

# POLITICAL SCIENCE 420A: AMERICAN POLITICS GRADUATE FIELD SEMINAR I

—PRELIMINARY DRAFT SUBJECT TO CHANGE—

Jonathan Wand  
<http://wand.stanford.edu/courses>  
wand(at)stanford.edu

## DESCRIPTION

This introductory seminar reviews various approaches to the study of American politics—those important today as well as those that have been important in the past. The course is organized around a selection of key questions in political science, and we will focus on evaluating the analytical usefulness and empirical support of existing theories and ideas. None of the questions are unique to American politics, and comparative cases are also considered. Examining the merits and limitations of different approaches to answering each type of question will be a core part of our discussion.

This course is also designed to provide exposure to the history and classic literature of the discipline. The intent is to provide students with grounding in the classic literature of the field and to provide intellectual context for their own reading and research.

This course is the first in a three course sequence, and *is not designed to be a complete survey of the field*. The two subsequent courses provide in-depth analysis of the study of political behavior and institutions. Students planning to be examined in American Politics are expected to master on their own the additional readings of this seminar, the other two quarters of American Politics field seminars, and the readings from American Politics seminars held in recent years.

## TIME AND LOCATION

Seminar: Tuesdays 4:15-6:45pm in Encina West 400 (GSL)

Office Hours: TBA

## REQUIREMENTS

You should be familiar with all of core readings on the syllabus each week. At each seminar, each person is expected to be able to provide a synthesis of all core readings. Active participation in the seminar is an important part of your course grade. Each student should come prepared with 2-3 questions to their classmates about the works they have read.

Students will divide responsibility for producing discussion papers on the core readings each week. A barely adequate paper would provide a summary of the readings; a superior paper would identify weaknesses, unresolved questions, and the substantive implications of any deficiencies. At the end of each paper, students should identify at least two questions for future research.

The discussion papers will be due by email at 12 NOON each Monday. The electronic documents must be saved in *pdf* format (not Word or other formats). Additionally, the file should be labeled using the following convention: “surname\_week#” (no capitalization, no spaces). Details on writing summaries will be discussed at the first meeting.

A short final paper will also be required at the end of this course. This will be discussed in the seminar. No extensions will be granted for this paper and late papers will not be accepted.

## READINGS

Topics and core readings are listed by week. Core readings that are subject to discussion in the seminar and summaries are identified by ‘•’. Additional readings not the subject of discussion in the seminar are identified by ‘\*’; these additional reading are considered fair game for American Field seminar exams.

## COURSE OUTLINE

### 1. VIEWS OF THE DISCIPLINE AND SOCIAL SCIENCE (SEPT 24)

*How do we study what we study? How does our approach affect what we study?*

ASSIGNMENT: Sketch the history provided by the readings (omiting Bloom) in 1-2 pages.

NOTE: In addition to discussing the reading, we will also use part of the meeting for the organization of the seminar and an introduction to the American Politics field at Stanford.

- Merriam, C.E. 1923. Recent Advances in Political Methods. *American Political Science Review*, 17(2):275–295 (J)
- Gosnell, H.F. 1933. Statisticians and Political Scientists. *American Political Science Review*, 27(3):392–403 (J)
- Truman, D.B. 1968. The Social Sciences and Public Policy Maturity brings problems of relevance and training. *Science*, 160(3827):508–512 (J)
- Bloom, A. 1987. *The closing of the American mind*. Simon & Schuster. Esp. Part III. (P)
- Almond, G.A. 1990. *A Discipline Divided: Schools and Sects in Political Science*. Sage. Esp Ch. 1 (P)
- Laitin, David D. 2004. The Political Science Discipline. In Edward D. Mansfield and Richard Sisson, editors, *The Evolution of Political Knowledge: Democracy, Autonomy, and Conflict in Comparative and International Politics*, Ohio: Ohio State University Press, chapter 1. pages 11–58. With Discussion (P)

