kiron

Study Guide

PS_Intro Introduction to Political Science

Foreword

Purpose and Structure

This document is called a Study Guide. It is a written script to walk you through the topics within a study unit, called a Module, in your Kiron studies. It introduces the subjects in the module and links to the relevant parts in the online courses that you have to take in order to complete the module. It provides video lectures, written pieces, other kinds of enriching materials and suggested exercises from additional open educational resources to elaborate on the topics.

The purpose of this document is to accompany you while you are studying the online courses in the module. It is not a replacement of any course or content within the modules, thus completing this material only helps you progressing in an easier way in your module.

While you can share your thoughts and report errors on this material, your feedback and questions regarding the external contents should be addressed to the producers and owners of those materials. **Kiron uses third-party content and thus the opinions presented do** *not* **necessarily represent those of Kiron Open Higher Education.**

Iconography

Below are the meanings of the icons that are used in this document:

General hints, suggestions and other things to check

Video lesson or tutorial resource

Book, web page or other written material resource

Exercise or assessment resource

Discussion point in Kiron Forum, Google Classroom or Google Hangouts

Reference to the Kiron Campus or to a MOOC

Table of Contents

Introduction

Welcome to Introduction to Political Science, your first module in the Political Science study track at Kiron!

The purpose of this Study Guide is to support you as you work through the MOOCs and tutorials in this module. This is your ultimate guide to all things political theory and you should use it to further your understanding of the topics covered in your courses.

Learning Outcomes

Once you have completed this module, you will be able to:

- identify the main political institutions and political systems
- define normative political theory & philosophy by clarifying main concepts, values and principles in politics
- explain the main terminologies and objects of investigation in Political Science
- summarize the history of Sociology as a discipline by recollecting classical social theories
- describe the foundations of research for scientific work.

Courses

This module is made up of **5 MOOCs**:

1) **Political Philosophy: An Introduction**
2) **Revolutionary Ideas: Utility, Justice, Equality, Freedom**
3) **Revolutionary Ideas: Borders, Elections, Constitutions, Prisons**
4) **Discover Political Science**
5) **Classical Sociological Theory**

Prerequisites

There are no prerequisites for this module because it is the first module in the Political Science study track. All you need is an interest in Politics and an enthusiasm to learn!

If only some of the mentioned topics and learning outcomes are not clear for you right now, do not worry. You will become more familiar with the terminology and have the possibility to check how you perform throughout the course.

Additional Resources

In this Study Guide, we will have links to additional video and text materials to enhance your understanding. Here is a list of the resources that we often refer to in this study letter:

- Internet Encyclopedia of Philosophy
- Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy

Chapter 1 - Political Philosophy: An Introduction

The first MOOC in this module, 'Political Philosophy: An Introduction', provides a solid foundation in political vocabulary. The abstract notions of 'politics', 'conflict', 'power' and 'legitimate power' will be examined and analysed in relation to the prevailing dominant political institution: the state. In this course, you will discover how such broad terms are critical to understanding the world around us, both in the political sphere and beyond. The political vocabulary provided by this course will provide you with a more autonomous and more critical understanding of political processes.

Conflict, (Legitimate) Power, Force

Hecralitus developed a theory of conflict in the 6th century, defining it as 'struggle'. He argued that 'conflict does not interfere with life, but rather is a **precondition of life**.'[1] In Max Weber's view, conflict is the 'social relationship in which an actor strives to affirm his/her/its own preferences against other actors' resistance'. There are three generally accepted types of conflict: **conflict of interest, identity conflict, ideological conflict** (including religious conflicts).

Power is another important concept in political theory. *Political* power has slightly different implications than power in general. *Political power* is the ability to shape and control the political behaviour of others and to lead and guide their behavior in the direction desired by the person, group, or institution wielding the political power. **Political power is the capacity to influence, condition, mold, and control human behavior for the accomplishment of political objectives.**[2] It is usually considered legitimate as it is institutionalised within the state structure and political system. A degree of voluntary compliance from the ruled is also characteristic of political power.

> Now watch all **five** videos in **"Chapter 2: Conflict, (Legitimate) Power, Force"**

> Remember to complete the **short quizzes** at the end of each video.

> **This** is an interesting TED Ed video about Power as a concept.

The Subjective Side of Politics, Legitimacy, Political Identity and Political Obligation

Legitimacy is a contested term, with some theorists following a descriptive concept and others using a normative approach. In the descriptive approach, developed by Max Weber, legitimacy refers so 'people's beliefs about political authority and, sometimes, political

---

[1] 'Hecralitus', https://www.iep.utm.edu/heraclit/#H6
[2] Dr. Almon Leroy Way, Jr., 'Political Power',
http://www.proconservative.net/CUNAPolSci201PartOneC.shtml

obligations'.[3] Weber relates legitimacy to **'having faith in a particular political or social order because it has been there for a long time (tradition), because they have faith in the rulers (charisma), or because they trust its legality—specifically the rationality of the rule of law'.**[4]

For scholars who take a normative approach, such as Rawls and Ripstein 'political legitimacy refers to some benchmark of acceptability or justification of political power or authority and—possibly—obligation.' Legitimacy refers to the **'justification of coercive political power'.**[5] Whether a political body such as a state is legitimate and whether citizens have political obligations towards it depends on whether the coercive political power that the state exercises is justified.

> Now watch all **five** videos of ["Chapter 4: The Subjective Side of Politics, Legitimacy, Political Identity and Political Obligation"](#)

> Remember to complete the **short quizzes** at the end of each video.

> [Here](#) is a detailed and informative source about political legitimacy.

> [This](#) is an additional video lecture about definitions of political (system) legitimacy.

Political Order, Political Institutions, Models of Order: From Aristotle to Hegel

Political order does **not** refer to law and the police as is commonly thought. Political order is a **'pattern of regularity leading to the achievement of basic goals'**. Order is maintained and reproduced through institutions. In a philosophical sense, the main aims of political order specifically are saving lives (or killing as few people as possible) and containing violence.

Professor Cerutti argues that **to achieve a relatively peaceful society is the overriding aim of politics as a frame for citizens to go about their daily lives**. Samuel Huntington, a prominent thinker on the topic of political order, contends that **'order itself was an important goal of developing societies**, independent of the question of whether that order was democratic, authoritarian, socialist, or free-market'.[6] Huntington also argues that **political order is sustained through the institutions in place**.[7]

> Now watch all **five** videos of ["Chapter 5: Political Order, Political Institutions, Models of Order: From Aristotle to Hegel"](#)

---

[3] 'Political Legitimacy', https://plato.stanford.edu/entries/legitimacy/
[4] 'Political Legitimacy', https://plato.stanford.edu/entries/legitimacy/
[5] 'Political Legitimacy', https://plato.stanford.edu/entries/legitimacy/
[6] Francis Fukuyama, 'Review of 'Political Order in Changing Societies' by Samuel Huntington', https://www.foreignaffairs.com/reviews/capsule-review/1997-09-01/political-order-changing-societies
[7] 'Political Order in Changing Societies: A Summary', https://lsempa.wordpress.com/2011/04/16/political-order-in-changing-societies/

Remember to complete the **short quizzes** at the end of each video.

This is a review of Francis Fukuyama's book *Political Order and Political Decay* which may be useful as a summary of more contemporary ideas about order.

Here is a short interview with Francis Fukuyama, one of the main contemporary theorists, talking about political order and decay.

