

**Political Science 217a/853a, U.S. National Elections  
Fall 2018, Wednesdays 1:30 – 3:20**

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

--office hours 3:30-5:00 Wednesdays or by appointment, at 87 Trumbull St.,  
top floor, Room D232 (in the ISPS complex, entrance at 77 Prospect St.)

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

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

**The course content.** Addressed will be a selection of topics associated with **U.S. national elections (presidential and congressional)**. **In all cases, U.S. history will be consulted** in a search for general patterns and to place today's politics in context. The material of the course is suitable for any student interested in understanding, or participating in, or doing journalistic coverage of, the electoral processes of the United States, but it is also an introduction to the kinds of research that political scientists undertake to study those processes. **Both the readings and the discussions will tilt toward political history, simple statistics, and proper nouns.** There will be a shortage of abstraction and statistical complexity. Topics to be addressed include party ideologies, voter participation, econometric analysis, homeostatic patterns in the electorate's behavior, incumbency advantage in presidential and congressional elections, districting and gerrymandering, voter balancing across institutions, voter policy blowback, the electoral college, partisan skew and dissonance, and the Trump-Clinton election in perspective. (Topics **not** to be addressed include campaign finance, presidential nominations, the social media, public opinion polls, the media, the conduct of campaigns, and the micro side of voter behavior.)

**The course mechanics.** This is a reading and discussion seminar. It will not accommodate senior essays or long research papers. There is a **heavy reading requirement each week**. Each undergraduate will write **a series of five analytic comment papers**, three to five pages in length. Each of these will address a required reading assignment chosen by the student to dwell on, and will be due at the start of the class covering that material. **These deadlines are a strict requirement.** At least two of these five papers will be written before Yale College's midterm date. Graduate students will write four of these papers plus, by the close of the fall reading period, an extended bibliographic essay on a suitable topic (which might be cross-national comparative) approved by the instructor. Students are expected to be ready to discuss the required readings in class. No midterm or final exams.

## August 29 – ORGANIZATION MEETING

## September 5 – HISTORICAL OVERVIEW

### Required:

David R. Mayhew, "Patterns in American Elections," ch. 21 in Richard M. Valelly, Suzanne Mettler & Robert C. Lieberman (eds.), The Oxford Handbook of American Political Development (Oxford University Press, 2016)

David R. Mayhew, "Which was the most important U.S. election ever?" Washington Post Outlook section, February 19, 2012, [https://www.washingtonpost.com/opinions/which-was-the-most-important-us-election-ever/2012/02/13/gIQAtBIGKR\\_story.html?utm\\_term=.1a995535fb33](https://www.washingtonpost.com/opinions/which-was-the-most-important-us-election-ever/2012/02/13/gIQAtBIGKR_story.html?utm_term=.1a995535fb33)

### Suggested:

Walter Dean Burnham, Critical Elections and the Mainsprings of American Politics (Norton, 1970). The canonical statement of the "electoral realignments theory" that is referred to at the start of the "patterns in American elections" piece above.

David R. Mayhew, "Electoral Realignments," Annual Review of Political Science 3 (2000), 449-74. A short summary critique of realignments theory.

David R. Mayhew, Electoral Realignments: A Critique of an American Genre (Yale University Press, 2002). A longer critique.

Daniel J. Gans, "Persistence of Party Success in American Presidential Elections," Journal of Interdisciplinary History 16 (1985), 221-37. A statistician. From 1856 through 1980. A "runs" analysis for presidential elections, as seen in the logic of flipping coins getting sequences of heads or tails. Across a century and a half, what is the "runs" record of D versus R holdings of the White House issuing from election victories?

Larry M. Bartels, "Electoral Continuity and Change, 1868-1996," Electoral Studies 17 (1998), 301-26. Patterns of continuity and discontinuity in the election returns.

Gary J. Kornblith, "Rethinking the Coming of the Civil War: A Counterfactual Enterprise," Journal of American History 90:1 (June 2003), 76-105. A model of smart counterfactual speculation. What if the close Polk-Clay election of 1844 had gone the other way? What happens regarding slavery or the Civil War?

Alan S. Blinder & Mark W. Watson, "Presidents and the US Economy: An Econometric Exploration," American Economic Review 106:4 (April 2016), 1015-45. Does it make any

difference which party wins an election and presides over the economy? State-of-the-art analysis as of early 2016.

