**PLSC 209a / HIST 167Ja / PLSC 839 - Congress in the Light of History**

**Fall 2019, Wednesdays 1:30 - 3:20**

**David R. Mayhew**, Sterling Professor of Political Science Emeritus

--office hours 3:30-5:00 Wednesdays or by appointment, Rosenkranz 236

--email: [david.mayhew@yale.edu](mailto:david.mayhew@yale.edu)

--website: <http://campuspress.yale.edu/davidmayhew>

**Content of course.** There are three segments:

--**Analytic themes** (weeks 2 through 6). Political scientists often dwell on the following five themes to probe into congressional activity: internal structure; member incentives; supermajorities/filibustering; divided government/gridlock/productivity; partisan polarization. Each week’s reading packet introduces one of these themes and walks it through a span of congressional history.

**--High-stakes showdowns** (weeks 7 through 9). Often, Congress accommodates or takes part in extreme, dramatic conflicts that erupt in the U.S. separation-of-powers system. Currently, for example, there is talk of impeachment and court-packing. Addressed here through use of narrative works are six instances of extreme conflict during the last century.

--**Policy making** (weeks 10 through 13). Tackled here are Congress’s participation in thirteen major impulses that have invested the U.S. and other relevant countries starting in the 1790s.

**Mechanics of course.** This is a reading and discussion seminar. It will not accommodate senior essays or long research papers. There is a substantial reading requirement each week.

**--Requirements for all students:** Attend classes, do the required reading, be ready to take part in class discussions, write a series of five comment papers three-to-five pages in length that address the required reading, and deliver a brief oral report during the course’s middle segment. Papers need to be due at the start of a class covering the relevant material—a strict requirement. Two of these five papers should be written during the “analytic themes” segment of the course, one in the “showdowns” segment, and two in the “policy making” segment.

--Within these bounds, students may choose which weeks, and thus which selections of required readings, to focus on for writing papers. All of this is straightforward for the first and third segments of the course, which feature weekly packets of reading that everyone should find manageable. But the middle segment has a special wrinkle. There, each student will be expected to tackle one long narrative work (a full long book or a good part of one) during the full three-week span of this middle segment, giving major attention to that work in one of the course meetings during these three weeks, and to report then on that work to class, but to read only one short “suggested” reading for each of the other two weeks of the three-week span. Here is the result of this middle-segment design: For any student, the average reading assignment during these three weeks will stay, in page-length terms, within the bounds expected of Yale undergraduates.

**--Requirements for graduate students.** It is a Yale requirement that graduate students taking cross-listed courses do something extra befitting their more advanced training. Hence the following. A graduate student taking the seminar should satisfy all the above requirements and also write a (sixth) three-to-five-page paper due at the start of the semester’s final-exam period. Such a paper should supply a critique of any four of the ten short readings labeled **GRAD** on the syllabus.

**--Grading:** 60% for comment papers, 30% for class participation, 10% for an oral report to class on a narrative work during the middle segment of the seminar. No midterm or final exams. All papers will be marked up and returned ASAP after they are submitted.

**--Availability of books.** Purchase of three books is recommended. Total price at Amazon’s posting is roughly $80. Any royalties accruing from the third item will go to a Yale student fund. These books will also be listed at the Bass Library. The three books:

Gregory Koger, Filibustering

Frances Lee, Insecure Majorities

David Mayhew, The Imprint of Congress  
The narrative books for the middle segment of the course pose a problem. It will be solved at probably no money cost to students. It can’t be suitably addressed until we figure out who wants to read what.

**--Prerequisites to take the seminar.** Formally none, although a basic AP grasp of American political history would help a great deal. A passion for that subject is recommended. Majors in any discipline are free to apply.

**August 28 – ORGANIZATION MEETING**

**ANALYTIC THEMES (the frame of weeks 2 through 6)**

**SEPTEMBER 4 – INTERNAL STRUCTURE**

**Required:**

Jeffery A. Jenkins & Charles Stewart III, “The Deinstitutionalization (?) of the House of Representatives: Reflections on Nelson Polsby’s ‘The Institutionalization of the U.S. House of Representatives,’ at Fifty,” Studies in American Political Development 32 (October 2018), 166-187. Discusses one of the most influential works ever written on internal congressional structure. See here a re-presentation of the Polsby’s article’s simple time-series charts going back through history to day one. Don’t get put off by the clunky 9- and 10-syllable nouns.