The (Modern) State: Basic Thoughts on Democracy

In this section Professor Cerutti examines the main theories of the modern state. He defines the modern state as:

> 'the institution exerting legitimate power, guaranteed by the monopoly of force, over a population and a territory… States are also the owners of an exclusive minting authority'.[8]

Max Weber was the first philosopher to write about the concept of the modern state. During the Renaissance era, communities lived in 'city-states, in which a government exercised authority in an urban center, and later **societies organized themselves into nation-states, bounded by borders**. These ideas were out there, but they were still largely abstract. Furthermore, nobody was able to really define what the state was or represented to the modern, industrialized world.'[9] It was Weber who constructed a definition of the nation-state and defined its main features.

1. The state was the independent legal system of administration, with authority over a defined geographical area.
2. It was a symbol of collective action and community.[10]

Weber's most influential contribution is the notion of a **'monopoly of violence'** held by the state. He argued that **the state is a human community that (successfully) claims the monopoly of the legitimate use of physical force within a given territory'**.[11] The monopoly of violence is what Weber sees as the definitive element of the modern state. However, it is important to note that Weber also claims that **using that violence is neither necessary nor common.** Just because the state holds the monopoly on legitimate violence, does not mean it always resorts to violence.[12]

Weber also discusses the role of **legitimacy** in his discussion about the nation-state. He makes a distinction between the modern state and its predecessors, claiming that despite all

---

[8] Professor Cerutti, 'State and Sovereignty I'.
[9] 'Max Weber's Theory of the Modern State: Origin & Analysis',
https://study.com/academy/lesson/max-webers-theory-of-the-modern-state-origin-analysis.html
[10] 'Max Weber's Theory of the Modern State: Origin & Analysis'.
[11] Max Weber, *Politics as a Vocation* (1918).
[12] 'Max Weber's Theory of the Modern State: Origin & Analysis'.

states having the *ability* to use force, **only the modern state has legal, legitimate authority to do so.** The modern state must maintain its legitimacy through the existence of a constitution and regular democratic participation. The state must be considered legitimate by its citizens, which can generally only be achieved through some form of democracy.

Now watch all **five** videos of **"Chapter 6: The (modern) State: Basic Thoughts on Democracy"**

Remember to complete the **short quizzes** at the end of each video.

This is an interesting article about the 'problems' with the modern state.

Here is a useful introduction to Max Weber and **this** is a video about his concept of modernity.

The States: Power, Peace, and War in the Anarchical Society

The modern state has two forms of sovereignty: internal and external. **Internal sovereignty means that a state has supreme authority over its citizens** and is subject only to its own laws and those of any external organisations it may be a member of (eg. the European Union). **External sovereignty refers to the independence of a state from other countries or superior bodies, ie. autonomy or self-rule.**

The issue of state sovereignty has been particularly prominent since the Brexit referendum in the UK. The slogan "take back control" that was used by supporters of Britain's exit from the European Union (EU) draws on the idea that British sovereignty was threatened by a 'superior body' (the EU) and was preventing the British government from making appropriate laws.

Have a look at **this** interesting article about Brexit, state sovereignty and democracy.

Conversely, sovereignty can also come in the form of international laws, known as **reciprocal recognition**, and diplomacy. This is a crucial part of international cooperation to prevent wars and anarchy. The 'state of nature' that Hobbes wrote about would be realised through international anarchy; a situation where war is the only way to solve dispute.G

Now watch all **five** videos of **"Chapter 7: The States: Power, Peace, and War in the Anarchical Society"**

Remember to complete the **short quizzes** at the end of each video.

Here is an interesting video about the nation-state

Globalisation and Global Governance

Globalisation is talked about constantly in the context of international relations, economics, travel and migration. It is often said that globalisation has "shrunk" the world: everything is within reach of anyone. In this Chapter, Professor Cerutti notes three main areas of change in the globalised era:

1. **Competition** has been redefined by the interdependence of states in the globalised world. Treaties and international organisations have reduced the gap between states' interests and concerns.
2. **Inequality** between states has increased, though between individuals it has reduced. The idea of winners and losers in globalisation helps to explain this - the difference between developed and developing countries.
3. **Poverty** and the fight against it has become a major policy area in recent years.

The negative effects of globalisation in developing countries can come in the form of **rapid industrialisation to keep up with market competition and increased tourism**. Though in the long-term these seem to be beneficial to economic growth, **moral and social disruption is often a side-effect, as well as drastic environmental degradation**. For example, companies in developed states such as the USA and UK often export their businesses to China or India to exploit the low wages and lack of effective environmental protection laws.[13]

Now watch all **five** videos of **"Chapter 8: Globalisation and Global Governance"**

Remember to complete the **short quizzes** at the end of each video.

This is a short article about the effects of globalisation on developing countries.

Here is a useful video explaining the notion of global governance discussing the governance of common spaces and collective responsibility.

Global Challenges and Politics after Modernity

The concept of 'lethal challenges' to civilisation can be divided into man-made challenges and climate change. Of course, it can be convincingly argued that climate change is also man-made issue!

- **Man-made challenges:** nuclear weapons are the physical, main man-made threat to the survival of civilisation. It is an issue that can only be contained through

---

[13] Fairooz Hamdi, 'The Impact of Globalisation in the Developing Countrie',
https://www.linkedin.com/pulse/impact-globalization-developing-countries-fairooz-hamdi

international cooperation of **all countries.** But this can be a serious difficulty when countries such as Iran and North Korea resent cooperation with the United Nations and its individual member states.

- **Climate change**: land submersion by higher sea level, enhanced desertification, severe meteorological events, break up of permafrost, spreading of diseases and the increased extinction of species are just some of the very real threats from climate change. As a direct result of these factors, **mass migration will occur due to the destruction of communities and even entire countries**. This presents a major problem for international politics and economics. Like nuclear weapons, the near-inevitable effects of climate change can only be lessened through **international cooperation and collective responsibility**.

Now complete **"Chapter 9: Global Challenges and Politics After Modernity"**

Remember to complete the **short quizzes** at the end of each video.

Have a look at **this** list of ten global challenges discussed at the 2015 World Economic Forum.

Here is a short video about the human impact on the environment.

Liberty and Equality

Negative freedom is defined as 'the absence of obstacles, barriers or constraints', while **positive freedom** is 'the possibility of acting — or the fact of acting — in such a way as to take control of one's life and realize one's fundamental purposes'.[14] The state fits into this in so far as it imposes constraints on freedoms in the form of **laws and the possibility of prison** sentences, but this is often with the **purpose of preventing others from undermining our "negative" freedom**. The state can also help promote "positive" freedoms, but should it? However, a major benefit is that governments can reduce the effects of lack of nutrition, shelter and education, as well as increase opportunities for employment. However, the concern is that state interference in positive freedoms could have **too much of an impact on social life**.

In states, **the values of individuals and those in power are transformed into principles that are in turn shaped as rights and responsibilities which are used to guide policy-making**. There are several distinctions of rights available to citizens:

- **Personal** - private property, individual liberty and security.
- **Civil** - belong to the individual as a citizen, eg. freedom of speech, religion and peaceful gathering; rights to due process and equal protection in law.

---

[14] 'Positive and Negative Liberty', https://plato.stanford.edu/entries/liberty-positive-negative/

- **Political** - sub-category of civil liberties, for example the right to vote and participate in political life.
- **Social** - debatable but some argue that access to healthcare and education should be a right of all individuals.

Now watch all **five** videos of **"Chapter 10: Liberty and Equality"**

Remember to complete the **short quizzes** at the end of each section.

This video illustrates the main features of the Charter of Rights and Freedoms and how they relate to democracy.

