The Veto Line Is Breaking

A Political Science and Legal Analysis of the 2026 North Carolina General Assembly Election

Investigative Op Ed and Analysis Report



Professor Dr. Lent C. Carr II PhD | Chief Editor | DINA | October 28 2026

A Democratic House has moved from remote theory to a live electoral contingency. A Democratic Senate remains an upset. The most defensible central judgment is that Republican veto proof power is likely to be broken or rendered operationally fragile.

Finding

The proposition survives serious scrutiny, but only after its claims are separated. North Carolina Democrats have a credible route to the House. They have a narrower and distinctly less probable route to a numerical Senate majority. Their strongest near term case is the restoration of a functioning gubernatorial veto by reducing Republican strength below a dependable three fifths coalition. The available evidence therefore supports a layered conclusion rather than a slogan: a dual chamber Democratic takeover is possible; a House turnover is genuinely competitive; and the collapse of automatic veto overrides is the result most strongly supported by current data.

No model can prove a future election before votes are counted. A proof based forecast can do something more disciplined. It can establish the governing legal thresholds, test whether several independent data streams point in the same direction, identify the districts that must change hands, and show how sensitive the conclusion is to turnout and modeling assumptions. On that standard, the old claim that neither chamber can move is no longer defensible. The remaining dispute concerns degree.

My judgment is direct. The House is a live contest and may now be the likeliest chamber to produce a political shock. The Senate map still imposes a severe structural penalty, so outright Democratic control should be treated as a tail outcome rather than the modal forecast. Yet Senate Democrats need only one net gain to deprive Republicans of a full attendance veto override. Public models currently center on three or four Democratic Senate gains. That is the institutional hinge of this election.

Table 1 The three questions that must be kept separate

Question	Legal threshold	Evidence based assessment
Can Democrats win the House	61 of 120 seats	Live contingency Two public forecasts place the chamber at or near a Democratic majority
Can Democrats win the Senate	26 seats A 25 to 25 tie gives the Democratic lieutenant governor a tie breaking vote	Possible upset Central forecasts remain at 23 or 24 Democratic seats
Can Democrats end dependable veto overrides	Fewer than 72 House Republicans or fewer than 30 Senate Republicans at full attendance	Most strongly supported outcome Senate forecasts center below 30 Republican seats

Method and Standard of Proof

This report uses triangulation. It gives the greatest weight to constitutional text, official membership data, official election records, transparent district forecasts, and polls that disclose their samples and field dates. It then tests those sources against political science findings about midterm backlash, presidential approval, nationalization, and institutional veto players. Campaign rhetoric and tactical behavior are considered only as corroboration.

The analysis applies a Bayesian logic without pretending to possess a single precise posterior probability. The prior is unfavorable to Democrats because Republicans have controlled both chambers since 2010 and because the 2023 maps translate statewide votes into Republican seats efficiently. The probability rises when independent polls show a consistent Democratic legislative advantage, when two different forecasting systems place the House at or near control, when early voting displays unusually high Democratic and unaffiliated participation, and when Republican

leaders themselves publicly warn of down ballot danger. The probability falls where evidence is weak, sponsor dependent, or unable to reveal vote choice.

A uniform statewide swing is not sufficient. North Carolina elects legislators in separate districts, and the same statewide margin can yield different seat totals depending on geography, candidate quality, incumbency, uncontested races, and turnout composition. The decisive test is whether the statewide environment is large enough to move the particular districts at the chamber control line.

The Constitutional Arithmetic

The current General Assembly contains 71 Republicans, 47 Democrats, and two unaffiliated members in the House, and 30 Republicans and 20 Democrats in the Senate.[1] The two unaffiliated representatives were elected as Democrats and changed affiliation in April 2026 after losing Democratic primaries. The current membership count therefore differs from the 2024 electoral baseline of 49 Democratic seats and 71 Republican seats used by election models. If Democrats recover all 49 districts won by their 2024 nominees, they need 12 Republican held seats to reach a 61 seat House majority.

North Carolina Constitution Article II Section 22 requires three fifths of the members present and voting in each chamber to override a gubernatorial veto.[2] At full attendance the familiar thresholds are 72 House votes and 30 Senate votes. Those numbers are not permanently fixed for vetoes. Absences, abstentions, and members declining to vote can reduce the denominator. This is why the difference between 71 and 69 Republican House members, or between 29 and 27 Republican senators, is larger than a casual seat count suggests.

