

# Issues in American Politics and Government

Thomas J. Leeper  
Department of Political Science and Government  
Aarhus University

November 7, 2014

The United States is a unique political system. It is one of the longest-running democracies in the world, has a relatively rare presidential system, has been politically defined by only two major parties for the better part of its history, is populated by a broad mix of racial, ethnic, religious, economic, and cultural groups, and takes an aggressive, frequently independent, role in other countries' affairs. This seminar dives into several important aspects of American democracy and politics to understand what shapes political activity in the United States. Students will leave the course with a deep understanding of the institutional, historical, philosophical, and cultural factors that shape American politics and will be able to better analyze policymaking and political events in the United States as a result. Broadly the course asks students to consider why things are the way they are in the United States and why things happen the way they do. In addressing these questions, the emphasis is placed on answering the questions 'who has power in the United States?' and 'what do they do with it?'

## 1 Objectives

The learning objectives for the course are as follows. By the end of the course, students should be able to:

1. Identify and explain dominant themes that shape (and have shaped) the dynamics of American politics from the founding to the present
2. Describe political polarization in the contemporary United States, as well as its origins and political effects
3. Describe political and economic inequalities in the United States and their consequences for political activity and policymaking
4. Explain institutional roles and functions of branches of the federal government, states, citizens, media, parties, and other political actors
5. Discuss the roles and power of citizens in American government and policymaking
6. Apply knowledge of United States political history and political science theories to understand contemporary political events
7. Evaluate activities of American political institutions and citizens, including their *de jure* powers and *de facto* operations

## **2 Exam**

Students will be evaluated via an oral examination with a written synopsis based upon issues raised in the course. The exam will be held on Friday December 19th and Thursday January 29th.

In preparation for the exam, students are expected to offer weekly presentations (either individually or in small groups). These presentations will cover the week's reading material and involve leading a discussion on that material. Each student should be involved in at least three such presentations during the course.

## **3 Reading Material**

The assigned material for the course consists of empirical research articles and book chapters, all of which are available online or in the printed compendium. There is no textbook.

## **4 Course Website**

All information about the course will be posted on <http://www.thomasleeper.com/ampolcourse>. Any changes to the syllabus or additional notes will be made available there.

## 5 Schedule

The general schedule for the course is as follows. Note that our first class meeting is in Week 37. Details on the readings for each week are provided on the following pages.

## 5.1 No class (Week 36)

## 5.2 American Values and Opinions (Week 37)

*What ideals and values define American politics and society? What do Americans value and how do those values shape their political opinions?*

### Readings

- Alexis de Tocqueville. Equality of condition. In Pietro S. Nivola and David H. Rosenbloom, editors, *Classic Readings in American Politics*, pages 5–10. St. Martin's Press, second edition, 1990.
- Louis Hartz. The concept of a liberal society. In Pietro S. Nivola and David H. Rosenbloom, editors, *Classic Readings in American Politics*, pages 11–20. St. Martin's Press, second edition, 1990.
- Rogers M. Smith. Beyond Tocqueville, Myrdal, and Hartz: The multiple traditions in America. *American Political Science Review*, 87(3):549–566, 1993.
- Michael B. MacKuen, Robert S. Erikson, and James A. Stimson. Macropartisanship. *American Political Science Review*, 83(4):1125–1142, 1989.
- Pamela Johnston Conover and Stanley Feldman. The origins and meaning of liberal/conservative self-identifications. *American Journal of Political Science*, 25(4):617–645, 1981.
- John L. Sullivan, James E. Piereson, and George E. Marcus. An alternative conceptualization of political tolerance: Illusory increases 1950s-1970s. *American Political Science Review*, 73(3):781, September 1979.
- Ch. 1–2 (pp. 7–36) from Milton Friedman. *Capitalism and Freedom*. University Of Chicago Press, Chicago, 1962.

### *See Also:*

- Stanley Feldman. Structure and consistency in public opinion: The role of core beliefs and values. *American Journal of Political Science*, 32(2):416, May 1988.
- Benjamin I. Page and Robert Y. Shapiro. *The Rational Public: Fifty Years of Trends in Americans' Policy Preferences*. The University of Chicago Press, Chicago, IL, 1992.

