Politics 305
2nd Sem. 2011
Meeting Room: King 335
Meeting Time: T 7:30-9:30 pm

Mr. Dawson
Office: Rice 230
Office Hours:
Tu 1:30-3 and
Th 4:30-6

THE PRESIDENCY

SYLLABUS

The study of the presidency provides an opportunity:

- to examine the ways in which personalities, politics, and governmental institutions affect (1) the process of making of public policy and (2) actual policy outcomes in different issue domains;
- to appreciate the ways in which policy making is constrained by characteristics of the political system and actors within it;
- to understand the ways in which policy change occurs, often in spite of systemic constraints;
- to analyze the interplay of historical, cultural, and political forces;
- to assess the relationship between electioneering and governing; and
- to begin to understand relationships among the determinants of presidential power, leadership, political support, and policy success.

OBJECTIVES

This seminar is intended to:

- focus on the evolving nature of the presidency and its role in the American political system;
- explore, in a scholarly manner, a personally interesting (and as yet unresolved) question about the presidency; and
- create an occasion for you to deepen and synthesize your understanding of American politics.

WAYS OF REACHING OBJECTIVES

To reach the above objectives, you must:

- Master the assigned reading;¹

¹ As evidence of mastery, I will expect you to be able to present, in a faithful and complete way, the argument and evidence of each of the required texts. To do so, you will need to read (and maybe re-read) the text well in advance of the day we discuss it. You also will have to read for comprehension, not just read to read (or skim) the words. Caveat: If you wait to read until the day of the seminar, or even the day before, you will not master the text and that will become painfully obvious.
Assess the logic of the text’s argument and the fit between its propositions and its evidence;\(^2\)

Try to apply the reading to more recent phenomena;

Listen closely and interact with one another in a manner that is attentive, respectful, and thoughtful – although it can be more or less supportive, more or less critical;\(^3\)

Ask questions of one another, to make sure you really understand what is said;\(^4\)

Critically assess what is said;\(^5\)

Think about and explore, out loud, the possible implications of what is said;\(^6\)

Keep track of the flow of a discussion; ideally, you will be able to sum up the discussion;

Recognize gaps and anomalies in the literature; i.e. incomplete explanations and phenomena that don’t fit or are inconsistent with commonly accepted interpretations; and

By able to design and carry out, in a manner you find personally meaningful, research that incorporates and builds on relevant seminar reading, elaborates previous research, closes gaps in knowledge and/or explains inconsistencies or anomalies (observations that seem at odds with theoretical expectations).\(^7\)

**REQUIRED READING** (Listed in the order in which they will be discussed.)


\(^2\) “Assessing” will require you to reconstruct orally the text’s argument and evidence before you critically comment on it. Caveat: It is facile and fake to take cheap pot shots at a text before you have demonstrated mastery of it.

\(^3\) This kind of active listening requires you to do much more than wait for someone to stop speaking so you can say whatever pops into your head.

\(^4\) These questions are of the sort: “Let me see if I’ve got it …”

\(^5\) This you do by asking: “What’s your evidence?”; “How would you account for these facts …, that do not seem inconsistent with what you are saying?”; etc.

\(^6\) You “explore” by asking questions of the sort: “If what you say is true, would you then expect …?”

\(^7\) For an elaboration of some of these points, see Martin Landau, “Due Process of Inquiry”. [ERes]

Additional required reading:
- Martin Landau, “Due process of inquiry” @ http://abs.sagepub.com/content/9/2/4.full.pdf

**COURSE REQUIREMENTS (EVALUATIVE WEIGHT)**

- Class participation, including presentation of your research (1/2 your grade)
- Seminar research project/paper (1/2 your grade)

**THE SEMINAR RESEARCH PROJECT/PAPER**

The first two years of the Obama presidency has not been an unqualified success. As the President has acknowledged:

“… we probably spent much more time trying to get the policy right than trying to get the politics right.”

“… success is determined by an intersection in policy and politics …”

For this seminar, there is a common research question: “For successful presidency, what is (or should be) the relationship between policy and politics?” [See ATTACHMENT I: How to go about answering the common research question.]

