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I write to you as the 19th president of the section, a section now mature enough to have spanned a generation. We, as the Jefferson Airplane once sang, “are no longer young.” But we are also not old. We are somewhere in between, neither idling at a crossroads nor hurtling down a freeway. The section has its share of challenges but seems to be in good shape. But this is not a “state of the section” essay. Instead, I write as one who, along with the rest of you, have watched Politics and History develop over the years. We have, as I will describe below, become a bit of a tribe but our tribalism has always been less developed than most of our peer sections. And this is all to the good.

A tension lurks at the center of most academic life, a tension between the sociological imperative of a profession and the individualizing, creative spirit of scholarship. The sociological imperative implacably demands that we belong to an identifiable intellectual community. These communities, in turn, come to have boundaries marked out by the analytical assumptions the members share, the subject matter of their investigations, and the texts they regard as foundational statements of their mission. In this they are much like tribes: the shared assumptions morph into a customary culture (replete with code words, shared recognition of sites of engagement, and common journals that disseminate news and events); the subject matter delineates the territory the tribe inhabits; and the texts become the canon that initiates must master. These are not original observations
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Nominations for Section Officers, 2009-2010

The Nominating Committee for section officers for 2009-2010 was chaired by Richard Bensel and included Sven Steinmo, Jytte Klausen, Julie Novkov, and Eric Patashnik. Professor Steinmo was chosen last year as President-Elect, and under the section bylaws, he automatically assumes the presidency at the 2009 section Business Meeting.

President-Elect:
Suzanne Mettler, Cornell University

New Council Members, full 2-year term:
Pamela Brandwein,
University of Michigan
Victoria Tin-bor Hui,
University of Notre Dame
Ken Kersch,
Boston College
Kimberly Morgan,
George Washington University

The Program Chairs for the Politics and History section at the 2009 American Political Science Association Meetings are:

Kimberly Morgan,
George Washington University
Julian Zelizer,
Princeton University (History)
Reconsidering Realignment from a Systemic Perspective

Curt Nichols, University of Texas at Austin

(Curt Nichols was co-recipient of the Presidency Research section’s 2008 Founder’s Award in Honor of David Neveh for the best paper by a graduate student. He received the award [along with Adam Myers] for: “The Good, The Bad, and The Ugly: Exploiting the Opportunity for Reconstructive Leadership.” He will begin teaching as an Assistant Professor at Baylor University in the Spring of 2010.)

There can be little doubt that critics gained the upper hand in debates about the realignment synthesis over the past quarter-century (McCormick 1982, Shafer 1991, Gerring 1998). Indeed, many argue that David Mayhew issued the theory its final coup de grâce in 2002 with his fifteen-pronged attack against what he calls the once “vibrant source of ideas” that had become “an impediment to understanding” (5). However, the recent concurrence of dramatic events — including the collapse of the Republican party brand, the onset of a financial crisis, President Obama’s historic victory, the strengthening of Democratic majorities in Congress, and the apparent willingness of partisan leaders to use their newfound authority to pursue path altering legislation — have suggested to many that a realigning moment has again come to American politics. If this is the case, and I would argue that it is, political science has the chance to observe the phenomenon while it happens and to learn from it. Indeed, as was suggested in the prompt calling for thoughts on this topic, “if this is a realigning moment for American politics, it is likely to be a realigning moment for the study of American political development as well.”

In answering the call for renewed debate, let me first clarify that my aim is not to lavish uncritical praise on the canonical version of realignment theory but rather to prevent the best aspects of it from being buried. I thus propose to outline how the theory can be given its best reading in light of its own foundations and advances in American political development research.

If the best way to make a bold transition is simply to make it, then the way for me to begin is by suggesting that we must abandon the misconception that the best reading of realignment theory holds that it is primarily about mass electoral behavior. While this proposition may seem to destroy the premise on which the realignment edifice is constructed (e.g., Key 1955; Burnham 1970; Schattschneider 1960; Sundquist 1983), it does not end up doing so upon further inspection. The proposition does, however, acknowledge the main thrust of the realignment critique, which has long based its attack in an electoral record strewn with irregularities, discrepancies, alternate patterns, and missing evidence. Yet, it suggests that this avenue of assault (as well as defense) has been focused at the wrong level of analysis and on the wrong causal mechanisms. If my starting proposition is correct, and realignment isn’t fundamentally about critical elections, then much from past debates need not be rehashed and we can get to the heart of the phenomenon by turning to examine its underexplored foundations.

As is so often overlooked in narrowly-focused electoral debates (by both champions and critics), Burnham rooted the “mainsprings” of realignment in a broad systemic perspective (1970). From this view, the American polity combines a stasis-tending political system with a dynamic socio-economic one. Realignments are then “tension-management” mechanisms, periodically allowing the former system to come into line with the later. As a result of this macro view, Burnham adopted what evolutionary paleontology would later call a punctuated equilibrium model of change to describe the general contours of American political
Politics and History Panels
at the 2009 American Political Science Association Meetings

Co-Chairs:

**Kimberly Morgan**, George Washington University
**Julian Zelizer**, Princeton University (History)

Business Meeting: Friday, September 4
6:15-7:15 pm, Convention Centre 713B
Reception: Friday, September 4
7:30-9:00 pm, Convention Centre 711

Thursday, September 3, 8:00 AM
**Panel 7-6  Standardizing the American State: Historical and Theoretical Perspectives**

Chair: **Robert C. Lieberman**, Columbia University, rcl15@columbia.edu

Bioequivalence: The Regulatory Career of a Medical Concept
**Daniel P. Carpenter**, Harvard University, dcarpenter@gov.harvard.edu

The American State and Imperial Standardization: Western Expansion and Native American Removal
**Paul Frymer**, Princeton University, pfrymer@princeton.edu

Failed Standardization: Social Capital and Political Participation in the Jim Crow South
**Kimberley S. Johnson**, Barnard College, kimjohnson@barnard.edu

Standardization and the American State: A Theoretical Framework
**Desmond King**, Oxford University, desmond.king@politics.ox.ac.uk
**Marc Stears**, University of Oxford, marc.stears@univ.ox.ac.uk

Discussant: **Margaret Weir**, University of California, Berkeley, mweir@berkeley.edu

Thursday, September 3, 10:15 AM
**Panel 7-11-10  North, Wallis and Weingast’s “Violence and Social Orders”**

Chair: **Margaret Levi**, University of Washington, Seattle, margaret.levi@gmail.com

Participant(s): **David Stasavage**, New York University, ds166@nyu.edu
**Barry R. Weingast**, Stanford University, weingast@stanford.edu
**Douglass C. North**, Washington University, batt@artsci.wustl.edu
**John Wallis**, University of Maryland, wallis@econ.umd.edu

Discussant(s): **Robert H. Bates**, Harvard University, robert_bates@harvard.edu
**Larry Diamond**, Stanford University, ldiamond@stanford.edu

Thursday, September 3, 10:15 AM
**Panel 7-15, 25-3  The Politics of Social Policy: Historical Perspectives**

Chair: **Patricia Strach**, Harvard University, pstrach@rwj.harvard.edu

Conspicuous and Inconspicuous Public Health Spending alongside the Development of a Private Health Care System in the United States
**Colleen M. Grogan**, University of Chicago, cgrogan@uchicago.edu
Urban Housing and the Rise of the Public-Private Partnership in United States Social Policy

Alexander Von Hoffman, Harvard University, alexander_von_hoffman@harvard.edu

Nixon’s Northern Strategy: Welfare Reform and Race after the Great Society

Scott Spitzer, California State University, Fullerton, sspitzer@fullerton.edu

Discussant: Patricia Strach, Harvard University, pstrach@rwj.harvard.edu

Thursday, September 3, 2:00 PM

Panel 7-2, 11-25  The Persistence of Nationalism and Nation-Building in the 21st Century

Chair: Henry E. Hale, George Washington University, hhale@gwu.edu

All Good Things Do Not Go Together: The Political Economy of Nation Formation in Tanzania

Elliott D. Green, London School of Economics, E.D.Green@lse.ac.uk

Theories of Nationalism in Latin America: Exploring Insights and Limitations

Matthias vom Hau, University of Manchester, Matthias.VomHau@manchester.ac.uk

Regions of Nationalism in Europe: Toward a More Complex East/West Divide?

Zsuzsa Csergo, Queen’s University, csergo@queensu.ca
Stefan Wolff, University of Nottingham, stefan.wolff@nottingham.ac.uk

Testing Mechanisms of Change in National Identity: Making the Case for an Evolutionary Dynamic

Nadav G. Shelef, University of Wisconsin, Madison, shelef@wisc.edu

“Hinduization” of Civil Society: A Study of Subregional Variation in the Proliferation of Hindu Nationalism in India

Soundarya Chidambaram, Ohio State University, chidambaram.2@osu.edu

Discussant: Ashutosh Varshney, Brown University, Ashutosh.Varshney@Brown.edu

Thursday, September 3, 2:00 PM

7-14  Experts in the American Polity

Chair: Ronald F. King, San Diego State University, rking@mail.sdsu.edu

Amateurs, Experts, and Regulatory Transformations in American History

Ann-Marie E. Szymanski, University of Oklahoma, ams@ou.edu

Overlooked or Out-of-Sight?: Congressional Oversight of Intelligence, 1945-2005

Meredith Wooten, University of Pennsylvania, mwooten@sas.upenn.edu

Information and Bureaucratic Expertise: The Bureau of Corporations, 1903-1914

Jonathan Chausovsky, SUNY-Fredonia, jchaus@gmail.com

Going Up, Getting Out or Moving In? The Rise of Professional Politicians in the U.S., 1812-1944

Scott A. MacKenzie, University of California, San Diego, samackenzie@ucsd.edu
Samuel Kernell, University of California, San Diego, skernell@ucsd.edu


Jody Schmid, University at Albany

Discussant: Ruth O’Brien, Graduate Center, City University of New York, robrien@gc.cuny.edu
Thursday, September 3, 4:15 PM
7-4  The Life and Scholarship of Charles Tilly

Chair:  Brian Balogh, University of Virginia, balogh@virginia.edu

Participant(s):
Richard F. Bensel, Cornell University, rfb2@cornell.edu
Sidney Tarrow, Cornell University, sgt2@cornell.edu
Ira Katznelson, Columbia University, iik1@columbia.edu
Sven Beckert, Harvard University, beckert@fas.harvard.edu

Friday, September 4, 8:00 AM
7-9  New Perspectives on Congress and History

Chair:  Frances E. Lee, University of Maryland, flee@gvpt.umd.edu

Public Opinion, the Congressional Policy Agenda, and the Limits of New Deal Liberalism, 1935-1945
Eric Schickler, University of California, Berkeley, eschickler@berkeley.edu

Congress and the Resurgence of a Democratic National Security Advantage, 1954-1960
Julian E. Zelizer, Princeton University, jzelizer@princeton.edu

The Dynamics of Lawmaking within Sovereignty Related Issues, 1877-1994
John Lapinski, University of Pennsylvania, lapins@sas.upenn.edu

Congress and the Roots of Sunbelt Conservatism
Joseph Crespino, Emory University, jcresp@emory.edu

Discussant:  Frances E. Lee, University of Maryland, flee@gvpt.umd.edu

Friday, September 4, 10:15 AM
Panel 7-20, 35-8  The Scholarly Legacy of Nelson W. Polsby

Chair:  Raymond J. La Raja, University of Massachusetts, Amherst, laraja@polsci.umass.edu

The Divided Democrats Revisited: Ideological Cohesion in the American Party System, 1996-2008
William G. Mayer, Northeastern University, w.mayer@neu.edu

Title TBD
Stephen D. Ansolabehere, Harvard University, sda@gov.harvard.edu

Presidential Cabinet Formation and Party-Building
Harold F. Bass, Ouachita Baptist University, bash@obu.edu

The Problem of Ideology,
John R. Zaller, University of California, Los Angeles, zaller@ucla.edu

Continuity and Change in the Study of Congress
David W. Brady, Stanford University, dbrady@stanford.edu

Friday, September 4, 10:15 AM
7-11  Shifting Modes of Governance: A Punitive Turn in American Social Policy?

