

**CANADIAN POLITICS**  
**LA POLITIQUE CANADIENNE**  
**CPO 4133**  
**FALL 2014**

**Tuesdays 5-6 (11:45-13:40), Thursdays 6 (12:50-13:40)**

Richard S. Conley, PhD  
Associate Professor  
Department of Political Science  
University of Florida  
309 Anderson Hall  
Gainesville, FL 32611  
Office hours: Tuesdays, 10:30-11:30; Thursdays, 10:45-12:45  
Virtual office hours on Skype (id: richardconley) by appointment  
(352) 273-2385  
rconley@ufl.edu  
<http://www.clas.ufl.edu/users/rconley>

Canada is the United States' closest neighbor geographically and largest trading partner. The United States shares much in common with Canada, yet the two countries diverge significantly in their political culture, institutions, and approaches to policy issues. Canada is a rich and complex democracy. It is a bilingual and multicultural country with different socio-political foundations. The Canadian Constitution is less than 30 years old and remains a hotbed of controversy. The country's Westminster-style parliament confronts regional and linguistic tensions, a multi-party electoral system that compounds efforts toward national unity, and a very real possibility that French-speaking Québec may decide to leave Canada. These factors shape political processes and institutional politics very differently across the border.

This comparative politics course closely examines the culture, institutions, behavior, and public policy in Canada, with comparisons drawn to the United States. The course will explore efforts to amend the Canadian Constitution and why they failed. Special emphasis will be given to relations with indigenous peoples (the First Nations) and the legacy of the Pierre Trudeau, Canada's flamboyant prime minister who sought to ward off Québec nationalism and "patriated" the Canadian constitution in 1983. The course will also evaluate the Québec sovereignty movement, the impact of the electoral system and calls for reform, and select policy questions.

**Required Books/Readings**

Patrick Malcolmson and Richard Myers, *The Canadian Regime*, fourth edition (Toronto: U. of Toronto Press, 2009).

James Bickerton and Alain-G. Gagnon (eds.), *Canadian Politics*, fifth edition (Toronto: U. of Toronto Press, 2009).

Ramsay Cook, *Watching Quebec: Selected Essays* (Montréal: McGill-Queen's University Press, 2005).

Alain-G. Gagnon (ed.), *Québec: State & Society* (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 2008).

Journal articles will be available on-line through Library West Reserve.

### **Grades**

Short paper on a member of the House of Commons (due 23 September)	15%
Short paper on political parties (due 16 September)	15%
Attendance/Participation	20%
Research paper design (due 4 November in class)	20%
Research Paper (due 9 December in class)	30%

Short paper assignments will be posted on the course home page.

The mid-term exam will be a take-home exam. The assignment will be approximately 5-7 double spaced pages (excluding bibliography), standard 12 point font, proper citations, and proper use of English grammar and spelling. (See Appendix B).

The research paper instructions will be posted on the course home page. The assignment will be approximately 9-12 doublespaced pages (excluding bibliography), standard 12 point font, proper citations, and proper use of English grammar and spelling. (See Appendix B).

### **Attendance/Participation**

Attendance will be taken in each session of the course beginning at the close of add/drop. Tuesdays count double. You determine your attendance grade: The number of times you attend will be divided by the number of course meetings.

Students will be allowed two (2) unexcused absences over the course of the semester. I follow the guidelines on *excused* absences straightforwardly and explicitly from the Office of the University Registrar. Information on what constitutes excused absences. Information is available at <http://www.registrar.ufl.edu/catalog/policies/regulationattendance.html>

Attendance for this course is **mandatory**. Participation is a component of the attendance grade. You cannot participate if you do not attend class. Your participation grade depends on your contributions to our class discussions (see the following section on general guidelines). You are expected to complete all reading assignments before the class meets and to come prepared to discuss the material. I reserve the right to give periodic quizzes during the semester which will count toward your attendance/participation grade if I feel that students are not keeping pace with the reading material. **Note that Tuesday classes count double, as we meet 100 minutes.**

