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Required Texts


Useful for Background


David Ray Griffin and Peter Dale Scott, editors, 9/11 and American Empire: Intellectuals Speak Out,


Course Conceptualization

This course is on “policy development.” Scholarship in this domain of inquiry is wide-ranging and employs many different approaches. It includes program evaluation, legislative compliance auditing, and studies of agenda setting, policy formulation, sub-governments, issue networks, and more.

The “policy orientation” generally conceives of government activity as problem-solving. Policy is assumed to evolve as new programs are developed and ineffective programs are weeded out through a recursive process of policy “formulation,” “implementation,” and “evaluation.” The policy orientation further assumes that policy learning takes place in a plethora of specialized arenas or “policy areas” that are separate, distinct, and largely independent of one another. This conceptualization of government activity is seldom questioned by policy scholars and policy analysts, who themselves tend to specialize in particular policy areas.

However, the policy orientation actually originated in doubts about modern democracy, especially democracy in the United States. Scholars wanted to know whether the initiatives of American government are in some sense started, directed, or at least limited by the political actions of the citizenry. In short, the founders of the field asked if American government is truly democratic, and they proposed the policy orientation as a way both to investigate the issue and to make government activity purposive and accountable. The policy orientation also offers insight into tensions between what officials say and what they do, and between what they want to do and what the Constitution allows.

The extent of democracy in America came into question for many reasons, but probably the most important are the vast and continuing bureaucratization of American government and the nation’s inclinations toward imperialism. Neither the framers of the U.S. Constitution nor the founders of modern democratic theory anticipated, much less advocated, government by administration, either domestically or internationally. They wanted a government small in size and limited in scope that would avoid “foreign entanglements,” and they expected checks and balances, separation of powers, codified citizen rights, and other institutional mechanisms to yield this result.

Unexpected in theory and therefore unimpeded by the framework of the U.S. Constitution, bureaucratization and imperialism pose serious challenges to democratic
theory and practice. The main theoretical difficulty is explaining how, if at all, the decisions of America government can truly reflect the citizenry’s wishes when more and more power is invested in administrative agencies. A related practical problem is determining how to keep administrative agencies—especially the military and police—under popular control.

The discipline of public administration has a schizophrenic relationship with these theoretical and practical problems of American democracy. On the one hand, the discipline embraces bureaucratization, at least in a certain form. The discipline originated in a vision of how bureaucracy could best serve democracy. The vision was first proposed by Woodrow Wilson, who conceived of the administrative aspects of government as unanticipated but nevertheless essential elements of popular sovereignty. In his view, democracies employ soldiers, police officers, fire fighters, and other workers to carry out the mandates of the citizenry. Hence for Wilson the proliferation and expansion of administered functions in modern democracies was not a problem in itself; it reflected the many needs and wants of a diverse citizenry.

From this perspective, large numbers of government employees are problematic only because public employees can be diverted to serve private ends and dominant groups. To prevent this, Wilson concluded that public administration must be placed in some manner under the direction of the citizenry as a whole. He advocated professionalizing the civil service, creating clear administrative hierarchies, and restructuring electoral and legislative processes so that elected officials would focus on policy and stay out of administration. Wilson’s vision of bureaucratic democracy is expressed most clearly in the council-manager form of municipal government, which was formulated and popularized during Wilson’s presidency. Wilson’s instrumental model of public administration continues to guide much public administration scholarship, if only as foil. It is also implicit in performance management, zero-based budgeting, management by objectives, and other policy-oriented administrative systems emphasizing accountability.

