

Political Science 171: State Politics

Loren Collingwood

University of California

loren.collingwood@ucr.edu

April 18, 2017

Interstate Interactions

- State gov'ts interact with each other often; known as **horizontal federalism**
- States compete with each other – over appropriate levels of taxation and expenditures. E.G. Boeing

Interstate Interactions

- State gov'ts interact with each other often; known as **horizontal federalism**
- States compete with each other – over appropriate levels of taxation and expenditures. E.G. Boeing
- States cooperate to solve various problems, including environmental and energy problems. E.G. Great Lakes states

Interstate Interactions

- State gov'ts interact with each other often; known as **horizontal federalism**
- States compete with each other – over appropriate levels of taxation and expenditures. E.G. Boeing
- States cooperate to solve various problems, including environmental and energy problems. E.G. Great Lakes states
- Legal equality between the states: Bigger states can't boss around smaller states. Thus, each state has relative influence

Interstate Interactions

- State gov'ts interact with each other often; known as **horizontal federalism**
- States compete with each other – over appropriate levels of taxation and expenditures. E.G. Boeing
- States cooperate to solve various problems, including environmental and energy problems. E.G. Great Lakes states
- Legal equality between the states: Bigger states can't boss around smaller states. Thus, each state has relative influence
- The Constitution legitimates these interactions: Full faith and credit clause (reciprocity); interstate rendition clause; privileges and immunities clause; Interstate compact clause

Cooperation

- States often face common problems; or neighboring states share certain ideologies

Cooperation

- States often face common problems; or neighboring states share certain ideologies
- Interstate compacts; joint legal actions; adoption of uniform state laws; promulgation of administrative agreements

Cooperation

- States often face common problems; or neighboring states share certain ideologies
- Interstate compacts; joint legal actions; adoption of uniform state laws; promulgation of administrative agreements
- Typically seen as win-win!!

Cooperation

- States often face common problems; or neighboring states share certain ideologies
- Interstate compacts; joint legal actions; adoption of uniform state laws; promulgation of administrative agreements
- Typically seen as win-win!!
- Cooperate to create/maintain interstate compacts: formal agreement/contract between multiple states. May cover criminal justice, education, natural resources (Keystone Pipeline might be an example), transportation

Cooperation

- States often face common problems; or neighboring states share certain ideologies
- Interstate compacts; joint legal actions; adoption of uniform state laws; promulgation of administrative agreements
- Typically seen as win-win!!
- Cooperate to create/maintain interstate compacts: formal agreement/contract between multiple states. May cover criminal justice, education, natural resources (Keystone Pipeline might be an example), transportation
- Compacts often lower the costs of a project/program to each individual state

Cooperation

- Multi-state legal actions: Demonstrates strength in numbers. Often why you may see 15 states charging one person with various crimes

Cooperation

- Multi-state legal actions: Demonstrates strength in numbers. Often why you may see 15 states charging one person with various crimes
- Substantive focus is often on consumer and/or environmental protection

Cooperation

- Multi-state legal actions: Demonstrates strength in numbers. Often why you may see 15 states charging one person with various crimes
- Substantive focus is often on consumer and/or environmental protection
- Research analysis indicates that states with a more “liberal” populace enter into more multi-state legal actions

Cooperation

- Multi-state legal actions: Demonstrates strength in numbers. Often why you may see 15 states charging one person with various crimes

Cooperation

- Multi-state legal actions: Demonstrates strength in numbers. Often why you may see 15 states charging one person with various crimes
- Substantive focus is often on consumer and/or environmental protection

Cooperation

- Multi-state legal actions: Demonstrates strength in numbers. Often why you may see 15 states charging one person with various crimes
- Substantive focus is often on consumer and/or environmental protection
- Research analysis indicates that states with a more “liberal” populace enter into more multi-state legal actions

Cooperation

- Multi-state legal actions: Demonstrates strength in numbers. Often why you may see 15 states charging one person with various crimes
- Substantive focus is often on consumer and/or environmental protection
- Research analysis indicates that states with a more “liberal” populace enter into more multi-state legal actions
- Uniform State Laws: Congress often adopts uniform state laws, but another way is for states to do this themselves via the Uniform Law Commission

Cooperation

- Multi-state legal actions: Demonstrates strength in numbers. Often why you may see 15 states charging one person with various crimes
- Substantive focus is often on consumer and/or environmental protection
- Research analysis indicates that states with a more “liberal” populace enter into more multi-state legal actions
- Uniform State Laws: Congress often adopts uniform state laws, but another way is for states to do this themselves via the Uniform Law Commission
- Cooperation of Administrative Agreements: Do not require legislative action, thus enacted more quickly, but sometimes less durable