#### Additional

- \* Dahl, R.A. 1961. The Behavioral Approach in Political Science: Epitaph for a Monument to a Successful Protest. *American Political Science Review*, 55(4):763–772
- \* Thelen, K. 1999. Historical Institutionalism in Comparative Politics. *Annual Reviews in Political Science*, 2(1):369–404
- \* Polsby, N.W. and E. Schickler. 2002. Landmarks in the Study of Congress since 1945. *Annual Reviews in Political Science*, 5(1):333–367

## 2. POLITICS OF IDEAS (OCT 1)

*What ideas and issues are the sources of consensus or conflict?*

*How do key ideas influence the structure of political debates and political organization?*

NOTE: Most readings in one week obviously have overlap with other weeks. Students should consider the seminar readings cumulative, instead of isolated groups of ideas, and be prepared to incorporate all readings that have been considered up to that point when discussing a particular question.

- The Federalist Papers (any edition), Numbers 10, 51, 70, 78
- Alexis de Tocqueville. *Democracy in America* (Doubleday 1969 or Harper-Row 1988; these are identical). Especially, Vol. 1, Part I, Ch. 3; Vol. 2, Part II, Chs. 1-9
- Hartz, Louis. 1991 [1955]. *The Liberal Tradition in America: An Interpretation of American Political Thought since the Revolution*. San Diego: Harcourt, Brace & Co., 2nd edition. Esp Chap 1-3,9
- Lane, R.E. 1962. *Political Ideology: Why the American Common Man Believes what He Does*. Free Press
- Converse, Philip E. 1964. The Nature of Belief Systems in Mass Publics. In David Apter, editor, *Ideology and Discontent*, Glencoe: Free Press. pages 206–61
- McClosky, Herbert. 1964. Consensus and Ideology in American Politics. *American Political Science Review*, 58(2):361–82
- Almond, Gabriel. ND. "The Civic Culture." Stanford University. Photocopy.
- Poole, Keith and Howard Rosenthal. 1997. *Congress: A Political-Economic History of Roll Call Voting*. New York: Oxford University Press. Esp. Chap 1, 2, 5, and 6.; Revised edition: Poole, K.T. and H. Rosenthal. 2007. *Ideology and Congress*. Transaction Publ

### Additional

- \* Dahl, R.A. 1956. *A Preface to Democratic Theory*. University Of Chicago Press
- \* Bailyn, B. 1967. *The ideological origins of the American Revolution*. Belknap Press of Harvard University Press Cambridge
- \* Herbert McClosky & John Zaller, *The American Ethos: Public Attitudes toward Capitalism and Democracy* (1984).
- \* Gordon S. Wood. 1992. *The Radicalism of the American Revolution*.
- \* Smith, Rogers M. 1993. Beyond Tocqueville, Myrdal, and Hartz: The multiple Traditions in America. *American Political Science Review*, 87(3):549–566
- \* Putnam, Robert. 1993. *Making Democracy Work: Civic Traditions in Modern Italy*. Princeton: Princeton University Press. Chs. 4-6.
- \* Gerring, J. 1998. *Party Ideologies in America, 1828-1996*. Cambridge University Press

### 3. ECONOMIC AND POLITICAL INEQUALITY, REDISTRIBUTION (OCT 8)

*How does economic inequality affect political competition? What explains the welfare and redistribution policies of the US?*

- Myrdal, G. 1944. *An American Dilemma*. Transaction Publishers. Esp. Chap 1 and 9.
- Hochschild, J.L. 1981. *What's Fair?: American Beliefs About Distributive Justice*. Harvard University Press
- Steinmo, S.H. 1994. American Exceptionalism Reconsidered: Culture or Institutions. In Lawrence Dodd and Calvin Jillson, editors, *The Dynamics of American Politics: Approaches and Interpretations*, Boulder: Westview Press. pages 106–131
- McCarty, N., K.T. Poole, and H. Rosenthal. 2006. *Polarized America: the dance of ideology and unequal riches*. Cambridge, Mass.: MIT Press
- Bartels, Larry M. 2008. *Unequal Democracy: The Political Economy of the New Gilded Age*. Princeton University Press