Gary C. Jacobson, "The Triumph of Polarized Partisanship in 2016: Donald Trump's Improbable Victory," Political Science Quarterly 132:1 (2017), 9-51. A quick refresher, and a nice analytic overview of what happened.

## **September 12 – PARTY IDEOLOGIES**

### **Required:**

John Gerring, Party Ideologies in America, 1828-1996 (Cambridge University Press, 1998), chs. 1, 3-7. Available at Amazon in paperback or kindle, and at Yale Bookstore:

<https://tinyurl.com/YALE-PLSC-217-F18>

, used-book prices, or kindle.

Pew Research Center, "The Partisan Divide on Political Values Grows Even Wider: Sharp shifts among Democrats on aid to needy, race, immigration," October 5, 2017,

<http://assets.pewresearch.org/wp-content/uploads/sites/5/2017/10/05162647/10-05-2017-Political-landscape-release.pdf>

### **Suggested:**

Thomas B. Edsall, "The End of the Left and the Right as We Knew Them," New York Times, June 22, 2017, <https://www.nytimes.com/2017/06/22/opinion/nationalism-globalism-edsall.html>.

How about ideological categories in 2016?

James L. Huston, "The American Revolutionaries, the Political Economy of Aristocracy, and the American Concept of Distribution of Wealth, 1765-1900," American Historical Review 98 (1993), 1079-1105. More on the strange-to-us 19<sup>th</sup>-century Democrats.

Thomas Goebel, "The Political Economy of American Populism from Jackson to the New Deal," Studies in American Political Development 11 (1997), 109-48. A follow-up to the Huston piece.

Ronald D. Rotunda, The Politics of Language: Liberalism as Word and Symbol (University of Iowa Press, 1986). When and how did the terms "liberal" and "conservative" attain their primacy as U.S. political labels? Look to the 1930s and 1940s.

Norman Luttbeg & Michael M. Grant, "The Failure of Liberal/Conservative ideology as a Cognitive Structure," Public Opinion Quarterly 49:1 (Spring 1985), 80-93. Ignore the title. This piece has some good basic information about what voters think the labels mean—at least what

they thought then in the 1980s: the usages have evolved somewhat. But this is a nice kind of analysis.

Christopher Ellis & James A. Stimson, "Symbolic Ideology in the American Electorate," Electoral Studies 28 (2009), 388-402. Liberal? Conservative? Since the 1930s, how has the public rated those labels? First-rate time-series analysis.

## **September 19 – PARTICIPATION**

### **Required:**

Charles A. Kromkowski, "Why Has Voter Turnout Declined? Because It Has Not: American Electoral Turnout Rates, 1776-2001," paper presented at the annual conference of the Midwest Political Science Association, April 2001.

Chart updating the Kromkowski chart (page 11, above) to include the 2004, 2008, and 2012 elections.

Richard H. Pildes, "Why the Center Does Not Hold: The Causes of Hyperpolarized Democracy in America," California Law Review 99:2 (April 2011), 273-333. Read pages 287-97.

Markus Prior & Lori D. Bougher, "'Like They've Never, Ever Seen in This Country'? Political Interest and Voter Engagement in 2016," Public Opinion Quarterly 82 (special issue 2018), 236-256.

### **Suggested:**

Charles A. Kromkowski, "Electoral Participation and Democracy in Comparative-Historical and Cross-National Perspective: A New Conceptualization and Evaluation of Voting in Advanced and Developing Democracies, 1776-2002," paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Political Science Association, Philadelphia, August 31, 2003. An expanded version of Kromkowski's 2001 MWPA paper.

Stanley L. Engerman & Kenneth L. Sokoloff, "The Evolution of Suffrage Institutions in the New World," Journal of Economic History 65:4 (September 2005), 891-921. Pretty much white males only. High U.S. participation rate around 1800.

Donald Ratcliffe, "The Right to Vote and the Rise of Democracy, 1787-1828," Journal of the Early Republic 33:2 (Summer 2013), 219-54. Again, white males. Recent research has pushed the U.S.'s record of relatively high 19<sup>th</sup>-century voting participation backwards in time. The picture doesn't look as 1830s-Jacksonian as it used to.

