogers’ franking files took a turn for the clearly partisan and staunchly against earmarks. It is important to note that under the aforementioned party caucus rule changes, Rogers had to swear his loyalty to the Speaker in order to maintain his Chairmanship on the Subcommittee, pushing clear partisan motives into play. Though only eight years prior Rogers had lauded his own ability to secure earmarks, upon ascending to the Subcommittee Chairmanship, his franked files turned partisan and negative, with the entirety of his earmark-related franked materials reflecting negative views regarding earmarks, and subtly hinting that Democrats were to blame for the “wasteful spending crisis Congress [was] now in.” Earmark-related franking files also increased relative to his overall number of franked files, from roughly half to exactly three-quarters, all of which were negative attacks on earmarks and thinly veiled shots at Democrats. Rather than announcing the earmarks secured for his district, Rep. Rogers instead decried the “out-of-control Washington spending” and “wasteful pet projects” that he promised to root out as the new Subcommittee Chairman. Rogers also began to target typically Democratic spending priorities like public transportation, welfare programs such as food stamps, and public education as the source of such “wasteful spending” but did not go as far as to label such priorities as Democratic. However, the thinly veiled partisanship within said franking files, along with the overall negative turn against earmarks is a swift and drastic change from just eight years prior, indicating the shift of the Republican
Party’s beliefs to the right, as well as the overall increasingly partisan nature of earmarks and the appropriations process as a whole.

On the other hand, Rep. Lowey used the franking privilege to tout her ability to secure earmarks without any (even thinly veiled) attacks on the Republican Party or its spending priorities, especially as she ascended to leadership positions both within the Democratic Party in the House and on the Appropriations Committee. This is in direct contrast to the franking tactics used by Rep. Rogers, which advocated against earmarks and took on a partisan tone. Rep. Lowey’s continued support of earmarks through her franked materials coincided specifically with her rise to head the Democratic Congressional Campaign Committee in 2001 and to the Ranking Membership on the Appropriations Subcommittee on Foreign Operations. Unlike Rep. Rogers, whose franked materials turned against earmarking, Rep. Lowey ramped up her support of earmarks upon her ascent. Rep. Lowey’s franked materials regarding earmarking announcements increased from roughly half, to nearly 80% in 2001, which is similar to Rep. Rogers’ increase up to 75% earmark-related franked materials. However, much unlike Rep. Rogers, Rep. Lowey’s franking files in 2001 not only announced her own earmarks, secured for her highly Democratic New York district, but also announced her support for larger funding projects that would not immediately or directly affect her district, but fall within her jurisdiction as Ranking Member. For example, Rep. Lowey announced additional funding for international aid programs that she advocated for using her position as Ranking Member. Unlike Rep. Rogers, Rep. Lowey’s ascendancy to party and Committee leadership was not accompanied by increasingly partisan or anti-
earmarking franking files, but instead increased her earmark-related franking and continued to use the franking privilege to support earmarks in a positive light.

The widening gap in party ideology was evidenced by divergent messages in franking and constituent communications regarding earmarks as both Rep. Rogers and Rep. Lowey ascended to leadership positions and reflects larger overall trends in increasing partisanship and polarization in Congress. In eschewing positive communications regarding earmarks and instead embracing the party-line message of lower government spending and rooting out waste in “excessive, pork barrel earmarks,” Rep. Rogers chose to stick with the rightward trend in the polarization of the Republican Party so as to attain and maintain a leadership position. As a Subcommittee Chairman, Rep. Rogers would have been forced to sign a statement of loyalty to party leadership, a holdover from the caucus rules implemented by Speaker Gingrich. As such, Rep. Rogers would have sworn fealty to the party-line spending numbers and ideology regarding federal spending, his status as a Subcommittee Chairman tied to his loyalty to the party rather than his ability to shepherd appropriations measures through Congress. Comparatively, Rep. Lowey’s ascension to leadership also brought an increase in earmark-related franking, though all of it was positive. Unlike Rep. Rogers, Rep. Lowey’s increasing responsibility both within her party apparatus and on the Appropriations Committee came with increasingly vocal support for earmarks, both within her district and in terms of overall federal spending. Though Rep. Lowey did not have to sign a pledge of loyalty to party-line spending or messaging ideology, her increasingly vocal support of earmarks coinciding with her increasing responsibilities.
within her party and her Committee assignment serves as a direct contrast to that of Rep. Rogers, and especially speaks to the widening ideological gap between the parties. With the overtly negative and partisan spin of Rep. Rogers’ communications, coupled with the fact that just eight years prior, he had supported earmarks on an equal level to Rep. Lowey, the divide between the parties alongside the increasingly rightward shift of the Republican Party was illuminated through the franking files of both members as they ascended to leadership positions.

**Post-Tea Party Wave Franking**

Once the first Tea Party Congress was sworn in in 2011, Rep. Rogers took the Chairman’s gavel for the full Appropriations Committee, overseeing the Committee without earmarks at its disposal, but still engaging in a communications strategy that decried them as a “waste and abuse of taxpayer dollars.” Upon his ascension to the Chairmanship, Rep. Rogers’ franking files clearly reflected the changing ideological nature of Congress after the influx of Tea Party members – a clearly partisan, ideologically conservative messaging strategy that, for the first time, was directly advocating against the priorities of his Democratic counterparts, especially those of President Obama. Considering that just fifteen years prior, under President Clinton, none of Rep. Rogers’ franking files contained overtly partisan tones against the spending priorities of President Clinton, and were instead completely in support of the earmarks he was able to secure for his district, the changes in Rep. Rogers’ constituent messaging show not only an ideological shift in his views on earmarks, by a hyper-partisan shift in his party’s willingness to directly attack the President. Though Rep. Rogers has used the
franking privilege less since becoming Chairman, now a full 100% of his materials consist of anti-earmark, anti-spending rhetoric, a clear ideological shift rightward and drastic change from his messaging just fifteen years prior. In railing against earmarks, Rep. Rogers has decried them as “pork-barrel wastes of taxpayer dollars” and has promised to use his position as Chairman to “ensure that earmarks never return.” In addition, not only has Rep. Rogers written to his constituents about his anti-earmark views, he also has begun to use the franking privilege to explicitly attack the President’s budget, calling it “fiscally irresponsible” and “the wrong path for our nation.” Using his post as Committee Chairman, Rep. Rogers has promised to fight the “left-wing, out-of-touch, and mathematically impossible budget and spending priorities” of the President. The new influx of Tea Party membership along with his new role as Committee Chairman clearly had a drastic effect on Rep. Rogers’ political attitudes and messaging to his constituents, reflecting a much more partisan and ideologically polarized tone, completely opposite from his messaging immediately after the Republican Revolution in 1994.

Once the Republicans retook the majority in the House after the 2010 Tea Party Wave, Rep. Lowey’s franking regarding earmarks flat-lined in line with the earmark ban put forth by the new Republican leadership in accordance with her rise to become the Ranking Member of the Appropriations Committee in 2013. However, reigning in government spending, a topic previously unexplored by Rep. Lowey in her franked materials, took its place as Rep. Lowey’s predominant message in her communications with constituents using the franking privilege in addition to an increase in partisan
rhetoric in attacking typically Republican spending priorities. Since the 2010 Tea Party and its influx of highly conservative members, Rep. Lowey has increasingly, and almost exclusively, used the franking privilege to decry “wasteful government spending.” But in decrying that sort of government spending, Lowey’s franked materials turned partisan, focusing on typically Republican funding priorities, such as defense, private schools, and agriculture as being “wasteful” forms of government spending. Though a veiled shot at Republican spending priorities, the change in tone and focus of Rep. Lowey’s franked materials after the Tea Party Wave represents a departure from her previously wholly pro-earmark franking files, but more importantly, it indicates the increasingly partisan rhetoric, now from both parties, as well as the ideological divide stymieing the appropriations process.

Since the 2010 Tea Party Wave, both Rep. Rogers’ and Rep. Lowey’s franking files demonstrate the increase in partisanship and polarization that has plagued the appropriations process, especially after the GOP-led ban on earmarks. As compared to their equally pro-earmark franking files immediately after the 1994 Republican Revolution, the divergence in ideology and increase in partisan tone reflects the nature of Congress after the Tea Party Wave, quite a difference in just fifteen years. In addition, the increasingly and overtly partisan nature of Rep. Rogers’ franked materials since the Tea Party Wave as compared to his bipartisan, pro-earmark franking files after the Republican Revolution is reflective of the hyper-partisan, asymmetrically polarized nature of the Republican Party in the House after the Tea Party Wave. While Rep. Rogers goes so far as to directly attack the President’s spending priorities in his franked
materials, Rep. Lowey’s attacks at Republican spending priorities are much more indirect, though the growing ideological divide between parties is incredibly clear. While both Rep. Rogers and Rep. Lowey once franked equally bipartisan, pro-earmark messages to their constituents, increasing responsibility in the Committee and required loyalty to their respective parties is reflected in their franked materials, especially after the Tea Party Wave of 2010, as the influx of hyper-partisan, strictly Conservative Republican members can clearly be seen in the partisan nature of the members’ franked materials.

ANALYSIS AND CONCLUSION

Though clear patterns of increased partisanship and polarization in the appropriations process have emerged, especially since the ban on earmarks in 2011, the question of what the change in both institutional earmark policy and constituent earmark messaging will have on the appropriations process and on Congress as an institution remains. However, the current situation of the earmark ban and hyper-partisanship and asymmetrical polarization can have multiple consequences, a few of which are explored below.

First, the ban on earmarks after the Tea Party Wave, a casualty of the increased partisanship in Congress ushered in by the Class of 2010, cedes Constitutional Congressional power to the executive branch. Article I, section 9, clause 7 of the Constitution gives Congress the power to appropriate funds, but without earmarks, Congress is appropriating funds to the executive branch and letting those agencies decide what to do with the money. While the expertise of each executive agency in deciding how
its funds are used is not necessarily a negative, this also raises questions about future planning for agencies, as many of these funds must be used the same fiscal year instead of saving them for future plans. In addition, in a time of divided government and hyper-partisanship, a Republican-led House ceding power to an executive branch led by a Democratic President is a recipe for only increasing the partisan rhetoric between not only the parties, but the branches of government as well. It is also somewhat ironic that the increasingly conservative Republican Party in the House, which believes in a limited role of the federal government and increased states rights, has ceded power to the executive branch and then threatened to sue the executive branch for overstepping its “Constitutional authority." All in all, the ban on earmarks by House Republicans has directly ceded power to the executive branch, a change in the power dynamics between the branches of government as well as serving to only increase partisan tensions both within Congress and within branches of divided government.

