This course explores the changing boundaries and content of state and national citizenship, from the period of slavery to the early twentieth century. The core question is: How was membership in the social and political community defined for men and women in the United States, and how were those definitions changed over time? We will examine the genesis and meanings of legal freedom and formal citizenship for former slaves, for immigrants, for Native Americans, and for residents of territories acquired or conquered by the United States. We will at several points juxtapose evolving concepts of citizenship in the United States with those developed in France and in the Caribbean colonies (and former colonies) of France and Spain, putting political thought in the United States into an Atlantic context.

The course will link the methods of historical research with those of legal scholarship, emphasizing the social dynamics that lie behind legal cases, and the legal constraints that operate on social processes. Readings for the course draw on state and federal Supreme Court cases, including the attorneys’ briefs and trial court records. We will also read interpretive works of history and law, Congressional testimony, and 19th century newspaper reports.

Students will be grouped into four or five panels, and each panel will take responsibility for studying and presenting a key post-Civil War legal case in historical context. These presentations will explore how competing conceptions of citizenship and its attendant rights emerged, were written into constitutional texts and statutes, and were challenged. The cases include U.S. v. Cruikshank (1875), Hall v. Decuir (1878),
Plessy v. Ferguson (1896), Wong Kim Ark (1898); and Gonzales v. Williams (1904).

The format of the course, which meets twice a week for an hour and twenty-five minutes, is lecture and discussion. Each student will participate in his or her panel’s preparation of a case for oral presentation, and will write a final research paper (approximately fifteen pages), focused on some aspect of that case or on a closely-related case. At the end of the first half of the course there will be a midterm exam; the research paper will be due at the end of the second half of the course. There is no final exam.

Copies of the following book have been ordered at the usual bookstores, including Ulrich’s and the Barnes and Noble in the Michigan Union.


A course-pack containing the other required readings will be available at Dollar Bill Copying.

All books used in the course are also on reserve at the Law Library. Full transcripts of record for the Supreme Court Cases can be accessed through the Law Library web portal; most will also be on reserve in paper copies. A bibliography of sources for each panel, which can also help you get started with research papers, is available on the Canvas site.

Laptop policy: To encourage full discussion and avoid distraction, all electronic devices including laptops and tablets should remain off and stowed for the duration of the class. Please plan to bring the readings for each week in paper copies, either as book, course-pack or printout from Canvas.

Writing assignments and grading: There will be a 5-page prospectus due on March 18, and a research paper (3,000 to 4,000 words; approx. 12 to 15 pages) due on April 21. Grades in the course will be based on a combination of class participation (including in-class discussions and the group panel presentations), the midterm quiz, the research prospectus, and the final research paper.

Schedule of Topics

Week I. First class. Wednesday, January 13. Introduction to the course and its procedures. Framing several core questions: What is citizenship? In what ways might being a citizen be different from being a national, a denizen, a resident or a subject? Can there be “degrees” of citizenship, offering access to different rights and duties? What are the links between formal citizenship and day-to-day struggles over its meaning?
Readings:


[Both selections are available in the Week 1 folder on the Canvas site; please read them before the first meeting of class.]

Monday, January 18. Martin Luther King Day. No class; you are encouraged to attend the lecture by Thomas Holt, in the Department of History, or the Law School’s Martin Luther King day program.

Week II. Wednesday, January 20.
Spoken and unspoken citizenship: The Constitutional framework and the compromises on slavery. The age of Atlantic Revolutions and the possibilities for an expanded citizenship.

Readings:

U.S. Constitution.


Edmund Morgan, American Slavery, American Freedom, pp. 3-6, 363-387.

Laurent Dubois, A Colony of Citizens: Revolution and Slave Emancipation in the French Caribbean, chap. 3

Assignment for in-class discussion on Wednesday: Please bring a copy of the U. S. Constitution and the first ten Amendments, having underlined all sections where you think some element of citizenship or nationality is spelled out or implied. Based on this document alone, how would you define the boundaries of citizenship, both in terms of inclusion and in terms of content?

Week III. Monday, January 25, and Wednesday, January 27.
How did citizenship emerge in the early nineteenth-century United States, given the lack of a formal definition of it in the Constitution? Were women citizens, and if so, what kind of citizens? What was the legal status of Native American communities and individuals?
Required Readings:


Cherokee Nation v. Georgia (1831) and Worcester v. Georgia (1832). Selections.

