

Politics

1. What is it? How do we study it?
2. Broad or narrow?
3. Arena or a process?
4. Many of the later themes and readings picked up on this question:
 1. Different conceptions of power, legitimacy, democracy and different conceptions of politics itself

Thinking Politically Reading by Adrian Leftwich

Apartheid: The system of racial domination in South Africa

Why should we define the study of politics?

It's different everywhere we study so what would be available for discussion if we were to meet?

The role of structure and the role of agent differ when they come to changing political behaviour

- Structure: will look at the broad features in the social, economic and political structures of the society
 - An example would be that some argue that the more wealthy a state is the less corruption it has so the state of the structure impacts the overall politics of the country
 - Agents counts more on the single person or group then on the factors surrounding them
 - But all agents work within a particular context of hardships and opportunity and the relationship between both of them is what is the most important to grasp
1. The "rational choice" understands politics by stating that politics everywhere is a marketplace where people choose to pursue their interests in a way to max their benefits and min their costs
 - And this is on the assumption that people are rational agents calculating their own interests and advantages because their resources are scarce but their wants are many and when the structure changes some policies are altered and it may become more expensive over time so they have to rethink their priorities
 - In South Africa it appeared that the apartheid generated more benefits than cost - them holding the racial upper hand was beneficial to them and cost nothing because there was no actual resistance
 - And so in the 1980s when the protests became more violent the cost of maintaining the apartheid overtook the benefits
 - The final collapse can be explained by the people on both sides, the agents, recognizing throughout rational calculation the changing of costs and benefits and that their respective interests was in making a deal
 - Different individuals with common interests in the selfish pursuit of their own future, require that they first analyze the interests at stake and then balance it against the costs and benefits of the different political parties
 1. The Marxist conception of politics
 - Politics is class conflict therefore if there are no classes there are no politics
 - South Africa had the apartheid but the blacks started working because of the economic growth which lead to them joining organizations like strengthening the black political party and trade union organizations which pitted themselves against both the state and the white owners of the capital
 - With the revolution the economy declined threatening South Africa's capitalism and the relative power of the classes and so the only way to protect themselves from class conflict was to end the apartheid so
 1. Politics is about governing which means the governing or the organization and management of social, economic and governing life

- Refers to the governance which means the web of formal and informal rules norms and expectations that govern our society that if it didn't exist we would cease to be civilized
- Institutions are fundamental to politics which are a collection of rules and routines in terms of relations to roles and situations
- By assigning laws they reduce the uncertainty of how to act in diverse situations but has to be shaped by the members and have some kind of consensus among them
- Formal institutions: are recognizable by the rules and regulations constituting and governing things like organizations
- Informal institutions: unwritten rules or generally agreed ways on doing things
- Institutions are not confined but a political sphere
- More generally societies are usually more stable when there is consistency and continuity across their institutional spheres both private and public
- Where there is tension and inconsistency between practises of institutions problems of governance can become acute and at most outright conflict about which institutions should have their rules applied
 - South Africa has a formal institution: the government, had massive political interference in the markets of land labour and capital and they made racist rules
 - Aims of the government was white rule and the aims of the other institutions was to make profit which included blacks
 - It hurt economy growth and would have to be eliminated if capital growth was to occur from a capitalistic stand point

Three main questions:

1. Process or arena?
2. Extensive or limited?
3. Science or interpretation?

What is important to distinguish is that each of them have a particular method of inquiry and a priority of research questions which is why they each yield different explanations with obvious overlap

- By defining politics we are helping develop a consistency of thought and judgement
- You can define it using process or arena, the process it took to make a decision or the place the decision was made
- Arena makes the argument that it is characterized by who is in power and in which area
- They are less inclined to accept that politics is a generalized human process
- Process has a wider explanation that includes politics occurring passively in day to day life
- Some people who claim that arena is politics, they argue that its only when the government interferes directly, others when it is extended to any institution, maybe even to the extent of foreign involvement
- Others argue with process say that whenever the process is implemented peace is a likely outcome, and that war is the result of failure
- Is it science or interpretation?
 - Is it a deeper pattern, regulations and general laws below the surface
 - Or is it contingent on the role of accidents and agents of history?
- State capture: the manner in which private interests can capture the state illegitimately and undemocratically influence policy and practise in their direction
- Disciplines: defined by the intimate combination of their theoretical and conceptual works and their typical methodologies of inquiry

- Some are interested in the sources of power, others on rules and regulations and the global focus of everything

State

- Different theories and evolutions of states

3 Theories of the State

1) Pluralist theory

Pluralism

- Links to political liberalism
- Participation by groups, on a group level

Pluralism: Key Ideas

- Actors: interest groups (ex: bankers, brewers) and economic, ethnic, language, religion, identity based groups
- Interest groups can be sectional (economic) and promotional (identity, issues)
- No single group can exert systemic control
- Rough equilibrium in power among major groups
- Separation of economic from political power

Pluralism: the state

- Pressures from groups within society affect the state
- Neutral: state doesn't have its own interests but rather responds to others
- An instrument: not a set of structures
- State actions explained by sum of individuals' behaviour

Pluralism: criticisms

- Limited analysis of states that are identified as pluralist (liberal, democratic)
- Power can be unevenly distributed
- The state is not fully neutral