Next, the increasingly negative and partisan messaging on earmarks threatens future bipartisan efforts in a sort of “chicken and egg” scenario, either reinforcing already partisan beliefs held by constituents or introducing these beliefs. It is impossible to say whether the views of voters in Rep. Rogers’ or Rep. Lowey’s districts changed before, with, or after those of the Representatives, but the overtly partisan and negative messaging on earmarks and government spending as a whole only serves to reinforce those beliefs. Not only do these messages reinforce partisan beliefs held by voters, they also threaten future attempts at bipartisan appropriations measures. As appropriations

leaders like Rep. Rogers and Rep. Lowey set the example with their messaging on earmarking and government spending, so too do they set the tone for future for appropriations negotiations. These franking files, coupled with other speeches, press releases, etc. put the members on record against their opponents in a highly public manner, making future negotiations difficult not only due to the hyper-partisan nature of these attacks, but also for the sheer fact that in politics, being labeled as a flip-flopper on an issue, no matter what it is, can be hurtful for one’s electoral career. The increasingly partisan nature of earmark messaging, as evidenced by two appropriations leaders, only exacerbates the problem of a partisan electorate and also serves to limit future possibilities for bipartisan compromise, as members are effectively locked into their respective corners by on-the-record, partisan statements against the other party.

The changes in earmark policy on an institutional level, especially after the outright ban in 2011, have removed a powerful logrolling tool for a hopelessly gridlocked Congress. As evidenced by the 2013 government shutdown, the appropriations process is highly partisan, and the diverging ideological beliefs surrounding federal funding make it that much more difficult to pass appropriations measures on time, especially within a politically divided bicameral legislature. Without earmarks, once used to trade vote-for-vote on measures, Congress, and the House in particular, has essentially lost some of the grease to its appropriating wheels. Additionally, the House Rule change instituted by Speaker Gingrich to allow an open amendment process to appropriations measures has undoubtedly democratized the process, but it has also allowed for highly partisan,

damaging amendments that not only slow the process down, but serve to poison it for more moderate members or appropriators. For example, a so-called “poison pill” amendment offered by Rep. Steve King (R-IA) to prohibit funds from being used by the Department of Homeland Security to allow children brought into the U.S. illegally to remain under executive order led the Democratic Ranking Member, Rep. David Price (D-NC), who supported the bill without the amendment, to vote against it. Not only do these sorts of amendments inject partisan messages into the appropriations process, the open amendment rule slows down the amendment process, making it harder to enact all twelve bills by the end of the current fiscal year. While the lack of earmarks has not been the only reason for the demise of regular order within the appropriations process, the outright earmark ban, coupled with the open rule amendment process has certainly hindered any sort of regular appropriations order within the House, especially after the Tea Party Wave of 2010.

Finally, the changing political attitudes and institutional rule changes enacted in the wake of the Tea Party Wave represent a major shift from those enacted by Speaker Gingrich after the 1994 Republican Revolution, indicating a major shift in the Republican Party in just fifteen years. While the Democratic Party in the House has also become much more partisan, as evidenced by the tone of Rep. Lowey’s franked materials, the Republican Party has been much more overt. The highly partisan, asymmetrically polarized nature of Congress, and the House in particular is worrisome, especially after the government shutdown of 2013. With the ban on earmarks and anti-earmark, anti-earmark ban, coupled with the open rule amendment process has certainly hindered any sort of regular appropriations order within the House, especially after the Tea Party Wave of 2010.

Finally, the changing political attitudes and institutional rule changes enacted in the wake of the Tea Party Wave represent a major shift from those enacted by Speaker Gingrich after the 1994 Republican Revolution, indicating a major shift in the Republican Party in just fifteen years. While the Democratic Party in the House has also become much more partisan, as evidenced by the tone of Rep. Lowey’s franked materials, the Republican Party has been much more overt. The highly partisan, asymmetrically polarized nature of Congress, and the House in particular is worrisome, especially after the government shutdown of 2013. With the ban on earmarks and anti-earmark, anti-earmark ban, coupled with the open rule amendment process has certainly hindered any sort of regular appropriations order within the House, especially after the Tea Party Wave of 2010.
government spending rhetoric, Congress has ceded power to the executive branch, has reinforced the beliefs of partisan voters, and has lost a key logrolling tool to pass even basic measures. The increasingly negative messaging on earmarks and spending also reinforces the increasing ideological distance between the partisans and has resulted in a dearth of bipartisan efforts. However, after the government shutdown of 2013 and the House’s attempted return to regular order in 2014, it is yet to be seen if these increasingly negative trends in institutional and attitudinal beliefs towards earmarks will be changed.
Money, Power, and Politics: Reconciling Political Campaign Identities

with Congressional Power as Appropriators from the Republican

Revolution the Tea Party Wave
INTRODUCTION

The Tea Party Wave of 2010 and the Republican Revolution of 1994 created dramatic shifts in American politics, particularly the increasingly rightward shift of the American political dynamic. The Tea Party Wave of 2010, characterized by a galvanized movement after the passage of the Affordable Care Act, or Obamacare, continued an anti-federal government messaging started under the Republican Revolution of 1994. Both waves ran their campaigns on anti-federal government, anti-spending, anti-“Washington corruption” messaging, but the Tea Party Wave took this one further, running on anti-corporation messaging. These campaigns won the Republican Party newfound majorities in the House of Representatives after years of Democratic rule, particularly in the case of the Republican Revolution. However, these new waves of Members of Congress still had to govern, or join others in governing, despite their anti-government messaging that got them into office in the first place. Faced with a choice between governing and appealing to their base of voters, both the Republican Revolution and Tea Party Wave Members forced lengthy government shutdowns early into their tenure. As such, the normal appropriations process took a hit. However, with increased membership turnover comes fast ascension to key committee assignments, including the Appropriations Committee, the committee tasked with funding the government and

overseeing government expenditures\textsuperscript{83}. The intersection of changing governance responsibilities for Members who ran on anti-governance and anti-government spending is confounded by increased campaign finance opportunities for Members upon ascending to posts on the House Appropriations Committee.

Often, Members who achieve coveted roles on the Appropriations Committee or other similar committees in the Congress begin to change their tone. Members who were once fervent anti-bank populists become top recipients of donations from the finance industry after they procure a slot on the Appropriations Committee\textsuperscript{84}. The question then arises whether Tea Party Members or Members of the Republican Revolution have shifted their staunch views upon their quick ascension to the Appropriations Committee, especially given their increased fundraising capabilities and whether these donations, coupled with their committee assignment, change the political views they ran on.

Changing campaign finance laws also confound this question, as the recent Supreme Court decision in \textit{Citizens United vs. FEC} has created a more open, unchecked, and less frequently-reported campaign finance system, wherein individuals and corporations can donate relatively freely. An examination of the intersection of political messaging and beliefs, increased power, and the influence of campaign donations on formerly staunch policy is merited. This study seeks to understand whether Members of the Republican Revolution of 1994 and the Tea Party Wave of 2010 have gone back on their original campaign messaging upon gaining a seat on the Appropriations Committee and the resulting increase in campaign donations. As such, this study will provide a comparison


\textsuperscript{84} Ibid.
of the change in messaging between select Members of the Republican Revolution and Tea Party Wave who earned seats on the Appropriations Committee. As such, this study will cross-compare political campaign messaging and donations for Members before their ascension to the Appropriations Committee as well as after their ascension. This study begins with a cursory overview of previous literature on the subject as well as a detailed overview of the theory and methodology undertaken. This study will cross-compare political campaign messaging and donations for four candidates and then as Members, two from the Republican Revolution and two from the Tea Party, before their ascension to the Appropriations Committee as well as after their ascension, and will seek to analyze and better understand the repercussions of the intersection between campaign finance, political messaging, and political power in the House of Representatives after 1994 and up until 2014.

REVIEW OF EXISTING LITERATURE

The topic of campaign finance and campaign donations affecting messaging and policy is a tricky one-especially for newly elected Members of Congress who ran their campaigns on anti-corporation messaging in 2010. The Tea Party Wave of 2010 provides an interesting case study in that many of its Members ran their campaigns against the idea of corporate involvement in government, and more “grassroots” involvement, but now accept untold millions in donations yearly from corporate donors, though this is not an uncommon trend among politicians. What is uncommon, however, is the way in which these Tea Party representatives have quickly attained prime committee positions on the Appropriations Committee, leading them to be major donation recipients from anyone
and everyone who wants to affect American government spending, including large corporations and contractors. What is unclear, however, is the role of these donations on political policymaking and messaging, especially given the platforms these Members ran their initial campaigns on: anti-corporate, anti-big government spending, anti-“Washington” messaging. The following literature review seeks to analyze any existing literature on the subjects of campaign donations and their effects on policy making as lawmakers attain powerful positions as well as the emergence of the Tea Party and the role of the Supreme Court’s decision in *Citizens United vs. FEC*.

Despite being about ten years old, the Harvard Law Review’s overview of the basic theoretical framework governing the influence of campaign donations on federal representatives in “The Ass Atop the Castle: Competing Strategies for Using Campaign Donations to Influence Lawmaking” is still relevant today. This overview is the most comprehensive for not only its historical background, but also its consideration of the different psychological reasons for political donations, delving deeper into why citizens donate to politicians and how this affects these representatives once they take office. As the Harvard Law Review notes, both of the theories that govern the psyche of campaign donations rest on the idea that political donors hope their donations will carry favor with the newly elected (or reelected) politician. These two theories provide comprehensive overviews of the timing of political donations, and what the timing of a donation reveals about its intentional use. For example, a donor who donates early in a campaign tends to be one who ideologically agrees with the candidate and hopes that the candidate will

---

continue to support the shared views once in office. On the other hand, later donors tend to donate to candidates to try to influence their beliefs once in office, making them more amenable to certain policy positions. An environmental group donating to a candidate at the last moment, for example, would seek to make that politician more amenable to pro-environmental policies once in office, even if that candidate did not support those positions prior, as they would feel as though they owed their victory to those donations pushing them over the top. However, the study lacks updated data for a world after the Supreme Court’s decision in *Citizens United*, providing an incomplete picture about the role of money and donations without limitations. Furthermore, the study is incomplete in that it does not cover the influence of political donations once a Member gains influence in Congress, i.e. being named to a powerful committee or gaining seniority. Despite these faults, the Harvard Law Review’s study is still the most comprehensive for its theoretical approach and provides the best starting point for future research on the influence of political donations on Members whose status changes.

