

# POLS 110

## What is Politics?

Lecture one – September 9<sup>th</sup>

- “Polis” is the greek word for city
- Political means what it means to live together
- Athens was the first democracy

Aristotle - “Man is a political animal”

- We have interest in questions that have to do with living together

What do Obama (a major political symbol) have in common with the Ontario teacher strike that directly effected me have in common?

- They both create political, social and economic change

### Definitions of the Political

- Emphasis on institutions: the government, political parties, or groups of interest
- Emphasis on the power in its various forms: control, influence and authority (Dahl, Pg. 8).
- Emphasis on distribution of resources and values “who gets what, when and how” (Harold Lasswell) and “allocation of values” (David Easton)
- Emphasis on process of conciliation

### Differences

- Emphasis on who is engaged (institutions) vs emphasis on focus of concern

### What still needs to be explained

- What is power? Is it control, influence, or authority?
- What are interests?
- What are values? Are all values political or are there some that are not? (Trudeau)

### What makes things Political?

- The common concerns of a group or community
- This could involve resources, power or influence
- These are socially constructed therefore they are subject to change through actions, structures and systems
- Always involves communication
  
- The definition of politics is political
- What or whom you include/exclude has political effects
- The study of politics is motivated by politics
- What we see as political is changing \*constant change

# POLS 110

## Proceeding Reading: Various Online Readings

Lecture three – September 16<sup>th</sup>

## Readings for this week

- Political Parties (initial impressions)
  - Interest Groups
    - Activists, lobbyists
  - Research centres
  - News sites
- \*find an issue of interest and look at the different sites for different perspectives

## Weekly Writing Assignments

- Organize your thoughts
- Focus your argument so that it answers the question
- Proof read
- Save as word document
- Structure your paper so that it fits with your argument
- Sign into moodle
- Go to writing assignment icon
- Follow the instructions
- Copy/paste your assignment in
- Deadline is **Wednesday at 11:59**
- Thursday two assignments should come in
  - is the writing quality clear? Does it make sense?
  - use ideas and concepts from the course?
  - argument/analysis
  - strength and weaknesses
- Comments can be limited to a sentence or two. The point is to be helpful.
- Submit evaluation before Friday at 11:55 pm
- Check the next day to see your own grade and comments (Sat 12:01)

## What caused the shift from a normative approach to a positivist one?

- Desire to make social science that could parallel the achievements of science, in both discovery of the world and change of the world
- What if we could advance society through our knowledge of how it works? Soc, econ, poli sci all turning to positivism to discover and general rule.

## Challenges to Positivist Approach

- Limitations of both deductive and inductive reasoning
  - deductive reasoning you might miss other correlations because you already have an idea of what you want to conclude
- Limitations to what could be studied – only those things that could be observed, measured, counted. What about someone's feelings? Are they even telling the truth? Some things just aren't quantified
- Difficult to sustain the semantic approach that treated the concepts as having a defined meaning
  - what does equality even mean? Are we measuring the same things when we say "equality"?

## Parallel Challenges within Science

- growing recognition that science is not neutral – e.g. The "space race" in the cold war, nuclear arms build-up, the green revolution
- These things aren't neutral, they're political! Genetic modified organisms, there are morals, and furthermore, what projects get funding?
- Thomas Kuhn, "The Structure of Scientific Revolutions" - Science doesn't develop gradually and incrementally, but undergoes paradigm shifts – dramatic, complete, changes in understanding the world, of matter, of energy, etc.
- The observer effect – we have an effect on the things we observe

- can we be looking at things at the same time?

## Growing Political Challenges

- 1960's increased criticism of authority – civil rights, anti-war, student politics, feminism, American Indian movement, anti-colonial revolutions
- So is the study of nations a tool of domination? To control people, you study them (dominant groups 'study' the marginalized groups, of "the Orient", of indigenous peoples, etc)
- Mistrust of authority – science and the researcher viewed as another form of authority
- Cynicism about statistical knowledge – that it can prove anything
- Positivist methodologies link to right-wing politics (assumptions about the individual, competitiveness, self-interests)

## Alternative Methodologies

- More critique of concepts and critique of assumptions in research studies
- Asking "who does this research benefit?" What are the politics of the research itself? (No assumption of inherent neutrality)
- Can the research we do be generalized to a larger group? Behaviourists thought we could generalize, but what we observe in one culture, might not be true in another
- Interest in "transformative methodologies" - how can one do research in such a way that the research itself has a positive "social justice" effect
  - how can we build social justice into what we are researching?
- Different assumptions in this methodology
  - effect of socialization (race, class, gender, etc) on researcher, on research and on research subjects
  - Effect of class divisions
  - Use of language, being aware of what our words imply
  - Power in the research relationship

## Contemporary Political Studies

- Everything is happening – wide range of methodologies
  - Statistical analyses – as before but with increased attention to assumptions, to bias, etc
  - Greater use of qualitative data
  - Analysis of institutional structures and their impact
  - Political history, political geo, political ethnography
  - Critique of conceptual and theoretical frameworks
  - Analyzing texts – discourse analysis, deconstruction

**\*How ever you study politics it is always going to be political**

POLS 110

Proceeding Reading: "Introduction Pg. 1-16"

Lecture two – September 12<sup>th</sup>

## What is "Political"?

- Politics by definition, is political
- Anyway you define it, it has political consequences
- There are political consequences of saying politics is "narrow"
- Common features regarding politics: concern, power, conflicts and resolutions, raises questions about issues of communication, values and meaning.

## What does it mean to study politics

- When studying politics, we are studying issues that are political
- Within the study of political science, there are fields that cluster topics together
  - Canadian politics - canadian political institutions, canadian parties, political approaches to health, the roles of courts)
  - How we compare countries – why does one voting system work here and not in another country, why are some more peaceful, why is another country more successful?
  - International relations – UN, wars, WHO, how do they operate differently then how countries operate
  - Gender and Politics – Division of labour in the household in Canada vs other countries, the impact of international organizations on women, what is the impact of women in the countries that they live in
  - Political Theory – What do we mean by equality, justice? How do previous generations understand politics?

## Text book indicates that there are 3 approaches to the study of politics

### 1) Normative Theory Dominated up into the 1950's

- What SHOULD happen
- How should we organize the state – the ideal state (plato)
- What should liberty look like, and how can the state make it happen?

### 2) Empirical Theory

- By using our minds and senses
- Measuring the number of people who vote
- Public opinion polls
- Looking at the reasons why people vote the way they do
  - **Deductive Theory**  
You come up with a theory that seems like it would work, and then you test it. Going into the study of politics and figure out what you think is going to happen, and testing for that.

#### *Ex. Rational Choice Theory*

Assumes that all individuals make choices that will benefit themselves. Therefore, in a political system people make choices that will benefit the whole society, because it will benefit them (utility maximizers). Its deductive because we deduce what we think is going to happen, and then we test for it.

- **Inductive Theory**

Be unbiased, and see what happens when you observe, and then make a theory. Problem is, you wind up with data that you couldn't explain because its hard to induce something from data when you are totally unbiased.

#### *Ex. Behaviouralism*

Observing the behaviour through experiments and then coming up with a conclusion out of nothing. Search for generalizable regularities (e.g in populations that show more affluence, people vote more for centrist parties)

### 3) Semantic

- Having to do with words
- What do we mean when we say democracy?

- Does it always require that every person gets treated equally?
- Semantics looks at the meaning behind our words and how carefully we must define them since there is no commonly accepted definition of various political concepts.

### The rise of positivism

- Only facts and data really count
- Took over at around 1950's
- Departments of politics, econ and social sciences decided that they shouldn't just be studying what SHOULD happen but what IS happening **\*Shift from Normative theory to Empirical and Semantic theory\***
- Asserts that there should be a strict separation between facts and values

### Karl Popper –

- The correct way to develop theories is from deductive reasoning. Shouldn't we be able to improve society like the way they use scientific tools in bio or chem? The hope was that we could set aside opinion and get something that was concrete.
- Saw inductivism (like in behaviouralism) as impossible – science must always be based on some prior conjecture or belief).
- He called his approach “critical rationalism”.
- Believed that the scientist's task is to test existing hypotheses to see if they can be “falsified”.
- “In so far as scientific statement speaks about reality, it must be falsifiable; and in so far as it is not falsifiable, it does not speak about reality”

### Objective vs Subjective

- Objectivity is being able to be un-biased (how scientists should be)
- Subjectivism is the opposite - it's acting on own beliefs and opinions
- A lot of politics and journalism regarding politics, is highly subjective
- Empiricism says politics should be more objective

### Critical Perspectives/ Alternative Methodologies

- Some of the methods in the 60's started to become problematic
- Prior to making decisions of what we're going to observe, we're already biased. The questions you ask change 'their' answers.
- Observing one thing, prevents you from observing another thing

### The structure of scientific revolutions – Thomas Kuhn

- The original belief was that the mind was cumulative
- Kuhn said that's not how it happens at all, there is a paradigm about how the universe is ordered and that's why people make the experiments they do. Even when they don't work, they cling to their understanding. There was eventually a revolution with atomic theory. This had its affect in social science because social scientists started to think maybe there was an existing frame work that was limiting.
- There was a sea change in politics in the 1960's, established authority had everyone revolting and therefore people were looking behind the pre existing frame work, and there was a paradigm shift.

# Issues and Contexts

## Proceeding Reading: "Introduction Pg. 1 -16"

Lecture four– September 19<sup>th</sup>

### Review

- Criticisms of Positivist Methods
  - problem that value neutrality may be impossible
  - simply be studied or studying something has an effect on you ("observer effect")
  - the outcome of the research may be predetermined by research methods
  - correlation does not indicate causation
  - concepts are always contestable and political, you can't use any concept like justice or equality without using it in a way that influences what you do
  - the research relationship itself, can be a power relationship. As an observer, you may have a power relationship to those people. They are being "subjected" to your research
- Alternative methodologies
  - because all these problems come from positivist methods, they came up with alternative methods
  - resurgence of normative approaches
  - resurgence in political economy approaches take greater look at economic factors (particularly at capitalism's influence on politics)
  - feminist approaches look at the impact of gender on politics. Big division in votes for women and men
  - A greater attention to social and cultural factors that influence behaviours (what stereo types are out there, whats happening in the media)
  - "transformative" methodologies try to develop methods of doing research to empower marginalized research subjects. Is there a way you can do the research and also help the issue? The way you interact with people, or what kind of research they actually need
- Contemporary Political Studies
  - Everything is happening, there is a very wide range of methodologies
  - Statistical Analyses, as before but with increased attention to assumptions, to bias, etc. (for a while, it was the only acceptable study)
  - Greater use of qualitative data alongside quantitative studies (not just numbers)
  - A greater analysis of institutional structures and their impact (educational institutions, family, health care institutions)
  - Political history, political geography, political economy, political ethnography
  - Increased use of "transformative methodologies"
  - Ongoing critique of conceptual and theoretical frameworks
  - Textual analysis – discourse analysis, deconstruction

### What Do We Look at When We Consider Context? (a range of things)

- Geography, time period, biases, history of the event, etc.
- Actors/Participants, not just the individuals but the government, the police, etc.
- Actions, (a hunger strike, a petition, the arrest)
- Influences/Motivations/Reasons (if he's a doctor, he knows the repercussions of a hunger strike but he is motivated by his desperation)
- Structures and Institutions (the fact that the state is so unstable)
- Practices and policies (treatment of prisoners, the fact that they can hold people for two years with no charges)
- Cultures (belief systems, religion)

- History
- Environment and Geography (the middle east always has things happening, how much does regional influence does effect the issue?)
- Economics
- Potential Outcomes
- Think of these contexts as concentric circles, the actors are the middle circle while all other factors move outwards
- Each aspect of context has both highly relevant, somewhat relevant and more remote aspects

## POLS 110

### The State

#### Proceeding Reading: Chapter One

Lecture five – September 23rd

#### **What is the state?**

- “a human community that successfully claims monopoly of the legitimate use of physical force within a given territory” - Max Weber
- it is human, made out of actors and institutions that are run by humans
- the state is the only thing allowed to restrain you (put you in a jail)
- the state is the only thing allowed to declare force against another state (legitimately)
- “the government/executive of a country”
- or “the whole structure of political authority in a country”
- historical origin of modern usage: Peace of Westphalia 1648 (treaty) – established territorial boundaries

#### **What is the difference between the state and the government?**

- Different definitions
  - government creates laws and policies where as the state is all of the political authority
  - the car is the state but the government is like the driver

#### **What is sovereignty? What is authority? What is political obligation?**

- The supreme power however acquired by the state
- There are many authorities but the state is the supreme and so it is considered ‘sovereign’
- Authority is the legitimate or recognized power
- Whoever is exercising power in an area who is considered to have the right to do so
  - use to be divine authority (god sent the royal family) religion based
  - we use legal/rational authority (we all agree that the laws are fair) because not to have a state is to put us in a position where our lives are threatened
  - it also makes it easier for us to live together
  - traditional authority: obeying your parents
- Political obligation: if the state is doing something for you (infrastructure, services, etc) there are things that the state expects you to do for it (obey the laws, participation in institutions (military, jury duty), paying taxes)

#### **Evaluating types of states**

- Limited vs Interventionist
  - Night watch man state – extremely limited, just watching your stuff, not protecting your rights.

- Very basic/limited
  - Highly interventionist – provides you with education and health care, engages in many ways in your life
- Goals of intervention can differ
  - one goal can be economic, one can be social (welfare state), or perhaps both or none
  - Hot topic: should they intervene and how should they do so?
- Authoritarian vs Democratic
  - how much influence do people have
  - Authoritarian: the average person has little to none influence
  - Democratic: typically a lot
  - Totalitarian state – totally authoritarian and interventionist

## How does the state work?

- Different states work differently
- Empirical and normative considerations
- Not the same as asking how governments get elected, but how power actually functions
- Pluralist
  - society is made up of different groups that find a way to be represented by authority
  - a member of the school board votes for the party that is focusing on education
  - the state/government mediates (by coming up with policies) all of these groups to keep the peace and so everyone is heard equally
- Elite Pluralism
  - the truth is that most of us don't really get heard by the government unless you are the elite
  - only the leaders of these institutions are heard
- Corporatism
  - term coined to say that the government must consult the people (leaders of trade unions and businesses), not just the elected people
- Elitist
  - every society naturally develops its own hierarchies
  - leaders will emerge and they will all agree on the basics
  - there may be an appearance of pluralism, but the decisions that are made will reflect the views of the elite in society
- Marxist
  - the state is primarily bound to whatever supports capitalism
  - therefore, the interests of workers will be much lower down than the economy
  - in every society some group of people is going to own and they benefit from the production that happens
  - in every society there is a subordinate group (slaves get to eat) but the profits go to the owners, so the state keeps them pleased
- New Right
  - the state has its own interest
  - whatever makes the state and the bureaucracy bigger and expanding
    - leads to economic downfall

## How should the state work? (very normative and depends what aspect you're coming from)

-

- 
- **What is happening to the state?**
- Challenged to sovereignty (inside and outside the state)
  - globalization
- Is the fact that transnational corps have most of the money mean that they can over rule the state?
- Is the state being 'hollowed out'

## POLS 110

### Democracy

### Proceeding Reading: Chapter Three

Lecture six – September 26th

#### Recap

- different theories of how the state works
  - all the different theories
  - pluralism, corporatism, elitism, etc.
- challenges to the state
  - from the inside of the state
  - challenges from (sub)nationalist groups who want their own sovereignty (Quebec and Native people)
  - outside or beyond the state
  - nation state is being questioned due to globalization
  - the decisions of other states, effect our state
- what do we want the state to be?
  - political ideologies

#### What do we mean by democracy

- demos – the people
- kratia – power, rule
- contrasted with other forms of government
  - monarchy – rule by the one
  - oligarchy – rule by the few
- aristocracy – rule by the 'best'
- anarchy – against rule
- plutocracy – rule by the very wealthy
- tyrant – rules for their own benefit

#### What is the history in the West?

- Begins in athens (400 BC)
  - city state comprised of 3000-4000 people, 20% were citizens (20+ male who was free and had served in the military)
- It was all a direct democracy
  - people asked for what they wanted and meet with the assembly
  - random self-participatory government
  - peoples ability to speak well and persuade other people dictated what did and did not happen

- Socrates didn't want to teach rhetoric, he thought he was teaching philosophy
  - wanted the truth, not to teach argument
  - does justice happen in our society because we find out the truth or does it happen because one person is just better than another person at speaking
- Plato (Socrates student)
  - society should be run by the elite (not the wealthiest, but those prepared to relinquish wealth in pursuit of knowledge)
- Feudalism – hierarchical rule (monarchs, religious leaders)
  - democracy was considered to be anarchy (complete chaos)
    - why would you want people to actually have a say in the government? People are foolish – it should be put up to God because he appointed the people who are powerful (divine rule)
- Reformation, renaissance, enlightenment, rise of a new class – the 'middle class' with demands for representation and influence.
  - With the growth of capitalism, (investing in small scale businesses, merchants, etc) we have a new wealth emerging. The kind of wealth that comes from successful trade relations, and new exploration.
  - Now that they were increasing their wealth, they wanted their own representation and power

## Rise of liberalism

- based on the view that humans are about rationality.
- It should be used to advance your own interests and the rest of society's
- The middle class was proved by property (you sunk your ship, you made a bad trade, etc.)
  - but if you had reason, you would build property
- Middle class wanted the government for security (for their interests and their property)
- They also wanted the government to secure their freedom
- Government or state is the consequence of a contract
  - if the government protects me, you will pay taxes, fight, etc

## What do we mean by 'liberal democracy'

- Protection of private property
- Freedom is important
- That we have rights, (the state can't just come take my stuff)
- Public realm vs private realm
  - we can have our own thoughts and beliefs
- People wanted to make a government that incorporated in mass suffrage
- Increased popularity of 'democracy' – expectation of representation
- Combined with 'utilitarianism' – goals of state as common happiness or common good (Bentham and Mill)
- Mill's son thought that it was more for the greatest good instead of the greatest happiness. Ideally, the government is supposed to make us good (not happy)
  - believed that the shared responsibility of the government made people better

## Protective Democracy vs Developmental Democracy

- Protective
  - representatives to benefit the interests of their supporters
  - main interest is to restrain the state's power esp. Vis a vis private property
  - and that it doesn't infiltrate our lives
- Developmental
  - benefit to the individual by participating in decision-making
  - increase in societal rationality

## Challenges, questions, political debated about democracy

- Who is represented in a liberal democracy?

