



Department of Political Science

POLS 101, National Government of the United States

Tuesdays and Thursdays @ 3:40PM

Michael K. Fauntroy, Ph.D.

Associate Professor of Political Science

112A Douglass Hall

Office Hours: Tuesdays and Thursdays from
1:30PM to 2:45PM, Wednesdays from
3:30PM to 4:45PM, and by appointment

Email: Michael.Fauntroy@howard.edu

Course Description and Requirements

Harold Lasswell informed us decades ago that politics is the process of determining who gets what – when and how. Politics determines which ideas governments accept and implement, and what ideas are not. These decisions at the federal level are a product of the machinations that occur within our national government. This course is designed to expose students to the major political and policy making institutions of the U.S. government.

We will explore the philosophical and historical roots of American politics and major institutions including, but not limited to Congress, the presidency, the judiciary, and the bureaucracy. We will also consider the role and function of state and local governments in the American political system.

More specifically, you should be able to:

- Explain how government and politics impacts your daily life;
- Recognize and evaluate the basic debates and issues in American government and American political history;
- Explain and critically assess the formal and informal political institutions, and their respective roles, in American politics;
- Identify and describe the key functions of the three branches of government;
- Assess the causes and consequences of different forms of political participation, and outline the ways in which individuals and groups can affect political outcomes in the United States;
- Identify the ways in which government, politics, and society interact; and
- Assess the impact of structural factors, such as the economy, culture, and technology, on the process of governance in the United States.

You should be able to discuss each of these areas confidently and in depth. Upon completion of this course, students will be familiar with the fundamental aspects of American government and the context in which they exist.

Course Goals

1. Gain a better understanding of key structures, functions, and processes of American concepts and assigned readings in national government.
2. Develop ability to construct well organized, clearly written, informatively presented, and effectively persuasive analytic arguments on issues pertaining to national government.
3. Improve ability to engage in oral debate and dialogue concerning issues and ideas concerning national government.

Course Objectives

1. Students will be better, more confident writers and thinkers.
2. Students will analyze critical concepts in a variety of settings.
3. Students will improve their ability to analyze historical and contemporary political events and claims.

Instructional Methods

This is a lecture course. A premium is placed on quality writing and class participation. You are expected to ask questions and offer informed analysis and commentary in class. That said, please be civil to and respectful of your colleagues, particularly if they express opinions that are unpopular. Also, make sure that your commentary is relevant to the discussion/literature.

Textbooks and Other Resources

Required

- Paula McClain and Steven Tauber, *American Government in Black and White*, 2nd Edition, (New York: Oxford University Press, 2014).

Note: Please get the most recently published edition. A number of journal articles will be available through JSTOR on the Howard University library's online research database.

Recommended

There are a number of recommended readings listed throughout the syllabus. They are intended to provide you with additional knowledge on selected topics. You will not be tested on any of the material listed as recommended. However, they are very useful to read to gain a deeper understanding of the issues they address.

Student Assessment

Students will be evaluated on the following:

- A **mid-term examination** that will test your knowledge and understanding of the assigned reading and class discussion from the first half of this semester. (40% of your final grade).
- **General participation:** Active participation in class discussions, demonstrating understanding of assigned reading, short writing assignments, and unannounced quizzes (as needed (20% of your final grade).
- A **final examination** that will test your knowledge and understanding of the assigned reading and class discussion from the second half of this semester. (40% of your final grade)

Please Note: For this course, an A grade is reserved for sustained outstanding performance in all aspects of the course – **examinations and class participation**. A B grade is assigned to those who demonstrate mastery of the course readings and above average performance in all aspects of the course. The grade of C denotes average/marginal performance.

A few words on class participation: Class participation encompasses questions and comments that demonstrate knowledge of – though not necessarily agreement with – assigned course readings or other information that sheds light on a topic relevant to the course. Remember, professionals in public policy must be able to speak effectively in small groups and to make presentations of their work. The only way to learn these skills is to practice, so students are expected to contribute to discussions and will be required to present summaries of selected readings. I place a heavy emphasis on class participation. Consequently, ***each week's assigned readings must be read before each class discussion***. Students should also be prepared to summarize, offer critical assessments – or both – of the literature as well as the comments of classmates. It is quite possible that a student who earned an “A” on both examinations can end up with a final grade of “B” if he or she does not regularly participate in class discussions.