Table 2 Attendance sensitivity of a party line veto override

Chamber alignment	Full attendance result	Opposition absences or nonvotes needed if every Republican votes yes
House 71 Republicans and 49 others	71 of 120 is 59.2 percent Override fails	2 A 71 to 47 vote among 118 reaches 60 percent
House 70 Republicans and 50 others	70 of 120 is 58.3 percent Override fails	4 A 70 to 46 vote among 116 exceeds 60 percent
Senate 29 Republicans and 21 Democrats	29 of 50 is 58 percent Override fails	2 A 29 to 19 vote among 48 exceeds 60 percent
Senate 28 Republicans and 22 Democrats	28 of 50 is 56 percent Override fails	4 A 28 to 18 vote among 46 exceeds 60 percent

The practical concept is coalition security. A one seat loss below the Senate threshold ends a guaranteed party line override when all members vote, but it does not eliminate override risk. Additional Democratic gains raise the number of absences or crossovers Republicans must obtain. That widening margin protects the governor from scheduling tactics and individual defections. It also converts the veto from a temporary objection into a bargaining instrument.

Two constitutional qualifications are essential. First, the lieutenant governor presides over the Senate and votes only when the chamber is equally divided.[3] A 25 to 25 Senate is therefore not a Democratic numerical majority, but Democratic Lieutenant Governor Rachel Hunt would possess a tie breaking vote. Organization and procedure would become contested and consequential. Second, redistricting bills, local bills, and constitutional amendment proposals are outside the ordinary veto

process. Article XIII Section 4 separately requires three fifths of all members of each house to propose a constitutional amendment, a fixed 72 House votes and 30 Senate votes before the proposal goes to voters.[4] Breaking ordinary veto power does not hand the governor control over maps or amendment referrals.

The Law of the Map and the Politics of the Map

The legal status of a district map and its political responsiveness are different questions. In Rucho v Common Cause, the United States Supreme Court held that federal partisan gerrymandering claims present political questions beyond the reach of federal courts.[5] In Harper v Hall, the North Carolina Supreme Court held on rehearing that partisan gerrymandering claims under the state constitution are nonjusticiable and dismissed those claims with prejudice.[6] Those holdings sharply limit general partisan fairness litigation. They do not establish that the enacted maps translate votes neutrally, and they do not foreclose every distinct claim arising under federal voting rights law.

The Duke Quantifying Gerrymandering project compared the 2023 legislative plans with large ensembles of maps drawn under nonpartisan criteria. Its analysis found that the enacted House and Senate plans under elect Democrats in closely divided statewide environments and are less responsive than the 2022 remedial plans. In several historical election scenarios with Democratic statewide vote shares near or above 50 percent, the Senate plan still preserved a Republican supermajority.[7] The finding does not predict the 2026 vote. It explains why Democrats require a statewide advantage substantially larger than a bare majority to reach a chamber majority.

This distinction is constitutionally important. Judicial nonintervention can leave political correction to elections even when the electoral mechanism is intentionally resistant to change. The 2026 contest therefore tests electoral elasticity: how large a public shift must occur before a map designed to dampen that shift finally yields seats. A wave does not erase a gerrymander. It can overwhelm its margins one district at a time.

The Statewide Environment

Four recent public polls with different sponsors and methods place Democrats ahead on the state legislative ballot. High Point University reported Democratic advantages of four points for the House and five for the Senate among 706 likely voters. Catawba College and YouGov found advantages of eight points for the House and ten for the Senate in a weighted sample of 1,000 adults. Carolina Forward and Change Research reported a seven point Democratic legislative advantage among 829 likely voters. Harper Polling for the Carolina Journal and John Locke Foundation reported a 5.8 point Democratic advantage among 600 likely voters.[8][9][10][11]

Table 3 Recent public legislative polling

Source and field period	Sample	House result	Senate result	Interpretive limit
High Point University Sep 6 to 16	706 likely voters	D 48 R 44	D 49 R 44	Online likely voter model
Catawba College YouGov Sep 4 to 15	1000 adults MoE 3.68	D 47 R 39	D 48 R 38	Adult sample subgroup error larger
Carolina Forward Change Research Oct 1 to 7	829 likely voters MoE 3.7	Combined legislative D 49 R 42	Combined legislative D 49 R 42	Democratic aligned sponsor

