

American Political Development
American Studies 6121; Government 6121; History 6121
Fall 2015

Richard Bensel
E-mail: rfb2@cornell.edu

Tuesday, 5:00-7:00
Room: White 104

This course will survey the literature on American political development from the Founding to the late twentieth century. The readings will encompass a wide sampling of work from intellectual, legal, economic, political, institutional, cultural, and social history. While most of the books will be drawn from what is commonly regarded as the American political development subfield in political science, we will also examine research in the closely related disciplines of history, sociology, and economics.

There are three important goals for this course. The first is to give the student an opportunity to become familiar with some of the most significant research and writing in the subfield. To that end, only one book will be assigned as required reading each week. However, we will read that book in its entirety. A second and related goal is to place the argument and content of that book in a larger historical context so that we can see both what has been brought into sharper focus and what has been relegated to the shadows. While we will not attempt to cover all of American political history in this course, much of that history will be covered in the weekly sessions. Finally, we are particularly interested in analyzing how each author conducted his or her research, including the kind of evidence that was collected, the manner in which that evidence was presented to the reader, and the relationship of this evidence to the claims the author makes. In sum, we want to reconstruct how each book came to be written by dissecting each of its elements.

Course Requirements:

Because this course is designed as a general survey of the vast literature on American political development, a research paper will not be required. Instead, seventy-five percent of the course grade will be based on a take-home final conducted as if it were a small version of a doctoral qualifying examination. An additional ten percent will be allocated according to the amount and quality of individual contributions to class discussion. The remainder of the course requirements will be satisfied in the form of one or two page papers on the reading assigned for each week.

A student can choose to prepare a research paper of a (to be negotiated) length in place of the take-home exam. This research paper should be intended for presentation in a professional forum outside of Cornell and/or publication in a professional journal.

Weekly paper assignments:

There will be weekly paper assignments which will be due by midnight on the Sunday before the class session on Tuesday. These papers will address five primary questions concerning that week's reading:

1) What is the author's main point? Put another way: What is the primary question that the author is attempting to answer? The author will almost always include references to other scholars who have either failed to

address this question or who have offered alternative answers. You should also note these references as well.

2) What is the evidence that the author has collected and presented in preparing an answer to his or her question? In some cases, the author has "returned to the archives" and reanalyzed primary documents. In others, new empirical data has been gathered from sources that other scholars have not used in the past. Among other things, you should try to reconstruct the research "practice" of the author as this evidence was gathered: What, actually, did he or she do when conducting research for the book?

3) In almost all important books, the author either creates new terms for organizing evidence (such as "party state") or redefines old terms (such as "social movement"). What are the most central terms in this week's readings? How and why does the author distinguish those terms from past usage?

4) What appears to be the least essential (and, often, the least interesting) section in the book? This question may seem to ask you for an opinion involving personal taste. However, the query has a follow-up: Why do you think the author included this section in the book? Every author wishes to entertain readers so that he and she will have many of them. But every author also wishes, at the very least, to protect his research from criticism by shoring up the weaker points of his argument. We are looking for those weaker points in this question.

5) If you were to investigate the same question, how would you go about it? This question asks you to reflect, in part, on the answers you have already given to the above questions. What we are looking for in this question is a very brief sketch of an alternative way of approaching the author's primary question that might possibly lead to a different answer.

These weekly papers should not be more than five hundred words (single-spaced, two pages at most). You can, of course, write more than that but you will also have an opportunity to bring up things in class discussion as well.

Final exam:

The final exam will have seven questions divided into two parts. Students will answer two questions from each part. The exam will last seventy-two hours with the expectation that students will write for no more than twenty-four hours (roughly the format of the doctoral examinations in the Government Department). There is no minimum or maximum page limit on this exam. Students are expected to draw upon all the readings for the course in answering these questions but are not permitted to bring outside readings into their discussions.

Required books available at the Cornell Bookstore and on Olin Reserve:

David Brian Robertson, The Original Compromise: What the Constitution's Framers Were Really Thinking (New York: Oxford University Press, 2013).

Sven Beckert, Empire of Cotton: A Global History (New York: Knopf, 2014).

Rogers M. Smith, Civic Ideals: Conflicting Visions of Citizenship in U.S. History (New Haven, Conn.: Yale University Press, 1997).