Class attendance is taken into account in evaluation for the course. While it is understandable that other requirements will occasionally conflict with class times, missing more than four class sessions will make it virtually impossible to earn a grade better than B for the course. Missing more than five sessions will make a grade of C likely.

Policies

Mobile Phones: Please be courteous to your colleagues and instructor by turning off your mobile phone before entering the classroom.

Extra Credit: No extra credit assignments will be given in this course.

Late Submission of Research Papers: All papers should be submitted on time. Any paper submitted after the deadline will be penalized one full letter grade (no exceptions).

Incomplete Grades: No incomplete grades will be assigned at the end of this semester, except in the case of extraordinary, officially validated emergencies.

Academic Accommodation for a Disability: Howard University is committed to providing an educational environment that is accessible to all students. In accordance with this commitment, students in need of accommodations due to a disability should contact the Office of the Dean for Special Student Services for verification and determination of reasonable accommodations as soon as possible after admission to the University, or at the beginning of each academic semester. Contact the Office for Special Student Services, Howard Center Suite 725, 2225 Georgia Ave, NW, Washington, DC 20059, at 202-238-2420 for more information. Please notify me within the first two weeks of class if you require such accommodation.

Howard University Academic Code of Student Conduct

(Revised 2010)

Approved by the Board of Trustees, June 29, 2010

Howard University is a community of scholars composed of faculty and students both of whom must hold the pursuit of learning and search for truth in the highest regard. Such regard requires adherence to the goal of unquestionable integrity and honesty in the discharge of teaching and learning responsibilities. Such regard allows no place for academic dishonesty. To better assure the realization of this goal any student enrolled for study at the University may be disciplined for the academic infractions defined below.

Definitions of Academic Infractions

- **Academic Cheating**—any intentional act(s) of dishonesty in the fulfillment of academic course or program requirements. This offense shall include (but is not limited to) utilization of the assistance of any additional individual(s), organization, document, or other aid not specifically and expressly authorized by the instructor or department involved. (Note: This infraction assumes that with the exception of authorized group assignment or group take-home assignments, all course or program assignments shall be completed by an individual student only without any consultation or collaboration with any other individual, organization, or aid.)

- **Plagiarism**—to take and pass off intentionally as one’s own the ideas, writings, etc. of another without attribution (without acknowledging the author).
- **Copy Infringement**—Copy infringement occurs when a copyrighted work is reproduced, distributed, performed, publicly displayed, or made into a derivative work without the permission of the copyright owner.

Administration of the Code

This Academic Code of Student Conduct applies in all schools and colleges. In professional schools and colleges that have adopted honor codes, the honor code may supersede this Code. The authority and responsibility for the administration of this Academic Code of Conduct and imposition of any discipline upon any particular student shall vest in the Dean and faculty of the School or College in which the student is enrolled but may be delegated by the faculty to the Dean of the School or College in which the student is enrolled. The Dean shall be assisted in this responsibility by any faculty members and administrative officers in the School or College the Dean shall consider appropriate. Any student accused of an infraction of this Code shall have a right to a limited hearing, as described herein, of the charges against him before a committee of faculty members, at least three in number, none of whom shall be the accuser or witness to the alleged infraction. The committee may be either a standing of the School or College, whose responsibilities are considered appropriate by the Dean to conduct a hearing under this code, or a committee appointed by the Dean for the special purpose of conducting only a particular hearing or all such hearings that may arise during an annual period. The hearing committee shall be chaired by a member designated by the Dean and the chairperson shall have the right to vote in cases of a tie vote.

Procedure

Any faculty member who has knowledge of an infraction of this Code shall assemble all supporting evidence and identify any additional witnesses to the infraction and make this information known to the Dean of the School or College in which the student is enrolled at least ten (10) business days after the date of the infraction.

Upon being notified of an alleged infraction of this Code, the Dean shall, as soon as possible, consider the weight of the assembled evidence and, if the Dean considers the evidence sufficient to warrant further action the dean shall notify the alleged offender of the charge(s) against him/her together with a designation of a hearing time and place where the accused may respond to the charge(s). The hearing date shall be no later than ten (10) business days after notification to the accused of the charge(s) against him/her. The Dean shall similarly notify the hearing committee members of the time and place of the hearing together with identification of the accuser and accused.

The “limited hearing” authorized by this Code is not an adversarial proceeding. Constitutional principles of “due process” are not applicable to these proceeding. The faculty member concerned shall present the case for the University. Both shall be allowed to present witnesses and evidence in support of their positions concerning the charge(s). However, no legal counsel for either side shall be allowed.