A Typology of Justice

Justice is one of the most important moral and political concepts. The word comes from the Latin *jus*, meaning right or law. The *Oxford English Dictionary* defines the **"just" person as one who typically "does what is morally right" and is disposed to "giving everyone his or her due"** offering the word "fair" as a synonym.   But philosophers want to get beyond etymology and dictionary definitions to consider, for example, the **nature of justice as both a moral virtue of character and a desirable quality of political society**, as well as how it applies to ethical and social decision-making.

For Plato, **justice is a virtue establishing rational order,** with each part performing its appropriate role and not interfering with the proper functioning of other parts. Aristotle says justice consists in what is lawful and fair, with fairness involving equitable distributions and the correction of what is inequitable. **Hobbes believed justice is an artificial virtue, necessary for civil society, a function of the voluntary agreements of the social contract**; for Hume, justice essentially serves public utility by protecting property (broadly understood). For **Kant**, it is **a virtue whereby we respect others' freedom, autonomy, and dignity** by not interfering with their voluntary actions, so long as those do not violate others' rights; Mill said justice is a collective name for the most important social utilities, which are conducive to fostering and protecting human liberty. **Rawls analyzed justice in terms of maximum equal liberty regarding basic rights and duties for all members of society**, with socio-economic inequalities requiring moral justification in terms of equal opportunity and beneficial results for all.[15]

Now watch all **five** videos of **"Chapter 11: A Typology of Justice"**

Remember to complete the **short quizzes** at the end of each section.

This is a useful article about the main Western philosophical explanations of justice.

---

[15] 'Western Theories of Justice', https://www.iep.utm.edu/justwest/

Here is a short overview of the concept of justice.

Ethics and Politics in Modernity

The unique character of the modern world has made thinking through the relation of the ethical to the political extremely pressing and yet deeply problematic. Since the 19th century, critics of **modernity have pointed to various forms of skepticism, alienation, indeterminacy, and abstraction that contribute to a sense of ethical crisis**. They point to a sense of uprootedness from the stability and meaning-conferring powers of cultures, traditions, and communities. It may be said without exaggeration that this sense of ethical crisis has global theoretical and practical significance. Various forms of alienation—economic, spiritual, political—have arguably led to extremist versions of the critique of modernity. At the theoretical level, **political reality has come to be seen as divorced from ethical life**. The political world is seen as either a kind of contingent result of competing interests or a coercive set of structures that impinge on rather than help actualize human freedom. **Postmodern critiques of liberalism and secularism tend to be characterized by a nostalgic yearning for a lost sense of ethical and political unity**. It remains to be seen whether these latter theoretical projects can persuasively specify the relation of the ethical to the political, or whether they will succumb to merely atavistic gestures towards a restoration of a lost world of cultural cohesion.

Often the ethical impulse behind modern political activism either remains obscure or is not even acknowledged. As **Alasdair MacIntyre** noted thirty years ago, **ethical and political discourse has become increasingly shrill as opposed camps take one or another form of relativism for granted, yet also proceed according to ethical assumptions about the possibility of social justice.** Rather than pointing the way to a resolution, modern moral theory—utilitarian and deontological ethics—merely reflects this crisis. A salutary return to virtue ethics seems to hold some promise, although again, one must be on guard against the lure of nostalgia.[16]

Now watch all **five** videos of **"Chapter 12: Ethics and Politics in Modernity"**

Remember to complete the **short quizzes** at the end of each section.

This is an in-depth analysis of the notion of ethics in modernity.

Here is a useful video summarising ethics in the age of modernity.

---

[16] 'Beyond Nostalgia: Ethics, Politics, and the Critique of Modernity',
https://platformed.org/2016/01/beyond-nostalgia-ethics-politics-and-the-critique-of-modernity

Chapter 2 - Revolutionary Ideas: Utility, Justice, Equality, Freedom

In this course you will look at the purpose and role of the state, and consider the arguments about what form it should take in the modern world. You will discover the foundational ideas that our political and legal institutions rest on and discuss ways to analyse such concepts. The course also discusses the key contributions of many of the world's most influential philosophers, from Aristotle to Kok-Chor Tan. The aim of the course is not to convince you of the correctness of any particular view or political position, but to provide you with a deeper and more philosophically-informed basis for your own views, and, perhaps, to help you better understand the views of those with whom you disagree.

Happiness and Welfare

There is significant debate surrounding the necessity and purpose of the state. One strand of thought is that the state should hold the means to **promote happiness and welfare**. Indeed, the United States' Declaration of Independence claims unalienable rights for American citizens including 'life, liberty and **the pursuit of happiness**'. This is not only a feature in the US Constitution; it can also be found in constitutions all around the world.

Thomas Hobbes (1588-1679) was one of the first thinkers to discuss happiness, although he referred to it as *felicity.* 'For Hobbes, power, rather than happiness, is the central human motivation and he believes that we seek happiness only in so far as we seek power'.[17] In answer to the question of why we need a state, Hobbes hypothesised about what society would be like without a state or government. He described a harsh environment lacking order and civility. He claims there would be 'no entity in place to help us arbitrate and peacefully resolve our disputes'.[18] Hobbes calls this government-less society the 'State of Nature'. So Hobbes' argument leads us to the conclusion that the state can create a civil, ordered and, therefore, happy society.

So, how can happiness be created in society? Many thinkers argue that **humans are social creatures** and thus we like to interact with each other. This leads to the idea that **collective action and public goods** would be a sensible place to start in forging a happy population.

Now complete **"Week 2: Happiness and Welfare"**

Remember to complete the **quiz** and the **peer-graded assignment.**

This is an interesting talk by the Prime Minister of Bhutan discussing the role of government in achieving happiness.

Here is a useful summary of Hobbes' view of happiness.

---

[17] Frank Devita, 'Hobbes' Concept of Felicity',
https://frankdevita.wordpress.com/2012/08/06/hobbes-concept-of-felicity/
[18] Alexander Guerrero, 'Happiness, Thomas Hobbes & the State of Nature'

Justice

This section of the course discusses the relationship between **utility and justice**. John Stuart Mill (1806-1873), a key voice in defining the principle of utility, argued that **justice is a separate concept to utility**. Mill contends that justice has two components:

1. The desire to punish a person who has done harm. This comes from humans' ability to demonstrate a moral concern,
2. The existence of an identifiable victim who suffers if justice is infringed upon.[19]

A utilitarian perspective on distributive justice - or a utilitarian perspective really on everything - says that we **opt to distribute resources, benefits, opportunities and everything else so as to maximize utility**.[20]

Jeremy Bentham (1748-1832) is regarded as the founding father of utilitarianism. For Bentham, 'the principle of utility is a to be a standard of evaluating or approving of every action whatsoever, including both our individual actions and decisions and the actions and decisions of the state'. Crucially, utilitarian thinkers attempt to put everything that's good - benefit, advantage, pleasure, good, or happiness - on the same scale, and then for each action, evaluate whether that action the, is the right thing to do by seeing whether that action will bring about more of this good stuff that's all been put on the same scale. More utility as it said, than any other available option.

Bentham argued that "**the interest of everybody is sacred**, or the interest of nobody". He claimed that 'basic securities must be afforded to each and every member of the community, and **violations of these vital interests are not justified**, whether they be perpetrated by other individuals or government, since they contravene the distributive elements of utilitarian theory. To this extent, **at the very least, each person's happiness must count'**.[21]

Now complete **"Week 3: Justice"**

Remember to complete the **quiz** and **peer-graded assignment**.

How do you think Bentham's ideas on utility relate to the principle of justice?