Anthony Chergosky & Jason M. Roberts, “The De-Institutionalization of Congress,” Political Science Quarterly 133:3 (2018), 475-495. Since the 1960s, Congress has drifted from strong committees to strong party leaders. What has happened, why, and so what? In a nutshell.

**Suggested:**

Jeffery A. Jenkins & Charles Stewart III, Fighting for the Speakership: The House and the Rise of Party Government (2012). New decisive account of the House Speakership from the 1790s to date.

Steven S. Smith, The Senate Syndrome: The Evolution of Procedural Warfare in the Modern U.S. Senate (2014). Reid, McConnell, et al. and the tightening of party leadership agenda control.

Barbara Sinclair, Unorthodox Lawmaking: New Legislative Processes in the U.S. Congress (2017 ed.). Weaker committees, omnibus bills, party leadership empowerment, Senate-versus-House showdowns, etc.

**GRAD**: David R. Mayhew, “Theorizing about Congress,” ch. 38 in Eric Schickler & Frances E. Lee (eds.), The Oxford Handbook of the American Congress (2011). Tucked into here is a thumbnail account of the tradition of rational-choice theorizing about congressional structure.

**SEPTEMBER 11 – MEMBER INCENTIVES**

**Required:**

David R. Mayhew, Congress: The Electoral Connection (1974 or 2005 edition), pages 11-77. Credit claiming, position taking, and advertising as inveterate member activities.

Lisa Hager, “Are Members of Congress Simply ‘Single-Minded Seekers of Reelection’? An Examination of Legislative Behavior in the 114th Congress,” PS: Political Science and Politics 51:1 (January 2018), pages 115-118. A congressional office staffer tracks credit claiming, position taking, and advertising activities in the Congress of 2015-2016.

John Lapinski, Matt Levendusky, Ken Winneg & Kathleen Hall Jamieson, “What Do Citizens Want from Their Member of Congress?” Political Research Quarterly 69:3 (September 2016), pages 535-545. An inspection from the public demand side using survey data from 2011-2014.

David R. Mayhew, “Actions in the Public Sphere,” chapter 3 in Paul J. Quirk & Sarah A. Binder (eds.), The Legislative Branch (2005), pages 63-94 (not the full chapter). A different kind of question. Since 1789, which members of Congress have engaged in what kinds of activity thus drawing notice in the public sphere? Think Henry Clay, Robert Wagner, John McCain, Nancy Pelosi.

**Suggested:**

Daniel Diermeier, Michael Keane & Antonio Merlo, “A Political Economy Model of Congressional Careers,” American Economic Review 95:1 (March 2005), 347-373. An economist’s-eye view. What are the returns, monetary and otherwise, to an individual from pursuing a career in politics?

**GRAD:** Justin Grimmer, Solomon Messing & Sean J. Westwood, “How Words and Money Cultivate a Personal Vote: The Effect of Legislator Credit Claiming on Constituent Credit Allocation,” American Political Science Review 106:4 (November 2012), 703-719

Charles J. Finocchiaro & Jeffery A. Jenkins, “Distributive Politics, the Electoral Connection, and the Antebellum US Congress: The Case of Military Service Pensions,” Journal of Theoretical Politics 28:2 (2016), 192-224. A deep dive into history.

R. Douglas Arnold, “The Electoral Connection, Age 40,” ch. 2 in Alan S. Gerber & Eric Schickler, Governing in a Polarized Age: Elections, Parties, and Political Representation in America (2017). What do member connections look like in the current partisan and polarized era?

**SEPTEMBER 18 - SUPERMAJORITIES/FILIBUSTERING**

**Required:**

Gregory Koger, Filibustering: A Political History of Obstruction in the House and Senate (2010), pages 3-56, 69-74, 97-132, 147-87. A history rich in themes and surprises. The centrality of civil rights. The House used to filibuster, too. The automaticity of the Senate’s 60-vote hurdle dates only to the 1980s.

