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As stunning as the visual differences in these two departmental photos are the intellectual differences between the 1933 and 2009 departments are even more profound. Both contrasts would be more dramatic if we had photos from 1850 or 1910, the informal and formal dates of origin. This monograph chronicles the evolution that led to the current department, which is already different from that in 2009 in important ways.

Introduction

The University of Michigan’s Political Science Department’s origins go back to the 1840s and 1850s. As with most successful organizations, its evolution to the current department is a combination of astute leadership, external forces, and luck. Our intent is to describe this leadership, the circumstances and the luck that at various points combined to produce the department we now celebrate. The objective is twofold. We hope readers enjoy knowing the details of this history and learn new and interesting facts about the department – we certainly did in the process of preparing this document. More importantly, in reading this history we hope people better understand the factors that have made this a prominent department and are thereby better equipped to maintain its standards, reputation and scholarly contributions.

This history is organized around the intellectual roots of the current department rather than a straight chronological series of begats, or more literally the sequence of appointments. Part of the reason for this is self-indulgence – it is what we find most interesting and satisfying to write about. We also thinks this
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explains more about the current department and why it does what it does, and does not do, and contributes better to the objectives stated above.

The Department’s history begins well before its formal Regental recognition in 1910. This initial section recounts this prologue as it nicely exemplifies the confluence of individuals and events that continued to shape the department. The activities of this period also affected the structure and organization of the department when it was formally organized in the Twentieth Century. The second section describes the individuals and themes that constituted the first Department of Political Science, and that continued to guide its scholarship and mission for the next several decades. The roots of the current department began to emerge in the late 1940s and 1950s incorporating, building upon, and then expanding innovations and strength from other universities and elsewhere within the University of Michigan. This era of significant expansion and creativity was followed here, as elsewhere, by a period of radical change and turmoil. Some of the Department’s present composition has its roots in this period, though now in different forms. We end by summarizing the factors and decisions that built and maintained this department and that we intend as a contribution to continuing this history.

Before the Beginning

The first record of what we would recognize as a Political Science course taught at the University of Michigan was in the 1840s by Professor Edward Thomas

\footnote{This section relies heavily on Fey (1960).}
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in the Philosophy Department. His texts included titles such as *Political Grammar*, *Political Economy* and *Commentaries on the Constitution*. His course was discontinued when he left to become the first President of Ohio Wesleyan University, a common occurrence in the early years. President Henry Tappan restored the teaching of Political Science in the 1850s with the appointment of Andrew Dickson White as Professor of History in 1857. Tappan's intellectual agenda for the University included the law of nations and constitutional law. The History Department became the location for the teaching of politics and government. One of that Department's three missions was to provide a foundation for the study of U.S. political and constitutional history. In 1860 the University Regents required a course of lectures on constitutional law and history to be given by a professor of law to the senior class, a very timely topic given the nation's constitutional crisis. The initial lecture was given in 1861 by Professor Thomas M. Cooley and continued through 1865. After the period of Cooley's lectures the

2 White later co-founded and was the first President of Cornell University, New York's land grant institution under the Morrill Act.

3 According to Fey this agenda also included Political Economy, though in that period this theme more likely referred to what is now just called Economics rather than Political Economy as that term is now understood.

4 Cooley was Dean of the University Michigan Law School from 1871 to 1883, Chief Justice of the Michigan Supreme Court from 1864 to 1885 and in 1887 became the first Chairman of the Interstate Commerce Commission.
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teaching of Political Science was vested solely in the History Department under the direction of Charles K. Adams, who taught courses on the Government of Great Britain, the Governments of Continental Europe, and U.S. Political History. Course offerings in Political Science within the History Department were expanded during the 1870s, including courses in International Law and the History of Treaties by University President James B. Angell (Kallenbach, nd. p. 1).

A notable event during this early period was a private donation of literary material related to Political Science to the University Library. Philo Parsons of Detroit purchased and then donated the library of Professor Karl Heinrich Rau of Heidelberg University along with other material that Parsons purchased to complete the collection. According to Fey the collection consisted of about 4,000 volumes and 5,000 pamphlets and became a central part of the development of the subsequent School of Political Science.

School of Political Science

In 1881 the University Regents approved the creation of a School of Political Science within LS&A. The initiative for the School came from University President James B. Angell, though he was then the U.S. minister to China; the Law School Dean

5 Charles Kendall Adams was a Michigan graduate, Class of 1861. He became Professor of History and chaired the Dept. of History at Michigan. He later was President of the American Historical Society (1890), President of Cornell University (1885 – 1892) and the University of Wisconsin (1892 – 1901).
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Thomas M. Cooley; and the History Department Chair, Charles K. Adams. The School had seven faculty members including Angell and Cooley with Adams serving as Dean. In his opening address titled “The Relation of Political Science to National Security,” Dean Adams said the School’s purpose was to promote “the good of the people and the welfare of the State” (Ross, 1991, p. 70; Fey, 1960, p. 5). The 1881-82 Catalog listed seven areas in the School. This list, in addition to the expected topics of History, Political Economy, and International Law included Sanitary Science and Forestry. In the context of the 1870s and 1880s these latter two topics were vitally important to a state that was beginning to urbanize but whose economy was still very dependent on the timber industry.

Students were admitted to the School after two years of study in LS&A (or its equivalent at another institution) and were considered candidates for the Ph. D. Subsequently, provisions for Bachelor’s and Master’s degrees were added to the program. The School pioneered the seminar method of instruction and the curriculum was composed primarily of electives rather than required courses, both features that Adams had observed during a visit to Germany.

6 Ross also quotes Adams as saying: “[P]opular opinion is always shaped and guided by the educated classes...there is much greater need of good leading than of good following.”

7 According to Dunbar (1965, pp. 474 - 75) timber was the state’s second largest industry, after agriculture, and Michigan was the nation’s largest lumber producer.
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The School had a relatively short life, ending after the 1887-88 academic year. The School's end is explained by a combination the administrative awkwardness of housing a graduate program within the undergraduate Department of LS&A and the departure of two key faculty members. Dean C. K. Adams resigned in 1885 to succeed A. D. White as Cornell University’s second president, and T. M. Cooley resigned in 1887 to become the first Chairman of the Interstate Commerce Commission.

The Interregnum Period

The demise of the School of Political Science did not terminate the teaching of Political Science at Michigan. It simply returned to the History Department. President Angell continued his courses on International Law and Treaties, his son-in-law Andrew C. McLaughlin began courses on Constitutional Law, Political Institutions, and Political History of the U. S. and Richard Hudson taught

8 The same year that the School closed, Woodrow Wilson (then on the faculty of Princeton) had written: “The time will soon come when no college of respectability can afford to do without a well-filled chair of political science,” [“The Study of Administration,” in Farr (1963) p. 43].

9 Andrew Cunningham McLaughlin received undergraduate and law degrees from the University of Michigan, taught at Michigan until 1906, chaired the History Department at the University of Chicago until 1927, was President of the American Historical Society and a Pulitzer Prize winner in 1936.
Comparative Constitutional Law. In 1896-97 Hudson also introduced new courses on Municipal Governments in Great Britain and in Continental Europe. By 1900 the History Department listed its courses under two different headings: history and government. The latter we directed by Professor John A. Fairlie, who was Professor of Administrative Law and taught courses on Municipal Administration.\(^{10}\)

There were also important organizational activities during this period that Fey says contributed importantly to the creation of a permanent Department of Political Science. One was Political Science Club organized in 1900-01. The other was the formation of the Michigan Political Science Association. This was a professional association initiated at Michigan where scholars and business leaders met regularly and where papers were presented and discussed. Proceedings of these meetings are available through the University of Michigan Library.\(^{11}\)

Political Science had a rich tradition at Michigan well before the current department was formed in 1910 despite only being formally organized for the short period from 1881 to 1887. The basic themes were Constitutions and Legal Systems,

\(^{10}\) John A. Fairlie received his Ph.D. from Columbia’s School of Political Science in 1898 and began teaching at Michigan in 1900. In 1909 he went to the University of Illinois where he chaired the department. In 1929 he served as President of the American Political Science Association.

\(^{11}\) Copies of the Association’s publications and proceedings, Vols. 1 – 6 for the period 1893 to 1905, can be found through a search for Michigan Political Science Association on the Mirlyn system at the University of Michigan Library.
both internationally and domestically, Treaties, Political History, and Municipal Government, again both comparatively and within the U.S. The faculty responsible for these courses and the associated scholarship were a distinguished group, both individually and collectively. Several become university presidents, held important public positions, and/or held the presidency of their respective national scholarly organizations. These individuals and their scholarly and teaching contributions formed a solid foundation for what was to become the Department of Political Science at the University of Michigan.

Creation of the Department of Political Science

In February 1910 the Board of Regents created a position of Professor of Political Science and authorized acting President Harry B. Hutchins to appoint someone to the position. These actions were in anticipation of creating a Department of Political Science. Jesse Siddall Reeves, then an Assistant Professor of Political Science at Dartmouth College, was called to fill the new position and to be the first Department Chair. Initially the courses followed the ones previously offered through the History Department – Public Law, American Diplomacy, Political Theory, American Government and Municipal Government (Kallenbach, nd, p. 1). The areas of Law, both International and National and Municipal Government were to be the Department’s core. Reeves’ specialty was International Law, though he was appointed the William W. Cook Professor of American Institutions and taught courses that ranged from American Constitutional Law to Political Thought. Reeves
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was the first of eight Michigan scholars to become President of the American Political Science Association, in 1928.

A commitment to teaching municipal administration was part of the department’s agenda from before and during the School of Political Science, but received greater attention after provisions for home rule became part of the Michigan Constitution in 1908 and then with enactment of the Home Rule Act of 1909 (Bromage, 1961). In 1913 the Department began offering an M.A. in Municipal Administration in response to the need for local charters.12 This was followed the next year by the creation of the Bureau of Reference and Research in Government (later the Bureau of Government) under the direction of Professor Robert T. Crane. The study and teaching of local government has remained an important part of the Department through several incarnations.

A singularly important figure from the very early days was Joseph Ralson Hayden. Hayden did not fit into the conventional department themes, as by current labels his specialty was Comparative Politics and specifically the study of the Philippines. He began in 1910 as an Assistant in History. (This position likely would

12 When Wilson (see above note 8) called for every respectable college to have a chair of Political Science, he added that it would not be enough to “multiply the number of intelligent critics of government”; it was also important to create a “body of competent administrators” (in Farr (1963) p. 43). Wilson’s bugle-call for Political Science as the education of future administrators had a major influence on the discipline at large.
have been a Teaching Assistant, or GSI more recently, as he was just beginning his graduate studies in 1910.) In 1912 he became an instructor in the Department of Political Science and received his Ph.D. in 1915, the first doctoral degree granted by the Department. He later became the Department’s second chair, from 1937 to 1943, and in 1941 the first James Orrin Murfin Professor. Governor-General Frank Murphy, the former Detroit mayor and future Associate Justice on the U.S. Supreme Court, appointed Hayden Vice-Governor-General of the Philippines from 1933 to 1935. He left the University in 1943 to join General McArthur’s staff in Australia and then the Philippines during WWII, playing an important role in the Philippines’ recovery.