Here is a useful overview of Mill's utilitarianism and how it relates to justice.

This is a short quiz on utilitarianism. Test your knowledge!

---

[19] 'Utilitarianism: John Stuart Mill', http://www.sparknotes.com/philosophy/utilitarianism/section7/
[20] Alexander Guerrero, 'Distributive Justice'.
[21] 'Jeremy Bentham', https://plato.stanford.edu/entries/bentham/

Equality

Equality is generally regarded as a pretty good thing, but over the years some people have seen it as a constraint on the progress of society. One major criticism is that 'complete equality is the defect of all single-value conceptions: if **equality is the all-encompassing goal**, then all other goals, regardless of their desirability or necessity, become lower in priority, and **no society can function by pursuing one goal above all others**'.[22]

The idea of political equality (eg. the right to vote and to express opinions) is undermined when you begin to question how far you are 'from having political equality in the sense of having **an equal right to participate directly or having equal power to determine political action**. Almost no one in modern representative democracies has this kind of power, the power to participate in making political decisions. Or, to use a metaphor, **the power to steer the political machine**. We live in societies with only a few hands on the wheel'.

This section of the course questions whether equality in voting rights and freedom of speech is enough for modern societies: should we demand more? Are elections really a good indicator of equality? What is an alternative to electoral, representative democracy? **Have a think about these questions and try and develop your own opinions using the MOOC material and the extra resources below.**

Now complete **"Week 4: Equality"**

Remember to complete the **quiz** at the end of this section.

Here is a useful overview of some arguments against equality.

This is a very interesting video about why the richest people in US society have more access to and influence on politicians.

Here is a short quiz about equality.

Freedom

This section considers the moral significance of freedom and the role the state plays in relation to freedom. As with equality, there is a **general agreement that freedom or liberty or autonomy is a good thing**. But there's much less agreement about exactly **what is meant by freedom or what freedom requires**. So almost every state, every political society sets out the importance or liberty as one of the core values. For example, the preamble to the US constitution says "the blessings of liberty" must be protected.

---

[22] Herbert J. Gans, 'Some Problems of Equality',
https://www.dissentmagazine.org/article/some-problems-of-equality

In Cuba's socialist constitution, the idea of freedom is present but coupled with other commitments that don't seem to be up for discussion. Perhaps most nakedly paradoxical, Article 53 of the Cuban constitution states that citizens have freedom of speech and of the press. In keeping with the objectives of socialist society, material conditions for the exercise of that right are provided by the fact that **the press, radio, television, movies, and other organs of the mass media are state or social property and can never be private property**. This assures their use at the exclusive service of the working people and in the interest of society. So one has **freedom of speech in this Article 53 provision but only in keeping with certain objectives**.

Negative freedom is defined as 'the absence of obstacles, barriers or constraints', while **positive freedom** is 'the possibility of acting — or the fact of acting — in such a way as to take control of one's life and realize one's fundamental purposes'.[23] The state fits into this in so far as it imposes constraints on freedoms in the form of **laws and the possibility of prison** sentences, but this is often with the **purpose of preventing others from undermining our "negative" freedom**. The state can also help promote "positive" freedoms, but should it? On the benefits side, governments can **reduce the effects of lack of nutrition, shelter and education, as well as increase opportunities for employment**. However, the concern is that state interference in positive freedoms could have **too much of an impact on social life**. For example, the regulation of drugs. Sometimes the regulation is to prevent people who might be on those drugs from harming others. But often the regulation is justified on the grounds that people on those drugs become impaired agents lacking positive freedom, and so they lack the ability to make a good choice about whether or not to use this drug, even if using it wouldn't harm anybody else.

Now complete **"Week 5: Freedom"**

Remember to complete the **quiz** and **peer-graded assignment**, and if you have time worth through the Bonus Materials.

Here is a useful summary of the differences between negative and positive freedom.

This is a controversial video expressing one commentator's opinion on freedom of speech and its apparent decline in the Western world. What do you think? Do you agree with her assessment?

---

[23] 'Positive and Negative Liberty', https://plato.stanford.edu/entries/liberty-positive-negative/

Chapter 3 - Revolutionary Ideas: Borders, Elections, Constitutions, Prisons

The second part of the 'Revolutionary Ideas' course focuses on borders, elections, constitutions and prisons. This course focuses on a number of crucial questions in the field of political science, including how to define political communities, methods of representation and lawmaking and the role of crime and punishment in political communities. You will build on the knowledge gained from the previous chapter to finish the course with a solid understanding of the origins and content of some of the most important theories in Political Science.

Political Community and Borders

It is important to start by defining the term 'political community'. According to Professor Alexander Guerrero, 'one way of defining a political community, is just by looking around and seeing **who's brought in to the political and legal jurisdiction**, of some set of legal or political institutions. So by jurisdiction, I just mean the territory, whether **literal physical territory or in some other sense, over which a political system exercises its power**.'

The American philosopher, Andrew Rehfeld, discusses the reasons for dividing constituencies (the group in which a citizen's vote is counted, for the purpose of electing a political representative) along geographical territory distinctions. This method of forming constituencies dates back to a time where those living in close proximity would most likely have similar values and interests. However, this is not so relevant in contemporary society. Benedict Anderson wrote about 'imagined communities' in relation to nationalism. He took an interesting perspective on community, claiming that it is socially constructed by those who view themselves as part of that group. Anderson defines a **nation as 'an imagined political community' and borders as 'limited' in that they have 'finite, if elastic boundaries, beyond which lie other nations'**.[24]

Now complete **"Week 2: Political Community and Borders"**

In your opinion, should constituency borders be drawn along geographical lines or on the basis of some other factor, such as race, gender, religion etc?

Remember to complete the **quiz** and the **peer-graded assignment** at the end of this section.

If you'd like to know more about Anderson's notion of 'imagined communities', **this** is a good summary of his book.

---

[24] 'Imagined Community', https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Imagined_community

Representatives, Elections and Lotteries

A core feature of modern democracies is the presence of representatives elected through public elections that are, generally, inclusive. Another characteristic of a democracy is freedom of expression and political debate.

In this section of the course you will discuss the merits and drawbacks of representative democracy. Additionally, you will examine the advantages of a "lottocracy" or "sortition". Lottocracy refers to a system of government whereby representatives are elected by lottery (ie. random selection) rather than the popular vote.

Professor Guerrero sets out the way in which a lottocracy would function:

1. **Single-issue focus:** the legislative function is fulfilled by many different single-issue legislatures, with each one focusing just on, for example, agriculture or health care or trade or immigration, rather than by a single generalist legislature like we have now.
2. **Lottery component:** the members of these single-issue legislatures will be chosen by lottery from the relevant political jurisdiction.
3. **Learning phase:** the members of the single-issue legislatures will hear from a variety of experts on the relevant topic at the beginning of each legislative session.

Now complete **"Week 3: Representatives, Elections and Lotteries"**

Do you think a lottocracy would help or hinder politics in Germany?

Remember to complete the **quiz** and the **peer-graded assignment** at the end of this section.

Here is an interesting article about the prospects for lottocracy in America.

Constitutions

The modern experiment of popular self-governance, which began in the late 18th century in the United States, established the legitimacy of state power through the people's will rather than on a monarch or the interests of the nobility and gentry. The people, formerly only subjects of the crown having few rights, became citizens with full and equal rights, regardless of class. In turn, the government, became the instrument for carrying out the people's will as expressed through their elected representatives.