Chair:  Christopher Howard, College of William & Mary, cdhowa@wm.edu

Governing the Poor: The Rise of the Neoliberal Paternalist State
Richard C. Fording, University of Kentucky, rford@uky.edu
Sanford F. Schram, Bryn Mawr College, sschram@brynmawr.edu
Joe Soss, University of Minnesota, jbsoss@umn.edu

**Suzanne Mettler**, Cornell University, sbm24@cornell.edu

Punitive Governance in Education: The Strange Origins of No Child Left Behind

**Jesse H. Rhodes**, University of Massachusetts, Amherst, jrhodes@polsci.umass.edu

Experimenting with Punitive Tools: The Changing Governance of Crime Control

**Vesla Mae Weaver**, University of Virginia, vmweaver@virginia.edu

Discussants:  **Christopher Howard**, College of William & Mary, cdhowa@wm.edu

**Paul Pierson**, University of California, Berkeley, pierson@berkeley.edu

Friday, September 4, 12:15 PM

**Plenary Session: Barack Obama: The Politics of Change**

Chair:  **Larry M. Bartels**, Princeton University, bartels@princeton.edu

Participant(s):

- **Glenn C. Loury**, Brown University, glenn_loury@brown.edu
- **Theda Skocpol**, Harvard University, skocpol@fas.harvard.edu
- **Rogers M. Smith**, University of Pennsylvania, rogerss@sas.upenn.edu

Friday, September 4, 2:00 PM

**42-10 Roundtable: 40 Years Since J David Greenstone’s “Labor in American Politics”: Reflections on Where We’ve Been, Where We Are, and Where We Should Go**

Chair:  **Susan E. Orr**, SUNY College at Brockport, sorr@brockport.edu

Participant(s):

- **Michael Goldfield**, Wayne State University, m.goldfield@wayne.edu
- **Paul Frymer**, Princeton University, pfrymer@princeton.edu
- **Janice Fine**, Rutgers University, fine@smlr.rutgers.edu
- **Peter L. Francia**, East Carolina University, franciap@ecu.edu
- **Dorian T. Warren**, Columbia University, dw2288@columbia.edu
- **Ira Katznelson**, Columbia University, iik1@columbia.edu

Friday, September 4, 2:00 PM

**Panel 7-17 Institutional Analysis of the Courts**

Chair:  **John D. Skrentny**, University of California, San Diego, jskrentny@ucsd.edu

Adversarial Legalism and the Civil Rights State

**R. Shep Melnick**, Boston College, melnics@bc.edu

Institutions, Rulemaking, and the Politics of Judicial Retrenchment

**Sarah Staszak**, Brandeis University, staszak@brandeis.edu

Delegation and Democracy: the Legislative Choice between Administrators and Courts

**Sean Farhang**, University of California, Berkeley, farhang@berkeley.edu

Intercurrence and the Politics of Injury Compensation

Jeb Barnes, University of Southern California, barnesj@usc.edu

**Thomas F. Burke**, Wellesley College, tburke@wellesley.edu

Discussant:  **Ken I. Kersch**, Boston College, kersch@bc.edu
Friday, September 4, 4:15 PM

**Panel 7-18  Economic Regulation in Historical and Comparative Perspective**

*Chair:  Stephen Weatherford, University of California, Santa Barbara, weatherford@polisci.ucsb.edu*

- Law and Economic Regulation in Nineteenth Century Canada and the United States  
  **Ryan R. Hurl**, University of Toronto, rhurl@utsc.utoronto.ca
- The National Recovery Administration Reconsidered, or Why Shipping Container Code Succeeded  
  **Gerald Berk**, University of Oregon, gberk@uoregon.edu
- Still Seeking Rents, After All These Years? Testing A Neo-Beardian Account of The Birth of the Bank of the United States  
  **Eric Lomazoff**, Harvard University
- The Creation of a Regulatory Framework: The Enactment of Glass-Steagall  
  **Erik M. Filipiak**, Cornell University, emf34@cornell.edu

*Discussant:  Stephen Weatherford, University of California, Santa Barbara, weatherford@polisci.ucsb.edu*

Friday, September 4, 4:15 PM

**Panel 7-3  Bringing Sexual Orientation In: Gay Citizenship and American Political Development**

*Chair:  Richard M. Valelly, Swarthmore College, rvalell1@swarthmore.edu*

*Participant(s):*
  - **Stephen M. Engel**, Yale University, stephen.engel@yale.edu
  - **Margot Canaday**, Princeton University, mcanaday@princeton.edu
  - **Mary Bernstein**, University of Connecticut, mary.bernstein@uconn.edu
  - **Priscilla Yamin**, University of Oregon
  - **David Rayside**, University of Toronto, david.rayside@utoronto.ca

---

**Politics and History Business Meeting**

**Friday, 6:15-7:15 pm, Sheaton Superior A**

**Politics and History Reception**

**Friday, 7:30-9:00 pm, Convention Centre 711**
Saturday, September 5, 8:00 AM
Panel 7-12  Social Movements and Their Tactics
Chair:  Eileen McDonagh, Northeastern University, e.mcdonagh@neu.edu

The Modern Presidency and Social Movements: the Allegiances and Rivalries that Reform Politics Make
Sidney M. Milkis, University of Virginia, smm8e@virginia.edu
Daniel J. Tichenor, University of Oregon, tichenor@uoregon.edu

Patience and Manly Virtue: First-Class Citizenship Rights as Men’s Rights
Julie L. Novkov, SUNY, Albany, jnovkov@albany.edu

State Constitutions as Tools for Educational Change
Emily Zackin, Princeton University, ezackin@princeton.edu

Innovation Edges, the Mobilization of Bias, and the Evolution of Political Campaigns: Modeling Changes in Campaigning over Time
David A Karpf, University of Pennsylvania, karpfd@sas.upenn.edu

Discussant:  Eileen McDonagh, Northeastern University, e.mcdonagh@neu.edu

Saturday, September 5, 10:15 AM
Panel 7-10  The Political Analysis of Policy Development
Chair:  Jacob S. Hacker, University of California, Berkeley, jhacker@berkeley.edu

The Theoretical Benefits of Policy-Focused Analysis
Paul Pierson, University of California, Berkeley, pierson@berkeley.edu

Suzanne Mettler, Cornell University, sbm24@cornell.edu
Deondra Rose, Cornell University, der33@cornell.edu

The Delegated State: Marketizing Governance of American Social Provision
Andrea Louise Campbell, Massachusetts Institute of Technology, acampbel@mit.edu
Kimberly J. Morgan, George Washington University, kjmorgan@gwu.edu

When Policy Does Not Remake Politics: The Limits of Policy Feedback
Eric M. Patashnik, University of Virginia, ericpat@virginia.edu
Julian E. Zelizer, Princeton University, jzelizer@princeton.edu

Discussant:  Jacob S. Hacker, University of California, Berkeley, jhacker@berkeley.edu

Saturday, September 5, 10:15 AM
Panel 7-19, 23-2  Presidential Development in Historical Perspective
Chair:  Ann-Marie E. Szymanski, University of Oklahoma, ams@ou.edu

From Substance to Symbol: Head Start and the Change From Modern to Postmodern Presidents
Joseph Cammarano, Providence College, jpcammar@providence.edu

The Presidency and Prerogative: Lessons From History
Michael A. Genovese, Loyola Marymount University, mgenovese@lmu.edu

Presidential Leadership in the Early United States
Fred I. Greenstein, Princeton University
Reliving the Lover’s Quarrel: The Creative Destruction of Federalism and Presidential Power
**Elvin T. Lim**, Wesleyan University, elim@wesleyan.edu

Judicial Politics in the Streets: How Nixon’s Court Changed American Politics
**Kevin J. McMahon**, Trinity College, kevin.mcmahon.1@trincoll.edu

Discussants: **Andrew J. Dowdle**, University of Arkansas, adowdle@uark.edu
**Graham G. Dodds**, Concordia University, gdodds@alcor.concordia.ca

Saturday, September 5, 2:00 PM
**Panel 7-5**  Rethinking the American State: Historians and Political Scientists Converse

Chair: **James T. Sparrow**, University of Chicago, jts@uchicago.edu

Beyond Retrenchment: Republicans and the Welfare State
**Jeremy Johnson**, Brown University, Jeremy.Johnson@Brown.edu

Irons of the American State
Robert C. Lieberman, Columbia University, rcl15@columbia.edu
**Desmond King**, Oxford University, desmond.king@politics.ox.ac.uk

A Government out of Sight: The Mystery of National Authority in Nineteenth-Century America
**Brian Balogh**, University of Virginia, balogh@virginia.edu

**Eduardo Canedo**, Princeton University, ecanedo@princeton.edu

Private Litigants, Public Policy Enforcement: The Regulatory Power of Private Litigation and the American Bureaucracy
**Quinn W. Mulroy**, Columbia University, qwm1@columbia.edu

Discussant: **James T. Sparrow**, University of Chicago, jts@uchicago.edu

Saturday, September 5, 4:15 PM
**Panel 7-7**  Fresh Debates in Southern Politics: Race, Class, Religion, and Partisanship in a Changing American South

Chair: **Byron E. Shafer**, University of Wisconsin, Madison, bshafer@polisci.wisc.edu

Participant(s): **James M. Glaser**, Tufts University, jglaser@tufts.edu
**John C. Green**, University of Akron, green@uakron.edu
**Elizabeth Sanders**, Cornell University, mes14@cornell.edu
**Harold W. Stanley**, Southern Methodist University, HStanley@smu.edu
**Richard G.C. Johnston**, University of Pennsylvania, rgcj@sas.upenn.edu

Sunday, September 6, 8:00 AM
**7-16, 32-11**  Race and American Political Development

Chair: **Catherine Paden**, Simmons College, catherine.paden@simmons.edu

**Gwendoline M. Alphonso**, Cornell University, gma22@cornell.edu
**Richard F. Bensel**, Cornell University, rfb2@cornell.edu
Crime and Citizenship

Megan Ming Francis, University of Chicago

Police Chief Ben C. Collins and Law Enforcement in Clarksdale, Mississippi, 1961-1966

Daniel Kryder, Brandeis University, kryder@brandeis.edu


Christina M. Greer, Smith College

Discussants:

Catherine Paden, Simmons College, catherine.paden@simmons.edu
Alvin B. Tiller, Rutgers University, atillery@rci.rutgers.edu

Sunday, September 6, 8:00 AM


Chair: Leslie Friedman Goldstein, University of Delaware, lesl@udel.edu

Participant(s):

Stephen Skowronek, Yale University, stephen.skowronek@yale.edu
Bartholomew H. Sparrow, University of Texas, Austin, bhs@mail.la.utexas.edu
Sheldon D. Pollack, University of Delaware, pollack@udel.edu
David B. Robertson, University of Missouri, St. Louis, daverobertson@umsl.edu
Leslie Friedman Goldstein, University of Delaware, lesl@udel.edu