Justin Crowe, Building the Judiciary: Law, Courts, and the Politics of Institutional Development (Princeton, N.J.: Princeton University Press, 2012).

Jeffery A. Jenkins and Charles Stewart, Fighting for the Speakership: The House and the Rise of Party Government (Princeton, N.J.: Princeton University Press, 2013).

Richard M. Valelly, The Two Reconstructions: The Struggle for Black Enfranchisement (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2004).

Stephen Skowronek, The Politics Presidents Make: Leadership from John Adams to Bill Clinton (Cambridge, Mass.: Belknap, 1997).

Richard R. John, Network Nation: Inventing American Telecommunications (Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 2010).

Milton Friedman and Anna Jacobson Schwartz, A Monetary History of the United States, 1867-1960 (Princeton, New Jersey: Princeton University Press, 1971).

Ira Katznelson, Fear Itself: The New Deal and the Origins of Our Time (New York: Liveright, 2014).

Monica Prasad, The Land of Too Much: American Abundance and the Paradox of Poverty (Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 2012).

Daniel Carpenter, Reputation and Power: Organizational Image and Pharmaceutical Regulation at the FDA (Princeton, N.J.: Princeton University Press, 2010).

Robert Mickey, Paths Out of Dixie: The Democratization of Authoritarian Enclaves in America's Deep South, 1944-1972 (Princeton, N.J.: Princeton University Press, 2015).

First Session (August 25): Organizing class (no reading assignment).

Recommended:

John Gerring, "APD from a Methodological Point of View" with commentaries, Studies in American Political Development 17 (April 2003): 82-115.

Karen Orren and Stephen Skowronek, Search for American Political Development (New York: Cambridge University Press, 2004).

Oxford Handbook of American Political Development (New York: Oxford University Press, forthcoming).

Paul Pierson, Politics in Time: History, Institutions, and Social Analysis (Princeton, N.J.: Princeton University Press, 2004).

Stephen Skowronek and Matthew Glassman, ed's., Formative Acts: American Politics in the Making (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 2008).

Note: There are several good, concise references for basic facts and dates in American political history. If you want one that can sit at your right (or left) hand as you read the books assigned for this class, it is difficult to do better than: Richard B. Morris, Encyclopedia of American History (New York: Harper and Brothers, 1996). There are many editions available and used copies are usually inexpensive.

Second Session (September 1): The Founding.

The United States Constitution is one of the three most important documents in American history (the other two being the Declaration of Independence and, more contentiously but nonetheless unavoidably, the Bible). David Robertson sets out to describe what the Founders "were really thinking" when the Constitution was written in an analysis that is simultaneously a narrative of composition and an exemplary study of collective "political reasoning." In some ways, we are ultimately led to understand the Constitution as a layered text in which earlier decisions on language and the allocation of authority influenced later deliberations. Put another way, there was a path the Founders both created and then, often unconsciously, followed as they put together the Constitution. Robertson reconstructs that path through a detailed examination and interpretation of the records of the Philadelphia Convention in 1787. You should pay close attention to the psychological assumptions and interpersonal dynamics that Robertson relies upon in that reconstruction. This is not just a study of the proceedings in the Convention or the thinking of the Framers...it is also a theoretical contemplation on historical contingency arising out of social relations and human personality. It also proposes a very perceptive, if largely intuitive and implicit, theoretical framework for analyzing group deliberations of any kind.

Required:

David Brian Robertson, The Original Compromise: What the Constitution's Framers Were Really Thinking (New York: Oxford University Press, 2013).

Recommended:

Jeremy Bailey, Thomas Jefferson and Executive Power (New York: Cambridge University Press, 2010).

Gretchen Ritter, The Constitution as Social Design: Gender and Civic Membership in the American Constitutional Order (Stanford, Calif.: Stanford University Press, 2006).

David Brian Robertson, The Constitution and America's Destiny (New York: Cambridge University Press, 2005).

David Brian Robertson, Federalism and the Making of America (Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 2014).

Third Session (September 8): The Political Economy of Cotton.