Mindful of the experience of tyrannical monarchy, newly self-governing societies adopted constitutional limits that defined the specific authority of the state, forbade it from violating basic rights, and divided government into distinct branches that would check and balance one another so that no single branch could amass too much power. Although the idea of

self-government in the US originally applied only to white males with sufficient property — and coexisted with the heinous practice of slavery — over time, the concept expanded to all persons. Today, self-governance is universally understood to mean a government that is, as Abraham Lincoln asserted, "of the people, by the people, and for the people."[25]

The original purpose of establishing **formal or constitutional limits on government was to check the arbitrary actions of hereditary monarchs or rulers who abused their power**, imposed unwanted taxes, or launched unpopular wars. Using written agreements like the Magna Carta or unwritten agreements, nobles with substantial property forced the principle of restraint on the rule of European monarchs by establishing consultative or representative institutions. Over centuries, through popular revolutions or the evolution of more representative institutions like parliaments, there developed **greater checks on executive power and a separation of government into independent branches exercising distinct powers of the state.** Rulers could no longer act unilaterally to enact decrees against the will of the people and instead had to gain approval from parliaments, having increasing popular representation, for passing laws and obey the judgments of courts, established to interpret the law.[26]

Now complete **"Week 4: Constitutions"**

Taking the USA as an example, do you think constitutional separation of powers is working effectively?

Remember to complete the **quiz** at the end of this section.

Here is a video lecture from Michael Huemer (one of the contemporary thinkers mentioned on this course) about constitutional limits..

This is also a good summary of the purpose and functions of constitutions.

Prisons and Punishments

In this section you will consider some of the theories of punishment. Theories of punishment can be divided into two general philosophies: utilitarian and retributive. The utilitarian theory of punishment seeks to punish offenders to discourage, or "deter," future wrongdoing.

---

[25] 'Constitutional Limits on Government: Essential Principles', http://democracyweb.org/constitutional-limits-essential-principles
[26] 'Constitutional Limits on Government: Essential Principles', http://democracyweb.org/constitutional-limits-essential-principles

The retributive theory seeks to punish offenders because they deserve to be punished. Under the **utilitarian philosophy, laws should be used to maximize the happiness of society**. Because crime and punishment are inconsistent with happiness, they should be kept to a minimum. Utilitarians understand that a crime-free society does not exist, but they endeavor to **inflict only as much punishment as is required to prevent future crimes.** Under the utilitarian philosophy, **laws that specify punishment for criminal conduct should be designed to deter future criminal conduct**. Deterrence operates on a specific and a general level. **Rehabilitation is another utilitarian rationale for punishment**. The goal of rehabilitation is to prevent future crime by giving offenders the ability to succeed within the confines of the law.

The counterpart to the utilitarian theory of punishment is the **retributive theory**. Under this theory, **offenders are punished for criminal behavior because they deserve punishment**. Criminal behavior upsets the peaceful balance of society, and punishment helps to restore the balance. The retributive theory **focuses on the crime itself as the reason for imposing punishment**. Where the utilitarian theory looks forward by basing punishment on social benefits, the retributive theory looks backward at the transgression as the basis for punishment.

Now complete **"Week 5: Prisons and Punishments"**

Which theory of punishment do you most agree with? Why?

Remember to complete the **quiz** and **peer-graded assignment** at the end of this section.

Here is a good summary of the theories of punishment.

Chapter 4 - Discover Political Science

In [this course](#), you will critically explore the ways in which politics permeates all areas of social life. The course discusses the notion of power in a multi-level society, the role of the state in relation to international and regional organisations and the relevance of ideology in contemporary politics. You will discover how to effectively analyse political events and relate them to core concepts in the Political Science discipline.

What is "Political Science"?

The word "political" originates from the **Greek word "politikos",** which means "that which concerns the polis". The most common translation for Polis would be "city" (city-state) but we will instead use "state" in a broad sense. This is one of the reasons why political science has historically been defined as **"the science of the state"**: "political" means something that concerns the city or the state in a broad sense.

Political science has also been regarded as the science of power. Max Weber's definition provides interesting insight into the **"political" aspect of power relations.** According to Weber, any dominating group whose orders are executed on a given territory by an administrative organisation with the **use of physical force and/or the threat of using it can be defined as "political"**. Concerning the definition of a 'dominating group', Weber insists on the concept of "power". One aspect of power is the use of violence, which is actually not necessary since the mere threat of violence is enough to achieve obedience. The structure which imposes norms on a group of people in a defined territory is considered to be "political". **"State" and "power",** if joined, define the political.

The term "political" can be divided into three variants: **polity, politics and policies**. "Polity" refers to concepts such as the city, the political community, the political regime, or even the republic. When referring to a political polity, we are indicating a **separate part of our society**, distinct from what is economic, cultural, social and religious. A polity **manages cooperation and conflicts** between individuals and groups within society to promote community life.

Politics are not limited to the activities of the political world. **NGOs or neighbourhood committees**, for instance, can try to influence rules and change how power is exercised within society, which is related to peaceful coexistence and, therefore, to polity and politics too. **Peaceful coexistence** is mainly possible thanks to a range of coherent decisions that constitute what we call policies. Policy making involves **many levels of power** (from local to international) and intricate networks of actors (public authorities and private actors).[27]

Now complete **"Week 1, Lesson 1: What is "Political Science"?"**

Remember to complete the **short activities** and **quizzes** in this section.

Here is an interesting interview with the former Canadian Prime Minister, Kim Campbell, about the differences between politics and policy.

---

[27] Discover Political Science, ['Week 1, Lesson 1 [Part 1]: Definition'](#); ['Lesson 1 [Part 2]: Polity, Politics, Policies'](#)

Politicization of Facts

Why does a social matter, at a certain point, become subject to regulations from the political system? Nothing is inherently a political matter per se, but any social matter can become one. The argument that **'a matter is not always political'** is often pushed on all sides of the political spectrum. Indeed, a matter can, in theory, **cease to be political**. In fact, the transformation of a social matter to a political matter depends on the way that actors shape it. It also depends on the contextual configuration (time and place). Take floods for example: the fact that rivers floods in the aftermath of heavy rains, appears to be a **purely natural phenomenon**. However, the crisis management of such an event can be the subject of a social mobilisation and can be addressed by the polity. Indeed, if **emergency services are considered inadequate,** or rainwater management **facilities outdated**, citizens may come to the point of protesting to **demand efficient infrastructures** that ensures the good functioning of the city. **The media** often considers themselves to be spokespeople for these claims and act to **remind the polity of its function as a society manager** that should act to ensure hazard prevention and the protection of its population.

What are the political, administrative, and social procedures that lead to a political decision? Why, at some point, do we choose to legislate a certain matter? **Why does a government decide to take action?** This process involves more than just a particular answer to certain needs. At the first stage, this takes place through the **'perception, emergence and the formatting of a public matter'**. The second step involves individuals, interest groups and lobbyists forcing the issue onto the **political agenda**. In the next step this new political agenda is **put into practice**. Finally, the relevant authorities will establish a **system to evaluate** the new legislation.[28]

> Now complete **"Week 1, Lesson 2: How does a fact become "political"?"**

> Remember to complete the **quiz** in this section.

> **This** is an article with a right-wing perspective arguing that those on the left of the political spectrum in America politicize "everything". Do you agree with the author's argument? This also links to "Lesson 5: Is everything "political"?".

What is the State?

'Some see a "state" as an ancient institution, going back to Rome, Greece and before, and theorized by Plato, Aristotle and other classical philosophers. Others insist on the unique features of the **modern state**, with its extensive rule of law, citizenship rights, and broad economic and social responsibilities. A state is more than a government; that is clear. **Governments change, but states endure**. A state is the means of rule over a defined or "sovereign" territory. It is comprised of an **executive, a bureaucracy, courts** and other institutions. But, above all, a state **levies taxes and operates a military and police force**.