2) Elitist theory

Elitism

- Rejection of egalitarianism
- Elite domination is inevitable

Elitism: key concepts

- "Iron law of oligarchy" -> inevitably ruled by the few
- An elite will emerge in any society, even liberal democracies and socialist states
- Organization creates bureaucracy, cliques
- Bureaucracy develops its own interests, power-base
- Elite is not necessarily economic, elite can be military, religious, administrative, (1984!)
- Power isn't always visible

Elitism: criticisms

- Fatalist: there's an "iron law", don't bother protesting
- Authoritarian (even fascist) tendencies
- Overly-simplified

3) Marxist theory

Marxism

- Huge economic progress and poverty
- Understanding state as capitalist, see economy as defining social relations and the state

Marxism: key concepts

- Capitalism (vs feudalism)
- Classes, those who own the means of production (Bourgeoisie) exploit those who don't (Proletariat)

Marxism: Role of the state

- Capitalist state
- Creates and enforces market rules, ex: private property and contracts (laws, labour contracts, etc...)
- Discipline workers (rules around unions, strikes, etc...)
- Manages growth (and mitigates crisis tendencies)

Marxism: Contradictions (criticisms)

- Capitalist dynamic but prone to crisis
- Seeks maximum exploitation but also needs markets, ex: bring together people only to have the exploited people organize against you
- No discussion on race and gender
- Democracy may not matter much
 - What does the state actually look like? (Pearson reading)

Max Weber argues that a state should be defined by its means, rather than its goals and functions

Is a compulsory, political organization that features:

1. Monopoly over the means of violence
2. Territoriality
3. Sovereignty
4. Constitutionality
5. The rule of law/ impersonal power
6. Public bureaucracy
- 7. Authority and legitimacy**
8. Citizenship
9. Taxation (from Pearson)

Power

- Understanding what political power look like, its history and how it works?
- What form does power take?
 - Faces of power

One-dimensional power (decision-making)

- Pluralist conception of power
- Defining power as having influence over another
- It's about one's own interests
- Defines power as negative and controlling
- A measurable types of power that is visible
- Fairly narrow conception of politics as "decision-making"
- Power is to be understood in terms of effects
- Power is power over- negative
- Power is zero-sum
- Interests are easy to know- revealed through preferences (ex: interest groups)

Strengths

- Quantitative data

Weaknesses

- Assumes all things hold the same significance

Measuring One-dimensional power (decision-making)

Measurable because it's "transparent"

- Figure out interests
- Add up the decisions/ votes (quantitative analysis)
- Most wins= most power

1) Two-dimensional power (agenda-setting)

Two-dimensional power (agenda-setting)

- Neo-elitist conception of power
- Agenda-setting is what's open for discussion and what's not, who's in the room
- Non-decisions
- Scope of politics is broader, look beyond formal decisions (ex: backrooms, golf clubs, bars)

Measuring Two-dimensional power (agenda-setting)

Measure power differently

- Power is less transparent, look into backrooms, interview people
- A party may concede on minor things but still have most power

Strengths

- Benefits agenda setters

Weaknesses

- How do we value the weight
- People can get superstitious... what's happening in the backrooms with the elitists?

2) Three-dimensional power (preference shaping)

Three-dimensional power (preference shaping)

- Marxist (Gramscian) conception of power
- One is encouraged to conform, people don't ask deeper questions
- Indoctrination: the process of teaching a person/ group to accept a set of beliefs uncritically.

- "Faceless Power" in Foucault
 - A historical shift from sovereign to disciplinary power
 - The power changes us into a specific kind of person like prisons,
- Gender as a source of power
 - Starting to look at role of identity in politics
- Exceptionalist power
 - Normal and exceptional power

Normal power derived from three sources

- 1) Executive (PM and Cabinet) enforce laws
- 2) Legislative (Senate and HOC) make laws
- 3) Judicial interprets laws

Checks on normal power:

- Three branches of normal power (government)
- Constitution
- Charter of Rights and freedoms
 - Civil, political, cultural, eco, and societal rights
 - Early example is Habeus Corpus in the Magna Carter

Exceptional powers exist when there is a need for an efficient, temporary solution to a massive problem. It concentrates the power to the executive branch and can suspend liberal democratic rights.

3 Kinds of Exceptional power

1. Roman Model (from the reading)
 - a. The senate appoints a dictator
 - b. 6 months only
2. Emergency Powers (power goes to the executive branch) or the (NEO ROMAN MODEL)
 - a. Ex. The Weimar Republic after the Reichstag Fire Decree
 - b. During WW1 and WW2
 - c. France renewed their emergency powers 6 times since 2015
 - d. In Canada after the 1970 October Crisis, suspended Habeus Corpus and Freedom of speech
 - e. Emergencies Act of 1988 replaced the War Measures Act and now measures have to be reviewed by parliament and consistent with the charter
3. Legislative exceptionalism
 - a. US patriot act became the USA freedom act
 - b. Bill C-51 - increased CSIS intervention within the nation

Now Exceptionalism has become

1. Everyday Exceptionalism
 - a. That we accept as an infringement on our rights and is not temporary
 - i. Like constant surveillance and border control
2. Legislative Exceptionalism
 - a. Which is less extreme and obvious