- Can elites “represent” the masses?
  - They don’t really *represent* the majority
  - they can’t relate to all of the population
- Does it mean doing what the people you are representing tell you to do, or what you think is good for them?
  - i.e. Capital punishment
    - most people in Canada would say yes, but the government says no because it doesn’t prove to be a deterrent
    - the elites see that it is not worth it
- Do political parties ‘represent’ interests well?
  - Aggregation of interests
- What is the effect of the electoral system on representation?
  - Diffuse parties vs. Centrist parties
- Should there be quotas to ensure representation of underrepresented groups?
- Should there be regional representation?
- Native representation?
- What can and should be done to protect minorities within societies where majorities rule?
  - Especially when they are subjugated by the majority

#### Crises in Liberal Democracy

- Late 1800’s early 1900’s – extension of the franchise would liberalism continue?
- 1930’s into 40’s The Great Depression – creation of welfare state – social democracy
  - we needed to eliminate the boom and bust cycle
- 1960’s and 70’s to present – crisis of ‘ungovernability’, huge student and social unrest. (free healthcare, free education)
  - the state was pulling back
- 1980’s to present – globalization as a challenge to state power

## POLS 110

### Democracy and Power

#### Proceeding Reading: Chapter Three and Four

Lecture seven – September 30<sup>th</sup>, October 1<sup>st</sup> and October 3<sup>rd</sup>

#### Democracy

##### Crises happening in Liberal Democracy?

- Late 1800’s – early 1900’s – extension of the franchise – would liberalism continue?
  - Large amount of people couldn’t meet basic needs because of the great depression
- 1930’s into 40’s – creating of “welfare state” - “social democracy”
  - states started to offer more programs
  - within one year everyone was employed
  - therefore, the state can play a role in boosting the economy (Keynes)
- 1960’s and 70’s to present – crisis of ‘ungovernability’
  - too many demands on state and beginning era of cutbacks
- 1980’s to present – globalization as a challenge to state power

#### Democracy and Capitalism

- There is an assumption that liberalism and democracy reinforce each other because they both place an emphasis on freedom (of the market, of association, etc)
- Force of capitalism – have we become more “consumers” than “citizens” (Reich’s article and this

week's assignment)

- problem with that is whether or not we would make different decisions if we thought of ourselves more of citizens than consumers
- go to mcdonalds, as a consumer but to a small owned, local, business as a citizen

## Increasing Power of Capitalism

- strength of transnational corporations
  - 51 out of the 100 largest economies are corps
  - 147 corps control 47% of the world's wealth
    - typically one corp owns lots of other corps
- Do corps have different interests than people?
  - Individuals are expected to volunteer, pay taxes, obey laws, etc
  - corps do this too, but their only interests are themselves and their share holders
  - if corps donate to charity it is only because they improve their sales
- Do they have too much power?
- Are the consequences of this anti-democratic? Is it a plutocracy (controlled by very rich)
- Examples of occupy movement slogans: We are the 99% and who are the 1%

## Continuing Justification for and Spread of Democracy

- That people should be involved in governing themselves
- That some principle of equality (of influence) should be involved in thi
- That this should be combined with other aspects of democracy (freedom of thought/speech)
- There there should be a way to meet the common needs of humanity
- That democracy is not just a set of rules

## New Debates

- is it a "universal value"?
  - Sen: democracy is becoming a universal value but the concern is that democracy is just a Western thing, and not applicable to China or the Middle East. He argues that the values in democracy are actually in other forms of government and therefore it is universal
- Must it be "endogenous"?
  - Can democracy be imposed from the outside or can it come from within the society?
- Are there different forms it should take?
  - "deliberative democracy" - people are more involved with what should be happening. This theory states they can deliberate and discuss what is to happen in their society
  - i.e. citizen assemblies, town halls
- Communitarian approaches (rather than individualist) - emphasis on finding common values within communities to strengthen democracy
  - Quebec's charter of values
- Can democracy be international in scope? - 'cosmopolitan democracy'
  - if the US goes to war, we are effected
  - International law effects all of us no matter what, we can't run away from it
  - Questions about whether or not we need to move to an international democracy

## Power

- Link to democracy through question of "who has power?"
- one way of looking at that is the question "whose interests prevail?"
- assumption: democracy is desirable because power is shared and because people are free
- democracy expresses core values of freedom and equality in sharing of power and limitations on power

## Defining Power As...

- The capacity to produce outcomes
- The ability of A to get B to do what B would not otherwise do
  - successfully influencing people means you have power over them
- linked to other concepts like violence, force, coercion, but also consent, authority, influence
- can involve actions but also inaction
  - the city decides not to clean up the garbage
- introduces important questions about responsibility (political, moral, legal, historical)

## Elitist Analysis of Power

- in every society, an elite will control the behaviour of others
- laws benefit the powerful
- main research question is “who has power”
  - somebody has it and somebody else doesn't
- elites holding the power may be true in democracies as well
  - masses do not care?
  - Elites are trusted, they have “earned” their position?
  - The work of politics takes time?
  - Ideal society: The elite rule in the interests of the community (Plato)

## Power and Pluralists Analysis

- response to the elitist approach
- Robert Dahl – investigated relationship of interests to outcomes
- Are “interests” of different groups reflected in ‘outcomes’ in terms of policy decisions made by the state?
- If so, this indicated that power is roughly shared
- main research question – How is Power Distributed?
- Example of “power over” - the power to make the state and other citizens do what they might not otherwise do
- approach raised questions about how ‘interests’ were determined
  - people criticized him for proving what he wanted to prove

## Two Faces of Power

- Bachrach and Baratz - “Two Faces of Power” challenge to Dahl and the pluralist approach
- “Power” has other dimensions:
  - who sets the agenda?
    - Agenda may be set to keep things “safe” for those in power
    - Some ideas/opinions/issues are seen as unimportant / not political
      - ex. the homeless, childcare because women were meant to play that role in the house
- Who makes the rules?
  - Who decided what and how the system is going to work
- Who has the capacity to co-opt others
- Main research questions: who gains from these biases, from non-decision making, from maintenance of the status quo?

## The Third Dimension of Power

- Lukes draws from Gramsci's two dimensions of power and said there is actually a third
- Gramsci: If the poor people in a society they got the vote, why didn't they overthrow the system that keeps them poor
  - hegemony (trying to fit in with the upper class by pretending they belong to the system)
- How is consent produced among people who are being oppressed
- Gramsci said power works best when it is least noticed. Consent is more powerful than coercion
  - there are governments that use force but they aren't as effective as the governments that have

- consent
- Lukes says this needs to be counted as a dimension of power
- Consent occurs through the shaping of desires and beliefs
  - we think that this is as good as it gets, so why get rid of it?
- People may not know their own “real interests”

## Agency and Structure

- Lukes thinks the most important thing to consider is who has the power and how they are using it
- Hayward’s challenges Lukes by saying we also need to look at the social structures, institutions as they shape people’s actions, beliefs, etc
- They discuss the aftermath of Katrina
  - Lukes says we need to look at the decision makers and why they allowed this disaster to happen
    - He questioned why people didn’t step up? They all knew that the preventions put in place were going to fail.
  - Hayward says we also need to look at social structures and institutions
- Questions about scope and responsibility
- Responsibility is for both action and inaction
- responsibility may extend to our political responsibility to redress historic injustice, to alter existing institutions and practices, etc
  - The home owners of “high river” should know their is a risk of flooding, but perhaps maybe the government should allow people to build houses there because its such a risk

## Power from below

- challenge to dominant understanding of power from Michel Foucault
- power not (or not only) top-down but also comes from below
- power as everywhere, as diffuse, capillary, constantly shifting/changing
- it’s not only dominating but its also creative and productive
- example of historic shifts in how power works – from medieval torture to prison to self-surveillance
  - it happened because if the King wanted to maintain power, he would have to demonstrate the power he had by making this violent, graphic depiction of power
  - he says that power is changing (fast forward a few centuries)
- Bentham came up with an idea of power where they (prisoners) were being watch all the time
  - power of fear that you might be observed
  - Foucault argues that we are constantly behaving to achieve ‘normal’ status, and to fit in. We want to behave the way we are expected to behave
- Nikolas Rose – changing forms of politics, technology, economy require a different understanding of power
  - we need to think of power differently because we live in a different world
  - power is not top down anymore
    - i.e. Arab spring – people just tweeted stuff
- How do we produce ourselves as ‘normal’ subjects within modernity
- are we ‘free’? What does freedom mean if we thought about power and responsibility differently?

## Freedom/Liberty

- Negative Liberty vs. Positive Liberty
- Negative as “freedom from” external constraints
  - the state should guarantee that you are free to pursue your own desires, not be enslaved, etc / the state must not interfere with your choices (freedom of religion, of association, of speech, of conscious)
  - protected by the UN covenant
- Positive as “freedom to” do things/use your freedom
  - in ancient times, positive freedom was the capacity to participate in democratic government
  - modern versions, capacity to act free from external or internal constraints
  - government may reduce constraints of poverty, illness, ignorance,etc

- are homeless people free? Are the uneducated free? If you are debilitated without healthcare are you free? Positive freedom says that the state has the capacity to set these people free
- positive rights: right to health care, to education, to clean water, etc
  - because if you have these rights you are set up to freely participate in society
  - in order for the government to interfere with these positive rights, they have to tax the people which prevents you from spending your money in the way you want
  - Therefore, in order to promote positive freedom, you may be taking away negative freedom

## Justifying Restrictions on Freedom

- “Harm principle” - only those actions that cause harm to others should be prevented by the state
- This is controversial because freedom is restricted
  - Whose freedom is restricted?
  - People without reason (children, elderly with senile) or people who act against reason (prisoners), those outside the community (foreigners), those required to obey (soldiers)

## Conflict of Negative and Positive Freedom

- cost of providing positive rights could interfere with the commitment to negative rights
  - if you’re going to provide healthcare it’s going to cost people money by taxing people. This infringes on people’s negative rights because they could use that money on ways they would otherwise wish (including donating that money to charity)
  - government provision of positive rights might interfere with the market
    - if the government in Canada has committed to funding public education it prevents private companies from offering education because the prices are so much higher
      - only the wealthy can go to that school so it’s not fair
      - but isn’t that what private schools cater to anyways?

## Justice

- giving people what is due to them
- punishment or reward – what is ‘fitting’
- procedural justice vs social justice
  - **Social Justice**
    - fairness of the outcome itself
    - socialism as example of altruistic model
    - “from each according to his/her ability; to each according to his/her need”
    - Liberalism – can social justice be based on individual’s self-interest
      - but can we actually be just when we are focused on nothing but ourselves
    - Rawls and the “veil of ignorance”
      - ‘original position’ – no idea who you are going to be in society or what role you will play
      - assumption: in the original position you will desire the primary needs of all individuals (shelter, food, water, education, healthcare, etc). And that you will be self interested.
      - Proposed outcome:
        - liberty principle (each person will have the right to the most extensive, total system of liberties that everyone would have access too) you wouldn’t know what you have so you would want it for everyone
        - difference principle (if there was disproportion and inequality you would want them to be subsidized by the government)
        - fair opportunity principle (everyone would have the same opportunity to run in positions of power and influence)
  - **Procedural Justice**
    - Nozick – objection to Rawls
    - any property we’ve acquired we’ve done so in truthful ways, so we have a right to keep it no matter what and we shouldn’t have to be taxed.
      - This is known as ‘entitlement’ theory

- emphasis is on fairness of laws and established rights
- concern with outcomes is itself unjust
- **Other Justice Concerns and Approaches**
  - Cosmopolitan justice
    - should there be justice higher than the nation state, and how would that work?
  - Communitarian Justice
    - reject the approaches on justice that revolve around the individual
    - it argues that different communities have different outlooks
    - an African community might think of justice that is different from the Western view
    - we might not all be self interested
  - Indigenous and Environmentalist
    - should animals and the environment receive justice?
    - What about the next generation?
    - It's not just about now, are we living our lives in way which will help our seventh generation?

## POLS 110

### Democracy and Power

### Proceeding Reading: Chapter 5 and 6 & Ideologies

Lecture ten and eleven – October 7<sup>th</sup>

#### Equality

- Two ways of thinking of political equality
  - 1) we are all inherently, equally human – should be reflected in treatment of all people
  - 2) distribution equality – concern with how goods are distributed

Approaches to distributional question

- equality of opportunity – everyone should have the opportunity to achieve (public education and loan systems/welfare)
- liberal equality – we are equally free to pursue our own desires but this doesn't entail any sort of redistribution
- democratic equality – equal opportunity to participate in government
  - equal opportunity to vote and be elected (i.e., spending cap on elections)
- socialist equality – the wealth of society is commonly produced and so it should be shared amongst all of those who produce (even workers)
  - profits being produced should be given to the workers, not just their wage
- Does equality conflict with other ideals? Does equality enhance or diminish freedom and/or justice?
  - Libertarian says equality can conflict with freedom
  - But in other versions like Socialism, equality enhances freedom because it ensures more people are free so therefore we all benefit

#### What are ideologies

- competing conceptual frameworks
- clusters of political beliefs and political values (I value freedom, equality and justice)
  - as we look at an ideologies, we look at what composite of beliefs of values it falls under

- the core value of an ideology is grounded in beliefs about human nature
  - a Christian fundamentalist would say that we are naturally sinful, therefore our law system should be God-based
- the cluster or composite are made to give you a reason for what is happening in the (political) world and in the government
- it also gives you a standard to judge these happenings and judge other people judgments
- they situate us in relationship to an issue, because we feel as if we can or can't relate
- ideologies help guide your political actions (whether or not you should be involved) and inform social relations

## Key features of ideologies

- historically contingent – constantly changing/shifting
  - every ideology has changed and has a history
  - i.e., Marxism has changed to the point where Marx himself doesn't associate with some versions
- changes in central concepts (meanings) and also in relation of concepts to other concepts (e.g. Relationship of freedom to equality)
- Core and adjacent concepts
- Ideologies appeal both to our emotions and our reason
  - component which appeals to your emotions because it is very much normative (how the world should be)
- Normative and Prescriptive
  - prescriptive because they tell you what to do
- Form various affinities and alliances with each other (historically shifting)
- Include a wide spectrum of views in any one ideology
  - within socialism there is a wide range of perspectives
- Most ideologies frequently claim to be true, to be non-ideological
  - within the ideology, that have the view point, don't think of it as an ideology, they are true – everyone else has an ideology

# POLS 110

## Proceeding Reading: What is Special About Political Ideologies?

Michael Freeden

Lecture twelve – October 10<sup>th</sup>

### Differentiating Ideologies from Political Theories/Philosophies

Freeden has 4 main important points regarding Ideologies and why they are important

1. typicality
  - its important that we study ideologies because it is typically politics takes place
  - Page 6 – definition of ideologies
2. influence
  - it is important to study them because they are influential and offer decision making frameworks which without politics can not take place
  - we expect and anticipate that the party we elect will act in a way that is reflective of their ideology
3. **conceptual creativity**

- ideologies take the ideas of political theory and applies them creatively to a particular moment in time
  - how do different ideologies make people respond to issues
4. communicability
- the nature of ideologies are communicable (communicated and shared among a population)
  - you can't have your own ideology
  - Since we've had democracy, we've had ideology because it depended on gaining popular support and organizing large groups of people to behave in a certain way
  - the language politicians use (very family oriented) – ideologies are effective of being communicated

ON EXAM: How do you think two different ideologies (conservatism vs socialism) would respond to this issue

## History of Ideologies and Negative vs. Positive Approaches to Ideologies

- Initially, it was used as a scientific term, and then there was a debate about how to use it
- Ultimately, in that debate there is 2 different ways this term is used (we use the second term)
  - Frequently used in a way that some people have the truth and other people have an ideology. Negative: Ideology is a distorted view of the world. It relies on opinion and self interest.
    - “I don't watch Fox news, it's too ideological”
    - You are influenced by your ideology
  - We use the term just to describe belief systems as a whole
    - not as loaded
    - we accept that everybody sees the world in their own way
    - belief systems are unavoidable
    - doesn't mean you have to be totally relativist – but you recognize that you don't hold the truth compared to everyone else. You are arguing on the basis on which your beliefs differ

## Complications in Studying Ideologies

- “We examine ideology as fellow sufferers, not as neutral observers” - Andrew Vincent, Political Ideologies (pg, 20)
- “Ideologies do not stand side by side with something objective or real, rather they subtly constitute this reality” Ibid., p. 21
  - How you understand the reality, reflects your ideology. You can't be totally neutral on anything
- Challenge: How might we best enter the political thinking of another, in order not instantly to counter it, but better to grasp it?
  - How do I best present an ideological perspective without giving off a bias

POLS 110

Liberalisms

Introduction and Ch.1 – Friedman

What do we know about Social Democracy? - Dow

Lecture thirteen – October 17<sup>th</sup>

## Introductory Notes

- \* Exam\* Diverse meanings of liberalism – possibly so conflicted that the term liberalism becomes meaningless perhaps
- Nearly everything we've studied in the course so far fits within liberalism – ideas about democracy,

- the state, justice, equality, etc
  - everything we've talked about fits under the broad spectrum of liberal thought
- difficult to 'see' because it is so familiar to us
  - assumptions of liberalism are which our culture, political, and economic are based on
  - attain social progress, the idea that we are important, etc
  - it is hard for us to see liberalism as a negative ideology
- the term liberal is not exactly the same as liberalism
  - liberal sometimes means generous, or 'a lot', tolerance, broad-minded, or general (liberal education)
  - liberalism comes from the root word of freedom
- names of ideologies like liberalism and conservatism are not connected with particular political parties
  - all Canadian parties fit within the liberal spectrum even though they have the 'conservative' name
- this is also true in both the Republicans and Democrats in the U.S., and the Conservatives, Liberal Democrats and Labour Party in the U.K.
- Any proportional representation governments means a wider ideological spectrum

## Rise of Classical Liberalism

- Enlightenment, Reformation, Renaissance (Time periods)
- Social Upheaval – famines and plagues
  - make people critical of religion
- Further social upheaval with industrialization and urbanization
- New faith in 'reason' and 'science', the possibility of advance and discovery
- With those, the possibility of social progress
- Notion of a 'social contract' – government as a consequence of human reason
  - different relationship with each other and the government
  - if you no longer believed that it was God's will that that King was placed there by God, you could question what type of government you wanted
- Growth of technology and transportation and the growth of industries and cities
- If you were to choose what type of society you wanted, you would choose to have a specific type of government, and choose to have laws that protect us and our property
- Contracts only work when they benefit both parties that enter into them
- Possibility of social progress through advance of reason

## Basic Tenets (essence) of Liberalism

- Individualism
  - YOU make the contracts that suit you
  - You are rational, and you will do what you need to do to survive. You are interested in your own well being. By doing so, you may end up in contracts with and competing with other individuals
- Freedom
  - We can decide what we sell our goods and labour for and who to sell it to – no body can tell us what to do
- Reason
- Property
  - Property is good
  - It becomes apart of us because we have done the work for our property (example of apple picking)
  - We can take our property and make trades with it
- Contract
  - If we mix our labour, we don't only own it – but we can trade it for other people's labour
  - Exchanges can be goods and labour
- Public and Private Sphere
  - You contract with people in the public realm to make a government but that government should stay in the public sphere
  - Where as, they should stay out of our individual freedom (stay out of the private sphere)

- Social Progress
  - If I have a particular talent for something, it makes sense to develop that talent so that we can make contracts with people to exchange
  - Not only will I benefit from that, but it will benefit other people because I am talented at that
  - This leads to social progress and efficiency
  - Gov shouldn't be able to say you do this and you do that because then our talents can't be developed and things won't be efficient

