

# David J. Siemers

## Office

Department of Political Science  
University of Wisconsin-Oshkosh  
800 Algoma Blvd.  
(920) 424-3456

## Home

2172 Hickory Lane  
Oshkosh, WI 54901  
(920) 426-4289  
email: siemers@uwosh.edu

## Teaching Experience

University of Wisconsin-Oshkosh, Assistant Professor, 2001-05; Associate Professor, 2005-10, Professor, 2010-2018; Department Chair, 2011-15; Distinguished Professor 2018-

Courses taught: US Presidency; American Political Thought; Modern Political Thought; Foundations of Political Thought; American Government and Politics; Power, Justice, and the State (FYE offering); Congress and the Legislative Process; Political Film; Political Analysis (major capstone) Honors American Government and Politics; Honors Introductory Seminar-Ethics, Honors Introductory Seminar-Education; Honors College Capstone: Government; Lincoln's Politics; Politics, Power and Protest in Great Britain (study abroad); Politics, Economics, and Culture in Thailand (study abroad)

Colorado College Colorado Springs, Colorado, Visiting Asst. Professor, 1999-2001  
American Political Thought, Western Political Tradition, Politics and Film, the Presidency, American Politics

Wellesley College Wellesley, Massachusetts, Visiting Asst. Professor, 1998-1999  
American Pol. Thought, Intro. to American Gov't, Congress and the Leg. Process

Bradley University Peoria, Illinois, Visiting Asst. Professor, 1997-1998  
Intro. to American Government, Intro. to Theory, American Political Thought

University of Wisconsin-Madison  
Teaching Assistant, 1992-96 — Depts. of Pol. Sci. and Integrated Liberal Studies  
American Politics, Ancient Political Thought, Modern Political Thought

## Education

University of Wisconsin (Madison, Wisconsin)

Ph.D. Political Science, August, 1997

M.A. Political Science, December, 1992

St. Olaf College (Northfield, Minnesota)

B.A. Political Science, 1991, Magna cum Laude

## Publications

**Book:** *The Myth of Coequal Branches: Restoring the Constitution's Separation of Functions*, University of Missouri Press, 2018. Commentary on the United States' government often touts the existence of three "coequal" branches, an arrangement typically thought to have been the intent of the founders. What, then, explains James Madison's assertion in Federalist #51 that in "republican government the legislative authority necessarily predominates"? And why does Alexander Hamilton make an equally stark observation in Federalist #78 that "the judiciary is beyond comparison the weakest of the three departments of power"? The plain fact is the idea that there are three coequal branches is a fanciful later construction, willfully appended to the founders' original design. How that idea came to be, its problematic effects, and better way to think about the Constitution are the subjects of this book.

The assertion that the branches are coequal begs the question "in what way they are coequal?" The implied answer today is that the branches are equal in power. But the only way any founder ever described the branches as equals was in their constitutional standing. During the middle part of the 20<sup>th</sup> century that limited idea of interbranch equality was forgotten or misinterpreted and the myth of three branches equal in power was created.

The myth of coequality seems to elevate the presidency and the federal courts. In fact, these two institutions are themselves responsible for helping to popularize the idea that places them on a par with Congress. But Congress has joined in as well. With a pair of coequals, members of Congress find it easier to shift blame for the state of American politics to others. The branches have not literally become coequal in power, but the frequent assertion that they are coequal normalizes the view that the proposed action of any one branch can be stopped by the objection of any other. This is a prescription for gridlock that was not in the minds of the founders. We should rededicate ourselves to an understanding of the Constitution as reflecting more of a separation of the functions of government, rather than a separation of its powers. In this way the nation can more effectively realize the positive, ambitious goals for the US government laid out in the Constitution's Preamble.

**Book:** *Presidents and Political Thought*, University of Missouri Press, 2009. "What did the president know and when did he know it" takes on a whole new meaning in *Presidents and Political Thought*. This book examines what presidents knew about political philosophy, and how they applied that knowledge in their job. I argue that academics have overemphasized the study of presidential power at the expense of presidential ideas. In chapters focusing on John Adams, Thomas Jefferson, James Madison, Woodrow Wilson, Franklin Delano Roosevelt, and Bill Clinton, I show that each one of these presidents gained his political bearings from an understanding of political philosophy and that we cannot fully appreciate these presidents' commitments or their rhetoric without knowing the ideas they appropriated from political philosophy.

