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IMPORTANT:
Section A (Theory) was substantially revised for 2015/16; Section B (Practice) was first taught and examined in its current form in 2014/15. Examination papers set before 2015 are not a good guide to the format of the First Public Examination.
Past examination papers are available on OXAM.

(1) Introduction to the Theory and Practice of Politics is composed of:
Section A (The Theory of Politics)
Section B (The Practice of Politics)

The two sections are taught through departmentally-provided lectures, delivered during Michaelmas and Hilary Terms, and college-provided tutorials and classes. They are examined together in the First Public Examination for PPE.

(2) Political Analysis provides an introduction to the methodology of empirical political analysis. It is taught in Hilary Term through 8 departmentally-provided lectures and 4 workshops, and is assessed by a 2000-word essay.
Examination Regulations 2022-23

(a) The Theory of Politics
Questions will be set on the following topics: (i) the nature and the grounds of rights; (ii) the nature and grounds of democracy; (iii) the role of civil society; (iv) power in the democratic state; (v) the nature and grounds of liberty; (vi) state paternalism; and (vii) free speech. Questions will also be set on the following texts: (i) John Locke, Second Treatise on Government; (ii) Jean-Jacques Rousseau, Social Contract; (iii) Alexis de Toqueville, Democracy in America; (iv) Karl Marx and Friedrich Engels, The Communist Manifesto; (v) John Stuart Mill, On Liberty.

(b) The Practice of Politics
Questions will be set on the following topics: (i) regime types; definition and measurement of variations between types of democracy; (ii) political institutions and practice outside the advanced industrial democracies; stability, state capacity and state formation; (iii) the state and its institutions (executives, legislatures, parties and party systems, electoral systems, courts, constitutions and centre-periphery relations); (iv) parties and party systems; political values and identity politics.

(It has come to our attention that there are three missing topics — revolutions or social movements, or democratic peace, and they will be added to the Regulations. In the meantime, tutors should continue to treat these topics as integral parts of the syllabus.)
SECTION A: THE THEORY OF POLITICS

Lectures: Monday at 10 am, exam schools - Please see the termly lecture lists for the most up-to-date schedules.

NEW FOR 2022-2023 – PLEASE NOTE THAT THE READINGS AND ESSAY QUESTIONS ON POWER AND THE DEMOCRATIC STATE IN SECTION 4.2 (POWER: RACE, EMPIRE, AND POLITICAL THEORY) HAVE REPLACED THE PREVIOUS SECTION 4.2 (POWER: WHO RULES?)

Aims and objectives:
Section A aims to familiarise students with major approaches to and issues in understanding political theory. Specifically, students will be encouraged:

1. to acquire knowledge and understanding of the basic concepts which inform theoretical and empirical discussion of politics, such as ‘rights’, ‘democracy’, ‘power’ and 'liberty';
2. to acquire knowledge and understanding of at least some of the core normative issues which concern democratic politics, such as the legitimate scope of state authority, the desirability of democracy, and the role of civil society;
3. to acquire knowledge and understanding of major theoretical frameworks used to understand the distribution and exercise of power in a state, including Marxist and pluralist approaches;
4. to acquire knowledge and understanding of, and to critically assess, the work of selected major political thinkers who have addressed major theoretical issues concerning democratic government;

Through a combination of lectures, classes and tutorials, students will acquire a basic grounding in all of these topics, though there will be considerable flexibility as to which topics students, in consultation with their tutors, elect to concentrate on in preparation for the Prelim exam.

Structure
The syllabus for Section A is organized into seven major topics. Questions will be asked on each of these topics in the Prelims exam. In addition questions will be asked on certain texts (Locke: Second Treatise on Government, Rousseau, Social Contract, Tocqueville, Democracy in America, Mill, On Liberty, and Marx The Communist Manifesto): these are referred to as basic texts. The basic texts have a clear relationship to the major topics, and students are encouraged to study texts and topics in conjunction, e.g., a student might spend 1 or 2 tutorials on The Social Contract and 1 or 2 tutorials on the nature and grounds of democracy. But the texts may also be studied in their own right, and questions on the texts in the exam may invite students to discuss any significant question raised by the texts. Thorough exploration of a given topic or basic text may reasonably take up more than one class or tutorial. It is necessary, therefore, for tutors to exercise a degree of selectivity in the topics and texts they teach. They can do so, however, assured that no topic or basic text will go uncovered in the Prelim exam.
PRELIMINARY READING

These readings are divided into two sections. Section A provides some general textbook introductions to the field. Section B readings raise questions about the nature of political theory and the “canon” in the history of political thought. Both should be useful both prior to and alongside the course as a whole.

Section A


Section B


TUTORIAL TOPICS

*** indicates a basic text.
* indicates a reading that is particularly recommended.

1. THE NATURE AND GROUNDS OF RIGHTS:

1.1 ASSOCIATED BASIC TEXT: LOCKE’S SECOND TREATISE ON GOVERNMENT

Core Reading:
*** Locke, John, *Second Treatise of Government*

Further Primary Reading:
Locke, John, *First Treatise of Government*

Secondary Reading:
Essays

• Why, according to Locke, is consent necessary for state legitimacy?
• Can individuals gain exclusive property rights by mixing labour with unowned goods?

1.2 RIGHTS

Core Reading:

Further Reading:

Finnis, John, Natural Law and Natural Rights (1980) ch 8.
Freeden, Michael, Rights (1991)
* Jones, Peter, Rights (1994)
Shue, Henry, Basic Rights (1980)

Essays

• Can rights conflict?
• Can states legitimately violate the rights of their citizens?