### 5.3 The American Founding (Week 38)

*What does the American Constitution of 1787 say? How does it distribute rights and powers among the branches of national government, states, and citizens? What controversies did the constitution create and resolve? How have those challenges been subsequently addressed?*

#### Readings

*On independence from Britain:*

- The Virginia Declaration of Rights (1776). Available at: [http://www.archives.gov/exhibits/charters/virginia\\_declaration\\_of\\_rights.html](http://www.archives.gov/exhibits/charters/virginia_declaration_of_rights.html)
- The Declaration of Independence (1776)
- Chapter 3 from Paine, Thomas. (1776). *Common Sense: Thoughts on the Present State of American Affairs*. Available at: <http://www.gutenberg.org/files/3755/3755-h/3755-h.htm#chap3>
- The Articles of Confederation (1778)

*On the American Constitution:*

- The Constitution of the United States of America (1787)
- Ch.1 (27–49) from Pauline Maier. *Ratification: The People Debate the Constitution, 1787–1788*. Simon and Schuster, New York, 2010.
- 1–2, 10, 45, 65, 69, 70 from James Madison, Alexander Hamilton, and John Jay. *The federalist papers, 1787–1788*.

*See Also:*

- Winthrop, John. 1630. *A Model of Christian Charity*.
- Robert A. Dahl. *A Preface to Democratic Theory*. University of Chicago Press, Chicago, 2006.
- William H. Riker. *Liberalism Against Populism: A Confrontation Between the Theory of Democracy and the Theory of Social Choice*. Waveland Press, 1988.
- William H. Riker. *The Strategy of Rhetoric: Campaigning for the American Constitution*. Yale University Press, New Haven, CT, 1996.
- Letters of Brutus II. (1787). Available from: <http://www.constitution.org/afp/brutus02.htm>
- Stephen Skowronek. *Building a New American State: The Expansion of National Administrative Capacities, 1877-1920*. Cambridge University Press, 1982.
- Theda Skocpol. *Protecting Soldiers and Mothers: The Political Origins of Social Policy in United States*. Belknap Press of Harvard University Press, 1995.

## 5.4 Congress (Week 39)

*What are the formal and informal institutions of Congress? How are Congressional decisions made and who influences those decisions?*

### Readings

- Eric Schickler and Gregory J. Wawro. What the filibuster tells us about the Senate. *The Forum*, 9(4):Article 11, 2011.
- Nelson W. Polsby. The institutionalization of the US House of Representatives. *American Political Science Review*, 62(1):144–168, 1968.
- Arthur T. Denzau and Michael C. Munger. Legislators and interest groups: How unorganized interests get represented. *American Political Science Review*, 80(1):89–106, 1986.
- Ken Kollman. Inviting friends to lobby: Interest groups, ideological bias, and Congressional committees. *American Journal of Political Science*, 41(2):519–544, 1997.
- Richard Hall and Frank Wayman. Buying time: Moneyed interests and the mobilization of bias in Congressional committees. *American Political Science Review*, 84(3):797–820, September 1990.
- III Edwards, George C., Andrew Barrett, and Jeffrey Peake. The legislative impact of divided government. *American Journal of Political Science*, 41(2):545–563, April 1997.
- James M. Jr. Snyder and Tim Groseclose. Estimating party influence in Congressional roll-call voting. *American Journal of Political Science*, 44(2):193–211, 2000.
- Robert S. Erikson. Constituency opinion and Congressional behavior: A reexamination of the Miller-Stokes representation data. *American Journal of Political Science*, 22(3):511–535, 1978.
- Ch.6 (129–159) from John R. Hibbing and Elizabeth Theiss-Morse. *Stealth Democracy: American's Beliefs about How Government Should Work*. Cambridge University Press, New York, 2002.

