

POLI 621 Interpreting the Canadian Political Process

Fall 2023 CRN 5146

McGill University is on the traditional territory of the Anishinaabeg and Haudenosaunee Nations and a place which has long served as a site of meeting and exchange amongst various Indigenous nations.

Logistics

Location: Please verify class location on Minerva.

Professor: Christa Scholtz

Class Time: Tuesdays 14h35 to 17h25.

Office hours: by appointment

Email: christa.scholtz@mcgill.ca.

Class communication: I will use the news feature on mycourses to make any announcements to the class. Please sign up for notifications on mycourses. If you do not do so, you will only receive the announcement when you log into mycourses, and not when I actually send it.

Seminar Rationale

This graduate seminar is designed to address core issues and debates in the study of Canadian politics. Given the 13-week timeframe, it is impossible to cover all of what I would like. I must, alas, make choices. The choices I have made, in terms of substantive content and assessment criteria, are driven by the following goals: 1) to structure student preparation for the PhD Canadian field exam; 2) to highlight areas of study in which Canada is a particularly interesting case, or where it has made a central contribution to a literature; 3) to address issues *not* covered in depth in other departmental course offerings in Canadian politics. Criteria 3 limits the scope of what criteria 2, operating alone, would lead me to include in this course. As a result, PhD students studying for their comprehensive field exam will need to look beyond this course for greater depth on important issues (eg. Québec politics with Prof. Éric Bélanger, gender and feminism in Canada with Prof. Kelly Gordon, the politics of race with Prof. Debra Thompson).

There is a core tension in this course, which I acknowledge but do not pretend to resolve. Can one separate the study of Canadian politics from a study of the literature on Canada? In other words, how are we to balance analysis of Canadian politics with an analysis of the discipline of Canadian political science? The former would push us to focus on the newest literature; the latter would require us to set out the trajectory of a literature from its starting point. The trade-off is

between breadth across issues versus depth across time. Given there are only so many hours in the day and sleep is important, we will do our best.

I acknowledge that I have benefitted tremendously from the syllabi of colleagues across the Canadian politics discipline, either because they were shared with me or because they were publicly available. These syllabi show the diversity of approaches and rationales that can structure a course such as this one. It has also confirmed for me how rich the study of Canadian politics has become.

McGill Policy Statements (So. Many. Statements.)

Language of Submission: In accord with McGill University's Charter of Students' Rights, students in this course have the right to submit in English or in French any written work that is to be graded. This does not apply to courses in which acquiring proficiency in a language is one of the objectives. Conformément à la Charte des droits de l'étudiant de l'Université McGill, chaque étudiant a le droit de soumettre en français ou en anglais tout travail écrit devant être noté (sauf dans le cas des cours dont l'un des objets est la maîtrise d'une langue).

Academic Integrity: McGill University values academic integrity. Therefore, all students must understand the meaning and consequences of cheating, plagiarism and other academic offences under the Code of Student Conduct and Disciplinary Procedures" (see [McGill's guide to academic honesty](#) for more information).

Extraordinary Circumstances: In the event of extraordinary circumstances beyond the University's control, the content and/or evaluation scheme in this course is subject to change.

Copyright of Lectures: All slides, video recordings, lecture notes, etc. remain the instructor's intellectual property. As such, you may use these only for your own learning (and research, with proper referencing/citation) ends. You are not permitted to disseminate or share these materials; doing so may violate the instructor's intellectual property rights and could be cause for disciplinary action.

Plagiarism: McGill University values academic integrity. Therefore, all students must understand the meaning and consequences of cheating, plagiarism and other academic offences under the Code of student conduct and disciplinary procedures (see www.mcgill.ca/integrity for more information). L'université McGill attache une haute importance à l'honnêteté académique. Il incombe par conséquent à tous les étudiants de comprendre ce que l'on entend par tricherie, plagiat et autres infractions académiques, ainsi que les conséquences que peuvent avoir de telles actions, selon le Code de conduite de l'étudiant et des procédures disciplinaires (pour de plus amples renseignements, veuillez consulter le site <http://www.mcgill.ca/integrity>).