The department continued to grow, albeit interrupted by WWI when both Reeves and Hayden left for military duty. The expansion in faculty largely continued the structure, content, and orientation of the department that was in place in 1910 with the addition of a few more courses in U.S. politics. For the next several decades it continued in the same fashion as a respectable department providing good service to students, one of whom was Gerald R. Ford, and to the citizens living in Michigan’s towns and cities. Arthur W. Bromage, for example, trained many of the state’s city managers. It would not, however, be considered a distinguished or intellectually innovative department. The School of Political Science created in 1881 was close to fitting that description, being the second such academic organization. (Columbia’ School of Political Science preceded Michigan’s by less than a year.) But by the 1920s and 1930s this was not innovative and the field of Political Science was developing new conceptual ways to study politics and political organizations. One
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only needs to examine the work being done at the University of Chicago by people like Merriam, Lasswell, Gosnell and Wright or later at Yale by Robert Dahl to see the changes that were occurring.13

The department’s most prominent member during this period was James K. Pollock. Pollock received undergraduate and Master’s degrees from the University of Michigan in 1920 and 1921. He was hired as an Assistant Professor in 1926, served as department chair from 1947 – 1961 and retired in 1967 as the James Orin Murfin Professor of Political Science, a position he held from 1947. His early work was on political parties and elections and administration. By the late 1930s this work had expanded to include work on the German government, including courses on propaganda and public opinion and administration. His professional accomplishments included being the first president of the Midwest Political Science

13 Charles Merriam, in an essay published in the 1923 APSR as part of report for the Committee on Political Research, described the earlier approaches to the study of politics as the “historical inquiry into the development of political institutions” and the “comparison of various types of institutions, with a view of classifying, analyzing, discovering similarities and dissimilarities in them.” In contrast he proposes a new “form of investigation which came to be the survey” which was “the actual observation of forces in operation, with an effort to measure these forces and to standardize some system of measurement.” He credited engineers and accountants for contributing “materially to [the survey’s] development” with their emphasis on “great accuracy and precision” [Merriam in Farr (1963) pp. 134-35].
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Association (1941), president of the American Political Science Association (1950), and the first president of the International Political Science Association (1955 – 58). He served on many governmental bodies, ranging from the Michigan Civil Service Study Commission (1935 – 37) and its Constitutional Convention (1961), the Hoover Commission (1945 – 49), and as special advisor to the U.S. Deputy Military Governor and High Commissioner in Germany (1945 – 50). For the latter service the Federal Republic of Germany awarded him its Grand Cross and its Knight Commander’s Cross. His scholarly work was rooted in the traditional mode of Political Science and he became increasingly resistant to the changes occurring in the discipline from the late 1940s through the 1950s. He epitomized the Department’s character, accomplishments, and reputation during the inter- and post-war period.

The Emergence of the Modern Department

The issue of the Department’s composition and future direction came to a head at the end of Pollock’s Chairship in 1961. Sam Eldersveld’s letter to the Dean commenting on the choice for a new chair argued strongly that the Department was falling behind peer departments and that under a new chair it needed “… either to become a great ‘old-fashioned’ department again or a ‘frontiers’ department (or) decline to a third level status.” The situation may not have been as dire and the choices as stark as the letter suggests, but it was a watershed point. Events show that the choice was to become a “frontiers” department, building on areas of existing
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strength within the University. This next section chronicles the efforts to create a frontiers department

By frontiers Eldersveld clearly had in mind empirically oriented research based primarily but not solely in the behavioral tradition. Eldersveld was a Michigan Ph.D. (1946), trained in the traditional manner, with James Pollock as his dissertation chair.14 Collaborations at Michigan with Dwaine Marvick (a Political Scientist from Columbia) and Morris Janowitz (a Sociologist trained at Chicago) and attendance at a Social Science Research Council (SSRC) summer workshop at the University of Chicago in 1951 persuaded Eldersveld that behaviorally based studies were the future of Political Science. This approach was the continuation of the Chicago tradition begun in the 1920s by Merriam and others there. Eldersveld

______________________________

14 Eldersveld began his Michigan career as a graduate student in 1938 and spent the rest of his life except for a tour of active duty with the U.S. Navy during WWII at the University. He was first appointed as an Instructor in 1946, Assistant Professor in 1948, and Associate Professor with tenure in 1953 and become a full professor in 1957. He chaired the Department from 1964 – 68, was a Fulbright scholar in 1954, won the Woodrow Wilson award from the APSA for the best book published in 1964, and was elected to the American Academy of Arts and Sciences in 1977. In 1987 the Political Organizations and Parties section of the American Political Science Association created the Eldersveld lifetime contribution award, and immediately presented it to him. He was the Mayor of Ann Arbor from 1957 – 59, the first Democrat elected since 1931.
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embraced this work enthusiastically, conducting one of the first field experiments, on voter turnout, since Gosnell’s work in the 1920s (Eldersveld, 1956). Through his efforts as a faculty member and then as Chair, Eldersveld pushed and led the Department to several frontiers.

Political Behavior

The Department had taken small, if reluctant, steps in the behavioral direction while Pollock was Chair. In a 1951 request to the LS&A Dean, Pollock requested a new position for someone who did the type of research being done at the Institute for Social Research (ISR). The ISR, and specifically its Survey Research Center (SRC), was (and is) a leading center for the development, collection and analysis of survey data on mass opinion and behavior across the social sciences. Angus Campbell and Robert L. Kahn, both in the SRC and Department of Psychology, had conducted an early survey study of voting behavior in the 1948 Presidential election, reported in the 1952 monograph The People Elect a President (Coombs, 1987). This was followed by election studies in subsequent election years.

A contributor to these studies was Warren E. Miller, who was in the process of finishing a Ph.D. in Political Science at Syracuse University. Miller came to the SRC in 1951 as an Assistant Study Director and became Study Director in 1953. Miller received his Ph.D. in 1954 and from 1954 – 56 was an Assistant Professor at the University of California – Berkeley. He returned to Michigan in 1956 as a Research Associate in SRC and as an Assistant Professor in Political Science. He was subsequently promoted to Associate Professor in 1958, Research Scientist in 1959.
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and Professor in 1963. Miller’s appointment was followed in 1958 with the appointment of Donald E. Stokes as an Assistant Research Scientist in SRC and as an Assistant Professor of Political Science. Miller later led the exodus of the political behavior and election studies from the SRC to the newly created Center for Political Studies (CPS) at the ISR in 1970.

These circumstances have several important implications for the development of the Political Science Department. Least consequently, the presence of Eldersveld, Miller and Stokes in the Department indicates that behavioralism was represented in the Department, though not to the level that Eldersveld thought was needed to be a frontier department, and this overstates behavioralism’s presence as Miller’s and Stokes’ appointments were divided between the Department and the SRC.

With the addition of Philip E. Converse, with appointments in the Departments of Political Science and Sociology and the SRC, the initial core of the Department's political behavior program was in place and proceeded to propel the Department to the frontier that Eldersveld envisioned. A critical feature of this building and transformation process is how it built upon intellectual and organizational strength already at the University. This is a process that was repeated in other subfields. Initially these strengths existed outside the department as it was beginning its transition while later the process would be repeated using strengths within the department.

A third, but probably the most significant, implication of the way the political behavior program was built was its roots in psychology and social psychology.
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Campbell’s and Kahn’s Ph.D.s were in Psychology and Converse’s Ph.D. was in social psychology. This meant the conceptual basis for the election studies and related work were derived from psychological theories that focus on individuals and “what is in individuals’ heads.” The central variable, for example, asked people if they identified with one of the political parties, not if they were they a member. A previous study by Columbia Sociologists (Lazarsfeld, et al., 1948 and Berelson, et al. 1954) put more emphasis on individuals’ social group memberships and some Political Scientists would have asked not just about party membership but about the electoral rules and the structure, strength, and strategies of local and state political parties where the respondents resided. The focus on the individual would have an important subsequent implication in the Department’s intellectual evolution.

The publication of *The American Voter* (Campbell, Converse, Miller, and Stokes, 1960) led a revolution in the study of voting and voters in the U.S. and eventually around the world. Its appearance marked the arrival of the psychological paradigm for the study of politics. This work was so identified with the University that the approach became known as the “Michigan Model.” It established the ISR and the Michigan Department of Political Science as the premier organizations for the behavioral study of Political Science, and particularly of individual behavior.

A watershed moment in the Department’s transition from a traditional to a frontier department was the 1963 debate over hiring M. Kent Jennings. Jennings received his Ph.D. from the University of North Carolina. His dissertation and parts of his later work dealt with local behavioral politics and schools, but he was a central figure in the development of Political Psychology as a prominent field in
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Political Science. He and his work became synonymous with the term socialization, which examined how people, as teenagers, acquired their political orientations and then how they evolved with age (See Jennings and Niemi, 1974 and 1981, and Jennings and Markus, 1984 and 1988). During the debate about Jennings’s appointment then-Chair Arthur Bromage is remembered as having remarked to those opposed to the appointment: “This is not how you and I were trained to do Political Science, but this is how it will be done in the future.” Bromage’s assessment carried the day, both in the Department’s decision and for significant segments of Political Science. Clear evidence of the accuracy of Bromage’s prediction is that all three leading figures in the Political Behavior program -- Converse, Jennings and Miller – served as Presidents of the American Political Science Association.

Political Psychology has remained a staple in the Department’s scholarship, evolving considerably as new scholars, such as Donald R. Kinder (1981 - ), Steven J. Rosenstone (1986 - 1996), Nick Valentino (1999 – 2007, 2009 - ) and Ted Brader (2000 - ) have brought their own specialties and scholarship to the Department. The intellectual and financial resources of the political behavior program, and of the CPS and of the ISR, have been a platform for other initiatives that have maintained the Department’s leadership and standing. These initiatives – the programs in Women and Politics, Race and Politics, Methodology, and Comparative Political Behavior – are described in more detail elsewhere, but it is important to note that just as the early political behavior program built on the strength of the ISR and the Department of Psychology, these newer activities could and did build on the
strength established by the political behavior program in very entrepreneurial but evolutionary ways.

**Public Policy and Political Institutions**

The Michigan Political Science Dept. is now highly regarded for the study of public policy and political institutions as well as of individual behavior. It was not always that way, particularly with respect to the federal government. To arrive at this point the Department was part of and the beneficiary of another major transformation in the discipline and at the University. In 1938 the Bureau of Government, previously the Bureau of Reference and Research in Government, was reorganized as the Institute of Public and Social Administration and later just the Institute of Public Administration. The Institute was a multi-disciplinary graduate program placed within the jurisdiction of the relatively newly created Rackham Graduate School, no longer a part of the Political Science Department. Members of the Department continued to play major roles in the Institute through the 1940s and 1950s. In the early and mid-1960s both the Institute’s Director, John Lederle, and its Associate Director, C. Ferrel Heady, were Professors of Political Science. In addition, the Department’s Chair was automatically a member of the Institute’s Executive Committee.
In the mid-1960s the University's Vice-President for Academic Affairs, Allen Smith, initiated a review of the Institute. The review committee, which included Sam Eldersveld, recommended sweeping changes to the Institute’s mission and leadership. The Institute was renamed the Institute of Public Policy Studies (IPPS) and John Patrick Crecine was appointed the new Institute Director. Crecine had arrived at Michigan as an Assistant Professor of Political Science and of Sociology in 1965. He received his Ph.D. in Industrial Administration from Carnegie Institute of Technology (now Carnegie-Mellon University) where he had studied under Herbert A. Simon and James G. March. Simon and March transformed the formal study of organizations while at the Carnegie Graduate School of Industrial Administration (GSIA). The GSIA revolutionized the study of business organizations by combining this work on organizations with rigorous quantitative methods drawn heavily from microeconomics. A comparable revolution in the study of and training for the analysis of public policies and the management of organizations was taking place at this time and Crecine’s appointment placed IPPS at the center of this change. This is the second place where the work of Merriam and the Chicago Political Science

15 At that time the Vice-President for Academic Affairs was the second highest executive officer as there was no Provost.