The members of the hearing committee may question the accused and the accuser and examine all evidence presented. The standard of proof for the proceeding under this Code shall be the standard of “substantial evidence.” The proceedings may be tape recorded but will not be transcribed.

After the hearing of the charge(s) against the accused, the hearing committee shall, in closed session, vote by secret ballot to sustain or reject the charge(s). If the charges are sustained, the committee shall transmit the results and recommendation of the hearing committee to the Dean five (5) business days after the hearing.

Upon receipt of the results and recommendations of the hearing committee, the Dean may sustain the recommendation of the Committee concerning the penalty or may reduce or increase the severity of the penalty, and shall, within five (5) business days, notify the student of the Dean’s determination. The student may appeal directly to the Provost and Chief Academic Officer or Senior Vice President for Health Sciences (Health Science students) for reconsideration of any disciplinary penalty. The student shall have five (5) business days to make such appeal from date of receipt of notification.

After hearing any appeal from a student, the Provost and Chief Academic Officer or Senior Vice President for Health Sciences shall make a decision that shall be communicated to the student within ten (10) business days. This decision shall be final.

Penalties

The minimum disciplinary penalty imposed upon a student found to have committed an infraction(s) of this Code shall be no credit for the course assignment or examination in which the infraction(s) occurred; however, a more severe penalty, such as failure in the course involved or suspension from the University, may be imposed depending upon the nature and extent of the infraction(s).

Additional Thoughts on Plagiarism

The profession of scholarship and the intellectual life of a university as well as the field of political science inquiry depend fundamentally on a foundation of trust. Thus any act of plagiarism strikes at the heart of the meaning of the university and the purpose of the Department of Political Science. It constitutes a serious breach of professional ethics and it is unacceptable.

Plagiarism is the use of another’s words or ideas presented as one’s own. It includes, among other things, the use of specific words, ideas, or frameworks that are the product of another’s work. Honesty and thoroughness in citing sources is essential to professional accountability and personal responsibility. Appropriate citation is necessary so that arguments, evidence, and claims can be critically examined.

Plagiarism is wrong because of the injustice it does to the person whose ideas are stolen. But it is also wrong because it constitutes lying to one’s professional colleagues. From a prudential perspective, it is shortsighted and self-defeating, and it can ruin a professional career.

The following poem offers some food for thought about the importance of politics.

“Why You Should Be Involved in Politics”

Politics and politicians decide
the wars you fight
the interest you pay
the speed you drive
the taxes you pay

Politics and politicians control
the purity of your food
the schooling of your children
the value of your money
the weights and measures you use
the floor under your wages

Politics and politicians use taxpayer money to hand out
subsidies to farmers
subsidies to airlines
subsidies to oil companies
subsidies to magazines and newspapers
subsidies to bankers
subsidies to builders

Politics and politicians protect or destroy
your right to speak freely
your right to worship freely
your right to organize
your right to vote

Politics and politicians control your life

The author of this poem is unknown to me, but his or her words strike at the core of my professional and political interests. There may well be very few things in this world you can do that are not shaped, directly or indirectly, by politics. To sit on the sidelines and not be involved could literally be hazardous to your health.

Course Outline and Assigned Reading

1. (August 27) Course Overview and Introduction

2. (August 29 and September 3) The Principles, Foundations, and Constitution of the United States

Required Reading—

Paula McClain and Steven Tauber, *American Government in Black and White*, 2nd Edition, (New York: Oxford University Press, 2014), Chapters 1 and 2.

The Articles of Confederation

The Constitution of the United States

The Federalist No. 10 and No. 51

Recommended Reading—

William Scruggs, “Ambiguous Citizenship,” *Political Science Quarterly*, v. 1, no. 2, pp. 199-205.

Charles Stewart, “Congress and the Constitutional System,” in Paul Quirk and Sarah Binder, eds., *The Legislative Branch*, (New York: Oxford University Press, 2005).

3. (September 5) Federalism

Required Reading—

McClain and Tauber, Chapter 3.

Recommended Reading—

William Dunning, “Are the States Equal Under the Constitution?” *Political Science Quarterly*, v. 1, no. 3, pp. 425-453.

Philip Frickey and Steven Smith, “Judicial Review, the Congressional Process, and the Federalism Cases: An Interdisciplinary Critique,” *The Yale Law Journal*, v. 111, no. 7, pp. 1707-1756.