Most work in the subfield of American political development adopts a perspective that we might describe as "from the inside out" because the rest of the world is often just an incidental backdrop for events and transformations within the United States. There are occasions, such as the Second World War, in which that backdrop becomes quite intrusive but narratives and interpretations still strongly foreground things that happen within the American nation. As with the rest of the rapidly expanding global history genre, Sven Beckert's Empire of Cotton reverses the interpretive telescope so that we view the United States (and every other nation for that matter) "from the outside in." Events and transformations still occur within particular nations and societies but they are situated within a global context that interprets them as parts of a transnational, interdependent system. From that perspective, the United States appears to occupy a much less prominent place in the world. This is true even though Beckert has chosen to focus on cotton, a plant that many Americans might have claimed as their own..

Required:

Sven Beckert, Empire of Cotton: A Global History (New York: Knopf, 2014).

Recommended:

Edward Baptist, The Half Has never Been Told: Slavery and the Making of American Capitalism (New York: Basic Books, 2014).

Sven Beckert, The Monied Metropolis: New York City and the Consolidation of the American Bourgeoisie, 1850-1896 (New York: Cambridge University Press, 2003).

James W. Ceaser, Nature and History in American Political Development (Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard, 2006).

William Cronon, Nature's Metropolis: Chicago and the Great West (New York: W.W. Norton, 1991).

Stanley L. Engerman and Robert E. Gallman, ed's., The Long Nineteenth Century, Vol. II of The Cambridge Economic History of the United States (New York: Cambridge University Press, 2000).

David Ericson, Slavery in the American Republic: Developing the Federal Government, 1791-1861 (Lawrence: University Press of Kansas, 2011).

Robert William Fogel, Without Consent or Contract: The Rise and Fall of American Slavery (New York: W.W. Norton, 1989).

Eric Foner, Free Soil, Free Labor, Free Men: The Ideology of the Republican Party before the Civil War (New York: Oxford University Press, 1995).

Ira Katznelson and Martin Shefter, ed's., Shaped by War and Trade: International Influences on American Political Development (Princeton, N.J.: Princeton University Press, 2002).

Kevin H. O'Rourke and Jeffrey G. Williamson, Globalization and History: The Evolution of a Nineteenth-Century Atlantic Economy (Cambridge, Massachusetts: MIT Press, 2001).

Fourth Session (September 15): The Construction of Citizenship.

Much of the work in American political development stresses the importance of ideas in shaping politics and that emphasis on ideas often brings such research much closer to political theory than most studies of American politics. In Rogers Smith's case, this focus on ideas as the wellsprings of politics attracts him to constitutional law because legal reasoning is one of the arenas in which ideas as logical systems are most intimately associated with the exercise of political power. As you read Civic Ideals, you might pay close attention to how he connects (1) abstract ideologies (liberalism, democratic-republicanism, and ascriptive essentialism) to (2) actual politics (in the form of motivations driving political actors as they make decisions) to (3) Supreme Court decisions (and, even more importantly, the majority opinions that justify those decisions). In many ways, Smith makes logical connections between these things by appealing to "reason." However, when he offers normative prescriptions for how we should restrain our expectations for the American regime, he seems to urge us to consider the limits and peculiar (even though universal) tendencies of popular political reason in that (a) all nations must have an identity to which their people can subscribe and (b) that identity must have at least some ascriptive (and thus formally illogical) elements.

Required:

Rogers M. Smith, Civic Ideals: Conflicting Visions of Citizenship in U.S. History (New Haven, Conn.: Yale University Press, 1997).

Recommended:

Andrea Louise Campbell, How Policies Make Citizens: Senior Political Activism and the American Welfare State (Princeton, N.J.: Princeton University Press, 2005).

Eric Foner, "Why Is there No Socialism in the United States?", History Workshop Journal 7 (Spring 1984): 57-80.

John Gerring, Party Ideologies in America, 1828-1996 (New York: Cambridge University Press, 1998).

Louis Hartz, Liberal Tradition in America (New York: Harcourt, Brace and World, 1955).

Michael F. Holt, The Rise and Fall of the American Whig Party: Jacksonian Politics and the Onset of the Civil War (New York: Oxford University Press, 1999).

Ken I. Kersch, Constructing Civil Liberties: Discontinuities in the Development of American Constitutional Law (New York: Cambridge University Press, 2004).

James Morone, The Democratic Wish: Popular Participation and the Limits of American Government (New Haven, Conn.: Yale University Press, 1998).