16 Crecine left IPPS and the University in 1976 to become Dean and then Senior Vice-President and Provost at Carnegie-Mellon University. From 1987 to 1994 he was President of the Georgia Institute of Technology. He returned to Carnegie-Mellon University in 2006 as Distinguished Service Professor.
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Department had a major influence on the transformation of the Michigan Political Science Department. Simon’s Ph.D. was in Political Science from Chicago, where he had encountered Merriam. One of Simon’s early books, co-authored with Donald Smithberg and Victor Thompson, simply titled *Public Administration*, permanently altered the teaching of Public Administration by introducing the behavioral work on organizations for which Simon would become famous. Crecine’s connection to March brought a second important thread to Michigan as the Yale Department, under the leadership of people such as Robert Dahl, had by the 1950s become a (if not the) premier department in the formal study of political organizations.

Under Crecine’s direction the study of politics and political organizations at IPPS became very behavioral but not in the deeply psychological way that the study of individual behavior was at the SRC. IPPS’s behavioralism was based on analyzing the interactions within and between organizations and the behavior of individuals within organizations. Because IPPS could not make its own faculty appointments its faculty had to be appointed jointly with organized departments, and Political Science benefitted tremendously from this arrangement. Most of the study of U.S. political institutions, as well as many important comparative studies, were associated with jointly recruited faculty. The breadth of the work done by these scholars and its professional influence was exemplary. The scholarship ranged from studies of organizational decision-making (Cohen, et al., 1972), of the emergence of cooperation among individuals and organizations (Axelrod, 1984 and 1997), and of political elites in advanced democracies (Putnam, 1976).
Jointly with IPPS and on its own the Department began to build its scholarship on U.S. national institutions following the behavioral approach. John W. Kingdon was appointed as Assistant Professor of Political Science in 1965 and spent his entire career at the University of Michigan until he retired in 1998. His dissertation and subsequent book on congressional candidates (Kingdon, 1968) was a major departure from the way previous Department members had studied U.S. politics. His subsequent books on Congress (Kingdon, 1973) and on interest groups and agendas (Kingdon, 1984) are paragons of careful and insightful fieldwork and are classics in the field of American Politics. Along with the graduate students he supervised, Kingdon’s innovative scholarship helped to establish the Department as a prominent place in the study of U.S. political institutions. Rick Hall has continued Kingdon’s work on Congress. Among Hall’s many studies, his research on the activities and influence of lobbyists is widely cited (Hall, 1990 and 2006).

The study of U.S. federal institutions extended to the executive branch as well as the Congress. Joel Aberbach collaborated on numerous important studies of senior officials in the executive branch of the U.S. government as well as those in several then Western European countries). The arrival of Charles Shipan in 2006

17 Kingdon was Department Chair from 1982 – 87 and was again in 1989 – 90. He received the Aaron Wildavsky Enduring Contribution Award from the Public Policy section of the American Political Science Association in 1994, was a Guggenheim Fellow and was elected to the American Academy of Arts and Sciences in 1991.

18 See for example, Aberbach and Rockman (1976) and Aberbach, Putnam, and Rockman (1981).
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brought new approaches to the study of executive branch agencies and regulatory policy. Shipan’s work is more heavily derived from the new institutionalism, which has its roots in game theoretic models, than from the earlier organizational behavior models, but continues the tradition of important new research on bureaucracies and executive agencies that was lost with Aberbach’s departure.19

Shipan’s scholarship, along with that of Jenna Bednar, retrieves another important thread begun at IPPS but lost with Jack Walker’s death. In 1969 Jack Walker published a paper on policy diffusion among the U.S. states (Walker, 1969) that became one of the most cited papers in the American Political Science Review. This agenda-setting article gave empirical support for Judge Brandeis’s (now often paraphrased) claim that states may serve as laboratories of democracy. Shipan brings a contemporary conceptual approach to this field that has yielded new insights to the diffusion process (Shipan and Volden, 2006 and 2008). They demonstrate, for example, that diffusion is a vertical as well as a horizontal process, with innovations moving from cities to states as well as among states. Jenna Bednar uses the game theoretic approach to rigorously examine the areas of conflict and cooperation within federal systems, further advancing the Department’s strength in the area of federalism (see Bednar, 2009 and Forthcoming). The 2002 hiring and subsequent tenuring of Robert Mickey, whose specialty is American Political Development, added a new theme to the study of U.S. political institutions.

19 See Huber and Shipan (2002) and Shipan (2004). The Huber-Shipan book won the triple crown of best book awards in 2003, being so recognized by the APSA Comparative Studies, Legislative Studies and Political Economy sections
The transformation of the way U.S. political institutions were studied and taught at the University is another example of Eldersveld’s agenda for the Department and its transition to a behaviorally and now formal theory driven department. It also coincides with the Department’s rise in its ranking within the American Politics subfield. The way it was accomplished is another example of how the Department leadership took advantage of changes occurring and resources available elsewhere in the University to promote its agenda. In this instance it was the replacement of the Institute of Public Administration by the Institute of Public Policy Studies, and the financial resources the University put into the new Institute that initiated this development. Unfortunate departures, a premature death, and an early retirement have depleted the Department of some of this strength and comparative advantage. The Ford School (formerly IPPS) no longer needs Department participation in making appointments so that scholars who once would have been part of the Department are now solely in the Ford School, further thinning the Department’s presence in this subfield. Fortunately recent appointments and promotions, such as Shipan and Bednar, are recovering this presence.

**Comparative Politics**

During the nineteenth century, the study of Political Science in the United States, under the influence of Hegel and the consequent attention to the reification of the “state,” often entailed constitutional history and the study of comparative constitutions. We see this in the courses taught at the University during the period
when Political Science was part of the History Department, courses devoted to the
development of parliamentary government in Great Britain and “the principal
governments of Europe,”\(^\text{20}\) and in the courses taught by Richard Hudson in the late 1890s at Michigan.\(^\text{21}\) For several decades after the founding of the Department in 1910, state and municipal law, international law, the US Constitutions and Political Theory continued to dominate (with a few exceptions) the curriculum, the research agenda, and the theses of the doctoral candidates. While Joseph Hayden’s work looked broadly at the social and economic conditions of the Philippines,\(^\text{22}\) work by faculty like Pollock focused on the study of “election administration” and more generally the “government” of Germany.

A sea change occurred after World War II. The failure of American intelligence during the war with regard to the culture and governments of foreign countries led to the post-war concern among “government granting agencies, private foundations, [and] the modern university”\(^\text{23}\) with supporting the establishment of research centers at universities around the country for the study of different foreign areas. The University of Michigan benefited from this new concern with foreign areas. The immediate postwar period saw the establishment of the Center of Japanese Studies in 1947 with initial funding from the Carnegie

\(^{20}\) Kallenbach, nd., p. 1.

\(^{21}\) See above, p.7.

\(^{22}\) See above, p.12.

\(^{23}\) Terence Ball in Farr (1963) p. 208.
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Corporation and the support of the University. The funding enabled departments throughout the University to hire scholars who specialized in Japan. Robert E. Ward\textsuperscript{24} came to the Department in 1962 as a specialist in Japanese politics, complementing a group of Japan specialists such as John Hall in History and Richard Beardsley in Anthropology. Together these Japan scholars worked at the forefront of investigating the social and political practices of rural Japan, producing the path-breaking book \textit{Village Japan} (1959).

Considerably later, in 1961, the Board of Regents established a diverse group of Centers, each one receiving support initially from varied foundations and eventually from the federal government through the Office of Education and the NDEA Title IX program, a program established in 1958 in response to the launching of Sputnik by the Soviets. The Regents established the Center for Chinese Studies (enjoying regular support from the Mellon Foundation, NSF and U.S. Office of Education), the Center for Research in East European and Soviet Studies (later the Center for Russian and Eastern European Studies), the Center for Near and Middle Eastern Studies (later the Center for Middle Eastern and North African Studies), as well as the Center for South and Southeast Asian Studies, all in 1961 and all with

\textsuperscript{24} Robert E. Ward remained in the Department until 1973, leaving at that point to take a position at Stanford. While he was still at Michigan he was elected president of the American Political Science Association.
mandates to foster and encourage teaching and research throughout the University in their particular areas. 25

Some of the Department’s area specialists were already present when the Centers were founded and helped pressure the University into supporting their establishment. Richard Park, for example, a Harvard trained political scientist with close ties to India, arrived at Michigan from Berkeley as the result of efforts by the Asian Studies Committee to establish a Center for Southern Asian Studies. 26 Park, along with Russell Fifield, a specialist on Southeast Asia,27 then became instrumental in the creation of that Center. Park became its first Director, but both Park and Fifield served as its Director on several occasions. Many of the Department's area specialists, though, came as the result of the founding of these centers: Richard Solomon in 1966, Allen Whiting in 1967, Michel Oksenberg in 1973, and Oksenberg’s former student Kenneth Lieberthal in 1986 were connected

25 In 1999 The Center for South and Southeast Asian Studies became a separate units so that there is now a Center for Southeast Asian and a Center for South Asian Studies.


27 Fifield had come to the Department in 1947. A winner of a Guggenheim Fellowship, he was a distinguished scholar of Southeast Asia with multiple books on the area. He is credited with coining the term ASEAN (Association of Southeast Asian Nations).
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with the China Center;\textsuperscript{28} William Zimmerman in 1964, Alfred G. Meyer in 1966, and Zvi Gitelman in 1968 all came with ties to the CREES.\textsuperscript{29} Upon Ward’s departure for Stanford, John Campbell came to the Department from the SSRC in 1973, was connected with the Japan Center, and served for many years as its director. All these Centers received initial funding from the Ford Foundation and continued support from the U.S. Office of Education and in each case, the funding helped the Department recruit this large number of distinguished scholars with area specialties, not only because of the financial resources the Centers helped to provide, but also because of the impressive library resources of materials in the relevant languages and the clusters of scholars with interests in the same geographical regions.\textsuperscript{30}

\textsuperscript{28} Solomon left the University in 1971 to work on the staff of the National Security Council, responsible for Asian Affairs, in the Nixon Administration. Whiting left the University in 1982 for the University of Arizona, Oksenberg in 1993 to direct the East West Center at the University of Hawaii, and Lieberthal for the Brookings Institute in 2008.

\textsuperscript{29} Though George Grassmuck began as a specialist in the presidency, his time teaching at the American University in Beirut before arriving at Michigan in 1957 connected him to CNENAS, which he directed on occasion, but he was not brought here by or because of the needs of that Center.

\textsuperscript{30} The Center on Western European Studies (under a grant again from the Ford Foundation) was only established in 1970; Political Science Department faculty Roy
Before the establishment of the area centers there were occasional scholars who focused on a particular country or area, as Hayden had done in the 1920s and 1930s; there was Park who studied India and had close personal ties to the government there, and was a major force in expanding the study of India throughout the US, and Russell Fifield who had come well before the establishment of the CSSEAS. The flourishing and recruitment of scholars with interests in foreign areas, however, only began after the area centers appeared on campus. During the 1980s the Dean of LSA, Peter Steiner, considered the area centers “gems” of the University; his concern with maintaining the strength and vibrancy of the centers led to creation of what were called FASAC (Foreign Area Studies Advisory Committee) positions, faculty slots which were to be specifically associated with particular centers. The worry was that when departments were faced with filling vacancies in faculty positions they might not choose to fill those slots with faculty with specific foreign area interests; this in turn would lead to the reduced stature and importance of these institutional gems. Departments, in consultation with then-Associate Dean William Zimmerman, designated a certain number of faculty positions as FASAC positions so that a full complement of faculty might maintain the activities and energy of the respective centers. Thus, the Department found itself with a number of FASAC positions assigned to the faculty who taught in the comparative field and were associated with area centers. This tied certain departmental positions to

Pierce and Samuel Barnes were instrumental in its creation, but not recruited because of it.
particular area centers and required coordination between area centers and departments in hiring and promotion decisions.

