

## Chapter 1 : American School (economics) - Wikipedia

*American Economics And Politics [Cordell O. Lampeer] on blog.quintoapp.com \*FREE\* shipping on qualifying offers. Considered the world's sole military superpower, America faces an array of dynamic issues both domestically and internationally.*

Overview[ edit ] Political scientists study matters concerning the allocation and transfer of power in decision making , the roles and systems of governance including governments and international organizations , political behaviour and public policies. They measure the success of governance and specific policies by examining many factors, including stability , justice , material wealth , peace and public health. Some political scientists seek to advance positive attempt to describe how things are, as opposed to how they should be theses by analysing politics. Others advance normative theses, by making specific policy recommendations. Political scientists provide the frameworks from which journalists, special interest groups, politicians, and the electorate analyse issues. According to Chaturvedy, Political scientists may serve as advisers to specific politicians, or even run for office as politicians themselves. Political scientists can be found working in governments, in political parties or as civil servants. They may be involved with non-governmental organizations NGOs or political movements. In a variety of capacities, people educated and trained in political science can add value and expertise to corporations. Private enterprises such as think tanks , research institutes, polling and public relations firms often employ political scientists. Because political science is essentially a study of human behaviour , in all aspects of politics , observations in controlled environments are often challenging to reproduce or duplicate, though experimental methods are increasingly common see experimental political science. Politics is an observational, not an experimental science. Like all social sciences, political science faces the difficulty of observing human actors that can only be partially observed and who have the capacity for making conscious choices unlike other subjects such as non-human organisms in biology or inanimate objects as in physics. Despite the complexities, contemporary political science has progressed by adopting a variety of methods and theoretical approaches to understanding politics and methodological pluralism is a defining feature of contemporary political science. The advent of political science as a university discipline was marked by the creation of university departments and chairs with the title of political science arising in the late 19th century. The American Political Science Association and the American Political Science Review were founded in and , respectively, in an effort to distinguish the study of politics from economics and other social phenomena. Behavioural revolution and new institutionalism[ edit ] In the s and the s, a behavioural revolution stressing the systematic and rigorously scientific study of individual and group behaviour swept the discipline. A focus on studying political behaviour, rather than institutions or interpretation of legal texts, characterized early behavioural political science, including work by Robert Dahl , Philip Converse , and in the collaboration between sociologist Paul Lazarsfeld and public opinion scholar Bernard Berelson. The late s and early s witnessed a take off in the use of deductive, game theoretic formal modelling techniques aimed at generating a more analytical corpus of knowledge in the discipline. This period saw a surge of research that borrowed theory and methods from economics to study political institutions, such as the United States Congress, as well as political behaviour, such as voting. Riker and his colleagues and students at the University of Rochester were the main proponents of this shift. Despite considerable research progress in the discipline based on all the kinds of scholarship discussed above, it has been observed that progress toward systematic theory has been modest and uneven. Several general indicators of crises and methods were proposed for anticipating critical transitions. The theory of apparent inevitability of crises and revolutions was also developed. Until the late years of the Soviet Union, political science as a field was subjected to tight control of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union and was thus subjected to distrust. Anti-communists accused political scientists of being "false" scientists and of having served the old regime. These institutes were victims of the first wave of anticommunist opinion and ideological attacks. Today, the Russian Political Science Association unites professional political scientists from all around Russia. Recent developments[ edit ] In , the Perestroika Movement in political science was introduced as a

reaction against what supporters of the movement called the mathematicization of political science. Those who identified with the movement argued for a plurality of methodologies and approaches in political science and for more relevance of the discipline to those outside of it. This is argued to explain many important features and systematic cognitive biases of current politics. Most United States colleges and universities offer B. The term political science is more popular in North America than elsewhere; other institutions, especially those outside the United States, see political science as part of a broader discipline of political studies, politics, or government. While political science implies use of the scientific method, political studies implies a broader approach, although the naming of degree courses does not necessarily reflect their content.

**Chapter 2 : The relationship between economics and politics | Economics Help**

*This text introduces students to the interrelationship of politics and economics in American public policymaking: how economic concerns have been legislated into law since Franklin Roosevelt's time and how politics (e.g., Washington gridlock) affects the economy and the making of public policy.*

State governments of the United States have the power to make laws that are not granted to the federal government or denied to the states in the U. Constitution for all citizens. These include education , family law , contract law , and most crimes. Unlike the federal government, which only has those powers granted to it in the Constitution, a state government has inherent powers allowing it to act unless limited by a provision of the state or national constitution. Like the federal government, state governments have three branches: The chief executive of a state is its popularly elected governor , who typically holds office for a four-year term although in some states the term is two years. Except for Nebraska , which has unicameral legislature , all states have a bicameral legislature, with the upper house usually called the Senate and the lower house called the House of Representatives , the House of Delegates , Assembly or something similar. In most states, senators serve four-year terms, and members of the lower house serve two-year terms. The constitutions of the various states differ in some details but generally follow a pattern similar to that of the federal Constitution, including a statement of the rights of the people and a plan for organizing the government. However, state constitutions are generally more detailed. Urban politics in the United States The United States has 89, local governments, including 3, counties, 19, municipalities, 16, townships, 13, school districts, and 37, other special districts that deal with issues like fire protection. Typically local elections are nonpartisan—local activists suspend their party affiliations when campaigning and governing. City governments are chartered by states, and their charters detail the objectives and powers of the municipal government. The United States Constitution only provides for states and territories as subdivisions of the country, and the Supreme Court has accordingly confirmed the supremacy of state sovereignty over municipalities. For most big cities, cooperation with both state and federal organizations is essential to meeting the needs of their residents. Types of city governments vary widely across the nation. Cities in the West and South usually have nonpartisan local politics. There are three general types of city government: These are the pure forms; many cities have developed a combination of two or three of them. Mayor-council[ edit ] This is the oldest form of city government in the United States and, until the beginning of the 20th century, was used by nearly all American cities. Its structure is like that of the state and national governments, with an elected mayor as chief of the executive branch and an elected council that represents the various neighborhoods forming the legislative branch. The mayor appoints heads of city departments and other officials, sometimes with the approval of the council. The council passes city ordinances, sets the tax rate on property, and apportions money among the various city departments. As cities have grown, council seats have usually come to represent more than a single neighborhood. Commission[ edit ] This combines both the legislative and executive functions in one group of officials, usually three or more in number, elected citywide. Each commissioner supervises the work of one or more city departments. Commissioners also set policies and rules by which the city is operated. One is named chairperson of the body and is often called the mayor, although his or her power is equivalent to that of the other commissioners. The answer has been to entrust most of the executive powers, including law enforcement and provision of services, to a highly trained and experienced professional city manager. The city manager plan has been adopted by a large number of cities. Under this plan, a small, elected council makes the city ordinances and sets policy, but hires a paid administrator, also called a city manager, to carry out its decisions. The manager draws up the city budget and supervises most of the departments. Usually, there is no set term; the manager serves as long as the council is satisfied with his or her work. County government[ edit ] The county is a subdivision of the state, sometimes but not always containing two or more townships and several villages. New York City is so large that it is divided into five separate boroughs, each a county in its own right. In other cities, both the city and county governments have merged, creating a consolidated city—county government. In small counties, boards are