James A. Morone, Hellfire Nation: The Politics of Sin in American History (New Haven, Conn.: Yale University Press, 2003).

Aziz Rana, The Two Faces of American Freedom (Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 2014).

Rogers Smith, "Beyond Tocqueville, Myrdal and Hartz: the Multiple Traditions in America," American Political Science Review 87:3 (September 1993): 549-66.

Fifth Session (September 22): Law and Institutional Development.

One of the most important areas of research in American political development is the study of institutions. Working firmly within that tradition, Justin Crowe analyses the origin and expansion of the federal judicial system from the Founding until the present. His analytical frame distinguishes between "policy," "politics," and "performance," as well as invoking notions of "events" and "entrepreneurship." But the most important distinction (and one that sets his work apart from more conventional histories of the federal courts), restricts the conception of institutional development to changes in formal authority, organization, and structure. To what extent does that conception shape the conclusions that he subsequently draws from that analysis? More fundamentally, does his analysis provide an explanation for how justices on the Supreme Court decide the cases that come before them and the legitimacy with which the American public accept those rulings? If so, what is that explanation? If not, is not there something missing in his account?

Required:

Justin Crowe, Building the Judiciary: Law, Courts, and the Politics of Institutional Development (Princeton, N.J.: Princeton University Press, 2012).

Recommended:

Thomas D. Morris, Southern Slavery and the Law, 1619-1860 (Chapel Hill: North Carolina University Press, 1996).

William J. Novak, The People's Welfare: Law and Regulation in Nineteenth-Century America (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1996).

Karen Orren, Belated Feudalism: Labor, the Law, and Liberal Development in the United States (New York: Cambridge University Press, 1992).

Howard Schweber, The Creation of American Common Law, 1850-1880: Technology, Politics, and the Construction of Citizenship (New York: Cambridge University Press, 2004).

Patricia Strach, All in the Family: The Private Roots of American Public Policy (Stanford, Calif.: Stanford University Press, 2007).

Keith Whittington, Political Foundations of Judicial Supremacy: The Presidency, the Supreme Court, and Constitutional Leadership in U.S. History (Princeton, N.J.: Princeton University Press, 2009).

Emily Zackin, Looking for Rights in All the Wrong Places: Why State Constitutions Contain America's Positive Rights (Princeton, N.J.: Princeton University Press, 2013).

Sixth Session (September 29): Congress and Institutional Development.

One of the primary themes in the American political development subfield is institutional development and change. At the substantial risk of over-simplification, we might divide institutional theories into three broad types. One of these views institutions as "unique solutions" to collective problems of one sort or another. From this perspective, the narrative describing institutional development reflects on the "learning" of political

actors as they progressively discover and then implement that solution. Adopting an almost polar opposite position, a second view assumes that there are multiple solutions to collective problems and, thus, many different arrangements of power and authority that can be embedded in stable institutions. Which one of these potential solutions is actually arrived at is then explained, in many these interpretations, by critical conjunctures in which an institution is sent, often almost randomly, down a particular "path." The third and last theoretical frame places much less stress on the formal features of institutions (such as bureaucratic routines, rules and statutory authority) and, instead, emphasizes individual personalities and ideas. From this perspective, institutional arrangements and designs are primarily important in so far as they enable political action by their most active and influential members. In some treatments, institutions even become merely what these agents make of them. Which of these three theoretical frames best describes the one adopted by Jenkins and Stewart's Fighting for the Speakership?

Required:

Jeffery A. Jenkins and Charles Stewart, Fighting for the Speakership: The House and the Rise of Party Government (Princeton, N.J.: Princeton University Press, 2013).

Recommended:

Jamie L. Carson and Jason M. Roberts, Ambition, Competition, and electoral Reform: The Politics of Congressional Elections across Time (Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press, 2013).

David Mayhew, America's Congress: Actions in the Public Sphere, James Madison through Newt Gingrich (New Haven, Conn.: Yale University Press, 2002).

David R. Mayhew, Divided We Govern: Party Control, Lawmaking and Investigations, 1946-1990 (New Haven, Conn.: Yale University Press, 1991).

Eric Schickler, Disjointed Pluralism: Institutional Innovation and the Development of the U.S. Congress (Princeton, N.J.: Princeton University Press, 2001).