Ferejohn and Pasquino Reading on Exceptionalism

- The whole reason for exceptional power is for conservation
- The roman's had a complete check on government authority which led to their need to establish a system to respond in times of emergencies
 - They made the Roman Senate appoint a Dictator for up to 6 months
- There is supposed to be no change in law and it was by temporary decree
- Opposing the Neo-Roman Model, the Roman Model chose a dictator that had special abilities, while the Neo-Roman model chooses the President, who won by popularity and because of democracy (may not be the most equipped)
 - The people declaring the state of emergency aren't the one's that are given power, also opposing the Neo-Roman model
- Now we are resorting to legislative exceptionalism
 - This may be the option because powers are hesitant to give that kind of dangerous power to someone
 - Or because their competence as a nation has grown and they can handle "emergencies" because they aren't really emergencies according to modern day
 - Supervises the authority of the legislature rather than complete faith
- The issues with legislative exceptionalism
 - Stalls the action, by the time laws are written and enacted
 - May interfere with the response to the crisis
 - And become embedded in the legal system
 - Which interferes with the liberties so many people fought for, so its like we are taking a step back
 - The conservative nature of the legislation is lost

- And since it is perpetuated, the actions may alter societal, and legal norms within the country

Legitimacy

- What makes a state's power legitimate through different lenses
- Problems for state legitimacy:
 - The state's failure to deal with:
 - New challenges
 - To represent new ideologies and interests
 - To deal with political complexity
 - Which leads to
 - A decline in voter turn-out
 - In part memberships
 - Increased cynicism about politics

Concepts and Definitions:

- Legitimacy and authority are closely related
- Authority as legitimate power
 - Not arbitrary, accepted as justified
 - By those ruled over
 - And by other rulers
- Weber's three types of political authority
 - **Traditional**
 - Why obey? Because tradition has dictated, based on futile, religious structures
 - **Charismatic**
 - Of a political leader, like Hitler
 - **Legal-rational**
 - Weber suggested its increasingly important
 - Bureaucracy, a source of authority because of a certain expertise
 - The law is rational and justified therefore we should obey

They are not mutually exclusive

Legitimacy

- Normative - is a state or a ruler legitimate?
 - *Should* it be obeyed? The ought, values of right or wrong
- **According to the leading theories:**
 - **Hobbes:** the state is protecting us
 - **Nationalism:** the state binds us
 - **Liberalism:** the state makes us free
- Empirical (positive) - do people accept state power and why?
 - *Is* it obeyed? And why?

Bases of Legitimacy

- Inputs - how do decisions get made?
 - Democracy, participative (consults with others) process
 - Rule of Law - constitutional process
 - Or in a theocracy - divinely chosen
- Outputs - how successfully do states solve problems?
 - Providing security
 - Protecting the rights and liberties

- Expressing the “general will” or national identity

Thomas Hobbes' goals (1588-1679)

- He is trying to demonstrate that we should subject ourselves to the absolute power of the sovereign
- **State of nature:** To show that anarchy is always worse
- Wants to justify state power by reference to the notion of a social contract
 - It made sense that we decided to have a greater authority

Logic of the text:

- The “state of nature”, which adds the whole premise of the argument
- It's in its essence a thought experiment: what if there was no sovereign authority?
 - He used the native Americans in the new Americas as a comparison, This is how people act without a civilized government
- Humans are by their nature equal and are motivated by passion
- These produce a “state of war” "where there were no common Power to feare”

Why isn't it always war then?

- **Humans desire peace**
 - There is a fear of death
 - Desire for things for “commodious living”
- **They are rational**, and they are able to establish a “commonwealth” - a sovereign power
 - “To confer all their power and strength upon one man or an assembly of men”
- Established via a contract (**covenant**) - between members
- “And covenants without the sword are but words”
 - Concentrate violence in order to secure peace
 - Tilly's war making is state making idea reinforced
- Sovereigns themselves are not part of the contract - they are still in the “state of nature”
 - There is no right or wrong in what they do
 - They cannot act unjustly (because in the state of nature there is no right or wrong)
 - **No opposition is legitimate**
- Sovereign power therefore is absolute
 - objective is peace and defines acceptable opinion
 - Sovereign power is not as hurtful as the lack of it

Why was Hobbes like this:

- Scientific revolution
 - New mechanical
 - Secularization
 - “Discovery” of the Americas - the role of the native Americans in the European imagination
 - Emerging commercial society
 - Emphasis on contract, pursuit of individual interests, decline of “traditional authority”
- Huge Social turmoil
 - Thirty years war (1618-1648)
 - Lived though the English Civil War
- Possibility of collapse into anarchy was legitimate and he actually lived through it

Thoreau (1817-1862)

- Legitimacy of the state is conditional, not absolute

- On how it is constituted :(Input)
- And on what it does :(output)
- Citizens have both rights and duties, to resist illegitimate governments

On legitimacy:

- How a legitimate state is constituted
 - Democracy: “to be strictly just, it (the government) must have the sanction and consent of the governed”
 - Consent must be active “I do not wish to be regarded as a member of any incorporated society”
 - Unlike Hobbes and Locke that consent is implicit
- A legitimate government should:
 - Be just:
 - *I cannot for an instant recognize that political organization as my government which is the slave’s government also*
 - Not fight unjust wars like the Mexican-American War
 - Respectable Individual rights:
 - *Is a democracy, such as we know it, the last improvement possible in government? Is it not possible to take a step further towards recognizing and organizing the rights of man? There will never be a really free and enlightened State until the State comes to recognize the individual as a higher and independent power*
 - The liberal side of it is the rights, and the protection of rights

On resistance

- As a right - simply assumes this, in opposition to Hobbes
- Voting is not enough of active consent, you need to act
 - Civil disobedience
 - Refusal to pay taxes to the government that is waging an unjust war
 - Prison is “the only house in a slave-state in which a free man can abide with honor.”

Context

- The American policies
 - Slavery until 1863
 - Us military expansion (Texas) and Mexican war (1846-48)
- American ideological heritage
 - Manifest destiny
 - American expansion that the United States not only could, but was destined to, stretch from coast to coast.
 - Hyper-individualism
 - Origins in rebellion against English rule
- Developments in liberal thought
 - From Hobbes to Locke and Montesquieu
 - Goal of states to promote individual freedom, not just security

Comparing Hobbes and Thoreau’s Legitimate Authority

Hobbes:

- Input - self interested, Consented - the contract
- Output
 - Security

- A little bit of commodious living
- Legitimacy is absolute

Thoreau:

- Input - democracy
- Output
 - limited - respect of individual rights
 - Justice - no slavery no militarism
- Legitimacy is conditional

Echoes of Hobbes:

- The international order as a “state of nature”
- The deployment of fear to secure consent
- The idea of politics as a social contract
- The idea of politics as about closing of self-interest (Interest groups in pluralistic power is an example)
- The idea that people can't restrain themselves without force
- Hobbesian ideas thus work to legitimize state power

Echoes of Thoreau:

- Other famous promoters of civil disobedience
 - eg. Ghandi
- Resistance movements
 - Civil rights, anti-colonial, peace, suffragettes, environmentalism
- Contemporary militarism
 - And anti-terrorism
- In American Society
 - Paradoxically - both movements to extend rights to all and libertarian republicans, tea party movement arguing from the right for an extremely limited states
 - His influence moves on both the right and the left
- What does the state actually do and in whose interests?
 - Three different theories: pluralist, elitist, marxist
- Where did it come from? The historical background
 - Tilly's account of the violent evolution of the state
- What kind of states are there?
 - Democracies, illiberal democracies, totalitarian states
- Social contract
 - Balance between security and liberty (which one should be favoured?)
 - To create a common wealth by agreeing because we are rational people
- Nationalism
 - Appeal to a common identity as a people
 - Imagined community that is powerful

Benedict Anderson on nationalism:

On the concept of nation: three paradoxes:

- 1) The objective modernity of nations to the historian's eye vs. the subjective antiquity in the eyes of the nationalists (from slides: nations are historically recent, but tell stories about being ancient)

- 2) The formal universality of nationality as a socio-cultural concept - in the modern world everyone can, should, will 'have' a nationality, as he or she 'has' a gender - vs. the irremediable particularity of its concrete manifestations, such as that, by definition, 'Greek' nationality is sui generis. (from slides: nations are imagined communities, for which a great many people have been willing to die) [I don't really see the connection here though]
- 3) The 'political' power of nationalism vs. their philosophical poverty and even incoherence. (from slides: nationalism is the source of great state authority, but is philosophically incoherent)

Definition of nation:

"It is an imagined political community - and imagined as both inherently limited and sovereign."

- Imagined because "even the smallest nation will never know most of their fellow members, meet them, or even hear of them"
- limited because "even the largest of them, encompassing perhaps [billions of living human beings], has finite, if elastic, boundaries, beyond which lie other nations"
- Sovereign because "the concept was born in an age in which Enlightenment and Revolution was destroying the legitimacy of divinely ordained, hierarchical dynastic realm."
- Community because "regardless of the actuality and exploitation that may prevail in each, the nation is always conceived as a deep, horizontal comradeship."

The shift in language:

- Vernaculars turned into languages-of-power, undermining and eroding the imagined community of christianity (through Latin)

The new imaginable communities:

- Imaginable because of capitalism
 - Interaction between a system of production and productive relations
- Imaginable because of the printing press
 - Technology of communication
- Imaginable because of the new power languages
 - The totality of human linguistic diversity

The print languages laid the basis for national consciousness:

- 1) They created unified fields of exchange
 - a) Fellow-readers
- 2) Print capitalism gave a new fixity to language
 - a) Helped to build that image of antiquity central to the subject idea of a nation
- 3) Print capitalism created languages-of-power
 - a) Different from the older administrative vernaculars

National consciousness is a result of the explosive interaction between capitalism, technology, and human linguistic diversity.