2. THE NATURE AND GROUNDS OF DEMOCRACY

2.1 ASSOCIATED BASIC TEXT: ROUSSEAU’S THE SOCIAL CONTRACT

Core Reading:


Further Primary Reading:

Rousseau, J-J, ‘Discourse on the origins of inequality among men’ [1755] (also known as ‘The Second Discourse’) in Rousseau: The Discourses and Other Early Political Writings (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1997).

Rousseau, J-J, Emile, or, On Education (multiple editions). [This is Rousseau’s short novel, published in the months after The Social Contract. Again, it gives you key insights into how he thought a young person should be raised in his ideal society. It will also give you critical purchase on the limitations of his case, and a perspective on who his texts were written for, and who they ignored.]

Further Secondary Reading:

* Bertram, Christopher, Rousseau and the Social Contract (2003) [available online via SOLO] 
* Cohen, Joshua, Rousseau: A Community of Equals (2010) [available online via SOLO]
* Okin, Susan, Women in Western Political Thought (Princeton, 2013), Part III, Chs 5-8.
Rawls, John Lectures on the History of Political Philosophy (2007), 1st lecture on Rousseau
Spector, Céline, Rousseau (2019).

Two useful podcasts are the BBC Radio 4 ‘In Our Time’ episode on The Social Contract and Professor Lane’s ‘Philosophy Bites’ podcast on Rousseau and Civilisation: https://www.bbc.co.uk/programmes/b008w3xm http://philosophybites.com/2008/07/melissa-lane-on.html

Essays:

- What problem is Rousseau seeking to solve in The Social Contract? To what extent does his proposal succeed in addressing this problem?
- In what senses are individual citizens in Rousseau’s state ‘free’?

2.2 DEMOCRACY: WHAT IS IT? IS IT DESIRABLE?
Core Reading:

* Young, Iris Marion, Inclusion and Democracy (2000), chapter 1.
Further Reading


* Fishkin, James S., Democracy and Deliberation: New Directions for Democratic Reform, (1991), chapters 1-6, 8.


Essays:

- Does a commitment to democracy require accepting the decisions of the majority regardless of the content of that decision?
- Is democracy necessary for liberty?
- How defensible is deliberative democracy?

3. THE ROLE OF CIVIL SOCIETY
3.1 ASSOCIATED BASIC TEXT: TOCQUEVILLE’S DEMOCRACY IN AMERICA

Basic reading:

Alexis de Tocqueville, Democracy in America,
Volume 1: Author’s Introduction; Part 1, chapters 3-5; Part 2, chapters 1-9
Volume 2: Part 1, Ch 7 and 15-17; Part 2, chapters 1-13; Part 3, Ch 8 – 13, 21; Part 4, chapters 1-8.

Further Primary Reading:


Secondary Reading:

* The Cambridge Companion to Tocqueville, esp essays by Villa, Richter and Gannett.

* Pitts, Jennifer, ‘Tocqueville and the Algeria Question’, in Pitts, A Turn to Empire (Princeton NJ, 2005), ch. 7.


Welch, Cheryl, De Tocqueville, 2001, especially chapter 2.

Essays:
- Is de Tocqueville an optimist or a pessimist about the prospects for democracy?
- What, in de Tocqueville’s view, are the virtues and what are the vices of democratic government?
- What is the role of freedom in de Tocqueville’s theory of democracy?

3.2 CIVIL SOCIETY

Basic reading:
- de Tocqueville, Alexis, Democracy in America, Volume 1, Author’s Introduction; Part 1, chapters 3-5; Part 2, chapters 6-9, Volume 2, Part 2, chapters 1-8; Part 4, chapters 1-8.

Essays:
- Why do some political scientists think that a strong 'civil society' is essential to effective democratic government? Are they right to think so?
- In what way or ways does a vibrant associational life contribute to the health of a democratic polity?
What is 'civic engagement'? How have political scientists attempted to explain differences across democracies and/or over time in the level and quality of civic engagement?

4. POWER IN THE DEMOCRATIC STATE

4.1 ASSOCIATED BASIC TEXT: THE COMMUNIST MANIFESTO

*** Karl Marx, *The Communist Manifesto*

Secondary Reading:


Terrell Carver and James Farr (edited), *The Cambridge Companion to the Communist Manifesto* (Cambridge, 2015) [access online via SOLO] (Especially editors intro and essays by Leopold, Martin, Farr/Ball and Panitch.)


* Elster, Jon, *An Introduction to Karl Marx*, 1986. 5 Prelims 2011-12


'Colonialism' in the *Stanford Encyclopaedia of Philosophy*, 'Section 4: Marxism and Leninism':
https://plato.stanford.edu/entries/colonialism/#MarLen

Essays:

- Assess Marx’s claim that the capitalist state is ‘but a committee for managing the common affairs of the whole bourgeoisie’.
- Explain Marx’s account of the relationship between technological and political change.
- Why should the capitalist state give way to communist society, according to Marx?
- Is Marx right to think that the state could wither away?
- Explain and evaluate Marx’s theory of the ‘dictatorship of the proletariat’.