While the area centers provided many valuable resources from financial support to library resources for faculty working in those areas, they also managed in some cases to Balkanize the study of Comparative Politics within the department, creating tensions that were to surface later when questions surfaced as to whether a deep focus on the particularities of a specific region could be adequately combined with the generic questions which concerned political scientists. At times, the Department found itself caught in a situation where a candidate satisfying the needs of an area center did not satisfy the needs of the Department looking for faculty concerned with comparative Political Science questions or the area centers found candidates proposed by the Department did not meet the needs of the area centers. At the same time, however, the serious engagement and familiarity with an area enabled a number of faculty to continue the departmental tradition we saw with Hayden of bringing their scholarly expertise to service in governmental agencies.31 This was especially true of the political scientists associated with the China Center: Michel Oksenberg served as a senior member of the National Security Council under in the Carter administration from 1977-80 and Kenneth Lieberthal was Special Assistant to the President for National Security Affairs and Senior Director for Asia at the U.S. National Security Council during the Clinton Administration. George

31 See above (p. 13) for the involvement in the 1930s of Joseph Hayden in the administration of the Philippines.
Grassmuck worked in the Nixon Administration as a Special Assistant for International Affairs on the staff of the Secretary for Heath, Education And Welfare and was a secretary to the Gerald R. Ford Foundation.

There were also members of the Department hired in the late 1960s who were specialists on particular regions of the world that were not covered by the area centers. Robert Putnam of “Bowling Alone” fame came to Michigan from the Yale Ph.D. program as a Lecturer in 1968 and remained a member of the Department until 1979. It was during his time at Michigan that he did the research for his first book, *Making Democracy Work: Civic Traditions in Modern Italy* (1993), in which he develops the theoretical concept of “social capital” that lies at the heart of his later work. Daniel H. Levine also came to Michigan from Yale a year after Putnam; he studied Latin America, initially with an interest in democracy’s potential in that part of the world and then moving more broadly to religion and politics, a move that took him beyond a central focus on Latin America. Although current faculty member Rocio Titiunik teaches about Latin America, she was not hired as a specialist in Latin American politics.

Africa was another area that the Department considered important to cover in its curriculum, but until the establishment of the Center for Afro-American Studies became the Center for African and Afro-American Studies, there was no

32 Putnam left Michigan for Harvard where in addition to being a member of the Government Department there has also served as Dean of the Kennedy School of Government and as Director of its Center for International Affairs.
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center that supported research in that area.\textsuperscript{33} Nevertheless, the Department had a series of scholars with interests in the region: Ali Mazrui (1973-1991),\textsuperscript{34} Ernest Wilson (1986-92),\textsuperscript{35} and Jennifer Widner (1995-2004).\textsuperscript{36} Since Widner’s departure no regular member of the faculty has had Africa as her or his primary area of scholarly focus. True to the worries expressed by Dean Steiner when he created the FASAC positions, Comparative faculty not explicitly associated with the area centers are not necessarily replaced with scholars with the same area focus. In contrast, FASAC has kept alive the positions associated directly with area centers: Kenneth McElwain fills the Japan ”slot”; Mary Gallagher and Yuen Yuen Ang the China slots; Allen Hicken the SSEAS slot; Mark Tessler the CMENAS slot.\textsuperscript{37}

\textsuperscript{33} Michigan State was designated as the locus for African studies in the state of Michigan and thus their library had a far more extensive collection of materials relevant to African studies than did the University of Michigan’s library.

\textsuperscript{34} Mazrui arrived at Michigan when he was forced into exile by Idi Amin. His writings focused on western oppression in Africa. He left Michigan to become the Albert Schweitzer Professor in the Humanities at Binghamton University (SUNY).

\textsuperscript{35} Ernest Wilson was more closely associated with the now defunct Center for Economic Development (CRED) rather than CAAS.

\textsuperscript{36} Widner looked to Africa for the study of judicial politics and emerging constitutions.

\textsuperscript{37} Although Anna M. Grzymala-Busse was not hired to fill a FASAC position, her interest in the post-communist states of Eastern Europe ensures her ties to CREES.
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The occasionally uneasy relationship between the Department and the Centers began to resolve itself as more scholars (such as those just listed) with a strong background in Political Science as well as area expertise found that their deep immersion into specific areas of the globe gave them insights into Political Science questions that might be better studied initially in an area and yet have purchase when the theoretical implication could be translated into a broader theory. An excellent, but not the only example, is Anna Grzymała-Busse. Her award winning books based on the examination of post-Communist parties in the transitional countries in this region add greatly to the discipline’s understanding of the processes of democratization and political institutional controls, knowledge that is highly relevant in all parts of the globe (Grzymała-Busse, 2002 and 2007).

During the same period in the early 1960s that the area centers were fostering the intensive study of particular regions of the world, the work at the Center for Political Studies independently nourished the study of political behavior in countries other than the United States. In the 1960s there was no Center for Western European Studies and faculty such as Samuel Barnes, Roy Pierce, and Ronald Inglehart with interests in Western Europe gravitated to CPS, which closely reflected the methodologies and approaches of their work.

and since her arrival at Michigan from Yale in 2004 she has become the Director of the recently established Weiser Center for Emerging Democracies and Weiser Center for Europe and Eurasia.
The faculty working on Western Europe with ties to CPS launched a number of major multi-national projects. Partially in response to the protest movements in western democracies in the late 1960s, scholars from CPS met with European counterparts in Brussels in 1971 to design a multinational study of political participation. The goal was to co-ordinate fund-raising and the development of survey instruments so that participants in each country could conduct surveys with common questions, thereby ensuring that the results would be truly comparative and not a series of case studies. Miller initiated the project, Barnes ultimately became the project director, and he along with Inglehart and Jennings constituted the United States participants. Work on what was called the Political Action Project resulted in the publication of the highly influential *Political Action: Mass Participation in Five Western Democracies* in 1979. Inglehart’s own research captures as well this meshing of comparative politics with the methodologies of CPS leading to large multi-national research. Inglehart’s early work had used survey data to examine post-materialist attitudes in Western Europe (Inglehart, 1977); he expanded this project into an international network of survey researchers studying a broad range of questions about values and beliefs in virtually every country of the world under the title of *The World Values Survey*.  

---

38 See as well Barnes (1977) and Pierce (1995).

39 Inglehart’s work was recognized with the Johan Skytte Prize in 2011 and the Helen Dinerman Award for innovations in survey research methodology in 2014.
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The most ambitious of the efforts to extend U.S. based scholarship to another region was the collaboration that began in 1988 between the Center for Chinese Studies at the University of Michigan and Beijing University (Beida) organized by Michel Oksenberg and Kenneth Lieberthal with support from the Luce Foundation. The explicit objective was to match Michigan scholars who had studied local politics in its many forms in the U.S. with four young Chinese scholars who were experts on local government in China to create an ambitious study of the democratic reforms then occurring in rural China. \footnote{The Michigan scholars were Sam Eldersveld, John Jackson, Kent Jennings and Melanie Manion (then finishing her Ph.D.). One of the China scholars, Shen Mingming, was finishing his Ph.D. at Michigan prior to returning to Beijing.} Oksenberg and Lieberthal led an intense series of seminars for the Michigan scholars to give them some background in Chinese politics and then turned them loose in Beijing and rural China, under Melanie Manion’s careful and skillful guidance. The end result, after many intervening crises such as the Tiananmen Massacre and the Chinese government’s embargo of the data, was an extensive and for the time period innovative study of Chinese politics, as evidenced by the publications from the project (Eldersveld and Shen, 2001; Jennings, 1997, 1998, 2003; and Manion, 1996, 2006, 2010.)

In the 1970s and 1980s there were also a number of department faculty associated with CPS whose work had been primarily on American politics who themselves became interested in expanding their findings and methods to studies of other countries. 

\footnote{The Michigan scholars were Sam Eldersveld, John Jackson, Kent Jennings and Melanie Manion (then finishing her Ph.D.). One of the China scholars, Shen Mingming, was finishing his Ph.D. at Michigan prior to returning to Beijing.}
Pierce in *PS*, the Michigan political scientists “refused to accept the proposition that the methodologies successful in studying American politics were unsuitable for studying politics outside the United States. That refusal to draw geographical boundaries between methodologies reduced the barriers between the subfields of American and comparative politics.”41 This led at first to a series of seminal collaborations between Americanists and scholars who worked on Western Europe: Donald Stokes joined with the British political scientist David Butler to produce *Study of Political Change in Britain, 1963-1970* (1972). Philip Converse was a co-author with Roy Pierce of *Political Representation in France* (1986). More recently, Kenneth Kollman collaborated with Pradeep Chhibber, a specialist on India who was on the faculty from 1993-2000,42 to write the jointly authored *The Formation of National Party Systems: Federalism and Party Competition in Canada, Great Britain, India and the United States* (2004).

The Department also has a long and continuing tradition of Americanists working individually, but with the assistance of their Comparativist colleagues, to expand the scope of their work. These endeavors extend well beyond the Western Europe explorations of the earlier CPS studies. Sam Eldersveld is an early example of this process. His most notable early work on political parties and organizations


42 Chhibber left the Department for Berkeley, where he eventually served as Chair of the Department of Political Science.
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was U.S. centered. During a sabbatical in 1984 Eldersveld combined a long standing nascent interest in India and its transition to a democratic system with encouragement by Richard Park, including help in obtaining a “beginner scholar’s grant” from the American Council for Indian Studies, to spend a year in India. Again with Park’s assistance, Eldersveld spent a very productive year at the Indian Institute for Public Administration leading to several books based on the data and experiences he collected there. Thomas J. Anton is another example. His training and first publications were concerned with local public and urban policy in the U.S. (see, for example, Anton, 1961 and 1963). He subsequently published two substantial books on local politics and administrative politics in Sweden (Anton, 1975 and 1980). More recently John Jackson, with help and encouragement from William Zimmerman and Anna Grzymala-Busse, brought the methods for studying economic transitions he used to examine the Michigan economy during the 1980s to the study of the economic and political transformations taking place in Eastern Europe and in Poland most particularly.

____________________


44 Jackson, Klich, and Poznańska (1999) present a direct comparison of the changes in the Michigan economy during the 1980’s and the Polish economy in the 1990s. A book from the project, Jackson, Klich, and Poznańsk (2005), received the Minister’s Award from the Polish Ministry of Science and Higher Education.
The department now houses a range of scholars working in the Comparative field with a variety of approaches. The area center focus remains with faculty like Mary Gallagher and Yuen Yuen Ang working on China, Allen Hicken on Southeast Asia, Kenneth McElwain on Japan, Pauline Jones Luong on central Asia, Mark Tessler on the Middle East, and Zvi Gitelman on Eastern Europe, though for each of these scholars the area focus provides the seedbed for the analysis of broadly applicable Political Science questions. There are also numerous other scholars whose Comparative work tends to be driven more by specific fields of inquiry such as democratization, political economy (William Clark, Robert Franzese, Andrew Kerner), political centralization (Kenneth Kollman), federalism (Jenna Bednar) and even sports culture (Andrei Markovits). In addition, formal modeling has become part of the Comparative field with study of political institutions abstracted from the particularities of any specific region in the work of George Tsebelis.