chosen by the county; in the larger ones, supervisors represent separate districts or townships. The board collects taxes for state and local governments; borrows and appropriates money; fixes the salaries of county employees; supervises elections; builds and maintains highways and bridges; and administers national, state, and county welfare programs. In very small counties, the executive and legislative power may lie entirely with a sole commissioner, who is assisted by boards to supervise taxes and elections. In some New England states, counties do not have any governmental function and are simply a division of land. Municipal government[ edit ] Thousands of municipal jurisdictions are too small to qualify as city governments. These are chartered as towns and villages and deal with local needs such as paving and lighting the streets, ensuring a water supply, providing police and fire protection, and waste management. In many states of the US, the term town does not have any specific meaning; it is simply an informal term applied to populated places both incorporated and unincorporated municipalities. Moreover, in some states, the term town is equivalent to how civil townships are used in other states. The government is usually entrusted to an elected board or council, which may be known by a variety of names: The board may have a chairperson or president who functions as chief executive officer, or there may be an elected mayor. Governmental employees may include a clerk, treasurer, police and fire officers, and health and welfare officers. One unique aspect of local government, found mostly in the New England region of the United States, is the town meeting. Once a year, sometimes more often if needed, the registered voters of the town meet in open session to elect officers, debate local issues, and pass laws for operating the government. As a body, they decide on road construction and repair, construction of public buildings and facilities, tax rates, and the town budget. The town meeting, which has existed for more than three centuries in some places, is often cited as the purest form of direct democracy, in which the governmental power is not delegated, but is exercised directly and regularly by all the people. Campaign finance in the United States Successful participation, especially in federal elections, requires large amounts of money, especially for television advertising. Both parties generally depend on wealthy donors and organizations—traditionally the Democrats depended on donations from organized labor while the Republicans relied on business donations. Even when laws are upheld, the complication of compliance with the First Amendment requires careful and cautious drafting of legislation, leading to laws that are still fairly limited in scope, especially in comparison to those of other countries such as the United Kingdom, France or Canada. Fundraising plays a large role in getting a candidate elected to public office. Without money, a candidate may have little chance of achieving their goal. Attempts to limit the influence of money on American political campaigns dates back to the s. Recently, Congress passed legislation requiring candidates to disclose sources of campaign contributions, how the campaign money is spent, and regulated use of "soft money" contributions. In Federalist Papers No. In addition, the first President of the United States, George Washington, was not a member of any political party at the time of his election or during his tenure as president. Washington hoped that political parties would not be formed, fearing conflict and stagnation. Hamilton and Madison ended up being the core leaders in this emerging party system. In modern times, in partisan elections, candidates are nominated by a political party or seek public office as an independent. Each state has significant discretion in deciding how candidates are nominated, and thus eligible to appear on the election ballot. Typically, major party candidates are formally chosen in a party primary or convention, whereas minor party and Independents are required to complete a petitioning process. Political parties in the United States The modern political party system in the United States is a two-party system dominated by the Democratic Party and the Republican Party. These two parties have won every United States presidential election since and have controlled the United States Congress since. The Democratic Party generally positions itself as left-of-center in American politics and supports a modern American liberal platform, while the Republican Party generally positions itself as right-wing and supports a modern American conservative platform. Third parties and independent voters have achieved relatively minor representation from time to time at local levels. The Libertarian Party is the largest third party in the country, claiming more than, registered voters in; [29] it generally positions itself as centrist or radical centrist and supports a classical liberal position. Other contemporary third parties include the left-wing Green Party, supporting Green politics, and the right-wing Constitution Party, supporting paleoconservatism. Elections in the United States Unlike in

some parliamentary systems, Americans vote for a specific candidate instead of directly selecting a particular political party. With a federal government, officials are elected at the federal, national, state, and local levels. On a national level, the President is elected indirectly by the people, through an Electoral College. In modern times, the electors virtually always vote with the popular vote of their state. All members of Congress, and the offices at the state and local levels are directly elected. Various federal and state laws regulate elections. The United States Constitution defines to a basic extent how federal elections are held, in Article One and Article Two and various amendments.