On the other hand, even though they are wedded to bureaucracy as a subject matter and therefore have a vested interest in bureaucracy’s care and development, scholars of public administration have become increasingly critical of the instrumental model of bureaucratic democracy, because they have found it to be hard to fulfill in practice. Much research since Wilson has shown that the links between voter preferences, legislative decisions, and administrative action are weak at best. Moreover, efforts to tighten them with reporting requirements, performance measures, benchmarks, etc., are often worse than ineffective; they exacerbate the “goal-displacement” tendencies of large organizations. The history of public administration for the past century has been devoted largely to trying to discover how to make bureaucracy compatible with democracy, either by formulating a new vision of bureaucracy that would work better in practice, by devising new administrative techniques to fulfill the original vision, or by finding ways for restricting bureaucracy to tasks amendable to bureaucratic processes.
However, this line of theory, research, and administrative reform has a number of weaknesses, and alternatives to it are beginning to be proposed, considered, and tried out. Perhaps the most glaring weakness of mainstream thinking in public administration is its inattention to the relationship between bureaucratization and militarization. The United States has long used military force as an instrument of foreign policy, and the public resources devoted to war and preparation for war constitute by far the single largest expenditure by American government. Moreover, this preoccupation with military might affects virtually all of government and much of everyday life in the larger society. Military spending fosters monopolization in the economy, violence in the culture, and manipulation-oriented inquiry in the academy.

And yet the discipline of public administration pays virtually no attention to America’s militarization. Worse, the discipline is largely unaware of its disciplinary blind spot. It senses the unseen only when questions arise near the field’s foundations. One of these questions is whether American government is in truth democratic.

**Course Readings**

The course readings address this question from a variety of perspectives. We will begin by reading *How Democratic Is the American Constitution?* by Robert Dahl, who has long been the most influential democratic theorist in the United States. Dahl suggests that the authors of the Constitution had little experience with representative government and made many mistakes when framing the nation’s political institutions. While reading Dahl’s text, students should skim the Declaration of Independence, the United States Constitution, and other foundational documents listed in the course outline below.

The initial readings also include several articles by Harold Lasswell on the “policy orientation” and the “garrison state.” Lasswell was a 20th Century social scientist who argued that all modern industrial societies are increasingly organized for purposes of warfare and are therefore becoming less and less democratic. He called for “policy sciences of democracy” which would evaluate the intentions, actions, and effects of government with reference to explicit values, especially respect for human dignity.

To give currency to Lasswell’s concerns about potential tensions between militarism and democracy, we will examine policy development in the war on terror. The Constitution says Congress is responsible for declaring war, whereas the President is commander in chief of the armed forces “when called into the actual Service of the United States.” However, Congress has not declared war since World War II for fear that it would unleash nuclear weapons. Instead, Congress has authorized the President to conduct limited military actions at his discretion. This policy deviates from the Constitutional framework and has, from the Korean War forward, resulted in muddled decision-making and political conflict. Initial readings to observe this problematic pattern in policy making include the 2001 Congressional resolution authorizing the President to use military force against those responsible for the 9/11 attacks, and the 2002 Congressional resolution authorizing the invasion of Iraq.
Having introduced the policy orientation and delineated some contemporary tensions between law and policy, we turn next to scholarly assessments of American democracy. The next three assigned readings are excerpts from the most important books written about American democracy in the 20th Century: The Power Elite, Who Governs, and Legitimation Crisis. These books were published in the 1960s and 1970s, when social scientists last engaged in a wide-ranging debate about whether American government is democratic. The readings lay out important theories and evidence, but they serve other functions as well. They demonstrate that answers to empirical questions about policy development have important implications for political action, policy research, and rhetoric. The texts also provide insight into the thinking, doubts, and hopes behind the bureaucratization and militarization of American democracy in the post-World War II era.

In the 1960s, out of many possible positions that could have been adopted in response to questions about American democracy, two quickly became dominant. One was referred to, somewhat misleadingly, as elitism, the other as pluralism. The former was formulated by C. Wright Mills in The Power Elite, which claimed that political power in the United States is effectively controlled by a relatively small group of wealthy elites who circulate between top positions in government and business. The principal alternative position voiced against elitism was stated first, if not best, by Robert Dahl in Who Governs?, which argued that government decisions are influenced by many different groups and that groups coalesce along different lines depending on the issues at stake.

Despite the importance of the issue and the excellent scholarship devoted to it, the debate between elitism and pluralism was never fully resolved. In part, the issue was redefined, and in part it was simply abandoned. In any event, the question of who governs, once central to political inquiry, fell off the research agenda of mainstream political science by the late 1970s. We will try to understand what happened by examining a number of journal articles and book chapters that appeared after Dahl’s and Mills’ seminal works. One of the most important of these is the Preface written by Robert Dahl and Charles Lindblom in 1974 for the re-release of their 1947 book, Politics, Economics, and Welfare. In it, Dahl and Lindblom concede that American government is not as responsive and pluralistic as they had assumed in 1947, and they suggest ways in which pluralist political theory might be modified and salvaged.