**World Politics, aka International Relations**

World War II and the Cold War that followed stimulated major changes in the study of International Relations and conflict between nations. The Department was well represented in the traditional mode, which emphasized a historical and legal approach to diplomacy, treaties and international organizations, but poorly suited for the new work, which was more analytical, such as models of arms races, bargaining and conflict resolution and behavioral and systematic empirical studies. Again activities outside the department would provide important opportunities for the Department to transform itself much as it had in the area of political behavior.
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The University established a Mental Health Research Institute (MHRI) in 1955 with the goal of applying scientific methods to the study of human behavior. The mathematician Anatol Rapoport was an early and important figure in the Institute. Independently of the MHRI in 1957 an interdisciplinary journal called *The Journal of Conflict Resolution* was created with its editorial offices at the University. The editorial board consisted of faculty from several Social Science disciplines, notably Robert Angell (Sociology), Kenneth Boulding (Economics) and Irwin Katz (Psychology). The journal’s purpose was to promote interdisciplinary Social Science research on conflict resolution aimed at preventing global war. In 1959 these scholars successfully created the Center for Conflict Resolution (CCR) with the same mission, what they now called “peace research.” There was no connection between the MHRI and the CCR, but together they formed a platform from which to change permanently the way International Relations were studied in the Department.

Kenneth Boulding met a young political scientist named J. David Singer at a conference on Asian Security about the time the CCR was being formed. Boulding encouraged Singer to apply for an open visiting position at Michigan, which Singer did and was hired. The visiting appointment stretched to two years. Singer’s work also caught the attention of the MHRI, where he interviewed for a position. He was offered the position and after a short stay at the U.S. Naval War College he returned to Michigan in 1960 as a research scientist at the MHRI, but at that point had no departmental affiliation.

Singer began his signature work, which came to be called the Correlates of War (COW), at this time. It was a massive effort done jointly with the Historian
Melvin Small to compile quantitative measures of inter-state conflict and their correlates beginning in 1816. The project formally began in 1963 with a grant to the CCR from the Carnegie Foundation. It was inspired by previous work by Quincy Wright at Chicago, whom Singer met during his time at the Naval War College and Karl Deutsch of Harvard, whom Singer met while a visiting Fellow there in 1957–58 before coming to Michigan. These data have become the standard in the systematic empirical study of inter-state conflict. In 1964 Singer joined the Department as an Associate Professor and was promoted to Full Professor in 1965. Singer’s work and appointment marked a major change in the way International Relations were studied at Michigan.

The next major step in building a systematic empirical IR program was the appointment in 1965 of A. F. K. Organski. Organski was a recognized and respected scholar and his 1958 book, World Politics, was being widely cited when he was recruited to Michigan from Brooklyn College. He was one of the rare instances during this transition period where the Department recruited an already established figure. His work, often done with current and former students, explored empirically the various objectives that countries pursued in the international arena and the resources they possessed to further those pursuits. This work encompassed a broader set of objectives and resources than the more traditional studies of power and conflict. Organski and Singer had very little in common other than both having Ph.D. degrees from NYU in the early 1950s; one current Department member argues the Department should retain the title World Politics for its subfield rather than the more common title International Relations simply because it was the one thing on
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which the two agreed. But, they shared a commitment to empirical studies of conflict and the interactions among states though each pursued these empirical studies quite differently, with Organski’s work more closely connected to International Relations and economic theories.

Security studies continued to expand and evolve after this period with the appointment of Raymond Tanter (1967), Paul Huth (1986), James Morrow (2000) and Allan Stam (2007). All contributed their own initiatives and agendas to the broad themes largely set by these two early appointments. Morrow and Stam, for example, in their own ways bring a very important blend of formal theory and empirical work to the Department’s scholarship. They have also expanded the scope of the study of conflicts, partially in response to the changes in the world environment. The Department can claim to have trained a large set of the scholars in this field. This effort received a major boost from a grant William Zimmerman received from the MacArthur Foundation for pre- and post-doctoral fellowships. Many of the prominent young full professors in International Relations are products of this program and the Michigan Department.

World Politics as studied and taught at Michigan has a second major component that has been an important part of the Department’s scholarly reputation. This is the study of International Organizations, which took its current form with the appointments of Inis Claude and Harold Jacobson in 1957 while
Pollock was still chair. Jacobson’s scholarly trajectory nicely captures the substantial change in the Department’s scholarship his hiring signaled and the evolution of this area back to some of the earlier roots, albeit with quite different conceptual thinking. The Department’s previous scholarship on International Organizations was historical and legal in its approach. Jacobson, with a 1955 Ph.D. from Yale, describes himself and his training as part of the behavioral revolution. The emphasis was on developing theories based on insights from the behavioral sciences, on amassing data, and then on systematically deriving generalizations and testing these theories (Jacobson, 2001, p. 15). Jacobson said he purposely avoided a course in International Law, opting instead for the works of Lasswell, then in the Yale Law School. He then proceeds to describe his extensive collaborations with international legal scholars, such as Eric Stein, Edith Brown Weiss, David Kay and Charlotte Ku. Jacobson carefully relates that one consequence of these collaborations is taking institutions seriously; he quotes North (1990, p. 3) to say: “Institutions are the rules of the game, ... the humanely devised constraints that shape human interactions” (Jacobson, 2001, p. 19). As he notes, this definition of

45 Claude left Michigan for the University of Virginia in 1968. Jacobson remained an active member of the Department where he was the Jesse Siddall Reeves Collegiate Professor of Political Science until his death in 2001. At the University he was honored with the Distinguished Faculty Achievement Award, an Amoco Teaching Award, and an Excellence in Education Award. He was elected a Fellow of the American Association for the Advancement of Science in 1999.
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and attention to institutions reconnects to the earlier legalistic studies of International Organizations, though one might add with newer conceptual tools and methods. This focus on institutions, as described by North and elaborated on by others, is now a central part of the study of political organizations in all settings.

The work of the current faculty studying International Organizations, such as Barbara Koremenos, fits well with Jacobson’s descriptions of his own evolution (see for example, Koremenos, forthcoming). Morrow’s forthcoming book connects the study of conflict with legal institutions, providing a very modern interpretation to some of the issues that originally motivated the Department’s formation (Morrow, 2014). The studies of conflict were further broadened to include those arising from ethnic differences, human rights violations and civil war in 2012 when Christian Davenport was hired as a Full Professor.

**Political Theory**

Although the study of Political Science (or “Government” as it was called in the eighteenth and nineteenth century) in its early years focused primarily on the classic texts of Political Theory, Plato, Aristotle, Locke, Rousseau, Montesquieu, and – especially after the trips by American scholars to German universities in the nineteenth century – Hegel, the transformation brought about by the re-orientation of Political Science to the scientific study of politics with an emphasis on measurement, precision and observation created a deep chasm between the new approach and the more traditional nature of a text-focused discipline, whether those
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texts be those of political theorists or constitutions and legal systems. Jesse Siddall Reeves, the first chair of the Department, for example, had published “Jeremy Bentham and American Jurisprudence” (1906) and “The Influence of the Law of Nature on International Law in the United States” (1909) prior to his appointment at Michigan and wrote pieces with titles such as “Fundamental Concepts in International Law in Relation to Political Theory and Legal Philosophy” (nd), “Justiciability of International Disputes” (1916), and “Two Conceptions of the Freedom of the Seas” (1917), a work that draws heavily on the writings of Hugo Grotius and other such late medieval theorists as Bartolus and Gentilis, theorists who are likely to be obscure even to political theorists of today, but not to Political Science students of World Politics or law in the early days of the Department.

The effort to bring the observational and developing statistical methods to the study of politics at places like Chicago and Columbia in the 1920s and 1930s coincided with the emergence and eventual philosophical hegemony in the Anglo-American scholarly world of positivism and its sharp demarcation between “facts” and “values.” In the (in)famous language of the English philosopher A.J. Ayer, “values” were simply “ejaculations” which could neither be proved nor disproved. 47

46 Charles Merriam, credited with initiating the “behavioral movement” at the University of Chicago, for instance, began his publishing career in 1900 with “The History of Sovereignty Since Rousseau,” a volume in Columbia University’s “Studies in the Social Sciences.”

47 Ayer was originally published in 1936.
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The success of positivism meant the diminishment of an interest in an unverifiable field of inquiry – most specifically Political and Moral Theory.

While members of the Department continued to teach courses on the classic texts in Political Theory, no scholar appears to have been identified as specializing in “Political Theory” as such. In 1947, James Meisel became a regular member of the Department. A German Jewish émigré, he had been a writer of novels and plays, a drama critic, translator and editor in Germany before leaving Europe in 1938 and serving for two years as the secretary to Thomas Mann at Princeton. In 1943 he arrived at Michigan to assist in the civil and military instruction program that was conducted in Michigan during World War II and then in 1945 after the war he became a Lecturer in the Department. The circumstances that led to his move from the military instruction program to the Department are unclear. Meisel’s scholarship centered on Italian social theory, the field in which he had specialized as a student in the twenties in Germany, but he had not been an academic before his arrival at Michigan. In 1947 Frank Grace, having worked on the theory of

__________

48 Meisel was the co-editor with James K. Pollock of *German Under Occupation: Illustrative Materials and Documents* (1947). He is listed in this volume as “Lecturer in Political Science.” Since Pollock was the Chair of the Department at this time, it may have been their common interest in Germany that brought Meisel into the Department, not a concern with hiring a political theorist.

49 Meisel published several volumes on the Italian social theorists, Mosca and Pareto, as well as on Georges Sorel. Though Meisel produced several academic
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property in Christian thought, joined the Department adding specifically to teaching in the field of Political Theory and introducing to the Department for the first time courses in American Political Thought. These two, Meisel and Grace, with very different theoretical orientations and backgrounds constituted the Theory component of the Department for the next twenty years. As the Department and the discipline changed radically during this period, Political Theory lived quietly on the side of those developments – at least at Michigan.

This quiet co-existence was not the case elsewhere; the dismissive attitude to Political Theory by many – but certainly not all – practitioners of the new Political Science led to schisms in departments of Political Science throughout the U.S. between political theorists and others, especially those influenced by the behavioral approach to politics. The writings by Straussians at the University of Chicago, in particular, challenged the positivism of the now dominant orientation to Political Science. In a volume of essays criticizing the direction of the discipline published in 1962, Walter Berns took aim at survey research and the sociological and psychological approach to voter studies that failed to set such studies within a truly political context. He complained that such studies of politics failed to address a concern with the “common good” on the part of citizens (Berns, 1962). Studies that concluded that “healthy democracies” depended on the abdication of involvement by the rational citizen threatened, he claimed, democracy. In an Appendix written volumes, he never gave up his literary ambitions and published a novel, *A Matter of Endurance*, in 1970.
after he wrote the article, however, he praises the Michigan authors of *The American Voter* for bringing “the political” back into the study of voting, and concludes: “The importance of this rediscovery of the political by empirical political science should not be minimized.... it provides the opportunity for a new beginning that could lead to the valuable studies of the politics of the mid-twentieth century America” (1962, p. 62).

Though Berns ended his essay with this praise of the Michigan work in voter studies, it was the final essay in the volume by Leo Strauss that defined the relationship between theory and empirical Political Science for decades to come. After criticizing what he calls the “new political science” for failing to build its work on a deep understanding of political things that are impervious to precise measurement, an understanding that recognizes what is “highest” – or the “qualitative difference...between liberal democracy and communism” (1968, 318) – Strauss concludes the essay with the (in)famous line: “One may say of it [the new political science] that it fiddles while Rome burns. It is excused by two facts: it does not know that it fiddles, and it does not know that Rome burns.” (1962, p 327)

Though other political theorists may not have been as virulent in their responses to the “new political science,” the gauntlet had been cast down and most political scientists found that the best way of dealing with the threat was to ignore the challenge Strauss and his students had posed.