Source and field period	Sample	House result	Senate result	Interpretive limit
Carolina Journal Harper through Oct 20	600 likely voters	Combined legislative D 48.5 R 42.7	Combined legislative D 48.5 R 42.7	Conservative sponsor and Republican associated pollster

The strongest inference comes from convergence across sponsors, not from any single topline. A Democratic aligned organization may overstate Democratic strength. A conservative publication may select a different likely voter universe. An academic survey of adults does not equal an election electorate. Yet every listed measure points in the same direction, with Democratic margins ranging from four to ten points. That directional agreement is difficult to dismiss as a house effect.

The national political science literature supplies a mechanism for the pattern. Steven Rogers found that changes in presidential approval have at least three times the effect on state legislative vote choice as assessments of the state legislature, and that legislators from an unpopular president's party are more likely to draw challengers.[18] James Campbell demonstrated a recurring midterm loss in state legislative control by the president's party, related to the prior presidential surge.[19] Joshua Zingher and Jesse Richman found that high national polarization increases the influence of national party orientation on state legislative outcomes.[20] Jacob Holt found that unified federal government increases midterm seat losses for the president's party and amplifies the counter surge.[21] In 2026, a Republican president and Republican Congress place North Carolina Republican legislators on the exposed side of those national forces.

North Carolina also retains a meaningful split ticket habit. In 2024 Donald Trump won the state with 50.86 percent while Josh Stein won the governorship with 54.90 percent.[22] The same electorate can reward candidates from opposing parties at different levels. A favorable environment for Roy Cooper does not mechanically transfer to every Democratic legislative nominee, but a strong statewide Democratic performance can raise turnout and reduce the persuasion burden in marginal districts.

The Early Vote Signal

Through October 27, North Carolina's accepted early vote file contained 1,961,168 ballots. Registered Democrats accounted for 792,034, Republicans for 486,519, and unaffiliated or minor party voters for 682,615. That is a 15.6 point Democratic registration advantage among ballots cast, compared with a 7.5 point Democratic advantage at the same stage of the 2022 voting calendar. Democratic ballots were up 42 percent from the comparable 2022 point, Republican ballots 8 percent, and unaffiliated ballots 59 percent.[16]

Those are participation records, not election results. The ballots remain sealed. Registered Democrats sometimes vote Republican, registered Republicans sometimes vote Democratic, and more than one third of the early electorate is unaffiliated. Early votes can also substitute for Election Day votes rather than add to them. The responsible inference is narrower: the Democratic and unaffiliated segments were participating with unusual intensity, while Republican participation had not grown at the same rate.

Republican Senator Thom Tillis independently described the same pattern on CNN. He said the intensity from Democrats and unaffiliated voters was at a very high level and warned that continued trends could threaten congressional races and the legislative majorities he helped create in 2010.[17] His statement is not neutral evidence, and public warnings can be designed to mobilize a party. It

matters because it is consistent with the official participation data and because it comes from a former North Carolina House speaker with direct knowledge of the Republican legislative coalition.

The Forecast Divide

Forecasts are useful when their disagreement is preserved. State Navigate labels Democrats narrow favorites for the House while showing a central 60 to 60 division, and it projects a 23 to 27 Democratic deficit in the Senate.[12] On Point Politics gives Democrats a 63 percent chance of House control in 2,000 simulations, with a median of 62 Democratic seats and an 80 percent range from 56 to 69. Its Senate model gives Democrats a 21 percent chance of numerical control, a median of 24 seats, and an 80 percent range from 22 to 27.[13] NCFREE identifies a broad field of competitive districts but does not treat a House change as its base case.[14]

Table 4 Public forecast comparison

Model	House	Senate	What the model establishes
State Navigate	Democrats narrow favorites central 60 D and 60 R	Republicans solid favorites central 23 D and 27 R	The House control line is within the central range The Senate majority line is not
On Point Politics Oct 27	63 percent Democratic control median 62 D	21 percent Democratic control median 24 D	A House flip is common in simulations A Senate flip is a real but minority outcome
NCFREE district ratings	Nine House tossups reported in late cycle analysis	Ten Senate districts classified as competitive	Candidate and district specific review supports gains but is more cautious about control

The On Point model begins with the 2024 presidential vote in each district, adjusts for state and national conditions, carries forward half of a prior candidate's overperformance, incorporates primaries and polls, and runs shared national, state, and district shocks across 2,000 simulations. Its transparency is a strength. Its projected Democratic environment of 11.1 points relative to the 2024 presidential vote is also an aggressive assumption that makes the forecast sensitive to late movement and turnout error. The correct conclusion is that the House is competitive, not that a Democratic majority is assured.