4.2 POWER: RACE, EMPIRE, AND POLITICAL THEORY

Core Reading:


Further Primary Reading:
Further Reading:
James Tully, “Aboriginal Property and Western Theory: Recovering a Middle Ground” (1994)
David Armitage, “John Locke: Theorist of Empire?” In Empire and Modern Political Thought, ed. Sankar Muthu (2012)
Uday Mehta, “Progress, Civilization, and Consent,” Liberalism and Empire (1999)
Barbara Arneil, John Locke and Colonialism: The Defence of English Colonialism (1996)
Andrew Sartori, Liberalism in Empire (2015), ch.1
Onur Ulas Ince, Colonial Capitalism and the Dilemmas of Liberalism (2019)
Vine Deloria, Caster Died for Your Sins (1969)
Duncan Bell, “John Stuart Mill on the Colonies” Political Theory (2010)
Burke Hendrix, Deborah Baumold (eds), Colonial Exchanges: Political Theory and the Agency of the Colonized (2017)

Essays:

- John Stuart Mill’s On Liberty is a text about general theoretical principles (e.g. the harm principle) that is also attached to particular forms of power politics (e.g. the ongoing domination of societies “in their nonage.”) Why, according to Mills and/or Mehta, does this matter?
- “In the beginning, all the world was America.” Discuss in relation to two of the three Core Readings (Mills, Mehta, or Lebovics).

5. THE NATURE AND GROUNDS OF LIBERTY
5.1 ASSOCIATED BASIC TEXT: MILL’S ON LIBERTY
Basic reading:

Further Primary Reading:

Secondary Sources:

The Cambridge Companion to Mill, chs 7, 8, 9, 10, 11.
Okin, Susan, Women in Western Political Thought (Princeton, 1979), chap 9.
Essays:
- Is Mill’s harm principle a clear and plausible basis for evaluating the community’s efforts to restrict individual freedom?
- How persuasive is Mill’s defence of freedom of expression?
- What place does ‘rationality’ have in Mill’s theory of liberty?
- Does Mill make a compelling case against state paternalism?
- Does Mill’s celebration of individuality subvert the needs of citizenship?

5.2 THE CONCEPT OF LIBERTY

Roberts, Neil, Freedom as Marronage (Chicago, 2015
Skinner, Quentin, Liberty Before Liberalism, 1998, especially chapter 2..

Essays:
• Is there a single concept of liberty underpinning the many ways in which the term is used by political thinkers?
• Is liberty primarily about the absence of law or the authorship of law?
• How (if at all) do economic circumstances affect an individual’s liberty?

6. STATE PATERNALISM:

Core Reading:
Devlin, Patrick, *The Enforcement of Morals*, (1965)

Further Reading:

Essays
• Should the state restrict people’s freedom for their own good?
• Would it be wrong for citizens to disobey paternalistic laws?

7. FREE SPEECH

Core Reading:
* MacKinnon, Catherine, *Feminism Unmodified: Discourses on Life and Law* (1987),

Further Reading:
* Parekh, Bhikhu, 'The Rushdie Affair: Research Agenda for Political Philosophy', 709, also in Kymlicka, Will, ed., *The Rights of Minority Cultures*, ch 14
* Wolff, Jonathan, *An Introduction to Political Philosophy*ch 4
Dworkin, Ronald, 'Is there a right to pornography?', *Oxford Journal of Legal Studies* 1 no. 2 (1981), pp. 177-212
Ten, C. L., *Mill on Liberty* (1980), Ch. 8
Lewis, Anthony, *Freedom for the Thought That We Hate* (2007)
Hare, Ivan and Weinstein, James, *Extreme Speech and Democracy* (2009)
White, Stuart, ‘Freedom of Association and the Right to Exclude’, *Journal of Political Philosophy* 5
SECTION B: THE PRACTICE OF POLITICS

Lectures: Wednesday and Friday at 10am, Exam Schools. Please see the termly lecture lists for the most up-to-date schedules.

Aims and Objectives
These tutorials introduce you firstly to the way government is classified across democratic regimes, and to debates about the merits and drawbacks of each type: particularly the implications for political stability, and for policy performance. In this section of your tutorial work (Section I) there is an explicit link with the work you will do in the Political Analysis lectures and classes.

The next set of tutorial topics considers political institutions under a range of regimes with different governance structures (Section II) as well as exploring issues relating to race, gender and colonialism. In this section general questions are asked about the nature of the state: where it comes from, and what determines differences between states – particularly in terms of democratic and authoritarian regimes (3) and ‘state capacity’ (4). There are then two topics on political contestation, examining the roles and impacts of social movements (5) and revolutions (6) and in modern politics.

The next set (Section III) considers key government institutions, the debates surrounding each type of institution, and the issues that arise when comparing specific institutions among countries. In this section you look mainly at the key dynamic tension between legislature (7) and executive (8), though you also consider the operation of counter-powers against majoritarian government (9) (based in the judiciary, direct democracy, decentralisation etc.). Topic 10 considers whether the presence of democratic institutions determines states’ engagement in war-making.

Finally, the tutorials examine what determines the shape and operation of political parties and the party system (11 and 12), and the extent to which the values and attitudes on which political appear to be changing, why this is so, and how we might measure such changes. In this section (IV), you consider not only stable attitudes and structured partisan competition, but also more deeply divided and contested politics, and sources of populism and radicalism, and identity politics (13).

Objectives
- To introduce you to regime classification and comparison, to develop your understanding of the conditions for democratic government and political stability
- To develop your analytical skills.
- To introduce you to social science methodology in the context of historical explanation and comparative analysis.
- To provide you with a sense of the social, intellectual and geographical diversity of practices and approaches to the study of politics
TUTORIAL TOPICS

I. Constitutional variations under democracy
1. Presidentialism and Parliamentarism

What is the difference between a presidential, semi-presidential, and parliamentary system? What other variables does the real-world operation of a regime depend on, besides those found in constitutions?