*Presidents and Political Thought* describes what each president read, explores what impact this reading had on his thinking, and describes how policies reflected the president's informed view. The reader learns why John Adams remained fiercely

independent when his fellow Federalists tried to goad him to declare war against France. We come to know that Thomas Jefferson, often thought to be a kind of philosopher-president, was actually dismissive of most works of political philosophy. The book comes to a new appreciation of James Madison as one who protected civil rights and the rule of law out of principle, even during wartime. The curious paradox of why Woodrow Wilson, a committed Burkean, felt he must champion a global collective security apparatus is explained. From the examination of FDR we find that even though his acquaintance with political philosophy was minimal, he still gained meaningful orientations from it. And we see the guiding principle—the social contract—behind Bill Clinton’s seemingly unconnected policy commitments.

Political philosophy is often thought to be hopelessly abstract and impractical. The real-life examples chronicled in this book demonstrate that there are usable ideas embedded within it. But I also stress that they are not ready-made blueprints for action. The politician in possession of its ideas must do the hard work of interpreting someone’s ideas and successfully adapting them to practice. This is far from foolproof work. Nevertheless, the ideas of political theory are like a set of tools. Depending on the job at hand, some of them might be useful. Presidents would do well to heed this advice and to learn from the examples of their predecessors/

**Book:** *The Antifederalists: Men of Great Faith and Forbearance*, Rowman & Littlefield, 2003. *The Antifederalists* offers my view of the critics of the Constitution along with original documents written (and spoken) by them. An introductory chapter explains the Antifederalists’ core positions and points of difference, discusses how their argument developed through time, and comments on its strengths and weaknesses. The commentary in subsequent chapters sets the political context in which associated documents were produced and introduces the documents. Chapter 2 treats the Constitutional Convention attendees who became critics of the handiwork of the convention; chapter 3 includes the most widely known Antifederalist writings—a “contemporaneous canon”; chapters 4 through 6 deal with the major varieties of Antifederalism, its “middling class,” “virulent populist” and elite strands. Congruent with my own findings in *Ratifying the Republic*, chapter 7 introduces post-ratification reactions. An appendix includes letters by an Antifederalist pretending to be a Federalist and a Federalist pretending to be an Antifederalist, both of which aim to discredit the position they are supposedly espousing. This appendix underscores that political shenanigans were part of the ratification process, alongside the expression of high principles and widely shared political interests. The volume is intended for classroom use in American Political Thought, American Political Development, and American Political History classes.

**Book:** *Ratifying the Republic: Antifederalists and Federalists in Constitutional Time*, Stanford University Press, 2002. *Ratifying the Republic* combines the study of philosophy, and American political history to explore how the Constitution gained legitimacy. Since the Constitution has endured as a blueprint for government, understanding how it moved from a very divisive proposal to a nearly unassailable framework for governance is of great importance. I review Congressional debates and personal papers of those who had been on both sides of the battle to ratify the Constitution to discern how their outlooks

and philosophies changed through time and were applied in practice. I also study their votes in Congress to understand what happened to these groups after ratification.

Antifederalist leaders, fearful of anarchy, agreed to support the ratified document. Meanwhile, James Madison and his colleagues who had favored the Constitution publicly broke from the Federalist coalition, joining the ex-Antifederalists to form the nation's first political party. I demonstrate that this stunning break between the Madisonian Federalists and the Hamiltonian Federalists was inevitable, prefigured by their significant philosophical differences over how to successfully implement the Constitution. The Madisonians felt that the document set clear boundaries on the national government through its language; the Hamiltonians felt that in order to be successful the national government had to transcend the paper limits set down in the Constitution. In the partisan fight that ensued both sides claimed to be the true defenders of the American Constitution, leading to an understanding among the American people that the Constitution was very important to heed.

What emerges in the work is an understanding of the American regime as a hybrid of the three major groups involved in the American founding: the Hamiltonian Federalists, the Madisonians, and the Antifederalists. The rational, contractual model of government is thus stretched even by its wildest success—the American founding. In a nation devoted to Locke and other Enlightenment figures, there was something of a Burkean element at work in the nation's political development. American politics played out in a way that no one had foreseen and with which no one was fully satisfied. This is an important lesson to be heeded and understood in both mature and emerging democracies. Democratic political development inevitably entails compromise and cannot easily be controlled by any single group or thinker, no matter how prescient.

**Journal Article:** “Presidential Coequality: The Evolution of a Concept” with Paul T. Beach in *Congress & the Presidency*, September 2012. The article employed a systematic word search of presidential statements used to determine when presidents referred to interbranch relations as “coequal.” Coequality of institutions was clearly rejected in the Constitution, none of the founding generation's presidents referred to that arrangement. The few presidents who did assert presidential coequality between Jackson and Nixon were not suggesting that the branches were of equal power, but merely had equal constitutional legitimacy. It was the weakness of Nixon and Ford, during the Watergate era, which led them to aggressively assert the presidency's coequality and recent presidents have followed their lead, altering our conception of the balance of institutional power in the United States.