## Economic Liberalism and/or Liberal Democracy

- We have lived through Feudalism and Slavery and now there is the growth of capitalism
- The trade routes that have been made make masses of money
- The other version of capitalism, is industrial capitalism
  - based on division of labour and increase in technology
  - ^ makes things more efficient
- by using reason you could become infinitely more productive
- Locke – justification of property in labour
  - state justified as protecting property
- Adam Smith – the invisible hand of the market
  - efficiency, productivity, expansion, best allocation of resources and talents
  - governments should not interfere and tell me where to sell my pies and I will be rewarded for my pie making skills and division of labour
- Economic Liberalism justified private ownership
- Linked to the rise of capitalism (private property, class divisions between owner/investor and wage-earning workers)
- American and French Revolution
  - Life, liberty and the pursuit of happiness
  - Liberalism is there to ensure your happiness, liberty, freedom, and equality
  - A liberal and democratic form of government was something worth a revolution (freedom and equality)
  - Everyone rationally will share an interest in protection of self and of property
  - Everyone will rationally want social progress and advance in common interest
  - BUT there will be divergent views of what the common interest is (social-liberalism and neo-liberalism) of what is the common interest:
  - property rights vs. social development

POLS 110

Liberalisms

On Being Conservative – Oakeshott

Anarchism: What it really stands for – Goldman

Lecture fourteen – October 21<sup>st</sup>

## Liberalism and Human Nature

- Most ideologies have a core understanding of what human beings are really like and our human nature
- Liberalism believes that we are autonomous (independent). We are in our personal world, and we experience things uniquely as individuals
  - We are responsible for ourselves

- We think for ourselves
- We are on our own
- It is up to us what we do
- Critical to the whole success of Liberalism, we are rational humans
  - we may not all be rational every day
  - but a key to liberalism is that we are rational and can choose our government
  - and what is best for society as a whole
  - this is why the market should work – we are rational and want what is best
- Competitive
  - goods are scarce so we are going to compete to get the best
  - we see others as our competition – but the competition is rational and encourages us to do good things like spending our money well
- Self-interested
  - not that we necessarily think selfishly, but that we will do what is best for us
  - with that being said, we can still be generous but we won't do it at our own expense
  - this is apparently good for everyone because we communicate to other people and to the market itself what goods are worth
- Acquisitive
  - we own ourselves, and that we acquire things
  - goods that we believe are good for us
  - Hobbes, Locke – we wanted to acquire what we need and desire

Liberalism thinks that you can base politics on this set of human characteristics

## Human Nature and the State

- Reason will lead the individual to contract with other individuals to form a state to protect common interests
- Protection from the state itself
- Common value of freedom
- Recognition of the equality of others
- Tolerant of human differences (in private sphere- religious differences, for example)

## Recap

- Political Liberalism – historical circumstance for emergence
- Links to economic liberalism (which theorized/justified capitalism as beneficial to all) – possessive individualism
  - Political liberalism emerged alongside economic liberalism
- possessive individualism – we think of ourselves first and we are interested in acquiring goods
- despite the fact that we are self-interested the argument behind economic liberalism is that the self-interest of the individual benefits everyone
- and to liberal democracy – to each person is of equal values
- belief that contracts, entered into freely by individuals, using their reason, will benefit all parties
  - even if my part loses, I will still see benefit
- social conflict can be overcome
  - we are all in competition, but we can develop systems like capitalism where this conflict will be contained
- economic resources will be distributed through the invisible hand of the market – each person seeking her/his own personal benefit inadvertently benefits everyone else
  - to do this, create the best product at the best price
  - the argument is that we would still be buying computers at 5000 dollars if we didn't have the invisible hand
- the convergence of political liberalism, economic liberalism and liberal democracy has proven to be precarious (going to collapse)

## Social Liberalism

- state has a role in the protection of freedom
  - linked to the rise of democracy
  - society can and should benefit individuals
  - equality of opportunity beneficial to society and to other individuals
    - positive freedom will be beneficial to all (welfare like education) – we benefit when other also enter into rational contracts
    - we shouldn't give free education not because the six year old will benefit, but because that six year old will eventually grow and as an adult we need her to be rational
  - we reason our way toward values and the best society will reflect the best values: e.g. Freedom, equality, higher morality of all, etc.
  - State has a role in social development which lead to the view that there might not just be individual rights but also social rights
- “Will (this action by the state) tend to the greater well being (physical, moral, intellectual) of man kind, or at least of this portion of man kind...” - Ritchie
  - should the state intervene or remove itself from restricting
  - universal daycare is very expensive and yet has been shown to be of benefit for the poor and single moms and ultimately its beneficial to the economy (every dollar spent in day care, we see more than a dollar in our economy)
  - Neo-liberals say that the state has no business doing that
- Justification for the state to moderate the effects of the market when these are seen to be unjust
- Market economies also benefit from state involvement
- Tendency in liberal thought that value in property is not only the consequence of one's own individual labour – perhaps the value of property doesn't just come from us putting our labour in (writing a book) but that welfare (free education) made you successful because school is what let you write the book really really well
- Examples
  - educated workforce, healthy workforce, transportation and communications infrastructure

## Social Democracy

- The kind of society that we can a social democracy was based on the set of ideas of social-liberalism
- Grew in the 40's and became the dominant form of society
  - more developed in the North (sweden, norway)
  - less developed in the South Europe and USA
- Our book calls social-liberalism new-liberalism but is the opposite of Neo-liberalism
- debates about how much intervention – is this a slide into socialism?
  - Is it what the wealthy class feared? (workers voting for socialists)
- Which basic rights and goods should the state provide?
  - Is day care too much? Dental and university?
- If we don't want kids, why should I pay for someone else's?
- How far should democratic control extend? (Table 1 in Dow article: political, social industrial and economic democracy [close to socialism or Marxism])
- Different Justifications:
  - Keynes: need for state to intervene to moderate severe economic fluctuations – through taxation and spending
  - Marx: the state should intervene, because eventually democracy should extend to the economy itself

## Neo-Liberalism

- Return to classical liberalism
- Rejection of most justifications for state involvement (Friedman reading)
- The main thing the state is responsible for is negative liberty (rather than positive liberty)
  - i.e., freedom of everything

- Importance of property
  - limited taxation if anything
  - we should run off of people who donate
- Faith in market economy to produce best and fairest outcomes – state can only distort this through economic activities such as welfare, taxation, etc
  - prejudice: under liberalism if you are poor, you made bad choices
  - in feudalist system it was because it was God's will
- Political freedom coincides with the free market
  - Dow says we can only see political freedom if the state interferes
  - Friedman says they must not interfere

## Role of the State in Neo-Liberalism

- Must be limited
- To maintain law and order
- To enforce private contracts
- To support competitive markets
- Prevent monopolies
- Additional roles should be only very carefully chosen and are probably inadvisable, better done by voluntary measure or by a private market
- Neo-liberals say welfare is best done privately or else we are interfering with other's human freedom

## Neo-Liberalism and Morality

- Limited state produces more moral citizens because we become more self-reliant
- Because
  - you must live with the consequences of your actions
  - (people make stupid choices because they can get away with it)
  - you will develop your talents to maximize their opportunities for you own benefit (and inadvertently benefit others in doing so)
  - you will be rewarded for you sensibility, work ethic and your calculated risk-taking

POLS 110\*

## Social Change and Ideology

Lecture fifteen – October 24<sup>th</sup>

### Liberalism's views on Ideology

- Theorizes from human nature (specifically rational and independent)
- Reason can + should take us beyond ideology
- Assumptions about human nature (rational etc.) are taken as facts
- Reason will also lead to human progress – to an end
- Ex. A rising tide raises all boats

### Social Liberalism

- Positive freedom
- Social rights
- Development democracy
- Equality of opportunity
- Moral development in shared democratic development
- Economic freedom is good when/if it supports positive freedom, equality, happiness etc.

- Critical of neo-liberalism's anti-state stance and belief in the good of all market transactions

## Neo-Liberalism

- Negative freedom
- Individual Rights
- Protective Democracy
- Liberal Equality
  - State shouldn't intervene to equalize opportunities
- Moral development of individual as a consequence of competitive striving
- Democracy is good in so far as it supports economic liberalism, the free market, and the advancement of the individual
  - Too many demands on the state made by the masses

## Ideological Affinities

- Neo-Liberalism shades into libertarianism, but its moral leanings can sometimes link it also to fundamentalism and/or conservatism
  - Night watch man state?
- Blend of neo-Liberalism with conservatism is often called neo-conservatism (ex. Ronald Reagan)
- Social liberalism shades into socialism, but can also be linked to some conservative trends (ex. Importance of the state) and some anarchist trends (importance of equality and non-domination)
- Exam style question
  - Is Liberalism best understood as a continuum of viewpoints from left to right with strong common beliefs and assumptions or as two fundamentally oppositional ideological perspectives?
    - Spectrum or is it quite incoherent?

## History of Conservatism

- Emergence in opposition to revolutions
- Rejection of liberal, anarchist and socialist ideologies
- Reference to ancient and medieval political thought – notions of nobility, tradition, and community
- Development through 19<sup>th</sup> and 20<sup>th</sup> century
- Affiliated with social democracy in 'red troy' politics
- Affiliated more recently with neoliberalism in neoconservatism in policies?

## Basic Trends of Conservatism

- Human Nature is intricate and complex
  - Never have an underlying truth of human nature
- Habits/customs/traditions/prejudice are important as they are the basis for stability – they're the because they work
  - Habits are good! Don't interfere with them
  - The importance of order and stability, of ritual
  - Idea of imperfectability
  - Disagreement with all of these ideologies that say 'we know best'
  - When you improve one part, another will indefinitely suffer
- Practical reason
  - We don't use it to improve things, but to exhibit that we are practical, pragmatic thinkers
- Inequalities
  - It is inevitable and it should be left alone
  - Society is a community of unequals
  - Some people are simply better than you at certain things
  - Society can be seen as an organic whole – we are complex!
    - Like organic beings

## Conservative State

- Natural leadership
    - Those who are noble or in an elevated position in society will rise above, have the experience of leadership
  - Edmund Burgh Quote
  - Good government
  - Need for government – importance of rule
  - Role of government – peace, justice, stability, equilibrium
  - Not aiming for perfection of society or for achievement of ideals
  - Limits to government – checks on power of individuals, of any particular group, or government itself
  - Importance of compromise (with different groups of society)
  - Checks on power on democracy
  - Importance of continuity
  - “Loblesse oblige” - use of power for good of whole
  - Importance of trust
- 
- Importance of the national community and of nations

## POLS 110

### Social Change and Ideology

Lecture sixteen – October 28<sup>th</sup>

## Conservatism

- Anti-revolution because it goes against the ‘stable’ state of human nature and tradition
- If change occurs at all, should be very gradual
- Balance of conservatism and correction
- Anti-ideology
- If you are going to look at the state critically, you must do that with caution. We should approach the state like children approaching a weak father instead of hacking it to pieces and cooking it up with crazy ideas and expect it to be better after cooking it with the juices of anarchy
- Conservatism as disposition
- Anti-utopia
- Trends in Contemporary Conservatism
  - 1) Traditional 20<sup>th</sup> century conservatism: Moderation, responsiveness to society as a whole, anti-ideology, nation building, welfare-state as basis for compromise
  - 2) Uneasy amalgam of social and fiscal conservatism in ‘neo-conservative’ politics. Combination of neo-liberalism and some aspects of conservatism
  - Tension between these two ideologies
  - Within the second one, there is tension between social and fiscal conservatism

## Anarchism

- Anarchism means against rule and having rulers
- Rejection of all forms of government and the state
- Does not think that we need to have governments
- We may need rules, but anarchists are against the state
- Holds the belief that society and individuals would function well without the state. In fact, we would benefit
- In favour of a decentralized and self regulating society consisting of a federation of voluntary associations of free and equal individuals

- What we have now is centralized, we have police and armies and that is not free
- Based on liberty, un-restricted from man-made law
- Anarchists are idealist, they think that this is achievable
- It is a very positive view of human nature
- Unlike liberalism they don't think human nature is self-interested and competitive

## History

- Revolutions to replace tyrannical governments often result in new tyrants
- i.e., The French Revolution – what went wrong? - 'reign of terror' – new emperor
- Contemporary examples – The arab spring, Iraq, any other revolution
- As soon as someone new has control of the army, or state they will use it to enhance their own power
- Political action to fight for freedom
  - not to get a new government in place but to totally over throw it
- Political communities of non-domination
  - QUESTION – if anarchists don't think that the nature of humans is self-interest, and that we can exist with co-operation, then how can they look back into history and say its tyrants over throwing tyrants.
- Names associated with anarchism: Bakunin, Proudhon, Kropotkin, Tolstoy, Gandhi, Goldman
- Marx replies to some of these people specifically

## Major Tenets

- Like Liberalism, human nature is rational and we all have reason
- The real potential of humans can only be revealed with true freedom
  - we don't know what human nature is really like until we are free from the state
  - we only think we are competitive now because that's what our society shapes us to be
  - when we are free, other aspects of human nature will emerge
- We have both individual and social instincts that we can and must make work together
- Shouldn't be a challenge because there is no inherent conflict between the individual and the social, but a conflict has been created by the state, religion, and property
- Freedom (human desire is for freedom)
- Therefore, no form of domination is justifiable (no form of domination can be justified)
- Altruism (respect for others is a value that all can learn)
- Equality and freedom are interconnected
  - You can't be equal with other people are free, and you can't be free unless you are equal
  - also true for religion and state
- Democracy is necessary to advance freedom and reason

## Anarchist Views of Capitalism

- Capitalism has put the individual and the social in conflict with each other
- Capitalism supports a version of property
- Property for anarchists – ownership of one's own labour and the product of one's own labour is valid
- But ownership of others' labour is not valid
  - Boss' should not be allowed
- Capitalism is wrong because one class of people owns the means of productions (the tools, technology and resources to produce)
- This always ends up with domination over labour and so cannot be permitted
- Maintenance of wealthy class of non-producers is wrong
- Capitalist lives through dominating over the work of others, they just own shit
- Cost of maintaining a state of wealthy, privileged, powerful people is also wrong
  - They are expensive to maintain, and that makes everyone else poorer
  - Capitalist don't just want the stuff to get by
- Drudgery in production limits human creativity and freedom
- All work could be enjoyable if we didn't have the capitalist wealthy class

- Domination over the environment is also wrong
- If you are constantly making production bigger and bigger, we are destroying our resources and environment
- New systems must be found for working in concert with each other and with the environment
- Proletariat – the working class

## Why They Refute The State

- The state protects the powerful
- The state restricts rather than enhances freedom
  - we can trade or even go over borders – but there is free trade. Because free trade benefits the capitalists
- Proudhon: To have government means to be subjected to the power of another
- Goldman: The state seeks obedience above all
- Buber: The state always takes more power than it actually needs

## Democratic Organization

- Up to future generations to decide the form that an anarchist society would take
- But fundamental commitment to:
  - Local and regional and workplace organizations
  - Power dispersed, comes from below
  - Anyone who wants to can withdraw/refusal from participation
  - Likely a form of 'federation of assemblies'
  - But we wouldn't actually need national building projects

## Social Change

- Social change may be violent or non-violent
- We often assimilate violence with anarchism
- There are very strong currents of non-violent anarchists (Gandhi)
- For some anarchists violence against the state or against capitalism is justified because the state and capitalism are seen as themselves violent
  - That makes no sense, if anarchism is better than capitalism, is that not just stooping to their own level?
- For other anarchists, violence can never be justified – protest must always take non-violent forms
  - i.e., catapulting teddy bears

POLS 110

Marxism

Lecture nineteen – November 7<sup>th</sup>

## Marxism

- Capitalism as dynamic historical mode of production
- Labour theory of value
- Class conflict
- Alienation
- Crisis within capitalism
- Role of the state and of ideology
- Socialism and communism
- Marx thought capitalism was heading towards crisis
  - capitalist society has many classes in it
  - he thought everyone was becoming a paid employee or an owner of capital

- he saw the capitalists were going to become fewer and fewer because they would keep buying more capital and that means more people become paid employees (proletariat)
- he also thought that this would spread throughout the globe
- he also predicted that there would be a crisis of overproduction
- there would be too much of what they were trying to produce
  - we could not match with dollars
  - there would be too much food but the poor wouldn't be able to pay for it and then the capitalists aren't even benefitting
  - we see this now in recession

### Three (at least) Directions After Marx: Revolutionary, Revisionist, Radical

- Lenin, Luxemburg
  - Inevitability of revolution, importance of 'vanguard' party
  - Critique of imperialism
- Bernstein, Kautsky
  - Gradualism, reformism, democracy
  - Socialism can come about through social democratic change
- Difference between socialists and social liberals
  - socialists want to overthrow capitalism – the means of production (oil companies, infrastructure, etc) could be commonly owned in economic democracy
  - social liberals think that capitalism is the best form of economy we can have but there needs to be some sort of government control also on health care, education, etc.
  - Neoliberalism says that they don't want any government control
- Gramsci
  - Hegemony and counter-hegemony

### 1) Socialists and Authoritarian Regimes

- Successful socialist revolutions
- Stalinsim
- Maoism
- One-part states
- Is this socialism?
  - Cold war view was yes, socialism would inevitably become authoritarian state (many people in the West adopted this) \*when to have your picnics i.e., no freedom
  - Critical view was that socialists goals had been distorted and lost
  - We won't see real socialism until we try in developed countries'

### 2) Social Democratic Compromise

- Gradualism, trade-unions
- Nationalist basis for compromise between capital and workers
- Advance of worker's interests through welfare state
- Example in Canada: CCF, cooperative commonwealth federation (farmer-labour-socialist)
  - forerunner of NDP
  - today the NDP is a moderate left leaning social liberal party
  - however, the CCF was the supplying for humans needs and not capitalism
- NDP voted to take the word socialist out

### 3) New Left

- More radical

- Increased demand for democracy
  - not parliament democracy but democratic based work places, schools, community councils, etc.
    - How?
- Links to new social movements
- Rejection of both authoritarian state regimes but also of rise of neoliberal politics
- Anti-capitalist globalization
- International solidarity among workers and amongst other oppressed groups
  - Feminists, minorities, etc
- Challenge of addressing other forms of oppression (gender, race, environmentalism)

## Contemporary Socialism

- End to 'authoritarian' socialisms
  - any socialist doesn't embrace authoritarian socialism
  - everyone hates Stalin
  - no one thinks that that is the way to get to socialism anymore
- Key feature to contemporary socialism: divided left
  - Ongoing Leninist, Trotskyist, and similar revolutionary parties
  - At one point it was illegal to be communist in USA
- Ongoing social democratic compromise with social liberals who do not share the same goals of economic democracy
- Ongoing experimental communities – alternative ownership
- Market socialism options – alternative economies \*\*\*
  - Spain modragone – corporation is democratically run, 86 000 people, run own trade school, university, own pensions, etc
  - If you work, you take a share of the profits
  - Everyone is an employee
  - Anti-corporate globalization and international solidarity movements
  - Links with social liberalism, anarchism (collectivism), anti-oppression social movements (feminism, anti-racism, labour, queer, indigenous), environmentalism