Sunday, September 6, 10:15 AM

7-13  Engines of Change? American Political Parties in Historical Perspective

Chair: Elizabeth Sanders, Cornell University, mes14@cornell.edu

Partisan Regimes in American Politics
Andrew J. Polsky, Hunter College, CUNY, apolsky@hunter.cuny.edu

Party Factions and the President
Daniel R. DiSalvo, City College of New York-CUNY, disalvodaniel@gmail.com

Mass Opinion and American Populism
Samuel DeCanio, Georgetown University, samueldecanio@hotmail.com

The Vietnam War and the American Party System
Robert P. Saldin, University of Montana, robert.saldin@umontana.edu

Parties as Political Institutions in American Political Development
Daniel Galvin, Northwestern University, galvin@northwestern.edu

Discussants: Nancy L. Rosenblum, Harvard University, nrosenblum@latte.harvard.edu
Elizabeth Sanders, Cornell University, mes14@cornell.edu

Kevin Ball, Wayne State University

This paper reinterprets the origins of US bankruptcy law. Current bankruptcy law has its roots in the Bankruptcy Act of 1898. Existing studies describe that law as the product of conflicts between regional, commercial, and populist interests, or as a legislative reaction to the depression of 1894, or simply as an expression of Congress’ and the public’s pro-business sympathies. This paper departs from those studies and instead identifies the statute as one of Progressivism’s early national successes. Progressive influences on the legislation can be seen in the critical role played by commercial organizations of middle class businessmen in drafting and lobbying for the Act, and in the Acts’ emphasis on professional administration and efficiency. Likewise, focusing on implementation in Southeast Michigan, the paper demonstrates that the 1898 law endured where earlier national insolvency laws failed because it provided key roles for progressive-minded professionals. In short, Progressivism provided the platform for the 1898 Act’s successful enactment and implementation, and set the course for the shape of current bankruptcy law.


Paula Nicole Booke, University of Chicago

Premillennialism is one type of Christian eschatology that is politically significant because proponents suggest that the theology forecasts the rise of a political and religious leader (the Antichrist) who sweeps over the geopolitical and economic landscape ushering in the end of days. Premillennial elites have through the decades suggested that disasters and political turmoil present on the world stage has continually put us on the cusp of the final era in human history. This paper offers an introductory primer on premillennialism in the American context and examines the politicization of this theology from its introduction to by Nelson Darby to its current pervasiveness within American evangelicalism.

“The Irrelevance of War for State and Regime Formation”

Deborah Boucoyannis, Harvard University

Most literature on state and regime formation, whether on Europe or the developing world, assumes war as a key independent variable, following Tilly’s classic formulation. Cases where war is found to be less relevant, like Africa or Latin America, are deemed deviations in need of explanation. Accounts such as Herbst’s and Centeno’s have enriched our understanding precisely by showing how war was not relevant for institution-building in these cases. I argue, by contrast, that there is no ‘deviation’ to be explained. The developing world seems ‘pathological’ in its history, often in need of a ‘stronger’ state, only because we have failed to correctly assess what the historical record really teaches about the European experience for state formation. I offer both logical and historical reasons to show why the Tilly paradigm, like most purely structural approaches, even in their most refined, enriching, and informative versions, like those of Tilly himself, rests on insufficient foundations. The experience of the developing world, as we know it, has many more similarities with the European one than we commonly acknowledge.

“The Birth of Liberty”

Sarah Mackenzie Burns, Claremont Graduate University

For those who look upon the current manifestation of liberal democracy and find it wanting, there is some comfort in studying the thoughts and deeds of men who stood astride the course of history and diverted its path. This study, however, is not without its pitfalls. The desire to praise and blame these men often leads scholars to subject the words and deeds of historical figures to a particular political agenda. Adding more difficulty to this endeavor, there is often a dearth of primary source material, leaving even the most meticulous and ambitious knowledge seekers with only a partial understanding. In an effort to combat the problematic but unavoidable nature of this type of study I have endeavored to engage in a careful study of The Federalist Papers in the hopes of shedding more light on the philosophical traditions that informed this document. Throughout the course of this study, it becomes apparent that the current scholarship has some fundamental flaws.

“Redirecting National Programs: State Interests and National Antebellum Railroad Plans”

Zachary Callen, University of Chicago

Beginning in 1850, Congressional land grants shifted American rail development from a local into a national issue. Congressional involvement drastically altered American rail planning, resulting in a greater emphasis on direct connections between urban shipping centers rather than dense local networks. However, even within the national program, state and local interests still possessed significant latitude to shape their rail development. Yet, not all states were equally adept at redirecting national directives for maximum local benefit. For states without
any meaningfully pre-existing infrastructure, such as Illinois, national intervention provided an opportunity to jump-start local economic growth. States with prior infrastructure systems, particularly those that conflicted with the national agenda, were not so lucky. Thus, Missouri, with its reliance on St. Louis and waterways, was unable to adapt to national rail intervention. The result was Chicago displacing St. Louis as the major shipping hub of the Midwest. I argue, through GIS, historical, and statistical analysis, that states’ ability to redirect national plans to local benefit varies with the degree to which local plans coincide with national projects.

“The Delegated Welfare State: Marketizing American Social Provision in Historical and Comparative Perspective”

Andrea Campbell, Massachusetts Institute of Technology

Kimberly Morgan, George Washington University

This paper explores the concept and origins of the delegated welfare state. Adapting a term developed by sociologist Elisabeth Clemens to describe the relegation of government functions to the non-profit sector in the early 20th century, the delegated welfare state refers to delegation of the governance of social programs to non-state actors. We discuss how the focus of delegation has changed over time, first shifting from contracts with non-profit actors to contracts with for-profit actors, and then later leaving contracts behind and invoking instead market-based models in which the locus of competition and risk is shifted from government to individuals. We argue that this phenomenon results from a persistent conflict in 20th century American politics: the imperative to respond to public demands for security and prosperity but also to keep government small. Relying heavily on private actors for the delivery of social programs has been a way to seemingly achieve both goals.

“Faith-Based Initiative in the New Deal: Clarence Pickett, the American Friends Service Committee, and the Subsistence Homestead Program”

Michael D. Cary, Seton Hill University

This paper traces the connections between the AFSC, a Quaker organization, and the development and implementation of the subsistence housing program in the 1930s, and concludes that government reliance on AFSC personnel and expertise in providing housing assistance stands as a precedent and precursor to the faith-based initiatives under President Bush. President Bush signed an executive order creating White House Office of Faith-Based and Community Initiatives. In 2005 over two billion dollars in social service grants were awarded to faith-based organizations. While the faith-based initiatives’ program is seen as a departure in government policy, it is not unprecedented. In the 1930s President Roosevelt relied on a Quaker organization, American Friends Service Committee, to help develop and implement his subsistence housing program, because of AFSC expertise in aiding the homeless and dispossessed. AFSC projects provided a model for the subsistence housing initiatives, and AFSC executive secretary Clarence Pickett was chosen to administer the Division of Subsistence Homesteads. AFSC involvement in creating the model community of Norvelt, Pennsylvania, (250 homes on 2 to 7 acre lots) provides illustration.

“The State and the Money Market in Historical Perspective: United States, 1800-1836”

Abhishek Chatterjee, University of Virginia

Money markets have historically been pivotal to the development of now-developed countries due to their role in mobilizing capital for industrial development. This paper will seek to explain the variation in institutionalized money markets over time. It will focus on two principal variations: (1) money markets or banking structures with high barriers to entry and “hard money” – or “sound” banking practices, (2) markets with low barriers to entry and “easy money” – or “liberal” banking practices. It will be argued that both are an outcome of a dependence relationship between rulers on one hand, and financial capital holders, on the other. It will be argued that markets with low barriers to entry and easy money result when rulers have an advantage in this relationship, assuming the preexistence of institutionalized markets. The case of the United States during the first three decades of the nineteenth century, especially the considerable lowering of barriers to banking in the aftermath of Jackson’s veto of the Second Bank of the United State’s charter provides a good demonstration of the argument. The capital market is therefore also shown to be an important locus of the relationship between political elites and capital holders.

“‘What the Hell Are You Fellows Afraid of? Women Want Protection’: American Race Riots from the Progressive Era through World War II”

Ann Collins, McKendree University

From 1898 to 1943, at least 50 significant race riots flared throughout the United States. Against the backdrop of white Radicalism, Jim Crow laws, political unrest, economic turmoil, labor strife, two world wars, African American assertions for equality at home as they fought for democracy abroad, and demographic change and its resultant effect on such issues as housing, race riots plagued the American landscape for the first half of the 20th century. My work identifies the conditions and factors that produce the specific instances in time at which race riots coalesce. I find that for race riots to occur three conditions must exist: certain structural factors, such as demographic change or economic turmoil; cultural framing,
including white supremacist mentality and African Americans’ assertions for rights; and a precipitating event, alleged or actual black infractions toward whites.

“Justifying the Constitutional Convention: Federalist 40 and the Use of the Rhetorical Syllogism”
William Collins, Samford University

The Federalist 40 is an example of Aristotle’s constitutive rhetoric. The term constitutive rhetoric is described, and its uses in political discourse are outlined. A case is made that rhetorical approach in 40 Federalist came to frame the subsequent legal and constitutional debates over the Constitutional text itself.

“Cycles of Anti-Catholicism”
Douglas Dion, University of Iowa

The liberal democratic theory that (arguably) forms a bedrock of American political development has a long history of anti-Catholicism. Despite the availability of these tools throughout history, episodes of anti-Catholic fervor occur at particular times rather than others. Traditional explanations for these episodes based on immigration pressures fail to account for the timing. A stronger account might be found by looking at the changing nature of the Roman Catholic Church, particularly as it has reacted to European liberalism. Such an approach can explain, for example, the timing of the Know-Nothing movement and the rise of the Second Ku Klux Klan of the 1920s. This study is based archival work with the anti-Catholic collection at the University of Notre Dame, and an analysis of Harper’s Weekly articles from 1857 to 1912.

“Truman’s Committee on Civil Rights and the Rise of a Civil Rights Litigation Support Structure”
Lynda Dodd, American University

This paper examines the post World War II development of a civil rights “support structure” for plaintiffs. Previous scholarship, such as Charles Epp’s, The Rights Revolution, has highlighted the importance of a litigation support structure for the growth of civil rights litigation. In this paper, I plan to build on this work by focusing my archival research on the records of the Committee on Civil Rights. In addition, I examine the views of the NAACP, the ACLU, and other leading civil rights groups, concerning the advantages of plaintiff-led civil rights suits compared with DOJ enforcement of criminal violations.

“Parties as Political Institutions in American Political Development”
Daniel Galvin, Northwestern University

Political parties figure prominently in studies of American political development: they are depicted as integral to many of the most significant turning points in American history. Remarkably, however, little effort has been given to understanding how, exactly, party structures and operations change, and under what conditions we might expect to see different kinds of changes in the parties. The reason is that the approach most political scientists have taken to studying parties over the last century has given us only limited purchase on parties as political institutions of significance in their own right. As parties are generally depicted as reflections of change rather than themselves integral to the processes through which they change, their own capacities to generate, obstruct, or redirect change seldom receive direct attention. What escapes investigation is the possibility that each party is on its own historical trajectory, follows its own internal logic, and has its own capacities to mediate and negotiate change in politically significant ways. This paper aims to take a first step toward addressing these shortcomings by treating parties as political institutions with identifiable mechanisms of reproduction and change.