**Week IV.** Monday, February 1, and Wednesday, February 3.

The extension of territory; the extension and contraction of rights. The Fugitive Slave Law. Were free persons who were categorized as “of color” construed as citizens of individual states, of the United States, or of neither? Understanding the unspoken in *Prigg v. Pennsylvania*: Was Margaret Morgan a “fugitive slave”?

**Readings:**


*Treaty of Guadalupe Hidalgo* (1848).

Fugitive Slave Law of 1850.

**Assignment:** On Wednesday, February 3, students will select among the five panels: *U. S. v. Cruikshank, Hall v. Decuir, Plessy v. Ferguson, Wong Kim Ark, Gonzales v. Williams*. The full Transcripts of Record for each case—including attorneys’ briefs, testimony, and lower court decisions—are available on-line through Electronic Resources at the Law Library. Paper copies of the Transcripts of Record can be found in the Law Library, and various additional sources have also been posted to the individual panel folders on Canvas. Briefly review enough of the relevant materials to decide which case you would like to work on, and convey your preference to the instructor by email by 5pm on Monday, February 1. (Please make a first and second choice).

**Week V.** Monday, February 8, and Wednesday, February 10. Previews of the cases for discussion by panels in subsequent weeks. Preparation for selection of research topics. How does one define a legal-historical research topic? What kinds of sources can be used?

This week we will interrupt our chronological progression in order to preview the cases
to be discussed by the panels, and to frame the selection of individual research topics. We will focus on the nature of legal-historical research, and modes of analyzing the relationship between doctrine and context.

The members of each panel should begin to review the bibliography related to that case, choosing one member of the panel to present a preview of the case, and another to offer a synopsis and analysis of the selected example of a legal-historical essay related to the case or core issue in question. [see ‘Readings for each panel,’ below].

On Monday we will ask members of panels 1 and 2 to present brief previews of their cases, and synopses of the legal-historical essays (the Ross article for the Cruikshank panel, and the Kressel essay for the Hall v. Decuir panel). We will similarly ask the members of the remaining panels to present such previews and synopses on Wednesday.

Monday: What does it mean to conceptualize law and social/political history in the same frame? What kinds of research strategies might this approach suggest, and how can you identify sources for your own research papers?

Wednesday: Readings for each panel: The members of each panel should read the essay or chapter linked to their case, and be prepared to discuss it in class, [An inspiring note: two of the five articles below originated as research papers prepared in earlier seminars on this subject at the University of Michigan Law School]:

Panel 1: U.S. v. Cruikshank, vigilante violence, and the protection of rights:

Panel 2: Hall v. DeCuir and the assertion of public rights during Reconstruction:

Panel 3: Plessy v. Ferguson and conceptual frameworks for legal challenges to the white supremacist project.


Panel 5. Gonzales v. Williams and the boundaries of citizenship in a period of overseas expansion.

Assignment for Monday of next week: Review the case file and the bibliography relevant to your case, and decide which aspects of your case and its context you wish to explore further in your research paper. On Monday, February 15, please submit (in class, in paper copy) a one-page description of the questions you would like to explore in your research paper, accompanied by the sources you have initially located that can help you find ways of addressing them. Please make use of the instructor’s office hours as you plan your research.

**Week VI.** Monday, February 15, and Wednesday February 17.
The debate over national citizenship: Dred Scott and its reevaluation during the Civil War.

*Required Readings:*


Decision of Attorney-General Bates, November 29, 1862, on the question of the citizenship of the commander of the schooner *Elizabeth and Margaret*. [Also available on the web at Making of America site, Library of Congress]

*Supplementary* (and excellent models of legal-historical research):


*Readings:*


“An Act to Protect All Persons in the United States in their Civil Rights, and Furnish the
Means of their Vindication” 14 Statutes at Large 27 (1866)

The Thirteenth, Fourteenth, and Fifteenth Amendments to the United States Constitution

Wednesday, February 24: Midterm Quiz.

February 26- March 6.  Winter Recess


Readings:

Civil Rights Act of 1870 (16 Stat 140 [1870])

Second Enforcement Act (16 Stat 433 [1871])

Third Enforcement Act (Ku Klux Klan Act) (17 Stat 13 [1871])


U.S. v. Cruikshank 92 US 542 (1875). Transcript of Record and Decision. [Pages to be chosen by the Cruikshank panel]

Other readings on Cruikshank may be chosen by the panel.

