

Political Science 218/218W/518 and History 377W/477
Spring 2015
Mondays, 12:30–3:15

Emergence of the Modern Congress

Gerald Gamm
Harkness Hall 319
585–275–8573
gerald.gamm@rochester.edu
Office hours: Friday mornings, 9:00-10:00

Through reading and research, this course examines major issues in congressional history and legislative organization. This course is appropriate for graduate students as well as qualified undergraduates with permission of the instructor.

Seven books, which we will be reading in their entirety, are available for purchase in the campus bookstore. They are also on two-hour reserve at the circulation desk of Rush Rhees Library. (You might also consider online sources, including www.abebooks.com, for book purchases. Any edition of these books is fine; do not feel compelled to buy the newest edition if an older version is available for less money.) The required books are these—

David R. Mayhew, *Congress: The Electoral Connection* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1974).

Sarah A. Binder, *Minority Rights, Majority Rule: Partisanship and the Development of Congress* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1997).

Richard F. Fenno, Jr., *Congressmen in Committees* (1973; rpt. Berkeley: Institute of Governmental Studies Press, 1995).

Ira Katznelson, *When Affirmative Action Was White: An Untold History of Racial Inequality in Twentieth-Century America* (New York: W.W. Norton, 2005).

David W. Rohde, *Parties and Leaders in the Postreform House* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1991).

Barbara Sinclair, *Party Wars: Polarization and the Politics of National Policy Making* (Norman, Okla.: University of Oklahoma Press, 2006).

Morris P. Fiorina with Samuel J. Abrams, *Disconnect: The Breakdown of Representation in American Politics* (Norman, Okla.: University of Oklahoma Press, 2009).

All other readings are available at the course website on Blackboard. To access the Blackboard readings off-campus, you will first need to download and run VPN, so that your computer can be viewed as part of the University's network. You can find VPN at <http://rochester.edu/it/vpn/>.

Track One: Graduate Students and Upper-Level Writing Undergraduates

Informed participation in weekly discussions (35%). Students are required to attend all scheduled class meetings, having read all assigned material; students who do not attend regularly will not receive credit for the course. Students are encouraged to listen attentively to others, to draw others into class discussions, and to take risks by asking questions and throwing out new ideas.

Three short papers (25% total). In 3-4 pages, students should address a central question in the week's readings, critically evaluate the readings, or analyze underlying issues in the readings. These papers must be analytical: they should scrutinize the logic and evidence marshaled on behalf of an argument and, where appropriate, analyze the relationship between various arguments. These papers must be short—no paper shorter than 800 words or longer than 1,300 words will be accepted—so get to the main point fast. Students may choose for themselves when to write their papers, except that *students must submit at least one paper by the third class meeting*. Students may write as many as five papers; in calculating the course grade, only the three highest paper grades will be included. Papers are due in Professor Gamm's box in Harkness 314 by Monday morning at 10:00. No late papers will be accepted without prior permission.

Congressional history narrative (10%). In about 5 pages, students should examine an episode in congressional history, drawing heavily on primary sources. At minimum, students should draw on the *Congressional Record* (or earlier records of debates, like the *Annals* or the *Globe*) and on contemporary newspapers. The episode could be an event (like the outbreak of a war), consideration of a particular bill, a discussion of caucus proceedings or committee assignments, a leadership battle, a recent election, etc. *By February 20, students must meet with Professor Gamm, receive approval on their topic, and set a deadline for submitting this paper.*

Research paper (30%). This paper may be an extension of one of the three short papers, an extension of the congressional history narrative, or an entirely separate project. Undergraduates might review and analyze the secondary literature, with some attention to primary sources where appropriate. For graduate students, the paper should identify a modest research question, identify existing literature bearing on that question, and lay out a strategy for collecting and analyzing data. A review of secondary literature is not sufficient for graduate students; they must identify primary sources, sketch out a theory and possible hypotheses for testing, and otherwise outline a plan for future research. Graduate papers might report—briefly—on preliminary findings, but this is not required. The paper should be 10–15 pages in length. The paper is due April 24; incompletes are strongly discouraged and will not be given without good cause. *By February 20, students must meet with Professor Gamm and receive approval on their topic and approach.*

There is no exam.