Why this topic? To enable you to understand basic constitutional differences in the way power is allocated between branches of government. In stable and long-established democratic government, power is often said to derive from a constitutional agreement (usually written down, but, even when written down, qualified by conventions and understandings which may not be written down). Similarly power is said to be allocated to branches of government in patterns that vary from country to country. The topic introduces several long-established concepts: the constitutional allocation of power; the separation of powers between governmental branches and its claimed effects on legislative politics; the fusion of executive and legislature under parliamentary government; the impact of separation or fusion on executive strength; variations in the real meaning of fusion depending on legislative and party politics. In one way this is a sorting and classifying exercise to make sure you use terminology clearly, and to help you understand how political science literature uses it. Your tutor may spend some time simply working through these definitions to be sure you see how they are conventionally used. However, underlying the exercise is an implicit debate about how useful classification is, and if it is useful, what it should be based on. One part of this debate is whether a constitution and its rules are a useful power-map at all, when so much seems to depend on informal and contingent aspects of politics like the nature of party politics, or where a country is in an electoral or political cycle, or how popular a government is at any particular point, etc. If the location of political power can vary so much, do constitutions only serve as background constraints, and if so, are comparisons of how they work only of limited usefulness?

Reading:

2. Types of Democracy

What claims have been made about the merits and defects of so-called majoritarian and consensus democracies, and how have these claims been tested in scholarly research?

Why this topic? A more advanced part of the debate begun in the first tutorial topic is whether there are better ways of getting at key differences between regime types than by examining constitutional rules. One example of this, which you can only touch on lightly at this stage, is veto-player analysis, which is squarely rooted in rational-choice approaches to political analysis, and which seeks to understand political processes by examining decisions according to the number and strategic location of actors who influence outcomes by their positional or institutional power of veto (and hence their bargaining power). Proponents of this approach observe that formal constitutional power is at times a poor guide to the bargaining power observable using veto-player analysis. A further area of debate relates to assumptions about “how democracy should work” in a more purposeful sense: is democracy there to deliver clear choices between alternatives, or is it there to bargain between, reconcile, and integrate, the wide range of interests and demands that society is composed of? Here we reach the debate between majoritarian democracy and consensus democracy, which forms the empirical background question to much of the work you will do in Hilary Term in Political Analysis.

Reading:

Developing the Consensus Model


Examining Effects


Critiquing Cases

II. Political institutions and practice outside of the advanced industrial democracies

3. Democracy and Authoritarianism

Can we draw a sharp distinction between regimes that are democratic and those that are not? If so, what are the criteria? If not, why not?

Why this topic? The concept of democracy is one of the most used in the study of politics and yet there exists enormous scholarly debate over what precisely constitutes ‘democracy’ and symmetrically, how to define non-democratic regimes. This tutorial explores the debate over conceptualizing political regimes and also touches on theories that explain transitions between regimes and variation within them. The tutorial readings begin with the classic distinction between ‘thick’ and ‘thin’ conceptions of democracy and the associated debate over measuring democracy. Some scholars argue for a multi-dimensional conception of democracy including contestation, inclusion, the separation of powers, the granting of civil liberties, and the responsiveness of government to demands. Accordingly, fine-grained scales of democracy or ‘polyarchy’ have been created to capture such distinctions. Conversely other scholars have argued that democracy should be considered a ‘bounded whole’ that is a binary ‘either/or’ concept. Still other scholars argue that formal democracy even in paradigmatic cases like the United States might be undermined by socioeconomic inequalities, producing oligarchy rather than democracy. The tutorial then turns to variations among authoritarian and democratic regimes, examining literature that explores the worlds of ‘electoral’ or ‘competitive’ authoritarianism. These works problematize the connection often made between holding elections and being ‘democratic,’ noting the ways in which authoritarian regimes might use elections to underscore rather than undermine their hold on power. Finally the tutorial concludes by examining a few cases of the contemporary challenges to democratic survival and consolidation. These readings should help students think about which structural or strategic forces hold together political regimes or split them apart.

Conceptualizing Democracy: Thick vs Thin Conceptions

- William R Clark, Matt Golder and Sonia Golder, Principles of Comparative Politics, CQ Press, Washington, 2013/2017, (Chaps 5 and 10). i.e. the chapters on "Democracy and Dictatorship: Conceptualizing and Measurement" and "Varieties of Dictatorships"

Hybrid and Authoritarian Regimes

4. State strength

What is state strength? What determines how strong a state is?

Why this topic? The state is one of the fundamental units of political life in modern politics. Why do states exist? This question has intrigued political theorists, scholars of international relations, and comparative political scientists. Scholars looking at the rise of the state in Europe (and elsewhere), often locate its origins in both the need for decisive action in the face of military conflict and the need for tax revenue to fund it. Yet, we continue to explore the historical origins of the state, in part because we continue to debate both the rationale for the state and what explains variation in state structure; recent scholarship has emphasised the historical impacts and ongoing legacies of empire. Literature looking at more recent state building, particularly outside of Europe but also in the post-Soviet context, points to quite different constellations of factors affecting the development and structure of states, raising further questions. While states as political units share a number of factors, scholars have pointed to wide variation among states. Political scientists often apply adjectives such as “high capacity” “low capacity” “strong” and “weak” to describe the role of states. This work points to both the institutional and social origins of state variation. States often possess highly varying bureaucratic structures, which are in part the product of their internal structure as well as their relationship to social groups. Can states promote beneficial societal outcomes through the right institutions? Can states withstand lobbying (or corruption) from societal elites without becoming predatory?