#### Additional

- \* Jackson, J.E. and D.C. King. 1989. Public Goods, Private Interests, and Representation. *American Political Science Review*, 83(4):1143–64
- \* Mebane, W. 1994. Fiscal Constraints and Electoral Manipulation in American Social Welfare. *American Political Science Review*, 88(1):77–94
- \* Martin Gilens, 1999. Why Americans Hate Welfare (esp. ch. 5, "The News Media and the Racialization of Poverty").
- \* Persson, T. and G. Tabellini. 1994. Is Inequality Harmful for Growth? *The American Economic Review*, 84(3):600–621
- \* Acemoglu, D. and J.A. Robinson. 2000. Why did the West Extend the Franchise? Democracy, Inequality, and Growth in Historical Perspective\*. *Quarterly Journal of Economics*, 115(4):1167–1199
- \* Bailey, M.A. 2005. Welfare and the Multifaceted Decision to Move. *American Political Science Review*, 99(01):125–135
- \* Llavador, H. and R.J. Oxoby. 2005. Partisan Competition, Growth, and the Franchise. *The Quarterly Journal of Economics*, 120(3):1155–1189
- \* Lee, W. and J.E. Roemer. 2006. Racism and redistribution in the United States: A solution to the problem of American exceptionalism. *Journal of Public Economics*, 90(6-7):1027–1052
- \* Brady, H.E. and P.M. Sniderman. 2008. Review of Racism, Xenophobia, and Distribution: Multi-Issue Politics in Advanced Democracies. By John E. Roemer, Woojin Lee, and Karine Van Der Straeten. *Perspectives on Politics*, 6(02):409–411

#### 4. THE ROLE OF PARTIES (OCT 15)

*Why parties? And what do parties stand for (and what do voters think they stand for)?*

- American Political Science Association. 1950. "Towards a More Responsible Two-Party System: A Report of the Committee on Political Parties". *American Political Science Review*. 44:3, part 2.
- Ranney, A. 1951. Toward a More Responsible Two-Party System: A Commentary. *American Political Science Review*, 45(2):488–99
- Turner, Julius. 1951. Responsible Parties: A Dissent from the Floor. *American Political Science Review*, 45(1):143–152
- Downs, Anthony. 1957. *An Economic Theory of Democracy*. Harper-Collins. Chap. 1–8
- Samuel Eldersveld. 1964. *Political Parties: A Behavioral Analysis*. Chs. 5,8, 22.
- Nie, N.H., S. Verba, and J.R. Petrocik. 1979. *The changing American voter*. Harvard University Press Chap 12 and 13
- Riker, William H. 1982b. The Two-Party System and Duverger's Law: An Essay on the History of Political Science. *American Political Science Review*, 76(4):753–766
- Aldrich, John H. 1995. *Why Parties? The Origin and Transformation of Political Parties in America*. Chicago: University of Chicago Esp. Chap 1, 2, 4, 6, 8
- Hirano, S. and J.M. Snyder. 2007. The Decline of Third-Party Voting in the United States. *Journal of Politics*, 69(1):1–16
- Aldrich, John H. and Richard D. McKelvey. 1977. A Method of Scaling with Applications to the 1968 and 1972 Presidential Elections. *American Political Science Review*, 71:111–30
- Brady, Henry E. and Paul M. Sniderman. 1985. Attitude Attribution: A Group Basis for Political Reasoning. *American Political Science Review*, 79:1061–1078

#### Additional

- \* Duverger, Maurice. 1963 [1954]. *Political Parties*. New York: John Wiley & Sons. Book II, Section I, Chs. 1,2. pp. 206-255.
- \* Arend Lijphart. 1994. *Electoral Systems and Party Systems*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- \* Hibbs, D. 1977. Political Parties and Macroeconomic Policy. *American Political Science Review*, 71(4):1467–1487
- \* Sundquist, James L. 1992. *Constitutional Reform and Effective Government*. Rev. ed. Washington, D.C.: The Brookings Institution.
- \* David Rhode. 1991. *Parties and Leaders in the Postreform House*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- \* Chhibber, P. and K.W. Kollman. 1998. Party Aggregation and the Number of Parties in India and the United States. *American Political Science Review*, 92:329–342
- \* Fiorina, M.P. 2002. Parties and Partisanship: A 40-Year Retrospective. *Political Behavior*, 24(2):93–115
- \* Snyder, J.M. and M.M. Ting. 2002. An Informational Rationale for Political Parties. *American Journal Of Political Science*, 46(1):90–110