**Journal Article:** “The Roosevelts in Superior” August 2009 issue of the *Wisconsin Magazine of History*. This is a piece about Franklin Roosevelt's family when he was a boy. FDR's father James Roosevelt was an investor in Superior, the “City of Destiny,” which he, railroad magnate James J. Hill, and other investors hoped would surpass Chicago as a hub for the distribution of grain and other products from the “Middle West.” FDR and his parents took a trip to Superior when young Franklin was 10 years old in part so that James Roosevelt could oversee his holdings. Shortly thereafter the Panic of 1893 hit, and it became clear that one of James Roosevelt's partners had been running one of

their Superior businesses as a pyramid scheme, ending the Roosevelt's dreams for a metropolis on Wisconsin's northern shore.

**Journal Article:** "Bill Clinton's Contractarian Worldview: The Intellectual Origins and Public Face of the Clinton Philosophy" (*Congress & the Presidency*, Autumn 2008, Volume 35, Number 2: 65-86). There is a robust debate about whether Bill Clinton possessed a consistent governing philosophy. This article lends credence to the claim that Bill Clinton possessed a consistent worldview with a significant caveat: he chose to articulate that view to the public only sporadically. I demonstrate that Clinton's worldview encompassed two major contractarian traditions and a theory of political development. Then I demonstrate that Clinton only articulated this unique view at three critical junctures in his political career. Far from being random, these periods were strategic responses to changes in political context.

**Journal Article:** "Theories about Theory: A Typology of Theory Based Claims from the Case of James Madison," to appear in March 2008 *Presidential Studies Quarterly* (Volume 38, number 1: 78-95). In this article I discuss varied claims about how Madison's acquaintance with political theory affected his performance in office. These "theories about theory" come in two major varieties: content based and "nature of theory itself" arguments. The former posits that a politician has accepted and used the ideas of specific political theorists. The latter suggests that the act of theorizing or attempting to apply political theory to practice produces a certain effect. I discuss the kinds of evidence required to demonstrate both types of claim, critique the arguments made by various commentators, and suggest that careful attention to both types of argument are required to understand the effect that political theory has in the hands of a president.

**Journal Article:** "Principled Pragmatism: Abraham Lincoln's Method of Political Analysis." This journal article appears in the December 2004 issue of *Presidential Studies Quarterly* (vol. 34, number 4: 804-827), and makes the case that the strength of Lincoln's approach to politics lies in his appropriate prioritization of core commitments based on careful attention to political context. I stress that this method of political analysis is reminiscent of the republican tradition, and of the Italian thinker Niccolo Machiavelli in particular. Using his speeches and writings as evidence, I discern that Lincoln found himself traveling through a series of distinctive political contexts during his lifetime, each of which called for a different emphasis in his political principles. During each of these contexts he self-consciously ordered his commitments to the Union of states, to universal human rights, to law, and to popular sovereignty, so as to best achieve these goals in practice. I term Lincoln's method "principled pragmatism," because of the successful combination of its principled nature and its attention to the realities of political practice.

**Journal Article:** "'It is Natural to Care for the Crazy Machine': The Anti-Federalists' Post-ratification Acquiescence," in Fall 1998 *Studies in American Political Development*, volume 12, number 2: 383-410. This article demonstrates that the Antifederalists responded to ratification "responsibly." My thesis contrasts with Lance Banning's view, which is that the Antifederalists first came to grips with the Constitution in 1791, as a bulwark against the policies of Treasury Secretary Alexander Hamilton. I marshal

evidence that the Antifederalists almost uniformly acquiesced to the Constitution much earlier, coincident with ratification. The Antifederalists viewed defying sanctioned laws, even ones understood to be very inadequate, as anarchical and dangerous. Rather than risk anarchy or civil war, the Antifederalists agreed to abide by the Constitution, setting the stage for a stronger kind of acceptance in subsequent years.

**Book Chapter:** “Yet Another Rogue President? Assessing Presidential Approaches to the Separation of Powers using James Madison’s *Federalist*” forthcoming in *The Constitution of Conflict: Function and Purpose*, from University Press of Kansas, 2025. Constitutional conflict between branches of government is inevitable in the American system of government. But there are acceptable and legitimate ways to go about contesting constitutional meaning and unacceptable and illegitimate ways of doing so. This chapter draws on James Madison’s thinking from The Federalist Papers to develop a typology of acceptable and unacceptable practices. Above all, each branch must recognize that the other branches occupy legitimate constitutional space.

**Book Chapter:** “The Antifederalists” chapter forthcoming in 2025 in the *Princeton Encyclopedia of American Political Thought*. This is a 10,000-word entry in what will be the premier compendium of writings in my main field. It consists of my summary of the Antifederalists’ thought along with curated and indicative excerpts of Antifederalist writings, including George Mason, the Pennsylvania Convention Minority, Brutus, and A Columbian Patriot.