Walter D. Burnham, "The Changing Shape of the American Political Universe," American Political Science Review 59:1 (March 1965), 7-28. Influential presentation of several time series addressing the middle half, more or less, of U.S. history. Dwells on the lasting turnout slump beginning around 1900.

Michael P. McDonald & Samuel L. Popkin, "The Myth of the Vanishing Voter," American Political Science Review 95:4 (December 2001), 963-74. This is an excellent measurement piece. What should be used as a denominator in tracking voter turnout? See also a follow-up piece: Michael P. McDonald, "The Myth of the Vanishing Voter in Comparative Perspective," paper presented at the annual conference of the Midwest Political Science Association, Chicago, April 22-25, 2010.

Jack Citrin, Eric Schickler & John Sides, "What if Everyone Voted? Simulating the Impact of Increased Turnout in Senate Elections," American Journal of Political Science 47 (2003), 75-90. Another smart dose of counterfactual speculation.

Jesse T. Richman, Gulshan A. Chattha & David C. Earnest, "Do non-citizens vote in U.S. elections?" Electoral Studies 36 (2014), 149-57. Well, maybe a bit.

Andrew B. Hall & Daniel M. Thompson, "Who Punishes Extremist Nominees? Candidate Ideology and Turning Out the Base in U.S. Elections," online paper July 20, 2017. New paper. Voter turnout uptick among the base of party B gives special November headaches to extremists nominated by party A.

## **SEPTEMBER 26 – ECONOMETRIC ANALYSIS**

### **Required:**

Larry M. Bartels & John Zaller, "Presidential Vote Models: A Recount," PS: Political Science and Politics 34 (2001), 9-20

D. Roderick Kiewiet & Michael Udell, "Twenty-five Years after Kramer: An Assessment of Economic Retrospective Voting Based upon Improved Estimates of Income and Unemployment," Economics and Politics 10: (November 1998), 219-47

### **Suggested:**

Robert S. Erikson, "The American Voter and the Economy, 2008," PS: Political Science and Politics 42:3 (July 2009), 467-71. Regarding a particular event. How did the Wall Street crash of September 2008 feed into the presidential election of November 2008? Here is some illuminating time-series analysis.

James E. Campbell et al., "A Recap of the Election Forecasts," PS: Political Science and Politics 50:2 (April 2017). Election forecasting is a special kind of enterprise. Here, several political scientists look back at their pre-election forecasts for 2016.

**October 3 – HOMEOSTASIS (that is, election-induced control of the government bounces around the median voter to left and right, in an evolving equilibrium, by way of the victorious parties' ideological overshoot once in office and voters' compensatory adjustment)**

**Required:**

James A. Stimson, Michael B. Mackuen & Robert S. Erikson, "Dynamic Representation," American Political Science Review 89:3 (September 1995), 543-65

Morris P. Fiorina, "The Temptation to Overreach," ch. 5 in Fiorina, Unstable Majorities: Polarization, Party Sorting & Political Stalemate (Hoover Institution Press, 2017)

**Suggested:**

Suzanna De Boef & James A. Stimson, "The Dynamic Structure of Congressional Elections," Journal of Politics, 57:3 (August 1995), 630-48. A companion piece to SM&E above.

Robert S. Erikson, Michael B. Mackuen & James A. Stimson, The Macro Polity (Cambridge University Press, 2002). The full statement of the SM&E project. Has a chapter that builds congressional enactments into the model.

Joseph Bafumi & Michael C. Herron, "Leapfrog Representation: A Study of American Voters and Their Members in Congress," American Political Science Review 104:3 (August 2010), 519-42. A U.S. House election lofts to power a party whose MCs are to the left, or to the right, of the U.S. median voter or the median voter of either party. This piece jibes with the Stimson et al. model.

HeeMin Kim, G. Bingham Powell, Jr. & Richard C. Fording, "Electoral Systems, Party Systems, and Ideological Representation: An Analysis of Distortion in Western Democracies," Comparative Politics 42:2 (January 2010), 167-85. Parties in single-member-district systems like the US's or the UK's tend to overshoot ideologically in their policy positioning once they win elections.