### See Also:

- Kenneth A. Shepsle and Barry R. Weingast. Positive theories of Congressional institutions. *Legislative Studies Quarterly*, 19(2):149–179, 1994.
- Gary W. Cox and Mathew D. McCubbins. *Legislative Leviathan: Party Government in the House*. University of California Press, Berkeley, CA, 1993.
- Keith Krehbiel. Where's the party? *British Journal of Political Science*, 23(2):235–266, March 1993.
- Keith Krehbiel. *Pivotal Politics: A Theory of U.S. Lawmaking*. University Of Chicago Press, Chicago, 1998.
- David Austen-Smith and John R. Wright. Counteractive lobbying. *American Journal of Political Science*, 38(1):25–44, 1994.
- Thomas Stratmann. Can special interests buy Congressional votes? evidence from financial services legislation. *SSRN Electronic Journal*, XLV(98), 2002.
- Keith Krehbiel. Party discipline and measures of partisanship. *American Journal of Political Science*, 44(2):212–227, 2000.
- Daniel Diermeier and Razvan Vlaicu. Parties, coalitions, and the internal organization

- of legislatures. *American Political Science Review*, 105(2):359–380, May 2011.
- Warren E. Miller and Donald E. Stokes. Constituency influence in Congress. *American Political Science Review*, 57(1):45–56, 1963.
  - David R. Mayhew. *Congress: The Electoral Connection*. Yale University Press, 1974.
  - Jr. Fenno, Richard F. *Home Style: House Members in Their Districts*. Longman Publishing Group, Boston, 1978.



## 5.5 The Presidency and Executive Branch (Week 40)

*What powers does the President have? And can the President do with those powers? How does the President respond to and influence American politics?*

### Readings

- Lynn Ragsdale and John J. Theis III. The institutionalization of the American Presidency, 1924–92. *American Journal of Political Science*, 41(4):1280–1318, 1997.
- Selections from Richard E. Neustadt. *Presidential Power and the Modern Presidents: The Politics of Leadership*. Free Press, 1960.
- Chapter 2 from Charles M. Cameron. *Veto Bargaining: Presidents and the Politics of Negative Power*. Cambridge University Press, New York, 2000.
- Brandice Canes-Wrone. The president’s legislative influence from public appeals. *American Journal of Political Science*, 45(2):313–329, 2001.
- Jeffrey E. Cohen. Presidential rhetoric and the public agenda. *American Journal of Political Science*, 39(1):87–107, February 1995.
- Terry M. Moe. An assessment of the positive theory of ‘Congressional dominance’. *Legislative Studies Quarterly*, 12(4):475, November 1987.
- Phillip J. Cooper. George W. Bush, Edgar Allan Poe, and the use and abuse of presidential signing statements. *Presidential Studies Quarterly*, 35(3):515–532, September 2005.

*See Also:*

- Keith E. Whittington and Daniel P. Carpenter. Executive power in American institutional development. *Perspectives on Politics*, 1(03):495–513, 2003.
- Lawrence R. Jacobs and Robert Y. Shapiro. Presidential manipulation of polls and public opinion: The nixon administration and the pollsters. *Political Science Quarterly*, 110(4):519–538, 1995.
- Lawrence R. Jacobs and Robert Y. Shapiro. The rise of presidential polling: The nixon white house in historical perspective. *Public Opinion Quarterly*, 59:163–195, January 1995.
- Matthew A. Baum and Samuel Kernell. Has cable ended the golden age of presidential television? *American Political Science Review*, 93(1):99, March 1999.
- Mathew D. McCubbins and Thomasw Schwartz. Congressional oversight overlooked: Police patrols versus fire alarms. *American Journal of Political Science*, 28(1):165–179, 1984.

## 5.6 Courts and Judicial Decision Making (Week 41)

*What role do courts, and especially the Supreme Court, have in the American political process? How do courts influence policy?*

### Readings

- Robert M. Howard and Jeffrey A. Segal. An original look at originalism. *Law & Society Review*, 36(1):113–138, 2002.
- Jack Knight and Lee Epstein. The norm of *stare decisis*. *American Journal of Political Science*, 40(4):1018–1035, November 1996.
- Jeffery J. Mondak and Shannon Ishiyama Smithey. The dynamics of public support for the Supreme Court. *Journal of Politics*, 59(4):1114–1142, 1997.
- James L. Gibson, Gregory A. Caldeira, and Lester Kenyatta Spence. The Supreme Court and the US presidential election of 2000: Wounds, self-inflicted or other? *British Journal of Political Science*, 33(4):535–556, October 2003.
- Sarah A. Binder and Forrest Maltzman. Senatorial delay in confirming federal judge, 1947–1998. *American Journal of Political Science*, 46(1):190–199, January 2002.
- Gregory A. Huber and Sanford C. Gordon. Accountability and coercion: Is justice blind when it runs for office? *American Journal of Political Science*, 48(2):247–263, April 2004.