**Book Chapter:** “‘A Faultless Plan was not to be Expected’: James Madison and the Separation of Powers” forthcoming in *James Madison’s Constitution: A Double Security and a Parchment Barrier* (University Press of Kansas), Eric T. Kasper and Howard Schweber, eds. This chapter makes the case that no one could have foreseen the twists and turns that the separation of powers took in the early republic. Examples demonstrate Madison’s pragmatic responses, which should liberate us from the dichotomy of thinking that he was either extremely prescient about constitutional matters or hypocritical when it came time to govern, abandoning his earlier stated principles.

**Book Chapter:** “Publius and the Antifederalists: A Satisfactory Answer to all the Objections”? in *The Cambridge Companion to the Federalist Papers*, edited by Jack N. Rakove and Colleen M. Sheehan, Cambridge University Press, 2020. My chapter looks at how “Publius” dealt with the critics of the Constitution in *The Federalist*. Rather than distinguishing itself from other commentary by providing a more well-reasoned refutation of the Antifederalists, Publius primarily engages in personal invective. Hamilton, Madison, and Jay knew the Antifederalists personally, and let their exasperation show. Underlying their different points of view were widely divergent assumptions about how the Constitution would work. In retrospect, the Antifederalists may even lay claim to a more accurate understanding of how politics would work under the Constitution than Publius.

**Book Chapter:** “John Adams’ Political Thought,” in *A Companion to John Adams and John Quincy Adams*, Wiley-Blackwell, David Waldstreicher, ed., 2013, pp. 102-124. This

volume is intended to be a definitive reference for the two Adams'. My chapter focuses on the elder Adams' political thought. The chapter first discusses Adams' core beliefs and who/what influenced him to think the way he did. Then I summarize Adams' major works of political theory. This is followed with a detailed explanation of what the mixed republic meant to Adams and why he so tenaciously clung to that as an ideal. A subsequent section shows that he practiced what he preached in his efforts at constitution-formation and as an executive. After this groundwork I present a holistic view of Adams' thinking, followed by a section on historiography. I conclude the work by offering my own judgment of Adams' political thought.

**Book Chapter:** "James Madison's Presidency: Foreign Affairs," in *A Companion to James Madison and James Monroe*, Wiley-Blackwell, Stuart Leibiger, ed., 2012, pp. 207-223. This volume is intended to be a definitive reference for Presidents Madison and Monroe. My chapter focuses on the foreign policy of President Madison. I begin by summarizing the well-established ideals which Madison possessed about foreign policy, including the thinkers from whom he borrowed. The travails of the early Madison Administration, in which the United States was at the brink of war is treated next. The lead-in to the War of 1812 and the occupation of West Florida are the subject of the next section and the War of 1812 itself is covered in the following one. I then summarize the remainder of Madison's tenure as president, stressing how he learned in office, and conclude by judging Madison's foreign policy performance.

**Book Chapter:** "The Electoral Dynamics of Ratification: Federalist and Antifederalist Strength and Cohesion, 1787-1803," pp. 233-266 in *The House and the Senate in the 1790s: Petitioning, Lobbying, and Institutional Development*, Ohio University Press, 2002, Donald R. Kennon and Kenneth R. Bowling, eds., part of the United States Capitol Historical Society's series in Congressional development. This chapter demonstrates statistically that the Antifederalists were electorally disadvantaged by the position they took on the Constitution. Through the first four Congresses, Antifederalist numbers in Congress were clearly below what they should have been based on their strength and prominence during the ratification debate. The elections of 1788 should therefore be placed alongside others recognized as "critical elections." In subsequent Congresses the former Antifederalists recovered and were bolstered by the breakaway "Madisonians," formerly part of the less cohesive Federalist coalition.

**Contributor:** *America's Forgotten Founders*, Gary L. Gregg II and Mark David Hall, eds., 2008. Louisville. KY: Butler Books.

**Essay:** "America's Machiavellian Moment" for *The Constitutionalist*, a nationally-prominent compendium of essays in American Political Thought addressing current issues, 12/15/2020: <https://theconstitutionalist.org/2020/12/15/americas-machiavellian-moment/>. This essay makes the point that Machiavelli believes that the goal of a political order is to contain, house, and direct conflict toward productive action and away from anarchic lawlessness.

Encyclopedia Entry in the *Oxford Encyclopedia of American Political and Legal History*, Donald T. Critchlow and Phil Vandermeer, editors in chief. Oxford: Oxford University Press. Entry on the “Anti-Federalists,” 2012.