Seminar Assessment

This course's modes of assessment are directly related to the seminar rationale. The work of this class is to build proficiency in understanding the Canadian politics literature in a graduate seminar format, with the understanding that many in the class have the comprehensive field examination in their future. The job here is to understand a breadth of arguments about Canadian politics, and then to build an argument about those arguments, both orally (through seminar participation and the oral final exam) and in written form (peer review, term paper).

Participation (10%)

In this class, I depart from the usual expectation that every student will read every reading every time. Instead, the default assumption will be that students will not read everything on the syllabus that week. However, no student will be allowed to read nothing. Every student will have clear expectations on what they are responsible for reading each week:

- 1) The Experts: Every student will be expected to have read two readings to an expert level. The experts will by default lead the discussion on those readings. Experts should be prepared to field questions about the reading from those in the class who have not read the reading at all, including questions on data sources and methodology.
- 2) The Generalists: Every student will be expected to have read two readings adequately. This means that generalists will be expected to engage with the experts on the reading in question.
- 3) The Eagle: One student will be expected to have read *all* of the readings that week. This student will have a bird's-eye view of the readings, linking them together and setting out reflections on the readings as a whole.

I will be working with the following rubric for each class. Each class is worth 10 points. Students will be graded as Low/Medium/High in their respective roles as follows:

Expert	L (3) / M(4) / H (5)	Demonstration of nuanced methodological knowledge of the readings, plus engagement with peer questions
Generalist	L (1) / M (2) / H (3)	Demonstration of knowledge and contribution to overall discussion on those readings
Outside contributor	L (0) / M (1) / H (2)	Engagement with readings for which the student is neither an expert nor a generalist.

Note that a perfect participation score requires active engagement with readings outside of the assigned expert and generalist roles.

Eagle's Report (10%): You will note that the Eagle role is not included in the participation rubric above. The Eagle will be responsible for delivering an oral presentation on the week's readings. It will be uploaded to mycourses by Tuesday 9am before the class starting on Tuesday afternoon. The presentation may be an audio (mp3) or video file (mp4), for a minimum duration

of 15 minutes and a maximum duration of 20 minutes. The Eagle's Report is not a successive summary of each reading. The Eagle will develop an account of key similarities or differences, synthesizing points of agreement or tension, strengths or weaknesses, between this collection of readings. It is possible, even likely, for a student to be an Eagle more than once a term. If so, I will take the best mark for the purpose of the course grade.

Formal Peer Review: 15%

Each student will write a formal written peer review of a peer's draft term paper. I do not have a hard and fast rule on how long a formal review needs to be. I cannot see how one page is long enough, even if the paper one is reviewing is quite strong. However, I think 5 pages is probably too long, even if the paper one is reviewing is quite weak. I would weigh succinctness and clarity over length every time.

Peer review is a very important part of being a scholar. Being a good peer reviewer does more than make you an altruistic scholar-citizen. It also allows you to be a more objective and effective evaluator of your own work. Effective peer review is a skill, and graduate school is where you should learn that skill. Here are some key considerations for the peer reviewer:

- It is always the author's prerogative to either accept or reject your advice. Your name is not on the paper. But you should understand your role as being the author's ally.
- Being an ally means the goal is to help the author with the paper that the author wants to write. It is not about pushing the author to write the paper that you would write, if it was yours. Go write your own. Respect the author's own stated goal. If the draft is such that the author's very goal is unclear, then you need to convey that feedback.
- The peer reviewer should value the position as a reader of the work. The author needs to know whether the writing actually conveys what the author thinks the author has conveyed. "The message I got was not the message you thought you sent" is valuable feedback to the author. "Your use of passive voice obscures the causal process that you want to outline" is specific and helpful advice. "You need to address X's work because it says the opposite of what you do, so you need to show your readers that you are aware of that counterargument" is also helpful.
- You need to deliver bad news sometimes. In order for that to be a constructive process, the reviewer is responsible for saying what does not work, and for offering suggestions to put things on a better path. Writing "this is just bad" and leaving it there is unhelpful, even if it may be completely true.
- You also need to deliver good news sometimes. Be clear about what you think the author does well. This could be structure, grammar, a knowledge of the literature, or other things. Hearing good news means we can spend our time addressing weaknesses without feeling like that is all there is.