### **Computers and Electronic Devices**

The use of laptop computers or other electronic devices is **prohibited** in the classroom. Do **NOT** bring cell phones, palm pilots, beepers, I-Pods, MP3 players, or any other gadgets to class and expect to have cell phones ring, answer calls, listen to music, text message, etc. The

use of these devices is **prohibited** in the classroom. Students who engage such tomfoolery during class time will be asked to leave, and **will receive a penalty in the equivalent of 2.5% of the FINAL GRADE, regardless of prior physical absences from the course.** Please take this rule very seriously. Further, the use of any such device during a quiz will result in a failing grade for the course and referral to the Dean of Students Office for cheating.

**Late assignments.** All written assignments are due in class on the days noted in the readings schedule/appendices. Late papers will be downgraded 1 full grade for each day they are late, including weekends. **NO PAPERS WILL BE ACCEPTED VIA EMAIL. THEY MUST BE TURNED IN AT THE BEGINNING OF CLASS.**

### **General Criteria for Grading**

#### ***Students who get top grades (A, B+) generally:***

- Turn in high-quality written work which reflects careful research, good planning, well-conceived arguments, originality, clarity of thought, and integration of course material, where appropriate. They stay within stated page limits. Their bibliographies are solid and their footnotes carefully used. Their final product is typed and readable. Written work submitted is in nearly flawless English grammar and spelling.
- Complete all assigned readings on time, and reflect this in their exams, written work, and class participation. They review carefully and productively.
- Attend class regularly.
- Participate actively and enthusiastically in class discussions. They ask questions on a regular basis, and their ideas are original and stimulating. They challenge the conventional wisdom. They summarize each author's principal argument and their reaction to it when discussing the course material.

#### ***Students who get middle grades (B, B-, C+) generally:***

- Turn in acceptable written work with no serious deficiencies in writing. They meet deadlines generally. Their work is readable and typed.
- Attend class, complete the assigned readings and participate in class discussions, asking occasional questions.

#### ***Students who get low and failing grades (C, C-, D, E) generally:***

- Do not turn in their assigned work, or turn it in late with penalty. Their work is of poor quality and shows inadequate research, documentation, thought, and originality. It is poorly presented (untidy and/or handwritten rather than typed).
- Complete only part of the required readings.
- Do not attend class and avoid participation. When called upon, they are obviously not familiar with the material. They ask no questions and accept new ideas and opinions without challenging them.

### **Academic Integrity and Plagiarism**

Plagiarism (using someone else's ideas without giving him proper credit) is a serious offense. Students are expected to comply with the University of Florida's Student Code of Conduct.

Questions should be directed to the Dean of Students Office, Judicial Affairs.

The written assignments for this class are to be your own work. Discussing your ideas or general approach with me, other students or faculty, revising your work in response to a colleague's criticism, or using words or ideas from a text or another source with proper attribution or referencing is acceptable, and is, in fact, an important aspect of intellectual discourse. Plagiarism and other forms of dishonesty, including the failure to cite proper references, are unacceptable at all times.

Cheating on examinations and plagiarism are violations of the academic honesty standards of the University of Florida, will have a serious effect upon your grade in this course, and will be referred to the appropriate University authorities for disciplinary action to the full extent provided for under the University's regulations.

### **Students with Handicaps or Special Needs**

If there is any reason why you require special physical accommodation for the examinations or during our time in class, please see me in confidence as soon as possible at the beginning of the course. Every effort will be made to accommodate your needs within the guidelines set forth by the University.

### **Creating a Dynamic and Rewarding Classroom Atmosphere**

Much of our class time will be spent in discussion. It is therefore important that you bring your ideas and questions to class with you and share them with others. I will strive for an atmosphere in which every student participates and receives constructive and respectful response of me and other students. Through this interaction, you will strengthen your critical skills and heighten your enjoyment of the literature and we will learn from each other.