Additional articles provide further backup on the theoretical approach taken by the Harvard Law Review, but also provide quantitative analysis of these theories, though they tend to be outdated. Authors Bronars and Lott ask pertinent questions backed with quantitative analysis in their study “Do Campaign Donations Alter How a Politician Votes? Or, Do Donors Support Candidates Who Value the Same Things That They Do?” Bronars and Lott use quantitative analyses of campaign finances of retiring Members who are no longer reliant on campaign contributions and how their voting patterns change.

---

records change. The study backs up the theories put forth by the Harvard Law Review, but at nearly twenty years old, it is extremely outdated, though still the most comprehensive to-date. Though there is further analysis available regarding the connection between campaign donations and political actions, none of the available studies address the role of the *Citizens United* decision or the landscape of Congress after the 2010 Tea Party Wave.

Separate analyses of the influence of the Tea Party and the *Citizens United* decision provide a comprehensive look into the role of campaign donations in electing Tea Party representatives to Congress as well as the separate role of money in political elections without legal restrictions, though none cover the role of campaign donations specifically on Tea Party Members’ policy positions or on the changing nature of Tea Party representation once Members have gained seniority and attained positions on key committees. However, having a background in both donations after *Citizens United* and the Tea Party movement is critical. As such, Sitaraman’s take in “Contracting Around *Citizens United*”

87 provides the best overview of the role of the Supreme Court’s decision in campaign finance and the way the legalization of almost all types of campaign donations affected electoral politics. Sitaraman argues succinctly that public pledges against this type of largesse in campaign financing are the most efficient way to mitigate the role of large donors.

---

In their book *Steep: The Precipitous Rise of the Tea Party*, Rosenthal and Trost provide insight into the rise and roots of the Tea Party movement prior to the 2010 electoral wave. Additionally, Rosenthal and Trost provide a concise examination of the role of the Tea Party in creating hyper-partisan tensions, especially in the House. The chapter, entitled “Grand Old Tea Party: Partisan Polarization and the Rise of the Tea Party Movement,” written by Alan Abramowitz, provides detailed information into the hyper-partisan, asymmetrically polarized nature of the Tea Party Wave of 2010. Abramowitz, as other scholars like Mann and Ornstein have noted, points out that the Tea Party Wave ushered in a congressional era in the House in which Members of the Republican Party are twice as conservative as Members of the Democratic Party are liberal. Abramowitz, and Rosenthal and Trost in editing the book, do not provide any insight into the role of money in politics in regards to Tea Party membership, however, which is ineffectual for the purposes of this analysis. However, the book and the chapter in particular do provide a concise overview into how these Tea Party Members changed the nature of the House and the political climate they ushered in.

Additionally, Tea Party sources help define the nature of their own movement. In *Change They Can’t Believe In: The Tea Party and Reactionary Politics in America*, Parker and Barreto lay out the Tea Party’s roots in the polarizing nature of President Obama’s legacy. Parker and Barreto argue that, rather than just being a reaction to the actions of President Obama, the Tea Party Wave is a part of a larger cycle of political

---


87
movements that come about in times of American change, a reaction to the fear that America has changed for the worse\textsuperscript{90}. However, this more cyclical approach leaves out the role of the Tea Party once in Congress as well as the role of money in Congressional power and political messaging and is thus incomplete in the context of this study.

Overall, none of the existing literature provides a comprehensive analysis of the intersection of Member power in committee assignment, campaign donations, policy outcomes, and the Tea Party Wave. Though understandable due to the recentness of the Tea Party Wave, this dearth in literature provides an opportunity for further analysis in order to better understand the role of campaign donations on Tea Party members and their changing political messaging since their election in 2010.

**CHAPTER METRICS AND APPROACH**

Theoretically speaking, the connection between increased and varying campaign donations and changing policy messages after winning a seat in Congress on staunch anti-government spending and anti-“Washington corruption” messaging is a telling sign of the influence of money in politics. If, for example, a congressman is against providing large agribusinesses with crop subsidies but then receives large donations from agribusinesses and begins to change his tune, the influence of money is clear\textsuperscript{91}. This study will seek to make direct connections between political messaging, particularly during the initial campaign for higher office, the change in campaign donations and the irony once these anti-government, anti-government spending Members changing their political tunes upon receiving thousands of dollars in political donations for their


\textsuperscript{91} Ibid.
reelection. The question remains whether the Members ushered in under the 1994 Republican Revolution were more heavily influenced by monetary donations from large corporations and advocacy groups, or whether the staunchly anti-government, anti-special interest Members of the 2010 Tea Party Wave made a greater about-face. The comparison between these two Republican waves offers insight into the effect of the Appropriations Committee on Members with staunch views. The Tea Party Members, recent additions to Congress with very ardent views, help display how quickly the power and influence of the Appropriations Committee takes hold. Republican Revolution Members, on the other hand, show the power of seniority on the Appropriations Committee and a more gradual shifting over time away from staunch positions held during the campaign.

In order to answer these questions, this study will focus specifically on four Members, two elected in the 1994 Revolution and two in the 2010 Tea Party Wave. Each of these four Members demonstrated and clearly identified with the associated movements of their electoral wave, and represent different geographical locations so as to provide diverse and varying comparisons across districts despite similar donation characteristics. Specifically, this study will compare both the messaging during these Members’ first campaigns for Congress during their respective electoral waves and after their ascension to the Appropriations Committee, and will include comparisons of their changing campaign donations during these time periods as well. For the Republican Revolution, this study will focus on two Members, Rep. Rodney Frelinghuysen (R-NJ) and Rep. Tom Latham (R-IA), who rode the Republican Revolution into Congress in
1994 and quickly ascended to the Appropriations Committee, but do not associate themselves with the Tea Party Movement. The Tea Party Members used in this study are the late-Rep. Alan Nunnelee (R-MS) and Rep. Jaime Herrera Beutler (R-WA), who represent geographically distinct areas, as well as districts of different demographic characteristics while also serving as example districts of Tea Party representation. It is important to note that these two Tea Party Members are Members of the House Tea Party Caucus and are not the most ardent Tea Party Members, as House Republican leadership would not necessarily appoint the most ardent supporters to a Committee of such power after pronounced and public disagreements. These Members were also chosen specifically as Reps. Frelinghuysen and Latham now hold positions of power on the Appropriations Committee, chairing the Subcommittees on Defense and Transportation, Housing, and Urban Development, a culmination of their many years on the Committee and the lingering influence of the 1994 Republican Revolution. Reps. Herrera Beutler and Nunnelee, on the other hand, do not yet serve and did not serve on positions of power within the Committee, and can serve as a base for better understanding the role of merely gaining a seat on the Appropriations Committee for messaging and campaign finance purposes.

The messaging aspect of this study is derived from news clippings and campaign reports provided by archived searches as well as more updated forms of communication such as Twitter and Facebook, where available. The campaign finance aspect is derived
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from both the Federal Election Commission, which is the reporting agency of campaign finance donations, as well as the non-partisan website OpenSecrets, which aggregates FEC data and makes it easily searchable and presentable. These cross-references and cross-comparisons allow for analysis regarding the difference between Members of the Tea Party Wave and the Republican Revolution and their respective turnarounds from formerly staunch campaign promises and positions.

It is important to note, however, that this study has three specific drawbacks: the changing campaign finance laws after the *Citizens United* decision, the differences in technology between 1994 and 2010 and their effects on messaging and campaign finance, and the change in House Rules regarding earmarks affecting the way groups receive federal money. First, the dearth of restrictions on individual and corporate campaign donations in the wake of the *Citizens United* decision makes tracking campaign donations that more difficult, and inhibits a direct comparison between 1994, prior to the decision, to present, after the decision. However, a broad comparison between the two elections allows for applicable conclusions to be drawn rather than focusing specifically on the dollars raised. Additionally, the comparison across money raised is made more difficult by the change in technology between 1994 and 2010 that allowed a greater amount of online fundraising to be done, especially for small donors. Again, however, this study will make broader comparisons based on money raised from different groups rather than total dollars raised so as to better contrast initial rhetoric with rhetoric as a result of campaign donations and increased Congressional status. Finally, the House Rule

---
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changes regarding earmarking in the wake of the 2010 Tea Party Wave resulted in a ban on earmarks and thus changing the way Congress appropriates funds. Up until 2010, Members could request and receive specifically targeted funds for projects within their district, whereas after the ban on earmarks, funds are appropriated more broadly to projects and departments. This may have an affect on campaign donations and the appropriations process, but does not affect the overall comparison between the two time periods as the overarching themes of the role of money in political messaging and campaigns as well as increasing status in Congress remain the same.

Altogether, this study will seek to cross-reference initial campaign messaging, including staunch anti-government spending, anti-government corruption, and anti-“Washington” messages during the campaign to the role of a seat on the Appropriations Committee and increasing power in Congress on top of campaign donations from interest groups. Despite a few drawbacks in the changing nature of House Rules regarding earmarks, the role of technology, and the changing laws regarding campaign finance, general comparisons across years related to campaign financing will still result in applicable analysis and conclusions and will not affect the basis of the study.

**THE REPUBLICAN REVOLUTION OF 1994**

This study will compare fundraising and political messaging of the Members of the Republican Revolution of 1994 so as to ascertain whether these Members who, after nearly two decades in Congress, have changed their once-staunchly anti-government spending and anti-“Washington” messaging\(^\text{96}\) due to their increased power in the House

in accordance with their seats on the Appropriations Committee and increased campaign donations from interest groups due to their Committee assignment.

Congressman Frelinghuysen

First, the election of Rep. Frelinghuysen in 1994 was aided by a rightward shift in the district after decades of Democratic rule, which Frelinghuysen clearly capitalized on in his campaign messaging as well as his campaign finances, which centered on both typically Republican messages of anti-government spending and a smaller federal government as well as donations from local, district interests rather than Political Action Committees and corporate donors. The following chart serves as a reference point to cross-compare Rep. Frelinghuysen’s statements and funding receipts as a candidate to those as a senior appropriator.