Grading Criteria for Peer Review (I've adapted this from a source on the web):

A range: The peer review shows evidence of exceptional effort, insight, and detail. It closely analyzes the essay's argumentation and organization and provides concrete revision recommendations. The review itself is well structured, with an introduction, clear transitions between paragraphs, and a conclusion.

B range: The peer critique is well structured, thoughtful, and discusses the strengths and weaknesses of the paper, occasionally providing suggestions for revision.

C range: The assignment was completed. The critique attempts to point out strengths and weaknesses but does so in a general way.

D or F: The peer critique was attempted but not successfully completed. It is either too brief and/or lacks enough content to be helpful to the writer.

Term Paper: 40%

The paper assignment is to write a 6000 word review style essay. The task is to make an argument about a literature, a set of writings. You are making an original analytical contribution by making a claim about a set of writings that you define, and then supporting your claim through evidence. The evidence / data to support your claim are the work of other authors. Students are not expected to conduct original empirical research.

Students who are TAs are granted the automatic 2 week extension.

Final Oral Exam: 25%

The format of this exam is a half hour oral exam. The McGill assessment policy requires that this be scheduled during the formal final exam period. I propose that it be conducted during the first week of the exam period.

The exam will take place in person. Students will be given a limited number of questions, and then 10 minutes to collect their thoughts. The student will then provide their answers orally. Students should expect follow-up or clarification questions.

Late penalties

Failure to submit the draft paper on mycourses by the stated deadline will result in a 5% reduction *of your overall course grade*. I recognize that this is a significant penalty. It reflects the responsibility that you owe to your peers. If your draft is not submitted by that deadline, it will not be peer reviewed.

Failure to submit the formal review on mycourses by the stated deadline will receive 0% on the review component.

The term paper will be penalized 5% for each day late.

Unsolicited Advice About Written Assignments

Surprisingly often I find myself dealing with a very stressed out student whose computer has died/was stolen/hijacked by ransomware/run over by a bus, yielding the situation where the paper that is due in hours or minutes is for all intents and purposes non-existent. Expect this to be you some day, maybe even today. You need a backup system.

If you haven't already developed a backup system for yourself, this is mine. Borrow or modify it at will. I have an automatic backup program set up for a weekly backup to an external hard drive. So, I should at most be one week behind if my computer dies or is stolen. In addition, when I am writing a paper, I email the draft to myself at the end of the day. The email is titled "backup, paper title, date". This makes it searchable if you have 10000 emails in your inbox.

Note that I have become entirely unsympathetic to student requests for emergency paper extensions due to the foreseeable and preventable occurrence that your digital paper has effectively disappeared. No extensions for that reason will be granted.

Summary of Important Dates

Oct 31: Thesis Speed Date

Nov.21 (23:59): Draft paper due

Nov. 27 (23:59): Peer Review due

Dec.5 (23:59): Final Paper due on mycourses (TAs add 2 weeks)

Dec.18 (and 19 if necessary): Final oral in person exam

Detailed Course Schedule

Sept.5: Introduction, Old Institutionalism's Revenge, plus Maps

The first hour is the class introduction. We will set out reading responsibilities (eg. experts, generalists, eagles). The remainder of the class we'll talk about Canadian constitutional history. I have found this useful as a way to start a conversation about Canada. It's not the only way, and we can talk about what a better way looks like, but it helps set a stage for graduate students who have highly variable knowledge about, and experiences of, Canada.