Seventh Session (October 6): Context, History, and Outcomes (I).

There are several ways in which historical events and processes have been theoretically framed in the subfield of American political development. In a narrative form, for example, they have been described as a sequence of events that appear to exhibit a logical order even if their underlying causal relations and mechanisms are left largely unspecified. Such narratives are often very close to what we conventionally categorize as "history." An alternative method of framing historical events has been to view them as part of a larger pattern. Such frames usually take the form of a "linear process" (e.g., the steady expansion of central state authority) or "cycles" (e.g., Walter Dean Burnham's notion of "critical elections" spaced over roughly 32 year periods). Explicit comparison with the experiences of other nations has been less common in American political development and, where comparisons have been made, has usually been restricted to brief references as opposed to full scale treatment (e.g., with research into primary materials for both the United States and the other nation). This week we examine a fourth

alternative in which historical events drawn from different periods in American political development are treated as distinct "comparative cases" for the purposes of theoretical analysis and explanation. This approach in effect treats these periods "as if" they occurred in separate (albeit very similar) nations.

Required:

Richard M. Valelly, The Two Reconstructions: The Struggle for Black Enfranchisement (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2004).

Recommended:

Brian Balogh, A Government Out of Sight: The Mystery of National Authority in Nineteenth Century America (New York: Cambridge University Press, 2009).

Richard Bensel, Yankee Leviathan: The Origins of Central State Authority in America, 1859-1877 (New York: Cambridge University Press, 1990).

William E. Gienapp, The Origins of the Republican Party, 1852-1856 (New York: Oxford University Press, 1987).

Victoria Hattam, In the Shadow of Race: Jews, Latinos, and Immigrant Politics in the United States (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2007).

Jeffrey A. Jenkins, "Why No Parties? Investigating the Disappearance of Democrat-Whig Divisions in the Confederacy," with subsequent exchanges, Studies in American Political Development 13 (October 1999): 245-287.

Alexander Keyssar, The Right to Vote: The Contested History of Democracy in the United States (New York: Basic Books, 2000).

Desmond King and Rogers Smith, Still a House Divided: Race and Politics in Obama's America (Princeton, N.J.: Princeton University Press, 2011).

James M. McPherson, Ordeal by Fire: The Civil War and Reconstruction (New York: McGraw-Hill, 2001).

Elizabeth Sanders, Roots of Reform: Farmers, Workers, and the State: 1877-1917 (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1999).

Stephen Skowronek, Building a New American State (New York: Cambridge University Press, 1982).

Daniel Tichenor, Dividing Lines: The Politics of Immigration Control in America (Princeton, N.J.: Princeton University Press, 2002).

Eighth Session (October 20): Context, History, and Outcomes (II).

Although he explicitly states that the notion of historical cycles is not intended to constitute the theoretical backbone of his book, Stephen Skowronek's The Politics Presidents Make does, in fact, make a recurring pattern of presidential performance the centerpiece of his framework. But there is also a linear trend as well, a trend that promises or threatens (depending on your point of view) to undermine the robusticity of the cycles he describes. In addition, he has attempted to reconcile "structure" and "agency" in explaining the (commonly perceived) success and failure of presidents. As if that were not enough, Skowronek has brought study of the presidency back into the mainstream of institutional analysis in political science.

Required:

Stephen Skowronek, The Politics Presidents Make: Leadership from John Adams to Bill Clinton (Cambridge, Mass.: Belknap, 1997).

Recommended:

David A. Crockett, The Opposition Presidency: Leadership and the Constraints of History (College Station: Texas A&M University Press, 2002).

Daniel Galvin, Presidential Party Building: Dwight D. Eisenhower to George W. Bush (Princeton, N.J.: Princeton University Press, 2009).

Scott James, Presidents, Parties, and the State: A Party System Perspective on Democratic Regulatory Choice, 1884-1936 (New York: Cambridge University Press, 2000).

Elvin T. Lim, The Anti-Intellectual Presidency: The Decline of Presidential Rhetoric from George Washington to George W. Bush (New York: Oxford University Press, 2008).

David Mayhew, Electoral Realignments (New Haven, Conn.: Yale University Press, 2004).

Sidney Milkis, The Presidency and the Parties: The Transformation of the American Party System since the New Deal (New York: Oxford University press, 1993).