Donald E. Stokes, "On the Existence of Forces Restoring Party Competition," Public Opinion Quarterly 26:2 (Summer 1962), 159-71. Classic statement of the electoral equilibrium idea.

## October 10 – PERSONAL INCUMBENCY ADVANTAGE

### Required:

David R. Mayhew, "Incumbency Advantage in Presidential Elections: The Historical Record," Political Science Quarterly 123:2 (Summer 2008), 201-28

Anthony Fowler & Andrew B. Hall, "Long-Term Consequences of Election Results," British Journal of Political Science 47 (2015), 351-72

### Suggested:

Christopher H. Achen, "A Baseline for Incumbency Effects," ch. 5 in Alan S. Gerber & Eric Schickler (eds.), Governing in a Polarized Age: Elections, Parties, and Political Representation in America (Cambridge University Press, 2017). An impressive model. Why might it be that U.S. presidential parties do better (on average) when they run incumbent candidates?

David Samuels, "Presidentialism and Accountability for the Economy in Comparative Perspective," American Political Science Review 98:3 (August 2004), 425-36. Net of all else, parties profit electorally in a range of presidential systems, not just the USA's, by running incumbent presidential candidates.

David R. Mayhew, "The Meaning of the 2012 Election," ch. 9 in Michael Nelson (ed.), The Elections of 2012 (Sage, 2014). Sights a likely ingoing personal incumbency bonus for candidates at all levels—presidency, Senate, House—in the election of 2012.

Robert S. Erikson, "The Congressional Incumbency Advantage over Sixty Years: Measurement, Trends, and Implications," ch. 4 in Alan S. Gerber & Eric Schickler (eds.), Governing in a Polarized Age: Elections, Parties, and Political Representation in America (Cambridge University Press, 2017).

Stephen Ansolabehere & James W. Snyder, Jr., "Incumbency Advantage in U.S. Elections: An Analysis of State and Federal Offices, 1942-2000," Election Law Journal 1:3 (2002), 315-38. Sweeping data for a large range of offices. Generally speaking, there was an uptick in personal incumbency advantage all across the ballot in the decades after World War II.

Markus Prior, "The Incumbent in the Living Room: The Rise of Television and the Incumbency Advantage in U.S. House Elections," Journal of Politics 68:3 (August 2006), 657-73. A boost for the ins in the 1950s or so, apparently.

Steven Ansolabehere, David W. Brady & Morris P. Fiorina, "The Vanishing Marginals and Electoral Responsiveness," British Journal of Political Science 22:1 (January 1992), 21-38. Personal incumbency advantage that loaded onto their members apparently helped cement the

Democrats into continuous control of the U.S. House during the forty-year-span of 1954-1994 (no exceptions, even in the GOP-tilting years of 1968, 1972, and 1984).

John Zaller, "Politicians as Prize Fighters," in John G. Geer (ed.), Politicians and Party Politics (Johns Hopkins University Press, 1998). Classic statement of the idea (employed in the Achen piece cited above) that incumbents are on average better candidates than challengers. That's why they win—at least, it's one reason.

Anthony Fowler, "What Explains Incumbent Success? Disentangling Selection on Party, Selection on Candidate Characteristics, and Office-Holding Benefits," Quarterly Journal of Political Science 11 (2016), 313-338. Analysts have worried this difficult question for years. Theory and empirics figure in the mix. This is a smart, state-of-the-art statement.

## **October 24 – DISTRICTING AND GERRYMANDERING**

### **Required:**

Jowei Chen & Jonathan Rodden, "Unintentional Gerrymandering: Political Geography and Electoral Bias in Legislatures," Quarterly Journal of Political Science 8 (2013), 239-69

Jowei Chen & David Cottrell, "Evaluating partisan gains from Congressional gerrymandering: Using computer simulations to estimate the effect of gerrymandering in the U.S. House," Electoral Studies 44 (2016), 329-40

### **Suggested:**

Nolan McCarty, Keith T. Poole & Howard Rosenthal, "Does Gerrymandering Cause Polarization?" American Journal of Political Science 53:3 (July 2009), 666-80. In Congress, that is. The answer: no.

Alan I. Abramowitz, Brad Alexander & Matthew Gunning, "Redistricting, and the Decline of Competition in U.S. House Elections," Journal of Politics 68:1 (February 2006), 75-88. Has redistricting made U.S. House seats less competitive? The answer: no (at least not through the date of this publication).