Eugene Boyd and Michael Fauntroy, *American Federalism: Significant Events, 1776 to 2000*, Washington: D.C. Congressional Research Service, November 2000.

4. (September 10) Civil Liberties

Required Reading–

McClain and Tauber, Chapter 4.

Recommended Reading–

Jon Gould, *Speak No Evil: The Triumph of Hate Speech Regulation*, (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2005)

Russell Hardin, “Civil Liberties in the Era of Mass Terrorism,” *The Journal of Ethics*, V. 8, No. 1, pp. 77-95.

Steve Holbert and Lisa Rose, *The Study of Guilt and Innocence: Racial Profiling and Police Practices in America*, (San Ramon, CA: Page Marque Press, 2004).

Milton Konvitz, “Civil Liberties,” *Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science*, Vol. 371, Social Goals and Indicators for American Society, Volume 1, pp. 38-58.

5. (September 12) Civil Rights

Required Reading–

McClain and Tauber, Chapter 5.

Public Statement by Bishop C. C. J. Carpenter *et. al.* To Rev. Martin Luther King, Jr.

Rev. Martin Luther King, Jr., “Letter From a Birmingham Jail”.

Recommended Reading–

A. Leon Higginbotham, Jr., “An Open Letter to Justice Clarence Thomas From a Federal Judicial Colleague,” *University of Pennsylvania Law Review*, January 1992, pp. 1005-1020.

Simon Hall, “Civil Rights Activism in 1960s Virginia,” *Journal of Black Studies*, V. 38, No. 2, pp. 251-267.

Joseph Luders, “Civil Rights Success and the Politics of Racial Violence,” *Polity*, V. 37, No. 1, pp. 108-129.

Maykel Verkuyten and Ali Aslan Yildiz , “The Endorsement of Minority Rights: The Role of Group Position, National Context, and Ideological Beliefs,” *Political Psychology*, V. 27, No. 4, pp. 527-548.

6. (September 17, 19, 24, and 26) The Congress of the United States

Required Reading–

McClain and Tauber, Chapter 6.

The Constitution of the United States, Article 1

The Federalist No. 51

Charles Kromkowski and John Kromkowski, “Why 435? A Question of Political Arithmetic,” *Polity*, v. 24, no.1, pp. 129-145.

Susan Webb Hammond, Daniel Mulhollan, and Arthur Stevens, “Informal Congressional Caucuses and Agenda Setting,” *Western Political Quarterly*, v. 38, no. 4, pp. 583-605.

Recommended Reading–

Burdett Loomis and Wendy Schiller, *The Contemporary Congress*, (Belmont: Thompson Wadsworth).

Frederick Kaiser, “Congressional Oversight of the Presidency,” *Annals AAPSS*, v. 499, pp. 75-89.

Bruce Bimber, “Information as a Factor in Congressional Politics,” *Legislative Studies Quarterly*, v. 16, no. 4, pp. 585-605.

Sarah Binder, “The Dynamics of Legislative Gridlock, 1947-1996,” *American Political Science Review*, v. 93 (September 1999), pp. 519-533.

Wendy Schiller, “Senators as Political Entrepreneurs: Bill Sponsorship in the U.S. Senate,” *American Journal of Political Science*, v. 39, no. 1 (1995), pp. 186-203.

Arturo Vega and Juanita Firestone, “The Effects of Gender on Congressional Behavior and the Substantive Representation of Women,” *Legislative Studies Quarterly*, v. 20, no. 2, pp. 213-222.

Jason Mycoff, “Congress and Katrina: A Failure of Oversight,” *State and Local Government Review*, v. 39, no. 1, pp. 16-30.

Alan Rosenthal, “Legislative Behavior and Legislative Oversight,” *Legislative Studies Quarterly*, v. 6, pp. 115-131.

7. (October 1, 3, 8, and 10) The Presidency

Required Reading—

McClain and Tauber, Chapter 7.

The Constitution of the United States, Article II

Kenneth Mayer “Executive Orders and Presidential Power,” *The Journal of Politics*, V. 61, No. 2, pp. 445-466.

Stephen Nicholson, Gary Segura, and Nathan Woods, “Presidential Approval and the Mixed Blessings of Divided Government,” *The Journal of Politics*, V. 64, no. 3, pp. 701-720.