Readings

State formation in Europe:

- Tuong Vu. 2010. “Studying the State through State Formation” *World Politics*. 62(01)


State capacity in contemporary times


• Elcin Kurbanoglu, “Feminist conceptualisations of the state”, Global Journal of Human Social Science 12-10 (2012)


5. Social Movements

What have social movements contributed to modern political practice?

Why this topic? Political action such as strikes, demonstrations, and manifestations of civic engagement most often take place outside of traditional political institutions such as political parties. The purpose of this topic is to help understand what drives individuals, groups, and movements to mobilize in this way, and whether these kinds of collective civil practices are different in form and nature; whether they can successfully win gains for groups who have traditionally been excluded from political power and formal institutions; how social movements cut across national boundaries; under what conditions these groups interact with formal institutional processes (for example elections), and with what effects; and some of the conditions under which this kind of collective action may be successful. There are also significant debates about whether these different forms of collective action can be regrouped under the heading of ‘contentious politics’, and whether they can be defined according to “rational” theories. There are discussions about social movements’ impact and success, and the extent to which they contribute to wider political socialization. The study of social movements is an important prism for understanding how politics is experienced at grass-roots and national levels, and how forms of institutionalized political power— in democracies and non-democracies - may be challenged from below.

Readings:


6. Revolutions

How and why do revolutions either succeed or fail?

Why this topic? Political orders and regimes are sometimes transformed comprehensively, for example from a monarchy to a republic, from an authoritarian regime to a democracy, or from a colonial to a post-colonial state. The purpose of this topic is to help understand how, why, and under what circumstances this sort of political change happens, and what it tells us more widely about politics. The important issues addressed are the causes of revolutions (what kind of factors make for their occurrence, and how they are to be prioritized), the processes of revolutions (what happens during the revolutionary moment); and the consequences of revolutions (the nature of the political change – partial change or complete rupture; the type of new political order; its impact on society). In thinking about its consequences, one relevant aspect is time, which can be distinguished between short, medium, and long-term factors. There are substantive contemporary debates in politics about historical revolutions (the French Revolution of 1789, the Haitian revolution 1791-1804, and the Russian revolution of 1917) and their relation to modern ones. There are different analytical frameworks in the literature on revolutions, which stress the varying importance of structural factors, such as class, race, and material conditions, the role of conjuncture, and the contributions of social actors, ideas, and ideology. Among the main debates around modern revolutions are the identification of the causes, and whether they can be generalized; the range of factors, and in particular the role of revolutionary ideas and political culture; how and why revolutions succeed or fail, and how this can be assessed. Readings:

- ***Theda Skocpol, States and Social Revolutions, Cambridge, 1979. (Introduction and Conclusion).
Blackburn, “Haiti, slavery, and the age of democratic revolution”, William and Mary Quarterly, October 2006
Henry Hale, ‘Regime change cascades: what we have learned from the 1848 Revolutions to the 2011 Arab uprisings’ Annual Review of Political Science 16 (2013) Natalya Vince, The Algerian war, the Algerian Revolution (Palgrave, 2020)
• Neil Ketchley, Egypt in a time of revolution: contentious politics and the Arab spring (Cambridge, 2017)
• Abdelrahman, Maha. (2013) In Praise of Organization: Egypt between Activism and Revolution, Development and Change. 44 (3)
• ***Frantz Fanon, The wretched of the earth (London, 2001 ed.)
• ***Angela Davis, Freedom is a constant struggle 2016 (ch. 3 “We have to talk about systemic change”)

III. The Institutions of the Democratic State

7. Legislatures “Judgments about the effectiveness of legislatures can only be made in the context of specific political cultures and state traditions. There are no absolute standards of judgment”. Discuss

Why this topic?
Elected legislatures at national level are a key part of our understanding of how modern democracies operate, and have made centralized representative government, (rather than direct democracy or highly decentralized systems of government), one of democracy’s key legitimizing components. We have already seen in topic 1, above, that the role of a legislature varies a great deal between presidential and parliamentary systems, with legislatures interacting with both the constitutional structure, and the nature of the party system, to produce different patterns of governance. This has generated a range of concerns about what legislatures “ought” to be delivering in a democracy, as perceptions have ebbed and flowed about their effectiveness in particular contexts. Sometimes the concern has been about the “decline of legislatures” while at other times it has been about “over-mighty” or excessively fragmented legislatures. The central issue is whether a legislature can fulfill a variety of sometimes contradictory tasks at the same time. We think that legislatures should be representative; that they should sustain the executive’s legitimacy, particularly in parliamentary regimes; that they should scrutinise the work of the executive and bureaucracy; they should appropriate resources, especially financial, for the other branches of government to do their work; and perhaps most of all they legitimate the laws of the polity through their internal procedures. So we want them to contribute to cohesive and purposive government (in the case of parliamentary government by creating and sustaining a parliamentary majority; in the case of presidential government, by retaining sufficient programmatic cohesion to enable a directly-elected executive to do so without the enforcing cohesion provided by a parliamentary confidence-relationship) while at the same time performing the role of holding the executive to account, scrutinizing its performance, and making national political debate meaningful to citizens. The way the two demands are reconciled in any given country will depend on how members of legislatures are socialized into expectations about the roles they are to perform, on the rules governing the legislature and its relationship with the rest of the national institutions, and on the operation of the party system. Increasingly, scholars have also recognised the importance of understanding legislative
politics from the perspective of excluded or underrepresented groups. While legislatures in advanced democracies have improved their ‘descriptive’ representation of diverse populations in recent decades, recent feminist scholarship on representative democracy in particular asks deeper questions about what a ‘good’ legislature really is.