## Major Tenants

- Critique of capitalism
  - there is another way to organize the economy that is more just and more productive
- Critique of liberalism as dominant ideology
  - our belief in liberal values is in fact an ideology that supports imprisonment
- Equality
  - equal opportunity if the public sphere
- Freedom
  - all equal individuals should be free to maximize their choices
  - i.e., positive freedom, freedom gained through education and healthcare for all
  - capitalism cripples individuals
  - education system suffers from this evil, a competitive student is shaped to view that his success cripples him
- Reason
  - sees itself as the development of reason
  - liberals thought that their system is the most advanced system of reason
  - socialists think that our reason can lead us beyond that because liberalism is limited
  - humans are capable of changing their lives and communities
  - through reason we realize it would be wise to do so
- Property
  - divisions among socialists
  - some say everyone should own everything
  - some say that workers should own their own property
  - and some say it should all be state owned

- Should we trade water to make profit?
  - Socialists say that all resources should be used for the good of the people and not profit
- Democracy
  - the economy itself should be democratically organized
- State
  - Marxists and socialists think that the state supports capitalism
- Class
  - there are opposing interests in a capitalist society
  - one class has interest in dominating one class

## POLS 110

### Fascism

Lecture twenty – November 11<sup>th</sup>

#### Origins

- The goal was to be totalitarian
- Associated with Stalin
- Mussolini 1922/ 1923 Italian Fascist party
- Hitler 1923 – Fascist party – came to power in 1933 (called nationalist socialist party)
  - Came to power democratically
- Franco – 1933 – Spain
- Confusing because it is a rejection of socialism
- Capacity to think of the nation as one
- National socialism is a total rejection of socialism

#### Rejection of Other Ideologies

- Explicit rejection of liberalism, democracy, and socialism
- Liberalism is too much of an atimistic view
- Liberalism would lead to democracy and democracy would be everyone out for themselves and having their needs met, which leads to socialism which leads to poverty which leads to anarchism
- Facists say the only alternative is facism
- Perceived enemies as communists and liberals
- Rejection of individualism
- Also rejection of many aspects of conservatism
- Mussolini came from a conservative party
- Both uphold tradition and national values
- Conservatives are anti-revolution
- Fascists think revolution is fine

#### Major Tenets

- Suspicious of liberals, and also reject reason
- To fascists emotion and passion are more true
- Therefore, people will be swayed by belief and not reason
- Human nature in Fascism is defined partly by being anti-rational
- We are first and foremost creatures of action and will
- It is natural to bond with people who are like us
- We are not all one big human nature, we each bound to those who are like us and share out beliefs and our blood
  - Fascism is racist
- Violence

- The way to get to peace is through violence
- Anarchism is violent to point out the violence being done
- Fascists do it to prevail the strong
- And want to 'weed out' the weak
- Understood to be a test of manly virtue
- War is to male what child bearing is to the female – Mussolini
- A minute on the battle field is worth a life time of peace – Mussolini
- Conservatism says we should change things gradually
- Fascism says there should be a mass of social change to bring about the ideal society
- Make violence beautiful
  - Futurism – features of creativity is violent (shock value to the system)
  - Aggression and passion is what fuels politics and that should be reflected
- Influence vote by making associations with your emotions
- Elitism and Inequality
  - There should not be equality among human beings
  - The powerful should dominate the weak
  - Natural leaders should step up – Glorification of leader is Fascist films
  - So compelling that millions follow
  - Nations are superior to other nations, and races
  - Superior culture should dominate over other cultures
    - Would other fascists want other countries to be fascist? Because then everyone would think that they were better
  - Fascists thought that the rest of the world needed to be ruled by Europe
- Anti-democracy
  - Democratic only in the sense that it is for everyone
  - Other than that, it is authoritarian
- Importance of nature and land
  - One of the first ecological ideologies
  - Connection of people and their land they come from (nationalism)
  - Celebrated german country side – it signifies who they are as a people
- Mass behaviour
  - The masses are the most important force within history
  - The leader must direct the power of the masses
  - Appealing to the people's reason (liberalism), fascism says human beings collectively act as a mass, so a leader should channel that
  - Masses (like women) want to be dominated (the leader is a man)
  - No time for democracy, it weakens the state
- Freedom as based in the state
  - No freedom for individuals other than the state enacting its freedom
  - If you are part of the state, you will be free through the state
  - Free through a state that imposes on the rest of the world and emerges on top
  - Freedom of the master race (Aryan race for Hitler)
- Obedience
  - Masses should want to be obedient to the state
  - Asking 'why' has not instilled them the recognition the extraordinary power of the leader
- Nationalism/Racism
  - Some nations and races are superior
  - The strength is in unity and not class warfare
  - Identification with a particular race and the traditional peoples
  - Race (german) is better because of race, culture, geography, etc.
  - Inter-race children are bad
  - Jews were associated with communism, liberalism and enlightenment
    - Also seen as a threat to take over the world
- Anti-semitism/Aryanism

- Expansionism
  - Superior races have the right to expand to other areas
- The State
  - The state is the embodiment of the people and nation
  - Condition of the existence of the individual or group
  - Meaningless without state
  - Meant to be lead by the state
  - Parliamentary democracy is a sham, because the state should rule

## Fascism Today

- Don't associate with states
- Associate with behaviours
- Cultural elements
- Heritage Front
- KKK
- Aryan Nation
- Bombing in the federal building in 1995 – Bay
- Shooting at socialist camp in Norway – Claimed Fascism
- Fascists states that exist are one party
  - anti-trade union
  - organized against communist threat
  - unification of country against perceived threat (internal or external)
    - people taking natives jobs because of immigration
  - emphasis on national purity
    - there was an America before immigration 'take America back'
    - taken over by liberals and who represent liberal values (gay, feminism, etc) and immigrants
    - attempt to ride of Fascist techniques even if they are just super conservative
  - emphasis on religious, national, ethnic identities rather than class
  - control of culture and communities
  - strong authoritarianism/police and military control
    - often coming up with their own visualanti
    - groups in South that police Mexican boarder because they feel that police aren't doing the job

# POLS 110

## Fundamentalism

Lecture twenty one – November 12<sup>th</sup>

### Origins/History

- Adopted by group of Protestant Christians who rejected modern religious interpretations
- Wanted to believe in biblical and scriptural literalism
- Felt threatened by liberalism
- Extended to other religious movements with similar emphases
- Common use of term to mean anyone with strongly held political values/beliefs
  - i.e., feminist fundamentalists

### What Fundamentalism ISN'T

- Not all religious believers are fundamentalists
- Not equivalent to conservatism or 'right-wing'

- many are similar to conservatism or right-wing, but not the same thing
- Not equivalent to extremist
  - i.e., violence
  - some are extremists and fundamentalists but they are not the same
- Not the purview of any one religion

## What Is Fundamentalism?

- Against other things
  - Anti-modernity
    - Modern world has corrupted religion and religious authority, and traditions in ways that are corrupt
    - Modernity is the reason the 'right' type of family and relationship between women and men has crumbled
  - Anti-rationalist
    - You can't reach the proper understanding through reason
    - You can understand the world through faith and belief and the political system should reflect that
    - Reason is a problem because it is presumptuous of humans that WE think WE could possibly understand the world – only god knows
  - Anti-humanist
    - We are not the centre of the world
    - Theism (Deism?)
  - Anti-secularist
    - There should be no separation between church and state (like liberalism)
    - Sharia law
    - Be an example of what God wants on earth
  - Anti-liberal
    - Liberalism defines itself by progress, modernity, higher state, rationalist, importance of reason, humanists, secular, etc
    - Therefore, it is also anti-socialists and anti-feminist
  - Anti-western and anti-colonialist
    - West is associated with liberalism and modernity
    - We should not be promoting Western values
  - Divine authority
    - religious scripture reveals the literal word of god
    - elites are needed to interpret the word of god (supreme authority)
    - God has appointed the leaders
    - This authorizes inequality, if you are chosen by god to be whatever by god, that is the right way
    - Allows to see other belief systems as inferior
  - Absolutism
    - The religion is based on absolute principals that are one truth
    - Necessary to maintain that truth and set of beliefs found in the religious texts
    - i.e., excluding or punishing people who don't believe in the same religion
    - Fundamentalists pick some aspects of religions to stand up against and ignore other things (i.e., gays) Particular verses that get emphasized
  - Dualism
    - People are either good or bad
    - Us vs them mentality
    - Good vs evil
    - Can even include different sects of the same religion
  - Apocalypticism
    - The Armageddon
    - The rapture

- If you think the time is coming, you are less concerned about world issues
- Chosenness
  - Being chosen by god to be his representative
  - Dualist thinking – other people are not chosen because they were born into the wrong religion
  - Dispensational – you as an individual might have been chosen, or your people (i.e., Americans)
  - God speaks through earthly representatives through tongues (language no one can understand)
- Charismatic Leadership
  - Emotional quality that the religious leaders are supposed to convey
  - Seen when leaders make speeches
- Behavioural controls
  - also indicate who has been chosen
  - Fundamentalists of every religion have particular rituals that they are expected to partake in
  - Those who don't participate, are non-believers
  - Things you do and things you don't do

## Political System

- Theocracy – state should be based on god
- Religious leaders should be the political leaders and the political leaders should be religious
- The values of the state should mirror the values of the religion
- State can and should promote its power to correct religious beliefs
- God literally gave Israel to Jewish people
- State must promote correct behaviours
- Children should be taught in a religious setting in the school system
- Concern with democracy and its likely secularism
- In a society that has a number of different beliefs systems, democratic states have to consider all so therefore it'll end up secular
- That means that the state is unlikely to uphold religious values
- Concern that political or state failure may be consequence or lack of religious beliefs
  - The reason your son or daughter was killed was because America has gone soft on gays
  - Some muslims in 1967 thought that them loosing the war had to do with them going soft on muslim beliefs
- Social welfare should be religious charity not state benefit

## Analysis of Fundamentalism

- Sociologically/politically/economically
- Alliance building
- More concern about why people choose – who are the people behind us?
- What is the appeal of Islamic fundamentalism in the countries that see it growing?
- Same of Christian fundamentalists in the US
  - one idea is the rejection of the West and modernity
  - people feel dispossessed, and lost so they want to go back to fundamentals
- When is it dangerous? When should we be concerned?
  - Most political leaders have had one sort of religious faith or another
  - When is it 'fundamental' or 'dangerous'
  - Flags: whether or not religious leaders are unafraid of a nuclear holocaust or environmental damage
- Right wing association
  - Sees allies as being conservatives
  - People were told to vote for republicans because they were more likely going to be the party to support religious tendencies (against abortion, gay rights, pro religious schooling)
  - Fundamentalists were disappointed – Bush didn't seal the fundamentalist deal

- Socialists are typically 'godless'

#### Examples

- Christian religious right influence (Dominionism, CUFI)
  - Dominion-ism is a belief system that is based on one verse
  - 7 different compartments of life
  - God intends for Christians to be the leaders in every field (Business, government, etc.)
- Jewish Haredim sectarianism
- Islamic fundamentalists

## POLS 110

### Feminism

Lecture twenty two – November 14<sup>th</sup>

#### Basic Beliefs

- That women have been treated historically as lesser or inferior
- Feminists believe that this should change
- The oppression, discrimination and inequalities of all kinds should be fought
- Rejection of the view that some people are biologically superior and others are inferior
- Some traditional belief systems (anti-feminist) believe that women were made as an inferior sex and that they were made to serve men
- This rejection extends beyond sex to race, ability, class, sexuality, etc.
- These are not reasons for a group to dominate over other groups

#### Historical Emergence

- "Waves" of feminist politics and activism
- First wave (1800s to 1940s) – associated with suffrage movement and legal recognition
  - Women got it in Canada in 1918
  - By 40's in the West, women got the vote
  - Women died and were beaten during the suffrage movement
  - Women did not have the right to vote because politics was mans job and women's job was to be in the home taking care of the children
  - Fantastic 5
    - 5 women worked to get women recognized as person (1929)
- Second wave (1960s to present) – challenges to social roles (in the home), extensions of rights, solidarity movements between women's movement and many other 60's movements (linked to the rise of civil rights movement\*, gay rights, peace, THEY ALL BELIEVE THAT BIOLOGICAL DIFFERENCES DO NOT MAKE IT OKAY TO DOMINATE A DIFFERENT GROUP) equivalent demands
  - Economy was expanding and women were moving into the work force
  - More workers were required and the women started taking more jobs
  - But were still discriminated against (fired if engaged or married)
  - Invention of birth control pill – for the first time, women could control their pregnancy
    - This freed up women to experiment sexually
- Third Wave?
  - 1990's – present
  - Diversity, self-expression, right to express sexuality

- Idea of slut walks – police officer implied that women could avoid being sexually assaulted if they dressed more conservatively
  - You could walk naked, you still don't deserve to be sexually assaulted
- Lady Gaga – image of reclamation of sexuality, and self expression

## Relationship to Other Ideologies - “Extension”

- Radical feminism is not the second wave. All of these fall under the second wave.
- Takes existing ideologies and just extends them to women
- Liberalism
  - view that women are equally rational – that women are also individuals who deserve representation, freedom, equality, etc.
- Conservatism
  - feminism is necessary but there are different roles for men and women
  - value for women but in separate roles that should be values (homemaker, mother)
  - Sarah Pailin? Some people say that this is not feminism because it is unequal treatment
- Anarchism
  - radical feminism
  - that the anti-domination of women has been a model for all other types of domination – similar to anti-domination views of anarchism
  - If you want to know how to oppress someone, treat them like a woman
- Socialism
  - the importance of challenging oppression/exploitation of women's labour, double-work day
  - women who graduate here will learn 10,00 dollars less than a man who graduates high school, if they have the same job
  - = education and same job is 72c to a dollar
  - the double work day, men should help with the work at home

## Relationship to other ideologies - Critique

- Liberal Feminism
  - critique of notions of autonomy, reason, as limited representations of human nature
  - these are the assumptions of masculinity
  - women are expected not to be competitive or autonomous
  - they have been socialized that the expectation is to be naturally nurturing, and inclined to care for others
  - feminists would say liberalism needs broader tenets to include women
- Conservative Feminism
  - gains need to be made for women at the level of the state
  - saying
- Socialist feminism
  - challenging understanding of labour to include domestic labour
  - need to include an understanding of sexuality and violence in women's oppression
- Stats Canada did a revolutionary research survey on violence against women and more than 50% of people could have pressed charges
- Radical Feminism
  - challenge to conventional values and beliefs about gender – need to free women from the societal norm

## Major Tenets

- “The personal is political” - Expansion of the concept of the political
  - Feminism says even your relationship is political

- Critique of the public/private split in liberalism
  - i.e., the state has a particular role to play in the public sphere but not the private sphere
  - but then feminists said things that go on (sexuality) behind closed doors is political too
- Critique of 'patriarchy' – of rule by men
  - there is something inferior about being female
- Distinction of sex and gender, biological difference and difference based in culture/socialization
  - gender refers to the ways in which we are socialized
  - the reason why the reason becomes interesting is because the 'gender' isn't consistent around the world
- Inequality and/or oppression as focus
  - Origins: inequality = liberal feminism
    - irrationality – men dominate women because it is a hangover of bigger people dominating other people and that isn't rational
    - historical unfairness
    - the solution to inequality, is education
    - do people have to be 'the same' to be treated equally?
  - Oppression is a different model
    - not just based on unequal amounts
    - based on the idea that someone else is benefitting
      - slaves wasn't amount that someone had more power, the difference is that the slave owners are benefitting
    - I.M Young: 5 faces of oppression exploitation, violence, marginalization, powerlessness, cultural exclusion
    - Marilyn Frye: oppression as barriers, restrictions, immobilization – experiences as constraint and lack of choice
      - oppression works like a bird cage, it's not just one little wire – it is all the different wires of oppression
- Implications of socialization for human nature
  - Challenging conventional understanding of human nature
    - Assumptions based on the ways in which we understand masculinity
    - Possibility, if our 'nature' is socialized, that it could be socialized differently...
  - What assumptions are built into other ideologies?
    - Individualism, in rationality, in competitiveness (liberalism)
    - importance of stability and belonging (conservatism)
    - creativity/productivity/sociality (socialism) might each be characteristic of culture and socialization
  - Implications for politics
    - That human nature can be affected by society
    - That politics does not have to be based on
- Questions about identity
- Intersectional (class, race, cultural) differences
  - the point isn't meant to make everyone the same, but to make everyone equal
- We need to also recognize that human nature is different for men and women, so we need to look further into each ideology

## Lecture twenty three – November 18<sup>th</sup>

### Identities in Feminism

- What does it mean to be male or female
- Or even a different race
- Emphasis on challenging stereotypes, prejudices, preconceptions, about who people are, and what

that means

- Where do identities come from?
  - Are they natural, or nurture? Or a cultural combination?
  - What do cultural differences indicate?
  - Different cultures there are different assumptions made as to what being male or female means
- Goal of maximizing possibility for self-expression
- Goal of challenging gender norms and sex binary
- Goal of preserving human diversity

## Identity Politics

- Broad range of social movements based on identity
- Broadening understanding to what is political
  - told to sit at the back of the bus, restrictions on rights to health care
  - Malcom X told he couldn't be a lawyer by a teacher – political
- Analysis and perspectives of different identities important in challenging oppression and inequality
  - not just abstract
- Identities matter
  - how we understand ourselves and others
  - what is meaningful to us
  - the sorts of relationships with others that we enter
- Feminism as a social movement
  - part of a larger phenomenon of social movements, aiming to change not only governments or specific policies or pieces of legislation, but society as a whole
  - Experimentation with form (direct, participatory, democracy, skill sharing, anti-hierarchical)
  - Coalescing around particular issues and points of agreement
  - Participatory democracy
  - Skill Sharing, taking turns

## Anti-Racism as an ideology

- Shares features with feminism as ideology
  - Diverse array of opinions
  - Often allied with other ideological approaches (e.g. Liberalism, socialism, nationalism, feminism)
  - Interested in both oppression and equality
  - Human rights orientation
  - Interested in social construction of 'race'
    - tend to think as race that is given
    - but different societies have given race different meanings
- Differences with Feminism
  - Races have been associated with particular culture, ethnicity, and nations
    - Women are everywhere
  - Link to anti-racism to anti-colonialism

## Understanding Racialization

- Race as social construct based on perceived phenotypical differences
  - Skin colour = meaningful
  - Height = not meaningful
- Power of the dominant group to define what this means
- The view that intelligence, character, physical prowess, beauty, and political views are a consequence of race

## Intentional Racism

- Includes beliefs and practices at the individual, group, national level

- Belief in one's own racial superiority
- View that the West is doing the East a favour because they were incapable of self rule
- Belief in a hierarchy of races
- Mistrust, fear, hatred of others based on stereotypes, prejudices, beliefs, and also the idea that you
- Actions (like violence, discrimination, etc.) based on those beliefs
- Intentional racism is acting on the belief you are better

## Structural Racism

- Despite few people openly adhering to views of racial superiority and inferiority, society can still reproduce effects of racism
- Social processes can lead to racial inequality
- Racist beliefs infiltrate social treatment
- Examples:
  - property values linked to race residents
  - hurricane Katrina – coloured people were discouraged from getting mortgages so white people usually own more houses
- Indigenous treaty rights not followed
- Treatment of immigrants as suspect and inferior
  - immigrants are usually highly educated but can't get jobs here because we don't recognize their education because we deem it inferior
  - education – whose history? Which geography?
    - We don't know about others history of geography and a part of that can very well be structural racism
    - war and conflict can only be understood if you understand racism
    - so prominent in parts of the world