To answer this question, undertake a comparative analysis of the presidencies of Obama and that of any other modern (1932+) president. To begin:

1. Select, by the next meeting of the seminar, a second (comparison) president from the list below:
   a. G. W. Bush (42)
   b. Clinton
   c. Bush
   d. Reagan
   e. Carter
   f. Ford
   g. Nixon
   h. Johnson

---

8 My travel plans do not permit discretionary incompletes.
10 One person per president, until all are chosen.
i. Kennedy
j. Eisenhower
k. Truman
l. FDR

2. On the basis of your research and with a focus on their politics and policies, prepare a detailed listing of those aspects of your two presidents that are similar, different, or unique to each. Email this listing to me, as a Word document, by Monday, March 14.

a. In lieu of a seminar meeting on March 22, we will have individual conferences during which we will:
   i. plan the rest of your research;
   ii. select the focus of your final research paper; and
   iii. schedule the in class presentation of your research.

b. Two issues that will run through our discussions of the assigned reading and our consideration of your research:
   i. “Has President Obama been more or less successful than his (modern day) predecessors?”
   ii. “Given his performance thus far, will President Obama be viewed as Carter or Truman? Or some other president? Or his own, unique, president?”

SCHEDULE/TOPIC/ASSIGNMENTS

Week 1: Seminar participants, the seminar, the research enterprise, the nature of presidential power

   Participants: Who are you and what are you doing here?
   Overview of the seminar
   Questions about the syllabus
      Instructor’s expectations
      Class rules (See below)
   Research Questions and Processes
      The key to success in the seminar: Early identification and focus
      The origins of research questions
      The nature of a research question
         At the frontier of what is known
         Beyond the frontier: Doubt
      Epistemological bias: Logical positivism
         1. There is an objective reality, capable of being known and existing independently of your wishes and preferences; i.e., “multiculturalism” leads to what Frankfurt refers to, technically, as “bullshit”\textsuperscript{11}.

2. Evidence matters.
3. Personal rants are irrelevant, inappropriate, and lead to failure.

Week 2: The Modern Presidency: The classical view

Reading Assignment: Neustadt
Discussion Questions: (For this and every discussion of a required text)
1. What is the thesis of the text?
2. What is the author’s supportive evidence?
3. What is your assessment/critique of the thesis, the argument and evidence behind it, and its implications?

Week 3: In lieu of the seminar meeting, we will meet in Mudd 113 at 7:30 pm for a presentation by Megan Mitchell on the use of presidency research materials. [NOTE: THIS IS A MANDATORY MEETING. COME ON TIME.]

Week 4: The president within the political system

Reading Assignment: Jones
Discussion Questions: See Week 1, above, Questions 1-3
Research Questions Due

Week 5: The evolving presidency

Reading Assignment: Lowi
Discussion Questions: See Week 1, above, Questions 1-3

Week 6: The isolated presidency

Reading Assignment: Burns
Discussion Questions: See Week 1, above, Questions 1-3

Week 7: Research Conferences (in lieu of class)

SPRING BREAK

Week 8: The presidency in political time

Reading Assignment: Skowronek
Discussion Questions: See Week 1, above, Questions 1-3

Week 9: Presentations begin this week. See below, the NOTE: “What makes for a good presentation”?

Week 10: Presentations (cont.)
Week 11: Presentations (cont.)

Week 12: Presentations (cont.)

Week 13: Presentations (cont.) and Wrap Up

PRESENTATIONS should be considered to be “workshops”. (As a “workshop”, you should use this opportunity to think out loud in a manner that recovers something of your “logic-in-use”; i.e. the probably not very orderly evolution of your thinking about the research topic.)

NOTE: “What makes for a good presentation”?