Competition

- State gov'ts may compete over federal grants

Competition

- State gov'ts may compete over federal grants
- States compete in the private sectors for specific companies to move there; tourism

Competition

- State gov'ts may compete over federal grants
- States compete in the private sectors for specific companies to move there; tourism
- Competition for Economic Development: Tax burden, training programs, wage rates, regulatory environment, venture capital possibilities, quality of life, union membership

Competition

- State gov'ts may compete over federal grants
- States compete in the private sectors for specific companies to move there; tourism
- Competition for Economic Development: Tax burden, training programs, wage rates, regulatory environment, venture capital possibilities, quality of life, union membership
- Do indicators of economic development have any effect on firm locational decisions? Perhaps individually, but trend data do not support this.

Competition

- Competition over Tax Systems: States rely on different revenue sources to fund their gov'ts. From NJ (12.2%) to TN (7.6%)

Competition

- Competition over Tax Systems: States rely on different revenue sources to fund their gov'ts. From NJ (12.2%) to TN (7.6%)
- Example: Washington State and Texas, tax increase ballot initiative

Competition

- Competition over Tax Systems: States rely on different revenue sources to fund their gov'ts. From NJ (12.2%) to TN (7.6%)
- Example: Washington State and Texas, tax increase ballot initiative
- Lawmakers more likely to propose tax increases when neighboring states do the same

Colorado River Compact

- Colorado River Compact
- Colorado vs. California

States' Relationship with Local Gov'ts

- Not a relationship of equals; the state holds all legal power and delegates as it sees fit

States' Relationship with Local Gov'ts

- Not a relationship of equals; the state holds all legal power and delegates as it sees fit
- Local gov'ts are creatures of their states, so there is much variation

States' Relationship with Local Gov'ts

- Not a relationship of equals; the state holds all legal power and delegates as it sees fit
- Local gov'ts are creatures of their states, so there is much variation
- Dillion's Rule: Local gov'ts may exercise only those powers explicitly granted them by the state

States' Relationship with Local Gov'ts

- Not a relationship of equals; the state holds all legal power and delegates as it sees fit
- Local gov'ts are creatures of their states, so there is much variation
- Dillion's Rule: Local gov'ts may exercise only those powers explicitly granted them by the state
- Any doubt regarding local gov't power is resolved in favor of state

States' Relationship with Local Gov'ts

- Not a relationship of equals; the state holds all legal power and delegates as it sees fit
- Local gov'ts are creatures of their states, so there is much variation
- Dillion's Rule: Local gov'ts may exercise only those powers explicitly granted them by the state
- Any doubt regarding local gov't power is resolved in favor of state
- State legislatures do not necessarily constrain local gov't power, but they can

States' Relationship with Local Gov'ts

- Home Rule: Provides some degree of self-government to a local jurisdiction. Local officials get more discretion in design of governance. Fits more with Jeffersonian principles.

States' Relationship with Local Gov'ts

- Home Rule: Provides some degree of self-government to a local jurisdiction. Local officials get more discretion in design of governance. Fits more with Jeffersonian principles.
- States are important revenue source to their local jurisdictions. States provide about 1/3 revenue of local gov't.

States' Relationship with Local Gov'ts

- Home Rule: Provides some degree of self-government to a local jurisdiction. Local officials get more discretion in design of governance. Fits more with Jeffersonian principles.
- States are important revenue source to their local jurisdictions. States provide about 1/3 revenue of local gov't.
- States give local gov'ts mandates to ensure the latter perform vital activities and achieve goals. E.G.: State spending on local education.

States' Relationship with Local Gov'ts

- Home Rule: Provides some degree of self-government to a local jurisdiction. Local officials get more discretion in design of governance. Fits more with Jeffersonian principles.
- States are important revenue source to their local jurisdictions. States provide about 1/3 revenue of local gov't.
- States give local gov'ts mandates to ensure the latter perform vital activities and achieve goals. E.G.: State spending on local education.
- Second Order Devolution: Shift in power from state level to local level. Can be administrative or substantive (policymaking)

States' Relationship with Local Gov'ts

- Home Rule: Provides some degree of self-government to a local jurisdiction. Local officials get more discretion in design of governance. Fits more with Jeffersonian principles.
- States are important revenue source to their local jurisdictions. States provide about 1/3 revenue of local gov't.
- States give local gov'ts mandates to ensure the latter perform vital activities and achieve goals. E.G.: State spending on local education.
- Second Order Devolution: Shift in power from state level to local level. Can be administrative or substantive (policymaking)
- Over time, states have tended to centralize power (Ross Stephens index). States most centralized: AK, DE, HI, VT; least centralized: CA, FL, IL, NV. Why?