Name_____

Date_____

Applying Four Theories of Governing

Directions: Read the following scenarios. Then identify which theory—bureaucratic, elitist, Marxist, or pluralist—corresponds with each situation.

Document 1

New York Housing Coalitions at Work

Nearly three years ago, as the 2001 elections approached, people who care about affordable housing in New York City faced a challenge. New York was in the midst of a deepening housing crisis. More than 500,000 households were paying more than half of their income for rent. However, despite widespread recognition of the problem, few candidates were proposing concrete solutions.

To begin to reverse the dire situation, community housing groups and homelessness advocates knew they would need to reach out to more than just the "usual suspects" concerned with affordable housing. And the Housing First alliance was born from this desire to unite a diverse group—from activists to developers to clergy to bankers—including groups that had not previously identified housing as a key issue for their constituents. . . .

In another nontraditional coalition effort in New York, affordable housing groups and building trades have begun working together. The barriers to this partnership are significant. Construction unions are unhappy that affordable housing, often built by nonprofit organizations, is nearly always built by non-union builders. . . .

Despite these differences, public housing residents, CDCs [community development corporations], and construction unions were drawn together by their common interests in affordable housing, forming an unlikely alliance known as the TRADES Coalition. . . .

In another recent partnership, unions are working with the Fifth Avenue Committee (FAC)—a Brooklyn-based CDC—to combine affordable housing construction with union jobs and local hiring. The unions would offer reduced wage rates in order to keep a 61-unit housing cooperative in Red Hook affordable to low-income families. The job will be built union, and the unions and contractors will hire local residents. FAC and the unions are now approaching contractors to see if they can build the project at the price needed. If this project is successful, several other CDCs have expressed interest in replicating it.[1]

Document 2

The End of Representation: How Congress Stifles Electoral Competition

For the past several decades, the reelection rate for members of the House of Representatives has hovered around 90 percent. In 1996 it exceeded 94 percent. The reasons that incumbents have enjoyed such tremendous electoral success are numerous.

House members frequently engage in pork-barrel politics. Many bring home pet projects that benefit their constituents and, as a consequence, their own chances for reelection. In addition, representatives use myriad taxpayer-funded perquisites to spread their messages and enhance their visibility. Incumbents also are able to help their constituents with various

[1]Brad Lander, "New York Housing Coalitions at Work," *Fannie Mae Foundation*, <http://www.fanniemaefoundation.org/programs/hff/v5i4-2ndarticle.shtml> (21 November 2005).

Name_____

Date_____

problems that they may encounter with the federal bureaucracy. Such help, known as constituent service, is made necessary by the increasing size of government and can significantly increase an incumbent's approval rating. Moreover, current campaign laws restricting the amount of money that a candidate can raise from an individual or group deter many potential challengers and greatly reduce the electoral chances of those who decide to run. Proposals that would regulate campaign finance even more would only further entrench incumbents.

To counter the many electoral advantages that incumbents now enjoy, a number of reforms could be implemented. Reducing the size of government would shrink the opportunities and necessity for constituent service. Eliminating campaign contribution limits would enable more candidates, particularly those with views outside the mainstream, to wage viable campaigns. Most of all, imposing term limits on members of Congress would ensure that party leaders and committee chairmen would not become part of a permanent ruling class. Since current members of Congress have little electoral incentive to pass such measures, a national movement to reject those seeking careers in Congress will be required.[2]

Document 3

History and Evolution of the Endangered Species Act of 1973, Including Its Relationship to CITES

Congress passed the Endangered Species Preservation Act in 1966. This law allowed listing of only native animal species as endangered and provided limited means for the protection of species so listed. The Departments of Interior, Agriculture, and Defense were to seek to protect listed species, and insofar as consistent with their primary purposes, preserve the habitats of such species. Land acquisition for protection of endangered species was also authorized. The Endangered Species Conservation Act of 1969 was passed to provide additional protection to species in danger of "worldwide extinction." Import of such species was prohibited, as was their subsequent sale within the U.S. This Act called for an international ministerial meeting to adopt a convention on the conservation of endangered species.

A 1973 conference in Washington led to the signing of the Convention on International Trade in Endangered Species of Wild Fauna and Flora (CITES), which restricted international commerce in plant and animal species believed to be actually or potentially harmed by trade. . . .

1978

. . . The Secretaries of Interior and Agriculture (for the Forest Service) were directed to develop a program for conserving fish, wildlife, and plants, including listed species, and land acquisition authority was extended to such species [section 5]. . . .

[2]Eric O'Keefe and Aaron Steelman, "The End of Representation: How Congress Stifles Electoral Competition" (Policy Analysis 279), *Cato Institute*, 10 August 1997, <http://www.cato.org/pub_display.php?pub_id=1138> (8 November 2005).

Name_____

Date_____

1982

Determinations of the status of species were required to be made solely on the basis of the biological and trade information, without any consideration of possible economic or other effects [section 4]. . . .

1988

. . . Protection for endangered plants was extended to include destruction on Federal land and other taking when it violates State law [section 9].[3]

Document 4

Civil Air Regulations Amendment 3-2

Service reports and the results of various studies conducted during the past few years indicate that the standards in the Civil Air Regulations for safety belts are not high enough to afford the proper protection for occupants of aircraft. It has also been learned that the belts now in general use are subject to service deterioration which further reduces the strength factor. The Board, therefore, is amending the requirements for safety belts to establish higher safety standards for this equipment. (For this purpose the Board is amending simultaneously Parts 3, 4a, 4b, 6, 15, 41, 42, 43, and 61.) The regulations are also being amended, in line with the policy of the Federal agencies to delegate maximum responsibility consistent with air safety to the industry, to permit safety belts to be approved on the basis of certified compliance with appropriately published specifications (Technical Standard Orders), as is now provided in §§ 3.31, 4a.31, 4b.41, and 6.6 of the Civil Air Regulations, instead of the type certification procedure currently required in Part 15.

It is our understanding that the Technical Standard Orders for safety belts will adopt specifications based upon those approved February 9, 1948, by the National Aircraft Standards Committee as NAS 802, except for the minimum strength values. The minimum strength values to be established in the Technical Standard Orders, while less than the values stated in NAS 802, are higher than existing requirements and are more consistent with crash load factor specified in the other parts of the regulations than the values stated in NAS 802.

The regulations hereby adopted provide that safety belts installed on airplanes manufactured on or after January 1, 1951, shall be manufactured under a Technical Standard Order.

Interested persons have been afforded an opportunity to participate in the making of this amendment and due consideration has been given to all relevant matter presented. . . .

§ 3.715 Safety belts. Airplanes manufactured on or after January 1, 1951, shall be equipped with safety belts approved in accordance with § 3.31. In no case shall the rated strength of the safety belt be less than that corresponding with the ultimate load factors specified in § 3.386(a), taking due account of the dimensional characteristics of the safety belt installation for the specific seat or berth arrangement. Safety belts shall be attached so that no part of the anchorage will fail at a load lower than that corresponding with the ultimate load factors specified in § 3.386 (a).[4]

[3]"History and Evolution of the Endangered Species Act of 1973, Including Its Relationship to CITES," *U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service*, October 1996, <http://www.fws.gov/endangered/esasum.html> (8 November 2005).
[4]"Civil Air Regulations Amendment 3-2," *Federal Aviation Administration*, <http://www.airweb.faa.gov/Regulatory_and_Guidance_Library/rgCCAB.nsf/0/4388ae3f0b2bd7c586256dff0052ae50> (8 November 2005).