Wednesday, March 9: Presentation of U.S. v. Cruikshank 92 US 542 (1875) [by Panel 1:]

Week IX.  Monday, March 14 and Wednesday, March 16.  Public accommodations and claims-making under state and federal laws.  The emergence of claims to women’s voting rights.

Required Readings:


Bill of Rights and Article XIII of the 1868 Louisiana Constitution

Federal Civil Rights Act of 1875

Hall v. Decuir 95 US 485 (1878) Decision and Transcript of Record. [Selections to be assigned by Panel 2]

**Wednesday, March 16: Presentation of Hall v. Decuir 95 US 485 (1878) [Panel 2]**

Assignment for **Friday, March 18**: Submit a five-page prospectus (three pages of prose plus two pages of annotated bibliography) for your research paper. The prospectus should indicate the working title, the key questions that you expect to be able to answer (avoid over-general or rhetorical questions), and careful annotations of at least two substantial primary sources and three secondary sources already located and consulted, as well as an indication of additional sources you have identified, and how you expect to use them.

The prospectus is a graded assignment, to be submitted in paper copy to the instructor [mailbox on the 9th floor, Legal Research Building], in MSWord to the ‘Assignments’ section of the Canvas site, and to your research partner. When the graded paper copy is returned to you with instructor comments, please be sure to review and retain it; you will be re-submitting this paper copy, including the instructor comments, along with your final paper at the end of term.

**Week X.** Monday, March 21 and Wednesday, March 23. The retreat from federal protection. The evolution of the “state action” doctrine. What is left of the 14th Amendment at the end of the day?

*Readings:*

Foner, *Short History of Reconstruction*, chaps. 11, 12.

Civil Rights Cases 109 US 3 (1883).

Yick Wo v. Hopkins 118 US 356 (1886)

Louisville, N.O. & Texas R. Co. V. Mississippi 133 US 587 (1890)

**Week XI.** March 28 and March 30.

The attack on suffrage and on public rights.

*Readings:*

The Separate Car Act, Louisiana, 1890.

Plessy v. Ferguson 163 US 537 (1896). Decision, dissent, brief by Albion Tourgée and other texts are excerpted in Brook Thomas, *Plessy v. Ferguson: A Brief History with Documents*. [pages from this and from the Transcript of Record of the case to be assigned by Plessy Panel].
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**Wednesday, March 30: Presentation of Plessy v. Ferguson 163 US 537 (1896) [Panel 3]**

**Week XII.** Monday, April 4, and Wednesday, April 6. Chinese exclusion, birthright citizenship, and the implications of territorial expansion. Comparative perspectives: what kinds of post-slavery arrangements yield broad suffrage rights, and why do other circumstances allow disfranchisement?

*Readings:*


Rebecca Scott, *Degrees of Freedom: Louisiana and Cuba after Slavery*, chap. 6.

**Monday, April 4, Presentation by the Wong Kim Ark panel [Panel 4].**

**Wednesday, April 6 [tentative]. Special guest, Prof. Sam Erman (University of Southern California Law School).** Professor Erman will discuss the interaction between domestic disfranchisement and territorial expansion. He will also be available for consultation with the members of the panel preparing *Gonzales v. Williams*.

**Week XIII.** April 11 and April 13. Constitutional disfranchising initiatives in the states; the creation of “non-citizen nationals”?

*Readings:*

Reread: Fifteenth Amendment to the United States Constitution

Selections from the Louisiana Constitutional Convention of 1898, and the text of the 1898 Louisiana Constitution.

Giles v. Harris, 189 U.S. 475 (1903) and Giles v. Teasley [selections on CTools]


Gonzales v. Williams. 192 US 3 (1904). [Selections to be chosen by panel 5].

**Wednesday, April 13, Presentation by the Gonzales v. Williams panel [Panel 5].**

**Week XIV.** April 18 and 20. Epilogue: Twentieth century struggles over the boundaries and meaning of citizenship. The slow recuperation and expansion of suffrage rights for citizens. The sharpening of borders and the evolution of policy on immigration.
Readings:


**Final Assignment:** Research papers are due Thursday, April 21. Be sure to attach your prospectus (with instructor comments) to the final paper.

[This course will not have a final exam.]