## 5. PARTICIPATION, VOTING (OCT 22)

*Who votes? What explains the level of turnout, and variance in turnout across groups?*

- Gosnell, Harold Foote. 1927. *Getting Out the Vote: An Experiment in the Stimulation of Voting*. University of Chicago Press
- Almond, Gabriel A., and Sidney Verba. 1963. *The Civic Culture: Political Attitudes and Democracy in Five Nations*. Princeton: Princeton University Press. (chapters 1, 5, 11)
- Aldrich, J.H. 1993. Rational Choice and Turnout. *American Journal of Political Science*, 37(1):246–278
- Brady, H.E., S. Verba, and K.L. Schlozman. 1995. Beyond SES: A Resource Model of Political Participation. *American Political Science Review*, 89(2):271–294
- Lijphart, A. 1997. Unequal Participation: Democracy's Unresolved Dilemma. *American Political Science Review*, 91(1):1–14
- Feddersen, T.J. and W. Pesendorfer. 1999. Abstention in Elections with Asymmetric Information and Diverse Preferences. *American Political Science Review*, 93:381–398
- Bendor, J., D. Diermeier, and M. Ting. 2003. A Behavioral Model of Turnout. *American Political Science Review*, 97(02):261–280
- Green, D.P. and A.S. Gerber. 2004. *Get Out the Vote!: How to Increase Voter Turnout*. Brookings Institution Press. Esp. Chap. 8.

### Additional

- \* Rosenstone, Steven J. and John Mark Hansen. 1993. *Mobilization, Participation, and Democracy in America*. New York: Macmillan
- \* Putnam, R.D. 1995. Bowling Alone: America's Declining Social Capital. *Journal of Democracy*, 6:65–65
- \* Verba, Sidney, Kay Lehman Schlozman, and Henry E. Brady. 1995. *Voice and Equality: Civic Voluntarism in American Politics*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.
- Timpone, R.J. 1998. Structure, Behavior, and Voter Turnout in the United States. *American Political Science Review*, 92(1):145–158
- \* Gerber, A.S. and D.P. Green. 2000. The Effects of Canvassing, Telephone Calls, and Direct Mail on Voter Turnout: A Field Experiment. *American Political Science Review*, 94(3):653–663; Imai, K. 2005. Do Get-Out-the-Vote Calls Reduce Turnout? The Importance of Statistical Methods for Field Experiments. *American Political Science Review*, 99(02):283–300; Gerber, A.S. and D.P. Green. 2005. Correction to Gerber and Green (2000), Replication of Disputed Findings, and Reply to Imai (2005). *American Political Science Review*, 99(02):301–313
- \* MacDonald Michael, P. and L. Popkin Samuel. 2001. The Myth of the Vanishing Voter. *American Political Science Review*, 95:963–74
- \* Brady, H.E. and J.E. McNulty. 2004. The Costs of Voting: Evidence from a Natural Experiment. *Annual Meeting of the Society for Political Methodology, Stanford University, July*:29–31
- \* Ansolabehere, S. and D.M. Konisky. 2006. The Introduction of Voter Registration and Its Effect on Turnout. *Political Analysis*, 14(1):83–100

## 6. THE SELECTION OF REPRESENTATIVES (OCT 29)

*How do we end up with our particular elected officials? In addition to policy preferences of voters, there are many additional factors.*

NOTE: These readings obviously omit most of the behavioral work on voting. This will be covered in the weeks on “Voting” in PS420B.