Encyclopedia Entry in the *Encyclopedia of the American Enlightenment*, Marilyn Holme, Managing Editor, Bristol, UK: Continuum. Entry on “The Antifederalists,” 2012.

Encyclopedia Entry in *The Encyclopedia of Political Science*, George T. Kurian, ed., Washington, D.C.: CQ Press, 2010. Entry on “The Constitution.”

Encyclopedia Entry in the *Encyclopedia of Political Theory*, Mark Bevir, Editor in Chief, Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications, Inc. Entry on “The American Revolution,” 2010.

Encyclopedia Entry in the *Princeton Encyclopedia of United States Political History*, Michael Kazin, ed. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 2010. Entry on “the anti-Federalists.”

Encyclopedia Entry in the *Encyclopedia of the Supreme Court of the United States*, David S. Tanenhaus, Editor in Chief, Farmington Hills, MI: Macmillan. Entry on “The Articles of Confederation,” 2008.

Encyclopedia Entries in the *Encyclopedia of the New American Nation*, Paul Finkleman et al., eds. New York: Charles Scribner’s Sons (2006). Entries on “The Antifederalists” and “James Madison – Presidency” with annotated bibliographies.

Encyclopedia Entries in *The Encyclopedia of American Religion and Politics*, ed. Paul A. Djupe and Laura R. Olson. New York: Facts on File (2003). Entries on “Henry David Thoreau,” “Transcendentalism,” “James Madison” and “Thomas Jefferson.”

Book Review: Alexander Keyssar’s *Why Do We Still Have the Electoral College?* in June 2022 *Journal of American History*.

Book Review: Alan Levine, Thomas W. Merrill, and James R. Stoner, eds., *The Political Thought of the Civil War* in the *American Review of Politics* 37(1): 149-151, April 2020.

Book Review: Peverill Squire’s *The Rise of the Representative: Lawmakers and Constituents in Colonial America* in *Congress & the Presidency* 45(2): 220-221, April 2018.

Book Review: Calvin Jillson’s *The American Dream in History, Politics, and Fiction* in the *Journal of Interdisciplinary History* 48(2): 277-278, Autumn 2017.

Book Review: Francis Cogliano’s *Emperor of Liberty: Thomas Jefferson’s Foreign Policy* (Yale University Press, 2014) in the December 2016 (46: 4) issue of *Presidential Studies Quarterly*.

Book Review: Saikrishna Bangalore Prakash's *Imperial from the Beginning: The Constitution of the Original Executive* (Yale University Press, 2015). In the September 2016 (103: 2) issue of the *Journal of American History*.

Book Review: Michael J. Gerhardt's *The Forgotten Presidents: Their Untold Constitutional Legacy* (Oxford University Press, 2013), for H-Net's H Law electronic book review forum, September 2013.

Book Review: Jurgen Heideking's *The Constitution Before the Judgment Seat* (University of Virginia Press, 2012) in the Summer 2013 issue of *Journal of the Early Republic*.

Book Review: *Madison's Metronome* by Greg Weiner (University Press of Kansas, 2012) in the March 2013 issue of *The Journal of American History*.

Book Review: Benjamin A. Kleinerman's *The Discretionary President* (University Press of Kansas, 2009) on H-Net's H Law electronic book review forum: <http://www.h-net.org/~law/> (posted Sept. 2010).

Book Review: *The Ideological Origins of American Federalism* by Alison L. LaCroix (Harvard University Press, 2010) in Autumn 2010 (97: 3) issue of the *Journal of American History*.

Book Review: *Political Moderation in America's First Two Centuries* by Robert McCluer Calhoun (Cambridge University Press, 2009) in the October 2009 issue of *American Historical Review*.

Book Review: *Formative Acts*, Stephen Skowronek and Matthew Glassman, eds. (University of Pennsylvania Press) and David Brian Robertson's *The Constitution and America's Destiny* (Cambridge University Press) in September 2008 *Perspectives in Politics*.

Book Review: Jon L. Wakelyn's *The Birth of the Bill of Rights*, vol. 1 (Greenwood Press), on H-NET's Law book review site.

Book Review: Daniel Wirls and Stephen Wirls's *The Invention of the United States Senate* (Johns Hopkins University Press), in the *Journal of American History*, June 2005.

Book Review: Gary V. Wood's *Heir to the Fathers: John Quincy Adams and the Spirit of Constitutional Government* (Lexington Books) in Fall 2004 *Perspectives on Political Science*.

Book Review dialogue with Richard B. Bernstein on *Ratifying the Republic*, appearing electronically on the Society of Historians of the Early American Republic's H-NET book review page, March 2004.

Book Review: Sotirios A. Barber's *Welfare and the Constitution* (Princeton University Press) in the June 2004 issue of *Perspectives on Politics*.