The two theorists at Michigan, one devoted to teaching the history of political thought and the other writing on Italian social theory, were not concerned with addressing the limitations of the new Political Science, and worked peacefully
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alongside the practitioners of the new approaches to the field. Roy Pierce, whose primary area was French politics and Comparative Politics, occasionally taught courses on French political theory,\(^50\) but was primarily located in the Center for Political Studies and connected with the work done there, and Pierce did not engage in the warfare about the place of Political Theory in the profession that marked other departments. Alfred G. Meyer was the exception to this. Though hardly one who would have found his intellectual roots in the work of Leo Strauss, Meyer often played the gadfly as a critic of the newer approaches to Political Science for which he displayed much contempt, finding a more comfortable home for himself among the theorists, teaching the large freshman Introduction to Political Theory and courses in Marxism. A German Jewish refugee (like Meisel), he shared with Meisel the Germanic gymnasium education and put that to play in the teaching of Political Theory. He had come to the University in 1966 as a specialist in the politics of the Soviet Union and served on occasion as the director of the Center for Russian and Eastern European Studies. He complemented his interest in Soviet bureaucratic practices with the study of Marxist ideology and had published major works on Leninism and Communism, tuning later in his career to the relation of feminism and socialism, in particular the feminist socialist Lilly Braun.

\(^{50}\) Pierce published a book on *Contemporary French Political Thought* (1966) developing the argument that the French political system needed to be understood as emerging from the intellectual history of that country.
When Meisel retired in 1970, the Department under the leadership of Donald Stokes initially hired two theorists, Nancy Hartsock, who had received her Ph.D. from Chicago with a thesis entitled “Philosophy, Ideology, and Ordinary Language: The Political Thought of Black Community Leaders” and Frances Svensson, who worked on Whitehead and process theory. Arlene Saxonhouse, a specialist in the study of ancient Greek and early modern political thought, joined the department in 1972 with a joint appointment in the Residential College, a unit of the University initially established to introduce a venue for the intensive study of the “great books.” After two years, as the Residential College responded to the “canon wars” and migrated from its original orientation, she chose to become full time in the Department, joining Frank Grace and Al Meyer (and briefly Hartsock and Svensson) to constitute the small section of the Department devoted to the teaching of Political Theory. At the same time John Chamberlin, who had a joint appointment with IPPS, brought his interest in John Rawls, whose *A Theory of Justice* was published in 1970, to the Theory program.

The Department consistently maintained a small number of theorists through the 1970s and 1980s. After Grace’s retirement in 1982, Don Herzog joined

---

Hartsock, who later became a significant contributor to feminist theory, was heavily involved in the activities surrounding the demands coming from the Black Matters Committee (see above, below p. 53). She left Michigan in 1974 first for Johns Hopkins and then for the University of Washington. Svensson left the University in 1978.
the Department in 1983 bringing to it a focus on liberal theory, contract theory, and an interest in English political thought. As his interests moved in the direction of the nature of law, however, he found himself teaching in the Law School and eventually moved his entire appointment to the Law School. In the 1990s, after the retirement of Meyer, Elizabeth Wingrove, with her ties to Women’s Studies and interest in feminist theory, and Mika LaVaque-Manty, with a Ph.D. in Philosophy from Michigan, joined the Department. In 2008 Lisa Disch, like Wingrove with a partial appointment in Women’s Studies and interested in feminist theory as well as contemporary democratic theory, joined the Department. The particular interests of and methods employed by the current core group of Theory faculty is very varied with Wingrove concerned with questions of classical reception and modes of address, Disch with concepts of representation (2011), LaVaque-Manty with the meaning of dignity (2006) and the place of technology in the classroom, and Saxonhouse looking at democratic theory and the meaning of responsibility. Nevertheless, they all subscribe to the importance of working from careful readings and understanding of the texts in the field, even as those texts have expanded from the canonical works as the basis of Jesse Siddall Reeves’s studies of international law to include literary works, country music, and prisoners’ letters.  

52 See for example Saxonhouse (2014), Wingrove, (2010), and LaVaque-Manty (2008).
Race and Gender

In 1938 the Department granted the Ph.D. to Thomas R. Solomon. The title of his dissertation was “The Participation of Negroes in Detroit Elections”; his supervisor was James K. Pollock. Following the granting of the degree, Solomon taught for the rest of his career at Prairie View A&M College in Texas. Solomon was the second African-American in the country to receive a Ph.D. in the field of Political Science. In the late 1960s and early 1970s Joel D. Aberbach and Jack L. Walker, Jr. wrote a series of articles and a monograph on racial attitudes of blacks and whites and on race and urban public policy (See Aberbach and Walker, 1970a, 1970b, and 1973). They also taught undergraduate and graduate courses within the Department on these subjects during this period. Their long-term interests were...

53 Solomon who was born in Macon, Georgia, began his graduate education moved to Detroit in his twenties and graduated with an AB and MA from City College of Detroit (now Wayne State University) before enrolling in the PhD program at Michigan. He taught at Prairie View from 1939 until his retirement in 1972. He was also heavily involved in the establishment of the Booker T. Washington Technical Institute in Liberia for which he was awarded the “Knight Commander of Humane Order of African Redemption” from the Liberian Government. See Prestage (1993).
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more focused on Public Policy broadly and on the federal executive branch, so their work on race and politics never grew into a viable long-term program.\textsuperscript{54}

The turmoil that beset the social and political world in the United States in the late 1960s and early 1970s put significant pressure on the Department to respond to the changing academic universe reacting to that unrest. One response was to hire minorities and women. Donald Stokes, who was briefly chair in 1970-71 (prior to becoming the Dean of the Rackham Graduate School), brought to the Department during that single year a number of minorities and women (Nancy Hartsock, Cedric Robinson, William Ellis, Frances Svensson, and Arlene Saxonhouse).\textsuperscript{55} These newly hired faculty – some more so, some less so – along with

\textsuperscript{54} Both Aberbach and Walker were jointly appointed in the Department and in the Institute for Public Policy Studies, hence their interests in broader public policy issues.

\textsuperscript{55} Raymond Tanter had came to the Department from Northwestern in 1967 and remained at the University teaching international relations until 2000. Nellie Varner, an African American woman who had received her Ph.D. from the Department, had joined the Department as a faculty member in 1968; she was the first woman. Her academic focus was Soviet politics. Varner went onto serve in the President’s office in 1973 and as a dean at Rackham. She then left the University to enter the business world in Detroit, returning to the University as a Regent and serving on numerous advisory boards. Archibald Singham was recruit from the
some faculty who were present already (specifically, Joel Samoff and Archibald Singham) were determined to make the department rethink its fundamental mission and the principles underlying its research agenda. It was during this period that the Committee on Black Matters (which later morphed into the PSOC, Political Scientists of Color) and the Women’s Caucus began, each having the goals of influencing departmental hiring and admissions priorities and providing a venue for the few women and minority faculty and students to explore common concerns and interests.

Following a radical and explicitly Marxist agenda and rejecting the work of Aberbach and Walker, some of the faculty hired during Stokes’ brief chairmanship made a serious effort to revise the Department’s graduate program by introducing a new subfield in “Political Economy,” understood as “The Study and Analysis of Imperialism, Oppression and Liberation.” This new subfield would include a core course on Hegelian philosophy that would provide a “powerful system...for discovering the butterflies in the larvae of contemporary society,” as well as other courses on such topics as “Workers and the Dispossessed,” “Class and Caste in Post-Industrial Society” and “The Garrison State.” A memo of support for this new subfield signed by over thirty graduate students was sent to the executive University of the West Indies in Jamaica in 1968, the same year Varner was hired. Singham left the Department in 1972 to take a position at Howard University.

56 Memo from the Black Matters Committee, revised (March 15, 1972).

57 Ibid.
committee and Department. Along with these efforts came proposals for an admission policy based on a lottery system with the goal of admitting a class that would be half male and half female, half minority (which largely meant African-American at that time) and half white. Though the recommendations for the revised admissions policy and the new subfield did not receive enough votes at faculty meetings in 1972 to be implemented, a series of courses on liberation politics with sections on women and minorities was added to the undergraduate curriculum. For years these courses were mostly taught by committed graduate students such as Virginia Sapiro, who carried these interests forward in their future research and careers.

The turmoil created by these proposals died down relatively quickly as most of the faculty involved in the efforts to have them adopted left the Department within the next several years. However, the pressure to keep questions of gender and race within the departmental purview remained, largely under the influence of the Women's Caucus and the Committee on Black Matters who continued to encourage the Department to admit more minorities and women to the graduate program and to hire more women and minorities as faculty. Though some women (Edie Goldenberg, Mary Corcoran and Pauline Stone at the junior level and Catherine Kelleher as an untenured associate professor) and faculty of color (Ali Mazrui at the full professor level and Nolan Jones as a junior faculty member) were hired in the next decade, the efforts at recruitment of women and minorities were not particularly successful until the mid-1980s. A glance at the pictures of the departmental faculty from that period shows a startling transformation in dress and
facial hair (as well as the length of that hair), but only a few non-white or female faces appear before the picture from 1987. The efforts to recruit students of color and women met with somewhat more success. By 1992, the number of minority students actively pursuing graduate degrees in the Department was somewhere around forty, most of whom entered the program after 1987.

In the fall term of 1982, alumnae of the Women’s Caucus returned to the Department for a 10 year celebration of the founding of the Caucus with a keynote speech by former graduate student Virginia Sapiro who was by then teaching at the University of Wisconsin. Invitations to the celebration noted the progress made since 1972: two tenured women, two untenured women and two women lecturers, three undergraduate courses on women and politics, a graduate class that had 25-30% women and “never holding a bake sale.” While progress was evident in the demographics of the department, the efforts to influence research did not move easily beyond the women faculty who were already devoted to the issues.

In 1974 Virginia Sapiro, on behalf of the Women’s Caucus, “created the first bibliography of writings on the role of women in the political system”58 with the hope of encouraging faculty to include relevant work on gender in their courses, as well as become themselves aware of the possibility of doing meaningful research in the area. It was not until 1992 that funding from ISR, Rackham and the Department supported hiring two graduate students to create a bibliography on race and politics with the explicit purpose of providing a “reference for professors and TAs in

58 Schram (nd), p. 11.
changing and developing new courses” and “references for people doing research on race and politics.” Each of these bibliographies were only a few pages long, but each served as a starting point for a field now well acknowledged to have a major role in the discipline; virtually no substantive area in the discipline can ignore either race or gender.

With financial support from the Department and under the leadership of the Women’s Caucus a Saturday symposium in the winter term of 1982 asked faculty in the Department to reflect on how questions of gender might “influence research in major fields of political science,” be incorporated into ongoing research projects, and “influence questions for research in political science.” Faculty from the American subfield (John Kingdon, Jack Walker, Tom Anton) and political theory (Alfred Meyer, Arlene Saxonhouse, Joel Schwartz) agreed to participate. Except for the theorists none had addressed the issues previously in their research and while none except the theorists went on to make gender a focus of their research agendas, the posing of the question and the participation of graduate students in planning and attending the symposium introduced a number of future scholars to potential of bringing gender questions into the study of politics.

The Women’s Studies program at the University of Michigan was one of the first to be established in the country, but it began modestly in 1972, run and taught largely by graduate students with faculty serving only as advisors. As such, it did not have the resources to support the research or provide the intellectual
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stimulation for faculty coming to the Department during the 1970s and early 1980s. With its largely undergraduate focus and staffed primarily by graduate students or lecturers, it could not participate in efforts to bring to the University faculty hired by the Department or provide resources for current faculty in the Department in the way that ISR, IPPS, MHRI, or the area centers could.60 While the early efforts by the Women’s Caucus to engage faculty in general with questions of gender met with only marginal success at first, by the mid-1990s the situation had changed significantly. By then, the Women’s Studies program was transformed from a program largely run by graduate students to one with budget to make its own faculty appointments and to provide resources for faculty in other departments. The changed status of the Program enabled the Department to make its first joint appointment with Women’s Studies of Elizabeth Wingrove in 1997; in 2006 Lisa Disch arrived in the Department, also with a joint appointment in Women’s Studies. While other faculty in the Department do not have budgeted appointments in what is now the Department of Women’s Studies, a number of faculty have affiliations with Women Studies (Saxonhouse, Corcoran, and Burns) and often regularly bring questions of gender to their distinctive areas of research. A number of graduate students in the Department have also taken advantage of the resources and courses

in Women's Studies and received a Certificate in Women's Studies along with their Ph.D.s.