### *See Also:*

- Robert A. Dahl. Decision-making in a democracy: The supreme court as a national policy-maker. *Journal of Public Law*, 6(279):279–295, 1957.
- Robert G. McCloskey. *The American Supreme Court*. University Of Chicago Press, 2000.
- Timothy R. Johnson and Andrew D. Martin. The public’s conditional response to supreme court decisions. *American Political Science Review*, 92(2):299–309, June 1998.
- Jeffrey A. Segal and Howard J. Spaeth. The influence of *stare decisis* on the votes of united states supreme court justices. *American Journal of Political Science*, 40(4):971–1003, November 1996.
- Ken I. Kersch. The reconstruction of constitutional privacy rights and the new American state. *Studies in American Political Development*, 16(01):61– 87, September 2002.
- Vincent L. Hutchings. Political context, issue salience, and selective attentiveness: Constituent knowledge of the clarence thomas confirmation vote. *The Journal of Politics*, 63(03):846–868, 2001.
- Lee Epstein, Rene Lindstadt, Jeffrey A. Segal, and Chad Westerland. The changing dynamics of Senate voting on Supreme Court nominees. *Journal of Politics*, 69(2):296–307, May 2006.

## 5.7 No class (Week 42)

## 5.8 State and Local Governments (Week 43)

*How does politics work in state and local governments in the United States? How do states interact with one another and the national government?*

### Readings

- Craig Volden. States as policy laboratories: Emulating success in the children’s health insurance program. *American Journal of Political Science*, 50(2):294–312, April 2006.
- Scott R. Meinke and Edward B. Hasecke. Term limits, professionalization, and partisan control in U.S. state legislatures. *Journal of Politics*, 65(3):898–908, August 2003.
- Robert S. Erikson, Gerald C. Wright, and John P. McIver. Political parties, public opinion, and state policy in the United States. *American Political Science Review*, 83(3):729, September 1989.
- Elizabeth Rigby. State resistance to ‘ObamaCare’. *The Forum*, 10(2):Article 5, 2012.
- Brian F. Schaffner, Matthew J. Streb, and Gerald C. Wright. Teams without uniforms: The nonpartisan ballot in state and local elections. *Political Research Quarterly*, 54(1):7–30, March 2001.
- J. Eric Oliver and Shang E. Ha. Vote choice in suburban elections. *American Political Science Review*, 101(3):393–408, August 2007.

### *See Also:*

- Selections from Robert A. Dahl. The behavioral approach in political science: Epitaph for a monument to a successful protest. *American Political Science Review*, 55(4):763–772, 1961.
- Priscilla M. Regan and Christopher J. Deering. State opposition to REAL ID. *Publius: The Journal of Federalism*, 39(3):476–505, 2009.
- Gerald C. Wright and Brian F. Schaffner. The influence of party: Evidence from the state legislatures. *American Political Science Review*, 96(2):367–379, June 2002.
- Jeffrey R. Lax and Justin H. Phillips. The democratic deficit in the states. *American Journal of Political Science*, 56(1):148–166, August 2011.
- Zoltan L. Hajnal, Elisabeth R. Gerber, and Hugh Louch. Minorities and direct legislation: Evidence from california ballot proposition elections. *Journal of Politics*, 64(1):157–177, February 2002.
- Elisabeth R. Gerber and Daniel J. Hopkins. When mayors matter: Estimating the impact of mayoral partisanship on city policy. *American Journal of Political Science*, 55(2):326–339, April 2011.

## 5.9 Partisan Politics (Week 44)

*How do parties compete in the United States? What is the nature of American partisanship and how does partisanship influence politics?*

### Readings

- American Political Science Association. The need for greater party responsibility. 44(3):15–36, 1950.
- Gregory Koger, Seth E. Masket, and Hans Noel. Cooperative party factions in American politics. *American Politics Research*, 38(1):33–53, December 2010.
- Shigeo Hirano and James M. Jr. Snyder. The decline of third-party voting in the united states. *Journal of Politics*, 69(1):1–16, July 2007.
- Ch. 6–7 (120–167) from Angus Campbell, Philip E. Converse, Warren E. Miller, and Donald E. Stokes. *The American Voter*. The University of Chicago Press, Chicago, IL, 1960.
- Review from earlier: Michael B. MacKuen, Robert S. Erikson, and James A. Stimson. Macropartisanship. *American Political Science Review*, 83(4):1125–1142, 1989.
- Shanto Iyengar, Guarav Sood, and Yphtach Lelkes. Affect, not ideology: A social identity perspective on polarization. *Public Opinion Quarterly*, 76(3):405–431, September 2012.
- Morris P. Fiorina. The decline of collective responsibility in American politics. *Daedalus*, 109(3):25–45, 1980.