## Major Tenets of Racism

- Need to challenge social effects of race and racism
  - Canada needs more nurses so they are going to start taking more seriously the training of nurses from else where
  - Why wasn't that considered the case before?
- Racial oppression linked to other (e.g. Gender class) and vice versa
  - some of the assumptions are made in our society about women (weaker, passive, mentally inferior), are made about other races
- The stereotype for black women is not passivity, it is aggression
- Different forms of racism directed at different racialized groups
- Challenge justification for white domination
- Different views on how anti-racist future could be achieved
  - reform vs revolution
  - violence or non-violence
  - separatism vs unification
    - should we neglect the West?
    - Black nationalist groups suggesting that blacks needed to separate
  - etc

## Examples of Racism

- Slavery abolished in the US but supplanted with "Jim Crow" laws
  - laws that segregate the black and white socially
  - white bathrooms
  - continued to treat them differently
  - if you had one ancestor that was black, so were you
- Current 'mass incarceration' of African-Americans - "The New Jim Crow"
  - the main reasons for higher incarceration is war on drugs
  - they can't afford good lawyers

- white people are just as involved
- but they don't get caught
- Canada: Africville
  - African american community
  - Very polluted
  - Halifax chose to put the polluting manufacturers there
- Chinese headtax
- Japanese, German, Ukrainian interment during the 2<sup>nd</sup> world war
  - put in camps because they were considered suspicious

## Anti-indigenous Racism

- Presumption of inferiority – that 'less civilized' races would die out or join in
- If you were native male and you were literate, you could declare non native status
- Starvation policies to clear land for settling
  - Food promised and then denied, sick animals
- Lack of treaties or respect for treaties
- The 'sixties scoop'
  - People removed and put in foster care \* Keara's mom

## Anti-racist Responses

- ongoing historical resistance and self defence
- civil rights movement
  - liberal politics
  - MLK – assassinated 1968
- black nationalism
  - Malkom X
  - Father killed, mother is psych ward
  - Went to jail
  - Became Islam because it was resistant to white
  - Pro-segregation
  - Black panther movement – willingness to be violent
- Alliances with other social/political movements
  - X said he was tired of this, they wanted a pan-african movement

POLS 110

## Anti-Colonialism

Lecture twenty four – November 19<sup>th</sup>

## Roots of Colonialism

- Growth of empire
  - France, Italy, Portugal, etc wanted colonies to assist them in development
- What we now call the third world, was seen as a vast opportunity for resources (minerals, etc)
- Creation of dependencies/interdependencies
  - On the imperial power
  - And in turn, the imperial power would be dependent on the colonies for resources
- The scramble for Africa as an example
  - Berlin conference to divide up Africa
  - No leaders from Africa were in attendance
  - US wasn't there, but everyone else was

- Amongst them, they divided up Africa
- Each empire had it's own style of governments
- The worst was Belgium (DRC)
- Other examples linked also to trade routes, conquests
- The empire either draws back or is over thrown

## Anti-colonialism

- Redesigning economy and politics to suit local needs
- Disputes between tribes and groups
- When there is someone overseeing it, it is fine but when they leave, there are tensions
- Potential links to socialism
  - in the over throw, there was a turn towards socialism because they felt used
  - link colonizers to capitalism so there was an appeal to socialism
  - Mandela was a communist
- How to overthrow internalized racism?
  - Imposed on people that this is what is good for you
  - This is what you need
  - Inferior group
  - Internalized racism and colonization
  - So to overthrow them, it takes confidence to think that you didn't need them to begin with
- Nationalism and separatism as options
  - Countries kicking out EU's who were i the country
  - The only way to resist
- Meant to end Western dominance
- Lead thinkers were Frantz Fanon and Aime Cesaire as leading thinkers
  - celebrating African culture, opposing the racism to be more French because it is superior
  - the future of the world depended on it
  - anti-colonization emerged at the end of the 2<sup>nd</sup> world war
  - Fascism was evil within EU
- Cesaire – recivilizing of the world with a different approach
- Fanon – black people need to separate themselves in order to heal and start a new civilization
  - He justified violence as a way of doing this, when treated with violence, respond with violence
  - Apartheid

## Anti-Apartheid Activism

- Persistence of South African Apartheid
- Leaders – Mandela, Steve Biko
- Biko – completely non-racial society, where everyone is totally integrated
- Part of black consciousness movement”
  - wrong solution is to respond with violence, but the expectation that because we can be educated into non-violence, we can be educated into socialism

## Link to anti-racist, anti-war, and civil rights Organizing

- Malcom X – importance of separatism and nationalism

## Oriental-ism

- 1980's
- Edward Said
- Study of the 'orient' by historians, geographers, Western intellectuals
- Beliefs on what muslims and arabs were like
- Violent
- Irrational

- Hadn't advanced
- The study of orientalism justified the oppression of people in the East
- Critiques western reason
- Link to postmodern critique – that knowledge is power – that reason is 'motivated'
- Foucault and Said are closely linked

## Indigenous Anti-Settler Movement

- Idle-no more as contemporary examples
- Importance of land and resources
  - division of land in Canada
- Clearing of land
  - links between indigenous movements and environmentalism
  - Cracking is a practice of drilling

# POLS 110

## Environmentalism

Lecture twenty five – November 21<sup>st</sup>

### Origins

- Not just a grass roots, modern movement
- Earlier societies had closer links to landscape, were less capable of widespread damage
- Early 'utopian socialist' and/or anarchist communities were anti-industrial
- Marx's critique of capitalist alienation from nature
  - alienation from nature because you don't see it as something to live on, you see it as something to use and make money off of
- Fascist link of people to a landscape
  - appeal to sense of landscape
- Primarily, contemporary environmentalism is a response to recognition of the impact humans now are able to have on the environment
  - not about the above reasons
- Intergovernmental panel on climate change report – 95% certain that human activity is causing 'global warming' – likelihood of dramatic impact: starvation, poverty, flooding, storms, heatwaves, drought, disease, war, violence
  - concern that climate change was responsible for heightening the typhoon that hit two weeks ago in the Philippines
- Environmentalism says that unless we act and do something differently, the consequences are going to be catastrophic
- Climate change seems most prominent now, but the list of concerns also includes:
  - pollution: air, water, land (also light, noise, space)
  - damming/diversion
  - nuclear waste risks
  - deforestation, loss of species

### Responses Include

- Outright rejection of skepticism
- Discrediting of scientific views
- Concern that the views expressed arise from leftists (socialist and anarchist) ideologies
- View, for example, that "Earth Summit's Agenda 21" was an attempt to change all values, to rule the

world

- Liberal (neo-liberal) individualist environmentalism
  - buy green
  - invest green
  - emphasis on market solutions
    - dolphin tuna
    - you can change the world through shopping
    - use resources you have at your disposal to promote change
  - faith in technology
    - reason will overcome the environmental problems
    - and you will buy it
  - corporate responsibility – ‘greenwashing’
    - corporations will decide to turn by themselves, and we will support them
    - make yourself appear environmentalist
    - blue washing is pro human rights
    - corporate social responsibility reporting – has become part of our culture that corps are to some degree taking on environmental concerns
    - making attempts to brand themselves as ethical and interested in green technologies
  - voluntary restraints on behaviours
  - this view prevalent because it doesn’t challenge contemporary political culture, because it relies on individual initiatives, etc
  - confidence in individual, voluntary, technological and market solutions

## Social Liberal/Social Democratic Environmentalism

- Governments need to regulate because of high risks to environment
- There may be conflicts between corporate needs for profit and people’s needs for clean environments
  - pollution controls
  - companies saying they need to put in laws or else the competition will just be bad about the environment, and they can’t compete if they are trying to be good, because it costs more
- governments can influence consumer choices (e.g. Through carbon taxes)
  - encourage different kinds of investments
  - like taxes on cigarettes
- governments can influence research and technology (through tax incentives, research support)
- governments can assist somewhat in redistributing risks (planning for endangered areas, reducing poverty, etc)
  - the people who are most effected are those who are poor

## Radical & Socialist Environmentalism

- Capitalism is the problem
  - requires constant growth
  - at odds with planetary limits – we don’t live in a finite world
- Social democratic solution always risky because state power depends on support by capitalists
  - we expect the GDP to keep going up
- States will be reluctant to raise taxes, to limit investment, etc
- Constant growth is unsustainable – there are ‘limits to growth’

## Different Radical/Socialist Environmentalisms

- “deep ecology” - separation of culture from nature – often anti-humanist in rhetoric
  - needs of nature, above needs of humans
- “eco-socialism” - democratization of the economy to allow for alternatives to growth
  - what it sounds like
  - socialism not only redistributing wealth and labour, we also need to do this with the environment

- “social ecology” – end to all domination including domination of nature (Murray Bookchin)
  - anarchist
  - end to domination
  - add in end to domination of nature
- “eco feminism” - women are often the first to feel environmental damage
  - they are responsible to gather wood, water, cook, clean, etc
  - link of identity and experience to environmental outlook
  - the women are affected more
- “indigenous environmentalism” - link to culture, traditional practices and identity to environmentalism
  - land is sacred
  - you are only temporarily taking the land, and it belongs to the 7<sup>th</sup> generation
  - so you can’t damage it

## Environmental Challenges

- Answers vary based on political ideologies
- Representation – does nature have interests? What are they? How do we integrate these? Who represents nature’s interest?
- Time – what are our responsibilities toward future generations? Does our current political system recognize or allow for these?
  - Democratic theory says that it is much easier for politicians to get your vote if you tell them that this will effect them now, not so much the future
- Economic Growth – it is inherently problematic to continue to try to expand productivity? What is the cost to the planet and the future?
  - Radical
- Should markets prevail? Should profit be the main driver of our economy? Is this the best form of distribution of scarce resources?
  - Should it be given to the highest bidder, or to those in need?
- Self interestedness as a political and economic virtue within liberalism – what do we think of this in light of the needs of future generations, of other species, of the uneven distributions of risk?
- What can be done about the problem of irrationality about one’s own future needs and/or risks? Does our current version of democracy and capitalism reward shortsightedness?
- Should we be more concerned about the uneven distribution of power? Those who have most power are least likely to feel the effects of environmental damage
- Capitalism legally requires corporations to pursue profits and to pursue growth?
- Borders/Boundaries – environments cross borders – does it continue to make sense to think of national interests and decision making when it is an international problem and we are being affected by the decisions of others
  - as well, because environments cross borders – concerns over violence and war over scarce resources for example
  - for everyone in the world to eat like we do in NA, we would need 4 earths

## Lecture twenty six – November 25<sup>th</sup>

- It is wrong to think that men can represent women so it may be wrong to think that we can represent the environment or other species
- Key Terms
  - sustainability
    - 2 different ones: maximal vs minimal
    - minimal (absolute minimum) – future generations (should be) are guaranteed avoidance of

environmental catastrophe

- we are at .8 degrees higher, we can only survive at 2 (oh no! )
- maximal (best scenario) – future generations are left the opportunity to experience a level of environmental consumption at least equal to that of the present generation
- sustainable development
- bioregionalism

## Crises of Sustainability

- Causes
  - actions that ignore dependency of humans on ecosystems
  - economic institutions/relations compelling over-growing economic activity
  - moral justification of hierarchy over nature – nature as a resource to be bought and sold, used, exploited
  - measuring nature in terms of price, market value, etc.
- Precautionary Principle: the principle that allows for the likelihood and the possibility of human mistakes – that there may be irreversible consequences to our actions
- “We are guilty until proven innocent”
- If we are wrong, the stakes are too high to take that risk

## Sustainability Criteria

- 1) protect long-term stability of global ecosystems
- 2) preserve non-human nature and ecological diversity
- 3) ensure intergenerational equity for humans and other species
- 4) maintain stocks of renewable and non-renewable resources (fossil fuels)
  - if we keep burning the fuels that we already know exist, we will go over the 2 degrees, therefore, we need to let it be
- 5) protect earth’s waste assimilation capacities
  - use less packaging so it can compost
  - some sorts of waste are really hard to assimilate
- 6) foster human diversity and equity among individuals and among cultures, regions, countries, communities, and social groups
  - diversity is good and to live environmentally soundly may be in another culture
- 7) allow for human mistakes

## Bio-regionalism

- concentrate on local production
- small scale technologies
- risk reduction
- reduce waste and limit it to local assimilation capacities

# POLS100B Exam Review Booklet

## Key Concepts

Week One, Lecture two – January 7<sup>th</sup>

## What is Politics?

- Harold Lasswell” “Who gets what, when and how”

- power
- distribution
- material element – the what could be material/resources, cultural, access to power, etc.
- David Easton: “The authoritative allocation of values for a society”
  - power to distribute
  - focus on values
  - resource/material distribution will depend on values of a society
  - where as in the first definition, the ‘what’ is far more open – i.e., not just material
- Rod Hague, Martin Harrop, and Shaun Breslin view politics as the process by which groups make collective decisions
  - not necessarily distribution
  - focuses on politics as a process of collective decision making
  - any group decision making is politics – family around dinner table
  - it is not always collective, sometimes there is an authoritative leader – dad says who gets the dessert

## Comparative Politics

- A means of studying politics through comparisons; addressing important empirical questions about political life within polities/political systems
  - explaining political phenomenon, such as ethnic conflict, political violence, social movements, political parties, voter behaviour, elections, etc
  - learning about individual cases and explanatory theory building
  - Questions are asked such as why are some countries more democratic than others
  - Why are some authoritative?
  - Why are some more economically advanced or not
- Distinct from political theory, which deals with normative-theoretical questions (what ought to be)
  - is low participation good or bad
  - where as comparatists would ask which forms of participation choose to use?
- \*We are concerned with normative questions, but just in the real world
- Distinct from IR, which deals with interactions between polities (war,trade,etc)
  - Comparative politics focuses more on domestic
  - However, domestic and international also interact
  - i.e., If we ask why do states go to war with each other, it could very well have to do with domestic politics or economy and vise versa
    - i.e., we act in a certain way because we feel pressure from the UN

## Comparative Methods

- Different methods of doing comparisons:
  - Comparing across countries, regions, time periods to reveal similarities and differences
  - Qualitative comparisons (small number of cases or single case study) i.e., how does having a written constitution influence politics (UK vs. Canada)
  - Quantitative, statistical analysis (large-n) i.e., is voting behaviour influenced by gender (comparing a sample of male and female voters)
  - Deductive (begins with theory) vs. Inductive (starts with empirics)

# Key Concepts

Week Two, Lecture One – January 13<sup>th</sup>

## Research Assignment

- Posted on Moodle
- Topics of annotated bibliography assignment
- No essay

## Theoretical Approaches

- **Positivism vs Constructivism**
  - **positivism** assumes that there are real facts that are observable and very viable by different individuals
  - it also assumes objectivity (i.e., we can distinguish fact and value in such a way that we can distinguish real facts no matter what our values are)
    - this is a chair -> that is a fact
    - no matter what their background or experience is, they know that it is a chair
    - nothing to do with our ideology
  - they also argue that social facts are observable and verifiable in the same way
  - social phenomenon can be studied, like in the natural science -> through measurement, hypothesis, and formulation
  - there are right and wrong answers
  - social science is scientific
  
  - **constructivism** believes that 'facts' are socially imbedded
  - they disagree with the fact value distinction
  - you can't say its a five dollar bill because you can also say it is a piece of paper painted blue
  - there is no right or wrong
  - we say it is a five dollar bill because we are socialized that way -> we have constructed an intersubjective understanding that that piece of paper in particular has value
  - it is not objective -> all social phenomenon is social constructed and a product of our society and our social norms
  - therefore, social scientists can't stand outside political phenomenon because they are apart of it -> you can't be unbiased
  
  - **overall**, \*most social scientists believe there is some sort of construction, but at the same time most also believe that we can understand politics via scientific methods, that allow us to understand political phenomenon aside from their assumptions -> some explanations are better than others
  - but comparativists will say that one is better than the other
- Rational Choice (individual interests)
  - assumes that individuals are rational people
  - that are motivated by personal interests
  - and are strategic in their thinking
  - some rational choice theorists believe that interest is best understood in economic terms
  - but not all
  - people are goal oriented
  - i.e., people vote because they think that party best serves their interest, if their party doesn't have a chance, they might vote for the next one that doesn't have a chance, so they vote for the next best thing (strategic thinking)
- Political Culture (collective values and ideas)
  - very broad concept -> refers to accumulation of values, ideas and beliefs about the political system
  - a society will have a political culture in the broad sense
  - it can also speak about individuals
  - i.e., person x votes for NDP reflects their values #fuckharper

- it has nothing to do with interests
- Institutions (structures)
  - focuses on the impact of what we refer to as institutions on our political life
  - institutions = the rules of the game
  - provide us with constraints, laws and rules that shape our behaviour and choices
  - they also shape our understanding of who we are
  - i.e., why do we believe we are Canadian? -> it influences who we support in hockey
  - if state institutions didn't exist, we wouldn't believe we are Canadian, our values and behaviour would be different
  - there is a federal state that makes us behave in certain ways
- Economic Development (structures)
  - focuses in particular on relationships that are built around the economy, even if it sucks
  - argues that politics is structured around the economy
  - countries that are less prosperous are more likely to experience instability
  - when there is gaps between rich and poor, we are likely to see the poor organize and demand their rights
  - politics revolves around distribution of resources, people want access to goods (poor and rich)
  - it is about we are capitalists, or welfare state
  - about regulation of corporation and economic transaction
- International Environment
  - domestic politics is related to international politics
  - a country is more likely to develop into a democracy if the environment is democratic
  - an environment that is authoritative is going to influence

## States and Nations

Week Two, Lecture Two – January 14<sup>th</sup>

### States

- Max Weber (1864 – 1920) “A state is a human community the (successfully) claims the monopoly of the legitimate use of physical force within a given territory”
  - It is supreme
  - We are always subordinate to the state
  - If we rebel against the state, we are imprisoned
  - Think about taxes – the average citizen of the state pays around 35% of their earned income to the state (that's 1/3) that's 4 months working, without pay
- States are not always able to uphold their regulation of force
- Many times, they are challenged by others who compete for the use of physical force
  - i.e., organized crime
  - organized social groups rise up non-violently and protests
- Joel Migdal “Distinction between the image of the state (Weberian) and practice (varies between states)
  - we can say that the state has an Image, which Weber verified
  - but the practices are more diverse
  - states differ in their capacity to exercise control

## Institutions

- State – the set of institutions that ideally function according to the Weberian principals (bureaucracy, police, government ministries, local councils)
- Regime – type/system of government (parliamentary democracy, military dictatorship, etc)
- Government – the body and people that do the governing

## Concepts

- Sovereignty – belongs to the body that has the right to make laws for the country
  - much more than the surface
  - said to belong to the head of state, even if they are symbolic
  - the practical aspect
    - i.e., sovereignty in Canada is in parliament but technically it is the Queen
  - In order to exercise sovereignty you need authority
- Authority – the right to rule
  - coercive power is inefficient
  - rulers do have power but they need to translate power to authority so people will respect their power and have a right to rule
  - democracy
  - tribal elders

## Society

- Civil Society
  - Operational
    - organized in the realm between the state and the individual
    - autonomous from the state
    - voluntary membership
  - Normative
    - romanticized: civil operation to promote collective good

## Nations and States

- State = institutions
- Nation = people, population
- Nation State = state that belongs to a population
- Self-determination = nations have a right to determine their defining characteristics and govern themselves

# Nations and States

Week Three, Lecture One – January 20<sup>th</sup>

## 1<sup>st</sup> Assignment Instructions

- Tips
  - writing should be concise and precise! Avoid repetitions! Choose carefully to reflect accurate meaning
  - maintain formal style of academic writing. Avoid passive voice and first person; use quotation marks for article name
  - addressing the questions in the order that they are listed in the syllabus will a coherent structure. But be sure to write formally (i.e., not in a question answer form). Be sure to avoid a chronological description of contents!
- What phenomenon is the author trying to explain? To identify this, you could simply identify the research question that the author poses at the outset as well as what she defines as a 'puzzle'

- What is her core argument? (The answer to the research question) The core argument is a direct answer to the research question/puzzle
- What are the main supporting arguments? The arguments used to support the core argument
- What is the conventional wisdom that she is trying to refute? All those answers to the research question/puzzle that she claims to be unsatisfactory
- What evidence does she present to support her argument and debunk the alternatives?