“A Liberal Beat with Illiberal Palpitations”
Robert Garrow, Claremont Graduate University

This paper will assess one particular angle from which one may adjudicate the seemingly intractable struggle between liberalism and republicanism, namely American citizenship, specifically as witnessed in Section One of the Fourteenth Amendment. The question that inspires this essay, then, is this: Is the American conception of citizenship, as defined by the Fourteenth Amendment, a liberal one or a republican one? In short, the liberal conception subsumes the republican conception.

“L.Q.C. Lamar and the New South”
Michael A Gattis, Gulf Coast Community College

It is my thesis that Lamar was not a pragmatist or a nationalist, as previous works have argued, but rather an opportunistic opportunist. He said the right words at the appropriate moment to a listening audience, while not revealing his ulterior motives. Lamar returned to Washington while Reconstruction still remained a winning issue for Republicans, but losing interest among the electorate in the changing Gilded Age. I emphasize not only his biography but also to expose his calculated decisions that certainly affected Reconstruction policy in the North and South. In addition, I would like to strengthen the arguments made by C. Vann Woodward, Russell Mattie, and James Murphy about the role Lamar played in establishing this New South. In addition to Lamar’s work in helping to create a New South, I will dedicate another chapter to analyze and identify key Democrats along with Lamar who orchestrated the re-taking of the House of Representatives during the midterm elections of 1874. Finally, I will define Lamar’s legacy, not just the South, but in the National Democratic Party.
Dorith Geva, University of Chicago

This paper argues that the modern state’s monopoly of violence reproduced private patriarchy, especially in the age of total war. Max Weber’s view that the modern state’s coercive capacities were enabled by weakening competing coercive powers held by corporatist or kinship groups is largely correct. However, the coercion/family nexus is more complex than the shifting of legitimate violence from the family to the state. Examination of conscription exemptions in First World War France and the U.S. shows that the American draft system established in 1917 incorporated familial dependency deferrals as a central feature of the draft system, becoming a durable feature of the Selective Service System. Likewise, French policymakers established special service exemptions for men from large families during WWI and in the years leading to WWII. Thus, mandatory conscription rules exemplify consolidation of the state’s coercive capacities, while they also reveal how patriarchal ideologies entered into the logic of conscription by exempting men viewed as carrying patriarchal obligations. Conscription exemptions must therefore be viewed as a key site for understanding the overall nature of gendered citizenship in a given state.

“Race Riot Memory Projects and Support for Redress of Past Racial Injustices: Evidence from Wilmington and Greensboro”
R. A. Ghoshal, University of North Carolina, Chapel Hill

Recent years have seen a rising tide of commissions and memory projects developed to commemorate past incidents of violent racial conflict in the United States. At the same time, the African American reparations movement has drawn increasing scholarly and public attention. But until now, there has been virtually no research on the effects of memory projects concerning US racial violence on public opinion about redress of such violence. This paper examines draws together the themes of memory projects and redress/reparations movements through an examination of the effects of two memory projects, both coming to fruition in early Twenty-first Century North Carolina, on views about redress. Using a representative survey of 800 North Carolinians, this paper shows that knowledge of the memory projects and the incidents they recognize yield increased public support for redress. The effects are not spurious, and are largely not explicable through an array of control variables that might be expected to be linked to redress views. The study provides evidence that whites’ widespread opposition to racial redress is not solely a function of material interests, but rather grows partly from historical unawareness.

“Institutional development as a consequence of displaced capacity: The creation of the New York state police force and the 1916 National Defense Act”
Simon Gilhooley, Cornell University

The subfield of American Political Development has concerned itself with explaining how the United States moved from being the “state of courts and parties” to the form associated with the modern state. However in the course of examining this shift little attention has been paid to one of the most overt developments of state capacity in America - the creation in the first half of the Twentieth century of a state police force in every state bar Hawaii. This rapid and intense creation of a police capability by the states has been largely overlooked by the subfield, with only one serious attempt to provide an explanation for this trend in terms of American political development, which itself predates much recent APD literature. This paper seeks to review the creation of one force, New York, with the intention of showing that state police development can offer scholars an important site for assessing the manner in which state capacity grows. Drawing on the work of Carpenter, the paper argues that in some instances institutional development can be most effectively explained not in terms of the demonstrated capacity of a bureaucracy itself, but paradoxically as a consequence of another bureaucracy’s demonstration of capacity.

“Institutional development as a consequence of displaced capacity: The creation of the New York state police force and the 1916 National Defense Act”
Simon Gilhooley, Cornell University

The subfield of American Political Development has concerned itself with explaining how the United States moved from being the “state of courts and parties” to the form associated with the modern state. However in the course of examining this shift little attention has been paid to one of the most overt developments of state capacity in America - the creation in the first half of the Twentieth century of a state police force in every state bar Hawaii. This rapid and intense creation of a police capability by the states has been largely overlooked by the subfield, with only one serious attempt to provide an explanation for this trend in terms of American political development, which itself predates much recent APD literature. This paper seeks to review the creation of one force, New York, with the intention of showing that state police development can offer scholars an important site for assessing the manner in which state capacity grows. Drawing on the work of Carpenter, the paper argues that in some instances institutional development can be most effectively explained not in terms of the demonstrated capacity of a bureaucracy itself, but paradoxically as a consequence of another bureaucracy’s demonstration of capacity.

“Rethinking Diversity and Social Democracy: Catholic Incorporation in Australia, the United States, and Canada in the Early 20th Century”
Willie S. Gin, University of Pennsylvania

In the past decade there has been a proliferation of research on the relationship between diversity and redistributive social welfare policy. In conceptualizing the independent variable, diversity, the paper argues for distinctions between diversity as richness and diversity as evenness. In the dependent variable, redistributive welfare policy, the paper argues for looking beyond measures of generalized trust and spending on welfare to measures such as labor market policy and electoral reform. In terms of causal mechanisms, the paper argues for looking as well at the organizational capacity of the minority groups and policy framing. The usefulness of such concepts are demonstrated by looking at the case of Australia in the early 20th century which faced considerable diversity in that 20 percent of its population was Catholic, a minority population stigmatized by many Protestants. Yet up to the 1930s, Australia was one of the most progressive nations in the world, with considerable unionization, electorally successful labor parties, compulsory voting, and high levels of social welfare spending, while simultaneously raising Catholics to levels of political representation never before seen in Australian history. Brief comparisons with the United States and Canada are drawn.
“Public Goods Provision and Ruling Party Type: A Study of Fire Control in American Cities”

Jeffrey D. Grynaviski, University of Chicago

A common theme in recent scholarship on political parties is that political machines are harmful to developing political economies—by securing the votes of marginal members of society through small amounts of selective incentives (and using government revenues to enrich/entrench machine operatives) rather than through the provision of pure public goods that benefit economic and social development, political machines retard development. Grynaviski (2007) argues instead that the formal organizational structure of political machines may actually lead to higher levels of public goods provision than other party types. Briefly, his argument is that the incentives for rent-seeking at the expense of public goods provision decrease with party organization size because the spoils of office have to be divided among a growing number of party members while public goods are shared among all members of society. This paper uses actuarial data that the author has collected on the performance of municipal fire departments during the period of industrialization of American cities, along with indicators for income inequality and ethnic fractionalization, to test Grynaviski’s claim that machine-run cities provide greater amounts of public goods.

“Indigenous people, Culture and Citizenship in Late Colonial Mexico and Peru”

Claudia Guarisco, El Colegio Mexiquense A.C.

This paper is about the indigenous people who lived in the rural towns surrounding the Viceroyalty capitals of New Spain and Peru, & how they dealt with the new local political institutions that the Constitutional Monarchy tried to establish across its territories. It was during this time that the wars of independence were taking place with different intensities in Spanish America. The explanation for the adoption and rejection of the new forms of vote and representation lies in the cognitive force of indigenous political traditions. The central argument is that in New Spain, many of the values, beliefs & representations made the transition easier, while in Peru it was not the case. This was due to cultural differences that arose from the density and frequency of local commercial interactions between Indians, low rank Spaniards & Mestizos.

“Turn Out the Lights the Party’s Over: Analyzing the Southern Walkout at the 1860 Democratic Party Convention Using James Caesar’s Party Classifications”

Darren Guerra, Christian Community College

Dustin Guerra, Vanguard University of Southern California

Abraham Lincoln would not have been elected president had the Democrats not split in 1860 along sectional lines. The Party was the only sectional moderating force in the nation and as such its rupture was a decisive blow to union. Valuable insight into this rupture may be gained by applying the party criteria articulated in James Caesar’s work Presidential Selection to the major factions in the Democratic Party represented at Charleston. Caesar, drawing on Tocqueville and historian Richard Hofstader, articulates three party types; the Great party, the Burkan party, and the Small party. Great parties hold views about the fundamental manner society should be ordered. Analysis reveals that Southern Democrats pursued a vision of “great” party politics in their efforts to shape the Democratic Party. In contrast, “small parties” exist simply to gain power and distribute largess or political patronage. In this sense, Northern Democrats tended to act in a manner consistent with a “small” party and as such they provided little principled resistance to the passionate secessionists. Evidence for these classifications will be drawn from actual floor debates of the 1860 Democratic Party Convention in Charleston.

“Subversive of the Constitution: The True Nature of the Southern States’ Rights Claims”

Dustin Guerra, Community Christian College

In Antebellum America, Southerners complained that abolitionist attempts to limit slavery’s influence was clearly a violation of the Constitution and an unnecessary intrusion into the Southern way of life. At the 1860 Democratic Convention, the South called for a pro-Southern platform that sought to guarantee the rights of all Americans through what the South thought was a less intrusive government. After Lincoln’s election, the South left the Union claiming that Lincoln would surely violate their state sovereignty. Modern Americans often assume that secession was the first attempt to limit the size of government and protect the states from the federal government. Careful study of the fugitive slave laws, Southern rhetoric, and the Southerners platform at the 1860 Convention clearly demonstrates that the states’ rights movement actually advocated for a big intrusive government that would seek limits to Northern states’ sovereignty in regards to how they react to the fugitive slave laws; to develop an aggressive foreign policy to prevent the seizure of slaves on the high seas and to get those who were hiding in Canada; and to call for the acquisition of Cuba and parts of Central America to get more land for slavery.
While federal authority was restrained in the core polity, prevalent conceptions of the 19th century American state. Federal state-building during the 19th century revises building. A revised account of 19th century federal state-establishment and enforcement of governing institutions made the territorial periphery a major site of federal state-authority. Extensive authority and the need for the federal government exercised broad powers outside of the federal government and the states. At the periphery, the Constitution divided governing authority between the federal governing authority. In the core polity, the federal government exercised broad powers outside of the limitations that federalism imposed on federal governing authority. Extensive authority and the need for government institutions made the territorial periphery a central site for 19th century federal state-building. After exploring the historical roots of federal authority over the territorial periphery, the article discusses the role of the U.S. Army, the Indian office and the General Land Office in the establishment of governing authority in U.S. territories during the antebellum republic. A territorial analysis of federal state-building during the 19th century revises prevalent conceptions of the 19th century American state. While federal authority was restrained in the core polity, sweeping federal authority and the need for the establishment and enforcement of governing institutions made the territorial periphery a major site of federal state-building. A revised account of 19th century federal state-building acknowledges the weaknesses of the federal government at the core and emphasizes its strengths at the periphery.