The earlier debate between Dahl and Mills faded from interest in the late 1960s to a large extent because it was eclipsed by the work of Jurgen Habermas, a German philosopher and political scientist who single-handedly reoriented the social sciences to a new constellation of issues. We will read a summery of Legitimation Crisis, which presents a crisis theory of history along with an analysis of the crisis tendencies in modern industrial societies.

Legitimation Crisis brought an end to the debate between Dahl and Mills, because it subsumed both of their positions within a more comprehensive theory. The
new theory came to be called “critical theory.” It redefined the landscape of political inquiry by pointing to an inherent but unconscious demand for democracy within the expanding consciousness of the human species. Habermas discovered a democratic imperative in the presuppositions of speech. He reminded social scientists that there is a universally recognized tendency for people to feel bound by their promises, to give reasons for their beliefs and actions, and to accede to the better arguments and more justifiable claims of others. Habermas argued that communication has this normative character because speech presupposes that human beings are reasonable creatures. As speaking animals, Habermas explained, human beings assume they can give reasons for their actions, and they presuppose that others should be able to account for their actions similarly. According to Habermas, even when persons are not consciously forming intentions but are, instead, just obeying rules or following social conventions, they generally assume that these rules and norms could be justified in the same way. This is why most people experience various forms of psychic discomfort (guilt, anxiety, depression, etc.) if they deceive someone, break laws, or defy conventions; by denying the presuppositions of speech, such actions violate basic tenets of people’s identities as human beings.

Of course, Habermas acknowledged that there are many areas of activity where these expectations are suspended--where, for example, rules are proscribed from questioning and commands are to be followed without hesitation--but he pointed out that even in these cases the range of activity exempted from communicative challenge and the need for the exemption have themselves been discursively decided and remain open to reconsideration. In fact, it was for these kinds of situations, where actions come into question and norms are reconsidered, that Habermas used the word discourse. He observed that formal systems of public discourse--such as judicial hearings, legislative processes, and political debates--as well as the informal public discourse conducted in the mass media, have this form and function, that is, they deal with previously routine activities that have become problematic and contested, and they are designed to adjust the rules and return the activity to normalcy.

Habermas’ conception of government and politics is referred to as critical theory, because it begins from an ideal conception of public discourse and then evaluates existing discursive processes against it to explain a variety of social and political problems. Of particular significance to the debate between Dahl and Mills, the theory implies that American government falls far short of true democracy, but that its shortcomings bring citizens’ democratic expectations to consciousness, which in turn pushes democratization forward. Thus critical theory redefined the research agenda on American democracy by directing attention to the unarticulated convictions and spontaneous reactions of mass publics when they are governed undemocratically. An example of this subject matter, which, although present all along, had gone unnoticed until critical theory brought it into focus, is the strange character of political legitimacy, e.g., the suddenness with which legitimacy can evaporate, the necessity for governments to constantly justify their actions to mass publics, and the potential for deficits of legitimacy to cause the collapse of powerful regimes (e.g., the Nixon Administration) and the dissolution of powerful empires (e.g., the Soviet Union).
In recent years, both Dahl and Lindblom have returned to the earlier debate, albeit tangentially. Dahl’s most recent book is *How Democratic Is the American Constitution?*, in which he took up the topic by comparing American government to other forms of modern democracy. Lindblom’s most recent book is *The Market System: What It Is, How It Works, and What to Make of It*. It is the latest of several since the mid-1970s in which he has examined democracy’s relationship to private enterprise market systems. He argues that the latter are both necessary for and threatening to democratic governance.

For his part, Habermas has pursued two main lines of theorizing. One focuses on his transcendental analysis of language, or what he refers to as “the theory of communicative action.” Habermas refined this theory and elaborated its implications for the study of politics, society, history, and human psychology. His other area of interest has been the history of social and political theory, which he has reconstructed in a two-volume work to show where and why the “linguistic turn” in political inquiry occurred.