1. The biggest sin is to be boring. Caveat: Do not read anything aloud.
2. The second biggest sin to b--- s---; this is no time to make it up or to engage in a rant in which you vent your personal feelings in the absence of logic and evidence.
3. You must engage the members of the seminar in your research process. To do so, make sure they understand the question (What is it you’re trying to figure out?) and, from time to time, come back to it, reminding them what you’re trying to do.
4. To engage them in the research process, realize that you’re trying to tell them how you actually went about looking for an answer to your research question. This, what you actually did (are doing), is called your logic-in-use, as opposed to a reconstructed logic (a more formal, retrospective statement of the research process, of the sort that appears in published research accounts).\(^{12}\)
5. It is understood that your presentation is of research-in-progress. Since they occur at different times in the semester, presentations and the class interactions that accompany them will differ in a number of ways:
   a. If you’re presenting early, I expect all members of the seminar will be very active, joining in and facilitating the discussion. Presenters going early also should focus on the research question:
      i. What is it?
      ii. Are there a number of variations of it?
      iii. How did you come to these? I.e., what were you thinking?
      iv. Why do you want to know?
      v. What is already known? I.e., what is the state of the literature? In what ways have other researchers already narrowed the research question by what they’ve found out? What does the seminar’s required reading contribute to a (partial) answer of the research question?

\(^{12}\) Both “logics”, i.e. ways of reasoning, are, strictly speaking reconstructed. In conveying a logic-in-use, you, however, try to stay more faithful to what you actually did. (To capture this, you will find it helpful to keep a journal or a research log, as a laboratory scientist would.) See, for example, Abraham Kaplan, The Conduct of Inquiry.
vi. What to you hypothesize (i.e., guess) the answer to be?
vii. Is there a proposition? I.e., a statement of a relationship you expect to observe?
viii. Why do you think that?
ix. If you’re right, so what? I.e., what would that teach us about the presidency? The American political system?
x. And if you’re wrong?
xi. So, tell me again, what’s the research question? I.e., what do you really want to know?

xii. How do you propose to find out? I.e., what research activities are you going to engage it? Where are you going to look?

- At this point, seminar members may be especially helpful in brainstorming possible ways of going about the research process.

xiii. What will you take as evidence? I.e., any proposition you have is a statement of the relationship between two or more concepts. E.g., Wartime presidents are unbeatable. In this instance, what “facts” (empirical indicators) are you going to use to signal that someone is a wartime president? An unbeatable one?

- Here again, the other members of the seminar should be very active, suggesting what they would take as supporting and non-supporting evidence.

b. If you’re presenting later, you will move through the above steps more quickly (with little or no brainstorming) and instead focus on:

i. Stating the hypotheses you tested
ii. Describing what you found (and how you found it)
iii. Leading a discussion that tries to interpret what you found
iv. Drawing inferences from the evidence
v. Making and discussing conclusions about your study
vi. Speculating about the broader significance of what you found; i.e., what does it suggest about the presidency and the American political system?

WRITTEN WORK

All written work that is turned in must be:

1. Double-spaced;
2. Printed in dark ink;
3. One side only of the page;
4. Securely fastened;¹³ and
5. Due on the last legal day for turning in written work.

---
¹³ As a practical matter, securely fastened means a staple or an alligator clip. It’s also a good idea to put, on every page, your name and a page number.
CLASS RULES

The quality of this class will depend, in part, on everyone following class rules. These include:

1. Show up; “nearly perfect”\textsuperscript{14} class attendance is required.
2. Come on time; late arrival is not permitted.\textsuperscript{15}
3. No in class use of laptops; they are isolating and sometimes disruptive.
4. No feet on the table; it’s disruptively rude and sometimes distractingly gross.

All these class rules are mandatory; that is, not following any of them will result in your not passing this seminar.

EMAIL

To reduce the risk of computer viruses, I do not open email from senders I do not recognize. If you want me to read your email, use your (nonfunky) OC email name.

(February, 2011)

\textsuperscript{14}“Nearly perfect” means you attend all but one class, unless you’re hospitalized (and can produce your discharge papers). If you’re sick and “contaminating” (sneezing, coughing, etc.), wear a mask.

\textsuperscript{15}If you’re late, as defined by my watch and as signaled by the closed door, do not even attempt to enter. The resulting non-attendance will count against your one permitted absence.
ATTACHMENT I

How to go about answering the common research question

The common research question: “For successful presidency, what is (or should be) the relationship between policy and politics?”