“Social Reformers in the National Liberal League, 1876-1883”
**Russell Hanson**, Indiana University-Bloomington

During the 1870s self-styled Liberals in the USA organized clubs for the purpose of education and political action. The proliferation of these clubs across the North, Midwest, and Pacific states encouraged reformers to establish the National Liberal League in 1878 and a National Liberal Party two years later. The National Liberal Party died a quick death in disputes over the Comstock Law, and the National Liberal League splintred, too. Why did the liberal alliance emerge so rapidly, only to collapse so quickly, during this period of American history? My answer is that the formation of an alliance in the mid 1870s, its subsequent disintegration, and then eventual reorganization along different lines was the result of identifiable features of the social network connecting reformers to each other. Out of a disparate movement of individuals two well-organized factions developed in the mid 1870s, with few personal connections between them. When these connections were attenuated in the conflict over the tactical question of how far to oppose the Comstock law, the movement bifurcated and pursued reform on two fronts, not one, as originally envisioned. One of those fronts survives to this day, in the American Civil Liberties Union.

“Core – Periphery Relations and federal State-Building in American political development”
**Stefan Heumann**, University of Pennsylvania

Distinctions between core polity and territorial periphery point to an important spatial dimension in the exercise of federal governing authority. In the core polity, the Constitution divided governing authority between the federal government and the states. At the periphery, the federal government exercised broad powers outside of the limitations that federalism imposed on federal governing authority. Extensive authority and the need for government institutions made the territorial periphery a central site for 19th century federal state-building. After exploring the historical roots of federal authority over the territorial periphery, the article discusses the role of the U.S. Army, the Indian office and the General Land Office in the establishment of governing authority in U.S. territories during the antebellum republic. A territorial analysis of federal state-building during the 19th century revises prevalent conceptions of the 19th century American state. While federal authority was restrained in the core polity, sweeping federal authority and the need for the establishment and enforcement of governing institutions made the territorial periphery a major site of federal state-building. A revised account of 19th century federal state-building acknowledges the weaknesses of the federal government at the core and emphasizes its strengths at the periphery.

“The Formation of the American Police State”
**Andrew Kolin**, Hilbert College

Abu Ghraib, Guantanamo Bay and the Patriot Act share one thing in common: they represent the culmination of events that led to the creation of an American police state. In all of the research and publications that have been written about the government response to 9/11, there is a surprising historical disconnect when discussing the oppressive measures that were put into place during the Bush administration, as if measures taken during prior administrations had not happened. In this paper, I propose to examine in detail how the post-9/11 police state was linked to the overall historical trend in post-Revolutionary War America to expand state power at the expense of democracy. It was political movements, which delayed and resisted the expansion of state power during the 19th and 20th centuries. The United States government was able to undermine democratic movements and in so doing, set the stage for the police state, which has appeared in post-9/11 America.

“Race, Class, and Interest: Constructed Identities and the Politics of Collective Inter-Ethnic Violence”
**Ryan Jerome LeCount**, Purdue University

Much of the literature dealing with inter-ethnic conflict has treated notions of identity and interest as static. This paper interrogates the means by which shifts in identity and interest—which often precede conflict—occur. Both structural and discursive data will be examined in order to better understand the environment in which identity and interest become aligned toward violent action. It is expected that structural conditions play a necessary but not sufficient role in activating these shifts, while frames and narratives cultivated by elite actors are often the catalytic force in the eruption of violence of this kind. The role of elites —those who stand to gain the most from a hostile and divided working class— in the period before the outbreak of inter-ethnic violence is under-examined, and this paper seeks to expand this area. Cases examined will include Rock Creek, WY (1885); Wilmington, NC (1898); Atlanta (1906); and Tulsa (1921).

“Christian Citizenship and Protestant Nationalism in Antebellum America”
**Allison Malcom**, University of Illinois at Chicago

Citizenship was an ambiguous category in the three decades before the American Civil War. Nonetheless, it took on a specific meaning to anti-Catholic nativists. These people, who represented themselves as both patriots and Christians, had much in common with the Protestant mainstream of the time. And their conclusions, describing a citizenship national in scope, and linked to specific political rights, was decidedly modern. Yet, they
coupled these assumptions with more traditional perceptions of the obligations of a man to his country. Specifically, I argue that their concept of citizenship included a social and historical understanding of Protestant Christianity as inherently linked with the history and success of the republic.

“Why Didn’t the United States Establish a Central Bank Until After the Panic of 1907?”

Jon Moen, University of Mississippi

Ellis Tallman, Oberlin College

Monetary historians link the establishment of the Federal Reserve System in 1913 to the financial turbulence of the Panic of 1907. But why 1907 and not earlier panics? The 1907 panic marked a significant change from previous National Banking Era panics, which either had struck national banks within the New York Clearing House or had their origins outside of New York. The Panic of 1907 started in New York City, and it focused on trust companies. In the aftermath, New York Clearing House member bankers recognized threats to the financial system arising from institutions, the trust companies, outside of the clearing house but participating in the same financial markets as the banks, the call loan market. Turbulence in the call loan market was the core of the Panic. The New York bankers realized that they would not have adequate resources to curb financial crises arising from institutions outside the Clearing House in future panics. This convinced the influential New York bankers that a central bank was finally necessary, an institution that they had previously been able to suppress. By lending their political support, the way for a central bank, ultimately the Federal Reserve System, was clear.

“We Are Coming Father Abraham, 300 Thousand Strong (Or Somewhere Thereabouts): Buffalo and the ‘Militia Draft’ Crisis of 1862”

Michael Pendleton, Buffalo State College

Casualties from Union military operations prompted the Lincoln Administration to make two calls for 300,000 new troops each in the summer of 1862. Each Union state was assigned a quota and recruiting was left to state and local governments. Should a state fail to meet its quota, it would have to resort to a draft, a process governed by state militia laws. This paper will address Buffalo’s collective public and private sectors’ response to the “Militia Draft” crisis of June through November, 1862. The city, like its Great Lakes counterparts, was young with civic institutions often less than three decades old, and a city government feeling its way along in dealing with mounting urban problems. Most of the adult population was born elsewhere and the political-economic elites of the early canal era were giving way to a new generation of merchants, shippers and a small but growing group of manufacturers. A new ethnic pluralism was developing as elsewhe and the political-economic elites of the early urban problems. Most of the adult population was born elsewhere and the political-economic elites of the early canal era were giving way to a new generation of merchants, shippers and a small but growing group of manufacturers. A new ethnic pluralism was developing as


Kirsten Nussbaumer, University of Minnesota

This paper considers the efforts of late-eighteenth-century Americans to reconcile their traditional republican or whig understandings about election reform with the design of a new federal republic. It demonstrates that the U.S. Constitution initiated a split in the tradition between (what we today would call) substantive rules (the qualifications of electors and elected) and most of the procedural election rules. While the latter were de-constitutionalized, the former (along with inter-state apportionment and fixed legislative terms) were understood as remaining within the constitutional tradition. The paper then questions whether, after the Founding, the constitutional election rules operated differently in practice than the rules that were shifted to routine legislative processes (i.e., it inquires into the empirical soundness of the late-eighteenth-century theories of election reform). [Note: I will likely post a longer version of this draft article on SSRN in December.]

“Explaining the Politics of Big Government Conservatism: Financial Bailouts, War in Iraq, and Education Reform”

Jesse Rhodes, Amherst College

The conventional wisdom in American political development is that conservative ascendance in American
politics has fostered a politics of governmental retrenchment and policy drift. However, the last 8 years has been a period of both substantial conservative influence and government expansion in many areas of American life.

This paper examines the politics of Big Government Conservatism in three enormously consequential areas: financial bailouts, war in Iraq, and education reform. Common processes undergird the expansion of federal governmental authority in each case. Each was marked by a crisis atmosphere; limited information about the origins and scope of the problem; and uncertainty about the appropriate course of policy. In each case, political entrepreneurs exploited these conditions to forge compelling policy agendas explaining the crises and providing policy paths for resolving them. These solutions were adopted because they attracted interest groups from both sides of the political aisle and catered to the electoral interests of factions within both political parties. Rising conservative influence in national politics has not been inconsistent with expanding governmental activism outside the traditional welfare state.

“Building the Disaster State: Disaster Relief from the Founding to the Twentieth Century”
Andrew Roberts, Northwestern University

How did the federal government assume responsibility for preparing for disaster? The US government has provided ad hoc aid since the early days of the republic. What 18th and 19th century Americans understood the concepts of response and recovery to mean, however, is different than their contemporary definitions. Disaster response in the early days of the republic was intended to relieve suffering, save lives, and restore critical functions. Today, citizens and some politicians expect the government to engage in recovery by returning a community to its pre-disaster condition. Ultimately, Congress’ responsiveness to local rather than strictly national concerns and its authority over taxing and spending for the general welfare led to a ratcheting up of disaster spending over time, punctuated by debates over central state authority during the Civil War. The emergence of private-sector and non-profit organizations that responded to disaster allowed the federal government to provide relief without increasing direct central government control and risking the ire of state and local authorities.

“The Good South: Moderation and the Changing Politics of Race”
Randy Sanders, Southeastern Louisiana University

In 1970 four racially moderate Democrats won the governor’s chairs of Arkansas, Florida, South Carolina and Georgia. These southern gubernatorial campaigns and the subsequent inaugural speeches signaled a change in racial politics in the region. As the campaigns began, however, persistent ambivalence concerning the pace of integration and court-ordered busing of school children to achieve racial balances tempted many politicians to exploit these concerns. Their efforts failed; southerners had decided to obey the law. The successful candidates understood that the electorate had come to this decision with varying degrees of enthusiasm and that their campaigns must reflect this uncertainty; they would eschew the rhetoric of resistance without uttering strong words in favor or desegregation or busing. Subtle evasion of racially charged issues appealed to a moderate electorate that had grown weary of upheaval. The 1970 gubernatorial campaigns marked the first time in southern politics that candidates who refused to play the race card won office. This paper examine the growing moderation tapped by a new breed of southern politician.

“The Lost Liberalism of the Prairie Populists: The Legacy of William Jennings Bryan and Robert M. La Follette”
Jeff Taylor, Jacksonville State University

In their day, William Jennings Bryan and Robert M. La Follette spoke for a significant portion of the American people within their respective parties. Their day lasted for three decades (1896-1925). Quite distinct from the elitist, urban, corporate, bureaucratic, and imperial liberalism of Woodrow Wilson and Theodore Roosevelt, the thought and techniques of Bryan and La Follette reflected their base of support arguably a majority of Americans despite their national election losses. What happened to the liberalism they championed after they left the scene? Where does this ideology fit on the political spectrum today? Neither man has served as a role model for the most powerful politicians in the decades since their
deaths, but the type of populist liberalism they embodied is alive and well in 21st-century America. It can be found in surprising places, under a variety of labels. The careers of the two men also suggest unlikely-but-potentially rewarding alliances for Democrats and Republicans of our own day: identification with evangelical Christians in Bryan’s case, and with African Americans in La Follette’s.

“John M. Daniel’s War on Jefferson Davis: An Interpretation”
Ted Tunnell

John M. Daniel was among the most influential editors in the Southern Confederacy. His Richmond Examiner waged a long and bitter print war against Confederate president Jefferson Davis. Historians of Confederate military and political history make liberal use of Daniel’s paper; students of Confederate morale and nationalism mine the Examiner and debate its influence. Despite his importance, no historian has looked beneath the surface of Daniel’s writings. This paper, part of a broader study of Southern editors, suggests a psychological basis for Daniel’s antipathy to Davis. Daniel was a frail and sickly man; of average height, he weighted barely 120 pounds. According to contemporaries, “he worshipped strength, and nothing but strength. He waxed rhapsodic over the robust physiques of men he admired. On the other hand, he loathed physical weakness in others and moral sensitivity, which he equated with women. It does not take Freudian analysis to suspect a connection between Daniel’s obsession with manly strength and his hatred of Davis, a chief executive plagued by chonic, incapacitating illness. Davis, moreover, refused to ill treat Yankee POWs and northern civilians, more evidence—in the editor’s mind—of unmanly weakness.