**Campaign Statements and Fundraising of Rep. Frelinghuysen vs. Appropriator Statements and Fundraising, 1994 vs. 2014**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statements</th>
<th>Donations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| **1994 (Candidate)** | - Advocated for limitations on defense spending  
- Signed the Contract for America  
  a. Budget control  
  b. Reign in congressional perks  
  c. End too big, intrusive government  
  d. Term limits for Members | - District-centric donations  
  a. Health insurance/pharmaceuticals: $60,000  
  b. Shipping industry: $13,000  
  c. Transport industry: $15,000  
  d. Securities and Exchange: $20,000 |
| **2014 (Senior Appropriator)** | - Chairman of the Defense Subcommittee in 11th term  
  a. Supported increases in defense spending  
  b. In favor of stimulus | - Defense-related funding  
  a. Defense industry: $350,000  
  b. Lobbyists: $90,000  
  c. Retirees: $60,000 |
Prior to his election to Congress, Rep. Frelinghuysen, who is, it should be noted, the heir to a long line of Frelinghysens in public service, maintained a robust conservative message of anti-government spending, anti-government corruption, and an overall smaller role of the federal government. As a candidate for federal office in 1994, Mr. Frelinghuysen signed the so-called “Contract with America,” which promised specific legislative policy priorities to be undertaken within the first one hundred days of the newly elected Republican majority. The first policy priority listed in the Contract was the “Fiscal Responsibility Act,” called for “a balanced budget/tax limitation amendment and a legislative line-item veto to restore fiscal responsibility to an out-of-control Congress, requiring them to live under the same budget constraints as families and businesses.” This first priority in cutting spending and limiting the benefits available to Members of Congress showed the importance of reigning in government spending as well as corruption by Congress and limiting special benefits to Members of Congress. Indeed, the first line of the Contract with America further reinforces this idea, saying that a new Republican Congress “would be the end of government that is too big, too intrusive, and too easy with the public’s money.” Additionally, the last policy priority listed in the Contract further seeks to limit the role of corruption and career politicians in the “Citizen Legislature Act” which promised a “first-ever vote on term limits to replace career politicians with citizen legislators.” In addition to the policy priorities embraced by the

Contract, Republicans signing the Contract also agreed to a host of changes to Congressional proceedings meant to root out corruption and make the body more transparent with a special focus on government spending, including “select[ing] a major, independent auditing firm to conduct a comprehensive audit of Congress for waste, fraud or abuse,” and “guarantee[ing] an honest accounting of our Federal Budget by implementing zero base-line budgeting.” Perhaps more importantly, the future Chairman of the Appropriations Subcommittee on Defense once advocated for limitations on defense spending, professing his belief that “this is the time to carefully assess both our domestic discretionary and our military commitments. In both areas, we face a potential fiscal imbalance between our program commitments and our available resources.” Each of these policy priorities within the Contract with America shows the policy priorities of Republican candidates like Mr. Frelinghuysen, specifically government spending, and Congressional corruption.

In seeking higher office in the House of Representatives, then-candidate Frelinghuysen accepted donations from a wide number of sources, but the majority of which were district-centric, meaning they came from interest groups within his future congressional district rather than outside interest groups seeking to influence him once in Congress. In terms of individual contributors, candidate Frelinghuysen’s top campaign contributor in 1994 was a shipping company, Maher Terminals, which donated $13,000, especially relevant to his district at the time, which was adjacent to New Jersey’s port system. Additionally, candidate Frelinghuysen received majority contributions from the
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sea transport industry and the securities and investment industry, donating $15,000 and $20,000 respectively, specifically related to the population of his district, which is located just an hour’s drive from the financial hub of New York City and connected by numerous ports and bridges. Candidate Frelinghuysen also received sizeable donations to the tune of $60,000 from health insurance and pharmaceutical companies which makes up roughly one quarter of the labor force in the district, with employers like Novartis and Saint Claire’s Hospital99. Overall, candidate Frelinghuysen’s campaign donations came from his district’s leading industries and concerns, including healthcare and pharmaceutical employers, port and sea transport industry, and securities and investment firms in his centrally located New Jersey district.

In gaining a seat on the Appropriations Committee, Rep. Frelinghuysen’s campaign donations were clearly affected by his position of power as the Chair of the Appropriations Subcommittee on Defense, changing his cash flow from district-driven to issue-driven with an emphasis on campaign contributions from defense contracting firms and subcontracting firms. Compared to his campaign in 1994, where his campaign contributions came from local employers like the healthcare and port industry, Rep. Frelinghuysen’s 2014 campaign contributions come largely and predominantly from large Department of Defense contractors like Boeing and Lockheed Martin, who donated $35,000 and $84,000 respectively. Indeed, of the top five industries to contribute to Rep. Frelinghuysen in his 2014 campaign, three were specifically related to the defense industry, contributing a total of $350,000, and the other two were retirees and lobbyists,

contributing $150,000\textsuperscript{100}. These industries also contribute considerably more to Rep. Frelinghuysen than his 1994 contributors, between five and seven times more, perhaps as a result of his Chairmanship. However, this could also be a product of the lack of campaign finance regulations and increased caps for donations. Overall, however compared to his 1994 fundraising, Rep. Frelinghuysen’s move to the Appropriations Committee has clearly resulted in a more issue-driven campaign financing rather than being district-driven like his initial campaign for Congress.

Congressman Frelinghuysen seems to undergo a complete reversal on many of his once-staunch policy positions and political messages by 2014, particularly when it comes to defense and defense spending, especially relevant as Rep. Frelinghuysen chairs the Appropriations Subcommittee on Defense\textsuperscript{101}. Of course, the most obvious change in messaging is the fact that Rep. Frelinghuysen signed onto the Contract for America and thus agreed to its constraints on term limits for politicians. That being said, Rep. Frelinghuysen is about to enter his eleventh term in Congress, his twenty-first year serving. Perhaps more importantly, however, Rep. Frelinghuysen’s prior focus on cutting defense spending coupled with his perch atop the Appropriations Subcommittee on Defense, which appropriates non-mandatory defense spending and some mandatory spending is antithetical to his prior messaging. Instead, it is a direct result of his perch on the Appropriations Committee and the vast donations by the defense industry to his campaign. Though defense spending has been relatively limited due to the effects of sequestration, its budget has increased by roughly six billion dollars under the
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Chairmanship of Rep. Frelinghuysen over the single fiscal year he has held the helm. Additionally, Rep. Frelinghuysen supported numerous spending increases passed by the House, including $192 billion in anti-recession stimulus spending, a $15 billion bailout for General Motors, increased Amtrak funding, and an additional $48 billion in new spending for anti-terrorism efforts, all of which are antithetical to his previous anti-spending promises within the Contract for America. It is important to note that Rep. Frelinghuysen’s New Jersey district does not contain any military installations that would account for his direct advocacy as a result of these contributions. It is clear, then that the influence of defense industry donations on the overall Department of Defense budget under Rep. Frelinghuysen has caused his about-face on reining in defense spending, instead, the campaign donations by the defense industry has increased Defense spending under his watch in addition to numerous votes to increase overall spending.

*Congressman Latham:*

Then-candidate Latham, just like candidate Frelinghuysen, focused specifically on issues relating to his district when honing his campaign message, while touching on nationwide themes of the Republican Revolution such as anti-government spending, pro-term limits, and pro-limitations on the size and scope of the federal government. The following chart serves as a reference point to cross-compare Rep. Latham’s statements and funding receipts as a candidate to those as a senior appropriator.

---
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### Campaign Statements and Fundraising of Rep. Latham vs. Appropriator
#### Statements and Fundraising, 1994 vs. 2014

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statements</th>
<th>Donations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| **1994 (Candidate)** | - Signed the Contract for America  
  a. Advocated for a reduction in the size of government  
  b. Cut welfare benefits  
  c. Lower taxes and penalties  
  d. No congressional perks  | - District-centric donations  
  a. Crop insurance and tobacco: $40,000  
  b. Agriculture: $37,000  
  c. Food processing: $22,500  |
| **2014 (Senior Appropriator)** | - Chairman of the Transportation Subcommittee  
  a. Increase budgetary limits  
  b. Pro stimulus spending  
  c. Raise pay for Senators  
  d. No limits on soft money campaign contributions  | - Transportation-related funding  
  a. Air transport: $39,000  
  b. Transportation: $34,000  
  c. Railroad industry: $30,000  
  d. Lobbyists: $25,000  |

Just like Mr. Frelinghuysen, Mr. Latham signed the Contract with America, promising to cut federal government spending and limit the terms of federal politicians. As a part of this push for a smaller role of the federal government, Mr. Latham also advocated for a reduction in welfare benefits, limiting these benefits to two years. Additionally, candidate Latham focused on lowering taxes, including the marriage
penalty and especially middle class taxes\textsuperscript{103}. Overall, candidate Latham’s focus on reducing the role, size, and scope of the federal government as well as limiting the influence of career politicians lines up with the Contract for America promulgated by Republican Revolution Members.

As he was seeking election to the House of Representatives, then-candidate Latham received the majority of his campaign donations from Iowa-related interests, including agriculture, specifically tobacco and crop insurance. In his 1994 campaign, candidate Latham’s top five industries overall included Iowa-based agricultural services and products ($37,000), food processing and sales ($22,500), crop production ($16,000), tobacco ($16,000), and insurance ($14,000). All of these donors have roots in Mr. Latham’s Iowa district, which, prior to 2010 redistricting, was the most rural district in the state with deep agricultural roots. Additionally, Mr. Latham’s top contributors in his 1994 campaign for office included Iowa-centric and district-centric industries, including Altria Group, the umbrella group for tobacco giant Philip Morris ($6,000), the National Association of Home Builders ($8,500), the National Rifle Association ($7,000), especially important to the hunting history of his district, and ConAgra Foods ($4,500), an agribusiness giant with deep and longstanding connections to the Iowa farms within Mr. Latham’s future district\textsuperscript{104}. Overall, these campaign donations show the clear district-centric fundraising effort by Mr. Latham in his run for Congress, and strengthen the connection between Mr. Latham and the needs of his future constituents.