David Samuels & Richard Snyder, "The Value of a Vote: Malapportionment in Comparative Perspective," British Journal of Political Science 1:4 (October 2001), 651-71. How do the U.S. House and Senate compare with other representative bodies around the world? The Senate is way off the world norm.

**October 31 – VOTER BALANCING (either as a voter intention, or as a product somehow of staggered terms across the House, Senate, and presidency)**

Robert S. Erikson, "The Puzzle of Midterm Loss," Journal of Politics 50:4 (November 1988), 1011-29

Robert S. Erikson, "Congressional Elections in Presidential Years: Presidential Coattails and Strategic Voting," Legislative Studies Quarterly, 41:3 (August 2016), 551-74

Bernard Grofman, Thomas L. Brunell & William Koetzle, "Why Gain in the Senate but Midterm Loss in the House? Evidence from a Natural Experiment," Legislative Studies Quarterly 23:1 (February 1998), 79-89

**Suggested:**

Morris P. Fiorina, Divided Government (Longman, 2<sup>nd</sup> ed., 2002). A section of this book is the locus classicus on the theory of intentional voter balancing.

Matthew S. Shugart, "The Electoral Cycle and Institutional Sources of Divided Presidential Government," American Political Science Review 89:2 (June 1995), 327-343. What is the story for midterms (or for other between-presidential-elections contests if not exactly midterms) in other presidential systems?

Holger Lutz Kern & Jens Hainmueller, "Electoral Balancing, Divided Government, and 'Midterm' Loss in German Elections," Journal of Legislative Studies 12:2 (June 2006), 297-312. Also very illuminating.

David R. Mayhew (with Matthew Bettinger), "What can Obama expect from his last Congress?" Washington Post (Monkey Cage), July 9, 2014. After a two-term president's second midterm, what does the politics look like?, <https://www.washingtonpost.com/news/monkey-cage/wp/2014/07/09/what-can-obama-expect-from-his-last-congress/>

David R. Smith & Thomas L. Brunell, "Special Elections to the U.S. House of Representatives: A General Election Barometer?" Legislative Studies Quarterly 35:2 (May 2010), 283-297. Well, yes, a bit on average anyway, especially if the special elections bring party seat turnovers (rather than just percentage changes in the vote). Dataset 1900 through 2008.

Brian Knight, "An Econometric Evaluation of Competing Explanations for the Midterm Gap," Quarterly Journal of Political Science 12 (2017), 205-239. This is a skilled, up-to-date probe into the various causes of the House midterm gap.

## November 7 – PERFORMANCE BLOWBACK

### Required:

David W. Brady, Morris P. Fiorina & Arjun W. Wilkins, “The 2010 Elections: Why Did Political Science Forecasts Go Awry?” PS: Political Science and Politics 44:2 (April 2011), 247-50

Gary C. Jacobson, “The 1994 House Elections in Perspective,” Political Science Quarterly 111:2 (Summer 1996), 203-223

Christian R. Grose & Bruce I. Openheimer, “The Iraq War, Partisanship, and Candidate Attributes: Variation in Party Swing in the 2006 U.S. House Elections,” Legislative Studies Quarterly 32:4 (November 2007), 531-57

### Suggested:

Brendan Nyhan, Eric McGhee, John Sides, Seth Masket & Steven Greene, “One Vote Out of Step? The Effects of Salient Roll Call Votes in the 2010 Election,” American Politics Research 40:5 (2012), 844-79. Findings similar to Brady et al.’s on the 2010 midterm.

Gary C. Jacobson, “The Republican Resurgence in 2010,” Political Science Quarterly 126:1 (Spring 2011), 27-52. Findings similar to Brady et al.’s on the 2010 midterm.

John Ferejohn, “A Tale of Two Congresses: Social Policy in the Clinton Years,” ch. 2 in Margaret Weir (ed.), The Social Divide: Political Parties and the Future of Activist Government (Brookings, 1998). Findings similar to Jacobson’s on the 1994 midterm. Also, the better that Republican House members voted lockstep for the provisions of Newt Gingrich’s “Contract with America” during the Congress of 1995-96, the worse they fared in the election of 1996.