To answer this basic question, break it down into more specific, more manageable questions:

1. What is a "successful" president?
2. What are the policies of a successful president?
3. What are the politics of a successful president?
4. What should be the relationship that a successful president would bring about between policies and politics?

How should you go about seeking answers to these four more specific questions?

First, recognize that every idea has two ingredients:

- A conceptual definition; and
- Some empirical referents.

A conceptual definition is just a definition of an idea or concept with other words or concepts. For example …

- The concept “a successful president” could be defined as …
  - One who wins re-election.

  This conceptual definition points to, or refers to, observable facts: the president wins re-election.

It gets more interesting after you realize that you might have lots of different conceptual definitions (and matching empirical referents). So … your first task it to figure out (to conceptualize) what you mean by a “successful president”. To figure that out …

- Think about what you would consider to be a successful president and WRITE THIS DOWN.
- Read what others have written about presidents they consider successful. Extract what you take to be their central meaning and WRITE THAT DOWN.
- Discuss these ideas with others, in an out of class. From these discussions, see what new ideas emerge about a successful president.
• Ask yourself: “What would a successful president look like? That is, if I had a complete history of a successful president, how would I know it? That is, what would I look for? That is …
  o What would a successful president have done?
  o What would have happened under a successful president?
  o What would others have said about a successful president?

That is, in general, what are the empirical referents that, if I found them, would allow me to conclude: “Yes, that’s one!” WRITE DOWN WHAT YOU WILL TAKE TO BE THE EMPIRICAL REFERENTS FOR YOUR CONCEPT: “A successful president.”

The next step … revisit your attempt to come up with a good conceptual definition. Now … in light of what you see as the observable aspects of one, exactly how, in general, are you going to define “a successful president”?

By this point, through the above exercise, you should now have:

• A working conceptual definition, and, for it
• A set of matching empirical referents.16

You’re now in a position to undertake your comparative research. That is, now that you know what you’re looking for, you can go into the records of your two presidents and begin to asses each of them as more or less successful. (And you will be able to back up your assessments with hard data!)

This effort also spills over directly into the upcoming meeting with Ms. Mitchell (and into other, future meetings with her and with other Reference Librarians). Now you can tell them: “I’m looking for evidence of how successful President X was (is) … and by “successful” I mean …. With that kind of conceptual and empirical clarity, they will be better able to help you.

What’s next?

Go through the same process of the other two concepts: successful policies and successful politics.

Carry out the research to find out where your two presidents score (fit) on these three dimensions (or variables).

Somewhere down the road, you will have six data points on three variables:

---

16 For an elaboration of this activity, see Martin Landau, “Due process of inquiry” @ http://abs.sagepub.com/content/9/2/4.full.pdf
Variable I. A successful president: Hypothetically …

I---------P1-----------------------------P2---------I

Variable II. P1’s and P2’s successful *policies*: Hypothetically …

I-------------------------------P1’s--------P2’s--I

Variable III. P1’s and P2’s successful *politics*: Hypothetically …

I---P1’s-------------------------------P2’s--I

You’re now in a position to analyze the results of your empirical research. Given what you’ve found, answer the common research question: “For successful presidency, what is (or should be) the relationship between policy and politics?”

NOTE: All this might seem a little abstract, at least right now. That’s to be expected. All this will become more clear and meaningful as you progress in your research. To help, I will, from time to time, bring us back to this discussion. When I do so, I will help you see how what you’re actually doing in your research process follows (and illustrates) everything above.

---

17 “Look at me, Ma: I’m doing empirical research. I’m not just making it up. This isn’t postmodern bullshit. As George Orwell would have me not act, I’m not just stringing together stock phrases in a way that muddles meaning and lobotomizes thought! I am using clear (understandable) language to make statements about reality … AND … my statements are supported by empirical evidence … AND … my statements can be considered by others to be true BECAUSE they (my statements) are falsifiable (if you think they’re incorrect, you can do what I did and you can see for yourself whether or not my statements hold up). [That is, you too can follow the due process of inquiry. It’s called normal science. That’s how we progress, by building up a body of empirically well-supported knowledge.]"