- Liberalism
 - Questions of liberty and equality and classic elements of justification for a state
 - Ideology that emerged out of enlightenment
 - Secularization of politics, individual rationality emergence, progress is possible, feudalism to capitalism, industrial revolution, and shift towards a commercial society

- Liberty is the most important value
- Equal opportunity and legal rights is also important
- Limits the interactions of a state to a degree
- Focus on individuals, prior to society
 - As rational and self-interested
 - As atomistic individual (not social)
 - As a moral being
- Belief in a market-economy being natural
 - Turning dangerous passion into useful (economic) interest
 - Individual interest → social good
 - Constraining power of the State
- Argument for a limited state (after Hobbes)
 - Provide laws, security & protect property rights
 - Rests on consent of governed
- Key thinkers: Hobbes, Locke, Smith, Mill, Wollstonecraft, Kant, Rawls & others
- Hobbes:
 - Social contract
 - Rational, self-interested individuals
 - Desire for commodious living (economic)
 - The need for a leviathan is significant
- Locke:
 - More benign state of nature
 - Natural rights (property leads to others)
 - Limited state that is supposed to uphold certain things
- Mill:
 - Utilitarianism → freedom is conducive to the greatest amount of happiness to the greatest amount of people → some pleasures more valuable than others: literature, music, art
 - The harm principle: only those actions that harm others → other regarding actions should be prevented by public opinion of the state.
 - Liberty: Mill located between classical liberalism and new liberalism → he justified limited state intervention and maximizing personal autonomy
 - Representative democracy: distinguishes between “true democracy” and the “ideal system”. Ideal system: plural voting based on education (the more educated you are, the more your vote counts). This builds on his idea of the democratic state as educational.
 - **On freedom:** it is important because it makes us happy, utilitarianism
 - Free press and free debate results in the best ideas being taken into consideration
 - Education is key
- Mary Wollenscraft:
 - A vindication of the Rights of Women
 - Minimal standard of living & education necessary to exercise freedoms (positive freedom)
- Social (or “new”) liberalism (late 19th century) → correcting inequalities of the market
- **Key LIBERAL CONCEPTS**
 - Freedom
 - Negative freedom: freedom of constraint

- Positive freedom: helps us be individuals with like healthcare
- Citizens must consent to the government
- Justice
 - To give people what they are entitled to
 - Procedural: the way of reaching the outcome is fair
 - Social: the outcome is fair (based on what criteria?)
- Equality
 - Hobbes argued that we are all equal, rational beings that are capable of killing one another
 - Challenges hierarchies
 - Legal equality: the rules are equal
 - Substantive equality: the effect of the rules are equal
 - Equal opportunity (link to gini coefficient)
 - **John Rawls:** that equality should be to the benefit of the disadvantaged and that liberty is still key

Freedom and Justice by Robert Garner

- Different definitions of freedom:
 - That we are able to pursue goods and values
 - That we are free from constraints
- The constraints on Freedom according to Garner:
 - Nondemocratic governments
 - Doesn't actually constrain, depends on the dictator
 - Physical incapacity
 - When a disability can be fixed but the government doesn't fund it
 - Physical coercion
 - Like imprisonment is too high of a cost of breaking the law that it constrains the individual lol
 - Rationality
 - Like we order around children and old people because they aren't rational
 - Which isn't rational because what is even rationality
 - Psychology
 - By commercial advertisements
 - Technology
 - And preference shaping in some governments
 - Economic impediments
 - You get freedom by giving people economic needs
 - Like Wollstonecraft's argument
- Negative Freedom: Locke
 - Give priority to individual autonomy
- Positive Freedom: Rousseau
 - Threats to capital system
- Tim Gray opposes saying that there are more types of freedom
- We can limit freedom to increase equality or we can define freedom as a thing that equalizes resources
- **Mill** argues that freedom is conducive on the greatest amount of happiness
 - Introduced the harm principle
 - True beliefs will trump bad beliefs in society so it doesn't matter if they are spread
 - Ex. homosexuality

- Opposition to Mill is **Devlin** who says that there is no such thing as private immorality, and communities share moral values
- There are always good reasons for states to intervene for example drugs are addictive so not everyone knows what's best for them also smoking
- **Justice**
 - Treatment and resources should be distributed equally
 - A meritocratic theory of justice, that everyone is rewarded based on their skills
 - **John Rawl**
 - Argues that if people were in an “original position” meaning they had no status, wealth, gender or any constraints, and they got to argue together what kind of government there is, everyone will still be self-interested for the “primary goods”
 - Each person has the equal right to the basic liberties which should be good for the least advantages
 - Ensures that the worst possible scenario is as good as it can be which is a model for a welfare state which he is opposed to
 - **Critiques of Rawl**
 - Should liberty always be the most important?
 - Robert Nozick, a liberal, would say that it's better to focus on procedural justice rather than social
 - How can you hold liberty to high account but also majorly distribute resources?
- **Alternative theories for justice**
 - Cosmopolitan theory
 - Not only justice in our country but for human beings as a whole
 - On a global scale, redistribute resources
 - Communitarianism
 - A society's culture, language and history will determine justice
 - Also a uniform form of justice is undesirable (like colonization again)
 - Green Political thought
 - We should be fair for our future generations
 - And to non human animals
 - Even ecosystems