\textsuperscript{103} Ibid.
After his election to Congress and roughly twenty-year tenure in the House and on the House Appropriations Committee, Rep. Latham’s campaign donations for his re-election campaigns became markedly geared towards his work on the Appropriations Committee, including his work as the Chairman of the Subcommittee on Transportation, Housing, and Urban Development. No longer does Rep. Latham receive the majority of his campaign contributions from Iowa-related sources. Instead, his position as the Chairman of the Subcommittee has allowed him to rake in millions of dollars in campaign contributions from lobbyists, transportation groups, and railroad companies, all directly related to his role as the Chairman of the Subcommittee. Gone are the days of agribusiness and tobacco companies being the predominant contributors to Rep. Latham’s campaign. Instead, Appropriations-related industries like air transport, which donated $39,000 to Rep. Latham in 2014, transportation unions, which contributed nearly $34,000, railroads, which contributed $30,000, and lobbyists, who kicked in nearly $25,000. Of course, these totals are relatively limited due to Rep. Latham’s 2014 retirement, but still blow Iowa-based industries out of the water in terms of overall contributions. It is clear, then, that Rep. Latham’s status on the Appropriations Committee and his status as the Chairman of the Subcommittee on Transportation, Housing, and Urban Development has clearly affected his donor pool and relegated Iowa-based donors to the bottom of the donor pool as compared to the high-powered industries and lobbyists that now support Rep. Latham as a result of his work on the Appropriations Committee.

Congressman Latham’s campaign donations clearly had an effect on his political
messaging, as a once-staunch supporter of term limits, reigning in the power of political incumbents, and limiting the size and scope of the federal government and its spending advocated for increased budgetary limits and stimulus spending that was even wholly unpopular within his own party in addition to increasing pay for Senators and increasing campaign donation limits after serving twenty years in Congress. The stimulus bill backed by Rep. Latham was directly tied into his work as the Chair of the House Appropriations Subcommittee on Transportation, Housing, and Urban Development, as it appropriated funds for highways and infrastructure projects during the recession that were not only covered under Rep. Latham’s Subcommittee’s jurisdiction, but also benefitted many of Rep. Latham’s larger donors in the transportation industry, many of whom received partial government grants as a result of the stimulus spending. In addition, the once-ardent supporter of term limits and restricting career politicians not only voted to raise the pay for Senators, but also voted against limitations on soft money campaign contributions and in issue ads, money that surely helps further entrench career politicians in their position\textsuperscript{105}. Not only did Rep. Latham’s seat on the Appropriations Committee and the ensuing donations change his anti-spending messaging, it also helped further entrench his incumbency and support of barring limitations on campaign donations, something he stood to benefit from during his twenty year congressional tenure.

\textbf{THE TEA PARTY WAVE OF 2010}

\textsuperscript{105} Ibid.
The 2010 Tea Party Wave was characterized by a heavily anti-federal government rallying cry after the passage of The Affordable Care Act, also known as “Obamacare” in 2010. This study of Tea Party Members and their ascension to the Appropriations Committee will seek to understand how their once-staunchly anti-government, anti-federal spending, anti-”Washington,” and anti-corporate influence rhetoric that first got them elected to Congress has been changed by their seat on the Appropriations Committee and the increase in campaign donations it brings. This comparison is different than that of the Republican Revolution in that these Members have only had four years to change their tune, and their original tune, especially against corporations, was arguably much more staunch and unwavering than that of the 1994 Republican Revolution Members.

_Congresswoman Herrera Beutler:_

Prior to her election to Congress, then-candidate Herrera Beutler enjoyed a meteoric rise to power, first serving as a legislative aide to Rep. McMorris Rodgers (R-WA), then serving as a representative in Washington’s state house. The following chart serves as a reference point to cross-compare Rep. Herrera Beutler’s statements and funding receipts as a candidate to those as a junior appropriator.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statements</th>
<th>Donations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| **2010 (Candidate)** | - Against corporate influence in politics  
- Government is too burdensome, pro-states rights, anti-federal government  
- Heavily anti-Obamacare  
- DC full of cronies  
- District-centric and Tea Party donations  
  a. Tea Party PACs: $470,000  
  b. Food service industry: $22,000 |
| **2014 (Junior Appropriator)** | - Wants cooperation between government and industry  
- In favor of spending increases in transportation  
- Appropriations-related donations, moderate Republican PACs  
  → Member of Financial Services, Interior and Environment, and Transportation Subcommittees  
  a. Moderate Republican PACs: $100,000  
  b. Securities and Investment: $90,000  
  c. Real Estate/Contractor: $100,000  
  d. Forestry/oil and gas: $85,000 |

Buoyed by the retirement of a moderate Democrat from her future congressional district, candidate Herrera Beutler followed the Tea Party Wave into Congress by advocating against major corporate influences, against burdensome government regulations, and against overall role of the federal government, advocating instead for a
states-rights approach. These messages were especially strong given the anti-ObamaCare party messaging that galvanized the Republican base at the time, allowing candidate Herrera Beutler to flex her conservative bonafides to appeal to the base and the growing anti-federal government sentiment in the wake of ObamaCare. Specifically, candidate Herrera Beutler rallied against large corporate interests and in favor of small businesses, saying: “Small businesses and entrepreneurs in Southwest Washington can and will lead us out of this economic recession; we just need Congress to give them the freedom to do it.” Additionally, candidate Herrera Beutler advocated against government and Washington, saying “today we train our focus on the largest hurdle to economic recovery in Southwest Washington - unsustainable federal spending on programs that aren't creating jobs.” Overall, candidate Herrera Beutler employed an anti-government, anti-government spending, and anti-corporate messaging in riding the Tea Party Wave into Congress in 2010.

When seeking higher office in her 2010 campaign, candidate Herrera Beutler received a majority of her campaign donations from district-centric interests, including a large population of retired people as well as the food and beverage industry, alongside contributions from Republican Leadership and independent Political Action Committees. First and foremost, these large political action committees, especially from Tea Party groups like the American Future Fund, contributed most heavily in the tune of $470,000 to candidate Herrera Beutler, showing the influence and interest of the Tea Party on her race. In addition, candidate Herrera Beutler received a large proportion of her donations
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from the food service industry in her district, particularly Pacific Bells, Inc., a large conglomerate of Taco Bell franchises in Washington State, which donated $9,000, that stood opposed to the business regulations in Obamacare that candidate Herrera Beutler rallied so heavily against as a part of her campaign and also accompanied her focus on small business owners rather than corporations. Additionally, candidate Herrera Beutler received sizeable donations from other food service industries within her district, including the Pacific Seafood Group ($7,000), and the National Beer Wholesalers Association ($6,000), which supports and distributes numerous small breweries located in her future congressional district\(^\text{107}\). Overall, candidate Herrera Beutler benefitted from campaign donations specifically tied to her districts’ small businesses and also to the Tea Party in her run for higher office, strengthening the bond between representing both district interests and those of the Tea Party upon being sworn in as a Member of Congress.

On the other hand, Rep. Herrera Beutler’s rise to the Appropriations Committee and its increased fundraising capabilities has drastically altered her campaign contributions to match her seats on numerous Subcommittees including donations from securities and investment, real estate, and air transport industries, but also most interestingly, an influx of donations from moderate Republican PACs. Due to her seats on the Subcommittees on Financial Services, Interior and the Environment, and Transportation, Housing, and Urban Development\(^\text{108}\), Rep. Herrera Beutler has become a prime target for interest groups within these jurisdictions, including the real estate

---
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industry, the forestry industry, and the securities and investment industry, relatively minor or nonexistent industries within her congressional district. For example, Rep. Herrera Beutler’s largest donor for the 2014 campaign season was an investment management corporation, directly related to her work on the Appropriations Subcommittee on Financial Services. Her next largest contributor was an apartment conglomerate, related to her work on Transportation, Housing, and Urban Development. Finally, third largest contributor, a timber company, relates directly to her work on the Subcommittee on Interior and the Environment. Additionally, the three largest overall donor industries match Rep. Herrera Beutler’s work on the Appropriations Committee, with the securities and investment industry donating nearly $90,000, the real estate and contracting industry donating over $100,000, and the forestry and the oil and gas industry donating $85,000. However, most interestingly, is the extreme influx of moderate Republican PACs donating nearly $100,000 to Rep. Herrera Beutler109, becoming her overall top PAC contributor as a clear attempt to moderate her Tea Party views. Overall, Rep. Herrera Beutler’s campaign donations from non-district-based groups and industries skyrocketed in direct correlation to her work on the Appropriations Committee, tying her re-election fundraising efforts more to industry and party than to district needs.

These campaign contributions to Rep. Herrera Beutler have drastically altered her stalwart anti-government spending message, specifically when it relates to the industries of her donors, to reflect a more positive message of cooperation between the government and these industries as well as a more moderate view of the role of the federal
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government in appropriating funds. Instead of advocating for small businesses within her district, Rep. Herrera Beutler now heavily advocates for the companies and industries that fall within her purview on the Appropriations Committee. Rep. Herrera Beutler has also now moderated her political views, voting for spending increases for transportation industries as well as more lax regulations of the forestry industry, specifically as related to her work on the Subcommittee on Interior and the Environment and the related donations. Additionally, Rep. Herrera Beutler has moderated her Tea Party views, moving away from staunch anti-Obamacare, anti-corporate messaging in other ways, including her voting record, which has gradually progressed from anti-corporate, anti-federal government ideology towards a more moderate, pro-business, pro-federal government spending, even on issues that do not relate to her Washington district. This is a clear, direct result of her seat on the Appropriations Committee and the increase in campaign donations related to her Appropriations jurisdictions, not only making her seat safer, but also moderating her views and pulling her away from the traditional Tea Party rhetoric she ran on just four years ago. Congresswoman Herrera Beutler’s moderation is in direct conflict with other Tea Party Members, whose beliefs since their elections have remained the same, if not grown in conservative fervor.

The Late-Congressman Nunnelee:

Candidate Nunnelee began his quest for Congress at the behest of party leaders, who sought someone to challenge the incumbent conservative Democratic congressman. In doing so, however, candidate Nunnelee employed traditional Tea Party
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tactics and rhetoric to win his seat in Congress. The following chart serves as a reference point to cross-compare the late-Rep. Nunnelee’s statements and funding receipts as a candidate to those as a junior appropriator.