### See Also:

- John H. Aldrich. *Why Parties?: The Origin and Transformation of Political Parties in America*. University Of Chicago Press, 1995.
- Kathleen Bawn, Martin Cohen, David Karol, Seth E. Masket, Hans Noel, and John Zaller. A theory of political parties: Groups, policy demands and nominations in American politics. Unpublished paper, August 2012.
- Donald P. Green, Bradley Palmquist, and Eric Schickler. *Partisan Hearts and Minds: Political Parties and the Social Identities of Voters*. Yale University Press, 2004.

## 5.10 Campaigning and Elections (Week 45)

*How do US elections work? Who votes? What actors influence election outcomes?*

### Readings

- Barry C. Burden, David T. Canon, Kenneth R. Mayer, and Donald P. Moynihan. Election laws, mobilization, and turnout: The unanticipated consequences of election reform. *American Journal of Political Science*, 58(1):95–109, January 2014.
- Richard R. Lau and Ivy Brown Rovner. Negative campaigning. *Annual Review of Political Science*, 12(1):285–306, June 2009.
- Andrew Gelman, Boris Shor, Joseph Bafumi, and David Park. Rich state, poor state, red state, blue state: What’s the matter with Connecticut? *Quarterly Journal of Political Science*, 2:345–367, 2007.
- Michael S. Kang. After *citizens united*. *Indiana Law Review*, 44:243–254, 2010–2011.
- Nolan McCarty, Keith T. Poole, and Howard Rosenthal. Does gerrymandering cause polarization? *American Journal of Political Science*, 53(3):666–680, 2009.

*See Also:*

- Michael P. McDonald. A comparative analysis of redistricting institutions in the United States, 2001–02. *State Politics & Policy Quarterly*, 4(4):371–395, Winter 2004.
- V.O. Key. A theory of critical elections. *The Journal of Politics*, 17(1):3–18, 1955.
- David R. Mayhew. Electoral realignments. *Annual Review of Political Science*, 3:449–474, 2000.
- Leonie Huddy and Nayda Terkildsen. Gender stereotypes and the perception of male and female candidates. *American Journal of Political Science*, 37(1):119–147, February 1993.
- Kim L. Fridkin, Patrick J. Kenney, and Gina Serignese Woodall. Bad for men, better for women: The impact of stereotypes during negative campaigns. *Political Behavior*, 31(1):53–77, May 2008.
- Deborah Jordan Brooks. *He Runs, She Runs: Why Gender Stereotypes Do Not Harm Women Candidates*. Princeton University Press, Princeton, NJ, 2013.
- John G. Geer. *In Defense of Negativity: Attack Ads in Presidential Campaigns*. Chicago University Press, Chicago, 2006.
- Stephen Ansolabehere and Shanto Iyengar. *Going Negative: How Political Advertisements Shrink and Polarize the Electorate*. Simon and Schuster, New York, 1997.
- Edward. Tufte. Determinants of the outcomes of midterm Congressional elections. *American Political Science Review*, 69(3):812–826, September 1975.
- Michael P. McDonald and Samuel L. Popkin. The myth of the vanishing voter. *American Political Science Review*, 95(4):963–974, 2001.
- Alan S. Gerber, James G. Gimpel, Donald P. Green, and Daron R. Shaw. How large and long-lasting are the persuasive effects of televised campaign ads? results from a large scale randomized experiment. *American Political Science Review*, 105(1):135–150, March 2011.
- Alan S. Gerber and Donald P. Green. The effects of canvassing, telephone calls, and