The required text by Sheldon Wolin is the most insightful analysis of American democracy published since the end of the Cold War and the beginning of the War on Terror, and the first comprehensive effort within political science and public administration since Charles Lindblom’s *Politics and Markets* and Jurgen Habermas’ *Legitimation Crisis* to critique modern representative government against enlightenment ideals. I would classify Wolin as a “neo-pluralists.” His ideas are similar to Lindblom’s but take into account the effects that certain mesmerizing events (notably, 9/11) have on popular opinion. Wolin calls these events and their effects “imaginaries.” He does not go so far as to say these events are concocted, but we shall consider this possibility in our class discussions.

I consider Wolin to be a neo-pluralist because he traces the rise of imaginaries to a structural bias in the balance of interests in public discourse. Basically, Wolin argues that American democracy has effectively been taken over by giant corporations which are advancing their economic interests politically at the expense of workers, the environment, established communities, underdeveloped nations, etc. Wolin traces the subversion of democracy to a number of factors. The most immediate of these are the decisions by the U.S. Supreme Court to treat corporations as persons with Constitutional rights, and to limit government regulation of campaign contributions as restrictions on freedom of speech. However, Wolin concludes that the fundamental source of "inverted totalitarian" tendencies in the U.S. is a failure of citizenship and civic culture. Citizens, he says, have become passive observers of elite politics, in large part because America has become a military empire and questions of policy center around international relations, which are the purview of national security experts who, alone, are privy to the nation’s secret strategies and covert operations. Wolin concludes his book by calling for a new, invigorated conception of citizenship and an approach to policymaking that stresses democratic processes more than "outcomes" and "performance."
Wolin’s analysis is an implicit indictment of the paradigm of public administration, which sees no problem with enormous amounts of power being invested in administrative agencies. The paradigm of public administration thinks of governmental organs as instruments of collective decisions made by representative institutions which reflect the preferences of the citizenry. However, Wolin points out that electoral processes for registering citizen preferences have been subverted by a system of campaign finance that leaves mass democracy gridlocked along partisan lines. This gridlock prevents policies from being enacted that are favored by a majority of voters (such as universal healthcare) while allowing earmarks, contracts, subsidies, and other actions benefiting special interests. In the political system considered as a totality, public administration functions, not as an advocate of the public interest, but instead as a conduit of public resources to private contractors and regulated industries.

As discussed in the next section of the syllabus, to get at some of these issues empirically, we will compare and contrast policy development in the war on terror and the Vietnam War. Our main text on policy development in the Vietnam War is Secrets, by Daniel Ellsberg. While analyst for the CIA, Ellsberg copied and leaked to the New York Times a classified history of the Vietnam War up to 1968. The leaked documents are now referred to as the “Pentagon Papers.”

Although the Vietnam War and the war on terror have many differences in military challenges and tactics, the legal frameworks and policy processes governing their initiation and prosecution are quite similar. War is initiated with explicit reference to policies that call for action in certain situations, but as the military action bogs down, questions arise about the policies themselves as well as about decision-makers’ motives, statements, and competence in executing those policies. The Gulf of Tonkin Resolution and the Congressional resolutions for the war on terror are comparable in form and also in being premised on questionable claims about military threats. Similarly, the wars in both eras were called into question by government whistleblowers; the Pentagon Papers of the war on terror are the videos and secret cables of Wikileaks. Another parallel is the way officials at the highest levels of government abused their powers in trying to silence their critics, e.g., Ellsberg in the Vietnam War and Joseph Wilson in the war on terror.

The course will conclude by applying and assessing the democratic theories covered earlier in the course. Mills’ elitism, Dahl’s pluralism, Habermas’ critical theory, and Wolin’s neo-pluralism will be evaluated in terms of their ability to account for similarities in policy development in the Vietnam War and the war on terror. Does the pattern observed across the two eras reflect an unstable balance among competing political pressures; the economic interests of the “power elite” or “military industrial complex”; a contradiction between democratic expectations and economic interests; a corporatized tyranny of “imaginaries”; or perhaps some combination of the different theories? We will also explore the implications of our findings for the roles and responsibilities of public administrators.
### Course Objectives

This course has four basic aims. The first is to familiarize students with the "policy orientation." Social scientists did not begin to speak of "policy" and "policy research" until the 1950s. Prior to this, analysis of government activity focused on laws, institutions, and constitutional principles. Social scientists asked whether government actions were properly directed and controlled by laws and regulations, whether laws were clearly articulated and constitutionally enacted, and whether political and economic institutions were functioning properly within the nation's constitutional framework.