- Berelson, Bernard R., Paul F. Lazarsfeld, and William N. McPhee. 1954. *Voting: A Study of Opinion Formation in a Presidential Campaign*. University Of Chicago Press Esp. Chs. 3-7, 10-14.
- Campbell, Angus, Phillip E. Converse, Warren E. Miller, and Donald E. Stokes. [1960] 1980. *The American Voter*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press Midway Reprints. Chs. 2, 6, 8, 10
- Key, Vladimir O. 1966. *The Responsible Electorate: Rationality in Presidential Voting, 1936-1960*. Cambridge: Belknap Press of Harvard University Press. Forward, Ch. 1.
- Riker, William H. 1982a. *Liberalism Against Populism*. Prospect Heights: Waveland Press
- Kramer, G.H. 1983. The Ecological Fallacy Revisited: Aggregate-versus Individual-level Findings on Economics and Elections, and Sociotropic Voting. *American Political Science Review*, 77(1):92–111
- Cox, G.W. and J.N. Katz. 2002. *Elbridge Gerry’s Salamander: The Electoral Consequences of the Reapportionment Revolution*. Cambridge University Press
- Wantchekon, L. 2003. Clientelism and Voting Behavior. *World Politics*, 55:399–422
- Sekhon, Jasjeet and Rocio Titiumik. 2007. Exploiting Tom DeLay: A New Method for Estimating Incumbency Advantage and the Effect of Candidate Ethnicity on Turnout. Paper presented at the Summer Methods Meetings

### Additional

- \* Cain, B.E., J.A. Ferejohn, and M.P. Fiorina. 1987. *The Personal Vote: Constituency Service and Electoral Independence*. Harvard University Press
- \* Gary Cox. 1997. *Making Votes Count*. Cambridge, U.K.: Cambridge University Press. Chs. 1-2.
- \* Wand, Jonathan, Kenneth Shotts, Jasjeet S. Sekhon, Walter R. Mebane, Jr., Michael Herron, and Henry E. Brady. 2001. The Butterfly Did It: The Aberrant Vote for Buchanan in Palm Beach County, Florida. *American Political Science Review*, 95:793–810
- \* Alesina, Alberto and Howard Rosenthal. 1995. *Partisan Politics, Divided Government, and the Economy*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press
- \* Cameron, Epstein, and O’Halloran. 1996. ”Do Majority-Minority Districts Maximize Substantive Black Representation in Congress?” *APSR* 90: 794-812.
- \* Fearon, J.D. 1999. Electoral Accountability and the Control of Politicians: Selecting Good Types versus Sanctioning Poor Performance. *Democracy, Accountability, and Representation*:55–97
- \* Mebane, W.R. 2000. Coordination, Moderation, and Institutional Balancing in American Presidential and House Elections. *American Political Science Review*, 94(1):37–58; Mebane, Walter R. Jr. and Jasjeet S. Sekhon. 2002. Coordination and Policy Moderation at Midterm. *American Political Science Review*, 96(1):141–157
- Herron, M.C. and J.S. Sekhon. 2005. Black Candidates and Black Voters: Assessing the Impact of Candidate Race on Uncounted Vote Rates. *Journal of Politics*, 67(1):154–177