### **Office Hours**

I keep regular office hours to ensure that I am available to assist you. I encourage you to consult with me on course readings, assignments, or any problems you may be having with the course. You may also reach me via email or by leaving a message on my office phone.

## **READINGS SCHEDULE**

**Tuesday, 26 August** – Introduction to the Course

**Thursday, 28 August** - *Foundations and Approaches to Canadian Politics*

Chapter 1, "Canada's Regime Principles," in Malcomson & Myers.

**Tuesday, 2 September** – *Tories and Liberals: Canada's Founding Fathers*

Film: *John A.: Birth of a Country*

**Thursday, 4 September** – *Canada's Founding*

Chapter 1, Samuel Laselva, "Understanding Canada's Origins," in Bickerton & Gagnon.

**Tuesday, 9 September** – *Canadian and Québec Political Culture*

Chapter 2, Will Kymlicka, "Citizenship, Communities, and Identity in Canada," in Bickerton & Gagnon.

Chapter 3, Stephen Brooks, "Canadian Political Culture," in Bickerton & Gagnon.

Chapter 4, James Bickerton and Alain-G. Gagnon, "Regions and Regionalism," in Bickerton & Gagnon.

**Thursday, 11 September** – *Canadian and Québec Political Culture (Map Quiz)*

Chapter 1, "Canada and the French-Canadian Question," in Cook.

Chapter 2, "'Au Diable avec le Goupillon et la Tuque'; The Quiet Revolution and the New Nationalism," in Cook.

Chapter 3, "Quebec: The Ideology of Survival," in Cook.

Chapter 1, Jacques Beauchemin, "What Does It Mean to Be a Quebecer?" Between Self-Preservation and Openness to the Other," in Gagnon.

**Tuesday, 16 September** – *The Canadian Constitution*

Chapter 2, "The Constitution," in Malcomson & Myers.

Chapter 6, Alain-G. Gagnon, "Québec-Canada's Constitutional Dossier," in Gagnon.

Chapter 7, Andrée Lajoie, "The Clarity Act in Its Context," in Gagnon.

**Thursday, 18 September** – *The Canadian Constitution*

Chapter 5, Roger Gibbins, "Constitutional Politics," in Bickerton and Gagnon.

Michael R. Stein, "Improving the Process of Constitutional Reform in Canada: Lessons from the Meech Lake and Charlottetown Constitutional Rounds." *Canadian Journal of Political Science* 30 (1997): 307-39.

**Tuesday, 23 September – Parliament**

Chapter 3, “Responsible Government,” in Malcomson & Myers.

Chapter 7, “Parliament,” in Malcomson & Myers.

Chapter 7, Jennifer Smith, “Canada’s Minority Parliament,” in Bickerton & Gagnon.

**Thursday, 25 September – The Government & the Executive**

Chapter 6, “The Crown and Its Servants,” in Malcomson & Myers.

Chapter 6, Donald Savoie, “Power at the Apex: Executive Dominance,” in Bickerton & Gagnon.

**Thursday, 2 October – Federalism**

Chapter 8, Richard Simeon and Ian Robinson, “The Dynamics of Canadian Federalism,” in Bickerton & Gagnon.

Chapter Four, “Federalism,” Malcomson & Myers.

**Tuesday, 7 October – Judicial Politics and the Charter of Rights and Freedoms**

Chapter 5, “The Canadian Charter of Rights and Freedoms,” in Malcomson & Myers.

Chapter 8, “The Judiciary,” in Malcomson & Myers.

Chapter 10, Raymond Bazowski, “The Judiciary and the Charter,” in Bickerton and Gagnon.

Charles R. Epp, “Do Bills of Rights Matter? The Canadian Charter of Rights and Freedoms,” *American Political Science Review* 90 (1996): 765-79.

**Thursday, 9 October – Political Parties & Representation**

Chapter 10, “Political Parties,” in Malcomson & Myers.

**Tuesday, 14 October – Parties, Representation and Elections**

Chapter 12, William Cross, “Representation and Political Parties,” in Bickerton & Gagnon.

