

## GOVERNMENT SHUTDOWN

A recent example of gridlock causing problems was the 2018 govt shutdown. Disagreements on the border wall and budget led to important services running low on funds. It ended when President Trump signed a bipartisan spending bill.

## PARTISANSHIP

The 'part' in partisanship literally means division, parts. If the parts don't agree, gridlock happens: this is when little to no policy is passed in a certain or even all sectors and the resulting aftermath.

According to the textbooks, the 50s to 70s were times where people swapped places and values changed. Party line voting has been a thing but is more common than it ever has been now. It's encouraged for representatives to vote along party lines even if their constituents wouldn't agree.

Not all lawmakers follow this ideology at all times however, there are other models:

MODEL	REMARKS
Delegate model	"We sent you to say what we say, not make decisions that you think are good decisions."  Substantive: advocating on behalf of certain groups Descriptive: advocating for the groups and what makes them unique (i.e. ethnicity or gender).
Trustee model	"We elected you to use your best judgement and make good decisions"  Representatives are chosen and are trusted with making good decisions and not screwing their constituents over.
Politico model	"Both in one"  If an opinion is strong then the lawmaker would make that a large factor in their decisions, at other points their best judgement may be at play.

## REDISTRICTING SHENANIGANS

By law, the lines in each state for Congressional districts must be redrawn (reapportioned) every 10 years after the Census data has been compiled and released. The way this is done is usually up to states, and this leaves lots of room for shenanigans by the majority party.

Usually the majority party is the bigger voice with determining the new statewide congressional districts. This naturally means that the new lines benefit the majority party.

This power however was reduced in 1960 with the Baker V. Carr Case of 1962, which put into question the Supreme Court's jurisdiction in monitoring Congressional districts. Before then, the court ruled that in *Colegrove V. Green* that if lines were unfair, the people would be responsible for taking action (such as removal from office, etc.). This case started in TN where in 1901 the lines were redrawn like normal. However, TN didn't do this from 1901. The pop. centers grew, but still had the same number of reps and same district lines, which means that mathematically the rural areas held more power.

It got so bad that  $\frac{1}{3}$  of TN was electing more than 60% of its electors, directly violating the ideal of equal representation. In 1959, Charles Baker sued the TN Sec. of State, for violating AM14 which contains the Equal Protection clause ("you must treat everyone with the same rights and regulations").

The question however soon turned from "did it violate AM14" to "can the supreme court do this?". The court decided that the Supreme Court can in fact do that and ruled that the Court could intervene when district lines violated the Constitution. The court case didn't actually say "the lines should be equal", but after granting that power to the Court, numerous cases followed where this ruling was used to change undemocratic lines. Further court cases also upheld this power, such as *Reynolds V. Sims*.