## 7. MOBILIZATION, AGGREGATION OF INTERESTS (NOV 5)

*What groups are able to organize, and to what effect?*

- Truman, David B. 1951. *The Governmental Process: Political Interests and Public Opinion*. New York: Knopf. Chs. 2, 3, 16, and introduction to 2e.
- Schattschneider, E. E. 1960. *The Semisovereign People: A Realist's View of Democracy in America*. New York: Holt, Rinehart, and Winston. Esp. Chs. 1-4, 9.
- Bachrach, Peter and Morton Baratz. 1961. "The Two Faces of Power." *American Political Science Review* 56: 947-52.
- Dahl, Robert. 1961. *Who Governs? Democracy and Power in an American City*. New Haven: Yale University Press. Chs. 1, 7, 8-16, 24, 27-28.
- Lowi, Theodore. 1969. *The End of Liberalism: Ideology, Policy and the Crisis of Public Authority*. New York: W.W. Norton. Chs. 2-3.
- Hirschman, A.O. 1970. *Exit, voice, and loyalty: Responses to Decline in Firms, Organizations, and States*. Harvard University Press
- Olson, Mancour. 1971. *The Logic of Collective Action: Public Goods and the Theory of Groups*. Cambridge: Harvard Esp. Chap. 1, 2, 5, 6
- Axelrod, R. 1981. The emergence of cooperation among egoists. *American Political Science Review*, 75(2):306–318
- Walker, Jack L. 1983. "The Origins and Maintenance of Interest Groups in America." *American Political Science Review* 77:390-406.
- Hall, Richard and Frank Wayman. 1990. Buying Time: Moneyed Interest and the Mobilization of Bias in Congressional Committees. *American Political Science Review*, 84:797–820

### Additional

- \* Terry M. Moe, "A Calculus of Group Membership," *American Journal of Political Science* 24 (1980), 593-632.
- \* Hansen, John Mark. 1985. "The Political Economy of Group Membership." *American Political Science Review* 79:79-96.
- \* Schlozman, Kay L. and John Tierney. 1986. *Organized Interests and American Democracy*. New York: Harper and Row.
- \* Dennis Chong, 1991. *Collective Action and the Civil Rights Movement*.
- \* Walker, Jack L. 1991. *Mobilizing Interest Groups in America: Patrons, Professions and Social Movements*. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press. Chs. 1-3.
- \* Putnam. 2000. *Bowling Alone*.



## 8. ISSUE CHOICES AND AGENDA (NOV 12)

*What issues get on the political agenda, and why?*

- Romer, T. and H. Rosenthal. 1984. Political Resource Allocation, Controlled Agendas, and the Status Quo. *The Theory of Public Choice-II*
- Kingdon, J.W. 1984. *Agendas, alternatives and public policies*. Harpercollins College Publishers
- Riker, William H. 1986. *The Art of Political Manipulation*. New Haven: Yale University Press
- Deborah A. Stone, Causal Stories and the Formation of Policy Agendas, *Political Science Quarterly* 104 (1989), 281-300
- Polsby, N.W. 1984. *Political Innovation in America: The Politics of Policy Initiation*. Yale University Press Esp. Part I, Part IV.2, Part V
- Tabellini, G. and A. Alesina. 1990. Voting on the Budget Deficit. *The American Economic Review*, 80(1):37-49
- Robert S. Erikson, Michael B. MacKuen, & James A. Stimson. The Macro Polity
- Jones, B.D. and F.R. Baumgartner. 2005. *The Politics of Attention: How Government Prioritizes Problems*. University Of Chicago Press
- Lupia, A. and J.G. Matsusaka. 2004. Direct Democracy: New Approaches to Old Questions. *Annual Review of Political Science*, 7:463-82

### Additional

- \* Anthony King, "Ideas, Institutions and the Policies of Governments: A Comparative Analysis" *British Journal of Political Science* 3 (1973), 291-303 and 409-423.
- \* Edward Carmines and James Stimson. 1989. *Issue Evolution: Race and the Transformation of American Politics*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press. Chs. 1-2.
- \* Judith Goldstein, "The Impact of Ideas on Trade Policy: The Origins of U.S. Agricultural and Manufacturing Policies" *International Organization* 43 (1989), 31-71
- \* Baumgartner, Frank R., and Bryan D. Jones. 1993. *Agendas and Instability in American Politics*. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press.
- \* Christopher Wlezien, The Public as Thermostat: Dynamics of Preferences for Spending, *American Journal of Political Science* 39 (1995), 981-1000.
- \* James A. Stimson, *Public Opinion in America: Moods, Cycles, and Swings* (1991).
- \* Cox and McCubbins. 2005. *Setting the Agenda*
- \* Lupia, Arthur. 1992. "Busy Voters, Agenda Control, and the Power of Information." *American Political Science Review*. 86(June):390-403.
- \* Jacobs, R. Lawrence, and Robert Y. Shapiro. 2000. *Politicians Don't Pander: Political Manipulation and the Loss of Democratic Responsiveness*. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press.