What for example does it mean for a legislature to be representative? Geographically, demographically, ideologically, federally…? How is this related to structure? How many chambers should a legislature have for these purposes? Given how differently these factors are configured even in otherwise similar democracies, claims about legislative effectiveness are likely to remain very difficult to confirm or refute. Nevertheless comparative study of their role and operation, helping us understand them in some of the most highly-studied contexts (the USA, UK, France, Germany), is important in understanding where there are common functional imperatives in democracies, and where culture, history and state tradition continue to affect operation.

Reading:

**Structure and Function**

**Feminist and Minority Representation**

**Class, ‘Professional’ Politics and Socialisation**
8. Executives

Executive power has a personal quality linked to popular support and party-based authority that sits alongside its formal, constitutionally-derived, qualities. How in practice do the two elements interact in real-world contexts?

**Why this topic?** The role of the executive, especially chief executives, is difficult to compare across countries. How can political science establish grounds for comparison between presidents, prime ministers, chancellors and their subordinates in different regimes? How do chief executives wield power and become effective leaders in different polities? Is this a function of the institutional structure of the executive? Or should we consider contingent factors like the scope for ‘charismatic’ leadership? Some models of executive power consider it to be wielded in a command-and-control way, and judge success by how far the chief executive ‘wins’ in a contest with others. Alternatively, executive power is a bargaining process, acknowledging that the chief executive can only succeed in achieving goals by working collaboratively with others. In newer democracies, problems of winnertake-all executive competition can cause problems with democratic stability.

**Reading:**

- ***Arend Lijphart Patterns of Democracy: Government Forms and Performance in 36 Countries ch. 7
- *** Rudy Andeweg et al. (eds.). The Oxford Handbook of Political Executives (2020) (chs by Doyle on measuring power, Beckwith on feminist approaches, and O’Bien on women)
- ***George Tsebelis Veto Players: How Political Institutions Work chs. 1-4
- Mark Garnett, The British Prime Minister in age of upheaval (2021)
- Gillian Peele et al. (eds.) Developments in American Politics 8 (2018) ch. 1
- Robert Elgie ‘Duverger, Semi-presidentialism and the Supposed French Archetype’ West European Politics 32(2) 2009
9. Counter-majoritarian powers

Democracies usually provide a range of counter-powers to majoritarian power, including judicial review, decentralisation of power, bi-cameralism, a permanent professionalized bureaucracy, direct democracy, and the media. Consider, in the case of any two, what the effectiveness of such counter-powers depends on, and how we would measure and compare effectiveness.

Why this topic? Democratic government is widely thought to require a balance between *purposive government* that is capable of identifying and addressing policy problems, and *restraints on government*. These restraints seek to ensure that power is exercised within agreed limits, and under agreed rules, that proper deliberation precedes key decisions, that different voices are heard as policy is being made, and that where possible (a big qualification) decision-making power is devolved to levels close to those most affected by it. Such checks and balances supplement the central tension between the executive and the legislature, which is itself potentially (though not always) a check on power. With the exception of the role of the media, the role of these restraints is usually described in a constitution, though they are not all present in every constitution, and the use of the constitution in understanding how power is wielded varies a good deal from country to country. (In rare cases there is no formal constitution at all). They have come to be known in much modern comparative political analysis as *institutional veto players*. The most fundamental restraint on executive power is constitutional: the commitment of government itself to be governed by a set of authoritative rules and principles. Constitutionalism requires a codified constitution that describes both the powers of different branches of government and a bill of rights. It also seems to require an umpire: a constitutional court, though an activist court’s behaviour may become so engaged in the political process that it can start to resemble a participant in the policy-making process as well as an umpire. The question of the relationship between constitutional courts and other political actors is especially pertinent in young democracies where the constitution seeks to promote social transformation. In a federal state, sovereignty is split constitutionally between different levels – usually the federal and state levels – so that each has at least some final authority in given policy areas. Bi-cameral legislatures are those with two distinct assemblies, usually based on the representation of different territorial entities. The actual power of each assembly varies as does the effect of various experiments in federalism and devolution on different forms of inequality and marginalisation. Less common in constitutions, and in general less dramatic in their effects, are those procedures that bring public opinion to bear on decision-makers through routes other than elected ones. Provisions for referendums and plebiscites are obviously constitutional, while others – for example factors which facilitate a free and pluralistic media – generally have non-constitutional roots. Finally, there is the impact of a permanent, professionalized bureaucracy. Since it lacks democratic roots, and is by some regarded as thwarting the effectiveness of policy action, bureaucracy may not immediately seem to fall into the category of a democratic check. However its professional expertise, set against impulsive and inexpert politicians, may allow it to be a type of check and its strategic role in decision-making certainly makes it a potential veto-player. The trade offs between technocracy versus democracy have been extensively debated in aid-dependent states.