**Organization of American political parties**[ edit ] See also: Political party strength in U. The two major parties, in particular, have no formal organization at the national level that controls membership, activities, or policy positions, though some state affiliates do. In the United States, one can often become a "member" of a party, merely by stating that fact. A person may choose to attend meetings of one local party committee one day and another party committee the next day. The sole factor that brings one "closer to the action" is the quantity and quality of participation in party activities and the ability to persuade others in attendance to give one responsibility. Party identification becomes somewhat formalized when a person runs for partisan office. A party committee may choose to endorse one or another of those who is seeking the nomination, but in the end the choice is up to those who choose to vote in the primary, and it is often difficult to tell who is going to do the voting. The result is that American political parties have weak central organizations and little central ideology, except by consensus. Once in office, an elected official may change parties simply by declaring such intent. At the federal level, each of the two major parties has a national committee. See, Democratic National Committee, Republican National Committee that acts as the hub for much fund-raising and campaign activities, particularly in presidential campaigns. The exact composition of these committees is different for each party, but they are made up primarily of representatives from state parties and affiliated organizations, and others important to the party. However, the national committees do not have the power to direct the activities of members of the party. Both parties also have separate campaign committees which work to elect candidates at a specific level. The most significant of these are the Hill committees, which work to elect candidates to each house of Congress. State parties exist in all fifty states, though their structures differ according to state law, as well as party rules at both the national and the state level. Despite these weak organizations, elections are still usually portrayed as national races between the political parties. By the 1790s, however, most joined one of the two new parties, and by the 1800s parties had become accepted as central to the democracy. Men who held opposing views strengthened their cause by identifying and organizing men of like mind. The followers of Alexander Hamilton, were called "Federalists"; they favored a strong central government that would support the interests of national defense, commerce and industry. The followers of Thomas Jefferson, the Jeffersonians took up the name "Republicans"; they preferred a decentralized agrarian republic in which the federal government had limited power.

**Chapter 3 : A New Society: Economic & Social Change**

*The Economist offers authoritative insight and opinion on international news, politics, business, finance, science, technology and the connections between them.*

Excluding the years from the long term, one finds that the long-term tendency was for the G-NM share to gain exclusively at the expense of the military share, as the private share remained approximately constant over the long period. Thus, if the United States during the Cold War was simultaneously a warfare state and a welfare state, it is clear that the welfare part expanded much more robustly than the warfare part after the initial military surge of the early s. The answer is clear. There was no systematic tendency at all for the G-NM share to fall when the G-M share rose during mobilizations. In fact, during military buildups the government nonmilitary share of GNP was more likely to rise than to fall. The G-NM share was higher in than it had been in , and higher in than it had been in . During the Carter-Reagan buildup the G-NM share fluctuated in a narrow band, sometimes rising and sometimes falling, but the share at the end . The behavior of the private share was quite different. Changes in the G-M and P shares were almost exactly offsetting. Deletion of the years from the data set has no effect on this conclusion. Figure 3 plainly shows the two offsetting changes to be deviations from a horizontal line representing a zero sum of the two changes. In short, during the Cold War the private sector alone bore the full cost of annual increases in the military share of total output as conventionally defined. In the metaphors explained above, one may describe the buildup of as completely butter-sacrificing and the demobilization of as completely butter-enhancing. But because the magnitude of the military upswing greatly exceeded that of the subsequent retrenchment, over the full cycle of the net change of the private share was . The buildup of was also completely butter-sacrificing. The ensuing demobilization was 50 percent butter-enhancing if considered complete in , and 59 percent butter-enhancing if considered complete in . Over the complete cycle of the net change of the private share was . The Carter-Reagan buildup of was 89 percent butter-sacrificing: During the Reagan portion of the buildup alone, from to , the mobilization was 76 percent butter-sacrificing, as the private share fell by one percentage point while the military share rose by 1. The post demobilization has continued into the early s, so its ultimate character remains to be seen.

Unconventionally Viewed To this point my analysis has proceeded by making use of the conventional categories of the national income and product accounts. I now take a different tack. The soundness of this accounting practice can be, and often has been, questioned. The challenges apply in some cases to the accounting treatment of all government spending;<sup>21</sup> in other cases, to defense spending in particular. Among the several bases for rejecting the usual accounting conventions, the following may be noted. What do they mean? If not, why should the actual prices paid be regarded as appropriate weights for the purpose of aggregating physically incommensurable goods and services? Second, even if the pricing problem be disregarded, defense purchases measure input not output. Obviously, what people value is national security, not the mere devotion of resources to the ostensible production of national security. Because no one knows the production function for national security, and because under certain conditions e. Third, defense output, even if it were measurable, ought to be regarded as an intermediate rather than a final good, and on this basis excluded from GNP. If there were no external threat, all defense spending could be eliminated and no one would be the worse. To the extent that defense spending serves to preserve the social and economic framework within which nondefense production can go forward, its value is already incorporated in the market prices of civilian goods. Hence, at the margin the observed defense spending amounts to transfer payments rather than payments for net additions to the real national product. At least three Noble laureates in economic science Kuznets, Tobin, and Buchanan are on record as proponents of some or all of the preceding arguments, and many other respectable economists also have subscribed to them. Especially weighty is the position of Simon Kuznets in opposition to the now-standard way of treating defense spending in the national product accounts, because Kuznets was the acknowledged leader in the original development of the accounts. The two series exhibit a similar upward tendency. Between and , real GNP grew at an average rate of 3. Again, growth rates are obtained from linear regressions of log output on time. On the basis of this difference, one has little to