Though the demands of the Committee on Black Matters in the early 1970s failed to bring race into the research and teaching agendas of the faculty, by the 1990s significant changes had occurred. Three faculty hired in the 1980s with significant ties to ISR and the Center for Political Studies (Donald R. Kinder, Steven J. Rosenstone,61 and Michael C. Dawson62) instituted a Research Program on Race and American Politics in the late 1980s with financial support from the Carnegie Foundation, the Ford Foundation, the OVPR and (what was then) the Center for Afro-American and African Studies. Working from the premise that “race constitutes a fundamental and defining feature of the contemporary American experience,” the Research Center identified a series of critical questions concerning the prevalence of race in American society, “how its pernicious political consequences [might] be diminished,” the effects of the election of blacks to political power on the daily lives of blacks, the political implications of the emergence of a black middle class, and much more. The brochure announcing the creation of the Program expresses the expectation that it will lead to the “recruitment and training of graduate students from a diversity of ethnic and racial backgrounds” to promote

61 Rosenstone left the University in 1996 for Minnesota where he eventually became Chancellor of the Minnesota State Colleges and Universities.

62 Dawson left the University first for the University of Chicago in 1992 and then for Harvard University before returning to the University of Chicago.
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the goals of “excellence in graduate education and the creation of a diverse community” expressed in the values of the University at large. The Program has met those goals with great success. Though Dawson and Rosenstone left the University in the early 1990s, the Department recruited Hanes Walton in 1993 and Vincent Hutchings in 1997. Walton was recruited from Savannah State when he was already the pre-eminent scholar in the area of Black Politics in the country. He had set the agenda for the field with his work *Invisible Politics* (1985) in which he found fault with previous studies of black participation that by focusing on individual level phenomena failed to pay attention to the importance of systemic factors and indigenous institutions. Hutchings brought concerns with the representation of black interests as well as the priming of racial attitudes to the work of the Department.

The Program on Race and American Politics, drawing on the strengths of faculty throughout the department such as Nicholas Valentino and Nancy Burns, has flourished and arguably can be credited with producing both the largest number of minority scholars in the profession, many of whom began as co-authors with Race and Politics faculty, and the most significant work being done in the field of Race and Politics, perhaps not in the way that the proponents of liberation politics in the

63 Walton died suddenly in 2013, leaving a huge hole in the program.

64 See, for example, Kinder and Kam (2009); Kinder and Sanders (1996); Valentino, Hutchings, and White (2002); and Valentino, Hutchings, Philpot, and White” (2004).
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1970s may have envisioned it, but in a way consistent with the peculiar University strengths at the ISR and the Center for Political Studies in working with large data sets and survey research to explore the sources, effects and expressions of racial prejudice.

Law and Politics

In the early years of the Department (and even before the official founding of the department in 1910 when members of the Law faculty such as Angell and of the History faculty constitute the School of Political Science) the study of constitutional systems, both national and international, of treaties, and of municipal government lay at the core of the Department’s teaching and research agenda. The academic specialty of the first Department chair Jesse Siddall Reeves was international law and treaties. And with a few exceptions it was Political Science understood as the study of law and constitutions that remained the primary focus of the Department’s teaching, research and graduate training until the transformation of the Department introduced by Sam Eldersveld in the 1960s.

Joseph E. Kallenbach, for instance, who arrived in the Department in 1932 as a graduate student and later jointed the faculty in 1939 wrote articles on such topics as the constitutional status of the President, the Supreme Court and civil liberties, proposals to reform the electoral college and books that tended to be reviewed in the best law journals. His book *Federal Cooperation With The States Under The* 

65 Kallenbach remained in the department until his mandatory retirement in 1974 while also taking on a range of public service assignments, working with the Labor
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**Commerce Clause** was published in 1939 as Volume 14 of the University of Michigan Press' Series in History and Political Science. Volume 13 of this same series was Harold Dorr's edition of *The Michigan Constitutional Conventions of 1835-36: Debates and Proceedings*. Dorr, like Kallenbach, was a graduate student in the Department and joined its faculty in 1929 as an instructor, retiring in 1967. The approach of these two faculty to Public Law and that of others in the Department in the 1930s through the 1960s was far from what came to define the field of Public Law once the behavioral revolution took hold in Political Science.

James Eisenstein, coming from Yale in 1967 with its strong graduate training in behavioral Political Science and having an interest in criminology and sentencing, brought the first hint of the new approach to the study of law, an approach that was eschewing the study of constitutions and looking at the practices of the courts and law enforcement. Eisenstein, though, was only briefly in the Department, leaving for Penn State in 1972. With the departure of Eisenstein and with Kallenbach's retirement pending in 1974, the Department in 1972 hired two younger scholars

---

66 Dorr served as member of the Ann Arbor City Charter Commission in 1939 and in addition to large number of local service appointment also was a visiting expert on legislatures and legislative procedures for the military government of Germany in 1949.
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whose work in Public Law meshed more closely with the new departmental agenda, Milton Heumann and Nolan Jones. Heumann’s work on plea bargaining engaged well with the newly developing field of Law and Society that melded sociology with the study of law. Jones left the Department for the National Governor’s Association in 1978 and Heumann departed in 1981 for Rutgers University, leaving the Department without a presence for Public Law. William H. Harris who worked on constitutional theory briefly filled the slot in Public Law (1982-86), as did Jonathan Simon (1990-1993) and although Kim Scheppele with a degree in sociology from Chicago was recruited in 1984, her departure in 1996 left the field with only Mark Brandon. Brandon who had arrived in 1994 worked on the historical study of law, but his departure for Vanderbilt Law School in 2001 left the Department lacking a real presence in the field of Public Law with only Noga Morag-Levine. Morag-Levine came in 1997 bringing an interest in the more traditional study of administrative law but now connected to the newer concerns with environmental regulation. She left in 2003 to teach at the Thomas Cooley Law School.

Although undergraduates were eager to take courses in Public Law under the mistaken impression that such courses might facilitate their admission to law schools, the Department had difficulty finding the right people to hire in that field. The field languished after Brandon’s departure with visitors hired to teach the relevant courses. In 2006, however, Mariah Zeisberg joined the Department with a focus on understanding the practice of constitutional politics (2013), and in 2007 Pamela Brandwein arrived bringing to the field an historical approach to understanding the constitution (2011). Brandwein and Zeisberg now constitute the
core of the field, though the comparative study of constitutions (Kenneth McElwain), federalism (Jenna Bednar), international treaties (Barbara Koremenos), the relation between the judiciary and the legislative branch and the political conditions affecting law’s implementation and stability (Charles Shipan) bring the other subfields of the Department into connection with the Public Law area.

In some sense these scholars return the Department to the original concerns of its early years – comparative constitutions, international law, the study of the relationship between the federal government and the states such as one would find in Kallenbach’s work – but the research tools and the theoretical frameworks they employ differ vastly from the highly descriptive work that marked the scholarship prior to the disciplinary transformation of the 1960s.

Though the School of Political Science in the 1880s drew on distinguished faculty from the Law School, the Department has not had a sustained relationship with the Law School. Apart from Don Herzog who migrated from teaching Political Theory in the Department to teaching in and eventually having a full time position in the Law School, none of the faculty who have been hired in the field of Public Law in the last 50 years has had any institutional connection with the Law School.

Methods

The first record of a Methods course in the Department is one titled Bibliography and Methods of Research in Political Science by Everett Sommerville Brown in 1925. By 1960, though, Eldersveld in his letter to the Dean describing the state of the Department decries the absence of any Methods courses appropriate for
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a Political Science Department of that period. The introduction of the teaching of formal empirical methods proceeded slowly, primarily to support the Political Behavior program. This meant an emphasis on survey research methodology, preparation of questionnaires, drawing of samples, coding of responses, cross-tabulations of the coded responses and measures of association. The statistics required to support these functions were also taught.

Much of the Methods teaching was outsourced to the Inter-University Consortium for Political Research (ICPR, now the Inter-University Consortium for Political and Social Research, ICPSR). The ICPR was a consortium of universities organized by Warren Miller in 1962 as a means of easily distributing the election data being collected at the SRC. Miller also recognized that effective use of the data required adequate Methods training, which very few departments were offering at the time. In 1963 the ICPR began a summer program in Methods training with most of the courses taught by Michigan faculty from the Political Behavior program. IPPS also taught its own Methods courses for its Master’s students. While the presence of the ICPR, and the ICPSR, at Michigan provided many benefits for the Department, its presence along with the separate IPPS courses allowed the Department to neglect the development of a sequence of graduate Methods courses and to avoid creating a Methodology subfield. Herbert Weisberg, the person in the Department closest to being a methodologist in the early 1970s, wrote a memo in 1974 deploring the lack
of an explicit Methods subfield and its associated courses within the Department.⁶⁷ Among other things, he argued that the Department needed to make Methods a recognized subfield, hire a formal theorist in the Rochester mold, and hire an advanced empirical methodologist.⁶⁸ Kent Jennings introduced a course on research design and data collection directed at all subfields. Gregory Markus, who received his Ph.D. from the Department in 1975, assumed responsibility for the empirical methods courses after his appointment as an Asst. Professor. He taught several advanced courses in the Department and the ICPR, but there was not the breadth and depth within the Department to constitute a subfield. Because most of the methods teaching was done by faculty associated with the Political Behavior program it was easy to see the two as being connected rather than as the distinct areas they are. It would be several years to decades before Weisberg’s proposals were acted on, but all ultimately met with considerable success.

In 1980 the Department expanded its methods teaching when it combined its resources in the form of one open position with financial commitments from the CPS

---

⁶⁷ Herbert Weisberg received his Ph.D. from Michigan in 1968 as part of the political behavior program and was an Asst. and Assoc. Professor in the Department from 1969 to 1974. He moved to The Ohio State University in 1974.

⁶⁸ The Political Science Department at the University of Rochester was pioneering the development of formal models building on work in Economics and Game Theory though leadership in this area was passing to Yale and the California Institute of Technology at the time of Weisberg’s memo.
to make offers to John E. Jackson and to Donald R. Kinder. Jackson and Kinder had been active members of the American National Election Studies Board of Overseers and its 1980 study committee. Their work, though from quite different backgrounds, fit nicely with the program at CPS and the Department’s need for methodologists. Kinder, trained as a social psychologist, joined Jennings teaching the graduate course in research design. Under Kinder and Jennings and later with the addition of Nancy Burns, it expanded into an even broader course covering many forms of experiments and quasi-experiments. Kinder co-authored an important and early laboratory experiment in political behavior (Iyengar, et al., 1982) and co-edited a book on experimental methods in Political Science. This continued the experimental work done by Eldersveld (1956) and established the foundation for the advancement of formal experimental methods being done by Brader, Hutchings, Lupia, and Valentino, in the laboratory, the field, via the internet and within surveys.