- direct mail on voter turnout: A field experiment. *American Political Science Review*, 94(3):653, September 2000.
- Ryan D. Enos, Anthony Fowler, and Lynn Vavreck. Increasing inequality: The effect of GOTV mobilization on the composition of the electorate. *Journal of Politics*, 76(1):273–288, January 2014.
  - D. Sunshine Hillygus. Campaign effects and the dynamics of turnout intention in election 2000. *The Journal of Politics*, 67(01):50–68, July 2005.
  - Rasmus Kleis Nielsen. *Ground Wars: Personalized Communication in Political Campaigns*. Princeton University Press, Princeton, NJ, 2012.
  - Marc J. Hetherington. Resurgent mass partisanship: The role of elite polarization. *American Political Science Review*, 95(3):619–631, 2001.
  - James N. Druckman, Erik Peterson, and Rune Slothuus. How elite partisan polarization affects public opinion formation. *American Political Science Review*, 107(1):57–79, January 2013.
  - Bill Bishop. *The Big Sort: Why the Clustering of Like-minded America is Tearing Us Apart*. Houghton Mifflin Harcourt, 2008.
  - Keith T. Poole and Howard Rosenthal. The polarization of American politics. *The Journal of Politics*, 46(4):1061–1079, December 1984.
  - Alan Abramowitz. Don’t blame primary voters for polarization. *The Forum*, 5(4):Article 4, 2008.
  - Diana C. Mutz and Byron Reeves. The new videomalaise: Effects of televised incivility on political trust. *American Political Science Review*, 99(1):1–15, 2005.
  - Kevin Arceneaux, Martin Johnson, and Chad Murphy. Polarized political communication, oppositional media hostility, and selective exposure. *The Journal of Politics*, 74(01):174–186, February 2012.
  - Diana C. Mutz. Cross-cutting social networks: Testing democratic theory in practice. *American Political Science Review*, 96(1):111–126, 2002.
  - Matthew S. Levendusky. The microfoundations of mass polarization. *Political Analysis*, 17(2):162–176, April 2009.

## 5.11 Exam Preparation I: Public Policy (Week 46) (Meet 9:15–11:00)

The purpose of today's class is to continue our conversation about policy controversies in the United States and use that discussion to lead toward individual synopsis topics. Specifically, the readings for this week highlight some ongoing controversies in contemporary American politics. Thinking about each of the controversies raised in the readings, discuss as a group how political institutions (Congress, the President, the Supreme Court, states, etc.), political parties, and public opinion influence contemporary policies and politics in these areas.

After your discussions, use remaining time to generate ideas for your own synopsis. What controversy would you like to explore and what factors will you examine to better understand that controversy? It is important to be specific and focused. Trying to explain the controversy of "federalism" or "race" will be too broad for a reasonable synopsis. Instead, focus your attention on a specific political controversy and try to use your understanding of political institutions (Congress, President, Supreme Court, states, etc.), political actors (politicians, political parties, etc.), and American opinions and values to make sense of that controversy. Focused topics might be, for example, the status of gay marriage, the degree of U.S. involvement in a particular international crisis, or similar.

If you are interested in meeting with the instructor to discuss your topic, please make arrangements for a meeting on November 17, 18, or 19 via email.

### Readings

- Jeffrey R. Lax and Justin H. Phillips. Gay rights in the states: Public opinion and policy responsiveness. *American Political Science Review*, 103(3):367–386, August 2009.
- Mark Peffley and Jon Hurwitz. Persuasion and resistance: Race and the death penalty in America. *American Journal of Political Science*, 51(4):996–1012, October 2007.
- Larry M. Bartels. Homer gets a tax cut: Inequality and public policy in the American mind. *Perspectives on Politics*, 3(1):15–31, March 2005.
- Lawrence R. Jacobs and Benjamin I. Page. Who influences U.S. foreign policy? *American Political Science Review*, 99(1):107–123, April 2005.
- Christopher P. Muste. The dynamics of immigration opinion in the United States, 1992-2012. *Public Opinion Quarterly*, 77(1):398–416, April 2013.