choose, as the growth rate of orthodox total output and that of civilian output alone differed by just 0. Notwithstanding the similarities of their long-run trends, the two series moved quite differently in particular years and, on one occasion, over the course of a conventionally demarcated business cycle. Empirical macroeconomists appear to be oblivious to this issue. As Figure 4 shows, the differences tended to diminish with the passage of time. The early s witnessed the greatest deviations between the growth rate of orthodox real GNP and that of civilian real GNP. The differences were considerably smaller from the mids to the mids, then even smaller between and To some extent, the diminution reflected the diminishing share of military spending in GNP Figure 2 above. For the early s the choice of an output concept makes a major difference in the description of the business cycle Figure 5. The conventional concept gives rise to a description that shows an expansion from through , a mild recession in , and a strong recovery in The year looks the same for both measures, but does not. Both series show strong recovery in , with civilian growth outpacing that of GNP including the military component. The year was far better for guns than it was for butter or roads. The year saw only minuscule growth of road output and actual decline of butter output; the year , a bad one for guns, brought slight improvements in the rates of output of both roads and butter. What we call these differences matters little, so long as we are clear. But appreciating the existence of the differences is important for understanding and evaluating the actual performance of the economy during the Cold War. I shall focus on issues related to ideology, information, and the conflict between governing elites and the public. Consider first the profile of resource allocation to the military during the Cold War. Until the late s the answers seem fairly transparent. The high base level of spending resulted from the Cold War ideology of global anti-communism and the foreign policy doctrines and military commitments that flowed from that ideology. The spending deviations were associated with the extraordinary costs of engagement in two major shooting wars in Asia. Set in motion by a unique combination of external events, astute partisan political action and information management, kept in motion by executive determination and bureaucratic tenacity, it bore little resemblance to the two preceding buildups. One may conclude that the establishment of the full-fledged Cold War regime caused real defense spending almost to treble. This staggering sum is equivalent to the entire GNP of the United States in the two-year period l Countless political cartoons, featuring bloated generals bedecked with rows of medals, promoted precisely such an attitude. Citizens did not need to be natural cynics. The problem of creeping skepticism was inherent in the remoteness of the subject from their immediate experience. Citizens [could] only spend and hope. In a perceived crisis, public opinion became volatile. Many people suspended their reason, critical faculties, and long-term judgments, reacting emotionally and with heightened deference to political leaders. But usually the world did not supply such clear-cut cases, and the national security managers had to take matters into their own hands. Of the fearsome Soviet divisions, a third were undermanned and another third were ill-equipped militia. All were revealed in due course to have been false alarms. Meanwhile the American people received an almost wholly fictitious account of an incident in the Gulf of Tonkin in , which stampeded Congress into giving its blessing to what soon became a major war. Claims about gaps placed the burden of argument on relatively ill-informed opponents of military spending. But nothing in the workings of U. The Iran-Contra affair and the Pentagon bribes and influence-peddling brought to light during the late s were only the latest of a long series of actions shielded by self-serving mendacity. These operations caused a variety of radioactive and other toxic contaminations of the surrounding air, water, and soil, yet the managers of the facilities repeatedly misrepresented and lied about the hazards to citizens living nearby. If they could have, retrenchments of the military establishment would not have occurred after the buildups. Certainly the steep decline of , especially its later phase, which defense interests stoutly opposed, would not have been so steep. The fact that the allocation of resources to defense did sometimes fall, and fall substantially, refutes radical arguments that allege the exercise of hegemony by the national security establishment. It lost some political battles, too. That is why during the late s, notwithstanding the preceding buildup, the defense share of GNP never exceeded 7 percent Figure 2 above. Defense interests had the political savvy to appreciate that proposals or actions widely perceived as excessively grasping and strategically unjustified would be imprudent and counterproductive. More important, however, were the domestic factors that constrained the defense managers in spite of their unique control of information and their

consequent ability to mold, rather than respond to, public opinion. Those were the most evident forms taken by the costs of extensive commitments of resources to military purposes. Of the two, death was the more important. Something had to give. Of the political factions struggling over the three grand categories of GNP, the pro-military faction proved the weakest, at least until 1945. When the national security elite lacked persuasive rationales to present to the public, they could only draw on the pool of patriotism. But that was not a bottomless reservoir, and without replenishment from sources that the public could understand and support, it tended to run dry. As the opinion balance became strongly negative, it worked its way through political processes, reaching both Congress and the administration, to affect the allocation of resources to the military. Despite the gaps in the record, the figure shows clearly the positive but sometimes just barely positive support for increased spending in the 1930s and 1940s through 1945, the strong preference for reduced spending at least from 1945 until the late 1950s, the strong support for increased spending from 1950 through 1960, and the substantial balance in favor of reduced spending thereafter. The Korean War made President Truman increasingly unpopular as it dragged on. Before World War II the allocation of resources to military purposes remained at token levels, typically no more than one percent of GNP, except during actual warfare, which occurred infrequently. The old regime ended in 1945. The massive mobilization of the early 1940s drove the military share of GNP to more than 41 percent at its peak in 1945. The trend tilted slightly upward for absolute real spending, slightly downward for spending as a share of GNP. Increases in the military share of GNP during the Korean and Vietnam wars came entirely at the expense of the private share. The government nonmilitary share increased during the first two post-World War II military buildups and remained approximately constant during the third. The largest discrepancies occurred during the early 1950s.

**Chapter 4 : Political, Social, and Economic Change after the American Revolution | Teen Ink**

*Readers question: Why cannot politics and economics be seen in isolation?. Economics is concerned with studying and influencing the economy. Politics is the theory and practice of influencing people through the exercise of power, e.g. governments, elections and political parties.*

The Roaring Twenties by Daniel T. Rodgers We should not accept social life as it has "trickled down to us," the young journalist Walter Lippmann wrote soon after the twentieth century began. The modern business corporation, modern politics, the modern presidency, a modern vision of the international order, and modern consumer capitalism were all born in these years. More than in most eras, Americans in the first years of the twentieth century felt the newness of their place in history. Looking back on the late nineteenth century, they stressed its chaos: A Revolution in Organization The pioneers in the reorganization of social life on more deliberate and systematic lines were the architects of the modern business corporation. In the aftermath of the s depression, they undertook to supplant the unstable partnership and credit systems of the past with the forms of the modern corporation: Morgan banking house into the mammoth US Steel Corporation in was a sign of the trends to come. The new scale of economic enterprise demanded much more systematic organization. On the shop and office floor the systematization of work routines was intense, from the elaborate organization of clerical labor at Metropolitan Life to the subdivision of automobile making at Ford in into tasks that workers could repeat over and over as an assembly line dragged their work past them. In the showcases of "welfare capitalism," a new cadre of personnel managers undertook to smooth out the radically unstable hiring and firing practices of the past, creating seniority systems and benefits for stable employees. By the s the corporate elite was heralding a "new era" for capitalism, freed of the cyclical instabilities of the past. Its watchwords now were efficiency, permanence, welfare, and service. With similar ambition to escape the turbulence of late nineteenth-century economy and society, progressive reformers undertook to expand the capacities of governments to deal with the worst effects of barely regulated capitalism. Their projects met far more resistance than those of the corporate managers. But between and they succeeded in bringing most of the characteristics of the modern administrative state into being. More professionalized corps of state factory inspectors endeavored to safeguard workers from dangerous working conditions, physically exhausting hours, and industrial diseases. Public utility commissions endeavored to pull the pricing of railroad shipping, streetcar fares, and city gas and water supplies out of the turmoil of politics and put them in the hands of expert-staffed commissions charged with setting fair terms of service and fair return on capital. New zoning boards, city planning commissions, and public health bureaus sprang into being to try to bring more conscious public order out of chaotic land markets, slum housing, poisoned food, polluted water supplies, and contagious diseases. Progressive Politics The energy of the new progressive politics was most intense at the state and local levels where civic reform associations of all sorts sprang up to thrust the new economic and social issues into politics. Despite the more sharply defined constitutional limitations on federal power in this period, visions of more active government filtered up into national politics as well. Theodore Roosevelt set the mold for a much more active, issue-driven presidency than any since the Civil War. Roosevelt brought an anti-trust rhetoric and a powerful interest in environmental conservation into politics. In the national railroad strike of , President Cleveland had dispatched federal troops to break the strike; now in the national coal strike of , Roosevelt offered the White House as a venue for mediation. Pushed by its farm and labor constituencies, the Democratic Party, too, moved toward more active and effective governance. To break what they saw as the corrupt alliance between business wealth and political party bosses, progressive reformers succeeded in moving the election of US Senators from the state legislatures to the general electorate and, in some states, instituting new systems of popular referenda, initiative, and recall. But they also tightened up voting registration systems to curb immigrant voters, and they acquiesced in disfranchisement measures to strike African Americans off the voting rolls that had swept through southern states between and Between and the outbreak of war in Europe in , more than thirteen million immigrants arrived in the United States, pouring into industrial cities largely from the rural regions of central and southern Europe. The new economy, in which six