**Campaign Statements and Fundraising of late-Rep. Nunnelee vs. Appropriator**  
**Statements and Fundraising, 2010 vs. 2014**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Statements</th>
<th>Donations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>2010 (Candidate)</strong></td>
<td>- Signed Contract From America</td>
<td>- District-centric and Tea Party donations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>a. statutory spending caps</td>
<td>a. Tea Party PACs: $230,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>b. moratorium on earmarks</td>
<td>b. Healthcare: $150,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>c. against “crony capitalism”</td>
<td>c. Construction: $30,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>d. federal government should be second to states</td>
<td>d. Agriculture: $30,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Staunchly anti-Obamacare</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>2014 (Junior Appropriator)</strong></td>
<td>- Favored increase in military spending</td>
<td>- Appropriations-related donations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Appropriations process important in federal government; should be federal rather than state</td>
<td>→ Member of Agriculture, Energy and Water, and Military Construction Subcommittees</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>a. Maintain integrity of appropriations process</td>
<td>a. Defense industry: $100,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Advocated for companies under jurisdiction of Appropriations Subcommittees</td>
<td>b. Agriculture and crop insurers: $95,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>c. Oil and gas: $75,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>d. Electric utilities: $50,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Candidate Nunnelee focused specifically on tying his opponent to the “government monstrosity that is Obamacare” as well as a stalwart opposition to federal government spending levels as a whole and the overall role of the federal government in
creating national policy priorities via spending outlays as well as Tea party, anti-corporation messaging. The anti-corporate rhetoric is unique to the Tea Party in that it is not a socialist rhetoric, but more a belief in the evil nature of some corporations and their relationship and receipts from the federal government, so-called “crony capitalism” and a preference in small businesses, a belief that mirrors the Tea Party’s ideology in terms of the role of the federal government compared to the role of state governments. Specifically, candidate Nunnelee signed the Contract From America, an “open-sourced platform for the Tea Party movement.” In signing this Contract, candidate Nunnelee expressed his support for imposing “a statutory cap limiting the annual growth in total federal spending to the sum of the inflation rate plus the percentage of population growth.” Additionally, the Contract explicitly called for a “moratorium on earmarks until the budget is balanced.” Perhaps most telling about candidate Nunnelee’s views on government, the Contract explicitly states

> “the purpose of our government is to exercise only those limited powers that have been relinquished to it by the people - chief among these being the protection of our liberties by administering justice and ensuring our safety from threats arising inside or outside our country’s sovereign borders. When our government ventures beyond these functions and attempts to increase its power over the marketplace and the probability of corruption, internal strife, economic depression, and poverty increases.”

Overall, candidate Nunnelee’s focus and support of the Contract From America showed his commitment to Tea Party causes and ideology in the role of the federal government and its spending priorities.
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Candidate Nunnelee’s fundraising for his run for Congress centered around not only his future district’s needs, but also capitalized on the anti-Obamacare movement that buoyed his candidacy and helped him into office, but oddly received no campaign contributions from the defense industry despite a massive Air Force Base in his future district. In his first campaign for higher office, candidate Nunnelee’s fundraising came primarily from retirees, crop production and agriculture interests, and health professionals, a fair mix of both his future district’s interests and the interests of the Tea Party Movement. First and foremost, candidate Nunnelee’s largest campaign contributor was the Tea Party-affiliated American Future Fund, which donated roughly $200,000 to candidate Nunnelee. This, coupled with a $30,000 donation from the group Americans for Limited Government, show the clear influence of Tea Party influence on Mr. Nunnelee’s campaign. Additionally, Mr. Nunnelee’s campaign benefitted from district-centric interests, including Lyle Machinery and Eutaw Construction’s donations of $30,000 total related to the construction industry in his district. Furthermore, candidate Nunnelee received significant donations from the agriculture industry, especially important to his district, in the form of $30,000. Additionally, candidate Nunnelee received more than $150,000 from health professionals in accordance with his anti-Obamacare views, the largest industry of donors outside of Tea Party-affiliated groups.114 It is clear, then, that candidate Nunnelee received significant donations from both Tea Party groups as well as industries and interests located within his district, though the clear

---

majority of donations came from ideological groups rather than district-based interest groups.

Owing to his seat on the Appropriations Subcommittees on Agriculture, Energy and Water, and Military Construction, late-Rep. Nunnelee’s campaign donations predominantly came from defense contractors, electric utilities, oil and gas, and agriculture-related interests. Gone are the days of ardent anti-Obamacare health professionals being the most dominant voice supporting late-Rep. Nunnelee. Instead, one of late-Rep. Nunnelee’s top backers was the oil and gas industry, which donated a total of $75,000. Additionally, electric utilities chipped in another $50,000 to late-Rep. Nunnelee, especially relevant given late-Rep. Nunnelee’s elevation to the Vice Chairmanship of the Appropriations Subcommittee on Energy and Water. Additionally, defense industries and contractors like Northrop Grumman contributed a total of $100,000 to late-Rep. Nunnelee’s 2014 re-election campaign though they had contributed nothing during his initial campaign for Congress despite the large Air Force Base in the district. Finally, agriculture companies and crop insurers contributed a total of $95,000 to late-Rep. Nunnelee’s 2014 campaign as a result of his status on the Agriculture Subcommittee of the Appropriations Committee. Overall, late-Rep. Nunnelee’s campaign connections from both district and Tea Party-affiliated groups have dissolved and been replaced by industry-related groups in relation to his seat on the Appropriations Committee.

As a result of the Appropriations Committee-minded campaign donations, late-Rep. Nunnelee’s rhetoric drastically changed comparable to his previous stalwart positions, now advocating for the importance of funding defense and military contractors
and construction as well as government contracts with oil companies, directly related to his seats on the Appropriations Subcommittees on Agriculture, Energy and Water, and Military Construction and Veterans Affairs. Rather than advocating for Tea Party-based positions on government spending and the role of the federal government, late-Rep. Nunnelee regularly advocated for the role of the federal government, specifically the Appropriations Committee, in spending and supporting the industries within his jurisdiction. Specifically within the defense industry and defense spending, a once isolationist, stalwart anti-spending candidate has been replaced by late-Rep. Nunnelee, whose position on the Appropriations Subcommittee on Military Construction afforded him numerous donations from the industry, affecting his approach to the role of the federal government and its spending outlays. \textsuperscript{115} Overall, late-Rep. Nunnelee’s former Tea Party approach to the role of government, or lack thereof, has been replaced as a result of his seat on the Appropriations Committee and the additional campaign funding it provides.

**ADDITIONAL ANALYSIS**

First and foremost, it is important to note that these Members have had differing amounts of time with which to change their political messaging as a result of their increased campaign donations due to their status on the Appropriations Committee. However, generalized comparisons across the two can still be made as a comparison of the elective movements these Members represent by maintaining a broad focus.

\footnote{115 Ibid.}
Overall, this study shows the influence of money and political influence on political ideology as a consequence of earning a seat on the House Appropriations Committee. Both members of the 1994 Republican Revolution and the 2010 Tea Party Wave abandoned their staunch beliefs upon ascending to seats on the Appropriations Committee and becoming recipients of campaign dollars specifically related to the industries under their jurisdiction as Members of Appropriations Subcommittees. This finding also harkens back to the suggestions of Fenno in *The Power of the Purse*, that the Appropriations Committee’s culture of protecting the appropriations process is amended, but still alive and well. The new culture of the Committee may no longer be stewardship of the appropriations process and taxpayer dollars, but instead in moderating conservatives on the Committee. This of course leaves the conservative, asymmetrically polarized Members not on the Committee, who continue to receive donations from the interests and Tea Party PACs that helped them get elected in the first place, to derail the appropriations process.

Regardless, the role of money on appropriators is clear, and must not be discounted in a post-*Citizens United* Congress. The influence of Appropriations power and donors is especially glaring in respect to Tea Party Members late-Rep. Nunnelee and Rep. Herrera Beutler, whose four years in the House and two on the Committee reflected a very quick and ardent turnaround against their Tea Party beliefs to accepting a more moderate tone, especially in advocating for Appropriations-related interests. So too, was the influence of the Appropriations Committee felt on more senior Members of the Committee, Rep. Frelinghuysen and Rep. Latham, who came into office as a part of the
Republican Revolution of 1994, and whose once-staunch views against government corruption and in favor of term limiting politicians were replaced by the influence and power wielded as Chairmen of Appropriations Subcommittees. It should be noted, too, that the views of Tea Party candidates like Mr. Nunnelee and Ms. Herrera Beutler were much more staunchly conservative across the board than Republican Revolution candidates, and their moderation as a result of their seats on the Appropriations Committee is even more remarkable for the political distance they traveled, from Tea Party to moderate Republican. Overall, the role of money and power as a result of a seat on the Appropriations Committee greatly affected the political messaging of both members of the Republican Revolution and the Tea Party, though perhaps was more immediately felt by the Tea Party. Nevertheless, both groups were clearly influenced by the influx of Appropriations-related donations to change their political messaging and advocacy, going back on campaign promises and rhetoric as a result of their work on the Appropriations Committee.

It is important to highlight the role of the Appropriations Committee in moderating polarized and partisan appropriators. Though the role of money in politics is clear for appropriators, the opposite is also true for non-appropriators: the polarizing effects of money, especially partisan, asymmetrically-polarized groups who helped these Members win election in the first place remains constant. As there are only so many spots on the Appropriations Committee, only so many Members can be recipients of the same type of *quid pro quo* donations that have led to the moderation of appropriators. Other Members are instead beholden to the Tea Party and ideologically-driven donors and
interest groups whose money undoubtedly helps drive their opposition to the return of the
regular order of the appropriations process and any sort of injection of bipartisanship and
comity into the process.

Perhaps the most important conclusion of this study is the role of money in
political messaging and policy, as evidenced by the very quick turn from the Members’
once anti-government spending and anti-special interest campaign rhetoric to now
accepting large sums of campaign donations from special interests and then reversing
their campaign rhetoric to support government spending capabilities to benefit these
interests. This message is true across the board, from Republican Revolution members to
Tea Party members, whose ideology during their candidacy was moderated by their
appointment to the Appropriations Committee and the benefits it brings in the form of
campaign donations. What is worrisome, then, is that the role of money in politics,
especially from more polarized donors, will polarize further the already incredibly
polarized and partisan Congress, the House in particular. A possible upside, however, is
that that once these polarized Members get into Congress and on a powerful Committee,
ye become more moderate as a result of their seat on the Committee and the donations
it brings. However, this is dependent upon these Members actually attaining a limited
seat on a powerful committee such as Appropriations, and does not limit the polarized,
partisan nature of the rest of Congress and the House specifically.