Chapter 13, Éric Montpetit, “Are Interest Groups Useful or Harmful?” In Bickerton & Gagnon.

Chapter 9, “Elections,” in Malcomson & Myers.

**Thursday, 16 October** – *Elections & Institutional Reform*

Chapter 11, A. Brian Tanguay, “Reforming Responsible Democracy: Taming the ‘Democratic Deficit,’” in Bickerton & Gagnon.

Michael Lusztig. 1995. “Federalism and Institutional Design: The Perils and Politics of a Triple-E Senate in Canada.” *Publius* 25: 35-50.

Henry Miller, “The Case for Proportional Representation,” *Policy Options* 1997 (November): 6-9. Available at < <http://www.irpp.org/po/archive/nov97/milner.pdf> >

**Tuesday, 21 October** – *The First Nations Today*

Film: The 8th Fire (*Le 8ème Feu*), produced by the Canadian Broadcasting Corporation

**Thursday, 23 October** – *The First Nations Today*

Film: The 8th Fire (*Le 8ème Feu*), produced by the Canadian Broadcasting Corporation

**Tuesday, 28 October** – *The First Nations Today*

Film: The 8th Fire (*Le 8ème Feu*), produced by the Canadian Broadcasting Corporation

Chapter 9, Martin Papillon, “The (Re)Emergence of Aboriginal Governments,” in Bickerton & Gagnon.

Chapter 5, Daniel Salée, “The Québec State and Indigenous Peoples,” in Gagnon.

**Thursday, 30 October** – *Federal-First Nations Conflict: The Mi’gmaqs of New Brunswick*

Film: *Is The Crown at War With Us?* By Alanis Obomsawin (National Film Board of Canada)

**Tuesday, 4 November** – *Provincial-First Nations Conflict: The Mi’gmaqs of Québec*

Film: *Incident at Restigouche* By Alanis Obomsawin (National Film Board of Canada)

**Thursday, 6 November** – *Provincial-First Nations Conflict: The Mowhawks of Kanehsatake*

Film: *Kanehsatake: 270 Years of Resistance* By Alanis Obomsawin (NFBC)

**Tuesday, 11 November** – No Class / Veterans’ Day

**Thursday, 13 November** – Québec Nationalism

Chapter 5, “The Evolution of Nationalism in Quebec,” in Cook.

Chapter 3, Luc Turgeon, “Interpreting Québec’s Historical Trajectories,” in Gagnon.

Samuel V. LaSelva. 1993. “Re-Imagining Confederation: Moving Beyond the Trudeau-Lévesque Debate.” *Canadian Journal of Political Science* 24: 699-720.

Chapter 15, “I never thought I could be as proud ...” The Trudeau-Lévesque Debate.” In Cook.

**Tuesday, 18 November** – *The Trudeau-Lévesque Debate*

Film: *The Champions (Les champions)* Canadian Broadcasting Corporation.

Some obstacles to democracy in Quebec

PE Trudeau - Canadian Journal of Economics and Political Science, 1958 - JSTOR

**Thursday, 20 November** – *The Trudeau-Lévesque Debate*

Film: *The Champions (Les champions)* Canadian Broadcasting Corporation.

Chapter 12, “The Meaning of Confederation,” in Cook.

Chapter 13, “Quebec and Confederation: Past and Present,” in Cook.

Chapter 14, “The Canadian Dilemma: Locke, Rousseau, or Action?” In Cook.