Model disagreement is itself evidence about the type of uncertainty. The dispute is not whether Democrats will gain seats. Every cited system expects gains. The dispute is whether the gains stop a few seats short of the House majority or cross it, and whether the Senate gain reaches three or six. That is a much narrower question than the conventional claim that neither chamber can move.

The House Path

The House path requires exceptional breadth. Ballotpedia reports Democratic candidates in 116 of 120 districts, compared with Republican candidates in 89, and identifies 23 House battlegrounds, 20 of them Republican held.[15] Broad candidate coverage matters because a wave cannot reach a district without a nominee. It also limits the number of uncontested seats that mechanically distort statewide vote totals.

On Point's district table illustrates the coalition needed for a majority. It favors Democrats in Republican held House Districts 25, 73, 37, 74, and 5, and gives Democrats narrow advantages in

Districts 64, 63, 20, and 82. The next reach seats include Districts 119, 26, 9, 7, and 75. The chamber turns only if Democrats win almost all of the first tier and enough tossups or Republican leaning reaches to complete the 12 seat gain from the 2024 baseline.[13]

This is demanding but not historically alien. In 2018 Democrats gained ten House seats and six Senate seats, leaving Republicans with 65 House seats and 29 Senate seats and ending veto proof supermajorities in both chambers.[23] The 2026 maps are different and, by ensemble analysis, less responsive. The precedent does not prove a repeat. It establishes that a double digit House gain and a multi seat Senate gain can occur in a North Carolina midterm when the national environment and suburban districts move together.

A 60 to 60 House is a serious possibility in a chamber with an even number of seats. Control would then depend on organization, attendance, and any cross party agreement rather than a simple partisan majority. That prospect is one reason the final one or two districts carry institutional weight far beyond their population share.

The Senate Path

The Senate is harder because the majority requires six net Democratic gains and the map contains fewer marginal seats. On Point favors Democratic gains in Senate Districts 7, 11, 34, and 4, which would produce 24 Democratic senators. A 25th seat would require a win in a district the model still leans Republican, such as District 1, 2, or 24. A 26th seat would require another reach or an unmodeled upset. State Navigate centers one seat lower, at 23 Democrats.[12][13]

The gap between breaking a supermajority and winning the Senate is therefore decisive. One Democratic gain moves the chamber to 29 Republicans and 21 Democrats, enough to defeat a full attendance party line veto override. Four gains produce the On Point median of 24 Democrats and 26 Republicans. Five gains create a 25 to 25 chamber with the lieutenant governor's tie breaking vote. Six gains produce a conventional Democratic majority. Each step has a different legal and political consequence.

The Senate takeover theory should be described as an upset because it depends on multiple correlated errors in the Republican direction of the map. The same Democratic statewide wave that flips Districts 7 and 11 must continue into districts that began 2024 roughly 15 or 16 points to the Republican side in the presidential vote. The current environment makes that conceivable. It does not make it the central case.

Why One Chamber Is Not Symbolic

A Democratic House with a Republican Senate could not enact a Democratic program by itself. The Senate could refuse House bills, and the governor could not compel bicameral agreement. Yet calling a House turnover merely symbolic mistakes lawmaking for bill passage alone. A House majority chooses the speaker, controls committees and calendars, determines which measures receive hearings and floor votes, conducts oversight, and decides which Senate proposals never advance. Those are governing powers.

Veto player theory explains the change. A new partisan majority in one chamber becomes an additional collective veto player. Policy change becomes harder where preferences diverge, but

bargaining power shifts because the other chamber can no longer set the entire legislative agenda.[27]

Agenda control scholarship likewise shows that majority parties often exercise their most reliable power negatively by keeping proposals off the floor. A Democratic House would therefore alter the feasible set of laws even when few Democratic bills reached the governor.[28]

The governor's role changes at the same time. With dependable veto protection, Governor Josh Stein can reject ordinary public legislation and force Republican leaders to decide whether to negotiate, abandon the proposal, or assemble cross party support. The likely consequence is neither a Democratic program nor automatic paralysis. It is divided government with real bargaining, a constitutional condition the present override structure has often muted.