This influence of money on politics calls into question the democratic nature of
the United States as it allows those with greater access and greater freedom to spend
money on campaigns to have a greater influence on public policy, rather than those who
may only be able to affect their democracy by going to the polls. If collective power is retained by individuals able to donate more freely than those only able to participate in the democratic process by going to the polls, campaign donors will be able to more easily shift public policy aims, creating a spending war between policy priorities. In a country whose motto, “out of many, one,” calls for unity even in the most divided of times, the influence of money in politics further divides a nation, especially across economic lines. If donors are able to influence policy positions, like those donors who gave to Members of the Appropriations Committee, more so than voters who elect officials, the democratic nature of American government is in jeopardy. No longer is every vote equal, as every vote has been influenced by millions of dollars of advertising. No longer is every representative duly-elected by the people, but instead is duly elected by the donors who help buy his or her votes. A seat on the Appropriations Committee may also serve to make a Member’s re-election bid easier, thus making the seat safer and further strengthening the relationship between donor and Member. If a Member does not have to be out raising funds for re-election due to Appropriations-related donations, he or she may be inherently more responsive to these donations and their causes as they are an easier source of campaign cash than holding fundraisers and calling donors every day. If Members are no longer held accountable to their constituents, the representative nature of American democracy is in jeopardy.

Additionally, the appropriations process and its role in oversight of government spending is also called into question, as Members who are supposed to be cutting wasteful government spending in certain areas may be especially susceptible to campaign
donations. Rep. Frelinghuysen, for example, was explicitly opposed to increasing defense spending during his campaign for Congress, but as the Chairman of the Appropriations Subcommittee on Defense, he has wholeheartedly advocated for defense spending increases and has received hundreds of thousands of dollars from the defense industry for his efforts.\footnote{Ibid.} If appropriators cannot be impartial when handling the power of the purse, a power specifically granted to Congress by the Constitution, they are failing their Constitutional duty and the trust of the nation.

It is also important to account for the role of the \textit{Citizens United} Supreme Court decision in not only confounding the role of money in politics, but in making campaigns more expensive and thus further strengthening the politician-donor relationship that will make politicians more responsive to campaign donors. It is especially important to note that even the most powerful, most senior Members of Congress, those being on the Appropriations Committee, were susceptible to the influence of campaign donors, begging the question of whether any lawmaker could be immune to the influence of money in politics. If, as previously suggested, the increasing role of money in politics influences public policy decisions, the unchecked donor allowance as a result of the \textit{Citizens United} decision would create a wholly symbiotic relationship between donor and politician, possibly cutting out the role of the voter in American democracy.

\textbf{CONCLUSION}

In seeking to understand the relationship between campaign messaging, political influence upon attaining a seat on a powerful Committee, political donations, and
changing political messaging by Members of both the 1994 Republican Revolution and the 2010 Tea Party Wave, this study finds that these Members, despite their staunch campaign rhetoric, were susceptible to the influx of donations as an effect of their seat on the Appropriations Committee. Members of the 1994 Republican Revolution represent a more longstanding view on the role of an Appropriations seat in changing political stances, while Members of the Tea Party Wave show the immediate effects. Both Rep. Frelinghuysen and Rep. Latham, Members of the 1994 Republican Revolution and signers of the Contract With America, advocated for term limits on politicians, reigning in the federal budget and spending, and a smaller overall role of the federal government. After gaining Chair positions on Appropriations Subcommittees, these two Members have expressed ardent support for extending Washington benefits like Senate pay, increasing spending in categories they previously advocated cutting but stopped opposing once gaining Chairmanships on related Appropriations Subcommittees, all while serving ten terms in Congress. Tea Party Wave Members Rep. Herrera Beutler and late-Rep. Nunnelee followed the same trend, shucking their severely anti-government spending, anti-”Washington,” and anti-big federal government ideology for more moderate beliefs in lieu of their seats on the Appropriations Committee and the vast campaign contributions they bring. It is clear, then, that both groups were affected by the drastic increase in campaign contributions as a result of their seats on the Appropriations Committee. It is troublesome, then, that these campaign contributions have such an impact on the policy positions of candidates and Members, especially Members on a powerful Committee tasked with governing federal government spending. This is also
problematic for the role of money in elections, as the increase in campaign donations and
the lack of limitations on donations in the wake of the *Citizens United* decision calls into
question the role of the American voter and the overall democratic nature of the
American system. To be sure, the nature of the appropriations process has also changed,
as Members tasked with cutting government waste and abuse may be more susceptible to
campaign donations to save certain government contracts, calling the oversight of
government spending into question. Overall, the role of money and committee influence
on once-staunch candidates is clear: a seat on the Appropriations Committee not only
moderates more fervent believers, but also makes them beholden to the interests who
donate as a result of their Appropriations jurisdiction.
Conclusion

This study demonstrates that the appropriations process in the House has drastically deteriorated as a result of both a change in the membership ranks, creating a hyper-partisan and asymmetrically polarized Congress, as well as a systematic change in institutional policy governing the appropriations process. As discussed in the first chapter of this study, slight House Rule and party rule changes as a result of the 1974 liberal Watergate elections trickled down through the 1994 Republican Revolution electoral wave, affecting not only the nature of the appropriations process, but ushered in a new era of partisanship and polarization surrounding the appropriations process. As a result of the 1994 Republican Revolution, especially within the Republican Party in the House, Republicans began moving further towards the conservative right, a movement solidified by the Tea Party Wave of 2010 which ushered in a new class of anti-government, anti-government funding Republicans to upend the appropriations process. In exploring the increasing ideological distance between the parties, especially in regards to the process of earmarks, the second chapter of this study highlights the growing ideological differences between parties and how those differences manifested themselves in the process of earmarks within the appropriations process. The chapter demonstrates this using the constituent correspondence of two top appropriators, showing the divergence between the two Members as a result of the changing ideological center of their respective party when
it came to the appropriations process, embodying the problem of polarization in Congress. The study also demonstrates the pronounced role of both the Republican Revolution and Tea Party Wave in further pushing the parties apart, a trend that began with the 1994 Revolution and intensified in the 2010 Wave, leading to the ban on earmarks and the end of the grease that kept the wheels of the appropriations process moving. Both the first and second chapters of this study serve to provide not only a historical overview of institutional changes to the appropriations process that have led to its present state, but also to trace the systemic changes in membership and ideology that have doomed a once-bipartisan process.

The third and final chapter of this study highlights the internal divisions of the Republican Party in the House as a result of the Tea Party Wave of 2010 and the severe conservatism it brought forth, but notes the connection between political moderation and a seat on the Appropriations Committee by tracing campaign statements and donations to compare to statements made and donations received after gaining a seat on the Appropriations Committee. The chapter contributes to the overall argument of this study in pursuing and exposing the extreme partisanship and polarization brought forth under the Tea Party Wave of 2010, whose vehemently anti-government beliefs were on display during the government shut down of 2013. This chapter specifically examines the beliefs of both Republican Revolution and Tea Party Wave members as they ran their initial
campaigns, as well as the type of campaign donations they received, compared to once they were elected to Congress and earned seats on the Appropriations Committee. This chapter explores the ways in which a seat on the Appropriations Committee, and the increased campaign donations it brings, helps to moderate extremist Members who once rallied around its very existence. The study concludes that the Appropriations Committee helps moderate Members and endears them to the appropriations process, but also highlighted the extreme partisanship brought forth by the Tea Party Wave of 2010 and its anti-government beliefs. Despite the moderating factor of a seat on the Appropriations Committee, the deterioration of the appropriations process continues from non-appropriators, particularly the hyper-partisan, extremely polarized Members who have retained their anti-government views in lieu of not attaining a seat on the Committee. Since there are limited seats on the Committee, the hyper-partisanship and extreme polarization from the Tea Party Wave of 2010 in particular lingers over the appropriations process, leaving a dearth of options for mitigation of gridlock and a return to the traditional appropriations process. Overall, this study concludes that the appropriations process in the House, as a result of the partisanship, polarization, and institutional changes, is irrevocably deteriorated to a point where only drastic changes to the electoral process would restore the regular order of the appropriations process.
It is important to put the gridlock and inability for Congress to follow regular appropriations order and its reliance on continuing resolutions in perspective in relation to the operations of the federal government as a whole. As this study has discussed, Congress is increasingly reliant on continuing resolutions, which continue funding at previously-approved levels for programs across-the-board in the federal government. Additionally, Congress is the only entity able to appropriate funds per the Constitution, which means its inability to regularly appropriate funds and fulfill its appropriations duties has left a void in the workings of government. This reliance on continuing resolutions does not allow for new programs to be created, and actually excludes government oversight of the spending of existing programs and cutting spending for programs that are ineffective and ineffectual. Both the reliance on continuing resolutions and the fear and reality of government funding lapses also hampers hiring, personnel retention, and employee morale within the federal government as well\textsuperscript{117}. If the government cannot fund new programs in agencies across the board, it hinders economic growth, national security initiatives, and signals to citizens, businesses, foreign governments, etc. that the United States Government cannot function at its most basic level.

\textsuperscript{117} Ibid.
It is also important to recognize the effect of the deterioration of the appropriations process and its tendency to careen from crisis to crisis in recent years in terms of federal agency planning and preparation. The deterioration of the appropriations process creates a culture of uncertainty in the executive branch, meaning that agencies cannot promulgate effective guidelines or plans for new programs, strategies, hire new employees, etc. Continuing resolutions cause agencies to be unsure of not only the timing of their funding, but also the level. Agencies who receive flat funding under continuing resolutions may not, legally, create new programs without explicit authorization from Congress. This creates enormous problems throughout the federal government and its ability to adapt to new challenges as they arise. This is especially relevant to national security agencies, who need to respond immediately in the event of a crisis and may be unable to do so without explicit congressional approval. Economic growth is also hampered by uncertainty over government funding and in funding lapses. If the government of the nation with the top economy in the world cannot function correctly, it signals to external markets and economies uncertainty in trade, regulation, etc., hindering economic growth. Additionally, other agencies are not able to plan throughout the year given the uncertainty of funding\textsuperscript{118}. It is hard to plan to promote regulations, issue

reports, conduct investigations, etc. when half of the necessary employees may be on furlough.