out of every ten industrial workers in was born abroad, was built on their cheap labor. Out of this new urban working class sprang not only new forms of poverty and overcrowded, tenement living but also powerful political machines, vigorous labor unions, and a socialist party that on the eve of the First World War rivaled any outside of Germany. Middle-class progressives sometimes took the urban masses as political allies. More often, however, the progressives saw the urban poor as objects of social concerns: Progressives inclined less toward talk of class justice than toward faith in a unitary public good; they thought less in terms of protected rights than of mediation and efficient management. They may have placed too much trust in experts, science, and the idea of the common good, but they brought into being the capacities of the modern state to push back against accidents of social fate and the excesses of private capital. The International Stage In all these state-building endeavors, early twentieth-century Americans moved in step with their counterparts in other industrial nations. That meant increasing the capacity of the nation to project its interests more forcefully abroad. In the Philippines, seized as a collateral asset in the war to free Cuba from Spanish rule in , a commission led by William Howard Taft undertook to establish an American-style model of imperial governance. On a dozen different occasions between and , US administrations dispatched troops to Mexico and the Caribbean to seize customs houses, reorganize finances, or attempt to control the outcome of an internal revolution. The outbreak of war in Europe in brought these state-building ambitions to a peak. Manpower was recruited through a wartime draft. Funds were raised through income tax levies and a public crusade for war bond sales, orchestrated with the best techniques that advertisers and psychological experts could muster. It was only thirteen months between the arrival of US troops in France in October and the Armistice, but the war gave Americans a model for the efficient mobilization of resources in a common cause that early New Dealers, in particular, would remember. The First World War gave Americans their first vision of a more effectively managed international order as well. The idea of reorganizing the world for the more efficient management of international disputes had many sources in this period. When the Senate failed to muster the two-thirds necessary to ratify US entry in the new League of Nations, the defeat came as a major blow to progressives. But the application of the label "isolationist" to the period disguises the heightened role that the United States actually played in the organization of international affairs in the s. Although the United States was not a participant in the new World Court created under the terms of the peace treaty, an American jurist served on its panel of eleven judges. Postwar America Domestically, the break between the prewar and postwar years seemed much sharper than on the international stage. The year , in which the war economic machine ground suddenly to a halt, was one of the most volatile years of the twentieth century. Demobilization unloosed a wave of labor strikes unprecedented in their scale and the radical character of their demands. Fearful of revolution abroad and at home, the Justice Department rounded up and deported hundreds of aliens whom it judged, without trial, to be radical and disloyal. Violence erupted along race lines as white mobs in more than twenty cities poured into African American neighborhoods to attack homes and persons. A new Ku Klux Klan emerged in both the North and South with the goal of intimidating not only blacks but also Catholics, immigrants, and radicals. Harding, a Republican presidential candidate committed to returning the nation to "normalcy," swept the election in a landslide. Vice President Calvin Coolidge succeeded Harding after his death in . Still, many of the managerial ambitions of the earlier years survived into the "new era. The massive Hoover Dam public works project was a product of the Coolidge and Hoover administrations; the most important Depression-era agency for financial restabilization, the Reconstruction Finance Administration, began as a Hoover initiative. But there were progressives who saw in both measures the promise of a better-organized society, deliberately managing its population movements and curbing the wasteful effects of drunkenness on labor efficiency and on abused wives and children. Southern leaders were not immune to progressive political ambitions. Southern farmers lobbied hard for federal credit systems to supplement private lenders in the cash-strapped South. They turned the system of federally supported agriculture extension agents into a far-flung network of scientific advice, crop marketing assistance, and lobbying help in Congress. But southern progressive reform had its limits. Efforts to enfranchise women, or effectively ban the employment of twelve- and thirteen-year-old children in the textile mills, or enact national anti-lynching legislation met with major resistance. Although there were islands of exception, the South was