Morris Fiorina, “An Era of Divided Government,” *Political Science Quarterly*, v. 107, no. 3, pp. 387-410.

Recommended Reading—

James Pfiffner, *The Modern Presidency*, (Belmont: Thompson Wadsworth).

Jeffrey Cohen, “Presidential Rhetoric and the Public Agenda,” *American Journal of Political Science*, v. 39, no. 1, pp. 87-107.

Cary Covington, “Guess Who’s Coming to Dinner: The Distribution of White House Social Invitations and Their Effects on Congressional Support,” *American Politics Quarterly*, v. 16, no. 3 (July 1988), pp. 243-265.

George A. Krause and Jeffrey E. Cohen, “Opportunity, Constraints, and the Development of the Institutional Presidency: The Issuance of Executive Orders, 1939-96,” *The Journal of Politics*, v. 62, no. 1, pp. 88-114.

Martha Joynt Kumar, “Does This Constitute a Press Conference?” *Presidential Studies Quarterly*, v. 33, no. 1 (March 2003), p. 221-237.

Frederick Kaiser, “Congressional Oversight of the Presidency,” *Annals AAPSS*, v. 499, pp. 75-89.

8. (October 15, 17, and 22) The Bureaucracy

Required Reading—

McClain and Tauber, Chapter 8.

Frances Rourke, "American Bureaucracy in a Changing Political Setting," *Journal of Public Administration Research and Theory*, V. 1, pp. 111-129.

B. Dan Wood and Richard Waterman, "The Dynamics of Political Control of the Bureaucracy," *American Political Science Review*, V. 85, No. 4, pp. 801-828.

Recommended Reading–

A. Lee Fritschler, and Catherine E. Rudder, *Smoking and Politics: Bureaucracy Centered Policymaking*, 6th ed., (Upper Saddle River, N.J.: Pearson/Prentice Hall, 2007).

Harvey Feigenbaum, and Jeffrey Henig, "Privatization and Political Theory," *Journal of International Affairs*, v. 50, no. 2, pp. 338-355.

Ralph Brower and Mitchel Abolafia, "Bureaucratic Politics: The View from Below," *Journal of Public Administration Research and Theory*, v. 7, no. 2, pp. 305-331.

Cornelius Kerwin, *Rulemaking: How Government Agencies Write Law and Make Policy*, (Washington, D.C.: CQ Press, 1994).

Grant McConnell, *Private Power and American Democracy*, (New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 1966).

William Megginson, "Privatization," *Foreign Policy*, v. 118, pp. 14-27.

9. (October 24, 29, and 31) The Judiciary

Required Reading–

McClain and Tauber, Chapter 9.

Lauren Cohen Bell, "Senatorial Discourtesy: The Senate's Use of Delay to Shape the Federal Judiciary," *Political Research Quarterly*, V. 56, pp. 589-609.

Mark Tushnet, "Some Legacies of Brown v. Board of Education," *Virginia Law Review*, V. 90, No. 6, pp. 1693-1720.

Recommended Reading–

A. Leon Higginbotham, Jr., "An Open Letter to Justice Clarence Thomas From a Federal Judicial Colleague," *University of Pennsylvania Law Review*, January 1992, pp. 1005-1020.

Bryon Moraski and Charles Shipan, "The Politics of Supreme Court Nominations: A Theory of Institutional Constraints," *American Journal of Political Science*, v. 43, no. 4, pp. 1069-1095.

Evan Ringquist and Craig Emmert, "Judicial Policymaking in Published and Unpublished Decisions: The Case of Environmental Civil Litigation," *Political Research Quarterly*, v. 52, no. 1, pp. 7-37.

Kent Kirwan, "The Use and Abuse of Power: The Supreme Court and Separation of Powers," *Annals/AAPSS*, no. 537, pp. 76-84.

10. (November 5) Public Opinion and Its Impact on Politics and Policy

Required Reading—

McClain and Tauber, Chapter 10

Recommended Reading—

Herbert Asher, *Polling and the Public*, (Washington, DC: CQ Press, 2001).

Michael X. Delli Carpini and Scott Keeter, *What Americans Know About Politics and Why It Matters*, (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1996).

Joshua Green, "The Other War Room," *Washington Monthly*, April 2002.

Amy Keller, "Subcommittee Launches Investigation of Push Polls," *Roll Call*, October 3, 1996.

Thomas Mann and Eary Orren, eds., *Media Polls in American Politics*, (Washington, DC: Brookings Institution Press, 1992).