Douglas L. Kriner & Francis X. Shen, “Iraq Casualties and the 2006 Senate Elections,” Legislative Studies Quarterly 32:4 (November 2007), 507-30. Findings similar to Grose/Oppenheimer’s on the 2006 midterm, but for Senate rather than House.

Jamie L. Carson, Jeffery A. Jenkins, David W. Rohde & Mark A Souva, “The Impact of National Tides and District-Level Effects on Electoral Outcomes: The U.S. Congressional Elections of 1862-63,” American Journal of Political Science 45:4 (October 2001), 887-98. Across the districts, the in-party Republicans’ fortunes varied inversely with Civil War casualties.

Alan I. Abramowitz, “It’s Monica, Stupid: The Impeachment Controversy and the 1998 Midterm Election,” Legislative Studies Quarterly 16:2 (May 2001), 211-26. Voter blowback against the Republican majority party in the House bent on impeaching Bill Clinton.

**November 14 – THE ELECTORAL COLLEGE. So what, the Electoral College? There is an interesting history of odd, complicated, or vexed elections. Those include 1800, 1824, 1860, 1876, 1884, 1888, 1916, 1960, 2000, and 2016.**

**Required:**

Brian J. Gaines, “Popular Myths about Popular Vote-Electoral College Splits,” PS: Political Science and Politics 34:1 (March 2001), 71-75. On the popular vote in the Kennedy/Nixon election of 1960.

Edward B. Foley, Ballot Battles: The History of Disputed Elections in the United States (Oxford University Press, 2016), pp. 217-228. On the electoral vote in the Kennedy/Nixon election.

Jonathan N. Wand, Kenneth W. Shotts, Jasjeet S. Sekhon, Walter R. Mebane, Jr., Michael C. Herron & Henry E. Brady, “The Butterfly Did It: The Aberrant Vote for Buchanan in Palm Beach County, Florida,” American Political Science Review 95:4 (December 2001), 793-810. A hinge feature in the Bush/Gore election of 2000.

**Suggested:**

James Roger Sharp, The Deadlocked Election of 1800: Jefferson, Burr, and the Union in the Balance (University Press of Kansas, 2010), chs. 8-10

Jeffery A. Jenkins & Brian R. Sala, “The Spatial Theory of Voting and the Presidential Election of 1824,” American Journal of Political Science 42:4 (October 1998), 1157-79. On the J.Q. Adams/Jackson et al. election resolved by the U.S. House.

Alexander Taborrok & Lee Spector, “Would the Borda Count Have Avoided the Civil War?” Journal of Theoretical Politics 11:2 (1999), 261-88. On the Lincoln election of 1860.

Ronald F. King, “Hayes Truly Won: A Revisionist Analysis of the 1876 Electoral Vote in Louisiana, South Carolina, and Florida,” paper presented at the annual conference of the APSA, 2000, and apparently not published subsequently. But King did publish papers on two of those states’ gubernatorial elections in 1876, which very likely matched what went down at the presidential level in the two states: “Counting the Votes: South Carolina’s Stolen Election of 1876,” Journal of Interdisciplinary History 32:2 (Autumn 2001), 169-91; “A Most Corrupt Election: Louisiana in 1876,” Studies in American Political Development 15 (Fall 2001), 123-37. The Hayes-Tilden election of 1876 is the one that was resolved by a commission.

Sources that back up Brian J. Gaines on the Kennedy/Nixon election of 1960: Neal R. Peirce, The People’s President (Simon & Schuster, 1968), pp. 102-07; George C. Edwards III, Why the Electoral College Is Bad for America (Yale University Press, 2004), pp. 48-51.

Edmund F. Kallina, "Was the 1960 Presidential Election Stolen? The Case of Illinois," Presidential Studies Quarterly 15 (Winter 1985), 113-18. Also: Kallina, "The State's Attorney and the President: The Inside Story of the 1960 Presidential Election in Illinois," Journal of American Studies 12:2 (August 1978), 147-60.

M. C. Herron & J. S. Sekhon, "Overvoting and representation: an examination of overvoted presidential ballots in Broward and Miami-Dade counties," Electoral Studies 22 (2003), 21-47. More on messy Florida in 2000.