---

[28] Discover Political Science, 'Week 1, Lesson 2: "How does a fact become "political?'

States distribute and redistribute resources and wealth, so lobbyists, politicians and revolutionaries seek in their own way to influence or even to get hold of the levers of state power. States exist in a **variety of sizes**, ranging from enormous China to tiny Andorra. Some claim a long lineage, while others are of modern construction. In all but the short term, **states are in flux**. They expand and contract as military and political fortunes change. Some, like Poland, even disappear and reappear later. Or they may be divided up (sometimes peacefully) by communities that prefer to go their separate ways (Czechoslovakia). Others, such as Iraq, may be occupied or run as a colony or protectorate. States can also **"fail"** - their governing institutions collapse due to civil war and internal strife (as in Somalia) or because the state has little authority outside the capital city (Afghanistan). While **globalization and regional integration (like the European Union) challenge the state's powers**, the state is still the dominant arena of domestic politics as well as the primary actor in international relations.

Some states occupy a unique status in the international community of states, due to a very small population or very small land area, but usually both. **Microstates**, or small states and territories (SSTs) are sovereign state and enjoy a disproportionately large influence in the United Nations General Assembly thanks to the one state, one vote rule. **Experimental States, such as Sealand, Freedom Ship, Cyber** Yugoslavia are among the hundreds of experimental states that people have founded in order to avoid taxation, feel independent, or to create a tourist attraction.'[29]

Now complete **["Week 2, Lesson 1: What is "the state"?"](#)**

Remember to complete the **short activities** and **quizzes** in this section.

[This](#) is a useful source about the different types of state. It is also useful for the other Lessons in this section.

Societies Without a State?

Generally, humans are considered to have organised themselves politically **in order to survive** against a series of threats, internal or external, to the thereby created group. According to some, humans organized themselves politically to feed themselves: hunting in groups is indeed easier. According to the French philosopher **Alain (Emile-Chartier)**, it was not in order to hunt so as to feed themselves that humans formed political communities, but rather to be able **to sleep**. Indeed, there's nothing more crucial than the need for sleep. He therefore speculated that **"some would be on watch duty while others would sleep: that would be the first draft of a politically organised city"**.

Let's assume sleep was the reason why humans organised society politically: how would the turns be organised? Would everyone have to contribute? **Would the most reluctant members of the community be forced to participate?** If so, would social pressure be used by the rest of

---

[29] Global Policy Forum, 'What is a "State"?',
https://www.globalpolicy.org/nations-a-states/what-is-a-state.html

the group to force them? Or would the order come from a leader? One concrete example, is the Nambikwara society studied by anthropologist and ethnologist Claude Lévi-Strauss who reported on it in his famous book "Tristes Tropiques" (literally "Sad Tropics"). This native American society located in Brazil is ruled by leader who doesn't use any coercion. The **ruler receives his power by performing duties**: finding a good camping spot leading war well and properly leading the hunt. In return, the **ruled ones agree to grant him some privileges** such as the right to polygamy.

Drawing on this, there are 4 types of communities:
- with or without a leader,
- with or without coercion, and thus:
- communities with a leader and coercion - today's states fall under this category;
- communities with a leader but no coercion - the Nambikwara* society falls under this category.

There are also communities without a **leader but with coercion: such as the Inuit* society**. The asterisk here highlights that we are referring to the Inuit and Nambikwara traditional societies **before their 20th century encounter with the modern world** and the respective states ruling their land. Finally, are there any societies without leaders or coercion? That would be the ideal of **anarchist or libertarian groups**. However, in practice, they almost never manage to avoid the power of a few members over the rest of the group, nor some form of coercion.[30]

Now complete **"Week 2, Lesson 2 [Part 1]: Societies without state? The contributions of anthropology"**

Remember to complete the **short activities** and **quizzes** in this section.

Here is an interesting article about the 7 important purposes of the modern state.

Liberalism

Liberalism is derived from two related features of Western culture. The first is the West's preoccupation with **individuality**, as compared to the emphasis in other civilizations on status, caste, and tradition. Throughout much of history, the individual has been submerged in and subordinate to his clan, tribe, ethnic group, or kingdom. **Liberalism is the culmination of developments in Western society that produced a sense of the importance of human individuality,** a **liberation of the individual** from complete subservience to the group, and a **relaxation of the tight hold of custom, law, and authority**. In this respect, liberalism stands for the emancipation of the individual.

---

[30] Discover Political Science, 'Lesson 2 [Part 1]: Societies without state? The contribution of anthropology'

Liberalism also derives from the **practice of adversariality* in European political and economic life**, a process in which **institutionalized competition** - such as the competition between different political parties in electoral contests, between prosecution and defense in adversary procedure, or between different producers in a market economy - generates a **dynamic social order**. However, the belief that competition is an essential part of a political system and that good government requires a vigorous opposition was still considered strange in most European countries in the early 19th century.

Underlying the liberal belief in adversariality is the conviction that **human beings are essentially rational creatures capable of settling their political disputes through dialogue and compromise**. This aspect of liberalism became particularly prominent in 20th-century projects aimed at eliminating war and resolving disagreements between states through organizations such as the League of Nations, the United Nations, and the International Court of Justice (World Court).

Liberalism has a **close but sometimes uneasy relationship with democracy**. At the centre of democratic doctrine is the belief that governments derive their authority from popular election; liberalism, on the other hand, is **primarily concerned with the scope of governmental activity**. Liberals often have been wary of democracy, then, because of fears that it might generate a **tyranny by the majority**. One might briskly say, therefore, that democracy looks after majorities and liberalism after unpopular minorities.[31]

---

*Adversariality - involving two people or two sides who oppose each other; of, relating to, or characteristic of an adversary or adversary procedures.

Now complete **"Week 4, Lesson 1: Liberalism"**

Remember to complete the **short quiz** and the **reading segment** in this section.

This page has a lot of detail about liberalism, its history and its contemporary incarnations.

Here is a very interesting video created by The Economist about the future of liberalism.

Communism and Socialism

Communism and Socialism both arose in the context of the **Industrial Revolution** and largely as a response to a time when business owners were becoming extremely wealthy by **exploiting their workers**. Through different processes both philosophies looked at the current

---

[31] K. Minogue, H. Girvetz, T. Ball and R. Dagger, 'Liberalism', https://www.britannica.com/topic/liberalism

situation as being unsustainable and eventually societal pressures would result in drastic changes.

Each is built on the premise that individual will contribute to society based on their own ability. Both advocate that **institutions are centralized and either controlled by government or by collectives**, this effectively **removes private business** as a producer of goods and services. Government (or some form of it) plays a large role in economic investment and planning, either in a centralized form or decentralized to local government bodies.

While there are certainly key similarities in the philosophies of Communism and Socialism, there are differences that make considering them interchangeable incorrect. The most fundamental difference is that under **Communism individuals are provided for or compensated based on their needs**, in effect meaning that in a true communist system you wouldn't have money and you'd simply be given what the government thinks you need in terms of food, clothing, accommodation, etc. Central to **Socialism is that individuals are compensated for based on their individual contribution**, so people that work harder or smarter would receive more than those that don't contribute. This difference highlights a key flaw in the Communist model, where no one has any motivation to work harder or smarter as it would have no impact or benefit for them.