**Suggested:**

Gregory J. Wawro & Eric Schickler, Filibuster: Obstruction and Lawmaking in the U.S. Senate (2006), especially chapter 2 (“Obstruction in Theoretical Context”). The full sweep of Senate history.

**GRAD:**  Gregory J. Wawro & Eric Schickler, “Reid’s Rules: Filibusters, the Nuclear Option, and Path Dependence in the US Senate,” Legislative Studies Quarterly 43:4 (November 2018), 619-647. A theoretical essay. Basically, the Senate keeps on with its supermajority rules and customs because the senators like things that way, not because they are helplessly “locked in” by previous institutional choices.

**SEPTEMBER 25 – DIVIDED GOVERNMENT/GRIDLOCK/PRODUCTIVITY**

**Required:**

David R. Mayhew, Divided We Govern: Party Control, Lawmaking, and Investigations, 1946-2002 (2005; earlier edition with the same pagination is dated 1991), chapters 3 & 4.

Continuation of DWG laws list, 1991-2004. Browse!

Continuation of DWG laws list, 2005-2018. Browse!

Sarah Binder, “The Dysfunctional Congress,” Annual Review of Political Science 18 (2015), 85-101, at pages 91-94 (read just those pages). Argues that to enumerate N’s of significant enactments that depart from the policy status quo is not enough. Needed is a denominator. At issue is: What are the societal problems that need addressing?

R. Douglas Arnold, “Explaining Legislative Achievements,” chapter 12 in Jeffery A. Jenkins & Eric M. Patashnik (eds.), Congress and Policy Making in the 21st Century (2016). Discusses the problems in measuring legislative productivity. Anyway, what’s so great about being productive?

**Suggested:**

**GRAD:** Joshua D. Clinton & John S. Lapinski, “Measuring Legislative Achievement, 1877-1994,” American Journal of Political Science 50:1 (January 2006), 232-249. The gold standard on this topic, going back in time.

Sarah Binder, “The Dysfunctional Congress,” Annual Review of Political Science 18 (2015), 85-101 (already excerpted above). Here the full version. An extended treatment of the idea of “dysfunction.”

**GRAD:** Keith Krehbiel, Pivotal Politics: A Theory of U.S. Lawmaking (1998), chapter 2. Classic presentation of the idea of a “gridlock interval,” nestled between, at least sometimes, the president’s 2/3 veto-override point and the Senate’s 60-vote cloture mark.

Josh Chafetz, “The Phenomenology of Gridlock,” Notre Dame Law Review 88 (2013), 2065-87. A theoretical essay. “Rather than asking why we experience gridlock, we should be asking why and how legislative action occurs. We should expect to see legislative action….when there is sufficient public consensus for a specific course of action.”

**OCTOBER 2 – PARTISAN POLARIZATION**

**Required:**

Frances E. Lee, Insecure Majorities: Congress and the Perpetual Campaign (2016), chapters 1-6, 9. Argues that close party competition for control of the House since 1980 or so has greatly affected internal congressional operations. Fight! Take no prisoners!

Christopher Hare, Keith T. Poole & Howard Rosenthal, “Polarization in Congress has risen sharply. Where is it going next?” Washington Post, February 13, 2014.

**Suggested:**

Richard H. Pildes, “Why the Center Does Not Hold: The Causes of Hyperpolarized Democracy in America,” California Law Review 99:2 (April 2011), 273-333, at pages 287-297 (read just those pages). An examination of three alleged basic causes of recent polarization: persons (that is, particular leaders like Bush 43 and Obama), history (that is, the expansion of U.S. democracy in the 1960s), and institutions (that is, primaries, gerrymandering, internal congressional rules, campaign finance). The prize goes to B.

**HIGH-STAKES SHOWDOWNS (the frame of weeks 7 through 9)**

**OCTOBER 9 – TWO BOOKS, AN HOUR OF DISCUSSION APIECE**

**--1) The rejection of the League of Nations (1919)**

**Book to read**:

John Milton Cooper, Jr., Breaking the Heart of the World: Woodrow Wilson and the Fight for the League of Nations (2001), chapters 1-9.