The policy orientation originated in the context of World War II and the Cold War. This is why the language of policy research includes so many military metaphors. Policy analysts speak of "missions," "delivery systems," "target groups," and "impacts." Policy research focuses on the aims and intentions of government, and on the execution and effects of government actions relative to goals and objectives. It asks whether missions were carried out as planned, whether objectives were achieved, and whether the results are consistent with larger societal goals.

Because of its militaristic origins, the policy orientation can blind analysts to important questions of law, governance, civil liberties, and human dignity. Policy analysts typically take government goals and objectives as givens, and yet all modern industrial nations have at times pursued aims that are inhumane, undemocratic, and/or criminal. The other objectives of this course are intended to compensate for this blind spot in the policy orientation.

The second goal of the course is to challenge students to question American democracy. During the seminar, students are expected to conduct scientific research on the nature and extent of democracy in the United States. To do this, students must first become familiar with the competing accounts of American democracy that have been developed in the social sciences as well as in ordinary political discourse. By the end of the course, students should be thoroughly aware that current developments in American politics may pose grave threats to popular control of government.

A third aim of the course is to help students learn to recognize and explicate the theoretical premises in American government, politics, and policy. The course teaches these skills by helping students read and understand the scholarship on who governs. It also does so by exposing students to some of the essays and books that are foundational to the United States Constitution of 1789 and to its dramatic transformation after the Civil War. The topics covered while reading these works include: the origins and premises of the theory of checks and balances; classical and modern theories of political communication or rhetoric; the role of class conflict in the classical and modern accounts of republican government; and the revolutionary and still-unfolding impacts of the 14th Amendment to the United States Constitution.
The course’s fourth objective is to teach students how to integrate theory and research. The purpose of research is not exclusively or even primarily to test theory, but rather to make discoveries, and the purpose of policy is not merely to ameliorate public problems but to do so while maintaining if not enhancing the health of our republic. This means that policy-oriented theorizing and research should point to discoveries that help us understand and better address not just the public problems of the day, but the enduring challenges to popular control of government, individual liberty, and national security.

Organization of the Course

The course is divided conceptually into three parts, and each part will take up about a third of the semester. The first segment of the course introduces students to the policy orientation. Class discussions will mirror the first assignment (Essay #1, discussed below), which is to apply the policy orientation to the so-called “war on terror.” Questions raised by the policy orientation about the war on terror center on intentions, goals, and results. We will ask: What is the war policy of the United States, that is, under what conditions is warfare initiated, and with what degree of intensity is it carried out? What has been the history of this policy’s development? What are the formal procedures for declaring war, directing warfare, evaluating military performance, and ending wars?

The second part of the course applies elitism, pluralism, and critical theory to policy development in the Vietnam War and the Iraq War. The aim here is not only to learn about the concepts, issues, and evidence associated with these theories of American democracy, but also to see how the theories elucidate different aspects of the policy process. In the process, we will try to draw some conclusions about which theories or combination of theories best accounts for the similar pattern of policy development evident in both the Vietnam and Iraq conflicts.

The course concludes by considering the “war on terror.” We will discuss its origins, evolution, and current status, and its implications for American democracy.

The FSU Honor Code

Students are expected to uphold the Academic Honor Code published in the Florida State University Bulletin and the Student Handbook. The Academic Honor Code of The Florida State University requires students to (1) uphold the highest standards of academic integrity in their own work, (2) refuse to tolerate violations of academic integrity in the university community, and (3) foster a high sense of integrity and social responsibility.

Violations of the Academic Honor Code are delineated in Chapter 8 of the Faculty Handbook (8.22.1 (b)). Students in PAD 5035 should pay special attention to paragraph 2.
2. Regarding academic assignments, violations of the Academic Honor Code shall include representing another's work or any part thereof, be it published or unpublished, as one's own. It shall also include presenting or submitting any academic work in a manner that impairs the instructor's ability to assess the student's academic performance. For example, plagiarism includes failure to use quotation marks or other conventional markings around material quoted from any source.