Given the range of counter-powers to the power exercised through the central institutions of legislature and executive, there are no simple ways of assessing the functionality of checks and balances as a whole. Each particular institution needs first to be understood in its own national context, and comparisons then need to be made across jurisdictions focusing on individual institutions. Conceptually however all these institutions have certain common features and effects,
and beyond asking how well each operates in a national context against the purposes set for it, comparative political analysis (in more advanced courses than the Prelim, however) can also assess, through formal veto-player theory, how much concentration or dispersal of power a particular jurisdiction displays.

**Reading:**

Constitutional courts in young democracies: agents of transformation?


Federalism and devolution:


Technocracy vs. democracy:


10. War and Peace

Is there a distinctively democratic way of waging war?

*Why this topic?* The absence of a world government has led many analysts of International Relations (IR) to believe that all countries exist within a constant state of war and insecurity. As Thomas Hobbes famously put it in Leviathan, ‘in all times kings and persons of sovereign authority, because of their independency, are in continual jealousies, and in the state and posture of gladiators, having their weapons pointing, and their eyes fixed on one another’. However, one of the most robust empirical findings of IR scholarship over the last fifty years has been that democracies are different, in that they do not seem to fight wars with other democracies (although, of course, they do continue...
to fight wars against non-democracies). Many have drawn the conclusion that, while the Hobbesian state of war continues in the rest of the world, a ‘zone of peace’ now exists among democratic states, and that regions such as the Middle East would be more peaceful if more regimes within them were democratic. This belief has been a major theme within recent US foreign policy although the collapse of the US-supported regime in Afghanistan in 2021, after two decades of war and intervention in the region, has perhaps closed this cycle.

Several controversies remain. For a start, some dispute the empirical claims of the ‘democratic peace thesis’, arguing that it rests on excessively narrow ways of conceptualising democracy, war and peace, or that its findings are statistically insignificant. But perhaps the largest literature has emerged around the question of why the democratic peace exists. Is it a result of the institutions within democratic political systems, such as the publicness of decision-making, or the checks and balances that inhibit the executive? Or is it the result of liberal values and a culture of bargaining and compromise that are unique to democratic states? Or might it even be due to some other factor that has less to do with democracy as such, such as high levels of economic interdependence among liberal democracies, or the hegemonic influence of the United States? There are also disagreements about the conclusion that democratisation will make the world a more peaceful place: perhaps the pacific qualities of democracy in the western world will not travel to new democracies elsewhere, while some believe that newly democratising states are exceptionally belligerent during the unstable process of political transition, which implies that the dangers of promoting democratisation may outweigh the possible benefits of a more democratic world. Finally, the tendency to focus on explaining the democratic peace has attracted criticisms that it has led to the neglect of other important aspects of the relationship between democracies and war: for example, their continuing tendency to make war against non-democracies, or the fact that they mobilise their forces and actually fight their wars in different ways from non-democratic states.

Reading:
- Brown, Michael E., Sean M. Lynn-Jones and Steven E. Miller (eds.) 1999. Debating the Democratic Peace (Cambridge: MIT Press). [Contains excerpts from several other pieces on reading list.]
- The Costs of War project https://watson.brown.edu/costsofwar/
- International Politics. 2004. Special Issue on the democratic peace. 41 (4), especially articles by Hasenclever and Wagner, MacMillan, Müller, and Owen.

**IV. Parties, party systems, values, identity politics**

**11. Party systems**

a) What are the sociological and institutional determinants of party systems? What are the major weaknesses of these explanations?

b) To what extent are party systems in developing world democracies based on social cleavages? Why this topic? To understand a key body of literature seeking to explain the sociological determinants of party systems across all democracies, from the emergence of mass democracy to the third wave of democratisation. In addition, to understand how political institutions, particularly the type of electoral system, shape the party system, thereby augmenting the sociological approach. A key interpretation of modern party systems in the advanced industrial democracies is that parties (thanks also to the freezing effect of strong party organisation) were frozen in the mould established in the late 19th and early 20th century, with the transition to mass democracy, raising the barrier to entry for new parties. From this perspective therefore, parties present in any particular advanced democracy primarily reflect the underlying social cleavages, which were important in the period of mass democratisation. With the third wave of democratization in the early 1980s, we also witnessed the emergence of new democracies from Latin America, Africa, Asia and Eastern Europe. While the literature on party systems in Western Europe sees party competition as programmatic, and the bases for it as social and ideological, work on party systems in other parts of the world often highlight competition, which is not rooted in social cleavages and stress alternatives to programmatic links, in particular clientelism. This topic introduces the concept of a party system, of political cleavages and party organization. It also highlights the differences between party systems in the advanced industrial democracies and newer, developing world democracies. However, political parties vary a good deal, both within and between countries, across advanced and developing democracies, and in the extent to which they are rooted in strong and distinct social identities. Many look as if they are not built on social identities at all. The rate of formation of new parties in recent decades seems to have increased in several advanced democracies, and their sociological origins are often difficult to pin down. What is more, in developing democracies, party systems often do not appear to reflect social cleavages at all. Since Maurice Duverger’s (1954) seminal work, observers have pointed to the effect of institutions on the shape of the party system, most notably the electoral system and more recently, the format of the executive. This topic introduces the mechanical and psychological effects of electoral systems on party systems. It also contrasts the effect of majoritarian electoral systems and proportional representation on party systems, and examines the interaction of electoral systems and cleavage structures.