“Did Roger Taney Author the 14th Amendment? Congress and the Definition of American Citizenship”
Richard Valelly, Swarthmore College
Lauren Kluz-Wisniewski, AIDS Law Project of Pennsylvania

It is widely held among public law scholars and in legal academia that the drafters of Section One of the 14th Amendment worried about and intended to overrule Taney’s holding in his per curiam opinion in Dred Scott v. Sanford. Taney held that African Americans never had been nor could ever be citizens of the United States. To prevent his holding from having a future effect Section One of the 14th Amendment voided it. But this view — when tested using a simple tool from qualitative methods — does not hold up. After demonstrating that this idea is exaggerated — and made plausible primarily because of the rise and development of judicial supremacy — the paper analyzes the legislative sources of constitutional meaning and of the definition of citizenship and links them to the incentives that congressional party politicians have to use Article V for party-building.

“Conservative Counter-revolution: Reconsidering the Nature and Development of Presidential Popular Leadership in the Progressive Era”
Chris West

This paper examines the socio-political context & the philosophy of Teddy Roosevelt’s and Woodrow Wilson’s turn to presidential popular leadership. Rather than describing their behavior as complete innovations on Constitutional theory, I show their break from predominant 19th century leadership practices to be driven by a return to pre-party, Federalist doctrine. This Federalist doctrine is, in turn, informed by a core philosophy of “reason of state” as introduced to modern executive design by Machiavelli and other theorists of executive power. Though they betray a founding-era bias against direct presidential leadership, their intention is to combat the limitations put on the presidency by the institution and norms of the Jacksonian party system. The “rhetorical presidency” of the Progressive era should thus be described as conservative and anti-democratic, not radical. Wilson and TR see themselves as pre-empting and combating the demagoguery of leaders like William Jennings Bryan and Robert LaFollette, even while utilizing a leadership style that has been described as demagogic itself.

“What is a Historical Legacy?”
Jason Wittenberg, University of California, Berkeley

The transition of so many polities from one form of rule to another has given much impetus to the study of historical legacies and their consequences. Yet there is still no general consensus on what a legacy actually is, how to distinguish different kinds of legacies from one another, and what makes a legacy argument different from other kinds of arguments. This paper offers a conceptual analysis of historical legacies.

McGee Young, Marquette University

Scholars have long seen the opening of America’s trade markets in the 1930s as an example of institutional dominance in policy making (though there is much debate within this perspective). Overlooked is the response by the business community to the policy initiatives of Cordell Hull, FDR’s Secretary of State. Studies that indicate growing strength of exporters point to aggregate macroeconomic indicators, but generally ignore the efforts of advocacy organizations. Hull’s success rested in part on his ability to convince key business leaders to support tariff reduction. Much of the persuasion that occurred took place within the context of leading business associations, especially the National Foreign Trade Council. With a Board of Directors comprising executives from General Motors, General Electric, Standard Oil, and
other major corporations, the NFTC stood in a unique position to shape business community perspectives on trade policy. This paper draws on newly-opened archives of the NFTC to explore the role of business leaders in providing political support for Hull’s controversial policy agenda. In doing so it speaks to the growing literature on business influence in American political development.

### Titles of Politics & History Papers from the 2009 Western Political Science Association Meetings

“Perhaps it was Gordon Wood who had it wrong: James Wilson, not William Findley and the Antifederalists had the most prescient view of the United States Constitution”
**Mark Alcorn**, St. Cloud State University, jmalcorn@stcloudstate.edu

“Edmund Burke’s Anti-Revolutionary Interventionism”
**Joonbum Bae**, University of California, Los Angeles, jbbae@ucla.edu

“Political History as a Contested Concept: The Case of First Nations Peoples in Canada”
**Paul Baxter**, York University, pjbaxter@yorku.ca

**Gayle Berardi**, Colorado State University-Pueblo, gayle.berardi@colostate-pueblo.edu

“Local Rail Innovations: Antebellum States and Policy Diffusion”
**Zachary Callen**, University of Chicago, zcallen@uchicago.edu

“Optional Wars, the Media, and Falling Empires”
**Eric Fattor**, University of Denver, efattor@du.edu

**Jennifer Hehnke**, University of Oregon, jhehnke@uoregon.edu

“Balance versus Hegemony in the Evolution of International Relations: Ideas, Interests, Institutions and Other Sources”
**Martin Hewson**, University of Regina, Martin.Hewson@uregina.ca

“Property Wrongs: Exploring the Negative Dimensions of Ownership and the Prospects for Transformation”
**Steven Horn**, Everett Community College, shorn@everettcc.edu

“The Republican Tradition in America”
**Aaron Keck**, Duke University, aaron.keck@duke.edu

**Jeffrey Lenowitz**, Columbia Universit, jal2154@columbia.edu

“A Violent Premise: Gender and the Revolutionary Legacy of the American State”
**Eileen McDonagh**, Northeastern University, e.mcdonagh@neu.edu

“The God (Talk) Debate: Atheism, Communism, and Discourse”
**Richard Meagher**, Marymount Manhattan College, rmeagher1@mmm.edu

**Jean Robinson**, Indiana University, robinso@indiana.edu
**Pamela Walters**, Indiana University, walters@indiana.edu
**Julia Lamber**, Indiana University, lamber@indiana.edu
**Emily Meanwell**, Indiana University, emeanwel@indiana.edu

“Nixon’s Welfare Reform and the Northern Strategy: The Politics of Poverty after the Great Society”
**Scott Spitzer**, California State University, Fullerton, sspitzer@fullerton.edu
**Journalscan**

**Administration and Society**


**Administrative Science Quarterly**


**American Behavioral Scientist**


**The American Economic Review**


**The American Historical Review**


**American Journal of Political Science**


**American Quarterly**


**The American Review of Public Administration**


**American Sociological Review**


Bruce Western, Deirdre Bloome, and Christine Percheski, “Inequality among American Families with Children, 1975 to 2005,” 73:6 (December 2008), 903-920


Edward T. Walker, “Privatizing Participation: Civic Change and the Organizational Dynamics of Grassroots Lobbying Firms,” 74:1 (February 2009), 83-105


The Annals


British Journal of Political Science


Business History Review

Naomi R. Lamoreaux, “Scylla or Charybdis? Historical Reflections on Two Basic Problems of Corporate Governance” 83:1 (Spring 2009)


Canadian Journal of Political Science


Canadian Public Policy


Comparative Politics


Michael Bernhard, “Methodological Disputes in Comparative Politics,” 41:4 (July 2009)

**Comparative Political Studies**


**Comparative Studies in Society and History**


**The Economic History Review**


**Electoral Studies**


**Environmental History**


Frederick Rowe Davis, “Unraveling the Complexities of Joint Toxicity of Multiple Chemicals at the Tox Lab and the FDA,” 13:4 (October 2008), 674-683.

José Luiz de Andrade Franco and José Augusto Drummond, “Wilderness and the Brazilian Mind (I): Nation and Nature in Brazil from the 1920s to the 1940s,” 13:4 (October 2008), 724-750.


Explorations in Economic History


Governance


Roland Zullo. “Does Fiscal Stress Induce Privatization? Correlates of Private and

Government and Opposition


The Journal of American History


Sarah Keyes. “‘Like a Roaring Lion’: The Overland Trail as a Sonic Conquest” 96:1 (Jun. 2009): 19-43


**Journal of American Studies**


**Journal of Contemporary History**

April 2009, Volume 44, No. 2


**Journal of the Early Republic**


**The Journal of Economic History**


**Journal of the Gilded Age and the Progressive Era**

Peter H. Argersinger, “All Politics Are Local: Another Look at the 1890s,” 8:1 (January 2009)


Troy Rondinone, “Guarding the Switch: Cultivating Nationalism during the Pullman Strike,” 8:1 (January 2009)


Christopher McKnight Nichols, “Rethinking Randolph Bourne’s Trans-National America: How World War I Created an Isolationist Antiwar Pluralism,” 8:2 (April 2009)

**Journal of Health Politics, Policy, and Law**


**The Journal of Policy History**


**The Journal of Politics**


Journal of Public Policy


Journal of Theoretical Politics


Journal of Urban Affairs


Journal of Urban History


The Journal of Women, Politics, and Policy


Labor History


**Law & Social Inquiry**


**Law & Society Review**


**Legislative Studies Quarterly**


**New England Journal of Medicine**


**New Political Science**


**Parliamentary Affairs**


**Past & Present**


**Perspectives on Politics**


**Politics and Gender**


**Political Research Quarterly**


Tom S. Clark, Measuring Ideological Polarization on the United States Supreme Court 62:1 (March, 2009), 146-157.


**Political Studies**


**Politics and Society**


Rebecca Neaera Abers and Margaret E. Keck, “Mobilizing the State: The Erratic Partner in Brazil’s Participatory Water Policy,” 37:2, (June, 2009), 289-314.

**Polity**


**Presidential Studies Quarterly**


Social Forces

Social Politics

Social Science History

The Social Science Journal

Social Politics & Policy Quarterly

Studies in American Political Development

Urban Affairs Review

West European Politics

William and Mary Quarterly

World Politics

*Contents*: 1. Blurring the conceptual boundaries between the women’s movement and the state; 2. Moving feminist activists inside the state: the context of the second wave; 3. Who are movement insiders?; 4. Mobilizing and organizing the second wave; 5. Choosing tactics inside and outside the state; 6. How insider feminists changed policy; 7. Changing with the times - how presidential administrations affect feminist activists inside the state; 8. What insider feminists tell us about women’s movements, social movements and the state; Appendix.


This work critically examines Calhoun’s argument for government on the basis of consensus among all key interests - vesting each significant interest with
formal veto rights -- rather than by majority rule. Calhoun’s thought is treated both in its original historical context (including its connection to slavery) and with regard to contemporary echoes including the 1998 Good Friday Agreement for Northern Ireland, the 1974 constitution of the former Yugoslavia, and contemporary theories of “consociational democracy.”


Carles Boix and Susan C. Stokes, eds. The Oxford Handbook of Comparative Politics (New York: Oxford University Press, 2007)


Hadley Arkes, *Constitutional Illusions and Anchoring Truths: The Key of the Natural Law* (Cambridge and New York: Cambridge University Press, 2010)


Michele Tracy Berger and Kathleen Guidroz, *The Intersectional Approach: Transforming the Academy through Race, Class, and Gender* (Chapel Hill: Univ of North Carolina Press, 2010)


Jürgen Buchenau and Lyman L. Johnson, eds., *Aftershocks: Earthquakes and Popular Politics in
Latin America (Albuquerque, NM: University of New Mexico Press, 2009)


James MacGregor Burns, Packing the Court: The Rise of Judicial Power and the Coming Crisis of the Supreme Court (New York: Penguin, 2009)


Robert McCluer Calhoon, Political Moderation in America's First Two Centuries (Cambridge and New York: Cambridge University Press, 2009)


Charles E. Closmann, ed. War and the Environment: Military Destruction in the Modern Age (College Station, TX: Texas A&M University Press, 2009)

Francis D. Cogliano, Revolutionary America, 1763-1815: A Political History, (London and New York: Routledge, 2009)


Miriam Dobson and and Benjamin Ziemann, ed., *Reading Primary Sources: The Interpretation of Texts from 19th and 20th Century History* (London and New York: Routledge, 2008)


Kirstin Downey, *The Woman Behind the New Deal: The Life of Frances Perkins, FDR’s Secretary of Labor and His Moral Conscience* (New York: Nan A. Talese, 2009)


Donald L. Drakeman, *Church, State, and Original Intent* (Cambridge and New York: Cambridge University Press, 2009)


Louis Fiset, *Camp Harmony: Seattle’s Japanese Americans and the Puyallup Assembly Center* (Champaign, IL: University of Illinois Press, 2009)


Cynthia Griggs Fleming, *Yes We Did? From King’s Dream to Obama’s Promise* (Lexington, KY: University Press of Kentucky, 2009)


Christopher Gerteis, *Gender Struggles: Wage-Earning Women and Male-Dominated Unions in*
Postwar Japan (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 2009)


Gerald Grant, Hope and Despair in the American City: Why There are No Bad Schools in Raleigh (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 2009).