Sidney Milkis, Theodore Roosevelt, the Progressive Party, and the Transformation of American Democracy (Lawrence: University of Kansas Press, 2009).

Stephen Skowronek, Presidential Leadership in Political Time: Reprise and Reappraisal (University of Kansas Press, 2011).

Jeffrey Tulis, The Rhetorical Presidency (Princeton, N.J.: Princeton University Press, 1987).

Ninth Session (October 27): Individuals, Inventions, and the State.

From one perspective, Richard John's Network Nation is a history of the emergence and development of the telegraph and the telephone as national systems of communication. However, this history is also a finely crafted analysis of the relationship between politics and economics in what, he would argue, is a too easily accepted "laissez-faire" interpretation of the nineteenth century political economy. Even more than that, he urges us to ponder individual personalities that are much more complex than the conventional "homo economicus" view of inventors and entrepreneurs. Those often quirky personalities shape, sometimes decisively, the unfolding of what we might otherwise see as the "technological imperatives" of what become socially essential devices and the systems in which they are embedded.

Required:

Richard R. John, Network Nation: Inventing American Telecommunications (Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 2010).

Recommended:

Richard Bensel, The Political Economy of American Industrialization, 1877-1900 (New York: Cambridge University Press, 2000).

Gerald Berk, Alternative Tracks: The Constitution of American Industrial Order, 1865-1917 (Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1994).

Gerald Berk, Louis D. Brandeis and the Making of Regulated Competition, 1900-1932 (New York: Cambridge University Press, 2012).

Alfred D. Chandler, Jr., The Visible Hand: The Managerial Revolution in American Business (Cambridge, Massachusetts: Harvard University Press, 1977).

Elizabeth S. Clemens, The People's Lobby: Organizational Innovation and the Rise of Interest Group Politics in the United States, 1890-1925 (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1997).

Victoria Hattam, Labor Visions and State Power: The Origins of Business Unionism in the United States (Princeton, N.J.: Princeton University Press, 1993).

Richard R. John, Spreading the News: The American Postal System from Franklin to Morse (Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1995).

Gwendolyn Mink, The Wages of Motherhood: Inequality and the Welfare State, 1917-1942 (Ithaca, N.Y.: Cornell University Press, 2006).

Theda Skocpol, Protecting Soldiers and Mothers: The Political Origins of Social Policy in the United States (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1992).

Tenth Session (November 3): Money, Institutions, and the Economy.

Monetarism is an economic theory that, *ceteris paribus*, links changes in the money supply to changes in the health and productivity of the national economy. The chief exponent of monetarism was Milton Friedman who, along with Anna Jacobson Schwartz, attempted to demonstrate that linkage in the book that we will read this week. We are particularly interested in four things: (1) the way in which monetarist theory and explanations provide a framework for the book as a whole; (2) the manner in which "*ceteris paribus*" events (such as war) are integrated into the monetarist interpretations; (3) the role assigned to institutions as determinants of the supply of money (even when the people who lead those institutions do not realize the effect their decisions will have); and (4) the place of politics (e.g., the organized competition for power over institutions) in the operation of the economy. With respect to this last point, we are most interested in the relevance, as the authors see it, of the terms of political contestation to the "real" explanations for changes in the national economy. All great books have an overarching theory of some kind that bind their parts together but few exhibit a theoretical framework as lean, cleanly articulated, and supple as the one in A Monetary History of the United States.

Required:

Milton Friedman and Anna Jacobson Schwartz, A Monetary History of the United States, 1867-1960 (Princeton, New Jersey: Princeton University Press, 1971).

Recommended:

Richard Bensel, The American Ballot Box in the Mid-Nineteenth Century (New York: Cambridge University Press, 2004).

Richard Benschel, Passion and Preferences: William Jennings Bryan and the 1896 Democratic National Convention (New York: Cambridge University Press, 2008).

John Coleman, Party Decline in America: Policy, Politics, and the Fiscal State (Princeton, N.J.: Princeton University Press, 1996).

Gretchen Ritter, Goldbugs and Greenbacks: The Antimonopoly Tradition and the Politics of Finance in America, 1865-1896 (New York: Cambridge University Press, 1999).