Book Review: John Kane's *The Politics of Moral Capital* (Cambridge University Press) appeared in the March 2003 issue of *Presidential Studies Quarterly*.

Book Review: David P. Currie's *The Constitution in Congress* (University of Chicago) appeared in the Spring 1999 *Congress & the Presidency*.

Book Review: Alan Brinkley, Nelson W. Polsby and Kathleen M. Sullivan's *New Federalist Papers* (W. W. Norton) appeared in Spring 1998 issue of *Perspectives on Political Science*.

Book Reviews: Stanley A. Renshon's *The Psychological Assessment of Presidential Candidates* (NYU Press) and *High Hopes: The Clinton Presidency and the Politics of Ambition* (NYU Press) in the Fall 1996 issue of *Congress & the Presidency*.

### **Current Research:**

**Book Manuscript in Progress:** "Calumny! The Politics of Rumor, Innuendo, and Allegations of Crime" takes as its theme the threat posed to republican self-government by public accusations against governments and their officials. Calumnies are false charges known to be false charges by those who use them. The purpose of calumny is to gain popularity and political office. Because these are false charges, they are not intended to be adjudicated by any institution. Thus, calumnies are a political tactic that erodes trust in the political and legal system as a whole. The point of liberal governments is to serve the people. Liberal political theory is so focused on this task that it ignores the need for government's reputation to be protected from innuendos and rumors. Niccolo Machiavelli, in his *Discourses on Livy*, described calumny as a grave danger to republics. With no institutional process used to evaluate of the charges, the public can readily be made to turn against a government, even for false reasons, which endangers popular government. A full discussion of calumny, including its prevalent use in current politics and its legal status in the United States suggests that is time for liberal political theory to revisit this concept. I argue that we need to find ways to guard the reputation of popular government within the bounds of liberalism.

**Article in Progress:** "The Farmer was a Framers: The Case for Elbridge Gerry as the author of the *Letters from the Federal Farmer*," submitted to *The William & Mary Quarterly* for review. Through content analysis and other evidence this article argues that a Massachusetts delegate to the Constitutional Convention (and later Vice President) wrote "Letters from a Federal Farmer," perhaps the best commentary on the Constitution by an Antifederalist. The authorship of these letters has been unknown for more than 200 years and actively disputed for the last 20 years. Coauthored with John P. Kaminski.

## **National Conference Presentations**

“Calumny! The Politics of Rumor, Innuendo, and Allegations of Crime” delivered at the American Political Science Association’s annual conference in Philadelphia, PA, September, 2024.

“Whither the Vortex? The Constitutionalism of Control and Chaos” presented at the annual conference of the American Political Science Association in Montreal, Quebec, Canada in September 2022.

“Yet Another Rogue President?” conference paper delivered in Portland, OR in March 2022 at the annual conference of the Western Political Science Association.

“In Their Proper Places: James Madison’s Separation of Functions Constitution.” Was to be delivered at the April 2020 Midwest Political Science Association annual meeting, which was cancelled due to the pandemic.

“Coequal and Dysfunctional: Judging the Presidency by a Separation of Functions Standard” delivered at the Lincoln Symposium in American Political Thought at the Jack Miller Center, Philadelphia, PA, August 2018.

“From Impetuous Vortex to Tyrannophobia: Four Approaches to the Placement of Institutional Power,” delivered at the annual meeting of the Western Political Science Association in Vancouver, British Columbia, Canada, April 2017

“Publius and the Antifederalists: “A Satisfactory Answer to all the Objections”?” delivered at the annual meeting of the American Political Science Association, San Francisco, September 2015.

“Coequality in the First Branch: Congressional Assertions about Institutional Equilibria,” paper delivered at the annual conference of the Southern Political Science Association’s annual meeting in New Orleans, January 2015

“For Every Action an Equal and Opposite Reaction: Coequality in the Popular Mind,” paper delivered at the annual meeting of the Western Political Science Association’s annual meeting in Seattle, WA, April 2014.

“The Judicial Face of Coequality” delivered at the annual meeting of the Western Political Science Association in Los Angeles, CA, April 2013.

“The Philosophical Origins of Coequality” delivered at the annual meeting of the Western Political Science Association in Portland, OR, March 2012.

“Presidential Coequality: The Evolution of a Concept” (with Paul T. Beach) delivered at the annual meeting of the Western Political Science Association in San Antonio, TX, April 2011.

“Calhoun and Coequality: Dubious Origins of a Respected Ideal” delivered at the annual meeting of the Western Political Science Association in San Francisco, CA, April 2010.

“The Myth of Equality: The Theory and the Founding of Institutional Power” delivered at the annual meeting of the Southern Political Science Association in Atlanta, Georgia, January 2010.