Royal Proclamation, 1763

An Act to reunite the Provinces of Upper and Lower Canada, and for the Government of Canada, 1840, 3 & 4 Victoria c 35

British North America Act, 1867, 30 & 31 Victoria c 3

The Manitoba Act, 1870, SC 33 Victoria c3

Constitution Act, 1982, being Schedule B to the Canada Act (UK), 1982, c 11

Recommended:

Quebec Act, 1774, 14 Geo III, c 83

Constitution Act 1791, 31 Geo III, c 31

Jeremy Webber. *The Constitution of Canada: A Contextual Analysis*. (Oxford and Portland, Oregon: Hart Publishing, 2015)

Stuart McConnell. "The Old Institutionalism and the New". *Polity*, 40(3) (July 2008), pp. 326-331

Sept 12: Constitutional Visions

*the following is a suggested reading order

Borrows, John. "Wampum at Niagara: Canadian Legal History, Self-Government, and the Royal Proclamation." In *Aboriginal and Treaty Rights in Canada: Essays on Law, Equality, and Respect for Difference*, edited by Michael Asch, 155-172. (Vancouver: UBC Press, 1997).

Province of Canada. Legislative Assembly. Debates. 7 February, 1865, pp 53-62 (Speech by Attorney General G.-E. Cartier)

Coel Kirkby. 2019. "Reconstituting Canada: The Enfranchisement and Disenfranchisement of 'Indians', circa 1837-1900. *University of Toronto Law Journal* 69(4): pp. 497-539

Pierre Elliott Trudeau. 1968. *Federalism and the French Canadians*. Toronto: The Macmillan Company of Canada. The chapter entitled "Quebec and the Constitutional Problem", pp.3-51

Pierre Elliott Trudeau. 1968. *Federalism and the French Canadians*. Toronto: The Macmillan Company of Canada. The chapter entitled "A Constitutional Declaration of Rights", pp.52-60

Guy Laforest. 2009. "The Internal Exile of Quebecers in the Canada of the Charter", in James B. Kelly and Christopher P. Manfredi (eds). *Contested Constitutionalism: Reflections on the Canadian Charter of Rights and Freedoms*. Vancouver: UBC Press. Pgs 251-262

Christa Scholtz. "Treaty Failure or Treaty Constitutionalism?: The Problematic Validity of the James Bay and Northern Quebec Agreement". *University of Toronto Law Journal*, vol. 70, no.3 (Summer) 2020: pp.306-340. *Focus on the later sections of the paper discussing existing and alternative constitutional interpretation of s.35*

Recommended:

Samuel Laselva. 1996. *The Moral Foundations of Canadian Federalism; Paradoxes, Achievements, and Tragedies of Nationhood*. Montreal and Kingston: McGill-Queens University Press. Chapter 2: Confederation and the Beginnings of Canadian Federalism Theory, pp.31-48

Jennifer Smith. "Canadian Confederation and the Influence of American Federalism". *Canadian Journal of Political Science* 21(3) (September 1988): 443-464

Peter H. Russell. *Canada's Odyssey: A Country Based on Incomplete Conquests*. Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 2017

Sept.19: Legislative Behaviour

Tremblay, Manon. "Do Female MPs Substantively Represent Women? A Study of Legislative Behaviour in Canada's 35th Parliament." *Canadian Journal of Political Science* 31, no. 3 (1998): 435-65

Jean-François Godbout. 2020. *Lost on Division: Party Unity in the Canadian Parliament*. Toronto: University of Toronto Press. (on reserve, ebook)

Stuart Soroka, Erin Penner, and Kelly Blidook. "Constituency Influence in Parliament", *Canadian Journal of Political Science*, Vol.42, No. 3 (Sep., 2009), pp. 563-591

Kelly Blidook (2010) "Exploring the Role of 'Legislators' in Canada: Do Members of Parliament Influence Policy?", *The Journal of Legislative Studies*, 16:1, 32-56

James B. Kelly; Kate Puddister, "Criminal Justice Policy During the Harper Era: Private Member's Bills, Penal Populism, and the Criminal Code of Canada," *Canadian Journal of Law & Society* 32, no. 3 (2017): 391-416

Andrea Lawlor & Erin Crandall (2013) "Committee performance in the Senate of Canada: some sobering analysis for the chamber of 'sober second thought'", *Commonwealth & Comparative Politics*, 51:4, 549-568

Graham White, "Traditional aboriginal values in a Westminster parliament: The legislative assembly of Nunavut," *The Journal of Legislative Studies* 12 (1), 2006, pp. 8-31.