John Zaller, *The Nature and Origins of Mass Opinion*, (New York: Cambridge University Press, 1992).

11. (November 7 and 12) Media

Required Reading—

McClain and Tauber, Chapter 11

Additional Reading: TBA

Recommended Reading—

Shanto Iyengar, *Is Anyone Responsible? How Television Frames Political Issues*, (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1991).

Jeremy D. Mayer, *American Media Politics in Transition*, (New York: McGraw Hill 2006).

Mark J. Rozell and Jeremy D. Mayer, eds., *Media Power, Media Politics*, 2nd ed. (Lanham, MD: Rowman and Littlefield, 2008).

12. (November 14) Social Movements

Required Reading–

McClain and Tauber, Chapter 12

Recommended Reading–

Cedric Robinson, *Black Movements in America*, (New York: Routledge, 1997).

13. (November 19 and 21) Interest Groups and Lobbying

Required Reading–

McClain and Tauber, Chapter 13

The Federalist No. 10

Marie Hojnacki and David Kimball, “Organized Interests and the Decision of Whom to Lobby in Congress,” *American Political Science Review*, v. 92 (December 1998), pp. 775-790.

Peter Burns, Peter Francia, and Paul Herrnson, “Labor at Work: Union Campaign Activities and Legislative Payoffs in the U.S. House of Representatives,” *Social Science Quarterly*, v. 81, pp. 507-522.

Paul Herrnson, Ronald Shaiko, and Clyde Wilcox, *The Interest Group Connection: Electioneering, Lobbying, and Policymaking in Washington*, 2nd Edition, (Washington, D.C.: CQ Press, 2005).

Recommended Reading–

Mancur Olson, *The Logic of Collective Action: Public Goods and the Theory of Groups*, (Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1971).

Robert Dahl, *Who Governs? Democracy and Power in the American City*, (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1961).

Stacy Gordon, “All Votes Are Not Created Equal: Campaign Contributions and Critical Votes,” *Journal of Politics*, v. 63, pp. 249-269.

Laura Langbein and Mark Lotwis, “The Political Efficacy of Lobbying and Money: Gun Control

in the U.S. House, 1986,” *Legislative Studies Quarterly*, v. 15, pp. 413-330.

James Lester and Joseph Stewart, “Agenda Setting,” in *Public Policy: An Evolutionary Approach*, (Belmont, CA: Wadsworth, 2000), pp. 66-85.

14. (November 26) Political Parties

Required Reading—

McClain and Tauber, Chapter 14.

Recommended Reading—

Michael K. Fauntroy, *Republicans and the Black Vote*, (Boulder: Lynne Rienner Publishers, 2008).

15. (December 3) Elections

Required Reading—

McClain and Tauber, Chapter 15

Recommended Reading—

Spencer Overton, *Stealing Democracy: The New Politics of Voter Suppression*, (New York: Norton, 2006).

Elizabeth Hull, *The Disenfranchisement of Ex-Felons*, (Philadelphia: Temple University Press, 2006).

Frances Fox Piven, Lorraine Minnite, and Margaret Groarke, *Keeping Down the Black Vote: Race and the Demobilization of American Voters*, (New York: The New Press, 2009).

League of United Latin American Citizens v. Wilson, CV-94-7569

Gray v. Sanders, 372 U.S. 368 (1963)

Westberry v. Sanders, 376 U.S. 1 (1964)

Reynolds v. Sims, 377 U.S. 533 (1964)

Thornburg v. Gingles, 478 U.S. 613 (1986)

Shaw v. Reno, 509 U.S. 113 (1993)

Shelby v. Holder

16. (December 5) Public Policymaking

Required Reading—

Joseph Stewart, Jr., David M. Hedge, James P. Lester, *Public Policy: An Evolutionary Approach*, 3rd edition, Chapter 1 (to be distributed via.pdf on November 15).

Recommended Reading—

John Kingdon, *Agendas, Alternatives, and Public Policies*, (New York: Longman, 2003).

Benjamin Ginsberg, “Elections and Public Policy,” *American Political Science Review*, V. 70, pp. 41-49.

Barbara Sinclair, “Party Realignment and the Transformation of the Political Agenda,” *American Political Science Review*, v. 71, pp. 940-953.

Darrell West, “Activists and Economic Policymaking in Congress,” *American Journal of Political Science*, V. 32, No. 1, pp. 662-680.