visibly poorer than the rest of country, much less urbanized, farther from the new consumer society being built elsewhere, and intractably committed to cotton, low-wage labor, and management of its own racial matters. The most striking change in the South was the massive wartime exodus to the North of African Americans, breaking the ties that had bound most former slaves to agricultural poverty and tenancy since the end of the Civil War. Almost a half million African Americans fled between and Most were rural folk for whom the sharply defined housing ghettos and racially segregated labor markets of the urban North still seemed a major step up from sharecropping and the codes of southern racial subordination. New racially segregated labor patterns changed the American Southwest as well, as expanding jobs in the farms, mines, and railroads drew hundreds of thousands of workers across the border with Mexico. Northern middle-class women had played a defining role in advancing many of the progressive social reforms of the day. Even before they gained the vote, they had established themselves as important politics actors. Consumer Culture These new women were both the objects and the subjects of the last major domains of society to be reorganized in this period, the industries of entertainment and consumption. Both grew dramatically between and It was one of the most important discoveries of the age that even pleasure could be engineered. Griffith learned not simply to film a gripping story, but, through new techniques of scene cutting, to pace and manipulate the very emotions of their audiences. Psychology moved into advertisements as goods and pleasures were made to sell themselves by their brands and slogans. Music halls, chain-managed vaudeville, amusement parks, dance clubs, the glittering movie palaces of the s and s, and, finally, radio transformed entertainment in this period, particularly for urban Americans. By the s they lived in a culture much more cosmopolitanâ€”with its African American jazz and dance music, Yiddish comedy, and screen idols who showcased their foreignnessâ€”more sexualized, more commercial, and more deliberately organized than any before it. Together with the new forms of pleasure, a new flood of goods poured out of the early twentieth-century economy as production emphases shifted to mass-marketed goods and household consumers. Canned foods, refrigerators and other electric appliances, factory-made shirtwaists, celluloid collars, and chemically made rayon, cigarettes and soft drinks, snap-shot cameras and phonograph records, together with hundreds of other consumer goods brought the reorganization of capital, production, and advertising into daily life. By there was one automobile for every five persons in the United States. Almost no one in the fall of thought that the bounty might be at its end.

**Chapter 5 : The Progressive Era to the New Era, | Gilder Lehrman Institute of American History**

*"Citizen is a powerfully written, poetic meditation on citizenship, race, culture, and American political life, full of everyday heartbreak and humor, woven through profound and searing critique.*

Why cannot politics and economics be seen in isolation? Economics is concerned with studying and influencing the economy. Politics is the theory and practice of influencing people through the exercise of power, e. In theory, economics could be non-political. An ideal economist should ignore any political bias or prejudice to give neutral, unbiased information and recommendations on how to improve the economic performance of a country. Elected politicians could then weigh up this economic information and decide. In practice there is a strong relationship between economics and politics because the performance of the economy is one of the key political battlegrounds. Many economic issues are inherently political because they lend themselves to different opinions. Political ideology influencing economic thought Many economic issues are seen through the eyes of political beliefs. For example, some people are instinctively more suspicious of government intervention. Therefore, they prefer economic policies which seek to reduce government interference in the economy. On the other hand, economists may have a preference for promoting greater equality in society and be more willing to encourage government intervention to pursue that end. If you set different economists to report on the desirability of income tax cuts for the rich, their policy proposals are likely to reflect their political preferences. You can always find some evidence to support the benefits of tax cuts, you can always find some evidence to support the benefits of higher tax. They may produce a paper that perhaps challenges their previous views. Despite their preferences, they may find there is no case for rail privatisation, or perhaps they find tax cuts do actually increase economic welfare. However, for a politician, they can use those economists and economic research which backs their political view. There were just as many economists suggesting this was not a good idea, but economists can be promoted by their political sponsors. In the US, the Paul Ryan budget proposals were welcomed by many Republicans because they promised tax cuts for better off, cutting welfare benefits and balancing the budget. Many economists may be generally supportive of the EU and European co-operation, but the evidence from the Euro single currency is that it caused many economic problems of low growth, deflation and trade imbalances. Economics needs political support If you study economics, you can make quite a convincing case for a Pigovian tax " a tax which makes people pay the full social cost of the good, and not just the private cost. This principle of making the polluter pay provides a case for Carbon Tax , congestion charges, alcohol tax, and tobacco tax e. However, whether these policies get implemented depends on whether there is political support for them. For example, a congestion charge was proposed for Manchester, but it was very heavily defeated in a referendum. A new tax is rarely popular. As an economist, I would like to see more congestion charging because it makes economic sense. The political appeal of austerity Another interesting example is the political appeal of austerity. After the credit crunch, there was a strong economic case for expansionary fiscal policy to fill in the gap of aggregate demand. Politically, it can be hard to push a policy which results in more government debt. Another interesting case is the relationship between fiscal policy set by government and monetary policy largely set by independent Central Banks In the UK and US and Europe fiscal policy has been relatively tight, given the state of the economy. As a consequence, it has fallen to Central Banks to pursue an expansionary monetary policy to offset the deficiencies of fiscal policy. If politicians pursue tight fiscal policy, Central Bankers have to adapt Monetary policy. There are some areas of economics we could argue are free of politics " basic supply and demand and concepts like the theory of the firm are not laden with political ideology. If you take an issue like privatisation " there is a clear political issue. Who should control key industries " private enterprise or the government? Agenda Another issue with economics is that some criticise the subject for prioritising economic growth and maximisation of monetary welfare. Some argue that the aim of society is not to maximise GDP " but to maximise happiness, the environment and being satisfied with what we have. Therefore, a politician from an environmental background may disagree with the whole premise behind macro-economics. It is not just about the best way to promote economic growth. But, whether we should be

aiming for economic growth in the first place. That is a political issue too.

**Chapter 6 : Politics of the United States - Wikipedia**

*American Economic Review* The *American Economic Review* is a general-interest economics journal. Established in , the AER is among the nation's oldest and most respected scholarly journals in economics.