### See Also:

- Brian J. Gaines, James H. Kuklinski, Paul J. Quirk, Buddy Peyton, and Jay Verkuilen. Same facts, different interpretations: Partisan motivation and opinion on Iraq. *The Journal of Politics*, 69(04):957–974, 2007.
- Jacob S. Hacker. The historical logic of national health insurance: Structure and sequence in the development of British, Canadian, and U.S. medical policy. *Studies in American Political Development*, 12:57–130, 1998.
- James H. Kuklinski, Paul J. Quirk, Jennifer Jerit, David Schweider, Robert F. Rich, and David Schwieder. Misinformation and the currency of democratic citizenship. *The Journal of Politics*, 62(3):790–816, 2000.
- Kenneth Mulligan, Tobin Grant, and Daniel Bennett. The dynamics of public opinion



- on cultural policy issues in the U.S., 1972–2010. *Political Behavior*, 35(4):807–829, December 2013.
- Suzanne Mettler. *The Submerged State: How Invisible Government Policies Undermine American Democracy*. University of Chicago Press, 2011.
  - Martin Gilens. *Why Americans Hate Welfare: Race, Media, and the Politics of Antipoverty Policy*. Studies in Communication, Media, and Pub. University of Chicago Press, 2009.
  - Joe Soss. Lessons of welfare: Policy design, political learning, and political action. *American Political Science Review*, 93(2):363–380, 1999.
  - Greg D. Adams. Abortion: Evidence of an issue evolution. *American Journal of Political Science*, 41(3):718–737, July 1997.
  - Daniel S. Nagin and John V. Pepper, editors. *Deterrence and the Death Penalty*. National Academies Press, Washington, DC, 2012.
  - Frank R. Baumgartner, Suzanna De Boef, and Amber E. Boydstun. *The Decline of the Death Penalty and the Discovery of Innocence*. Cambridge University Press, New York, 2008.
  - Jack Citrin, Donald P. Green, Chrisotpher P. Christopher Muste, and Cara Wong. Public opinion toward immigration reform: The role of economic motivations. *Journal of Politics*, 59(3):585—881, 1997.
  - Benjamin I. Page and Robert Y. Shapiro. Effects of public opinion on policy. *American Political Science Review*, 77(1):175–190, 1983.

## 5.12 Politics of Race and Inequality (Week 47)

**Meet 8:00–12:30 in Building 1330 Large Meeting Room in Political Science Faculty Kantine**

*How much inequality is there in the United States and what forms does inequality take? What impacts does inequality have on American society and politics? What do Americans think about inequality? In what ways to race influence political beliefs, attitudes, and behaviors? How are policies racialized and race politicized?*

### Readings

- APSA Task Force on Inequality and American Democracy. (2006). American Democracy in an Age of Rising Inequality. Washington, DC: American Political Science Association. Available from: <http://www.apsanet.org/imgtest/taskforcereport.pdf>
- Chapter 5 from Larry M. Bartels. *Unequal Democracy: The Political Economy of the New Gilded Age*. Princeton University Press, Princeton, NJ, 2008.
- Sidney Verba, Nancy Burns, and Kay Lehman Schlozman. Unequal at the starting line: Creating participatory inequalities across generations and among groups. *The American Sociologist*, pages 45–69, Spring/Summer 2003.
- Vincent L. Hutchings and Nicholas A.. Valentino. The centrality of race in American politics. *Annual Review of Political Science*, 7(1):383–408, May 2004.
- Volume I, Chapter 10 (316–363) from Alexis de Tocqueville. *Democracy in America*. Harper Perennial Modern Classics, 2000.
- Charles M. Cameron, David Epstein, and Sharyn O’Halloran. Do majority–minority districts maximize substantive black representation in Congress? *American Political Science Review*, 90(4):794–812, 1996.

### See Also:

- Benjamin I. Page, Larry M. Bartels, and Jason Seawright. Democracy and the policy preferences of wealthy Americans. *Perspectives on Politics*, 11(1):51–73, March 2013.
- G. William Domhoff. *Who Rules America?* Prentice-Hall, Englewood Cliffs, NJ, 1967.
- Larry M. Bartels. *Unequal Democracy: The Political Economy of the New Gilded Age*. Princeton University Press, Princeton, NJ, 2008.
- Jeffrey A. Winters and Benjamin I. Page. Oligarchy in the united states? *Perspectives on Politics*, 7(04):731–751, 2009.
- William Graham Sumner. *What Social Classes Owe to Each Other*. Caxton Press, 1883 [2003].  
Available from: <http://www.gutenberg.org/ebooks/18603>
- Milton Friedman. *Capitalism and Freedom*. University Of Chicago Press, Chicago, 1962.
- Ronald Takaki. *A Different Mirror: A History of Multicultural America (Revised Edition)*. Little, Brown, and Company, New York, 1993.
- Ira Katznelson and Suzanne Mettler. On race and policy history: A dialogue about the g.i. bill. *Perspectives on Politics*, 6(03):519–537, August 2008.