## Nations and States

- State = institutions
- Nation = people, population
- Nation-state = state that belongs to a population
- Self-determination = nations have a right to determine their defining characteristics and govern themselves
  - This is said to be the theory that will bring about world peace
  - But in reality, most populations are multi-national and contain national minorities that don't see themselves as a part of the dominant nation that owns the state
- The state is seen as an expression of the nations political self-determination

## Periods of State Formation

- Western Europe from the late 15<sup>th</sup> century
- China pre- 'Western' modernity
- Latin America – early 19<sup>th</sup> century
- In the 20<sup>th</sup> century – the collapse of empires all over the world
  - following WWI (Turkey, Iran, Finland, Austria)
  - following WWII (African states, the Middle East)
  - following the collapse of communism (Eurasia)
- Period of 25 years where empires decolonization because its too expensive to keep colonies, therefore new states are created
- Russian Empire -> 90s
  - USSR
  - Communists
  - Communism collapses and all of the sudden all these republics make claims for independence (Ukraine, Lithuanian, Croatia, etc.)

## State Types

- Strong States – typically institutions that were built by local populations (N. America, China, Japan, Europe)
  - those that are able to claim the monopoly using legitimate force in a given territory
- Weak States – typically institutions left behind by colonizers that did not reflect social reality of local populations (most of Africa, the Middle East, South Asia, Latin America)
  - unable to exert their authority and can't function according to Weber's definition
  - found in post-colonial context because their state structure, and territorial boundaries are inherited from the colonizers and didn't emerge from within
- Failed States (collapsed) – govt's lose capability to function, primarily on human security (Sierra Leone, Colombia, Democratic Republic of Congo, Libya, Afghanistan)
  - consumed by civil wars and violence
  - cease delivering basic services to the residence (especially personal security)
  - incapable of adjudicating disputes (non-affective judiciary)
  - they can not collect tax – can't deliver services or function
  - can't permit drivers license
- Failed states can be resurrected
- Strong states can deteriorate
- Weak can become strong

# States and Regimes

Week Three, Lecture Two – January 21<sup>st</sup>

## State Structure

- Federal States
  - decentralized, making the central gov weaker
  - (provinces, states, etc)
  - distribution of authority between the two tiers of gov is constitutionally enshrined
    - the central gov can not decide to take away powers or authority from the lower levels
    - but they can withhold funding
  - Canada, US, India, Germany, Europe, Nigeria, Mexico, Brazil, Russia, Australia (all very big)
    - hard to govern large area from a centralized place so they disperse the power to lower levels
- Unitary States
  - highly concentrated in the hands of the central gov
  - the central gov has the authority to decide how much power lower levels of gov get
  - most states
- Confederations
  - union between sovereign states
  - 1991 - soviet union was confederation
  - local states decide to give up their authority to a higher tier government
  - the EU union is a confederation in the making
    - independent EU states are gradually giving up their power to a higher power

## Main Regime Types

- Democracies
  - i.e., US, UK, France, India, Botswana
- Authoritarian
  - i.e., Saudi Arabia, Zimbabwe, China, Burma
- Hybrid (Authoritarian with some elements of democracy)
  - i.e., Russia, Malaysia, Georgia
  - Transitions and static situations
  - corruption

## Attributes of Democracy

- Robert Dahl's characteristics of polyarchy
  - regular, free and fair elections for the major positions of government power (i.e., elected officials) at all levels
    - regular in the sense that they happen every few years (four or five years)
    - fair in the sense that the election results aren't rigged – all votes have equal weight
    - in corrupt regimes, people may be threatened if they don't vote a certain way
  - universal suffrage
    - suffrage should be inclusive
    - all adults have the right to vote and run
    - sometimes restrictions apply
      - some countries have restrictions for people with criminal past
      - age is also a restriction
  - (almost) universal right to compete for elected office
  - civil and political liberties that facilitate the integrity of political competition and participation, including freedom of expression, association, media (alternative sources of information)

- if people are being suppressed then they won't have honest votes
    - very important to have alternative sources of information that are protected by the law
      - regimes can shut down media outlets that other parties use and so that citizens can't get access to information that's critical of the gov
  - separation of powers – independent judiciary
    - to make sure that the government isn't abusing their authority
    - if it isn't independent, then the chances of equality are slim
  - supremacy of the rule of law and equality before the law
- No democracy perfectly meets these standards but in order to be considered a democracy, they need to hold a lot of them
  - Some countries are more democratic than others
- \*\*\*Procedural and Substantive Democracies?
- Most of the world we are familiar with are democratic, 116/192 are democracies
  - Not all democracies have a formal written constitution
    - The UK
  - Most restricted constitution is the US
    - Consider, the simple

## The Democratic Turn?

Week Four, Lecture One – January 27<sup>th</sup>

### Samuel Huntington: The Three Waves of Democratization

- Is it now the era of democracy? And if so, how has it come to be this way?
  - Because it wasn't always this way...
- First Wave: 1820s – 1920s: by the end of it there was 29 democracies (N. America and W. Europe)
    - Took over a century
    - The right to vote increases and expands and spreads
      - only to the male population
      - therefore, most of those countries that are considered democracies then, wouldn't be now
      - since there wasn't universal suffrage (half the adult population not being able to vote)
      - but in a historical context, it still counts
    - Reversal (set back) with the rise of fascism in Europe (1920s and 1930s – followed by WWI) (12 democracies in 1942)
    - 29 democracies to 12 democracies
  - Second Wave: Following WWII – early 1960s: 36 democracies
    - Has to do with decolonization
    - Countries that lost in WWII turned democracy (Germany)
    - Reversal 1960-1975: 30 democracies
  - Third Wave: 1974 – 1990s, most sweeping: 60 democracies in 1990 (Latin America, Asia, E. Europe, S. Europe)
    - Huge wave – tsunami

- Encompasses much of the rest of the world, outside of EU and N.A
- Asia, Taiwan, Latin America, and Eastern EU communist regimes democratize
- Dictatorships are replaced with democracies
- By 2008 121 democracies – Africa begins to democratize except North Africa and the Middle East
  
- Reversal since 2008? (116 in 2011)
- Thailand saw a military coup
- Since we are talking so far about a short period of time, its too early to say what we are observing
  
- Huntington says there are five major causes as to why the third wave happened
- 1) The Legitimacy Problems to Authoritarian Regimes
  - performance problems of Authoritarian Regimes
  - democracies perform better economically, militarily, and socially
  - populations see the authoritarian regimes as crappy, so they are losing legitimacy
- 2) The Economic Boom
  - economic growth has lead to the expansion of a more educated population, a rise in standard of living, and the emergence of the middle class
  - the middle class is important because historically, the middle class is the agent at the fore front of demanding regime openness
  - the middle class is the class where taxes are more extracted
  - if they are more on the rise, they have more of a say on how their money is being spent
  - they want more say in governance
- 3) The shift in the position of the Catholic church
  - Up until then, the church was very conservative
  - changed its position on authoritarianism
  - in the 70's many of the Catholic states (Latin America)
- 4) Exogenous Factors
  - changes in the policies of international actors (EU, US, Sov. Union)
  - the cold war had a strong ideological value to it
  - Soviet union promoted communism, and the US tried to spread democracy and capitalism
  - the two countries were attempting to spread their word around the world
- 5) The snow ball effect
  - not only countries that democratize but also regions
  - if one country in Latin America democratizes, other regions tend to democratize right after
  - currently, when we talk about the Arab Spring, countries in Northern Africa are democratizing one by one

## Important Distinctions Between Democracies

- There are different sub types of democracies
- Substantive/Liberal Democracies and procedural democracies
  - main difference is the structure of the executive
  - president of the executive is voted in directly by the population
  - voters vote for who they think should be elected as the head of the executive
  - the head does not need the confidence of the legislature, just the voters
  - United States of America
  - Americans vote for their president and their vice president in the same ticket
  - The president appoints the Cabinet (the rest of the exec)
    - Canada = ministers
    - US = secretaries
  - They do need to be approved by the legislature
  - The American Legislature is called congress
  - And it has the house of representatives and the senate

- Two chambers
- Each of these chambers gets elected independently of the president
- American voters vote every 4 years
- The senators gets elected for a period of 6 years
- But every 2 years, 1/3 of the senate is up for election
- The senate represents the federal structure of the United State
- Each state, irrespective of its size, gets 2 representatives
- The upper chamber ^
- The lower chamber is elected by the population and has representatives relevant to its size
- Both chambers and the president have to agree – there are many steps and veto points before a bill gets passed into law
- You could have a president from one party, the senate as the rival party and the chamber as the other party which makes for lots of negotiation
- Once there is an agreement in the chamber and the senate, the president can veto it or agree it
- \*cheques and balances
- No one element can have full control of all government actions
- It is supposed to be restraining and create tier-any
- Parliamentary democracies (UK and Canada), presidential democracies (US), semi-presidential (France, Poland)
- Majoritarian or Consensus

## Society and Political Culture

Week Four, Lecture Two – January 30<sup>th</sup>

### Us Presidential-ism

- Separation of powers between executive (president) and legislature (congress) – separate elections
- Bi-cameral legislature
  - lower chamber: house representatives (435 member/based on state size), elections every two years
  - upper chambers: senate (100 members, 2 per each state), elections for 1/3 of seats every two years
  - legislation requires approval of both chambers; conference committee for compromise
  - authority: fiscal; foreign commerce, declaration of war
    - when the president is the military chief, and that war is the best call, they need congressional approval
    - Busch didn't declare war – the congress declared it
    -
- President: head of state + head of executive + commander in chief
  - elections every 4 years, fixed terms, max. 2 terms following 1951 constitutional amendment
    - Franklin Roosevelt had more than two terms prior to this
  - head of executive signs all bills, can veto legislation
- Judiciary – supreme court
  - judicial review, arbitration between arms of government, power to interpret laws
- Obama says that congress has made it so difficult for him to do stuff, that he says he'll "go it alone" through executive orders
  - this isn't how its supposed to work
  - president can get around congressional approval
  - i.e., what if there is a mission in Afgan, the president (chief of staff of the military) and thinks # of soldiers needs to be increased by 10 times because now there are different fronts – are they new wars? If they aren't, because he decides they aren't, he doesn't need congressional support

- Congress can appeal the president and say that they are wrong – but the president usually has sufficient reasoning that he is right
- This is a system of separation of power and authority
- CHECKS AND BALANCES????
- 1990s – President Clinton was trying to be impeached (charged against the law)
  - did Clinton lie under oath?

## Majoritarian Parliamentary Democracy

### United Kingdom

- Great Britain and Northern Ireland
- 1. **Head of state:** Monarch, no executive and legislative powers but signs legislation and can vote
  - in the US the head of state is also the president and head of exec, the UK doesn't elect and the head of state is symbolic – the monarch
  - in order for a bill to turn into a law, the monarch has to sign and for decades we thought this was purely symbolic
  - there is symbolism in the fact that the Queen signs the bills, and turns them into laws – has to do with tradition
  - but recently, there has been leaks that this might be more than what we thought
  - that there has been attempts under the labour government to consider legislation that would limit and have influence on the palace and monetary issues (budgets that are allocated to the palace)
  - this didn't make it onto the table, because the queen would veto those bills (by not signing) – so to avoid embarrassment, they didn't make it to the floors
  - **\*BUT IF THEY TRIED TO PASS IT AND SHE SAID SHE WOULD VETO IT COULDN'T THEY SAY THAT IT IS JUST SYMBOLIC ANYWAYS SO FUCK HER?**
  - There is no confirmation, but no denials
  - This is unlikely for the Queen to do because most Brits are ready to be done with the institution
- 2. **Parliamentary Democracy:** Bicameral legislature: house of commons – elected 650 members, house of lords – unelected 760 members, life peers
  - Parliamentary vs Presidential
    - Talking about structures by which the legislature chooses the executive (parliamentary)
    - Presidential the executive is voted in
  - House of commons picks the prime minister (whoever is the leader of the party)
    - that's why people don't know their reps, because they know who the leader is and that's who is actually going to be the PM
  - In the UK the PM is a member of the legislature, but in the US they can't be
    - **\*DOES THE UK PM IN LEGISLATURE HAVE THE SAME WEIGHTED VOTE IN THE LEGISLATURE?**
  - Both the PMs and the Ministers will also be Mps
  - What if the PM's don't win their riding?
    - They can still be the PM, if the party chooses that (but that is really embarrassing, so the party typically picks someone else)
    - Typically they put them in a riding that they will win **\*HOW ARE THE RIDINGS DECIDED?**
  - For these reasons, the visions are likely to be similar
- House of Lords – a sober second thought of the house of commons
  - 1990's – too many lords
  - Blair introduced reform that managed to bring the number down to 760, and they need to approve every piece of legislation
- 3. **Electoral Rules:** Single member riding plurality (first past the post)
  - The country is divided into two ridings

- in the UK there are 650 ridings
  - in each riding, each candidate gets to represent that riding in parliament
  - to win the riding, the member must win the plurality of votes (not majority)
  - this means if there is three candidates, and one gets 40% and the other two get 30%, then the 40% wins
  - but when you x this by 650, you need at least 40% to get 60% in the house of parliament and form a government
  - issue – 40% voted for them, but 60% thought different – so what do we do?
- 4. **Executive:** PM, member of the party who controls a majority in the house of commons, requires the confidence of the house (typically single party, but since 2010, conservative – liberal democrat coalition)
    - No confidence motion – brings the gov down
    - Monarch is the only position that can invite someone from parliament and try and get the confidence of the house, or call new elections
    - Rarely happens because members of parliament from a winning party, and no incentive to change their status from winners to losers
      - if we bring down, our own PM, we might lose in the next election
    - Its easier to just replace the PM – they oust them as leaders internally
      - John Cretan – they lead him to step down, instead of ousting him
      - Paul Martin replaced him
    - Labour party in the UK did the same thing with Tony Blair with Warden Brown
      - he stepped down
      - **\*HAS ANYONE ACTUALLY BEEN OUSTED? - what does this look like?**
    - When they oust, usually they use the next election, but then they usually lose
  - 5. **Bureaucracy (Whitehall):** permanent secretaries (career civil servants)
  - 6. **Judiciary:** No unified written constitution – basis of system of gov't: Bill of Rights (1689), acts of parliament, tradition and convention
    - Supreme court established in 2009 as final court of appeals but no authority of judicial review

## Ethnicity and Nationalism

Week Five, Lecture One – February 4<sup>th</sup>

### Different Systems Favour Different Values

- Each system has its flaws, and therefore when a society picks a system, they are picking certain values
- Consensus parliamentary democracies: representatives
  - everyone and all interests (almost) are represented
  - but in many cases, it creates huge conflict
  - hard to reach a consensus, and often governments don't last 4 years
- Majoritarian parliamentary democracies: governance and stability
  - this is at the expense of checks and balances and representation
  - not everyone is represented, but they can actually govern
- Presidential systems: checks and balances
  - prevents tyranny
  - leads to internal conflict, and less stability

# Authoritarian Regimes

Week Five, Lecture One – February 4<sup>th</sup>

## New Topic \*

### Definitions

- Patrick O’Neil: “A political system in which a small group of individuals exercise power of the state without being constitutionally responsible to the public”
- David Samuels: “Non-democracies” (methods of selecting and removing leaders
  - this is highly contested (hybrid regimes – not democratic, but not authoritarian)
- Patrick’s is more accepted

### General Characteristics - FUCKIN LOVE GENERAL CHARACTERISTICS

- Highly centralized power in hands of few
- Regime exercises monopoly over political activity
  - opposing parties are banned, harassed, oppressed, etc
  - this includes parties and civil society groups
- Absence of free, fair, regular elections
  - if there are any elections, they are often rigged
  - the population is pressured to vote for a certain party
  - the voter turn out is always higher in authoritarian regimes
  - because the population is ‘encouraged’ (intimidated) to vote for incumbance
  - identify things in the platform of opposing parties to ban them from participating
    - i.e., in Iran only few candidates are permitted because everyone else doesn’t meet religious standards
    - in Syria, the constitution says only one party can run (Bath party)
    - use the constitution to preserve their legal authority
- Limited freedoms
  - freedom of association, civil society, freedom of press, freedom of speech
  - in contrast to Dahl’s polyarchy
  - reasoning: causing public disorder
    - i.e., in Russia it isn’t illegal to critique to president, but when they do critique, they are accused of causing public disorder – just masked in a different rhetoric
- Extensive coercion and suppression
  - authoritarian regimes use brutal suppression and coercion to stop popular mobilization
  - authoritarian regimes that manage to sustain themselves, are ones that have a coercive apparatus the functions
  - family ties are at the core of the centre of power
    - not just a characteristic of monarchies
    - DRC, Syria, Cuba, Iraq, etc.
  - It might not be family, but ideology that is at the centre common ground
    - fascism and communism don’t think that democracy is a proper way to go about social order
  - Totalitarian regimes control every aspect of social life

### Types

- Military regimes (Junta) (Myanmar)
  - common in Latin America until 1980s
  - existed in S Korea and Taiwan until 1980s
  - currently in Egypt
  - is more common in weak and failing states
  - the military comes up because governments suffer from instability and lack of legitimacy
  - military intervenes in politics and takes over the state to restore stability
  - some times through a coup