As the economy boomed, wages rose for most Americans and prices fell, resulting in a higher standard of living and a dramatic increase in consumer consumption. These changes were encouraged by the new mass media that included radio and motion pictures. Booming economy and consumerism. The number of cars on the road almost tripled between and , stimulating the production of steel, rubber, plate glass, and other materials that went into making an automobile. Henry Ford pioneered the two key developments that made this industry growth possible – standardization and mass production. Standardization meant making every car basically the same, which led to jokes that a customer could get a car in any color as long as it was black. Mass production used standardized parts and division of labor on an assembly line introduced by Ford before the war to produce cars more quickly and efficiently. Both innovations had a dramatic impact on price: Ford also created new management techniques that became known as welfare capitalism. These tactics, along with yellow dog contracts, through which employees agreed not to join a union, worked; union membership dropped by almost two million between and . American industry produced thousands of consumer goods in the s, everything from automobiles to washing machines to electric razors. Mass consumption was encouraged through a combination of advertising, which created a demand for a particular product, and installment buying, which enabled people to actually purchase the product. When peace came, ad agencies used newspapers, mass circulation magazines, and radio to effect consumption patterns. The power of advertising even influenced religion. Providing the opportunity to buy on credit was also a powerful marketing tool. Businesses exhorted consumers to put a small amount down and pay off the balance in monthly installments, instead of saving money for an item and purchasing it with cash. The new woman and minorities. With a new look came new viewpoints and values, including a more open attitude toward premarital sex. Margaret Sanger, who had first promoted birth control before World War I as a means of sparing poor women from unwanted pregnancies, argued that the diaphragm gave women more sexual freedom. But the flapper represented only a small percentage of American women; for the overwhelming majority, life did not change that much. The sharp increase in the number of women in the labor force during World War I ended abruptly with the armistice. Female employment grew slowly in the s, mostly in occupations traditionally identified with women – office and social work, teaching, nursing, and apparel manufacturing – and women who worked were usually single, divorced, or widowed. Even with more women in the workplace, no progress was made on issues such as job discrimination or equal pay. At home, despite claims of creating increased leisure time, the myriad of electrical appliances on the market actually did little to alleviate the amount of housework women had to do. When given the vote, for example, women cast their ballot much the same way that men did, basing their decisions on class, regional, and ethnic loyalties rather than gender. Furthermore, although the Equal Rights Amendment was first introduced in Congress in , and Nellie Ross became the first woman elected the governor of a state Wyoming in the following year, there were still parts of the country where women could not hold public office. The black population of Chicago grew from less than 50,000 in 1890 to almost a million by 1930. Blacks were not the only minority on the move in the s. Neither the Quota Act nor the National Origins Act limited immigration from countries in the Western Hemisphere, and nearly 1 million Mexicans entered the United States between 1900 and 1930. Commercial radio began in 1920 when Pittsburgh station KDKA broadcast the results of the presidential election. As the number of homes with radios rapidly increased from 60,000 in 1920 to more than 10 million in 1930, the airwaves became the medium over which Americans got their news and entertainment. The business of radio was simple and supported the growing consumer culture: Studios built theaters that resembled palaces, featuring mirrors, lush carpeting, and grand names such as the Rialto and the Ritz. Hays , to control the content of films. On the stage, playwrights turned their attention to topics that had not been addressed before. Daring feats could also turn people into instant celebrities, as in the case of Gertrude Ederle in 1926 when she became the first woman to swim the English Channel. Similarly, following his solo flight across

the Atlantic Ocean in March , Charles Lindbergh became without question the most famous person in America and perhaps the world.

**Chapter 7 : American Political Attitudes and Participation [blog.quintoapp.com]**

*The president also has a large team of economic advisors in the Council of Economic Advisors, the office of the United States Trade Representative, and the National Economic Council. Interactions between Congress and the president are central to understanding social and economic policy.*

American Political Attitudes and Participation The political views of Washington power-couple Mary Matalin and James Carville are on either side of the political spectrum. During the election, Carville worked for the Clinton campaign while Matalin worked for the Bush campaign. Democracy, liberty, equality, and justice. These values are not very controversial. But Americans have vastly divergent viewpoints on the meanings of these core values. Does assisting the poor represent a movement toward equality, or does it create an unfair burden on the middle and upper classes? Does the permission of abortion defend the liberty of American women or endorse the ending of a human life? Do elected officials really represent the people, or are they just out for themselves? These issues and many more reflect a wide range of political attitudes that shape how Americans participate in government and politics. Are You Liberal or Conservative? Political labeling becomes confusing as lines between liberalism and conservatism become blurred. Generally, a liberal ideology favors the use of government power to regulate the economy and bring about justice and equality of opportunity. Liberals generally favor a tax system that taxes the rich more heavily than it does the poor. Conservatives also believe in justice and equality of opportunity. Any government support should come from the local and state levels, or preferably, from families and private charities. To a conservative, big government infringes on individual rights. Here, former President Richard Nixon waves farewell as he boards his helicopter on the day of his resignation in 1974. Since the mid-1970s, Americans have become increasingly frustrated with their government? But earlier Presidents have made mistakes. Why do these events seem to have such long-lasting effects? Some observers believe that the growing political influence of the media is largely responsible for public skepticism about government and politics. For example, the complete Watergate hearings were broadcast on television. Millions of Americans followed the proceedings and anticipated the answers to important questions. Others blame investigative reporting because it emphasizes sensational, high interest stories. Continuing scandals, such as the Monica Lewinsky scandal and investigation of the personal behavior of President Bill Clinton, keep the public focused on negative aspects of politics. According to this view, the media almost never reports anything good that politicians do, so they feed and extend the influence of negativism. The media is often accused of stoking the flames of discontent among American voters. Others believe that we expect too much of government. With the dramatic increase of government responsibilities since the New Deal era, how can politicians live up such high expectations? Others contend that voter indifference is on the rise because times are good. If Americans are content with the progress of their economy, why should they bother with following every political issue? Although Americans share some broad agreements on basic political values, such as liberty, equality, and justice, they reflect a wide range of political attitudes, from highly conservative ideologies to very liberal ones. Despite their differences, modern Americans share one other political view – they are highly critical of politicians, and they have high expectations for their government and their elected leaders.

**Chapter 8 : LSE USAPP - American Politics and Policy blog**

*John P. Eleazarian is listed as an economist with the American Economic Association. But membership to the AEA is open to anybody who coughs up dues, and membership simply grants access to AEA journals and discounts at AEA events.*