**Suggested:**

James E. Hewes, Jr., “Henry Cabot Lodge and the League of Nations,” Proceedings of the American Philosophical Society 114:4 (August 1970), 245-255. An interpretation of the whole business favorable to Wilson’s nemesis, Senator Henry Cabot Lodge.

David Mervin, “Henry Cabot Lodge and the League of Nations,” Journal of American Studies 4:2 (1971), 201-214. An interpretation not favorable to Lodge.

Dewey W. Grantham, Jr., “The Southern Senators and the League of Nations, 1918-1920,” North Carolina Historical Review 26:2 (April 1949), 187-205. Wilson’s solid base of support.

**--2) The defeat of FDR’s court-packing plan (1937)**

**Book to read:**

Joseph Alsop & Turner Catledge, The 168 Days (1938). This classic work is long out of print, copies at Yale are scarce, and the used copies available online are expensive. Hence, the scanned version posted here is the best bet.

**Suggested:**

Michael Nelson, “The President and the Court: Reinterpreting the Court-packing Episode of 1937,” Political Science Quarterly 103:2 (Summer 1988), 267-293. An interpretation of FDR’s behavior.

Gregory A. Caldeira, “Public Opinion and the U.S. Supreme Court: FDR’s Court-Packing Plan,” Public Opinion Quarterly 81:4 (December 1987), 1139-53. The drift in the opinion polls during the many months of the confrontation. What motored the evolution of the views?

**OCTOBER 23 – TWO BOOKS, AN HOUR OF DISCUSSION APIECE**

**--1) The showdowns over Soviet spying (real or alleged) during the 1930s and 1940s. In this case, two successive high-publicity showdowns occurred involving Congress. Thus, here is a choice between two books, both of which, given a willing reader or two for each, can be taken up during an hour’s discussion.**

**BOOKS TO READ (choose one of the two):**

Allen Weinstein, Perjury: The Hiss-Chambers Case (1978), chapters 1, 5, 8; chapter 9 at pages 328-32 & 340-42; chapter 10. The interests of the Truman administration, the FBI, and the House Un-American Activities clashed in this controversy that exploded in 1948.

David M. Oshinsky, A Conspiracy So Immense: The World of Joe McCarthy (1983), chapters 22-32. These chapters cover blow-by-blow the Senate’s Army-McCarthy hearings of 1954.

**Suggested:**

K.A. Cuordileone, “The Torment of Secrecy: Reckoning with American Communism and Anticommunism after Venona,” Diplomatic History 35:4 (September 2011), 615-642. A lookback in the light of later cascading evidence. “Venona” refers to Soviet cables of those vexed times that were hard to decode and weren’t public knowledge until later.

Jennifer Delton, “Rethinking Post-World War II Anticommunism,” Journal of the Historical Society 10:1 (March 2010), 1-41. Another reflective lookback.

**--2) The passage of the Civil Rights Act of 1964**

**Book to read:**

Robert Mann, The Walls of Jericho: Lyndon Johnson, Hubert Humphrey, Richard Russell, and the Struggle for Civil Rights (1996), chapters 17-20. This works addresses the enactment of the historic Civil Rights Act of 1964. Many months of planning, public mobilizing, cross-party compromising, filibustering, and so on.

**Suggested:**

Katherine Krimmel, “Rights by Fortune or Fight? Reexamining the Addition of Sex to Title VII of the Civil Rights Act,” Legislative Studies Quarterly 44:2 (May 2019), 271-306. How and why did this happen?

Sean Farhang, “The Political Development of Job Discrimination Litigation, 1963-1976,” Studies in American Political Development 23 (April 2009), 23-60. In a move of lasting importance, the terms of compromise in the Senate nudged the enforcement of anti-job discrimination into the courts (as opposed to the federal bureaucracy).