Not only do continuing resolutions within the current quagmired appropriations process cause trouble to federal agencies, but most obviously, funding lapses cause undue burden and stress to agencies and employees who may work without pay or be furloughed without knowing when their next paycheck will come. Government lapses in funding and government shutdowns like those of 1995 and 2013 create low morale among employees and a distrust of the very government who employs them. Additionally, even the fear of government shutdowns and lapses in funding may also serve to deter new employees from seeking employment in the government, as instability and volatility in government funding are certainly not draws for employment. The recent reliance on continuing resolutions across the board may be cause for a so-called “brain drain” of longtime employees who are simply fed up with the uncertainty and depart for the private sector or retire. Employee morale across the board has also been affected by the uncertainty of government funding, with wages remaining stagnant, cost of living adjustments remaining far below actual increases in cost of living, and hiring freezes limiting promotions or opportunities for external training. It is clear, then, that the deterioration of the appropriations process affects all aspects of American government,
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and the core democratic nature of American government remains at risk when the appropriations process falters, requiring mitigation from outside the government.

To be clear, the quick fixes available to the appropriations process in the House are simply not viable due to the partisanship and polarization that have doomed the process. Trying to reverse institutional and party changes would be the easiest way to revert the appropriations process to its old order, but would not be viable with the growing number of Members who use anti-government rhetoric during appropriations debates to stave off more conservative primary challenges. The House could easily create a new package of House Rules that revert back to the pre-1994 regular order of the appropriations process, while each party could theoretically change their party rules to return more power to the Appropriations Committee rather than party leadership. However, the party leadership would stand nothing to gain by bringing up these changes, only the loss of power and control of their caucus. Institutional changes, too, would require the support of the majority of the chamber, including both partisan actors who stand to gain by dysfunction, and moderate Members who have enjoyed the open amendment process to appropriations measures that have given them a voice in the growing partisanship. Indeed, the House could set up a website to make public earmark requests from Members, something that has support from Republicans in cash-strapped states like Alabama. However, public sentiment is still fairly staunchly against earmarks,
the word triggering an immediately negative connotation among many, further drying out
the grease that once kept the wheels of the appropriations process moving. Legislative
incentives like tying congressional pay to the appropriations process have been popular,
but are not viable for two reasons. The first is that many Members are multi-millionaires
who rely more on investment income rather than their congressional salary\textsuperscript{120}. The
second is that the Members who are reliant on their congressional paycheck would be
more likely to just continue to rely on the continuing resolution to fulfill the base
requirement of appropriating funds rather than passing individual appropriations
measures. Overall, the internal options to change the appropriations process from inside
the institution simply are not viable because too many actors stand to lose in today’s
political climate by the return of the appropriations process to its former order. The onus
for change, then, is on the electorate and the electoral process.

It is important to remember that the appropriations process is one solely delegated
to Congress, and that any solutions to the current crisis must be limited to Congress and
its membership. Therefore, the solutions must address the same. It is important to note,
however, that electoral laws in America, especially those that establish congressional
district boundaries, are left up to individual states in the absence of a federal law. That
being said, there are two reforms to the electoral system to address the partisanship and

\textsuperscript{120} Ibid.
polarization that have caused the deterioration of the appropriations process at its root: jungle primaries as a result of independent or bipartisan congressional redistricting, and eliminating private campaign funding, both of which are no easy task.

The first possible solution, a so-called “jungle primary” system is one currently employed by the State of California, whose Citizen Redistricting Commission, made up of an equal number of Democrats, Republicans, and non-majority party members, is in charge of drawing legislative district boundaries. Rather than entrenching Members in their seats, the aim of these district boundaries is to reduce partisanship by forcing candidates to appeal to the majority of voters, not just the majority of voters from their own party. Additionally, district lines are not left up to partisan legislatures, but instead handled by a bipartisan group, and must be approved by a plurality of members, helping to eliminate the stringent partisan nature of congressional district boundaries and removing the possibility of gerrymandering. Members of the Commission are deemed qualified by independent state auditors, with some Members being chosen out of a qualified applicant pool by the state legislature and others being randomly drawn to minimize the potential for quid-pro-quo agreements with legislators who stand to benefit from district lines drawn a certain way. These Members also have less to gain from drawing partisan lines, as they are not a part of the state legislature or Congress, and are not drawing district lines for their colleagues or their opponents. The Commission also
went the extra step to obtain preclearance from the Justice Department under Section V of the Voting Rights Act, satisfying the requirements of minority inclusion in districts and the equal opportunity for minority candidates to represent both minority and non-minority districts\textsuperscript{121}.

With the new jungle primary system, the top two candidates in the primary, regardless of party, advance to the general election, which helps promote more moderate candidates especially in more partisan districts. Even if a district is heavily conservative or liberal, the candidates will have to appeal to the moderate voters and voters of opposing political beliefs, who may make up to thirty percent of the electorate, to win the plurality of votes in both the primary and the general election. Of course, the effect of these primaries relies on the reliability of primary voters, which is historically hazy. However, the incentives to vote in the primary are now much higher, and could increase voter turnout and voter engagement. The nature of these primaries, in which candidates benefit from engaging with all voters across the political spectrum, could help solve this problem, and engaging with voters from across party lines would help affect the partisanship and polarization that has so helped create the quagmire of the appropriations process today. These new districts often also force Member against Member primaries after the census, which helps put emphasis on constituent services and district

representation\textsuperscript{122}. Overall, the use of independent or bipartisan redistricting commissions mixed with jungle primaries helps to not only negate partisanship in drawing congressional boundaries, but also in congressional representation, therefore mitigating the partisanship and polarization that has rankled the appropriations process in the wake of the Republican Revolution of 1994 and especially the Tea Party Wave of 2010.

The second option for limiting partisanship and polarization in Congress is limiting private donations to campaigns. It is no secret that campaign donations have increased in the wake of the 2010 \textit{Citizens United v. FEC} Supreme Court case, which loosened restrictions on campaign donations from corporations and lead to the rise of Super PACs, third party campaign groups with few restrictions on campaign donations and advertising. Now, the nation’s wealthiest citizens have incredible power and sway over the electoral process as candidates simply need their money to compete, and even those who oppose the role of money in politics post-\textit{Citizens United} like President Obama have reversed course and embraced the role of Super PACs in elections. However, the unrestricted role of money only serves to further polarize an already-polarized House, with issue groups and donors on either side of the aisle using their cash to pull candidates to the ideological poles. There are few groups seeking to restore the

ideological center or the institutional honesty to Congress, perhaps because it is not as attention grabbing as the polarizing fundraising that groups like Americans For Prosperity and others engage in\textsuperscript{123}. The argument can be made that corporations and citizens are due a voice in the electoral process, and therefore their private campaign donations are a form of speech or political expression. However, when the rights of one citizen infringe upon another citizen, who may be unable to donate the same levels of cash to influence the political process, there is an inherent problem with the democratic system. Instead, eliminating private money in public elections and forcing candidates to rely on a limited, taxpayer-funded campaign fund would alleviate this problem.

If candidates were given a limited fund to run their campaign on, on equal footing with their opponent, they would not be reliant upon partisan Super PACs and political mega donors with special interests, helping to mitigate the rancorous partisanship and polarization that have dominated political theater since 2010. Rather than being accountable to interest groups, lobbyists, and mega donors who are given a wide berth of access to the political process via Super PACs, candidates would instead be beholden to their constituency and to their institution. Eliminating private funding from campaigns would also free candidates from the hundreds and thousands of hours they spend fundraising to instead engage further with constituents and with Congress as incumbent
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Members. Rather than listening to interest groups that may not even be connected with their district, Members can instead spend time listening to their constituents.

Additionally, without the weight of special interest groups, mega donors, and Super PACs, Members may be more likely to see the benefit of a regular appropriations process for their district, with greater engagement in everyday citizens who stand to directly benefit from funding for jobs, infrastructure, and educational opportunities in the district rather than funding going directly to the corporations and interest groups that contributed to the campaign fund. Of course their constituents may display the partisanship that has aided in the deterioration of the appropriations process today, but the institution of jungle primaries and independent redistricting will help to mitigate this problem. Overall, limiting the influence and access of interest groups and mega donors with special interests on campaign funding would serve to not only reintegrate candidates with their constituency, but also take away many of the causes of partisanship and polarization in the name of Super PACs, interest groups, and mega donors with special interests that have polarized the appropriations process to the point where it has deteriorated to an unrecognizable degree.

The true problem with these solutions is that they require congressional actions, something hard to come by in a day and age where Congress cannot even appropriate funds to keep the government open. Many Members of Congress have too much to lose
by changing the formula that governs congressional redistricting and primary
formulations, namely their seat in Congress. Additionally, many Members have adjusted
to the campaign cash available to them from donors and industries as a result of the

*Citizens United* decision. There is little for Congress to gain from enacting these reforms,
and too much to lose, especially in the current partisan, polarized Congress. Outside of a
major scandal reminiscent of Watergate, these reforms would be tough to implement and
pass through Congress, and look relatively unlikely. Until then, the appropriations
process looks to be left to mire in its current state. Not only is the appropriations process
in the House truly even worse than it looks, there looks to be no way out of the current
quagmire as a result of the partisanship and polarization that has gotten Congress into its
current state in the first place.

The fact of the matter is that the appropriations process in the House is broken
beyond immediate repair. Congress reeks of polarization, a rancor that has soiled
centuries of comity. The hyperpartisanship and asymmetric polarization that has defined
Congress in the wake of the Tea Party Wave 2010 has clearly pulled legislators to the
ideological poles, though the Appropriations Committee may remain a moderating force
for Members. The institutional changes affecting the appropriations process like changes
in House Rules and in party rules that have trickled down over the past forty years have
wreaked havoc on the regular order of the appropriations process, creating a reliance on
continuing resolutions and eschewing the Constitutional authority vested in Congress. The end of earmarks especially shows the growing divide in Congress, as a result of the partisanship fostered under the 1994 Republican Revolution, and has left Congress and the Appropriations Committee without a quid-pro-quo system to pass appropriations measures. There are no easy fixes to this, either, as Congress must enact reforms to a system that many benefit from electorally. The appropriations process, as we know it, is dead. This study cannot find a suitable means to revitalize the process or the institution, though that does not mean there is not one. Simply, the polarization and partisanship that have doomed the appropriations process have doomed any viable solutions, making the process truly even worse than it looks, and the end of the centuries-long tradition of the appropriations process in the House.
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