And other contending ideologies

- **Conservatives**
 - Due to the rise of individual rationalisation and the movement towards more commercial behaviour
 - **Edmund Burke**
 - Criticized the french revolution
 - Empirical assumptions:
 - Society is above the individual
 - Human nature resorts to passion
 - There is a natural hierarchy
 - Normative assumptions:
 - Strong government
 - Skeptical of the free market
 - Upholds traditional values
 - Doesn't encourage change

- Socialist (Bernie Sanders, NDP)
 - Product of enlightenment but advocates for the working class
 - Empirical assumptions:
 - Optimist about humans (like conservatives)
 - Human are social beings
 - Normative assumptions:
 - Equality and freedom are essential
 - Economy needs to be more managed to become qual
 - State plays an important role in day to day lives
- Anarchist (occupy wall street movements)
 - Empirical assumptions:
 - Individual is important to society
 - Skeptical about government and constraints to freedom
 - Normative assumptions:
 - Freedom important
 - No state
 - Sometimes anti-capitalistic
- **The following new ideologies stemmed from:**
 - Social changes, immigration mobility, post-colonial independence, emergence from globalization trends
 - “Post Materialism” - don’t need to worry about material needs
 - “Most modernism” - no universal truths and skeptical about authority
 - Changing of class structure
 - Changing political relationships internationally
- Feminism
 - Gender is a social category
 - The personal is political
 - There is an importance of liberating from the patriarchal
 - How to increase legitimacy of state according to fem?
 - Change the social structure
 - Increase the representation of women
 - Will pose challenges to:
 - Representative systems
 - The welfare system workings
 - To the private spheres for issues like sexual harassment
- Religious fundamentalism
- Environmentalism
 - The core principles are attributed due to a post materialist world
 - Focuses on environmental sustainability
 - Nature is ethical implication
 - Nature and time is discussed
 - Anishinaabe and the concept of 7 generations
 - Implicates the economy and politics
 - Dark and light environmentalism
 - Dark is ecocentric, and light is weak anthropocentrism
 - Dark wants radical social change and weak wants reforms in existing system
 - Dark wants to limit growth and light wants sustainability

- There is a structural problem for the state responding to their needs, like priority of economic growth
- And the state's legitimacy is declining because the available parties are declining in legitimacy

Democracy

- **Understanding what it is where it comes from and how secure or fragile it might be**
- **The dominant mode of liberation**
- **Democratization and de-democratization**

The key basis for legitimacy:

1. Living in a state is compulsory
2. The input and output of laws
3. Social contract perspective: we can imagine choosing a democracy is within our state of nature

Defining Democracy:

Constitutional: what are the laws considering how political decisions are made?

The infringement of the rights to freedom, unless you subscribe it as a minimal infringement in accordance

Substantive: does the regime actually promote human welfare?

Procedural: are there competitive elections (does the government actually change?)

Process Oriented: are key democratic process continually present

- It's a matter of how democratic a state is
 - State capacity
 - The ability of the state to actually enforce its decisions
 - Political rights
 - Relation to the political participation
 - Civil liberties
 - Liberal and illiberal democracies

History of democracy:

- City-states of classical Greece
 - Citizen assembly with considerable power
 - Rotated civic roles and jury duty
 - Equal rights and obligations among citizens
 - Women, rights and slaves and foreigners not citizens
- Indigenous Six nations (In what's now North America)
 - Combination of elective and hereditary rights, checks and balances
- Other precursors in Europe: eg merchant oligarchies like Venice
 - Yet none filled all of the criteria that Tilly identifies: broad, equal, protected and binding

States become more democratic because

1. States have to negotiate with citizens to extract resources, and if it's dependent on agriculture or taxes
2. Revolution and other shocks loosens the holds on elites, and they become less effective to rule

Why do we see waves of de-democratization?

- From elite defection
 - Citizens passivity

- Defection of the elites
- Rapid reversal of democratization
- Because liberal governments are fragile
 - There was an explosion of democracy after the cold war that are losing ground today
 - There are erosion of attacks on the press, and informed debate
 - By limiting public information
 - The census was limited
 - Scientists as well
 - Undermining courts
 - Stifling debate

- **Representative, Participatory and Competitive elitist models**

- **How much participation is a good thing?**

- **Danger of populism**

Rousseau was one of the spokespeople for participatory democracy

The social contract theory

Active consent is crucial

Freedom comes from participation

“**The general will**” expression of common will and people feel ownership and if you’re a part of the process you don’t agree

Key requirements for participation: equality, independence, interdependence

Key benefits: education, political freedom, helps accept decisions made

Mill was another of the spokespeople for participatory democracy

Not necessarily efficient, and democracy helps educate us

Democracy should be at a local level, and expand upwards

Should start with private spheres

Elitist: people that rule should be the best educated, not everyone should have an equal voice

Schumpeter critiqued participatory democracy: was an elitist

Psychology of public is too easily swayed

General will is not possible

Weber mass politics is a threat to liberty because of the tyranny of the majority

Pateman requires thinking of democracy beyond formal politics

Argues that it results in a better decision: leads to more educated people and even better decisions

Problems of participatory

Weakness of participatory mechanisms

Political overload, it’s too expensive and damaging to the economy

Governments manage economy to maximize election chances

Which leads to failure of long term problems

What is competitive elitism?