Recommended:

Donald Savoie, "The Rise of Court Government in Canada," *Canadian Journal of Political Science*, vol. 32, no.4, 1999, 635-664.

Sept 26: Parties and Party Systems

Archer, Keith. "On the Study of Political Parties in Canada." *Canadian Journal of Political Science* 22, no. 2 (1989): 389-98

Brian Tanguay. "What's So Bad about Cultivating Our Own Theoretical Gardens? The Study of Political Parties in Canada." In Linda White, Richard Simeon, Robert Vipond, and Jennifer Wallner (eds) *The Comparative Turn in Canadian Political Science*. UBC Press, 2008 pp.177-193

David Coletto, Harold J. Jansen and Lisa Young, "Stratarchical Party Organization and Party Finance in Canada," *Canadian Journal of Political Science* 44:1 (March 2011), 111-36.

Gidengil, Elisabeth, ed. *Dominance and Decline: Making Sense of Recent Canadian Elections*. Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 2013 (on reserve, ebook)

Scott Pruysers, "Reconsidering Vertical Integration: An Examination of National Political Parties and their Counterparts in Ontario," *Canadian Journal of Political Science* 47:2 (June 2014), 237-58.

Richard Johnston. *The Canadian Party System: An Analytic History*. Vancouver, BC: UBC Press, 2017 (on reserve, ebook)

Melanee Thomas. "In Crisis or Decline? Selecting Women to Lead Provincial Parties in Government", *Canadian Journal of Political Science* 51:2 (June 2018) 379–403

Éric Bélanger. 2017. "Third Parties in Canada: Variety and Success" in Gagnon, Alain-G, and A. Brian Tanguay, eds. *Canadian Parties in Transition* (4th edition). Toronto: University Toronto Press, 185-214.

Tolley, Erin. "Who you know: Local party presidents and minority candidate emergence." *Electoral Studies* 58 (2019): 70-79

Recommended:

Cairns, Alan, "The Electoral Systems and the Party System, 1921-1965", *CJPS* 1, 1 (1968): 55-80.

Oct.3: Voting Behaviour

Gidengil, Elisabeth. 2022. "Voting Behaviour in Canada: The State of the Discipline," *Canadian Journal of Political Science*, 55(4): 916-938

Richard Johnston. 2006. "Party Identification: Unmoved Mover or Sum of Preferences?" *Annual Review of Political Science* 9:329-51.

Jason Roy and Christopher Alcantara. 2015. "The Candidate Effect: Does the Local Candidate Matter?" *Journal of Elections, Public Opinion & Parties* 25(2): 195-214. DOI: 10.1080/17457289.2014.925461.

Amanda Bittner. 2018. "Leaders always mattered: The persistence of personality in Canadian elections." *Electoral Studies* 54: 297-302

Armstrong, David A., Jack Lucas and Zack Taylor. 2022. "The Urban-Rural Divide in Canadian Federal Elections, 1896–2019." *Canadian Journal of Political Science*, 55 (1): 84-106.

Scott Pruyssers. 2022. "Gender Affinity Voting and the 2017 Municipal Elections in Quebec City and Montreal", in Éric Bélanger, Cameron D. Anderson and R. Michael McGregor (eds) *Voting in Quebec Municipal Elections: A Tale of Two Cities*. Toronto: University of Toronto Press, pp.35-55

Oct.17: Mobilization

Manfredi, Christopher P. *Feminist Activism in the Supreme Court: Legal Mobilization and the Women's Legal Education and Action Fund*. Vancouver, B.C.: UBC Press, 2004 (on reserve, ebook)

Smith, M. 2005. "Social Movements and Judicial Empowerment: Courts, Public Policy, and Lesbian and Gay Organizing in Canada," *Politics and Society* 33, no. 2, 327-53.