**Tuesday, 25 November** – *Violence and Nationalism in Québec*

Film: *Octobre* by Pierre Falardeau (French, subtitled)

**Thursday, 27 November:** No Class / Thanksgiving

**Tuesday, 2 December** – The Legacy of Pierre Trudeau

Film: *Trudeau: The Man, the Myth* Canadian Broadcasting Corporation

[PE Trudeau: 'Say goodbye to the dream' of one Canada.](#)

PE Trudeau - The Toronto Star, 1987 - wfms.org

<http://www.wfms.org/Other/Legal/Constitutions/Canada/English/Arguments/trudeau%20-%20say%20goodbye%20to%20the%20dream%20of%20one%20canada.pdf>



**Thursday, 4 December** – The Legacy of Pierre Trudeau

Film: *Trudeau: The Man, the Myth* Canadian Broadcasting Corporation

**Tuesday, 9 December** – Discussion

## Appendix A Map of Canada



## Appendix B Short Paper Assignments and Research Paper Style Sheet

Details on the short paper assignments and the research paper will be posted at [www.clas.ufl.edu/users/rconley](http://www.clas.ufl.edu/users/rconley). The mid-term exam will be take home and provided in class.

Papers will be graded on the following criteria as well as substance. All papers must be typed, double-spaced, standard 12 point font, with proper referencing and proper use of English grammar, spelling, etc. You must follow one of the referencing styles below—either parenthetical (in text) referencing, footnotes, or endnotes. Failure to follow the styles as they are presented below will result in a full-grade penalty.

### **Citations for written work:**

All written work for this course must contain proper references. Proper referencing is critical for exemplary analytical writing. *Students who fail to properly cite references will receive lower evaluations of their work.* The general rule for citations is that any material that is not “common knowledge” should be referenced, in addition to specific citations to direct quotations and specialized commentary/works/etc. *Do not plagiarize.*

Footnotes, endnotes, or parenthetical references in text (with an accompanying bibliography at the end of the paper) are ALL acceptable. However, you must choose one style and keep to it throughout your work. Footnotes place the reference at the bottom of the page; endnotes place the reference at the end of the paper; both styles are easily employed using common word processing software such as WordPerfect or Microsoft Word and will automatically number your references.

Examples of footnote/endnote references:

### **Books:**

<sup>1</sup> Richard S. Conley, *The Presidency, Congress, and Divided Government: A Postwar Assessment* (College Station: Texas A&M University Press, 2002), p. 10.

<sup>2</sup> John S. Jackson and William Crotty, *The Politics of Presidential Selection*, second edition (New York: Longman, 2001), pp. 100-02.

### **Journal articles:**

<sup>3</sup> Richard S. Conley, “Presidential Influence and Minority Party Liaison on Veto Overrides: New Evidence from the Ford Presidency.” *American Politics Research*, Volume 30, No. 1 (January 2002), pp. 34-65.

<sup>4</sup> Walter J. Stone, Lonna Rae Atkeson, and Ronald B. Rapoport, “Turning On or Turning Off? Mobilization and Demobilization Effects of Presidential Nomination Campaigns.” *American Journal of Political Science* 36 (1992): 665-91.

**Articles in edited volumes** (make sure you cite the author of the article first, then the editor(s):

<sup>5</sup> Richard S. Conley, “Congress, The Presidency, Information Technology, and the Internet: Policy Entrepreneurship at Both Ends of Pennsylvania Avenue.” In *Congress and the Internet*, edited by James Thurber and Colton Campbell (Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall “Real Politics” Series, 2002), pp. 135-160.

<sup>6</sup> Thomas E. Patterson, “Out of Order: Game and Governing.” In *Understanding the Presidency*, second edition, edited by James Pfiffner and Roger H. Davidson (New York: Longman, 2000), pp. 70-77.

***Newspaper articles:***

<sup>7</sup> Robert Schlesinger, "N.H. Gets to Keep Its Prime Position; New DNC Plan Makes Allowance," *Boston Globe*, January 20, 2002, p. A13.

***Articles on the Internet/Web Pages:***

<sup>8</sup> *Public Citizen*, "How the Presidential Public Financing Program Works," <[http://www.whitehouseforsale.org/documents/how\\_pub\\_fi\\_works.pdf](http://www.whitehouseforsale.org/documents/how_pub_fi_works.pdf)>, accessed 9/11/03.