Track Two: Undergraduates Not Receiving Writing Credit

Informed participation in weekly discussions (35%). See above.

Six short papers (55% total). In 3-4 pages, students should address a central question in the week's readings, critically evaluate the readings, or analyze underlying issues in the readings. These papers must be analytical: they should scrutinize the logic and evidence marshaled on behalf of an argument and, where appropriate, analyze the relationship between various arguments. These papers must be short—no paper shorter than 800 words or longer than 1,300 words will be accepted—so get to the main point fast. Students may choose for themselves when to write their papers, except that *students must submit papers in at least two of the first five weeks of the course*. Students may write as many as eight papers; in calculating the course grade, only the six highest paper grades will be included. Papers are due in Professor Gamm's box in Harkness 314 by Monday morning at 10:00. No late papers will be accepted without prior permission.

Congressional history narrative (10%). See above.

There is no exam.

Introduction

Jan. 19 *No class—Martin Luther King, Jr., Day*

Jan. 26 The Electoral Connection

David R. Mayhew, *Congress: The Electoral Connection* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1974).

Michael Les Benedict, "The Party, Going Strong: Congress and Elections in the Mid-19th Century," *Congress & the Presidency* 9 (1981–82), 37–60.

William T. Bianco, David B. Spence, and John D. Wilkerson, "The Electoral Connection in the Early Congress: The Case of the Compensation Act of 1816," *American Journal of Political Science* 40 (1996), 145–71.

Justin Grimmer, Solomon Messing, and Sean J. Westwood, "How Words and Money Cultivate a Personal Vote: The Effect of Legislator Credit Claiming on Constituent Credit Allocation," *American Political Science Review* 106 (2012), 703–19.

Part One: History and Development of the House of Representatives

Feb. 2 Careers and Committees

Nelson W. Polsby, "The Institutionalization of the U.S. House of Representatives," *American Political Science Review* 62 (1968), 144–68.

Nelson W. Polsby, Miriam Gallaher, and Barry Spencer Rundquist, "The Growth of the Seniority System in the U.S. House of Representatives," *American Political Science Review* 63 (1969), 787–807.

Douglas Price, "Careers and Committees in the American Congress: The Problem of Structural Change," 28–62 in William O. Aydelotte, ed., *The History of Parliamentary Behavior* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1977).

Samuel Kernell, "Toward Understanding 19th Century Congressional Careers: Ambition, Competition, and Rotation," *American Journal of Political Science* 21 (1977), 669–93.

Jonathan N. Katz and Brian R. Sala, "Careerism, Committee Assignments, and the Electoral Connection," *American Political Science Review* 90 (1996), 21–33.

Erik J. Engstrom, "Stacking the States, Stacking the House: The Partisan Consequences of Congressional Redistricting in the 19th Century," *American Political Science Review* 100 (2006), 419–27.

Feb. 9 Rules

Sarah A. Binder, *Minority Rights, Majority Rule: Partisanship and the Development of Congress* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1997).

Jason M. Roberts, "The Development of Special Orders and Special Rules in the U.S. House, 1881–1937," *Legislative Studies Quarterly* 35 (2010), 307–36.

Feb. 16 Leaders, Followers, and Insurgents
With Kenneth A. Shepsle (Harvard University)

- Charles O. Jones, "Joseph G. Cannon and Howard W. Smith: An Essay on the Limits of Leadership in the House of Representatives," *Journal of Politics* 30 (1968), pp. 617-46.
- Joseph Cooper and David W. Brady, "Institutional Context and Leadership Style: The House from Cannon to Rayburn," *American Political Science Review* 75 (1981), 411-25.
- David W. Rohde and Kenneth A. Shepsle, "Leaders and Followers in the House of Representatives: Reflections on Woodrow Wilson's *Congressional Government*," *Congress & the Presidency* 14 (1987), 111-33.
- Gerald Gamm and Kenneth A. Shepsle, "Emergence of Legislative Institutions: Standing Committees in the House and Senate, 1810-1825," *Legislative Studies Quarterly* 14 (1989), 39-66.
- Randall Strahan, *Leading Representatives: The Agency of Leaders in the Politics of the U.S. House* (Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 2007), 79-126.
- Ruth Bloch Rubin, "Organizing for Insurgency: Intraparty Organization and the Development of the House Insurgency, 1908-1910," *Studies in American Political Development* 27 (2013), 86-110.