Jackson, whose background was Political Economy, was an early participant in a movement to bring econometrics to Political Science. In 1977 he co-authored

69 In 1978 the National Science Foundation created three social science “laboratories” that were large-scale data collection programs, with the ANES being one of these. This designation carried the promise of steadier and more abundant funding in exchange for participation by a group of scholars from outside the University of Michigan in the oversight, planning, and design of the election studies, hence the Board of Overseers and the 1980 study committee.
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one of the first textbooks making econometrics accessible to social scientists outside Economics (Hanushek and Jackson, 1977). Previously most empirical work in Political Science was based on work in Psychology and derived from measures of association and analysis of variance, which were common to the experimental paradigm. The econometric approach, by contrast, was more model based, focused on what was called the data generating process. Initially this approach relied heavily on the linear regression model though increasingly the work featured more complex and richer types of models.

With Chris Achen from 1990 to 2003, the addition of Robert Franzese in 1996, and Jude Hays from 2000 to 2005 the Department had one of the premier empirical methodology groups in the discipline. An important development starting in the late 1970s but accelerated during this period was the extension of these empirical methods outside the Political Behavior and even the American Politics subfields. Achen contributed major papers to the World Politics subfield while Franzese's work and his work with Hays have been central to empirical work in Comparative and International Political Economy. William R. Clark was added to this group in 2004 and his co-authored piece showing the proper use of interaction terms using Comparative Politics data is one of the most cited Methods papers in the field’s main journal.

This area is going through another major transformation, moving away from the highly structured parametric models of the 1980s and 1990s to an approach that more closely mimics the experimental world of medical research. Some of this work is experimental, as described above. Other work is developing ways to use
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non-experimental, or observational, data in ways that capture the practices and advantages of experiments. Walter Mebane (hired in 2007) and Rocio Titiunik (2010) provide the department with a highly visible presence in this new direction.

The scholarly work of this group accounts for the Department’s consistently high and at times top rank in the Methodology subfield. Achen, Franzese and Jackson have been Presidents of the Society for Political Methodology, the discipline’s formally organized section, and a fourth, Charles H. Franklin, received his Ph.D. at Michigan (of a total of fifteen presidents between 1983 and 2013). Achen and Jackson received the Society’s first two Career Achievement Awards (of a total of seven awarded). The empirical part of the Methods subfield has fulfilled the goal that Eldersveld laid out in his 1960 memo – it just took awhile.

The development of a Formal Theory subfield, as envisioned by Eldersveld and proposed by Weisberg, was more difficult and took longer. A departmental strength has been its deep commitment to the development and interpretation of empirical evidence, in its many forms, as a means of comparing and evaluating alternative theories and explanations for political phenomena. This attention to empirically based scholarship was not restricted to quantitative methods, but was a characteristic of both quantitative and qualitative work in all fields. It was simply more evident in the studies of political behavior and inter-state conflict, but very

70 Achen was at UC-Berkeley when he was Society President and at Princeton when received the Career Achievement Award, but he was at Michigan longer than any other institution.
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much a part of the work on Congress, international organizations and various area studies. This set of shared values facilitated communication among what could have been very disparate groups. It was also a weakness because it fostered skepticism that at time bordered on outright hostility towards abstract theoretical work. These attitudes made it difficult to recruit and retain formal theorists.\(^{71}\) A comment made on more than one occasion during such discussions was that this person, “does not know things,” meaning some type of empirical facts, be they based on history or analysis of data. The theorist that Weisberg called for eluded the department for decades, to the point that it was late incorporating formal theory into its curriculum, something other departments which led the way (Rochester, CalTech, Stanford Business School, and Northwestern) had been doing for at least a decade.

The Department’s graduate curriculum included courses on mathematical models of social and political processes taught by Robert Axelrod or Michael Cohen. These models focused on how to use mathematical equations taken primarily from algebra and calculus to represent the relationships among concepts, represented by specific variables. Formal Theory in Political Science by the 1970’s increasingly followed a mostly abstract rigorous deductive approach that emphasized the derivation and proof of theorems about proposed relationships. These deductive

\(^{71}\) In 1985 the Department overcame rigorous objections from some members to hire James Morrow and Robert Powell, two young formal IR theorists trained at Rochester and UC-Berkeley in Economics, respectively. Both left shortly thereafter, Powell in 1986 and Morrow in 1989.
theories largely started with agents who had well developed information about the consequences of alternative actions and choices, who possessed well-defined objectives with which to compare these consequences and who then made the optimal choice given the alternatives. This style of theorizing was most advanced in Economics and most of the theoretical tools, such as models of optimization and game theory, had their origins in Economics. It was a combination of the abstraction and the assumptions about information and choice behavior that seemed at odds with the behavioral and empirical orientation of the faculty at the time.

It was not that rational choice was totally absent. Robert Axelrod’s research into the prisoner’s dilemma, and his widely praised book, Evolution of Cooperation in 1984, was based on a deep analysis of one of the most important games in the rational choice tradition.72 His presence and the prominence of his research kept rational choice approaches on the agenda for the Department. But Axelrod’s research was a specific variant of rational choice, evolutionary game theory that was important but narrower than the range of tools and concepts in the discipline. The

72 Robert Axelrod is the Walgreen Professor for the Study of Human Understanding. The methodological contributions of his work go well beyond the discipline of political science to such fields as economics and biology in addition to having a profound influence on the study and practice of International Relations. He received a MacArthur Prize Fellowship in 1987, the Charles E. Merriam Award from the American Political Science Association in 2011, the Johan Skytte Prize in 2013 and was elected President of the American Political Science Association.
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Department lacked faculty who could train graduate students in the full range of modeling methods.

The situation began to change around 1990, the year the Department hired Douglas Dion, a formal theorist with a Ph.D. from Michigan but who had received his training in formal theory from the Agricultural and Applied Economics program at the University of Minnesota.73 This marked only a small change as the Department in this period declined to make offers to two very highly recommended formal theorists, both of whom are now very prominent scholars. The more substantial changes came in 1992 and 1993 with the appointments of John Huber, a Ph.D. from the University of Rochester, and Ken Kollman, who received a Master’s degree in Mathematical Modeling in the Social Sciences along with his Ph.D. from Northwestern. Each was hired for their substantive expertise, Huber in Western European democracies and Kollman in U.S. politics though the work of both was solidly rooted in the application of formal models.74

These appointments provided vocal and scholarly support in the area of formal models but other than Dion not enough for graduate Methods teaching. This

73 Dion left for Purdue in 1997 and is now an Associate Professor at the University of Iowa.

74 Huber was recommended for tenure in 1997-98 but decided to move to Columbia University; Kollman is now the Frederick G. L. Huetwell Professor of Political Science at the University of Michigan. He is the recipient of several awards from APSA sections and a Faculty Recognition Award from the University of Michigan.
situation changed dramatically with the return of Jim Morrow and the arrival of Scott Page in 2000 and the (belated) hiring of Arthur Lupia in 2001. All three are highly recognized scholars and give the Department a strong Formal Theory subfield. The scholarship of the members of this group goes beyond proving theorems, though they can do that well, and gives Michigan’s Formal Theory subfield a distinctive character. Lupia’s scholarship uses formal models and experiments to examine how citizens acquire and use information in making careful decisions (See for example, Lupia and McCubbins, 1998, and Lupia, 2004). Page’s work examines how sets of individuals make decisions and interact within the context of complex settings to solve difficult problems. These complex settings may be large organizations, electoral systems, or even urban areas (See Kollman, Miller and Page, 1992 and Page, 2007). Page’s models have roots in some of Axelrod’s earlier work, which along with a multidisciplinary group helped found the Center for the Study of Complex Systems, which Page now directs. Axelrod also taught courses on models of political processes in earlier periods. With the hiring of Jenna Bednar, and continuing hires in Political Economy (see below), by the 2010s, the Department had a strong applied Formal Theory faculty.
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\[\text{situation changed dramatically with the return of Jim Morrow and the arrival of Scott Page in 2000 and the (belated) hiring of Arthur Lupia in 2001. All three are highly recognized scholars and give the Department a strong Formal Theory subfield. The scholarship of the members of this group goes beyond proving theorems, though they can do that well, and gives Michigan’s Formal Theory subfield a distinctive character. Lupia’s scholarship uses formal models and experiments to examine how citizens acquire and use information in making careful decisions (See for example, Lupia and McCubbins, 1998, and Lupia, 2004). Page’s work examines how sets of individuals make decisions and interact within the context of complex settings to solve difficult problems. These complex settings may be large organizations, electoral systems, or even urban areas (See Kollman, Miller and Page, 1992 and Page, 2007). Page’s models have roots in some of Axelrod’s earlier work, which along with a multidisciplinary group helped found the Center for the Study of Complex Systems, which Page now directs. Axelrod also taught courses on models of political processes in earlier periods. With the hiring of Jenna Bednar, and continuing hires in Political Economy (see below), by the 2010s, the Department had a strong applied Formal Theory faculty.}\]

\[\text{75 Morrow is now the A. F. K. Organski Collegiate Professor, Page is the Leonid Hurwicz Collegiate Professor, and Lupia is the Hal R. Varian Collegiate Professor, all at the University of Michigan. In addition, all three are members of the American Academy of Arts and Sciences.}\]
Political Economy

Political Economy encompasses a wide range of topics and styles, ranging from the development of formal models common in Economics to describe political institutions and processes, to the behavior of economic organizations such as central banks, to the effect of economic variables on political systems, to the effect of variations in political structures on economic outcomes, such as trade, interest rates, and GDP growth. A common theme is a reliance on concepts and propositions associated with Economics. This is a very active and large subfield within Political Science. The Michigan Department was late coming to this party, for some of the same reasons it was late to incorporate Formal Theory, and when it did, it did so with a definite Michigan flavor.

Organski’s version of World Politics included attention to the interaction of political and economic phenomena. In 1993 Jackson, whose Ph.D. is in Political Economy began a lengthy project on the political economy of the transitions taking place in Eastern Europe (Jackson, 2005) and taught a course on the Political Economy of Transitions. Neither, though, was considered to be a political economist by the field’s criteria. The Department’s formal attention to Political Economy began with the appointment of Rob Franzese in 1996. Franzese’s Ph.D. is in Political Science, but he finished all the course work and prelims in Economics as well. His early work concerned variations in macroeconomic policies (Franzese, 2002) and in central bank behavior (Franzese, 1999) in Western Europe. Allen Hicken, who specializes in the processes of political and economic development particularly in
Michigan’s Department of Political Science

Southeast Asia, (Hicken, 2005 and 2009) was appointed in 2001 and added an important dimension to the Political Economy program. The breakthrough came in 2001 with the arrival of William Clark. His specialty is International Political Economy, as distinguished from Franzese and Hicken who are identified as Comparative Political Economy, though the distinctions between these two sets are minor and Clark is part of the Comparative subfield as well as the World Politics field. With the 2013 hiring of Mark Dincecco and Iain Osgood the Department now has the necessary critical mass for a vibrant Political Economy group.

The Political Economy group features a strong empirical orientation. While some departments stress the development of formal deductive models, similar to Formal Theory, the Michigan faculty are all recognized for their empirical work and contributions to the field of empirical methodology. Franzese is the past president of the Society for Political Methodology and two of his papers have received important Methods prizes (Franzese, 2005, and Franzese, Hays, and Kachi, 2012) and Clark is the co-author of one of the most cited papers published in *Political Analysis*, the main empirical methods journal. This work solidifies the Department’s standing in methodology and its reputation in empirical political economy.

**Epilogue**

We began with a picture of our great-grandfathers’ department. We thought it fitting to close with a picture of our great-grandchildren’s department. Just as the generations of scholars who followed the one in the 1933 photo shaped and built a department, and a discipline, that could not be envisioned in 1933, the generations
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succeeding the one in the 2009 photo will create and build a department and a discipline that we in 2014 are unlikely to be able to envision.
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