<sup>9</sup> *Associated Press Wire*, "McCain Revels in Decisive Win, Bush Looks Down the Road," Tuesday, February 1, 2000. <[http://www.primarymonitor.com/news/stories/aej\\_2100mccainreax.shtml](http://www.primarymonitor.com/news/stories/aej_2100mccainreax.shtml)>, accessed 9/14/2003.

<sup>10</sup> Karlyn Bowman, "Vote of Confidence," *The Public Perspective* (March/April 2002). <<http://www.aepoliticalcorner.org/KB%20Articles/kb02marchapril.pdf>>, accessed 9/18/2003.

***Parenthetical referencing:***

If you choose parenthetical (in-text) referencing, you might have the following paragraph you have written (text is from R.S. Conley, "George Bush and the 102nd Congress: The Impact of Public and 'Private' Veto Threats on Policy Outcomes, *Presidential Studies Quarterly* 33 (December 2003):

Changing institutional and electoral dynamics in Congress in the last several decades have placed greater limitations on presidents' ability to influence roll-call outcomes. Presidents' floor success rates have been a casualty of the interaction of split-party control of the presidency and Congress, or "divided government," with heightened intraparty cohesion on Capitol Hill (Fleisher and Bond 2000). Recent presidents who have confronted assertive opposition majorities in Congress have adapted to these conditions by turning to a powerful tool in the bargaining process: the veto. Although critics may contend that "frequent use of the veto is difficult to reconcile with the Neustadtian imperative to govern by persuasion" (McKay 1994, p. 449), presidents' *veto success* was exceptional in the closing decade of the twentieth century. President George Bush sustained twenty-eight of the twenty-nine regular vetoes he cast from 1989-92. Similarly, only one of William Clinton's thirty-six regular vetoes was successfully challenged in Congress from 1995-2000.

*At the end of the article you would give the full reference of the in-text citations. The references should be in alphabetical order by last name of the author:*

## References

Fleisher, Richard and Jon R. Bond. 2000. "Partisanship and the President's Quest for Votes on the Floor of Congress." In *Polarized Politics: Congress and the President in a Partisan Era*, edited by Jon R. Bond and Richard Fleisher. Washington, DC: Congressional Quarterly.

McKay, David. 1994. "Divided and Governed? Recent Research on Divided Government in the United States." *British Journal of Political Science* 24: 517-34.

## Appendix C: Research Design (due 4 November)

This assignment has three parts: 1) a thesis statement; 2) a draft outline; and, 3) an annotated bibliography. All told, you should produce a 3-5 pp. (typewritten) proposal for your research paper.

### A. Thesis Statement

The thesis statement lays out the argument of your paper, the model/hypothesis you are developing, and should be followed by a statement that conveys how you will organize your analysis. See Baglione, Chapter 5 (Effectively Distilling Your Argument) for further details. Here is one example:

"In this essay, I argue that President Reagan's deft, direct communication style with the American people propelled his first-year agenda to stunning victory. He utilized a strategy of "going public" to rally grassroots support for his legislative proposals to cut government spending and taxes, all the while negotiating behind the scenes with both Democrats and Republicans on Capitol Hill to surmount the obstacles of opposition party control of the House of Representatives. However, just several years later liberal Democrats' successful efforts to impede the influence of conservative southerners in their party—who were key to Reagan's 1981 legislative coup—stifled the president's agenda thereafter. Reagan nonetheless remained the "great communicator," using the bully pulpit to challenge communism, save his administration from the fallout of the Iran-Contra scandal, and to console the American people after the Space Shuttle *Challenger* accident. On balance, Reagan's communication strategy was employed on several different levels to achieve diverse objectives.

The following section of this essay details Reagan's rhetorical style by reviewing briefly the scholarly literature. The second section provides brief case studies of Reagan's use of the bully pulpit, including his strategy for his 1981 agenda, his varied approach to rhetoric on communism and the Soviet Union, his *mea culpa* on the Iran-Contra affair, and his ability to act as "healer-in-chief" after the *Challenger* disaster. The concluding section considers whether Reagan's rhetorical style in light of changes in the media environment and the electorate that have arguably had significant implications for his successors' use of the rhetorical presidency."