Ilyana Kuziemko & Ebonya Washington, “Why Did the Democrats Lose the South? Bringing New Data to an Old Debate,” American Economic Review 108:10 (2018), 2830-67. In an inspired use of data, this work shows how the Birmingham, Alabama demonstrations of the spring of 1963 led by Martin Luther King, Jr., decisively shook up the national politics of civil rights paving the way to the 1964 enactment.

**OCTOBER 30 – TWO BOOKS, AN HOUR OF DISCUSSION APIECE**

**--1) The Watergate investigations**

**BOOK TO READ:**

Stanley I. Kutler, The Wars of Watergate: The Last Crisis of Richard Nixon (1990), chapters 8-20, except skip pages 391-98, 417-22, 431-38.

**Suggested:**

Michael Schudson, “Watergate: A Study in Mythology,” Columbia Journalism Review 31:1 (May 1992), 28-33. “Did the press really bring down the president? Also, did Watergate really change the press?”

Mark Feldstein, “Watergate Revisited,” American Journalism Review 26:4 (August-September 2004), 60-68. More on the journalists.

Paul Matzko, “’Do something about Life Line,’ The Kennedy Administration’s Campaign to Silence the Radio Right,” Presidential Studies Quarterly 48:4 (December 2018), 817-31. Where were the conservative media during Watergate? A surprising story. No Fox channel or Rush Limbaugh back then.

**--2) The defeat of the Clinton administration’s health-care reform in 1993-94**

**BOOK TO READ:**

Haynes Johnson & David S. Broder, The System: The American Way of Politics at the Breaking Point (1996), chapters 6-11, 13-20.

**Suggested:**

Sven Steinmo & Jon Watts, “It’s the Institutions, Stupid! Why Comprehensive National Health Insurance Always Fails in America,” Journal of Health Politics, Policy and Law 20:2 (Summer 1995), 329-372. The record from Truman through Clinton. Pre-ACA.

Joseph White, “The Horses and the Jumps: Comments on the Health Care Reform Steeplechase,” Journal of Health Politics, Policy and Law 20:2 (Summer 1995), 373-383. A response to Steinmo & Watts.

Mollyann Brodie & Robert J. Blendon, “The Public’s Contribution to Congressional Gridlock on Health Care Reform,” Journal of Health Politics, Policy and Law 20:2 (Summer 1995), 403-410.

David W. Brady & Kara M. Buckley, “Health Care Reform in the 103d Congress: A Predictable Failure,” Journal of Health Politics, Policy and Law 20:2 (Summer 1995), 447-454. A probe into the views of the median voter, the median House member, and the median senator.

**POLICY MAKING: 13 major impulses during U.S. history (the frame of weeks 9 through 13; during these weeks, undergraduates should feel free to choose as a component of required reading any short piece labeled GRAD even though it is thus labeled)**

**NOVEMBER 6 – launching the new nation; continental expansion; mid-19th-century consolidation; building an industrial economy; rise to world hegemony**

**Required:**

David R. Mayhew, The Imprint of Congress (2017), pages 1-42, 48-53 (this hops around a bit).

Choose any two of these short pieces:

--Peter L. Rousseau & Richard Sylla, “Emerging Financial Markets and Early US Growth,” Explorations in Economic History 42 (2005), 1-26. The country’s new financial system of the 1790s, due chiefly to Alexander Hamilton, as a spur to take-off economic growth.

--Todd Estes, “Shaping the Politics of Public Opinion: Federalists and the Jay Treaty Debate,” Journal of the Early Republic 20:3 (Autumn 2000), 393-422. What did lawmaking look like in this major showdown of the 1790s?

--John E. Ferling, Adams vs. Jefferson: The Tumultuous Election of 1800 (2004), chapter 12 (“…Horrors, The House Decides the Election”). Making a deal.

--Alfred A. Cave, “Abuse of Power: Andrew Jackson and the Indian Removal Act of 1830,” The Historian 65:6 (Winter 2003), pages 1330-53. The roles of president and Congress in this tragic drive.