Ronald E. Adkins & Kent A. Kirwan, "What Role Does the 'Federalism Bonus' Play in Presidential Selection?" Publius 32:4 (Autumn 2002), 71-90. "Federalism Bonus" means the extra (so to speak) two Electoral Votes that each state gets thanks to its senator count. A canvass of U.S. history.

### **November 28 – PARTISAN SKEW AND DISSONANCE IN THE SYSTEM**

#### **Required:**

#### **Required:**

David R. Mayhew, Partisan Balance: Why Political Parties Don't Kill the U.S. Constitutional System (Princeton University Press, 2011), pages xiii-xiv and chapter 1.

Two new charts that update Tables 1.3 and 1.4 (in the book above) to include the elections of 2012 and 2016

### **December 5 – THE TRUMP-CLINTON ELECTION IN PERSPECTIVE**

#### **Required:**

David Byler, "Demographic Coalitions: How Trump Picked the Lock and Won the Presidency," ch. 2 in Larry Sabato, Kyle Kondik & Geoffrey Skelley (eds.), Trumped: The 2016 Election that Broke All the Rules (Rowman & Littlefield, 2017)

Sean Trende, "The 'Emerging Democratic Majority' Fails to Emerge," ch. 14 in Larry Sabato et al., Trumped.

Courtney Kennedy plus twelve other experts appointed as an ad hoc committee of the American Association for Public Opinion Research (AAPOR), "An Evaluation of the 2016 Election Polls in the United States," Public Opinion Quarterly 82:1 (Spring 2018), 1-33

#### **Suggested:**

John B. Judis & Ruy Teixeira, The Emerging Democratic Majority (Scribner, 2002), ch. 2 (“George McGovern’s Revenge: Who’s in the Emerging Democratic Majority”). Judis & Teixeira were the leading proponents of the idea of an “emerging Democratic majority.”

John Sides, Michael Tesler & Lynn Vavreck, “The 2016 Election: How Trump Lost and Won,” Journal of Democracy 28:2 (April 2017), 34-44. Brief zippy accessible piece. The education divide, the immigration issue.

David Cottrell, Michael C. Herron & Sean J. Westwood, “An exploration of Donald Trump’s allegations of massive voter fraud in the 2016 General Election,” Electoral Studies 51 (2018), 123-142. No evidence of fraud.

Larry M. Bartels, “Partisanship in the Trump Era,” online Working Paper 2-2018, February 7, 2018. Deft investigation of many issue ingredients.

Nicholas Jacobs & James W. Ceaser, “The 2016 Presidential Election by the Numbers and in Historical Perspective,” The Forum 14:4 (2016), 361-383. Good summary piece.

For those with a keen interest in political geography, there exists a set of very nice county-level maps, in color, comparing 2016 with previous elections:

Sean Trende & David Byler, “How Trump Won” – The South, The West, The Northeast, The Midwest, and a wrapup, at RealClearPolitics (online)

January 16, 2017 - The South

[https://www.realclearpolitics.com/articles/2017/01/16/how\\_trump\\_won\\_the\\_south\\_132796.html](https://www.realclearpolitics.com/articles/2017/01/16/how_trump_won_the_south_132796.html)

January 17 – The West

[https://www.realclearpolitics.com/articles/2017/01/17/how\\_trump\\_won\\_the\\_west\\_132803.html](https://www.realclearpolitics.com/articles/2017/01/17/how_trump_won_the_west_132803.html)

January 18 – The Northeast

[https://www.realclearpolitics.com/articles/2017/01/18/how\\_trump\\_won\\_the\\_northeast\\_132827.html](https://www.realclearpolitics.com/articles/2017/01/18/how_trump_won_the_northeast_132827.html)

January 19 – The Midwest

[https://www.realclearpolitics.com/articles/2017/01/19/how\\_trump\\_won\\_the\\_midwest\\_132834.html](https://www.realclearpolitics.com/articles/2017/01/19/how_trump_won_the_midwest_132834.html)

January 20 – Conclusions

[https://www.realclearpolitics.com/articles/2017/01/20/how\\_trump\\_won\\_-\\_conclusions\\_132846.html](https://www.realclearpolitics.com/articles/2017/01/20/how_trump_won_-_conclusions_132846.html)