“FDR as Trimmer: The Influence of Thomas Babington Macaulay on Franklin Roosevelt” paper presented at the Western Political Science Association’s annual meeting in Vancouver, BC, March 2009.

“Ambivalent Sage: Thomas Jefferson and Political Philosophy” presented at the annual meeting of the Western Political Science Association in San Diego, March 2008

“Adams and Jefferson: Two Differing Approaches to Political Theory” presented at the annual meeting of the Southern Political Science Association in New Orleans, January 2008.

“Leading the People away from the Presidency?: The Paradoxes of the Whig Inaugurals,” paper presented at the annual meeting of the Western Political Science Association in Las Vegas, March 2007.

Roundtable panelist on David Brian Robertson’s *The Constitution and America’s Destiny* (Cambridge) at the annual meeting of the Social Science History Association in Minneapolis, November 2006.

“Theories about Theory: A Typology of Theory Based Claims from the Case of James Madison,” conference paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Political Science Association in Philadelphia, September 2006

“Hiding in Plain View: The Social Contractarianism of Bill Clinton,” conference paper presented at the Midwest Political Science Association annual meeting in Chicago, April 2006.

“Hiding in Plain View: The Social Contractarianism of Bill Clinton,” conference paper presented at the Western Political Science Association’s Annual meeting in Albuquerque, March 2006.

“Woodrow Wilson and Political Philosophy,” conference paper presented at the annual meeting of the Midwest Political Science Association, Chicago, April, 2005.

“Presidents and Political Thought: Four Perspectives,” conference paper presented at the annual meeting of the Southern Political Science Association, New Orleans, LA, Jan., 2005.

“James Madison and Political Philosophy,” conference paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Political Science Association, Philadelphia, PA, August, 2003.

“American Fabius,” conference paper presented at the 2002 annual meeting of the Southern Political Science Association, Savannah, GA, November, 2002.

Roundtable discussion on my *Ratifying the Republic*, at the annual meeting of the Wisconsin Political Science Association, Oshkosh, October, 2002.

“American Fabius: The Machiavellian Nature of Abraham Lincoln’s Political Thought,” conference paper presented at the 2002 meeting of the Midwest Political Science Association, Chicago, April, 2002.

“Publius in Constitutional Time: Madison, Hamilton and the Mutual Search for Incompatible Equilibria,” conference paper presented at the annual meeting of the Midwest Political Science Association in Chicago, April 2001.

“Constitutionalism, Consensus and Conflict,” address given at the 42nd annual U.S. Air Force Academy Assembly in Colorado Springs, Feb. 2000.

“Continuity and Change in the Transition to Partisanship, 1789-1801,” conference paper presented at the Northeastern Political Science Association in Philadelphia, Nov. 1999.

“The Electoral Dynamics of Ratification,” invited conference paper presented at the annual meeting of the United States Capitol Historical Society in Washington, D.C. April 1999.

“The Unbearable Transience of Federalist #10,” conference paper presented at the annual meeting of the Midwest Political Science Association in Chicago, April 1998.

“Antifederalism, Consensual Legitimacy, and the American Constitutional Order,” conference paper presented at the annual meeting of the Western Political Science Association in Tucson, March 1997.

“Republican Rivalry Revisited: A Comparison of Federalist and Antifederalist Approaches to Committee Work in the U.S. Congress,” conference paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Political Science Association in San Francisco, August 1996.

### **Grants, Awards, and Honors**

Year Sabbatical—University of Wisconsin-Oshkosh, 2024-25

Year Sabbatical—University of Wisconsin-Oshkosh, 2016-17

Faculty Development Grant, Research Component, UW Oshkosh, Summer 2012

Community Engagement Award 2011 (Community-wide award presented at the Oshkosh Area Community Foundation and Oshkosh *Northwestern’s* “Evening of Stars”