Another interesting difference between the two ideologies is that **Communism views all property as being public property and effectively there is no personal property or items** held by individuals. **Socialism** rather sees individuals still having **their personal property but all industrial and production capacity would be communally owned and managed by consensus or government**. Furthermore, Socialism is at its core an **economic philosophy**, whereas Communism is **economic and political** in its requirement that government be the central owner and decision maker in all matters.[32]

Now complete **"Week 4, Lesson 2: Communism and Socialism"**

Remember to complete the **short quiz** and the **reading segment** in this section.

Here is a useful video elaborating further the differences between Communism and Socialism.

Christian Democracy

'Christian democracy, political movement that has a close association with Roman Catholicism and its philosophy of **social and economic justice**. It incorporates both **traditional church and family values** and progressive values such as **social welfare**. For this reason, Christian democracy does not fit squarely in the ideological categories of left and right. It **rejects the individualist worldview** that underlies both political liberalism and laissez-faire economics, and it recognizes the **need for the state to intervene** in the economy to support

---

[32] Jeffrey Glen, 'Communism v Socialism',
http://www.businessdictionary.com/article/1030/communism-vs-socialism-d1412/

communities and defend human dignity. Yet Christian democracy, in opposition to socialism, **defends private property and resists excessive intervention of the state** in social life and education. While Christian democracy found its inspiration and base of support in Christianity, its parties operated autonomously from ecclesiastical organizations and often welcomed the support of agnostics or atheists. Many Christian democratic parties have adopted over time a more secular discourse, privileging pragmatic policies over overtly religious themes.

After World War II, a number of Christian democratic parties appeared in Europe, including the Italian Christian Democratic Party (later the Italian Popular Party), the French Popular Republican Movement, and the **German Christian Democratic Union, which became the most successful**. Christian democratic parties were a major political force during the Cold War and led coalition governments in Germany, France, Italy, Belgium, Luxembourg, Austria, and the Netherlands. The same period also saw the appearance of Christian democratic parties in Latin America. Though most were small splinter groups, **Christian democrats eventually achieved power in Venezuela, El Salvador, and Chile**. After the fall of the Berlin Wall and the collapse of the U.S.S.R., Christian democratic parties made **electoral strides in central and eastern Europe**.'[33]

> Now complete **"Week 4, Lesson 3: Christian Democracy"**

> Remember to complete the **short quiz** and the **reading segment** in this section.

> **Here** is a summary of the Christian Democratic Union party in Germany.

Nationalism(s)

'Nationalism, ideology based on the premise that the **individual's loyalty and devotion to the nation-state surpass other individual or group interests**.

Nationalism is a **modern movement**. Throughout history people have been attached to their native soil, to the traditions of their parents, and to established territorial authorities; but it was not until the **end of the 18th century** that nationalism began to be a generally recognized sentiment molding public and private life and one of the great, if not the greatest, single determining factors of modern history. Because of its dynamic vitality and its all-pervading character, nationalism is often thought to be very old; sometimes it is mistakenly regarded as a permanent factor in political behaviour. Actually, **the American and French revolutions may be regarded as its first powerful manifestations**. After penetrating the new countries of Latin America it spread in the early 19th century to central Europe and from there, toward the middle of the century, to eastern and southeastern Europe. At the beginning of the 20th century nationalism flowered in the ancient lands of Asia and Africa. Thus the 19th century

---

[33] André Munro, 'Christian democracy', https://www.britannica.com/topic/Christian-democracy

has been called the age of nationalism in Europe, while the 20th century has witnessed the rise and struggle of powerful national movements throughout Asia and Africa.'[34]

Nationalism can be divided into various strands, each with a slightly different focus. The four broad categories of nationalism are elaborated below.

Ethnic Nationalism

Ethnic nationalism functions on the principle that a **nation can only be defined by its ethnic connection which encompasses shared language, culture, heritage and ancestry**. Because of this characteristic, Roshwald (2001) describes this form of nationalism as **intolerant** and descriptive of authoritarian regimes. Studies have found that, in general, ethnic nationalism is composed of a series of terms that have distinctive definitions, including ethnicity, nation and state. In the real world ethnic nationalism has often **lead to conflict**, especially in ethnic diverse locations (i.e. Niger Delta) (Sulaiman, 2016).

Religious Nationalism

Religious nationalism denotes a form of nationalism which relies upon a **central religion or dogma** that has implications in politics and state affairs (Omer and Springs, 2013). This notion contrasts strongly with modern forms of nationalism and has often been described as 'irrational' (Omer and Springs, 2013: 80). Several real world examples include **non-secular states**, such as Iran, Saudi Arabia or Afghanistan, where the **religious law** (Sharia Law or the Islamic Law) is the **ultimate law of the state** (Kavalski, 2016). Like ethnic nationalism, religious nationalism shows **little to no tolerance** for other religious beliefs (Kavalski, 2016), however it **does not focus on ethnic unity**, but rather on **religious unity** by repelling any opposing views.

Civic Nationalism

At the other end of the spectrum, civic nationalism (also referred to as progressive nationalism) advocates for **social unity, individual rights and freedoms**. This form of nationalism is centred on the idea of a **non-xenophobic society**, which shows **tolerance** for all its individuals and strives to provide equality and social justice (Hall, 1998). A practical example of this can be found in **Singapore**, where the government's strategy for development derived directly from civic nationalism and globalisation (Brown, 2000).

Some scholars argue that **civic nationalism and ethnic nationalism have a converging point**, namely the element of **shared culture**. The cultural form of nationalism thus defines a middle ground between civic nationalism and ethnic nationalism (Fedorenko, 2012; Song, 2009). Hutchinson (1987) argues with historical examples from Arab, Jewish and Hindu nations that **cultural nationalism plays a significant part in the building of nations**, as it is a shared belief, value and tradition alongside with ethnic heritage which can lead to the consolidation of states.

Ideological Nationalism

Finally, ideological nationalism is a form of **political nationalism which argues for the capacity of nations to self-govern** (Smith, 2013). This notion can also be seen in Dahbour's (2003) idea of **self-determination**. Looking at the history of nationalism two main conclusions can be drawn. The first refers to the fact that nationalism is highly connected with the concept

---

[34] Hans Kohn, 'Nationalism', https://www.britannica.com/topic/nationalism

of national identity and claims made for self-governance. Thus it may be argued that early forms of nationalism were **ideological in nature and focused on notions of territory, population and self-governmen**t. This seems to justify Coakley's (2012) ideas, according to which definitions of nationalism overlap definitions of state, nations and ethnicity.[35]

Now complete **"Week 4, Lesson 4: The nationalism(s)"**

Remember to complete the **short quiz** and the **reading segment** in this section.

There are a lot of interesting videos about nationalism on the internet, but **here** is a Crash Course video discussing 19th century nationalism.

This is a useful resource for more detail on nationalism.

The Left/Right Spectrum

There is a huge amount of information about the Left/Right political spectrum available online, and there is significant debate about its validity in the modern era. In this section of the Study Guide you will find a number of external resources from different sources, rather than a long piece of text here. However, here is a breakdown of which ideologies fit under which category.

N.B. It is essential to remember that **within each category there are ideologies that are more or less "right-wing" or "left-wing"**.

Try and decide for yourself where on the spectrum each of the following ideologies fit.