Part Two: The "Textbook Congress" and the House Reforms of the 1970s

Feb. 23 Goals and Strategies

- Richard F. Fenno, Jr., *Congressmen in Committees* (1973; rpt. Berkeley: Institute of Governmental Studies Press, 1995).
- Justin Grimmer and Eleanor Neff Powell, "Congressmen in Exile: The Politics and Consequences of Involuntary Committee Removal," *Journal of Politics* 75 (2013), 907-20.

Mar. 2 Theories of Committees and Parties

- Kenneth A. Shepsle and Barry R. Weingast, "The Institutional Foundations of Committee Power," *American Political Science Review* 81 (1987), 85-104.
- Barry R. Weingast and William J. Marshall, "The Industrial Organization of Congress; or, Why Legislatures, Like Firms, Are Not Organized as Markets," *Journal of Political Economy* 96 (1988), 132-63.
- Keith Krehbiel, "Are Congressional Committees Composed of Preference Outliers?" *American Political Science Review* 84 (1990), 149-63.
- Gary W. Cox and Mathew D. McCubbins, "On the Decline of Party Voting in Congress," *Legislative Studies Quarterly* 16 (1991), 547-70.
- Gary W. Cox and Mathew D. McCubbins, "Bonding, Structure, and the Stability of Political Parties: Party Government in the House," *Legislative Studies Quarterly* 19 (1994), 215-31.
- Keith Krehbiel, "Where's the Party?" *British Journal of Political Science* 23 (1993), 235-66.

Mar. 9 No Class—Spring Recess

Mar 16 Civil Rights and the South

Ira Katznelson, *When Affirmative Action Was White: An Untold History of Racial Inequality in Twentieth-Century America* (New York: W.W. Norton, 2005).

Eric Schickler, Kathryn Pearson, and Brian D. Feinstein, "Congressional Parties and Civil Rights Politics from 1933 to 1972," *Journal of Politics* 72 (2010), 672-89.

Ira Katznelson and Quinn Mulroy, "Was the South Pivotal? Situated Partisanship and Policy Coalitions during the New Deal and Fair Deal," *Journal of Politics* 74 (2012), 604-20.

Jeffery A. Jenkins and Nathan W. Monroe, "Negative Agenda Control and the Conservative Coalition in the U.S. House," *Journal of Politics* 76 (2014), 1116-27.

Mar. 23 Congressional Reform

Kenneth A. Shepsle, "The Changing Textbook Congress," 238-66 in *Can the Government Govern?*, ed. John E. Chubb and Paul E. Peterson (Washington, D.C.: Brookings, 1989).

David W. Rohde, *Parties and Leaders in the Postreform House* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1991).

Part Three: History and Development of the Senate

Mar. 30 Parties and Leaders

Margaret Munk, "Origin and Development of the Party Floor Leadership in the United States Senate," *Capitol Studies* 2 (Winter 1974), 23-41.

Gerald Gamm and Steven S. Smith, "Last among Equals: The Senate's Presiding Officer," 105-34 in Burdett A. Loomis, ed., *Esteemed Colleagues: Civility and Deliberation in the U.S. Senate* (Washington: Brookings, 2000).

Gerald Gamm and Steven S. Smith, "Steering the Senate: The Consolidation of Senate Party Leadership, 1879-1913," chap. 4 in *Emergence of Senate Party Leadership*. Manuscript.

Gerald Gamm and Steven S. Smith, "Arthur Pue Gorman and the Origins of Senate Floor Leadership, 1890-1913," chap. 5 in *Emergence of Senate Party Leadership*. Manuscript.

Gerald Gamm and Steven S. Smith, "Elements of Leadership, 1890-1913," chap. 6 in *Emergence of Senate Party Leadership*. Manuscript.

Gerald Gamm and Steven S. Smith. "Emergence of the Modern Senate Floor Leader, 1913-1937," chap. 7 in *Emergence of Senate Party Leadership*. Manuscript.