\$2500

Willard Smith Teaching Award co-winner, 2010-11  
Give Students a Compass Award, 2010-11 (for student mentoring), \$500  
Special Projects Coordinator, (summer money for civic engagement projects)  
Rosebush Professorship (distinguished campus "lifetime" merit award)  
Faculty Development Grant—University of Wisconsin Oshkosh, 2009-10  
TRISS Endowed Professor, University of Wisconsin Oshkosh, 2009-2013  
Spring Commencement Address—University of Wisconsin Oshkosh May 2009  
Beeke-Levy Research Fellowship, Franklin and Eleanor Roosevelt Institute, 2008  
Editorial Board Member, *Oshkosh Northwestern*, 2007-8  
Year Sabbatical-University of Wisconsin-Oshkosh, 2007-8  
Distinguished Teaching Award Nominee, 2007  
Faculty Development Grant—Teaching Component  
Distinguished Teaching Award Nominee, 2006  
Willard Smith Outstanding Teacher Award, 2005-6  
Distinguished Teaching Award Nominee, 2005  
Faculty Development Grant—University of Wisconsin-Oshkosh, 2005  
Chapter Activity Grant—Pi Sigma Alpha, 2005  
Willard Smith Outstanding Teacher Award, 2003-4  
Faculty Development Grant—University of Wisconsin-Oshkosh, 2004  
Faculty Development Grant—University of Wisconsin-Oshkosh, 2002  
Lloyd E. Worner Teacher of the Year Award Nominee—Colorado College, 2001  
Congressional Research Award—Dirksen Congressional Center and Caterpillar  
Foundation  
Colorado College Social Science Research Council—research grant—2000  
Pinanski Teaching Excellence Award Nominee—Wellesley College, 1999  
Louise Overacker Fund Award—Wellesley College, 1999  
United States Capitol Historical Society Research Grant, 1998  
Schattschneider Award Nominee, for best dissertation in American politics, 1998  
Advanced Research Fellowship-Wisconsin Alumni Research Foundation, 1996-7  
High Pass-American Government Preliminary Examination, 1993  
High Pass-Political Theory Preliminary Examination, 1993  
Research Grant-Wisconsin Alumni Research Foundation, 1992-3  
Wisconsin Alumni Research Foundation Year-Fellowship, 1991-2  
Phi Beta Kappa, 1991  
Intern in Washington for Representative Les Aspin, 1990  
Pi Sigma Alpha, 1989  
National Merit Scholar, 1987

**Manuscript reviewer:** *American Political Science Review*, Oxford University Press, *Publius*, *Presidential Studies Quarterly*, *Review of Politics*, *American Political Thought*, *Journal of American History*, *American Journal of Political Science*, Stanford University Press, University of Virginia Press, Vanderbilt University Press, Northern Illinois University Press, Edinburgh University Press.

**Professional Memberships:** American Political Science Association, Midwest Political Science Association, Southern Political Science Association, Western Political Science Association, Presidency Research Group, APSA Politics and History Section

**Select Extra-Departmental Service:**

Faculty Senate (2023-2024)  
President, United Faculty and Staff of Oshkosh (2021-2024)  
University Club Executive Board (2014-2024)  
Faculty Workload Task Force (2021)  
Instructional Academic Staff Task Force (Chair, 2019-2020)  
United Faculty and Staff of UW Oshkosh Executive Board (2017-2024)  
Bachelor of Arts degree requirement reform Committee, (2017-18)  
Faculty Senate (3 years, including one on the Executive Committee)  
Faculty Committee (Letters & Science Steering Committee-4 years, 2 as chair)  
Promotion and Post Tenure Review Committee (4 years, including 1 as chair)  
UW-Oshkosh Faculty Advocacy Committee (5 years, including 3 as Chair)  
American Democracy Project, (15 years, 4 years as chair)  
UW-Oshkosh Chancellor Search Committee (2014)  
Oshkosh *Northwestern* Editorial Board  
Wisconsin Public Radio guest commentator  
Oshkosh *Northwestern* and Appleton *Post-Crescent* columnist and commentator,  
Political Science Student Association faculty adviser (6 years)  
College Democrats faculty adviser (19 years)  
Faculty Development Program proposal reader  
UW-Oshkosh Provost Search and Screen Committee  
Political Science Department Chair (4 years),

**References**

Prof. James H. Read  
Dept. of Political Science  
St. Johns College  
Collegeville, MN  
(320) 363-2723  
[jread@csbsju.edu](mailto:jread@csbsju.edu)

Prof. Emeritus Emily R. Gill  
Department of Political Science  
Bradley Hall  
Bradley University  
Peoria, IL 61625  
(309) 677-2493  
[gill@bradley.bradley.edu](mailto:gill@bradley.bradley.edu)

Prof. Jack N. Rakove  
Department of History  
Stanford University  
Stanford, CA 94305-2024  
(415) 723-4545  
[rakove@leland.stanford.edu](mailto:rakove@leland.stanford.edu)

Prof., Emeritus Paul Schumaker  
Dept. of Political Science  
University of Kansas  
504 Blake Hall  
Lawrence, KS 66045  
(785) 864-9038  
[schu@KU.edu](mailto:schu@KU.edu)

Prof. David Brian Robertson  
Dept. of Political Science  
University of Missouri-St. Louis  
8001 Natural Bridge Rd.  
St. Louis, MO 63121-4499  
(314) 516-5855  
daverobertson@umsl.edu

Prof. Benjamin A. Kleinerman  
Dept. of Political Science  
Baylor University  
One Bear Place #97276  
Waco, TX 76798-7276  
(254) 710-3551  
benjamin\_kleinerman@baylor.edu