Zoltan Hajnal, America’s Uneven Democracy: Race, Turnout, and Representation in City Politics (Cambridge and New York: Cambridge University Press, 2009)

Maurice Hamington, The Social Philosophy of Jane Addams (Champaign, IL: University of Illinois Press, 2009)


Jacob Heilbrunn, They Knew They Were Right: The Rise of the Neocons (N Y: Random House, 2008)

Mary Heimann, Czechoslovakia: The State That Failed (New Haven: Yale University Press, 2009)


David C. Hendrickson, Union, Nation, or Empire: The American Debate over International Relations, 1789-1941 (Lawrence, KS: University Press of Kansas, 2009)

Marc J. Hetherington and Jonathan D. Weiler, Authoritarianism and Polarization in American Politics (Cambridge and New York: Cambridge University Press, 2009)

Padhraig Higgins, A Nation of Politicians: Gender, Patriotism, and Political Culture in Late Eighteenth-Century Ireland (Madison, WI: University of Wisconsin Press, 2010)


Richard T. Hughes, Christian America and the Kingdom of God (Champaign, IL: University of Illinois Press, 2009)


David Hunt, Vietnam’s Southern Revolution: From Peasant Insurrection to Total War (Amherst, MA: University of Massachusetts Press, 2009)


Ellen M. Immergut, Karen M. Anderson and Isabelle Schulze, eds., The Handbook of West European Pension Politics (Oxford and New York: Oxford University Press, 2009)


Gary King, Kay L. Schlozman, and Norman Nie, eds., *The Future of Political Science: 100 Perspectives* (London and New York: Routledge, 2009)


Steven E. Lobell, Norrin M. Ripsman, Jeffrey W. Taliaferro, Neoclassical Realism, the State, and Foreign Policy (New York: Cambridge University Press, 2009)

Craig Lockard, Southeast Asia in World History (Oxford and New York: Oxford University Press, 2009)


Christopher Manning, William L. Dawson and the Limits of Black Leadership (DeKalb, IL: Northern Illinois University Press, 2009)


Janet W. Martin, The Presidency and Women: Promise, Performance, and Illusion (College Station, TX: Texas A&M University Press, 2009)


David Maybury-Lewis, Theodore MacDonald, and Biorn Maybury-Lewis, Manifest Destinies and Indigenous People (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 2009)


Lynn Metzger and Peg Bobel, eds., *Canal Fever: The Ohio & Erie Canal, from Waterway to Canalway* (Kent, OH: The Kent State University Press, 2009)


Roman Popadiuk, The Leadership of George W. Bush: An Insider’s View of the Forty-first President College Station, TX: Texas A&M University Press, 2009)


Gene B. Preuss, To Get a Better School System: One Hundred Years of Education Reform in Texas (College Station, TX: Texas A&M University Press, 2009)


Deborah A. Reid, ed., Seeking Inalienable Rights Texans and the Quests for Justice (College Station, TX: Texas A&M University Press, 2009)


Donald W. Rogers, Making Capitalism Safe: Work Safety and Health Regulation in America, 1880-1940 (Champaign, IL: University of Illinois Press, 2010)


Cesare P. R. Romano, ed., The Sword and the Scales The United States and International Courts and Tribunals (Cambridge and New York: Cambridge University Press, 2009)


Paul C. Rosier, Serving Their Country: American Indian Politics and Patriotism in the Twentieth


Todd C. Shaw, *Now Is the Time!: Detroit Black Politics and Grassroots Activism*


Michael J. Yochim, *Yellowstone and the Snowmobile: Locking Horns over National Park Use* (Lawrence, KS: University of Kansas Press, 2009)


development (Niles and Eldridge 1972; Burnham 1999). This model predicts that an old status quo will be disrupted by a rapid-change event that establishes a new status quo. Burnham filled in this expectation for a rapid-change event with V.O. Key’s conception of the critical election and led the field to concentrate on this aspect of the theory. While I suggest that this misdirects focus away from the most promising part of the theory, I do not conclude that it undermines the greater vision from which realignment is drawn.

Indeed, Mayhew only spends three paragraphs within his one hundred and sixty-five page critique on the idea that tension alleviation dynamics drive the cycle. Yet his analysis — claiming that there were no signs of tension buildup before the Great Depression — is, at best, impressionistic (2002: 62-64). Furthermore, it ignores the comparative literature on party system change (Stewart and Clarke 1998; Mair 2001; Wellhofer 2001), which argues:

The (party system) landscape can retain its familiar features; but deep within the system, changes are accumulating. When the cumulative pressures caused by these changes reach some tipping point, fractures in the party system become visible. (Dietz and Myers 2007: 64).

In my own work, I have therefore begun to suggest that the tension build-up at the heart of realignment theory can be more fruitfully thought of in terms of increasing entropy (Nichols: forthcoming dissertation; Nichols and Myers 2009).

Following the Second Law of Thermodynamics, entropy is defined as the quantitative measure of the amount of energy NOT available to do work. It is the inevitable by-product of performing any work (turning inputs into outputs) and may therefore be loosely thought of as the amount of disorder or randomness that exists within a particular system. Importantly, entropy can only be reversed through systemic reordering that brings new energy into the system.

I trace the source of the build up of entropy in American politics back to the U.S. Constitution, and explore how America’s unique combination of separation of powers and a two party system structure political competition to produce it. In short, I conclude that the design of the American political system is almost perfectly suited for governing majorities to use increasing returns dynamics to initiate “path dependent” pathways of development, which are then easily defended from major

Chart 1: Rising Entropy, the Realigning Tipping Point, and Reordering Politics
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alterations for long periods of time (North 1990; Pierson 2004). This developmental lock-in brings the stability that the system was designed for. However, it also (unintentionally) makes it nearly impossible to reorder politics and dissipate the entropy that, over time, manifests itself in increasingly inefficacious coalitional and institutional arrangements. Eventually, at some historically contingent point, accumulated entropy causes the governing majority’s institutional “regime” to be seen as an impediment to both progress and necessary change. When this happens, past arrangements lose their relevance and politics have reached a realigning tipping point (t2, Chart 1).

I argue that we should view this tipping point as the beginning of a critical moment or “juncture” (Collier and Collier, 1991) in which structural constraints posed by the old order diminish and “the space for human agency opens” (Katzenelson, 2003, 282). This space allows partisan leaders to effectively repudiate the enervated status quo. These efforts function as a “structural cause” that produce an additional, and rapid, rise in entropy. This moves “the pressure on the status quo to a much higher level” and creates conditions of political crisis (Pierson 2004, 93). These crisis conditions then provide partisan elites the “leadership” opening to realign/reconstruct politics (Burns 1978; Miroff 2007).

The sequence of events that follow, within what I call the “reordering opportunity” (t2 to t3, chart 1), can be conceived of as a “reactive sequence” or temporally linked and casually tight chain of events that is nearly uninterruptible (Arthur 1989). Here attempts can be made to form a new governing majority by first shifting the main axis of partisan conflict (Schattschneider 1960) and then “outflanking” political opponents to assemble a new majority coalition (Miller and Schofield 2003, 2008). If these efforts are successful, and effective control over the Presidency and Congress is gained (in what has traditionally been viewed as a critical election) partisan leaders can then attempt to “reconstruct” politics by institutionalizing their partisan advantage and preferences and turning path dependent processes to their favor (Skowronek 1993). If partisan leaders succeed in this whole enterprise in a straightforward manner, systemic entropy should drop dramatically, a new status quo will be established, and development will proceed upon new pathways (t3, solid line, chart 1). Politics will thus be realigned and the cycle will begin again.

However, I also introduce the argument that it is possible for leaders to fail to complete all of these tasks. When this happens, entropy will continue to increase, the status quo will not (yet) be reordered, and development will proceed upon more complex and protracted pathways (t3, dashed line, chart 1). In cases that witness unexploited opportunities or initial failures, unexpected outcomes may therefore be produced. Specifically, there may be: 1) more than one administration involved in reconstructing; 2) extension of the previous partisan majority’s dominance through coalitional expansion; 3) more than one election that clearly shifts power -- or none at all. These are some of the things that I suggest happened in the two most controversial cases of realignment: the “System of 1896” and the late twentieth century’s missing / long “sixth party system” realignment – in which Cleveland and Bryan and then Goldwater failed in their initial opportunity / attempts to realign politics.

My “reimagining” of realignment thus attempts to give the theory its best reading, both in light of its own foundations and through incorporation of advancements that have been made in neo-institutional and regime centered APD research. This reading draws attention away from narrow electoral debates and centers focus on the periodic need to reenergize a high entropy political system through the reordering of political arrangements. In arguing that this phenomenon has constitutional origins, I suggest that the elite-led realigning response is as inevitable as its structurally produced cause is. Indeed, I suggest that successful realigning efforts will always require accomplishment of the following tasks: 1) shifting the main axis of partisan conflict; 2) assembling a new majority coalition that allows effective control of federal governing institutions; and, 3) institutionalizing a new governing regime. Finally, by allowing for the idea that leaders can fail in their opportunity to reorder, the new reading of the theory is able to offer fresh avenues of insight into the most difficult cases. All of this suggests that realignment theory deserves further articulation under a fresh systemic reading rather than a funeral procession.

My suggested reading also hints at things for APD. First and foremost, it recommends a return to broad and self-consciously systemic focused research within the sub-field. As Orren and Skowronek document, this sort of scholarship was once the mainstay of historical research in American politics until the “cultural critique” scoured it so badly that faith in the concept of development itself was shaken (2004). One way forward is, then, to take their advice and “double back” upon such iconoclastic conclusions (76). This would allow scrutiny of their idea that development is directionless and merely consists of “durable shifts in governing authority” when it is examined from the perspective of the polity and in light of partisan leaders attempts to respond to political, societal, and historical challenges (123).

This does not mean that systemic scholarship has to chase after teleological projections or tilt at metaphors. Rather, as is demonstrated by my modeling of the realignment dynamic in terms of rising entropy, macro level studies can be grounded in causally specific narratives that derive from neo-institutional theory and predict that empirically verifiable indicators and patterns will be witnessed. This suggests that APD research does not have to satisfy itself with necessary brush clearing efforts, micro-foundational analysis, and study of the
Nichols, continued from preceding page

complexity and incongruence of clashing orders. Indeed, while all of these avenues of exploration have provided and will certainly continue to provide valuable insights, the sum of their parts still offers a fragmented vision of the whole, which is unable to explain something as large as why American politics seems to continue to need realigning. Therefore, if we are looking to suggest how current events could best help realign developmental research, we could do worse than hope that they will inspire confidence in widening our perspective.
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The products of the sociological imperative are both internally driven and externally demanded. Internally, individual ambition and group recognition of particularly creative contributions generates a hierarchy of concepts, ideas, and research agendas. These, in turn, become the frame and format for what becomes more routinized, conventional research. Externally, other intellectual communities demand that their counterparts mark out their tribal claims. Failure to mark out and defend these claims in ways recognized by other tribes can and probably would entail a loss of intellectual identity and professional standing.

