### The Eclipse of the States in the U.S. Senate

The Eclipse of the States in the U.S. Senate rather than as an institution that protects the interests and autonomy of the constituent states especially during the late 20th century, states have been less and less able to depend on the U.S. Senate, as well as the Representatives, to protect their prerogatives as sovereign polities, even been regarded as one of the "political safeguards" of U.S. federalism.

The system with the status of constituent political communities in other federal systems. Compared to some other federal countries, the United States is more centralized, and the federal government exercises more authority over the states than is true in more non-centralized decline of state autonomy in the face of rising federal power within the United States from 1789 to 1845. 1. The earliest federal arrangements in what became the United States were confederal. As the Congress of 1781–89, each of the 13 colonies and then states was represented equally in these bodies and, in a state had one vote in the Continental Congress and a majority of states in Congress was needed to pass legislation, and a unanimous vote of all 13 confederal government had no effective executive capacity and no independent...
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own laws, and enforce treaties. This new federal government, moreover, came into power with an independent executive (i.e., the president) and independent courts. This new federal government also acquired implied powers, namely, the ability to expand its power through constitutional interpretation through the “necessary and proper” clause (Article 1, Section 8). The U.S. Supreme Court soon interpreted this leading critics to accuse the Court of converting the clause into an enacted pursuant to it, and treaties to be the supreme law of the land, thus overriding any conflicting state constitutions and state laws.

Bowman, Ann O’M. and Richard C. Kearney 1986. The Resurgence of the States. Englewood Cliffs: Wheaton 316 (1819). 69 Eclipsing Constitutional Rules the rules that governed the Confederal Congress. With only a few exceptions (e.g., vote), voting in both houses of the U.S. Congress is by a simple majority of a quorum of the members of each house. Thus, voting in the Senate is by the 100 individual senators, not by the 50 states. Rules established by the Constitution are quite different from the same state may vote differently on a bill, even if they belong to the same political party. For example, on May 25, 2006, the U.S. Senate approved an immigration reform bill by a vote of 62-36. For that vote, ten states, each having two Republican senators, voted differently on the bill, one voting “no” on the bill. Which senator, then, best represented the interests of the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania? Example, 24 senators, almost one-quarter of the Senate, split votes not only the independence of each senator, coupled with relatively weak political-party autonomy, even though they may represent the state. This diversity makes it impossible, in most cases, to claim that any given state has a single, unified interest to represent in the U.S. Congress. For example, Pennsylvania’s electorate has long been almost culture also has been described as one anchored by two liberal, cosmopolitan centers, one on the (Pittsburgh) with Alabama occupying the state the same year. This staggered election arrangement increases the possibility that a state’s two senators will being a Democrat, the other being a Republican. Even if a state’s two senators belong to the same party, they might reflect different conditions or political coalitions prevailing in different election years. Again, the U.S. Senate. 70 These two features of the very constitution of the U.S. Senate, therefore, sharply undermine the role of senators as ambassadors from sovereign polities seeking to maintain the Constitution, but rather a design preference supported by those framers in 1787 who Senate is commonly (though erroneously) viewed as the upper house, because only one-third of its members stand for election during any two-year election cycle, and that constituencies, the Senate, more often than the House, has been regarded by ambitious senators as a national forum in which they opportunity to shed their ambassadorial coat and assume the role of national ambassadors. Examples from the nineteenth century include Senator Daniel Webster (1782–1852) of Massachusetts and Senator Henry Clay (1777–1852). Senate, more often than the House, is viewed as a pathway to the popular election of the president became widespread in 1824, 37 men have held the presidency. Within 12 years of their election to the presidency, ten (27%) had been governors, ten had been vice president (27%) – though one who ascended to the presidency because of the death of a president not died in office. Of the 37 presidents, 9 (24%) had been U.S. senators, three (8%) had
senators, hope springs eternal, as reflected in and in 2004. A large number of U. S. senators sought or won their party's nomination for White House since Senator John F. Kennedy constitutional design features were mitigated legislatures. However, legislative selection of state autonomy. For one, during the early dec the Senate. Senators, who have no constitut disagreed with them, and state legislatures ab senators could also produce two senators from and the second senator. At the same time, if a rather than seek legislative appointment to at century than in the twentieth century. This co though House members have 71 always been shielded the states from overly aggressive fede autonomy can be seen in the rather inconseq require the direct election of U. S. senators by Republican senators, became less partisan an that directly elected senators became more or Factors Slowing Eclipse If the institutional de then what factors did serve to substantially pr assault? Two important factors were weak ins capacity. The federal government did not hav sales – all of which were politically charged ar taxes on personal and corporate incomes unt the amendment to require popular election o tax power until World War II. As late as 1927, s expenditures in the United States, compared to 77% in 1958, fluctuating thereafter in the 62 United States. Each national political party w decentralized, almost confederated, assemb in 1800 and then highly institutionalized after local and state government officials were able party control to restrain federal invasions into senators often voted along national-party line or perhaps even more important, was the role o 72 Congress stoutly resisted any federal legisla efforts to abolish polygamy in the Mormon-co legislation abolishing polygamy would estab life in the southern states. It was only after the supremacy was restored in the southern state state autonomy, or what was commonly calle successful in protecting states’ rights. During strong Democratic political machines in mos
example, massive federal regulation of the U. S. economy was strongly supported by many state regulation of banking, telecommunications, and some other sectors of the economy was established or maintained; and some sectors, such as insurance, were preserved for exclusive state regulation. Social welfare on excluding agricultural workers and household servants from Social Security; other welfare programs were intergovernmental, with state and local officials determining eligibility. The Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938 (i.e., minimum wage and working hours) originally private sector, not to the employees of state institutional and fiscal capacities and the confederated structure of the national political-party up, served to restrain the eclipse of state powers by the federal government for approximately 175 years. Constitutional restraints on federal power collapsed during the 1960s. Given Senate, are tilted against protecting state autonomy, there were few effective constitutional barriers socio-political forces overwhelmed the nonconstitutional barriers. For social movements and for focusing public political campaigns, reducing the role of local groups able to fund costly television advertising, finance their own campaigns with less and less played a pivotal role, too. During the 1960s, it by state and local governments, as well as the down race segregation in public schools, the 'reform state and local governments. Although the federal courts had achieved unprecedented little retreat, except in rights guarantees for cr representation in both the U. S. House of Representatives districts conformed to county and municipal individuals and social groups in legislative bodies of organization is what gave the national part door to party nationalization. The full impact individualistic and “atomistic” as members less attentive to hometown state and local government forces increasingly insisted that the dogcatcher to members of Congress and the party officials by allowing rank-and-file party election was the last in which “party bosses” president. In short, there was a massive change in local party leaders and elected government of party actors had substantial control over the members of Congress were no longer beholde Brown v. Board of Education, 349 U. S. 294 (1955). 377 U. S. 533 (1964). 7 Hertzke, Allen D. and Ronald M. Peters, eds. 1992. The Atomistic Congress: An Interpretation of Armonk: M. E. Sharpe. 74 cials for electoral success is no political capital in intergovernmental re black civil-rights movement led by the Rev. Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr., triggered massive federal intervention into the southern states, including the use of U. S. marshals and U. S. t convinced many Americans that the South’s s
scientist William H. Riker declared: “[I]f in the industrialization and modernization of the South of American politics. Third, growing migration conditioning (i.e., cooling systems) and the c population of Georgia increased from 3.4 million to 23.5 million (205% increase). Mean (18% increase). Consequently, while southern the House, neither the House nor the Senate than the rest of the country, is no longer a def movements for women, Indians, Hispanics, p rights movements almost unanimously and u government was seen as the champion of ind (1981–89) and, then, the 1994 capture of Cong interests; however, these movements ultimat to maintain the federal guarantee of abortion state policies from prohibition to permission. (e.g., Massachusetts) or civil unions (e.g., Ve politically feasible. Should it become feasible, states and guarantee gay marriage or civil un policies that will displace state laws and instit Significance. Boston: Little, Brown, p. 155. 75 and the environment, also have favored expa adequately with national and global phenom environmental pollution and weak consumer these movements turn to the states for action action when Democrats control federal instit expand federal power. As more and more busi diverse regulatory regimes. Hence, they sough nationwide. Globalization has fostered federa marketplace. The European Union, for exam therefore, big business prefers to be regulated forces outlined above, therefore, have given ri unprecedented increases since the 1960s in fe imposed on state and local governments, intr governments, federal encroachments on state of state criminal law. Conclusion The United reserved powers of the states. This view is due institutions have been models for many other powers against federal power. Instead, perha power in the new republic, the proponents of individuals, providing for staggered elections 1970; more than 20 million people participate
Coercive Federalism. Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science providing that no state’s two senators are elected at the same time. Proponents of federal power who sought to preserve in the Senate a strong federal role might have weakened the Senate’s ability to act as a deliberative body. Many supporters of states’ rights did not believe that socio-political and cultural forces would necessarily prevail in the Senate. Instead, those forces prevailed for about 175 years, leading to institutional incentives to rally around states’ rights. The Senate continued to provide a strong voice for states, and there has been no public outcry to revive federalism. The system continues to perform better than the federal government.1