Fact Checking the Signs of Republican Concern

Several Republican actions are consistent with electoral concern, but motive must be established cautiously. The 2026 ballot includes constitutional proposals on photo identification, a 3.5 percent maximum income tax rate, and limits on local property tax increases.[24] Such measures can energize conservative voters. They also advance substantive priorities Republican legislators have pursued for years. Their presence is circumstantial evidence of turnout strategy, not proof that internal polling predicts defeat.

The October special session and temporary motor fuel tax suspension present a similar mixed record. Session Law 2026 62 reduced the tax to zero through November 30 and used reserve funds to replace affected transportation revenue.[25] The timing, weeks before Election Day, supports an inference of political responsiveness. Yet the measure passed nearly unanimously, Governor Stein supported and signed it, and only Representative Pricey Harrison voted no. The policy may have been electorally useful to Republicans, but it was also bipartisan emergency relief during high fuel prices. A rigorous argument should not treat it as a confession of panic.

The stronger evidence of Republican concern is measurable and on the record: competitive district spending, public polling, early participation patterns, and Thom Tillis's warning about legislative majorities. Tactical actions become persuasive only when they align with those independent indicators.

The Scenario Structure

Table 5 Institutional outcomes after the election

Outcome	Illustrative composition	Constitutional and political effect
Republicans retain both chambers and the Senate falls below 30	House 68 to 71 R Senate 27 to 29 R	Stein vetoes become sustainable at full attendance Republicans need absences or crossovers for overrides
Democrats win the House and Republicans retain the Senate	House at least 61 D Senate 26 to 29 R	Democratic House controls its agenda and blocks Senate measures Ordinary legislation requires negotiation
Senate reaches a tie	25 D and 25 R	Lieutenant Governor Hunt votes on ties Organization and procedure become central This is not a 26 seat Democratic majority

Outcome	Illustrative composition	Constitutional and political effect
Democrats win both chambers	House at least 61 D Senate at least 26 D	Democratic trifecta with Governor Stein Still subject to constitutional rules and judicial review
Republicans preserve 30 Senate seats	At least 30 R	Full attendance party line Senate overrides remain available even if House control changes

Verdict

The strongest defensible conclusion is that North Carolina has entered a legislative control election for the first time in years. A Democratic House is a live outcome supported by two public forecasting systems, a sustained legislative polling advantage, broad candidate coverage, and a national environment that political science associates with losses for the president's party. The claim remains contingent because the map requires Democrats to convert a large statewide advantage into a dozen specific Republican seat defeats.

A Democratic Senate majority is possible but remains an upset. The median public forecasts produce 23 or 24 Democratic senators, not 26. A 25 to 25 tie is more plausible than a conventional majority and would confer real tie breaking power on the Democratic lieutenant governor. The most probable Senate change is the end of a 30 seat Republican supermajority.

The central institutional forecast is therefore a restoration of friction. Republicans are likely to lose the ability to treat the governor's veto as a brief procedural delay. A House turnover would deepen that change by adding an independent agenda setter and veto player. Even without a dual chamber Democratic victory, North Carolina could move from near unilateral legislative control to enforced negotiation.

The impossible has not become inevitable. It has become measurable. The House control line now lies inside the range of credible forecasts. The Senate majority line lies near the edge of that range. The veto line lies squarely in the path of the current wave. That is the proposition the evidence proves as far as evidence can prove a future election.

Methodology and Limitations

This report is a public source analysis current through October 28, 2026. It compares official constitutional and membership records, public polling, public district forecasts, official or official sourced early vote files, historical election results, peer reviewed political science, and contemporaneous reporting. Forecast descriptions reproduce each source's stated assumptions and should not be combined as if they were independent polls; several models use overlapping election and polling inputs.

Early voting data identify who participated by registration, not how anyone voted. District forecasts can miss candidate scandals, local field strength, late advertising, ballot curing, weather, and Election Day turnout. Generic ballots are statewide measures and do not account perfectly for district geography. Legal analysis describes constitutional structure and published cases; it is not legal representation or a prediction of future litigation.