- coup – change in government that isn't regulated by the constitution (i.e., Egypt – military was unhappy with the president, so they came in and kicked him out)
- revolution – encompassing change, it revolves a change in the system of governance and regime type. Sometimes a change in the social order
- usually when the military intervenes, they promise to return to civilian rule once stability is restored
  - Turkey has seen numerous interventions by the military to oust rulers, but these coups only ever last 2 – 3 years and then return
  - Sometimes, military intervention might gain support, if it is seen as terminating corruption
  - Nigeria lasted 10 years, but also had support
- Single Party (Soviet Union, Syria)
- Monarchies (Power by hereditary rights) (S. Arabia, Brunei, Kuwait)
- Personalistic (Libya until 2011; Uganda under Idi Amin; Burkina Faso)
  - occurs when the dictator appears as the embodiment of the nation
  - he is the nation – the single person who can run the country without any formal checks/balances to keep tabs on him
  - he is not equal before the law, but is the law, he is not subject to the rules
  - he owns the state, and its society – they are his subjects
  - in democracies, elected officials are supposed to serve the people, and we evaluate whether they are serving us or not – “civil servants”
  - if we are unhappy, we can hold them accountable
  - in personalistic rule, it is the citizens that serve the ruler
  - no ideological basis for the regime – it is about the persona
  - Russia: neo-personalistic ruler
- Theocracies (Iran)
  -
- Totalitarianism refers to the extent of control 'total' – ideological and social control, highly coercive

## Ethnicity and Nationalism

Week Six, Lecture One – February 10<sup>th</sup>

### Types

- Military regimes (Junta) (Myanmar)
- Single Party (Soviet Union, Syria)
- Monarchies (power by hereditary rights) (S. Arabia, Brunei, Kuwait)
- Personalistic (Libya until 2011; Uganda under Idi Amin; Burkina Faso)
- Theocracies (Iran)
  - the religion itself is the form of government
  - religious institutions form the institutions of the state
  - i.e., Islamic Republic of Iran
    - Non-elected institutions
      - supreme leader (chief executive): Ayatollah Khomeini (1980 – 1989); Ali Khamenei (1989 – Present)
        - only ever 2
        - only replace after death, the appointment is for life
        - supreme leader has veto over everything
        - control over media, hierarchy, etc
        - most powerful
      - Supreme judicial council until 1989 (appointed by supreme leader)
        - most important judicial body
        - sort of like a supreme court

- supreme court that abides by religious law
  - all members are sr. Members of the clergy
- Guardian council (6 clerics appointed by supreme leader + 6 judges named by Majlis from a list compiled by the supreme judicial council) - responsible for approving all majlis legislation + approved all candidates for elections for elected institutions
  - its almost like a second chamber
  - as if every elected institution has a non-elected institution that oversees it and can veto it
  - sometimes there will be disputes between maigis and gaurdian council (re: US having a comittee that negotiates) well, thats where the expediency council comes in
- Expediency Council (appointed by supreme leader for 5 years) to resolve disputes between guardian council and majjis
  - often going to be on the clergys (conservatives) side because it is appointed
  -
- Elected Institutions
  - President (head of executive)
    - if order to be elected, you need to pass to get the approval of the majlis (religiosity) but then also elected, so they need to appeal to voters who are far less religiously oriented then the ruler and guardian council
    - interesting dynamic
    - changes policies
      - i.e., women couldn't go to soccer games – women dressed like men
      - policy changed and now there are segregated sections
      - point: politicians who are elected are usually the ones that are the most reformist in relationship to their competitors - most remote for clergy (Khamatami – won 75% of vote)
      - also makes us believe that these elections aren't rigged, because the clergy would rig it
      - Ahmadinejad – accused of rigging in 2005
  - Majlis (legislative body)
  - Essentially, they are parallel institutions
  - the non-elected institutions always have more power – rule of god
- Totalitarianism refers to the extent of control 'total' – ideological and social control, highly coercive

## Elected Institutions

- President
  - direct elections by population every 4 years; two terms limits
  - Candidates need approval of the guardian council
  - Ali Kamenei 1981 – 1989; Hashemi Rafsanjani (1989- 1997); Mohammed Khatami (1997 – 2005)

## Hybrid Regimes

Week Six, Lecture Two – February 11<sup>th</sup>

## General Characteristics

- Regularly held elections and universal suffrage but

- Manipulated of procedures to ensures incumbents win the elections
  - restriction of opposition
  - limitation on civil liberties and association
  - control over judiciary, security apparatus, media
- Hybrid regime when incumbents control all the institutions and the media, then they allow for elections when the competitors are at a disadvantage
- There is the potential for government turn over, but it is also authoritarian
- It is legally possible for the incumbents to lose, but it is unlikely
- The competition isn't fair, nor are the elections – hens the classification of hybrid regimes
- Larry Diamond: Pseudodemocracies instead of hybrid
- Levitsky and Way: Competitive Authoritarianism
  - there is competition, it is possible for authoritarian rulers to be ousted if they lose
- But in practice, they can only be considered free when there is fairness and equal opportunity for all parties
- It is also essential that voters aren't coerced
- Requires freedoms (of speech, association, etc). And if these are absent, then democracy doesn't exist. In hybrid regimes they are absent.
- Hybrid regimes have existed in the 70s, 60s, but weren't very common
- Far more common in the last 2 decades
- This is because democracy promotion has become a main foreign policy objective in the world
- Gained as a value – countries are pressured externally and internally to democratize
- But the elites don't value democracy because they will lose their privileges and alliance with the coercive apparatus
- Pressure to democratize + desire to retain political control = democratic facade
- Elections are essential for democracy, but on there own are not enough

## How Common and Where?

- How do we distinguish the boundaries?
  - Well the differences are impossible to measure, because it is so circumstantial
- Commonality:
  - depending on where the boundaries lie: between 45 – 60 at the beginning of 21<sup>st</sup> century (according to Larry Diamond)
- Where:
  - Eurasia/Post Communist: Ukraine, Georgia, Armenia
  - Latin America: Venezuela, Paraguay
  - Asia: Malaysia, E. Timor
  - Africa: Nigeria, Zambia, Tanzania
- These all manipulate the institutions to ensure they become re-elected
- What is interesting about all these cases is that many of them were previously under full authoritarianism
- The transition has been towards greater democracy, but the transition was halted
- This is a debate in political literature
- 1990s lit : predicted that the turn of democracy has come
  - 1991 – the soviet union collapsed
    - the world was considered bi-polar (the US and allies and the Soviet Union and its allies)
    - when the soviet union collapsed, Fukiyama coined the “end of history”
    - meaning that it was all going to be liberal democracy because thats what people want
    - he is often misrepresented
    - but the main point is that a few years later that those declarations of liberal democratic



- the man who was president, was a puppet of Puti, because it was forced
- The facade is so great, that Russia can not be characterized as hybrid, it must be authoritarian
- Russia also has a legislature, but because of those tensions, it never got to become a functioning legislature
- The population never really got a chance to get involved with Russian institutions because it was elite centred, and brought the transition to a halt.
- During that referendum, only 55% of people came out to vote – usually people are eager in early democracies
- No one came to vote because no one had information on it
- Point: We can't say that there is popular support when it was voted in because only 32% of Russians actually voted for it

## International Relations

Week Eight, Lecture One and Two – February 24<sup>th</sup>

### Real of Focus

- International Milieu
- Explaining IR phenomena: i.e., 9/11, global financial crisis, secession of South Sudan
- Questions:
  - International or inter-state, or World Politics?
    - International – nations refers to people and population
    - Inter state – state refers to a set of institutions that govern a territory
    - Are we interested in the various states or nations?
      - Different approaches have different answers
    - The term world politics is more inclusive than the other two
      - it implies that the political patterns in the world are not only those between nation states, but also between world entities that are just as important (international institutions that aren't necessarily states or nations (NGOs, MNCs, UN, WB))
      - some of these actors are known as transnational actors because they don't have borders
    - On the other hand, the conventional term is international relations because ... (see below) \*
  - How relevant is the domestic sphere for our analysis
    - Traditionally, scholars distinguished between the domestic and international in a definite, sharp way.
    - They weren't interested in the domestic
    - States were actors who acted in their own identifiable interests in a sphere of many states
    - What happened internally wasn't relevant to scholars of international relations
    - Now we realize that international is influenced by the domestic
      - i.e., we can't analyze the secession of South Sudan without understanding the nationalism within that nation/state
      - empirically oriented research shows that domestic matters
        - but if they matter is there really a distinction between comparative politics and international relations?
          - Some say that the lines are becoming more and more blurred
          - \* But there is still a distinction because in IR the phenomena are in the international milieu (it is always at the international level)

### Main Issues of Concern

- The international order and state system
- Security Studies

- Peace Conflict Studies (War)
- International Trade and Political Economy (IPE)
- Foreign Relations
- International Organizations
- International Law
- Nationalism and ethnicity
- Population movements (migration)
- Environment
- Poverty and Development
  - many of these are inter-related
  - and many overlap

## IR Theories

- So much material, so which things matter and which do not?
- Where would you start if you want to explain an important event?
  - How would you explain 9/11?
  - Whenever we are faced with these theories, we resort to theories
- Theories evolve formal models with hypothesis and assumptions
- But, theories are also a simplified device that allows us to decide which facts matter and which do not
- They involve a certain degree of general knowledge that goes beyond a particular event/case
- We are always using theories to yield different conclusions
- International relations scholars dispute which 'colours' the world should be seen in
- Mainstream Theories
  - Realism
  - Liberalism – dominant over the last century
  - Constructivism – replacing Marxism over the last two decades
- Alternative Theories
  - Marxism
  - Post-structuralism
  - Post-colonialism
    - these have also made gains, but they are less influential and less common
    - but this does not mean they are wrong – just fewer people follow them
- Distinction can be made between normative theories (involves ideals and how the world ought to be) and realist theories (stress how the world really is)
- The real world as seen by realists, isn't very pleasant
- This debate is old and has to do with the question of the role of scholarship
  - are we to describe what exists or to prescribe values for a better world?
  - one could argue that these are not mutually exclusive
    - i.e., in order to prescribe, we must know what the problem is!

## Realism

- Dominant way for explaining politics in the last 100 years
- Number of underlying assumptions
  - States as main actors
    - states = legal sovereign actors
    - sovereignty = for IR it means that there is no actor above the state that can compel it to act in another way
    - actors such as MNCs have to allow it to work within interstate relations
    - there is an assumption that states and nations overlap (hence the name of international relations)
    - but if it's true that states are the ruler it should be interstate relations

- based on comparative politics, we know that most states have multiple nations residing in them and that the state national identity reflects the ...
  - i.e., the nation of Quebec feels like the state doesn't represent their identity
- Realism doesn't think it should be world politics
- It thinks that all other institutions (NGOs) need to answer to the state
- Maximization of national interest
  - what makes states act the way they do?
  - This is where realists see human nature as centrally important
  - they argue that humans are selfish and self interested
  - this isn't a normative position, they aren't ought to be this way, this is an observation and to think otherwise would be naïve
  - If that's the case, then this assumption is elevated to the international level
  - states act to maximize their national interest
  - therefore, IR is a struggle of power between states, each trying to grow in power
- Realists see international politics as struggles of power between states -> balance of power
  - the balance of power is what dictates international politics
  - states act to prevent any one state from dominating
  - therefore, IR is about bargaining and alliances with diplomacy as a key mechanism of governing interests
  - a way of ensuring this is military force
  - since there is no sovereign body above the states, IR is a self help system in which states must rely on their own resources
    - financial resources
    - military resources
    - to achieve their objectives
    - usually done through alliances
    - but the potential for war is ever present
- Realists also like the term anarchism
  - they refer to IR as anarchism
  - this is largely related to the lack of any level of governance
  - not anarchy as the ideological sense, but the understanding of the international system as anarchic because there is nothing above states, therefore their interactions (which are driven by interest) are not subject to instituting goals
  - no overarching, central authority above the individual states
- Neorealism: Behaviour determined by structure
  - variant of realism
  - stresses the structure of the international political systems, and affects the behaviours of all states
  - structures here are not international law
  - example: during the cold war the USSR and the US dominated and the world was bi-polar
    - every other country was influenced by this bi polar structure and were forced to chose
    - when the US decided to boycott the olympics in Moscow, many alliances also did because they were influenced
    - then the cold war ended, world politics moved to a phase of mono polarity (one dominant power)
      - this was a brief period
      - but the behaviour of other states were influenced still
    - Now we are at a multi-polarity (Russia, China, etc) – not just the US
- Pessimism: War/conflict as a natural state of affairs (observation as opposing to endorsement)
  - however many realists have opposed war because it does not take into consideration the best interest of the state
  - they don't necessarily endorse military force, but they understand that it's how the world works
    - not surprising that realism emerged during world wars

## Liberalism

- Contrasts realism
- States are not the only actors
  - According to liberals, Important actors include international organizations, multinational corporations, transnational actors (these are not bound by the state system)
  - Liberals also question the realist assumption that states are the only actors
- States are not unitary actors -> 'national interest' depends on perspective (not) objectively identifiable
  - ideas matter
  - states are bureaucratic that have their own vision and interest, and therefore there isn't a single identifiable national interest as realist would have us believe
  - different governments would identify the national interests differently
    - it matters what ideology and power is in power to identify the state's national interests. For realists, the identity is identifiable from the outside and therefore should remain consistent
- Humans are social-able, perfectible; democracy as essential for perfectibility -> cooperation and interdependence (as opposing to self interest and war);
  - what is the best setting for cooperation?
  - Concerned with devising these setting so that positive objectives can be realized
  - therefore, world politics in the liberal view is complex system of different actors with different agendas
  - not to say that military isn't as important – but it isn't as restricted as the realist one (just to the military option)
- National interest: not just military, also economic, environmental, technological
- World order: interaction between laws, norms, international regimes, and institutional rules (as opposing just to balance of power)
- Democratic peace theory (below)
- Peace is natural order, not war – war and conflict are irregular where as peace is the most regular state of affairs
  - so if thats true, why is there so much war?
    - It depends on conditions according to liberals
    - conditions which allows humans to express their social-ability and allow for their improvement of human behaviour, is freedom
    - if people were free, and not repressed, the natural condition could come into play
    - \* democracy according to this theory is conducive to peace
  - Realists have an explanation for the world wars

## Social Constructivism

- Human agency plays significant role
- Understanding of world is not external to the people who live in it
  - Alexander Wendt (1992): “anarchy is what states make of it”
  - People make and remake their world (as opposing to fixed and regular)
  - Possibilities of human progress through action (“self help” is only one response to “anarchy”)
  - Possibilities of change to structures, identities, and interests
- Not the same as post modernists
- These guys argue that the social world is not external to the people who live in it
  - Realism and Liberalism stresses the realities and the laws of how the world works

## Marxism (Social Materialism)

- Always less influential than realism and liberalism
- World Order: global capitalist economy
- Main Actors: Classes (rather than states) -> multinational corporations, states, international organizations as representative of a dominant class

- Conflict between classes (rather than national interests), conceived in economic (rather than military) terms
- World connected/divided into core, semi-periphery, and periphery
  - core – economic power
  - periphery – where resources are extracted from
    - can have periphery within the core
  - semi-periphery – in between
- Sovereignty not important, all actors are subordinate to rules of global capitalist economy
- World politics is more of conflict between classes rather than states
- It is where one stands in the class struggle that matters

## International Order and World Politics

Week Nine, Lecture One – March 3<sup>rd</sup>

### Post colonialism

- Critical of “Eurocentric” focus
- World politics: power relations between previous colonizers and colonized (histories intertwined)
- We could understand world politics through its history of empires and colonizers, versus colonized
- Contemporary world politics is really an extension of that

### Introduction

- How is the world organized?
  - World of sovereign states
  - Except marxists say its a world of classes
- How did it come to be?
  - Centripetal and centrifugal trends
  - Theories of state formation
  - We don't think of it being constituted by empires -> its the states
  - State is a relatively new concept
  - cities (venice, sicily, were all independent) but they came together to form Italy
  - centre frugal -> something bigger collapses
  - 1648 -> the peace of westphalia

### Treaty of Westphalia

- October 24<sup>th</sup>, 1648
- Principles: Respect for
  - state sovereignty (external actors not allowed to intervene in domestic affairs of others)
  - territorial integrity = non-intervention
  - treaty started when the empire sought to impose Catholicism on Protestants
  - war was driven by power politics or religion politics and commercial interests
  - up until the trey territorial boundaries did no correspond with sovereignty
  - common for external actors to assume that they had a right to intervene and influence and provide an alternative source of authority to the local king or the local ruler
  - the HRE was guilty of this because the pope was supposed to be a political religious authority beyond the boundaries of the empire
  - Henry the 8<sup>th</sup> -> trying to get a divorce, the importance was that it was a battle for sovereignty. Who has the right to determine the rules in England? Was it the king or the head of the church? (pope) -> it was contested, not a given that it was the king
  - sovereignty was not unified
  - part of the 30 years war was over these issues

- to what extent is an outsider allowed to intervene in domestic affairs?
- End of the war came about through this treaty have a long period of negotiation, in which principal of domestic affairs had the upper hand -> no such thing as supranational authority
- they agreed to respect each others territorial boundary and sovereignty
- Treaty of Westphalia -> beginning of interstate system
- To what extent were they respected?
  - Wars did not end in 1648 and the map continued to change
  - certainly, was a Europe of empires which were expanding via colonization
  - still a world of empires rather than states
  - empires are states of sorts -> characteristics are the same
  - RE: Weber's definition of states
  - for our purposes, empires have those characteristics
  - The map on the eve of WW1 was a map of empires
  - IR theorists say that empires aren't really states because they are ruling outside of their boundaries but they have the characteristics
- How do we explain those transitions in world politics
- statehood that can explain imperialism

## Theories of State Transformation

- economy based explanations (Gellner)
  - argues that pre-modern society was a agrarian and most of the population was not geographically mobile
  - they lived there all their lives and inherited their position
  - patterns of authority were localized (feudalism)
  - locals weren't loyal to anyone else and had no attachments to neighbouring villages -> lot of the time spoke different languages
  - but industrialization meant a change of social order
  - fewer people were agrarian, more people started to work in the industrial sector
- needs of industrializing economy: mobile work force
  - factories opened, and then they closed and the economy wasn't as stable -> the labour force needed to be mobile
- standardize language
  - workers needed to be able to read the same language -> industrialized economy meant same languages because there needed to be communication if they were mobile
  - language of the elite
  - need standardization of education system - who can change that?
  - Institution that could reach out to the periphery
  - this institution is the state
  - so according to Gellner, the state was institutionalized to do just that
  - the industrialization of economy had certain requirements (mobile, language, education) which needed a centralized authority that could regulate it and that was the state
  - created centralized state -> single 'peoplehood', or nations
- War based accounts
  - "war made the state and the state made war" (Tilly)
  - War based account
    - Growth of empires -> war
    - extraction of means of war (arms, capital, etc) required a centralized coercive apparatus lead to states
  - need to mobilize hundreds and thousands of soldiers
  - requires resources and bureaucracy that can tax
  - the extend of taxation and its regularization is unparalleled

- poor people wouldn't allow themselves be taxed, so the means of extraction required a bureaucracy that could be coercive and paying soldiers well so they had incentive
  - Tilly recognizes states as different
  - they don't have the same capacities, so those that were successful, were able to expand their empires, extract resources from their colonies, and award their population
  - they needed rewards for their soldiers, their citizens, etc
  - those that were unsuccessful had their empires collapse
  - the expansion of empires through war was linked to commerce, and empire states that engaged in commercial activities
    - gave war making an advantage to those states
  - this account explains the formation and transformation of the state, but accounts for empires, which other theorists are short on
  - Westphalia alone and Gellner can't tell us about empires
- Nation expansion