Plagiarism on any assignment in this course will result in a failing grade for the assignment and may result in a failing grade for the course.

ADA Policy

Students with disabilities needing academic accommodation should (1) register with and provide documentation to the Student Disability Resource Center; and (2) bring a letter to the professors indicating the need for accommodation and what type. This should be done during the first class.

Course Requirements

Course requirements include class attendance and participation; two brief essays (approximate length is 4-8 pages); a 5 minute presentation on your second essay; and a final exam. The assignments will be discussed in detail in class and may be refined with student input. The basic nature of the written assignments is as follows:

**Essay #1**: Analyze the tensions between law and policy in the war on terror, and recommend actions to address these tensions. Recommended actions can include changes to legal constraints (constitutional, statutory, etc.), policy aims, policy implementation, evaluation, legal enforcement, etc. The analysis should specifically discuss: the Bush Doctrine as stated in the National Security Strategy of 2002 and 2005; the U.N. Charter, U.N. Resolution 1441, and other relevant U.N. resolutions; the 2001 and 2002 Congressional authorizations for use of military force; the War Powers Resolution of 1973; and the United States Constitution.

**Essay #2**: Compare and contrast policy development in the Vietnam War and the war on terror (specifically, the decisions to invade Afghanistan and Iraq and to support NATO air strikes in Libya) to draw conclusions about the quality and character of American democracy. Begin by highlighting similarities between policymaking in the two wars, e.g., in the quality of intelligence used to justify military action, in the Congressional decisions to authorize the use of military force, in the criticisms that were subsequently voiced, in the personalities and circumstances of the commanders-in-chief, in policymakers’ responses to their critics, and so on. Next, discuss the implications of these similarities for elitism, pluralism, critical theory, and Wolin's neo-pluralism. To what extent can each of these theories, individually or in combination, account for the pattern of policymaking in the two wars? Conclude by discussing the implications of your analysis for U.S. national-security policymaking.
Essays should be 4-8 pages in length, doubled-spaced, using a 12-point font. A bibliography is required, listing the works cited in the text. All sources should be referenced, and references for material quoted directly or paraphrased should include page numbers. Follow the APA style for writing and references.

Students will make presentations in class near the end of the semester. The presentations should take no more than 5 minutes. The use of PowerPoint is encouraged but not required. The presentation should focus on the student’s theoretical analysis and the implications from this analysis.

The final exam will be a multiple choice test administered online through the blackboard website. The exam will include 50 multiple-choice questions. Students will be allowed 2 hours to complete it. The exam will be available for completion online on April 25 beginning at 5:30 p.m. Availability will be closed at 9:00 p.m. Regardless of when you begin taking the exam, the time limit is 2 hours.

**Special Instructions for All Assignments**

1. **Assignment Submissions.** All essay assignments must be submitted to SafeAssign on the course website. Go to the Assignments folder and click on the appropriate assignment link. Essays must also be submitted in hardcopy so that comments can be written on them during grading.

2. **Penalty for late assignments.** Assignments are due on the appointed date. Grades on late papers will be reduced 5 points for each week they are tardy.

**Computation of Grades**

In the calculation of grades, the assignments will be weighted as follows: Essay #1 (25%); Essay #2 (25%); final exam (30%); and preparation for and participation in class (20%). The latter includes attendance, participation in class discussions, and student presentations.

Grade equivalencies are: 100-93=A, 92-90=A-, 89-87=B+, 86-83=B, 82-80=B-, 79-77=C+, 76-73=C, 72-70=C-, 69-67=D+, 66-63=D, 62-60=D-, 59-0=F. In the computation of final grades, all decimals from .5 and above are rounded up, and all below this are rounded down.

**Attendance Policy**

Students are expected to attend classes. Absences will be excused only for medical problems, travel required for work or professional development, or other legitimate reasons. One unexcused absence will lower your participation grade by one step (e.g., if you were to receive an "A" (95) for your class participation in the course, your final grade for participation would be "A-" (91) instead.) Each additional absence will incur a further one-step reduction in your participation grade.
Schedule of Assignments

Jan. 9:  First class
Jan. 16: Martin Luther King, Jr. Day. No class
Feb. 13: Essay #1 due
Mar. 5:  Spring Break. No class
Apr. 9:  Essay #2 due
Apr. 23: Final Exam, on Blackboard, 5:30-8:15.