The hypothesis that parties in the advanced industrial democracies reflect social cleavages, and that party systems are frozen in time, is much contested on several levels. The thesis of long-term historical continuity in party systems often requires a very stretched interpretation of “continuity”, even across the period from the 1880s to the 1960s, let alone subsequently. Parties vary a good deal, both within and between countries, in the extent to which they are rooted in strong and distinct social identities, and many look as if they are not built on social identities at all. The rate of formation of new parties in recent decades seems to have increased in several advanced democracies, and their sociological origins are often difficult to pin down. Although this does not render the sociological thesis of Lipset and Rokkan redundant, it does raise questions about its utility as an explanation for the contemporary party systems of the advanced democracies. Secondly, this sociological thesis also struggles as a framework of understanding for party systems outside of the advanced industrial democracies. Party systems in these countries often have not
followed the evolutionary development pattern of the Western European party systems described by Stein and Rokkan. Rather the development of party systems outside of the advanced industrial democracies has tended to be discontinuous; reflect divergent responses to expanded political mobilization; or simply reflect long-standing historical elite divisions. In many of these party systems as a consequence, competition, is often not based on programmatic policy proposals, but on catch-all parties centered upon personality and clientelism. Finally, while it is widely agreed that the relationship between electoral and party systems is mutual, nearly all work has been focused on the effect of electoral systems on party systems, and a general consensus exists on this topic. However, electoral institutions may shape party systems, but these institutions also emerge from party systems. How party systems shape electoral systems remains completely underdeveloped and under-theorised and no clear consensus yet exists on this issue.

Readings
Introducing party-voter linkages: How do parties connect with voters and why does it matter?

Sociological Determinants

Institutional Determinants
12. Parties and Voters
Do voters still exhibit stable links to established parties in contemporary democracies, and if not why not?

Why this topic?
Perhaps the single most important notion in the study of voting behavior is that of party identification, which denotes an affective orientation towards a political party. It is thus hardly surprising that the observed trend towards weaker party attachments over the last half century has featured as a key issue in the study of voting behavior. Almost any textbook of party politics dedicates a lengthy section to explain the loosening of partisan ties in advanced democracies at least since the 1960s. The stylized picture that emerges from this literature is one of partisan dealignment, whereby party loyalties have eroded, electoral volatility has increased and turnout has decreased. By delving into this literature, this topic allows us to assess the generalizability of these conclusions and unpack the underlying mechanisms of electoral change. Consider, for example, the contrast between this dealigning pattern described above and the pattern of increased partisan polarization and sorting in American politics. What accounts for this divergence within advanced democracies? Why does party seem to be becoming less important in Europe and more important in the US? What are the implications of dealignment for individual voting behavior and party competition? How have parties’ strategies changed as a result of this change? These questions addressed in this topic. We will focus both on topdown factors of political change driven by party competition, and on bottom-up developments from partisan dealignment.

As a way to explain electoral change, it is not always good practice to perceive the electorate as a single homogeneous entity. Electoral change may not therefore be the result of unanimous opinion shifts among the electorate. It may be driven by disproportionate change among specific age groups, which become more influential through generational turnover. The concept of generational turnover enables us to examine more systematically the sources of dealignment and its prospects for the future. In so doing, we will touch upon the distinction between dealignment and realignment and discuss how these concepts help us understand the dynamics of party competition in contemporary democracies.

Reading:
Introducing foundations of people’s vote choice

Stability and variation in programmatic party-voter linkages
13. Populism and Radicalism

What are the causes of populism and radicalism in contemporary democracies?

Why this topic?
The rise of populism in advanced industrial societies is, in large part, a reaction to the inability of traditional parties to respond adequately in the eyes of the electorate to a series of phenomena such as economic and cultural globalization, immigration, the decline of ideologies and class politics, and the exposure of elite corruption. In Western Europe the phenomenon is also directly connected to the speed and direction of European integration. One of the important issues to be analyzed is how far the different cases in Europe are comparable, and should be seen as manifestations of the same underlying phenomena; also how far European populisms can be compared to their American counterpart.

More generally, the question of populism opens up a discussion of the current ‘political malaise’ in advanced industrial societies, manifested in steadily falling turnouts across Western Europe, declining party memberships, and ever-greater numbers of citizens in surveys citing a lack of interest and distrust in politics and politicians. This perception has in turn affected electoral behaviour as increasing numbers of de-aligned and disillusioned voters either simply do not bother participating or become available and open to new, and sometimes more radical, alternatives.
This topic seeks to understand the underlying social and cultural sources of these phenomena, and to establish how far populist claims that politics has become more convoluted, distant and irrelevant to people’s lives can be defended. The aim is also to assess how far populist politics represents a serious challenge to established political institutions, and whether populism marks the emergence of a new dimension of politics which transcends the classic Left-Right divide.

Reading

Populism – conceptual issues

- *Albertazzi, Daniele and McDonnell, Duncan (eds), Twenty-First Century Populism. The Spectre of Western European Democracy, Basingstoke, Palgrave, 2008
- Jan-Werner Müller What is populism? University of Pennsylvania Press, 2016

Cases of right-wing populism

- * Sobolewska, Maria, and Robert Ford, Brexitland. Identity, diversity and the reshaping of British politics (Cambridge University Press, 2020)
- Julius Maximilian Rogenhofer & Ayala Panievsky (2020) “Antidemocratic populism in power: comparing Erdoğan’s Turkey with Modi’s India and Netanyahu’s Israel”, Democratization, 27:8, 1394-1412
- *Norris, Pippa and Ronald Inglehart, Cultural backlash. Trump, Brexit and authoritarian populism (Cambridge, 2019)

Radicalism


• Mouffe, Chantal, For a Left populism London; Verso, 2018.