### B. Annotated Bibliography

The annotated bibliography first gives the full, proper citation for a journal article, book, or book chapter. Following the citation, you generally have 3-7 sentences that indicate what the major arguments and thrust of the scholarly work entail. Here is an example:

Conley, Richard S. 2003. "President Reagan, White House Lobbying, and Key Votes: A Reassessment." *White House Studies* 3: 133-55. The author uses archival research in addition to data from prior presidencies to develop a statistical model of presidential influence in Congress. The author argues that Reagan did better on his early agenda not only because of southern Democrats' support, but also particularly because congressional Republicans were more unified behind the president than they had been for Reagan's predecessors. The article covers the 1981 Economic Recovery and Tax Act (ERTA) lobbying effort closely, and details the Reagan White House's strategy. The article gives emphasis to economic votes in Congress in the early Reagan presidency, which the White House believed were key to Reagan's agenda.

The purpose of the annotated bibliographical entries is to provide yourself with a concise overview of the work so that as you prepare to write your manuscript, you can "remind" yourself of the focus and then go to work to cite appropriate quotations, cite general concepts/theories/themes, etc., with much greater ease.

### C. Draft Outline

In the draft outline, which should follow the thesis statement and annotated bibliography, you develop a more detailed layout of your paper. The major headings should follow your "organizational statement" that follows the thesis in Section A. Then there should be subheadings. *There is no single, correct way to develop a draft outline.* However, a bulleted, numbered, or most preferentially, a multi-level list (available in MS Word) works well. And there should be a high level of attention to detail, which underscores that you have thought through the most important elements of your paper—and this will pay off once you begin to actually write (of course, as you write, other citations may be added, information may be moved around, etc. You are not in a straightjacket. The outline is a heuristic). Here is a possible draft outline for this hypothetical research paper on Reagan and rhetoric:

---

#### 1) Introduction (1-2 pp.)

- a) Paragraph introducing the theme of the paper – why it is important to consider Reagan's rhetorical skills. Find a good quote from journalistic/academic source(s) to solidify.
- b) Thesis statement
- c) Organizational statement

#### 2) Literature Review – Why Was Reagan Considered the "Great Communicator"? (1-2 pp)

- a) Reagan's pre-presidential career
  - i) Actor
  - ii) Head of Hollywood's Screen Actors' Guild & McCarthy "red scare"
  - iii) Time at the "General Electric Theater" and promotion of the company's conservative views
  - iv) Transformation from Democrat to Republican
    - (1) Speech for Barry Goldwater: "A Time for Choosing"
  - v) Governor of California
- b) 1980 Campaign
  - i) Simple themes
    - (1) Lower taxes, less government, cuts to entitlements
    - (2) Increased military strength
    - (3) Loss of US prestige abroad under Carter
- c) General strategy as president
  - i) Few press conferences to avoid overexposure
    - (1) Article by Weintraub, "The Presidential Press Conferences of Jimmy Carter and Ronald Reagan."

- (2) Book by Hertsgaard, *On Bended Knee*.
- ii) Selective public appeals & willingness to bargain with Congress
  - (1) Brace and Hinckley article, "Presidential Activities from Truman Through Reagan."
  - (2) Sloan article, "Meeting the leadership challenges of the modern presidency: The political skills and leadership of Ronald Reagan."
  - (3) Barrett article, "Gone Public The Impact of Going Public on Presidential Legislative Success."
  - (4) Collier article, "Writing for the Great Communicators: Writing rhetoric with Roosevelt and Reagan"