- Limited participation is a good thing
- Democracy is the ability of people to choose its leader

- Competition regulates the megalomania of leaders and limits their power
- It's a very pessimistic approach to politics
- As a means to the end of efficiency and national greatness
- Do we lose liberties to help people

Expanding the realm of participation:

- Increased role for lobby groups
 - Transparency
- Referenda and recall processes: should they stay in place
- Decentralized processes in states
- The government will be forced to take ownership for everything when the information is available
- **Race, Religion and Ethnicity**
 - **Why do certain forms of identity become politically salient**
 - **It's not because they are dangerous to society but because they are socially constructed**
- **Consensual or conflictual?**

Consensual: coming to an agreement

Rationalistic approaches to Consensual:

- Pluralist models
- Individualistic approaches to democracy
- "Aggregative" model of politics (it's all adding up)
- Resolving differences through competition
 - Everyone accepts how the system is set up
- Politics as management
- People vote (rational voter paradox)

Deliberative approaches to Consensual:

- Debate and deliberation differentiate democracy from all other types of government
- Parliament is a place for talking and the process is usually out of consensus

Conflictual: consensus is not possible

Marxist approaches to Conflictual:

- Class conflict
- Containing the range of conflict is what politics is about
- Class homogeneity: making their interests our interests

Mouffe approaches to Conflictual:

- Politics vs. the political
- Theorists exclude the political
- Assuming that you can achieve consensus is dangerous
- Identity in itself is conflictual
 - Dichotomy of I am this not this
 - Someone is always excluded
 - One is always above the other
 - They are constructed for example nationalisms imagined community
- Agonism vs antagonism

- Adversaries rather than enemies should be the basis of democracy
- Political channels for agonism can reduce antagonisms
- Passion
 - Is in politics and should be there
 - We can't just evacuate it like deliberative or rational approaches
 - Channel passion so that bills can become partisan
 - We need to make the values iterated real

Essay Questions:

1. Is mass participation a potentially vital force in democratic societies today or a danger to political stability? In your answer, make sure to engage with the arguments of both those thinkers who have argued in favour of participation, and those who have argued against it.

Mill was another of the spokespeople for participatory democracy

Not necessarily efficient, and democracy helps educate us

Democracy should be at a local level, and expand upwards

Should start with private spheres

Elitist: people that rule should be the best educated, not everyone should have an equal voice

Rousseau was one of the spokespeople for participatory democracy

The social contract theory

Active consent is crucial

Freedom comes from participation

“**The general will**” expression of common will and people feel ownership and if you're a part of the process you agree

Key requirements for participation: equality, independence, interdependence

Key benefits: education, political freedom, helps accept decisions made

Carol Pateman: participation is the means of the end of democracy

Argues that it results in a better decision: leads to more educated people and even better decisions

Expanding the realm of participation:

- Increased role for lobby groups
 - Transparency
- Referenda and recall processes: should they stay in place
- Decentralized processes in states
- The government will be forced to take ownership for everything when the information is available

Schumpeter critiqued participatory democracy: was an **elitist**

Psychology of public is too easily swayed

General will is not possible

Weber mass politics is a threat to liberty because of the tyranny of the majority

What is competitive elitism?

- Limited participation is a good thing
- Democracy is the ability of people to choose its leader
- Competition regulates the megalomania of leaders and limits their power

- It's a very pessimistic approach to politics
- Results in efficiency and national greatness
- Do we lose liberties to help people

Problems of participatory

Weakness of participatory mechanisms

Political overload, it's too expensive and damaging to the economy

Governments manage economy to maximize election chances

Which leads to failure of long term problems

2. One of the most prevalent themes throughout this course is the influence of elitist theories of politics—whether it is relation to the state, power or democracy. Discuss, making sure to engage with elitist theories in all three (3) issue areas. Do you find these theories convincing or not?

Elitist democracy:

Elitist: people that rule should be the best educated, not everyone should have an equal voice

Schumpeter critiqued participatory democracy: was an elitist

Psychology of public is too easily swayed

General will is not possible

Weber mass politics is a threat to liberty because of the tyranny of the majority

Elitism state

- Rejection of egalitarianism
- Elite domination is inevitable

Elitism: key concepts

- “Iron law of oligarchy” -> inevitably ruled by the few
- An elite will emerge in any society, even liberal democracies and socialist states
- Organization creates bureaucracy, cliques
- Bureaucracy develops its own interests, power-base
- Elite is not necessarily economic, elite can be military, religious, administrative, (1984!)
- Power isn't always visible

Elitism: criticisms

- **Fatalist: there's an “iron law”, don't bother protesting**
- **Authoritarian (even fascist) tendencies**
- **Overly-simplified**

Agenda setting elitist power (Mills)

Two-dimensional power (agenda-setting)

- Neo-elitist conception of power
- **Agenda-setting is what's open for discussion and what's not, who's in the room**
- **Non-decisions**
- Scope of politics is broader, look beyond formal decisions (ex: back rooms, golf clubs, bars)

Measuring Two-dimensional power (agenda-setting)

Measure power differently

- Power is less transparent, look into backrooms, interview people
- A party may concede on minor things but still have most power

Strengths

- Benefits agenda setters

Weaknesses

- How do we value the weight
- People can get superstitious... what's happening in the back rooms with the elitists

4. Analyze the Quebec government's new law to ban the wearing of face coverings by anyone giving or receiving public services using some of the concepts discussed in this class, including at least three (3) of the following concepts: equality, liberty, identity, rights and democracy.