## Theories of State Formation

Week Nine, Lecture Two – March 6<sup>th</sup>

### Intro

- Economy based explanations (Gellner)
- War based accounts
  - War made the state and the state made war – Tilly
  - Explains what Gellner can not – expansion of empires
  - Therefore, Tilly is preferred for scholars in IR
- Nation expansion

### Nation Expansion

- Not all states experience the same trends, this theory gives room for diversity
- The state and its institution and its national identity is an expression of a particular part of the population which plays a decisive role in state formation
  - Dominant core of population with some bureaucratic
  - But the population moves, and the institutions move along with it from the centre
  - Those institutions are the new state – the expanding state
  - They are often maned by the moving population
- Sometimes: population movements; followed by bureaucracy expansion
  - ex. China – Can be traced back to the Ming dynasty
  - it is really a Han state – this was the majority of the population
  - But then that population started to move away from the centre, and they were followed by the institutions of the Ming dynasty
  - This expanded territorial boundaries
  - and they included population that were not Han population
  - those populations were now governed by the Han institutions
  - The contemporary Chinese states was based on this
- New populations and bureaucracies overpowered pre-existing populations
  - ex. North America – natives
- New institutions reflected identities of the moving populations (nation-states that reflected 'core nation')
- Domination of new states reflected in: state name, cultural symbols, national holidays, positions of economic and political power, domination of state apparatus

- Victoria Day – official May long weekend – reflects our own cultural background
- 20 dollar bill, same idea – Queen’s face
- The English population moved to Canada and it’s institutions followed

## Imperial States

- Principle of population movement, occupying positions in expanded bureaucracy (French officers in Algeria; Russian speakers in Ukraine)
  - Ukraine in news
    - Russian speakers in East
    - Low scale migration in 16<sup>th</sup> and 17<sup>th</sup> century, but larger waves started in 18<sup>th</sup> and 19<sup>th</sup> centuries under Russian Empire. Economic and Political migrations
    - In early 20<sup>th</sup> century, ethnic Russian speakers were largest groups in many important cities (Kiev)
      - currently about 30% are native Russian speakers
    - Crimea Peninsula – joined Russia today (dominated by Russian speakers)
    - 100 years ago the capital had a majority of Russian speaking population, Donetsk is now majorly Russian (East)
    - the theory we just looked at would say that ...
- every successful empire has a governor who is native speaking
- by the end of WW1, Russian was the dominant language
- the Russian empire collapsed at the end of WW1, so from 1917 – 1920 Ukraine had a short self governance
- 1920 – 1991 the Soviet Union formed, non-nationalist ideology, (communist)
  - but at this point the local Ukraine population rejected the Russian’s
  - some times violence
  - when the Ukraine gets independence in 1991 it does not transition to democracy, it is a hybrid
  - neighbouring countries (Estonia and Latvia) stripped Russians of citizenship
    - UN made them change this
  - for Ukraine, they can’t just do that because they’ve been around since the 18<sup>th</sup> and 19<sup>th</sup> century
- Russians see themselves as part of the new establishment to ensure that the two states remain close
  - Estonia was aligned with the EU, where as Ukraine is aligned with Russia
- 2004 – Orange revolution
  - new president Yushchenko (Western oriented)
  - he was Ukraine, not Russia
  - 2006 – Yanukovich comes back as PM
  - 2012 – limited access for opposition to compete
  - Yanukovich started to back track on the EU agreements
  - People freak the fuck out
  - Winter 2014 – Yanukovich escapes Russia, interim government (Turchynov) recognized by the “West”, reports of Russian troops enter the Crimea regions
    - if Crimea joins Russia, there are less Russians in the Ukraine and therefore less alliances for Russia within Ukraine
  - Not just a domestic and internal fight, it is also EU versus Russia
  - Some are pro-Western by default because they are anti-Russian
    - but that doesn’t mean that they are democratic
    - they are more like fascists (racist, superior)
    - the policies that they advocate are not reflective of EU
    - Ukraine actually invited Nazi
      - your enemy is my enemy, therefore we are allies
- \*Lens of nation expansion theory and realist theory
  - realist – Russia as an empire, just wanting to expand

- Implications for Canada and US if Russia actually wins?
  - Much of the answer is no longer about immediate concrete goals
  - More to do with long term vision
  - Would it project an image of weakness of the West
  - Wasn't about the case, more about what it would imply
  - all about competition – realist theory
    - what self interest is at stake here?
  - Some say it is also about trade
    - liberal theory

## Principles of Woodrow Wilson's 14 Points

- Open covenants of peace and diplomacy for resolving disputes
- Absolute freedom of navigation upon the seas with some caveats
- Free trade and freedom to trade
  - empires can no longer block routes to pursue their own interests
  - sticking to treaties – treaties were signed but then broken before
- Sovereignty and rolling back of empires and colonialism, with particular emphasis fair treatment of post-imperial Russia, and decomposition of losing empires (Prussia, Austria-Hungary, Ottoman) central and Eastern Europeans countries (Balkans, Romania)
  - need some sort of international organization
- A readjustment of borders in EU (Italy, France whose territorial integrity violated by Prussia since 19<sup>th</sup> century))
- National self-determination to people under previous empires (Poland)
- Formation of an association of nations with specific 'covenants for the purpose of affording mutual guarantees of political independence and territorial integrity to great and small states alike"
- amount to **Liberal democratic peace**
- If people had freedom then people will be at peace
- Moving away from self interest, and opening up trade
- saw empires as source of law
- so he said all the losing empires needed to be dismantled
  - all these populations

## Foreign Policy and Diplomacy

### Week Eleven, Lecture One – March 17<sup>th</sup>

## Foreign Policy

- A subfield of study re-states' deal with each other
  - war and violence
  - diplomacy – the main mechanism for conducting inter-state relations
  - most states use diplomacy, not violence
  - security studies and foreign policy overlap
  - diplomacy as an alternative has a history – much older than the state

## Diplomacy

- Many forms and covers many issues
  - dispute resolution
  - treaties negotiation

- trade regulation
- collective environmental policy
- foreign aid
- international law

## Diplomacy Types

- 1) Formal diplomacy
  - official diplomats, heads of governments
  - it is done officially – official diplomacy of the state
- 2) Informal diplomacy
  - “track two” negotiations
  - done by citizens, business people, academics
  - heads of states are sometimes unaware its happening
  - they bring it back to their heads of government
  - if the policy makers like it, it becomes policy

## Formal Diplomacy

- Professional diplomats
- Heads of government get involved directly in diplomatic affairs, ‘diplomacy’
  - Reasons for getting involved:
    - Signal importance of the issue to:
      - 1) Counterpart – whoever is negotiating with, trying to signal that the issue is of the highest importance (Obama calling Putin)
      - 2) Domestic audience
      - 3) Allies
- US – state department, (ministry of foreign affairs for the US)
- Very high profile, considered as number 2 in the cabinet
  - indicates that foreign policy is highly regarded in policy formulation
- Some countries have consulates, these shouldn’t be confused with embassies
  - they do not do policy issues, just services to citizens

## Other Forms of Diplomacy

- Third party mediation
  - sometimes the parties want to resolve the problem but can’t come to a resolution, so they ask for third party help
  - sometimes it is for the third parties’ interest
  - requires that the mediator has clout – especially when they are doing it for themselves -
- Summit (coined by W Churchill) (bilateral and multilateral)
  - world leaders come together to discuss foreign policy
  - very useful for nuclear arms treaties
  - usually meet in EU
  - today, many observers take a more cynical view
    - where world leaders socialize, and nothing much happens.
    - This is not a meaningless gesture – it helps build trust
    - reasons for war – lack of trust and lack of information (especially for security)

## Informal Diplomacy – Track II

- Carried out away from the limelight, sometimes without knowledge without public officials
- Carried out by private citizens, academics, business people
- Particularly useful in peace negotiations
- Sometimes alongside track:

- example: Madrid Arab-Israel Summit (1991) and secret Oslo negotiations (1993)
- the US managed to achieve a diplomatic gain – it brought Israel and arab neighbours to have a summit in Madrid
- talked about the importance of peace
- after 2 years, very little was achieved – no concrete agreements were signed
- at the same time, a group of Israeli academics started to meet with second tier Palestine representatives, unofficially
- and they asked what would be acceptable to both sides?
  - These were just discussions but they eventually told their seniors
  - they did not go to the foreign minister, or the prime minister
  - made progress
  - 1993 – reached a stage where they could go to the PM and say we think we have a framework agreement for peace -> 2 years later they signed an agreement
  - \* good example of track II working better than formal diplomacy because it was away from the media frenzy
  - on the other hand, without track I grabbing all the attention, track II may not have worked

## International Institutions and Regimes

Week Eleven, Lecture Two – March 18<sup>th</sup>

### Definitions

- International institutions – norms, rules, and practices that constrain activity and shape expectations (e.g. Treaties, international law)
  - don't need organizations
  - the general agreement on tariffs and trade (WTO) has organizational infrastructure, and most people conceive of it as an organization, but its an institution because it sets off rules for how we should behave
  - formal rules vs informal rules – you don't show up to a birthday party without a present (informal institution)
    - we are expected to behave this way, and if they don't bring a present, we might think differently of them
    - we refer to these as customs
  - constitution is an institution
- International organizations (IOs) – physical entities with infrastructures, offices, and staff and letter heads (the UN)
- International regimes - “sets of implicit or explicit principles, norms, rules, and decision making procedures around which actors’ expectations converge in a given area of international relations” (Krasner 1983)
  - international regimes and institutions generate benefits for states
  - increase certainty, capacity to cooperate and create order
  - that's why states opt for them – OVER ORGANIZATIONS?

### Types of International Institutions

- Fundamental institutions – principal rules and norms (sovereignty)
  - difference between fundamental and constitutions – constitutional institution is needed for international society to exist
  - so the most basic constitution institution would be sovereignty and fundamental institutions would be the principles that rely on sovereignty
- Issue-specific institutions (refer to as regimes) – set of rules and norms that sovereign states agree upon to define legitimate actions in international society
  - visible and obvious

- 1933 - Montevideo Convention on the rights and duties of states, nuclear non-proliferation treaty; international covenant on civil and political right
- rules that states agree upon, but first sovereignty is needed

## International Law

- The most obvious institution is international law
- International law is a term that is used frequently in discourse and the media, everyone knows this term
- But what is it and how do we come by it and why is it there?
- Paradox in International Law:
  - default position traditionally is that international law matters little
  - why wouldn't it matter? It sounds catchy, and powerful but is a rhetoric tool
    - because power is invested in states – law is serving of the powerful states because they create the law that suits them
    - there isn't an enforcement mechanism to police the international law – the UN, but the US vetos everything
    - You can't put France behind bars
- Does it matter?
- No: law is subservient to states (realist)
- Yes: otherwise why the effort in the first place? States want to overcome problems of collaboration and cooperation (liberal institutionalists)
  - they wouldn't do the investment just for show
  - they also abide the treaties
  - more than what realists would say (just for show)
  - liberal institutionalists would say that it is there to increase certainty
- What constitutes law?
  - Treaties, (peace treaty of versailles 1919, UN Charter 1945) Multilateral consent
    - these are considered international law even if they are not enforceable
  - Custom – evolved over the years on the basis of agreed upon norms, i.e., diplomatic immunity, freedom of the seas
    - customs are more problematic than treaties because they are norms that have evolved over the years
    - i.e., diplomatic immunity – don't have to abide by the law
    - seas as non sovereign and non belonging to anyone
    - issue: what if there is a disagreement over customs?
      - “we never signed a treaty, this isn't a law”
  - UN security council operative resolution
    - not UN general assembly
    - ONLY the security council (US, Russia, China, UK, France – veto power)

## Problems of International Law

- 1. Consent (or lack thereof) and legal obligation
  - are they bound by the treat if they didn't sign it?
  - Is it just a formality?
  - Only the 5 have any sway
- 2. Rhetoric tool

# International Law

Week Twelve, Lecture One – March 24<sup>th</sup>, 2014

## Problems With International Law

- 1) Consent (or lack thereof) and legal obligation
- 2) Rhetoric tool
  
- International Law sounds very nice and compelling
- There is a problem that scholars have notes -> legal argument is rhetorical
- It's not just logical or about the law
- Or a sphere above politics
- Because it is made by states, it conserves their interest and becomes a rhetoric tool that doesn't get applied to all cases
- Especially the rule in interpretation – which rules apply when?
- International law is rhetorical as they are logical
  - i.e., Ukraine and Russia
  - legalistic argument that Ukraine can make – sovereignty laws -> they can't just can't come in and take away territory
  - legalistic argument that Russia can make – the right of referendum (even though it wasn't legit)
  - they also argue that historically, it was part of Russia and it was only by error that they passed the peninsula onto the Ukraine in the 50s
- The point isn't who is right or who is wrong, its that it becomes a rhetorical tool motivated by interest
- It is strategic – it could mean access to resources (gas, black sea, etc)
- There is a fear that international law is increasingly becoming a rhetorical tool rather than structuring state behaviour
- Critics say that it is inherent that international law would be this way because international law is created by states that are self interested so it is bound to become a tool than a guide to behaviour

## International Organizations (IOs)

- 3 types – text book only identifies two
- type 3 listed here is treated separately, and there is some merit to doing that
- scholars who focus on IO either focus on states formed organizations or non governmental organizations INGOs
- Many of the financial organizations fall under the category of type one (WB, IMF)
  
- Type 1: Established by states through multilateral agreements
  - purpose: creating some order in this system that lacks certainty
  - international governance: league of nations (following WW1) and UN
    - precisely to address those insecurity issues
    - not a government, but governance
    - governance – bring in order, but not through a centralized authority. Speaks about principles of organization, regulating behaviour. Prevents war – driven by idealist liberal way of thinking -> having right organizations in place will increase trust and certainty
    - government – authority that makes decisions for the rest of international society
  - collaboration and coordination: e.g. NATA, NAFTA
    - not all IO have to be encompassing all countries
    - can be regional
    - increase collective benefit if we coordinate economies and securities
  
- Type 2: Established by non state actors (transnational NGOs)
  - Promote a “universal good or value” - Human rights organization (amnesty); Environmental (green peace), Health (international women's health coalition)
  - Problem: Is international civil society a means of the privileged class to bypass governance?
    - Statistically
    - those who tend to be engaged tend to come from a very specific social sphere
    - usually wealthier, have resources, time, educated
    - and on the one hand that may be the case, but these issues are universal so why does it

- matter who is involved
      - on the other hand, if we value democracy and equality, a civil society (domestic or international) is a means for the privileged to pressure the government and so they have more say in politics than the average person in the world
- Financial Institutions
  - WB, IMF, Multinationals
    - text book: WB and IMF belong in class 1 and multinationals don't belong

## International Political Economy (IPE)

- There is an underlying assumption: there is some level of collaboration between states
- But there is also another level which includes some degree of globalization
- Main focus of IPE: How does the world economy work and what explains its evolution?
- Many lenses in which it can be studied, but we also have watershed moments and events that have shaped post WW2 economy
- Watershed moments and events
  - **Bretton Woods** (US - 1944) and the formation of key organizations: IMF (1946) to assist countries in crisis and international bank for reconstruction and development (later changed to WB) to rebuild pro war EU and later development in other countries; GATT (1947)
    - wanted to resolve to problems
    - 1) the great depression of the 30s
      - wanted to ensure it would never happen again
      - needed to establish a stable global monetary system
      - a system that would prevent crisis
    - 2) the EU economy was suffering as a result of WW2
      - needed to be resurrected
      - they planned and agreed on the information of key institutions (3) to promote new world economic order
      - 1 - IMF (1946) - a stable exchange rate regime, chose a currency that would be the standard currency of the world (USD), also wanted to assist countries facing temporary crisis in the economy by providing aid (loans on good terms, not meant to be paid back for profit)
      - 2 - IBRD (changed to WB) reconstruct EU. Once EU regained strength, the WB moved to developing countries
      - 3 - GATT (general agreements on taxes and tariffs) - general agreement on trade liberalization
  - Because the US was engaged in the cold war, and USSR rejected these institutions because it was communist, meant that the US was in charge and they would help their allies through these institutions
    - i.e., EU
    - **by the 60s EU was good and policy makers were diverging from American policy recommendations**
    - **one could argue that the economic integration of EU shaped international political economy**
    - but the crisis now makes us wonder if we are at a watershed moment again
  - Post colonialists would disagree because imperialist expansion precedes Bretton Woods -> they would say that globalization began when the EU started to colonize
  - Export Oriented Growth in Asia (1970's - 1980's)
    - new economic styles that focused on export
    - export economic growth
    - if they could manufacture things at a cheaper cost, they could sell them cheaper in bulk
    - this lead to huge growth at first for Japan and China
    - this was happening at a time where the US economy was suffering
  - Import substitute industrialization in L.America -> economic turndown

- different from Asia's economic policy
- lead to high inflation rates, rise of crime, poverty
- inward looking economic policy
- idea is that the country would produce, for itself, what it was importing before
- the industry would be planned such that LA could produce for themselves whatever they consumed
- they did this because the balance of trade was negative -> all imports were more expensive
- they were in the trade deficit
  - exporting tomatoes, and importing ketchup
  - so they started making ketchup but that wasn't their speciality, so inflation rates rose and poverty increased
- 1980s debt crisis -> structural adjustment policies
  - in Africa -> "the lost decade"
  - partly because of SAP
  - and also because of internal politics and social structures: corruption, bad management, etc.
  - For that reason, they had to turn to IMF and WB
  - these institutions are supposed to help in development -> providing loans at very good rates
  - terms are such that sometimes part of the loan is a grant
  - but conditions are SAP
  - which require structurally readjust the economies -> state has to be less involved
  - liberalizing trade, investing in health and education but going through the process of economic liberalization that reduced the role of the government in the economy
    - imagine the factories and industries that we are involved in were government owned
      - imagine GM was government owned, and the chair has capacity to appoint people, and you can build political alliances
      - it is conducive to corruption and it isn't economically efficient
      - so then who takes over?
        - Multinationals
  - controversy: does the "Washington consensus" reflect US interests? \*derogatory
    - SAPs sometimes called this ^
    - because it reflects the needs and wants of the US
    - the US wants to take over the industries -> who is in the best place to take over these industries? (the US)
    - given that most of the funds of the IMF and the WB come from the US means that they have veto power and the greater say
    - privatization, rolling back the role of the state in the economy
    - this gives an advantage to the MNC that are already existent
      - i.e., Nigeria needs economic help, WB says you need privatization because there is corruption, and the WB won't support corruption
      - Let market forces to their thing
      - The thing is, those who are best to take over are already in the business and are MNCs
      - As a result, locals can't take over and MNCs can take over the local industries
      - This is why it's called the Washington consensus
- WTO (1995)
  - It began operations in 1995 as a forum for negotiating international political issues
  - Trade agreements, trade regulation, intellectual property rights
- 21stC: a shift in global economic power?
  - Is there a power shift?
  - Latin American economies have grown substantially
    - out of the crisis
  - Asian are out of crisis, and making profit
    - China is not biggest economy, not the US
  - EU has been experiencing major economic crisis

- EU and US has many debts
- US also has crash of market
- Unclear to economists how the US can repay their debt
- The US consumes more than it produces