Apr. 6 Statehood Politics and Direct Elections

- William H. Riker, "The Senate and American Federalism," *American Political Science Review* 49 (1955), 452–69.
- Charles Stewart III and Barry R. Weingast, "Stacking the Senate, Changing the Nation: Republican Rotten Boroughs, Statehood Politics, and American Political Development," *Studies in American Political Development* 6 (1992), 223–71.
- William Bernhard and Brian R. Sala, "The Remaking of an American Senate: The 17th Amendment and Ideological Responsiveness," *Journal of Politics* 68 (2006), 345-57.
- Sean Gailmard and Jeffery A. Jenkins, "Agency Problems, the 17th Amendment, and Representation in the Senate," *American Journal of Political Science* 53 (2009), 324-42.
- Wendy J. Schiller, Charles Stewart III, and Benjamin Xiong, "U.S. Senate Elections before the 17th Amendment: Political Party Cohesion and Conflict, 1871-1913," *Journal of Politics* 75 (2013), 835-47.

Part Four: The Partisan Revolution

Apr. 13 The Republican Revolution in the House

With John Aldrich (Duke University) and David Rohde (Duke University)

- Barbara Sinclair, *Party Wars: Polarization and the Politics of National Policy Making* (Norman, Okla.: University of Oklahoma Press, 2006), 3-184.
- John H. Aldrich and David W. Rohde, "The Republican Revolution and the House Appropriations Committee," *Journal of Politics* 62 (2000), 1-33.
- John H. Aldrich, Brittany N. Perry, and David W. Rohde, "Richard Fenno's Theory of Congressional Committees and the Partisan Polarization of the House," 193-220 in *Congress Reconsidered*, 10th ed., ed. Lawrence C. Dodd and Bruce I. Oppenheimer (Los Angeles: Sage and CQ Press, 2013).

Apr. 20 The Transformation of the Senate

- Donald R. Matthews, "The Folkways of the United States Senate: Conformity to Group Norms and Legislative Effectiveness," *American Political Science Review* 53 (1959), 1064-89.
- Barbara Sinclair, "Senate Styles and Senate Decision Making, 1955-1980," *Journal of Politics* 48 (1986), 877-908.
- Barbara Sinclair, *Party Wars: Polarization and the Politics of National Policy Making* (Norman, Okla.: University of Oklahoma Press, 2006), 185-233, 283-88.
- Steven S. Smith, *The Senate Syndrome: The Evolution of Procedural Warfare in the Modern U.S. Senate* (Norman, Okla.: University of Oklahoma Press, 2014), 207-51.
- Adam Bonica, "The Punctuated Origins of Senate Polarization," *Legislative Studies Quarterly* 39 (2014), 5-26.

Apr. 27 Party Polarization
With Morris Fiorina (Stanford University)

Gary C. Jacobson, "Partisan Polarization in American Politics: A Background Paper,"
Presidential Studies Quarterly 43 (2013), 688-708.

Alan I. Abramowitz, "The Electoral Roots of America's Dysfunctional Government,"
Presidential Studies Quarterly 43 (2013), 709-31.

Morris P. Fiorina with Samuel J. Abrams, *Disconnect: The Breakdown of Representation in American Politics* (Norman, Okla.: University of Oklahoma Press, 2009), 1-161.

Despite the obvious geographic importance of eastern Asia in human migration, its discussion in the context of the emergence and dispersal of modern humans has been rare. *Emergence and Diversity of Modern Human Behavior in Paleolithic Asia* focuses long-overdue scholarly attention on this under-studied area of the world. Arising from a 2011 symposium sponsored by the National Museum of Nature and Science in Tokyo, this book gathers the work of archaeologists from the Pacific Rim of Asia, Australia, and North America, to address the relative lack of attention given to the emergence of modern hum Congress and the Territorial Expansion of the United States. Nolan M. McCarty Columbia University. Keith T. Poole Carnegie-Mellon University. Howard Rosenthal Princeton University. 16 December, 1998.Â This was, in effect, the modern form of land ownership free of the old feudal. 4.Â a. Missouri and the Emergence of the Balance Rule The problem Missouri posed was that, although it was not a Deep South cotton producer, it had a large enough slave population (16.4%) to cause slavery proponents to seek its admission as a slave state. (It did have a smaller slave percentage of the population than any of the 11 slave states.)⁷ Missouri was sufficiently populated to seek admission, but there was no other newly settled northern area that could enter as a free state.