W.W. Rostow, The Stages of Economic Growth (New York: Cambridge University Press, 1990; third edition).

Eleventh Session (November 10): The New Deal.

Fear Itself is primarily organized around three concepts: "liberal democracy;" the New Deal; and a composite of these two, "the New Deal as liberal democracy." "Liberal democracy" is presented as a universal political theory, one that we should attempt to realize in our own time. The New Deal, by contrast, denotes a political regime with many, disparate programs and policies inevitably rooted in a particular historical period. From the combination of the two ("the New Deal as liberal democracy"), Ira Katznelson urges us to draw lessons as we do politics in the present. On the one hand, this might be a difficult task in that such lessons demand a comparison between distinct cases and the New Deal is clearly interpreted as unique and thus, perhaps, beyond comparison. On the other hand, there could very well be aspects of a unique historical experience that can, unlike the experience as a whole, be generalized to other periods, including our own. What might be these aspects and how might we apply them to other cases?

Required:

Ira Katznelson, Fear Itself: The New Deal and the Origins of Our Time (New York: Liveright, 2014).

Recommended:

Ira Katznelson, City Trenches (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1981).

Robert C. Lieberman, Shifting the Color Line: Race and the American Welfare State (Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 2001).

Eileen McDonagh, The Motherless State: Women's Political Leadership and American Democracy (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2009).

Suzanne Mettler, Dividing Citizens: Gender and Federalism in New Deal Public Policy (Ithaca, N.Y.: Cornell University Press, 1998).

Suzanne Mettler, Soldiers to Citizens: The G.I. Bill and the Making of the Greatest Generation (New York: Oxford University Press, 2007).

Suzanne Mettler, Submerged State: How Invisible Government Policies Undermine American Democracy (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2011)

Suzanne Mettler, Degrees of Inequality: How the Politics of Higher Education Sabotaged the American Dream (New York: Basic Books, 2014).

Eric Patashnik, Reforms at Risk: What Happens after Major Policy Changes Are Enacted (Princeton, N.J.: Princeton University Press, 2008).

Brian Waddell, The War Against the New Deal: World War II and American Democracy (DeKalb: Northern Illinois Press, 2001).

Twelfth Session (November 17): Paradox as a Research Problem.

A few of those working in the subfield of American political development have made explicit comparisons between the United States and other nations a prominent theme in their work. The most common comparisons set up advanced industrial European nations as a foil for identifying what the United States did not become: a highly-regulated welfare state. As Monica Prasad points out, those comparisons and the foil that they construct should, at the very least, be seriously revised and even, perhaps, be inverted. In addition to the way she makes her argument, we are interested in two things: (1) the almost exclusive emphasis on comparisons with European nations; and (2) her suggestion that a massive "unintended consequence" explains many of the peculiarities of American political development since the late nineteenth century. What other (non-European) nations might provide apt comparisons for American political development? How does she explain the disjunction between the intentional designs of political actors (such as agrarian radicals in the United States) and the massive unintended consequences of the policies that they helped to enact?

Required:

Monica Prasad, The Land of Too Much: American Abundance and the Paradox of Poverty (Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 2012).

Recommended:

Jacob Hacker, The Divided Welfare State: the Battle Over Public and Private Social Benefits in the United States (New York: Cambridge University Press, 2001).

Jacob Hacker, The Great Risk Shift: The New Economic Insecurity and the Decline of the American Dream (New York: Oxford University Press, 2008).

Jacob Hacker and Paul Pierson, Off Center: The Republican Revolution and the Erosion of American Democracy (New Haven, Conn.: Yale University Press, 2006).

Thirteenth Session (November 24): Individuals, Regulation, and Public Opinion.

As the title suggests, "reputation" is the most important analytical concept in Carpenter's book. In fact, the concept organizes most of his theoretical description of the emergence of the Food and Drug Administration as he explicitly pits his own interpretation up against more conventional explanations of government regulatory behavior. One of the most striking results is the way that Carpenter comes to view the relationship between, on the one hand, "science" as a logical system of knowledge and discovery and, on the other, political attitudes toward its application and relevance to society. As he would certainly maintain, the contrast between them does not rest on the rationality of the former and the, for want of a better term, emotional content of the latter. But "science" and "political attitudes toward science" are nonetheless distinct. Wherein lies the difference?