--Charles S. Maier, “Consigning the Twentieth Century to History: Alternative Narratives for the Modern Era,” American Historical Review 105:3 (June 2000), pages 813-23 (this is a short extract from a longer article; read just these pages). Argues that the 1860s were the true hinge point of the 19th-century in the U.S. and elsewhere. National consolidations. Jibes with the citations to Kolchin, Hobsbawm, Deudney, Bayly, Foner, Degler, Fredrickson, and Osterhammel supplied in the Imprint book.

--Charles W. Calhoun, “Political Economy in the Gilded Age: The Republican Party’s Industrial Policy,” Journal of Policy History 8:3 (1996), 291-309. Railroads, tariffs, colleges, and the rest.

--**GRAD:** Isaac Ehrlich, Adam Cook & Yong Yin, “What Accounts for the US Ascendancy to Economic Superpower by the Early Twentieth Century? The Morrill Act-Human Capital Hypothesis,” Journal of Human Capital 12:2 (2018), 233-81. Were subsidies for the land-grant colleges a significant lever? **(grads: check this piece for causal inference).**

--Jeffrey W. Meiser, Power and Restraint: The Rise of the United States, 1898-1941 (2015), pages xiii-xxx and 260-65. Why didn’t the U.S. match Britain, France, and other countries in gathering colonial empires during this era of competitive expansion? This is a puzzle in some international relations theory. Well, both Congress and public opinion seem to have acted as major drags.

**NOVEMBER 13 – taming the corporations and the rich; responding to the Great Depression; building a welfare state**

**Required:**

David R. Mayhew, The Imprint of Congress, pages 42-48 and chapter 4

Choose any one of these pieces:

--William H. Becker, “Managerial Capitalism and Public Policy,” Business and Economic History 21 (1992), 247-256. How the Sherman Anti-Trust Act of 1890, wholly a congressional product, triggered a cascade of unending policy development. The result: a distinctive pattern of oligopolistic (as opposed to monopolistic) competition among firms through pricing and ads. A complicated story. Silicon Valley beware.

--Gyung-Ho Jeong, Gary J. Miller & Andrew S. Sobel, “Political Compromise and Bureaucratic Structure: The Political Origins of the Federal Reserve System,” Journal of Law, Economics, and Organization 25:2 (2008), 472-498. How the structural independence of the Fed emerged from congressional compromise.

--W. Elliot Brownlee, “Wilson and Financing the Modern State: The Revenue Act of 1916,” Proceedings of the American Philosophical Society 129:2 (June 1985), 173-210. How the country’s lasting mix of corporate, estate, and personal income taxation emerged from defense preparedness for World War I, thanks to the presidency plus insistent congressional progressives.

--Monica Prasad, The Land of Too Much: American Abundance and the Paradox of Poverty (2012), chapter 6 (“Progressive Taxation and the Welfare State”). Over the long run, given European comparisons, U.S. progressive taxation hasn’t yielded an awful lot of government revenue (see esp. pages 166-170).

--G. John Ikenberry & Theda Skocpol, “Expanding Social Benefits: The Role of Social Security,” Political Science Quarterly 102:3 (Autumn 1987), 389-416. On the enactment of the Social Security Act of 1935. Given European comparisons, why did government social provision come relatively late to the U.S. and take the form it did? The historical messiness of congressional processes seems to be one reason (see esp. pages 395-396).

--Randall E. Parker, The Economics of the Great Depression: A Twenty-First Century Look Back at the Economics of the New Deal Era (2007), pages 1-21 (“An Overview of the Great Depression”). The gist of a report based on interviews with a dozen leading economists of recent vintage. In recovery terms, what were the roles of the presidency, Congress, fiscal policy, monetary policy?

**--GRAD:** Christina D. Romer, “What Ended the Great Depression?” Journal of Economic History 52:4 (December 1992), 757-784. The prize seems to go to monetary policy.

--Joshua K. Hausman, “Fiscal Policy and Economic Recovery: The Case of the 1936 Veterans’ Bonus,” American Economic Review 106:4 (2016), 1100-43. But here was a blast of countercyclical fiscal policy, so to speak.

**NOVEMBER 20 – postwar prosperity; civil rights; neoliberalizing the economy; climate change; long-run debt and deficit**

**Required:**

David R. Mayhew, The Imprint of Congress, chapters 5 and 6.