- Tali Mendelberg. *The Race Card: Campaign Strategy*. Princeton University Press, Princeton, NJ, 2010.
- Donald R. Kinder and Lynn M. Sanders. *Divided by Color: Racial Politics and Democratic Ideals*. University of Chicago Press, 1996.
- Jane Mansbridge. Should blacks represent blacks and women represent women? a contingent ‘yes’. *Journal of Politics*, 61(3):628–657, August 2009.
- Daniel M. Butler and David E. Broockman. Do politicians racially discriminate against constituents? a field experiment on state legislators. *American Journal of Political Science*, 55(3):463–477, 2011.
- Nicholas A. Valentino, Ted Brader, and Ashley E. Jardina. Immigration opposition among U.S. whites: General ethnocentrism or media priming of attitudes about latinos? *Political Psychology*, 34(2):149–166, April 2013.
- Cathy J. Cohen and Michael. DaDawson. Neighborhood poverty and african american politics. *American Political Science Review*, 87(2):286–302, 1993.
- George Fitzhugh. *Cannibals All! Or, Slaves without Masters*. Belknap Press of Harvard University Press, 1857.
- Doug McAdam. *Political Process and the Development of Black Insurgency, 1930-1970*. Chicago University Press, 1982.
- Dennis Chong. *Collective action and the civil rights movement*. University of Chicago Press, Chicago, 1991.
- David O. Sears, Carl P. Hensler, and Lelie K. Speer. Whites’ opposition to ‘busing’: Self-interest or symbolic politics? *American Political Science Review*, 73(2):369–384, 1979.
- David R. Williams and Chiquita Collins. Racial residential segregation: A fundamental cause of racial disparities in health. *Public Health Reports*, 116:404–416, September–October 2001.
- Martin Gilens. ‘Race coding’ and white opposition to welfare. *American Political Science Review*, 90(3):593–604, September 1996.
- James H. Kuklinski, Paul M. Sniderman, Kathleen Knight, Thomas Piazza, Philip E. Tetlock, Gordon R. Lawrence, and Barbara Mellers. Racial prejudice and attitudes toward affirmative action. *American Journal of Political Science*, 41(2):402–419, April 1997.
- Becky Pettit and Bruce Western. Mass imprisonment and the life course: Race and class inequality in U.S. incarceration. *American Sociological Review*, 69:151–169, April 2004.

### 5.13 Exam Preparation II (Week 48)

*This week is set aside for exam preparation. The idea is for you to receive feedback on your written synopsis from your peers and practice defending that synopsis in a mock oral exam.*

The class should be conducted as follows:

- Each student will be assigned (randomly) two other students who will serve as examiners.
- Each student should submit a written draft of their synopsis to their co-examiners 48 hours before class (i.e., by Tuesday morning).
- In class, each student should prepare a 2–3 minute presentation of their synopsis for the whole class.
- After the short presentation, the examiners should ask the presenter questions about the synopsis, with reference to ideas, theories, actors, and institutions discussed in the course. This should take about 5 minutes.
- Examiners may also provide written feedback about the synopsis.
- After all the presentations and cross-examinations, please open a general discussion about the synopses and arrive at any questions you have as a group about the synopsis and the exam as a whole.

## 5.14 To-be-determined and Wrap-up (Week 49)

*What have we learned? What implications does it have for understanding American politics and politics elsewhere?*

### Readings

- Hans Noel. Ten things political scientists know that you don't. *The Forum*, 8(3):Article 12, 2010.
- Morris P. Fiorina and Samuel J. Abrams. Political polarization in the American public. *Annual Review of Political Science*, 11(1):563–588, June 2008.
- Ch.2 (62–98) from Michael X. Delli Carpini and Scott Keeter. *What Americans Know about Politics and Why It Matters*. Yale University Press, New Haven, CT, 1997.