Required:

Daniel Carpenter, Reputation and Power: Organizational Image and Pharmaceutical Regulation at the FDA (Princeton, N.J.: Princeton University Press, 2010).

Recommended:

Daniel P. Carpenter, The Forging of Bureaucratic Autonomy: Reputations, Networks, and Policy Innovation in Executive Agencies, 1862-1928 (Princeton, N.J.: Princeton University Press, 2001).

Aaron L. Friedberg, In the Shadow of the Garrison State: America's Anti-Statism and Its Cold War Strategy (Princeton, N.J.: Princeton University Press, 2000).

Marie Gottschalk, The Prison and the Gallows: The Politics of Mass Incarceration in America (New York: Cambridge University Press, 2006).

Joanna L. Grisinger, The Unwieldy American State: Administrative Politics since the New Deal (New York: Cambridge University Press, 2014).

David Vogel, The Politics of Precaution: Regulating Health, Safety, and Environmental Risks in Europe and the United States (Princeton, N.J.: Princeton University Press, 2012).

Fourteenth Session: (December 1): The American South as a Comparative Research Problem.

Although, as Robert Mickey notes, there are few works in American political development that explicitly invite comparisons with the historical experiences of other nations, they often do so in creative and somewhat surprising ways. With respect to Paths Out of Dixie, we might ask three distinct questions: (1) what are the analytical terms that enable cross-national comparison and how are their definitions crafted for that purpose; (2) how far can we pursue these comparisons before they begin to peter out (in the sense that the comparative differences begin to swamp attempts to trace parallel trajectories); and (3) how does the cross-national comparative frame influence the construction of the internal examination of the American experience. With reference to this last question, please consider the ways in which the analytical narratives in the middle portion of the book are shaped by the comparative theoretical ambitions stated and restated in the first and last chapters.

Required:

Robert Mickey, Paths Out of Dixie: The Democratization of Authoritarian Enclaves in America's Deep South, 1944-1972 (Princeton, N.J.: Princeton University Press, 2015).

Recommended:

John H. Aldrich, Why Parties?: The Origin and Transformation of Political Parties in America (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1995).

Richard Benschel, Sectionalism and American Political Development, 1880-1980 (Madison: University of Wisconsin Press, 1987).

Walter Dean Burnham, Critical Elections and the Mainsprings of American Politics (New York: W.W. Norton, 1970).

Anthony Chen, The Fifth Freedom: Jobs, Politics, and Civil Rights, 1941-1972 (Princeton, N.J.: Princeton University Press, 2009).

Mary L. Dudziak, Cold War Civil Rights: Race and the Image of American Democracy (Princeton, N.J.: Princeton University Press, 2000).

Paul Frymer, Black and Blue: African Americans, the Labor Movement, and the Decline of the Democratic Party (Princeton, N.J.: Princeton University Press, 2007).

Paul Frymer, Uneasy Alliances: Race and Party Competition in America (Princeton, N.J.: Princeton University Press, 2010).

Michael Jones-Correa, Between Two Nations: The Political Predicament of Latinos in New York City (Ithaca, N.Y.: Cornell University Press, 1998).

Ira Katznelson, When Affirmative Action Was White: An Untold History of Racial Inequality in Twentieth-Century America (New York: W.W. Norton, 2005).

V.O. Key, Southern Politics in State and Nation (Knoxville: University of Tennessee Press, 1984; reprint).

Daniel Kryder, Divided Arsenal: Race and the American State during World War II (New York: Cambridge University Press, 2000).

Taeku Lee, Mobilizing Public Opinion: Black Insurgency and Racial Attitudes in the Civil rights Era (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2002).

Joseph Lowndes, From the New Deal to the New Right: Race and the Southern Origins of Modern Conservatism (New Haven, Conn.: Yale University Press, 2008).

Joseph Lowndes, Julie Novkov, and Dorian Warren, ed's., Race and American Political Development (New York: Routledge, 2008).

Bruce Miroff, The Liberals' Moment: The McGovern Insurgency and the Identity Crisis of the Democratic Party (Lawrence: University of Kansas Press, 2007).

Barrington Moore, Jr., Social Origins of Dictatorship and Democracy: Lord and Peasant in the Making of the Modern World (Boston: Beacon Press, 1966).