Choose any two of these pieces:

--Eric M. Patashnik, Putting Trust in the US Budget: Federal Trust Funds and the Politics of Commitment (2000), chapter 6. How did the government launch the interstate highway program in the 1950s? It took immense planning and compromising. For one thing, they needed a way to pay for it. A lesson for us all in the politics of infrastructure design.

--Richard M. Flanagan, “The Housing Act of 1954: The Sea Change in National Urban Policy,” Urban Affairs Review 33 (1997), 265-86. Where did urban renewal come from?

--Robert L. Fleegler, “Theodore G. Bilbo and the Decline of Public Racism, 1938-1947,” Journal of Mississippi History 68:1 (2006), 1-28. How did the Senate’s most vicious racist lose his license to rant? A major change in background political climate associated with World War II.

--Francis G. Castles, “The Dynamics of Policy Change: What Happened to the English-speaking Nations in the 1980s,” European Journal of Political Research 18 (1990), 491-513. The onset of neoliberalizing reform to the economies of Britain, Canada, Australia, New Zealand, and the U.S.

--Monica Prasad, “The Popular Origins of Neoliberalism in the Reagan Tax Cut of 1981,” Journal of Policy History 24:3 (2012), 351-383. Why the Reagan tax cut?

--**GRAD:** Jack H. Nagel, “Social Choice in a Pluralitarian Democracy: The Politics of Market Liberalization in New Zealand,” British Journal of Political Science 28 (1998), 223-267. Big things can happen fast by way of uncluttered majority rule in a non-separation-of-powers system.

--David Vogel, “The Hare and the Tortoise Revisited: The New Politics of Consumer and Environmental Regulation in Europe,” British Journal of Political Science 33:4 (2003), 557-580. Why did the U.S. pioneer in environmental regulation in the 1960s and 1970s yet come to lag in later years?

--**GRAD:** George A. Krause, “Partisan and Ideological Sources of Fiscal Deficits in the United States,” American Journal of Political Science 44:3 (July 2000), 542-559. Has divided party control of the government made a difference? A stab at multivariate analysis.

**DECEMBER 4 – WIND-UP**

**Required:**

David R. Mayhew, The Imprint of Congress, chapter 7 (“Legitimacy, Messiness, and Reflections”)

Choose any two of these pieces:

--Richard H. Pildes, “Why the Center Does Not Hold,” California Law Review 99:2 (April 2011), at pages 287-297 (read just those pages). This discussion appears earlier in the syllabus under “polarization,” but it fits snugly here, too.

--**GRAD:** Gabriel Felbermayr & Jasmin Groschl, “Within U.S. Trade and the Long Shadow of the American Secession,” Economic Inquiry 52:1 (January 2014), 382-404. A surprising finding. Can it be true that the shadow lasted so long? **(check for causal inference)**

--Martha Derthick, Agency Under Stress: The Social Security Administration in American Government (1990), chapter 4 (“Congress as Legislator”). This work by the leading historian of Social Security addresses a particular policy wrinkle, but it offers a fetching general discussion of the complexities that can be associated with Congress’s monitoring and updating of programs.

--Eileen Burgin, “Congress, Policy Sustainability, and the Affordable Care Act: Democratic Policy Makers Overlooked Implementation, Post-Enactment Politics, and Policy Feedback Effects,” Congress and the Presidency 45:3 (2018), 279-314. Discusses member and party incentives in play in the ACA enactment process of 2009-2010.

--Gary C. Jacobson, “Extreme Referendum: Donald Trump and the 2018 Midterm Elections,” Political Science Quarterly 134:1 (2019), 9-38. All said and done, nothing in Congress’s job description beats the institution’s role of checker and balancer of a powerful presidency. In that task, U.S. House elections have played a key role, not least in recent times. In the 19 biennial House elections since 1980, which include contests held in presidential years as well as midterms, only twice (in 2002 and 2004—hint: the 9/11 attack)) has a party controlling the White House managed to win a seat majority in a national House election that was conducted while that party held the presidential office. This seems like a slam-the-king model.