If a tribe were only organized for the purpose of defending its existence and professional standing, it would necessarily sacrifice much of the space in which creative scholarship might otherwise thrive. On the other hand, if a tribe were only organized for the purpose of liberating creative imagination, it would be unable to defend its identity and existence in what is often an intense competition for resources and position in the profession. In a sense, this is a classic Maoist dilemma: how to incorporate revolutionary (intellectual) insurgency as a legitimate and necessary element in the design of an institution (organized intellectual community). And, like most dilemmas—what is to say, real dilemmas—we cannot eliminate this inherent contradiction by formulating an explicit policy: so much of this and so much of that. Instead, we can only recognize the dilemma as one that haunts our professional and intellectual lives, coping as best we can.

It is in that sense that I now turn to what I believe to be one of the reasons that Politics and History has been able to live with this dilemma much more successfully than most sections and subfields. At the most general level, we borrow freely from and sometimes collaborate with colleagues from related disciplines: history, sociology, economics, law, and, somewhat less frequently, anthropology and philosophy. Within political science, we have even stronger connections to comparative politics, political theory, international relations, and, of course, American politics. Some would say that these connections are eclectic, perhaps too much so in that they blur our collective identity. But I would contend that they constitute our major strength and most important justification for existence. In order to show why I believe that, I would like to take us on a whirlwind tour of some of the analytical concerns and interpretations that have emerged at the intersection of American political development, comparative politics, and history. Please forgive the absence of citations. If I started providing them, they would easily overwhelm the narrative. And what I am after here is the ideas generated at the intersection, not their advocates.

We start, as most narratives of American political development do, with the original European settlement of the eastern and southern portion of the North American littoral. These coastal settlements were oriented toward what we have come to call the “Atlantic World:” English, for the most part, on the east coast, Spanish in Florida and New Mexico, and French and Spanish in Louisiana. Among the major interpretive concerns are how the differing colonial origins of what became the American nation affected political development. For instance, how did the Napoleonic Code that has served as the basis for Louisiana law distinguish the political development of that state from those in which the British common law tradition dominated legal thinking. But there are many other concerns as well, arising out of analysis of trade patterns, colonial commodity relations, the contrast between (at least nominally) free labor and slavery, and the movement of peoples between colonies and between colonies and the frontier.

The American Revolution and the adoption of the Constitution comprise the Founding. Here the intersection between law and political theory is particularly pronounced but the literature on the revolution and the early republic is vast in all directions. Comparisons are sometimes made to the French Revolution, for example. And the inheritance has been obvious throughout Latin America in terms of structural parallels in the organization of power into presidential regimes and of the constitutional construction of political institutions generally. A developing concern with equally clear contemporary applications is how the Constitution came to be, in Madison’s terminology, “venerated.” The Founding was, from this perspective, the first “democratic transition” and thus presented the first instance in which conscious political design faced the problem of becoming legitimated practice.

The United States became a very large nation through continental expansion. And that expansion has only a few comparative parallels. The one most commonly investigated is with Canada but the most promising might be with the eastward expansion of the Russian Empire. All three cases raise questions concerning how much the central state guided and controlled the expansion in that “spontaneous” migrations of peoples across the frontier often seem to have dragged sovereign authority in their wake. In the Russian case, serfdom created a parallel with the expansion of slavery in what became the American South. Slavery and emancipation has generated some of the richest cross-national comparisons. The most familiar are those with Prussia/Junkers (serfs); Russia/nobility (serfs); and Brazil/coffee producers (slaves). All of these focus on the political economy of bonded labor and emancipation. One of the major questions addressed here is why American emancipation was so exceptionally violent.

The academic and popular literature on the American Civil War is said to be second in size only to that of...
French Revolution. Most work is, of course, American-centric with no comparative applications or implications in view. Where comparative parallels are suggested or pursued, they might be more or less divided into three comparative frames. The modernization perspective views the American Civil War as part of a global transformation of labor into a market commodity, a bourgeois revolution in which market capitalism triumphed over an “ancient regime” dominated by an aristocratic, landed nobility. Even more generally, the conflict is seen to have enabled a change from “status” to “contract” as the basis for socio-economic relations. There are many comparative possibilities here, including, of course, Prussia, Russia, and Brazil.

Another, related frame through which to bring the American Civil War into comparative focus is separatism. In this perspective, the transition from an agricultural to an industrial economy engenders stress that frequently breaks up large, continental size empires (defined here as incompletely consolidated sovereignties) as uneven economic development imposes regionally unequal costs and benefits. Industrialization is often accompanied by completion of the “nation-building project” (the consolidation of political power in a central state that eventually imposes more or less uniform relations between the center and all parts of the nation). Because industrialization often creates very stark inequalities between regions in large states (e.g., between regions that remain agricultural while other industrialize), large states often break up during the twin industrialization and nationalization projects. The United States was a “near miss” in that sense. The Soviet Union, Austria-Hungary, and the Ottoman Empire were casualties. India and China are contemporary cases that, in some ways, have yet to be decided.

The last frame presents the American Civil War as the occasion for the founding of a Republican party state which I have defined elsewhere as meeting three criteria: “(1) a political system in which a single party dominates all other contenders for power; (2) the dominant party coalition excludes important groups and classes in the national political economy from almost all participation in government decision making; and (3) membership in the dominant party is the most important single qualification for office holding within the state bureaucracy.” The most prominent parallels are the foundings of: Bolshevik party rule during the Soviet Revolution; the onset of party domination by the PRI after the Mexican Revolution; Congress Party rule in India following independence; and the ongoing Communist party domination of the Chinese state. The basic questions are when, how, and why a revolutionary party gives up control of the state.

American industrialization raises comparative questions revolving around the compatibility between democracy and development. Capital investment during industrialization often reduces the share of national income going to agriculture. Because industrializing societies are usually poor, this redistribution causes acute suffering in rural areas. In the midst of this suffering, a redistribution of the wealth pouring into industrial expansion appears to offer immediate relief. Hence, a democratic system is problematic. Later, once industrialization has picked up pace, the income of most groups begins to rise and it is the anticipation that this increase will continue, plus the relief it offers the poorest segments of society, that decreases the urgency of political demands for a redistribution of wealth. And that has been the historical point at which suffrage reform begins to expand electorates. China, for example, may fit this scenario with the implication that it is too early to institute a democratic system there. But India is a very interesting counter-example because widespread poverty combined with the emergence of competitive party politics might have been expected to stifle industrialization. This comparative perspective stresses the probable incompatibility of, on the one hand, aggressive working class and agrarian claims on wealth and, on the other, heavy capital investment in industrial plant and supporting infrastructure. In these terms, the United States still presents the outstanding example of the possible (if unlikely) compatibility of rapid economic development with a democratic system.

A closely related perspective focuses on the rampant, almost uncontrolled market forces that impelled American industrialization in the late nineteenth century. And the most likely parallel is again contemporary China. The basic problem addressed by the comparison is how to both exploit an explosive market expansion of industrial capacity and, at the same time, control what become increasingly harmful collateral effects. For that reason, Chinese scholars have become increasingly interested in the American Progressive Era with its “capitalist friendly” regulation of things like capitalist predation (monopoly), pollution, and the marketing of dangerous products.

As we are now entering the twentieth century, I will only briefly outline some of the remaining comparative perspectives on American political development. One of the most timely is, of course, immigration where the United States has been compared to other settler countries, particularly Canada, Argentina, and Australia. The problem in this instance is the reconciliation of multicultural origins with the maintenance of a cohesive national identity. By broadening the perspective just a bit, the frame can be extended to encompass strains between minority religious beliefs and the political principles that legitimate national states. A somewhat related set of problems can also be addressed through the comparative study of the dismantling of race segregation and other socio-economic systems based on ascriptive characteristics. Here the United States is most commonly compared with South Africa and Brazil but might also, with respect to “affirmative action” arrangements, be aligned...
with India (the caste system) and Malaysia (indigenous Malays).

American federalism has been contrasted with the structure and operation of many state systems, each of them characterized by a formal division of sovereignty between central and regional government authorities. The most common comparisons are with Australia, Germany, and Canada but there are a lot of possibilities (e.g., Britain and Scotland; Spain and Catalonia/the Basque region; China and Hong Kong). One area in which the United States is usually described as a distinct “outlier” in the contemporary world is in the study of the emergence and development of large social welfare bureaucracies delivering government-funded benefits in advanced capitalist societies. Because of its relatively meager benefit levels and more restricted eligibility, the United States usually occupies the “right” end of a continuum (sometimes along with New Zealand) with most European political economies much further to the left. These comparisons of advanced industrial democracies sometimes bleed over into the study of the relationship between, on the one hand, electoral rules and, on the other, the shape and ideological content of party systems. Here the origins of the American two-party system with its broad-based and relatively moderate competing organizations is attributed to the operation of “first-past-the-post” plurality-determined, single-member elections. Britain is the most commonly suggested parallel. At the other end of the spectrum are parliamentary/multi-party systems now in place in many other countries. Last but certainly not least, American hegemony on the world stage has often been compared to the British Empire of the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries and, less frequently, with the Soviet sphere of influence before 1989.

I have, of course, left many, many other possible comparisons out of this whirlwind tour, among them labor rights, war mobilization and military command structures, the tenets of American liberalism, the principles and practice of corporate regulation, and the rate and quality of inter-class mobility. And the comparisons that I have discussed here are certainly not fully representative of all the possibilities (although I am not sure what that sampling would look like). Even so, I would note that all these comparisons have a protean character; which nations “look like” the United States depends on what political, economic, or social feature we are examining. And, for that reason, it would be impossible to take all these pieces of the American puzzle and fit them together into one coherent picture. For those who would want to construct such an interpretation, each comparative dimension tends to distort the feature that is the focus of attention, wrenching it out of its proper relation to the full ensemble of such features. But another way of looking at this is to conclude that the search for such a “unitary, national” interpretation is itself illusory because real world politics, like academic studies, rarely entertains or operates upon such an interpretation.

Putting that (significant) caveat aside, there are still some interesting things that lift out of the pattern etched by this whirlwind tour. One of these is the prominence of other large nations, such as China, India, and Russia, among the comparative interlocutors with American political development. That contrasts rather strikingly with the contemporary research proclivity to lump the United States within a Europe-heavy sampling of nations for whom roughly comparable social and economic data are readily available. Another is the almost complete absence of African or Islamic nations among those “most like” the United States. That absence, over a wide variety of areas, creates something like a category of experiences “most unlike” the United States. And this, too, is useful.

But the most important implication returns us to the beginning of this essay: The historical, comparative study of the United States (and, thus, by proxy, any nation) can only be pursued by eclectically-assembled interdisciplinary talents and expertise. No one intellectual community can hope to command the entire field and, as we move from one comparative focus to another, their intersecting combinations unites us in their sheer diversity. There is a variety of approaches and interpretative frames and, at the same time, contact and mutual exchange between them. We are thus a community that celebrates its own diversity. This celebration is the strength of Politics and History, the strength that holds the dilemma between professionalism and creativity at bay.

Queen Victoria’s Proclamation of the Canadian Confederation, July 1, 1867. July 1 is celebrated as Canada Day / Fête du Canada.
Canadian Parliamentary buildings under construction, 1865
City of Ottawa (http://www.ottawa.ca/residents/heritage/archives/virtual_exhibit/building_en.html)