Brodie, J. 2008. "We are all equal now: Contemporary gender politics in Canada." *Feminist Theory*, 9(2), 145–164

Vanhala, L. 2009. Disability Rights Activists in the Supreme Court of Canada: Legal Mobilization Theory and Accommodating Social Movements. *Canadian Journal of Political Science*, 42(4), 981-1002

Kelly Gordon. 2021. Mobilizing Victimhood: Situating the Victim in Canadian Conservatism. *Canadian Journal of Political Science*, 54(1), 41-59.

Daniel Voth. "Her Majesty's Justice Be Done: Métis Legal Mobilization and the Pitfalls to Indigenous Political Movement Building." *Canadian Journal of Political Science* 49, no. 2 (2016): 243–66.

Dave Snow, "Litigating Parentage: Equality Rights, LGBTQ Mobilization and Ontario's All Families Are Equal Act" (2017) 32:3 *Canadian Journal of Law and Society* 329.

Pascale Dufour, Bergeron-Gaudin, J., & Chicoine, L. (2020). Social Movements and the National Question in Quebec: The Institutional Legacy of a Cleavage. *Canadian Journal of Political Science* 53(3), 658-675.

Oct.24: Judicial Behaviour

Dave Snow & Mark S. Harding (2015) "From Normative Debates to Comparative Methodology: The Three Waves of Post-Charter Supreme Court Scholarship in Canada", *American Review of Canadian Studies*, 45:4, 451-466

Donald R Songer, John Szmer and Susan W Johnson. "Explaining Dissent on the Supreme Court of Canada", *Canadian Journal of Political Science*, Vol.44, No. 2 (June 2011 juin), pp. 389-409

Emmett Macfarlane. *Governing From the Bench: The Supreme Court of Canada and the Judicial Role*. Vancouver: UBC press, 2013. Chapters 1, 4, 5 (on reserve, ebook)

Vuk Radmilovic, "Governmental Interventions and Judicial Decision Making: The Supreme Court of Canada in the Age of the Charter", *Canadian Journal of Political Science*, Vol.46, No. 2 (June 2013 juin), pp. 323-344

Songer, Donald R, C. L Ostberg, Matthew E Wetstein, and Susan W Johnson. *Law, Ideology, and Collegiality : Judicial Behaviour in the Supreme Court of Canada*. Montréal & Kingston: McGill-Queen's University Press, 2012. (on course reserve, ebook available)

Lori Hausegger, Troy Riddell and Matthew Hennigar, "Does Patronage Matter? Connecting Influences on Judicial Appointments with Judicial Decision Making", *Canadian Journal of Political Science*, Vol.46, No. 3 (September 2013 septembre), pp. 665-690

C. L. Ostberg; Matthew E. Wetstein, "Strategic Behaviour and Leadership Patterns of Modern Chief Justices," *Osgoode Hall Law Journal* 55, no. 2 (Spring 2018): 478-514

Oct.31: Thesis speed date, plus Political Economy

For the first hour: Students are to prepare a short paragraph, where they sketch out a proposed argument for their term paper. The feedback may quite wide ranging, including: issues with conceptual clarity, logical problems, methodological challenges, premises the student has not considered but the reviewer feels must be, readings or literature (primary or secondary) that the student should know about. The goals of this component are: 1) to get students working on their papers earlier than they might otherwise, 2) to cultivate the practice of sharing early ideas with peers even when those ideas are still quite mushy and unpolished, 3) to engage students as critical allies at the earliest stages of a peer's intellectual project, where the marginal impact of solid feedback is arguably at its highest.

Chris Hurl & Benjamin Christensen (2015) Building the New Canadian Political Economy, *Studies in Political Economy*, 96:1, 167-193

Elaine Coburn (2016) Alternatives: New Canadian Political Economy and the relations of ruling: a comment on C. Hurl and B. Christensen, *Studies in Political Economy*, 97:2, 206-215

Keith Banting and Debra Thompson (2021). The Puzzling Persistence of Racial Inequality in Canada. *Canadian Journal of Political Science*, 54(4), 870-891. doi:10.1017/S0008423921000585

Rodney Haddow. *Comparing Quebec and Ontario: Political Economy and Public Policy at the Turn of the Millennium*. Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 2015 (on course reserve, ebook available)

Douglas Macdonald. 2020. *Carbon Province, Hydro Province: The Challenge of Canadian Energy and Climate Federalism*. Toronto: University of Toronto Press.