As later defined by Senator Henry Clay who became known as the Father of the American System because of his impassioned support thereof, the American System was to unify the nation north to south, east to west, and city to farmer. The creation of a strong central government able to promote science, invention, industry and commerce, was seen as an essential means of promoting the general welfare and making the economy of the United States strong enough for them to determine their own destiny. A number of programs by the federal government undertaken in the period prior to the Civil War gave shape and substance to the American School. Marcy, the assignment of Army Engineer officers to assist or direct the surveying and construction of the early railroads and canals, and the establishment of the First Bank of the United States and Second Bank of the United States as well as various protectionist measures such as the Tariff of 1816. Leading proponents were economists Friedrich List and Henry Carey. Carey called this a Harmony of Interests in his book by the same name, a harmony between labor and management, and as well a harmony between agriculture, manufacturing, and merchants. The name "American System" was coined by Clay to distinguish it, as a school of thought, from the competing theory of economics at the time, the "British System" represented by Adam Smith in his work *Wealth of Nations*. Cumberland Road and Union Pacific Railroad. This involved the use of sovereign powers for the regulation of credit to encourage the development of the economy, and to deter speculation. Carey, a leading American economist and adviser to Abraham Lincoln, in his book *Harmony of Interests*, displays two additional points of this American School economic philosophy that distinguishes it from the systems of Adam Smith or Karl Marx: Rejection of class struggle, in favor of the "Harmony of Interests" between: Two systems are before the world; One looks to increasing the necessity of commerce; the other to increasing the power to maintain it. One looks to underworking the Hindoo, and sinking the rest of the world to his level; the other to raising the standard of man throughout the world to our level. One looks to pauperism, ignorance, depopulation, and barbarism; the other to increasing wealth, comfort, intelligence, combination of action, and civilization. One looks towards universal war; the other towards universal peace. One is the English system; the other we may be proud to call the American system, for it is the only one ever devised the tendency of which was that of elevating while equalizing the condition of man throughout the world. The policy has roots going back to the days of the American colonies, when such a type of currency called colonial scrip was the medium of exchange. As early as 1790, John C. Calhoun called for a debt-free currency issued and controlled by the government. Such a policy would reduce the profits of the banks, and in response to this, the banking institutions threw their support behind the British school, espousing the gold standard throughout the 19th century. The most serious move in the retrograde direction is that one we find in the determination to prohibit the further issue of [United States Notes] To what have we been indebted for [the increased economic activity]? To protection and the "greenbacks"! What is it that we are now laboring to destroy? Protection and the Greenback! Let us continue on in the direction in which we now are moving, and we shall see Clay first used the term "American System" in 1820, although he had been working for its specifics for many years previously. Portions of the American System were enacted by Congress. The Second Bank of the United States was rechartered in 1816 for 20 years. High tariffs were maintained from the days of Hamilton until 1842. However, the national system of internal improvements was never adequately funded; the failure to do so was due in part to sectional jealousies and constitutional scruples about such expenditures. It protected their new factories from foreign competition. The South opposed the "American System" because its plantation owners were heavily reliant on production of cotton for export, and the American System produced lower demand for their cotton and created higher costs for manufactured goods. After the United States kept tariffs low until the election of Abraham Lincoln in 1860 Jackson in particular, the founder of the movement, held an unflinching commitment to what he viewed as the sanctity of the majority opinion. In his first annual

message to Congress, Jackson proclaimed that "the first principle of our system [is] that the majority govern". This commitment to the majority and to the voiceless came in direct conflict with many elements of the American System. The Jacksonian presidents saw key tenets of the American System, including the support for the Second Bank of the United States and advocacy of protectionist tariffs, as serving moneyed or special interests rather than the majority of Americans. Several key events, legislative conflicts, and presidential vetoes shaped the substantive opposition to the American System. And no hands are less worthy to be trusted with it than those of a moneyed corporation". Jackson saw this manipulation as clear evidence of the penchant of a national bank to serve private, non-majoritarian interests. Clay hoped that when Jackson vetoed the bill, it would more clearly differentiate the two sides of the debate which Clay then sought to use to his advantage in running for president. The Tariff Question[ edit ] The question of protective tariffs championed by the American System proved one of the trickiest for Jacksonian presidents. Tariffs disproportionately benefited the industrial interests of the North while causing great injury to the trade-dependent agrarian South and West. The Jacksonian presidents, particularly the southern-born Jackson, had to be extremely cautious when lowering tariffs in order to maintain their support in the North. This ran strongly contrary to Jacksonian ideals. Jackson reformed the Tariff of also known as the Tariff of Abominations by radically reducing rates in the Tariff of This helped stave off the Southern nullification crisis, in which Southern states refused to enact the tariff, and threatened secession if faced with governmental coercion. The Jacksonian presidents feared that government funding of such projects as roads and canals exceeded the mandate of the federal government and should not be undertaken. When the tariff question came up again in , the compromise of was overthrown, and the protective system placed in the ascendant. Due to the dominance of the then Democratic Party of Van Buren , Polk , and Buchanan the American School was not embraced as the economic philosophy of the United States until the election of Abraham Lincoln in , who, with a series of laws during the American Civil War , was able to fully implement what Hamilton , Clay , List , and Carey theorized, wrote about, and advocated. For centuries England has relied on protection, has carried it to extremes and has obtained satisfactory results from it. There is no doubt that it is to this system that it owes its present strength. President William McKinley â€” stated at the time: Well, whether a thing is cheap or dear depends upon what we can earn by our daily labor. Free trade cheapens the product by cheapening the producer. Protection cheapens the product by elevating the producer. Under free trade the trader is the master and the producer the slave. Protection is but the law of nature, the law of self-preservation, of self-development, of securing the highest and best destiny of the race of man. Why, if protection builds up and elevates 63., [the U. We cannot take a step in the pathway of progress without benefitting mankind everywhere. Of course, that applies to labor as to everything else. Let me give you a maxim that is a thousand times better than that, and it is the protection maxim: Evolution[ edit ] As the United States entered the 20th century, the American School was the policy of the United States under such names as American Policy, economic nationalism , National System, [31] Protective System, Protection Policy, [32] and protectionism, which alludes only to the tariff policy of this system of economics. The election of Warren G. Harding and the Republican Party in represented a partial return to the American School through restoration of high tariffs. A subsequent further return was enacted as President Herbert Hoover responded to the crash and the subsequent bank failures and unemployment by signing the Smoot-Hawley Tariff Act , which some economists considered to have deepened the Great Depression , while others disagree. At the close of World War II, the United States now dominant in manufacturing with little competition, the era of free trade had begun. Japan has followed his model.

## Chapter 9 : The Cold War Economy: Independent Institute

*The American School, also known as the National System, represents three different yet related constructs in politics, policy and blog.quintoapp.com was the American policy from the s to the s, waxing and waning in actual degrees and details of implementation.*