Liberty:

Freedom from, freedom to, which one is the niqab it is **negative freedom, to practise one's own religion?**

Look at **Bentham**, is it a burden on state resources and a restriction on freedom?

Those who want to limit freedom should make a strong case, Robert Dworkin that everyone is treated with equal concern and respect should be inviolable

Mill, Do we give priority to the individual right or to the collective.

Make a distinction that this is not cultural pluralism but freedom to practise one's religion. It is not in our religion to circumcise women, but it is in many african cultures,

Wearing the headscarf is decreed by religious law and this would counter religion not culture

Look at the harm principle, if the action harms others (look at statistics of crimes with women who wear hijab) self regarding others

Equality:

There is no substantial or legal equality in the matter, the result is that no one wears religious symbols and that is not the case in the niqab ban

Legal equality: the rules are equal

Substantive equality: the effect of the rules are equal

Equal opportunity (link to gini coefficient)

John Rawls: that inequality should be to the benefit of the disadvantaged and that liberty is still key

Rights and democracy:

The way to define democracy:

Constitutional: what are the laws considering how political decisions are made?

The infringement of the rights to freedom, unless you subscribe it as a minimal infringement in accordance

Substantive: does the regime actually promote human welfare?

Procedural: are there competitive elections

Process Oriented: are key democratic process continually present

6. What conception of politics (as an arena or a process) is implicit in the various theories of democracy? In your answer, be sure to discuss (and explain) at least three (3) of the following conceptions of democracy: participatory, elitist, deliberative, rationalist, agonistic.

- Discuss what arena and process are and choose the three types of conceptions of democracy, participatory, deliberative and elitist and explain each one of them
- Arena makes the argument that it is characterized by who is in power and in which area

Participatory:

Mill was another of the spokespeople for participatory democracy

Not necessarily efficient, and democracy helps educate us

Democracy should be at a local level, and expand upwards

Should start with private spheres

Pateman requires thinking of democracy beyond formal politics

Argues that it results in a better decision: leads to more educated people and even better decisions

Problems of participatory

Weakness of participatory mechanisms

Political overload, it's too expensive and damaging to the economy

Governments manage economy to maximize election chances

Which leads to failure of long term problems

Elitist:

Elitist: people that rule should be the best educated, not everyone should have an equal voice

Schumpeter critiqued participatory democracy: was an elitist

Psychology of public is too easily swayed

General will is not possible

Weber mass politics is a threat to liberty because of the tyranny of the majority

Rationalist: democracy is consensual

- Pluralist models
- Individualistic approaches to democracy
- "Aggregative" model of politics (it's all adding up)
- Resolving differences through competition
 - Everyone accepts how the system is set up
- Politics as management
- People vote (rational voter paradox)

Arena politics:

- You can define it using process or arena, the process it took to make a decision or the place the decision was made
- They are less inclined to accept that politics is a generalized human process
- Process has a wider explanation that includes politics occurring passively in day to day life
- Some people who claim that arena is politics, they argue that its only when the government interferes directly, others when it is extended to any institution, maybe even to the extent of foreign involvement

- Others argue with process say that whenever the process is implemented peace is a likely outcome, and that war is the result of failure

8. Although liberalism has its critics, it arguably remains the most powerful logic through which states seek to legitimize themselves today. Discuss some of the main elements of liberalism as well as those of two (2) of the following strands of criticism: conservative, feminist, Marxist, environmentalist, post-colonial. Has liberalism responded adequately to its critics?

What are the three elements of liberalism? **Maybe talk about where they came from?**

1. Focus on the individual
 - a. Not social beings, just moral
 - b. Integrity of the individual should be stored
2. Belief in a market economy
 - a. The passions are utilized to create a useful economy
 - b. Constraint the power of state to achieve this
3. Argument for a limited state
 - a. Provide basic natural rights like property
 - b. Rests on the consent of the governed

Because the ideology that emerged out of enlightenment

Secularization of politics, individual rationality emergence, progress is possible, feudalism to capitalism, industrial revolution, and shift towards a commercial society

The strands of criticism: **(and what they would argue instead so that it's a complete essay?)**

1. From liberals (Nozick)
 - a. Rawls would argue that equality of opportunity and substantive equality have gone too far
 - b. Focus more on private property like the estate taxes in America
2. From Conservatives (Burke)
 - a. Too optimistic about human nature
 - i. Human nature resorts to passion
 - ii. There is a natural hierarchy
 - b. Hierarchy and order trump liberty and equality
3. Marxist/socialist
 - a. That possessive individualism is at the core of liberalism
 - b. The free market economy is actually harmful
 - c. Economic inequality is corrosive to liberty and democracy
4. Feminist
 - a. Individualism is centered around masculinity
 - b. Formal equality is discriminatory to women
5. Post-colonial
 - a. Theorists like Mill and Locke were active in the British Empire
 - b. That Barbarians don't deserve equality, so then again who is the equality encompassing?