Glen Coulthard. "From Wards of the State to Subjects of Recognition? Marx, Indigenous Peoples, and the Politics of Dispossession in Denendeh". In Simpson, Audra, and Andrea Smith (eds). *Theorizing Native Studies*. Duke University Press, 2014

Gabrielle Slowey. 2008. *Navigating Neoliberalism: Self-Determination and the Mikisew Cree First Nation*. UBC Press. Selected chapters. (on course reserve, ebook available)

Amy Janzwood. "Explaining Variation in Oil Sands Pipeline Projects", *Canadian Journal of Political Science* 53 (2020): 540-559

Nov 7: Political Culture

Elkins, David J. and Richard Simeon. 1979. "A Cause in Search of Its Effect, or What Does Political Culture Explain?" *Comparative Politics* 11: 127-145

Cairns, Alan. 1979. "The Governments and Societies of Canadian Federalism", *Canadian Journal of Political Science*, vol.10, no 4, pp. 695-725.

Mancke, Elizabeth, "Early Modern Imperial Governance and the Origins of Canadian Political Culture", *Canadian Journal of Political Science* 31, 1 (1999): 3-20.

Rocher, Francois and Patrick Fafard, 2013, "Is There a Political Culture of Federalism in Canada?" in Skogstad et al. (eds.) *The Global Promise of Federalism*. Institute of IGR, Queen's, and University of Toronto Press.

Henderson, Ailsa. "Regional Political Cultures in Canada". *Canadian Journal of Political Science* 37:3 (September 2004), pp. 595-615

Wiseman, Nelson. 2007. *In Search of Canadian Political Culture*. Vancouver: UBC Press. *Introduction, Chapters 1-3, and 7 (on reserve, ebook).

Bonita Beatty, Loleen Berdahl and Greg Poelzer, "Aboriginal Political Culture in Northern Saskatchewan," *Canadian Journal of Native Studies* 32:2 (2012), 121-39.

McGrane, David and Loleen Berdahl. 2019. "Reconceptualizing Canadian Federal Political Culture: Examining Differences between Quebec and the Rest of Canada." *Publius: Journal of Federalism*

Recommended:

Gad Horowitz. "Conservatism, Liberalism, and Socialism in Canada: An Interpretation". *Canadian Journal of Economics and Political Science*, vol.32, no.2. 1966. pp.143-171

Schmidt, Vivian. 2008. "Discursive Institutionalism: The Explanatory Power of Ideas and Discourse." *Annual Review of Political Science* 11: 303-326.

James Johnson. 2003. "Conceptual Problems as Obstacles to Progress in Political Science: Four Decades of Political Culture Research." *Journal of Theoretical Politics* 15(1): 87-115

Nov.14: Multiculturalism / Liberalism

Taylor, Charles, and Amy Gutmann. *Multiculturalism: Examining the Politics of Recognition*. Princeton, N.J.: Princeton University Press, 1994. Chapter by Charles Taylor (The Politics of Recognition)

Jennifer Elrick. 2022. "Bureaucratic Implementation Practices and the Making of Canada's Merit-Based Immigration Policy". *Journal of Ethnic and Migration Studies*, vol.48, no.1, pp.110-128. DOI: 10.1080/1369183X.2020.1817731

Coulthard, Glen. 2007. « Subjects of Empire: Indigenous Peoples and the 'Politics of Recognition' in Canada, » *Contemporary Political Theory* 6 (4): 437-61 (2007).

Dhamoon, Rita (2006). Shifting From 'Culture' to 'the Cultural': Critical Theorizing of Identity/Difference Politics. *Constellations* 13 (3):354-373.