Course Calendar, Materials, and Readings

Jan. 9:  Introduction to the Policy Orientation

Read:   This syllabus

Skim:   Lasswell, “The Policy Orientation”
        Lasswell, “The Universal Peril”
        deHaven-Smith and Ripley, “Political-Theoretical Foundations of Public Policy”
        deHaven-Smith, Preface and Chapter 1, Philosophical Critiques of Policy Analysis

Lecture material:  Table on “Policy Frameworks” (posted)

Jan. 16:  Foundations of American Democracy (Martin Luther King, Jr. Day, no class)

Read:   Dahl, How Democratic Is the American Constitution?

Skim:   The Declaration of Independence, 1776
        Federalist 51
        Articles of Confederation
        The U.S. Constitution
        Lincoln’s First Inaugural Address
        The Gettysburg Address

Jan. 23:  Threats to American Democracy

Read:   deHaven-Smith, “When Political Crimes Are Inside Jobs”

Skim:   Eisenhower Farewell Address
        Bernstein, “The Road to Watergate and Beyond”
        NSC 68, Sections VI(A), VII(B), IX(D)(2)
Jan. 30:  **Tensions between Law and Policy in the War on Terror**

**Read:**  
- Congressional Declaration of War against Japan  
- The War Powers Resolution of 1973  
- 2001 Authorization to Use Military Force (War on Terror)  
- 2002 Iraq War Resolution  
- U.N. Resolution 1441  

Feb. 6:  **Political Power: Elitism, Pluralism, Critical Theory**

**Read:**  
- Posted excerpts from Dahl, *Who Governs?*  
- Posted excerpts from Mills, *The Power Elite*  
- Dahl and Lindblom, Preface to the re-release of *Politics, Economics, and Welfare*  
- Chapter on critical theory in deHaven-Smith, *Philosophical Critiques of Policy Analysis* (available online from FSU Libraries via WorldCat)

Feb. 13:  **Imaginaries and Legitimation of the War on Terror**

**Read:**  
- Wolin, *Democracy Incorporated*

Essay #1 due

Feb. 20:  **The Vietnam War: Law, Policy, and Politics**

**Read:**  
- Ellsberg, *Secrets* (first half)  
- Gulf of Tonkin Resolution  
- Introduction to the *War of Numbers*  
- Galbraith article re: JFK Vietnam policy  
- The Garrison Case

Feb. 27:  **The Vietnam War: Legitimation Crisis**

**Read:**  
- Ellsberg, *Secrets* (second half)  
- Rawls (1979) NYT article on HSCA  
- Ellsberg article on secrecy oaths  
- Article re: Clinton impeachment and Nixon

Mar. 5:  **Spring Break**
Mar. 12: **Silencing Critics: The Crimes of Watergate**

**Read:**
http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Watergate_scandal
Listen to or read transcript of the meeting on Wednesday, March 21, 1973, at

Mar. 19: **The War on Terror: Shifting to Iraq**

**Read:**
Article on what Bush knew
2003 State of the Union Address (video available online)
The “Downing Street Memo”
Twisted Intelligence
2002 Bybee Memo on Interrogation Methods

Mar. 26: **Legitimation Crises: Plamegate and Wikileaks**

**Read:**
Ridge on the politics of terror alerts
Novak article outing Plame
Libby indictment
Engineer fired for doubts about 9-11
Kelly Death not a Suicide

Apr. 2: **9-11: Unanswered Questions**

**Read:**
Presidential Briefing, Aug. 01
OBL family flights after 9-11
OBL denies role in 9/11
Fire Engineering
Pentagon cancelled flights
Evidence of 9/11 insider trading
Experts claim 9-11 was hoax

Apr. 9: **Student presentations**

Essay # 2 due

Apr. 16: **Student presentations**

Apr. 23: **Final Exam, available online on Blackboard, 5:30-9:00, with 2 hours for completion once begun**