### 3) Case Studies (6-8 pp.)

- a) 1981 Legislative Agenda
  - i) Divided government
  - ii) Reagan's electoral strength among conservative, southern Democrats
  - iii) Impact of assassination attempt by Hinckley (?)
  - iv) Public appeals and private bargaining
    - (1) Conley article, "President Reagan, White House Lobbying, and Key Votes: A Reassessment." *White House Studies*.
    - (2) Collier article, "Behind the Bully Pulpit: The Reagan Administration and Congress."
  - v) Sum up what the case study demonstrates about Reagan's leadership/style
- b) Iran-Contra
  - i) Brief introduction to scandal
  - ii) Reagan's televised speech
    - (1) Benoit et al. article, "President Reagan's defensive discourse on the Iran-Contra affair."
  - iii) Establishment of Tower Commission – probably saved his presidency
  - iv) Public support – why was Reagan "forgiven"?
    - (1) Brody article, "Policy failure and public support: The Iran-Contra affair and public assessment of President Reagan."
  - v) Sum up what the case study demonstrates about Reagan's leadership/style
- c) Communism and the Soviet Union
  - i) Metaphorical use
    - (1) Evil Empire
    - (2) Hantz article, "Ideology, Pragmatism, and Ronald Reagan's World View: Full of Sound and Fury, Signifying...?"
  - ii) Hard line against Brezhnev
  - iii) More conciliatory tone at times with Gorbachev
    - (1) Trip to Berlin: "Mr. Gorbachev, tear down this wall."
  - iv) Sum up what the case study demonstrates about Reagan's leadership/style
- d) *Challenger* Disaster
  - i) Speechwriting of Peggy Noonan
  - ii) Reactions/Interpretations
    - (1) Middlebury College article, "A Tale of Two Speeches."
      - <http://sites.middlebury.edu/presidentialpower/2011/01/23/a-tale-of-two-speeches/>
    - (2) *New York Times* article, "Presidential Speeches at Times of Tragedy."
      - [http://www.nytimes.com/interactive/2011/01/13/us/20110113\\_CONSOLATION\\_INTERACTIVE.html?\\_r=0](http://www.nytimes.com/interactive/2011/01/13/us/20110113_CONSOLATION_INTERACTIVE.html?_r=0)
    - (3) *New York Times* article, "The Shuttle Explosion: President as Healer."
      - <http://www.nytimes.com/1986/01/29/us/the-shuttle-explosion-president-as-healer.html>
  - iii) Sum up what the case study demonstrates about Reagan's leadership/style

#### 4) Conclusions (2-4 pp.)

- a) Paradox: Reagan heightened *institutional* partisanship but often transcended partisanship in the electorate
  - b) One big year legislatively
  - c) Essentials of what he wanted to accomplish largely finished in 1981 – holding the line thereafter
  - d) Got himself out of a potentially impeachable offense with Iran-Contra
  - e) Memorable rhetoric on communism and Soviets
    - i) But could not convince Americans about communist threat in Central America
  - f) Grandfatherly figure after the *Challenger* accident
    - i) Speech is recalled as one of the most touching of the modern presidency
  - g) Have Reagan's successors followed suit?
    - i) Momentary occasions, depending on the context
      - (1) H.W. Bush –successful on Gulf War
      - (2) H.W. Bush –unsuccessful in rallying public on the 1990 budget; huge disaster as public opinion turned against him and the 'deal'
      - (3) Clinton and Oklahoma City bombing: consolation yet resolve
      - (4) Clinton and Lewinsky: lies, and coming clean
      - (5) W. Bush and 9/11: consolation yet resolve
    - ii) Obama and his inaugural speech – transcendent?
      - (1) Failure to convince many Americans on the right about his agenda
        - (a) Cite George Edwards, *On Deaf Ears*. Limits to the bully pulpit.
- 

#### ***Final Research Paper (due 9 December)***

The final research paper should be approximately 10-14 pages, *excluding* citations. Essays that have fewer than 10 double-spaced, typewritten pages (using normal margins and 12 point font) will be graded significantly lower.

How many citations should you have? There is no hard and fast rule. The answer is: “as many as you need to present a well-crafted analysis that is buttressed by the scholarly literature.” A minimum of 7-10 references is a good place to start, but excellent essays will likely have more.

Students must turn in a hard copy of the research paper in class on the due date.