Kymlicka, Will « Testing the Liberal Multiculturalist Hypothesis: Normative Theories and Social Science Evidence », *Canadian Journal of Political Science*, vol. 43, n° 2, 2010, p. 257-272

Luc Turgeon, Antoine Bilodeau, Stephen E. White and Ailsa Henderson. "A Tale of Two Liberalisms? Attitudes toward Minority Religious Symbols in Quebec and Canada." *Canadian Journal of Political Science* (2019), 52, 247–265

Debra Thompson. 2012. "Making (Mixed-)Race: Census Politics and the Emergence of Multiracial Multiculturalism in the United States, Great Britain and Canada." *Ethnic and Racial Studies*, Special Issue: Accounting for Racial and Ethnic Diversity 35(8): 1409-1426.

Johnston, Richard, Keith Banting, Will Kymlicka, and Stuart Soroka. "National Identity and Support for the Welfare State." *Canadian Journal of Political Science* 43, no. 2 (2010): 349-77.

Recommended:

Will Kymlicka. *Multicultural Citizenship: A Liberal Theory of Minority Rights*. Oxford Political Theory. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1996.

Ayelet Shachar, *Multicultural Jurisdictions: Cultural Differences and Women's Rights* (New York: CUP, 2001), ch. 2.

Sarah Song. "Multiculturalism". *Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy*, 2016

Nov.21 Draft paper due on mycourses at 23:59. No class

Nov 27 at 23:59: Formal Peer Review due on mycourses

Nov.28 Peer Review Session

Depending on the size of the class, I will divide the class into groups. Prior to the class, each student will be responsible for reading the draft papers of the other students in their respective group. During class, the groups will assemble. Each student will take 5 minutes (max!) to communicate what they most need from the group, and then each student's paper will be discussed first by their formal reviewer and then by the other students in their group.

This exercise develops a number of skills. The first is to engage with your peers' work at various stages of polish. Some draft papers will struggle with key problems, and others will be relatively polished. Students need to learn to engage with and provide constructive feedback whatever stage the draft is in. Constructive feedback never demeans. The point is to engage with the ideas and writing on the page in order to make the work better. And there is no substitute for peer review in a supportive group setting.

Dec 5. Term papers due by 23:59 on mycourses

TAs to add 2 weeks.

Dec.18 and if necessary 19: Oral Exam (in person)

An Appendix: Reflections on Canadian Political Science

I add this here because 1) it should be of interest to students and I want to bring it to students' attention, but 2) I feel constrained by time to cover other issues during class time.

Smiley, Donald, "Must Canadian Political Science Be a Miniature Replica?" *Journal of Canadian Studies* 9, 1 (1974): 31-42.

Debra Thompson. 2008. "Is Race Political?". *Canadian Journal of Political Science* 41:3 (September/septembre) 525-547

Jack Lucas. 2013. "A Century of Political Science in Canada." *Journal of Canadian Studies* 47(2): 89-118

Alain Noel. "Studying Your Own Country: Social Scientific Knowledge for Our Times and Places (Presidential Address to the Canadian Political Science Association, St Catharines, May 28, 2014)", *Canadian Journal of Political Science* 47:4 (December) 2014) 647–666

Kiera Ladner. "Taking the Field: 50 Years of Indigenous Politics in the CJPS", *Canadian Journal of Political Science* 50:1 (March / mars 2017) 163–179

Nisha Nath, Ethel Tungohan et Megan Gaucher, "The Future of Canadian Political Science: Boundary Transgressions, Gender and Anti-Oppression Frameworks" *Canadian Journal of Political Science*, vol51, no 3, 2018, p. 619-642.

François Rocher, "The Life and Death of an Issue: Canadian Political Science and Quebec Politics." *Canadian Journal of Political Science*, 1-25. Doi:10.1017/S0008423919000672. (ahead of print, 2019)

Thomas B. Pepinsky. "The Return of the Single-Country Study". *Annual Review of Political Science*. 2019. 22:187–203

McMahon, Nicole, Christopher Alcantara, and Laura B. Stephenson. "The Qualifying Field Exam: What Is It Good For?" *PS: Political Science & Politics* 53, no. 1 (2020): 94–99.