Sources

All online sources were accessed October 28, 2026. Polling and forecast figures are reported as published by the cited source.

[1] North Carolina General Assembly member tables and party affiliation records. 2025 to 2026 House and Senate composition including 71 House Republicans 47 Democrats 2 unaffiliated members and 30 Senate Republicans 20 Democrats

[2] Constitution of North Carolina Article II Section 22. Veto procedure and three fifths requirement based on members present and voting along with veto exceptions

[3] Constitution of North Carolina Article III Section 6. Lieutenant governor as President of the Senate with a vote only when the Senate is equally divided

[4] Constitution of North Carolina Article XIII Section 4. Three fifths of all members of each house required to submit a constitutional amendment to voters

[5] Rucho v Common Cause 588 US 684. United States Supreme Court decision of June 27 2019 holding federal partisan gerrymandering claims nonjusticiable

[6] Harper v Hall 384 NC 292. North Carolina Supreme Court decision of April 28 2023 holding partisan gerrymandering claims under the state constitution nonjusticiable

[7] Duke Quantifying Gerrymandering analysis of the 2023 plans. Ensemble analysis finding the proposed legislative plans less responsive and more favorable to Republicans than neutral ensembles and 2022 remedial maps

[8] High Point University Poll 127. September 2026 North Carolina likely voter poll including state House and Senate generic ballots and methodology

[9] Catawba College YouGov Poll 39. September 2026 weighted statewide survey with legislative ballot and presidential approval measures

[10] Carolina Forward October 2026 Poll. Change Research survey of 829 likely voters reporting a seven point Democratic legislative advantage

[11] Carolina Journal October 2026 Poll. Harper Polling survey of 600 likely voters including a 48.5 to 42.7 Democratic legislative advantage

[12] State Navigate North Carolina legislative forecasts. House forecast labeling Democrats narrow favorites with a 60 to 60 central projection and Senate forecast with 23 Democrats and 27 Republicans

[13] On Point Politics North Carolina House and Senate forecasts. October 27 2026 forecasts using 2000 simulations and disclosed district methodology

[14] NCFREE Partisan District Scores. Regression based district scores using presidential margins historic incumbency down ballot lag and demographics

[15] Ballotpedia 2026 North Carolina House and Senate election coverage. Candidate coverage and battleground classifications

[16] North Carolina 2026 early vote tracker sourced to the State Board file. Accepted ballot totals through October 27 with party registration and same stage comparisons to 2022

[17] CNN transcript of Thom Tillis interview. October 19 2026 interview discussing Democratic and unaffiliated intensity and risk to North Carolina legislative majorities

[18] Steven Rogers National Forces in State Legislative Elections. The Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science 667 2016 pages 207 to 225 doi 10.1177/0002716216662454

[19] James E Campbell Presidential Coattails and Midterm Losses in State Legislative Elections. American Political Science Review 80 1986 pages 45 to 63 doi 10.2307/1957083

[20] Joshua N Zingher and Jesse Richman Polarization and the Nationalization of State Legislative Elections. American Politics Research 47 2019 pages 1036 to 1054 doi 10.1177/1532673X18788050

[21] Jacob Holt Party Does Not Matter Unified Government and Midterm Elections. Social Science Quarterly 103 2022 pages 168 to 180 doi 10.1111/ssqu.13112

[22] North Carolina State Board of Elections 2024 election results. Official statewide results for president and governor and historical election data

[23] North Carolina 2018 legislative election results. Post election composition of 65 Republicans and 55 Democrats in the House and 29 Republicans and 21 Democrats in the Senate

[24] North Carolina General Assembly 2026 constitutional amendment summaries. Official summaries for photo identification income tax cap and local property tax limitation proposals

[25] North Carolina Session Law 2026 62 and WUNC report. Motor fuel tax suspension through November 30 2026 and contemporaneous account of the nearly unanimous vote and estimated fiscal cost

[26] North Carolina General Assembly party affiliation changes. Official record of Carla Cunningham and Nasif Majeed changing from Democratic to unaffiliated in April 2026

[27] George Tsebelis Veto Players. Princeton University Press 2002 theory of institutional and partisan actors whose agreement is required for policy change

[28] Gary W Cox and Mathew D McCubbins Setting the Agenda. Cambridge University Press 2005 account of majority party agenda and negative agenda control