9. REPRESENTATION AND LEGISLATIVE POLICY CREATION (NOV 19)

*The competing incentives faced by legislators.*

- Wilson, Woodrow. 1896. *Congressional Government: A Study in American Politics*. Boston: Houghton, Mifflin.
- Eulau, Heinz, John C. Wahlke, William Buchanan, and Leroy C. Ferguson. 1959. The Role of the Representative: Some Empirical Observations on the Theory of Edmund Burke. *American Political Science Review* 53: 742-756.
- Matthews, D.R. 1959. The Folkways of the United States Senate: Conformity to Group Norms and Legislative Effectiveness. *American Political Science Review*, 53(4):1064-89
- Fenno, R. 1962. The House Appropriations Committee as a Political System: The Problem of Integration. *American Political Science Review*, 56:310-324
- Achen, C.H. 1978. Measuring Representation. *American Journal of Political Science*, 22(3):475-510
- Mayhew, David R. 1974. *Congress: The Electoral Connection*. New Haven: Yale University Press.
- Austen-Smith, D. 1993. Information and Influence: Lobbying for Agendas and Votes. *American Journal of Political Science*, 37(3):799-833
- Snyder, SK and BR Weingast. 2000. The American system of shared powers: the President, Congress, and the NLRB. *Journal of Law, Economics, and Organization*, 16(2):269-305
- Eskridge Jr, W.N. and J. Ferejohn. 1991. Article I, Section 7 Game, The. *Georgetown Law Journal*, 80:523

Additional

- \* Morris Fiorina. 1977. *Congress: Keystone of the Washington Establishment*. New Haven, CT: Yale University Press.
- \* Richard Fenno. 1978. *Home Style: House Members in Their Districts* Boston: Little, Brown, and Company. Ch. 1.
- \* Sulkin, T. 2005. *Issue Politics in Congress*. Cambridge University Press
- \* Powell, G.B. 2000. *Elections as Instruments of Democracy: Majoritarian and Proportional Views*. Yale University Press. Esp Chap 2
- \* Grossman, Gene .M. and Elhanan Helpman. 2001. *Special Interest Politics*. Cambridge: MIT
- \* Austen-Smith, David, and John R. Wright. 1994. "Counteractive Lobbying." *American Journal of Political Science* 38:25-44.
- \* Canes-Wrone, B., D.W. Brady, and J.F. Cogan. 2004. Out of Step, Out of Office: Electoral Accountability and House Members' Voting. *American Political Science Review*, 96(01):127-140

10. THANKSGIVING BREAK—NO CLASS (NOV 26)

11. SYNTHESIS: ANALYZING HEALTH CARE POLITICS (DEC 3)

*How does what we have covered thus far help us to understand the policy proposals for health care coverage in the US, and their political outcomes? Particular attention will be paid to health care reform efforts in the 1990s and 2009.*

- Cutler, D.M. 1994. A Guide to Health Care Reform. *Journal of Economic Perspectives*, 8:13–29
- Glied, S. 1997. *Chronic Condition: Why Health Reform Fails*. Harvard University Press Esp. Ch. 1,3,7
- Hacker, J.S. 1997. *The Road to Nowhere: The Genesis of President Clinton's Plan for Health Security*. Princeton Univ Pr Esp. Ch 1,5, Conclusion
- Chernew, M.E., R.A. Hirth, and D.M. Cutler. 2003. Increased Spending On Health Care: How Much Can The United States Afford? *Health Affairs*, 22(4):15–25
- Pauly, M.V. 2004. Conflict and Compromise Over Tradeoffs in Universal Health Insurance Plans. *The Journal of Law, Medicine & Ethics*, 32(3):465–473

Additional

- \* Fuchs, V.R. 1996. Economics, Values, and Health Care Reform. *American Economic Review*, 86:1–24
- \* Newhouse, J.P. 1996. Health Reform in the United States. *Economic Journal*:1713–1724