1 Kincaid, John 2008. Contemporary U. S. Federalism: Coercive Change with Cooperative Continuity. Federals 6, pp. 10-36. 12 Kincaid, John 2007. States, and there has been no public outcry to revive federalism. The system continues to perform better than the federal government.1

The Australian Senate: Form, Function and Effectiveness were well aware of the conceptual difficulties in accommodating responsible government with federalism. Under the system of responsible government, a government is formed from and is accountable to the popularly elected House of Parliament. It ceases to hold office when it loses the confidence of that House. Federalism entails a division of power and a system of checks and balances. As Brian Galligan has put it more recently, “[t]he purpose of responsible government is to unify and consolidate political power whereas that of federalism is to fragment and circumscribe its exercise.”1 The modern Australian Senate continues to manifest the tensions between these principles. But it does so as a House thoroughly dominated by Party allegiances and in which territorial representation is vastly attenuated. It government much of the time, not because it represents the Australian Senate in mid 2006 when the paper on which it is based was published, but because it reflects the state of the Senate in 2006.

1 Galligan, Brian 1995. A Federal Republic: Australia’s Constitutional System of Government. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, p. 47. See also p. 48: “Federalism enshrines complicated procedures and conflicting institutions within the democratic process in order to refine and restrict the majority will. Responsible government consolidates the majority will of the people for its effectiveness.”1

The Constitution provides that the Senate “shall be composed of senators of the United States, who shall have been elected . . . the use of an electoral college or the selection of senators by State Parliaments. Senators are chosen by the Australian Research Council through a Discovery Grant (DP0450991). It reflects the state of the Senate in mid 2006 when the paper on which it is based was published, but because it leaves out the initial provisions that applied to matters.
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