Left
Civil Libertarianism: Personal freedoms are virtually unlimited, although there may still be some economic controls.
Localism: Communities determine their own laws and regulations without interference from a higher authority.
Direct Democracy: The people vote directly for every policy they want to see enacted.
Democratic Socialism: Markets and elections are generally maintained within a system of large-scale redistribution of wealth and heavy regulations.
Social Engineering: The state encourages people to behave in certain ways through incentive programs.
Progressivism: The state actively directs society and the economy through the supposedly objective lens of science.
Dictatorship of the Proletariat: Workers seize control of factories. Capitalistic ownership is

---

[35] The WritePass Journal, 'Nationalism Essay',
https://writepass.com/journal/2017/08/nationalism-essay/#Ethnic_Nationalism

outlawed.

Socialism: The government owns the means of production and decides how they should be employed.

Marxism: Karl Marx's vision was of a transition from capitalism, to socialism, and finally to communism, a transition that explicitly relied on violence.

Communism: Private property is abolished and the state directs all economic production.

Right

Classical Liberalism: The state respects individual rights and only exists to protect them from aggressors.

Constitutional Conservatism: Individual rights are spelled out in a constitution, which constrains government action.

Representative Democracy: The people elect representatives to make and execute laws for them. Republicanism.

Nationalism: Devotion to national greatness and a common identity. Demonization of "the other."

Fascism: Industry remains nominally private, but is actually directed by the state.

Theocracy: Rule by the church, in which obedience and worship are prized over personal freedom.

Islamo-Fascism: Islamic theocracy that puts fealty to the religion ahead of individual rights, and demands violence against infidels.

Nazism: Hitler's version of fascism, including a state directed economy, heavy militarism, and genocide.[36]

Now complete **"Week 4, Lesson 6: Left / Right"**

Remember to complete the **short quiz** and the **reading segment** in this section.

This series of videos argues that the political spectrum goes vertically, rather than from left to right. Find out why by watching the videos. Do you agree with their arguments?

Here is a 4-minute explanation of the Left/Right spectrum.

This article has a lot of useful diagrams to help you visualise the political spectrum.

---

[36] Logan Albright, 'The Political Spectrum, Explained', https://freethepeople.org/the-political-spectrum-explained/

Citizens, Citizenship and Political Participation

Citizenship, relationship between an individual and a state to which the individual owes allegiance and in turn is entitled to its protection. Citizenship **implies the status of freedom with accompanying responsibilities**. Citizens have certain **rights, duties, and responsibilities** that are denied or only partially extended to aliens and other non-citizens residing in a country. In general, full political rights, including the **right to vote and to hold public office**, are predicated upon citizenship. The usual responsibilities of citizenship are allegiance to the **state, taxation, and sometimes military service**. Citizenship is the **most privileged form of nationality**. This broader term denotes various relations between an individual and a state that do not necessarily confer political rights but do imply other privileges, particularly protection abroad. It is the term used in **international law** to denote all persons whom **a state is entitled to protect**. Nationality also serves to denote the relationship to a state of entities other than individuals; corporations, ships, and aircraft, for example, possess a nationality.[37]

'Ensuring that government actually works for the public good requires **informed, organized, active and peaceful citizen participation**. Citizens must, therefore, understand ideas about citizenship, politics and government. They need knowledge to make decisions about policy choices and the proper use of authority, along with the skills to voice their concerns, act collectively and hold public officials (i.e. elected representatives, civil servants, and appointed leaders) accountable.

The term citizen has an inherently political meaning that implies a certain type of relationship between the people and government. **Participation** is an instrumental **driver of democratic and socio-economic change**, and a fundamental way to empower citizens. **Civil society organizations** (CSOs) are a vehicle through which citizens can aggregate their interests, voice their preference and **exercise the power** necessary to affect sustained change. However, this requires CSOs learning to work together and to play a variety of complementary political roles that include: acting as **watchdogs; advocates; mobilizers; educators; researchers; infomediaries; and policy analysts**.'[38]

Now complete **"Week 5, Lesson 1: Citizens"**

Remember to complete the **short quiz** and the **reading segment** in this section.

This is a very interesting interview with migration expert Nando Sigona where he discusses citizenship and nationality.

Have a look at **this organisation** and the work they do to foster political participation.

---

[37] Encyclopaedia Britannica, 'Citizenship', https://www.britannica.com/topic/citizenship
[38] National Democratic Institute, 'Citizen Participation',
https://www.ndi.org/what-we-do/citizen-participation

Lobbies and Advocacy Groups

There is a difference between lobbies and advocacy group. Both aim to influence political decisions on behalf of their members but they do so in different ways. **Advocacy** can be defined as the **practical use of knowledge for purposes of social changes**. These changes can be directed to government policies, laws, procedures, or sometimes to ourselves. Advocacy is therefore an act of **supporting an issue and persuading the decision makers on how to act** in order to support that issue. This definition tells, in fact, that advocacy is a process, not an one-way activity. By this definition it is clear that advocacy is an effective process aimed at achieving some specific results. Advocacy is about **motivating and mobilizing the community**, too. It starts with a small group of people who share concerns about a specific problem and are willing to devote time, their expertise and resources available to reach the desired change.

Lobbying can generally be defined as **any attempt to influence a politician or public official on an issue**. Lobbying is a complex and sensitive task, one must approach **very well prepared**. Lobbying is a term that includes activities of **influencing the decision makers**, both political and all other decisions for which the community or individuals are concerned about. Lobbying is a targeted activity and is mainly consisting of a **direct influence on decision-making persons**.[39] Lobbying is further broken down into:

- **'Direct lobbying:** Any attempt to **influence new or existing legislation via communication** with a member of the legislative body or other government representative who has a say in the legislation.
- **Grassroots lobbying:** Asking the general **public to contact their legislator and/or mobilizing the public around a legislative issue**. Organizations, such as nonprofits, cannot ask their members to contact their legislators or government agencies regarding the legislation, though, as this is considered direct lobbying. Examples of grassroots lobbying include creating an online petition to generate public support for a cause, distributing flyers, and organizing a public demonstration or rally.'[40]

Now complete **"Week 5, Lesson 2: Lobbies"**

Remember to complete the **short quiz** and the **reading segment** in this section.

Here is an interesting video discussing the possible benefits of lobbying the government.

This is a useful article explaining advocacy, lobbying and a number of related terms.

---

[39] Center for Society Orientation, 'Advocacy and Lobbying',
https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=aTbtKRdYbYo
[40] LobbyIt.com, 'Advocacy vs. Lobbying: Understanding the Difference',
http://lobbyit.com/advocacy-vs-lobbying-understanding-difference/

Political Parties

A political party can be defined as **a group of persons organized to acquire and exercise political power**. Political parties originated in their modern form in Europe and the United States in the **19th century**, along with the electoral and parliamentary systems, whose development reflects the evolution of parties. The term party has since come to be applied to all organized groups seeking political power, whether by democratic elections or by revolution.

In earlier, pre-revolutionary, aristocratic and monarchical regimes, the political process unfolded within restricted circles in which factions - grouped around particular noblemen or influential personalities - were opposed to one another. The establishment of parliamentary regimes and the appearance of parties at first scarcely changed this situation. Regimes supported by nobles were **succeeded by regimes supported by other elites**. These narrowly based parties were later transformed to a greater or lesser extent, for in the 19th century in Europe and America there e**merged parties depending on mass support**.

The **20th century** saw the spread of political parties throughout the entire world. In developing countries, large modern political parties have sometimes been based on traditional relationships, such as ethnic, tribal, or religious affiliations. Moreover, many political parties in developing countries are partly **political, partly military**. Certain socialist and communist parties in Europe earlier experienced the same tendencies. Developing originally within the **framework of liberal democracy** in the 19th century, political parties have been used since the 20th century **by dictatorships for entirely undemocratic purposes**.[41]

> Now complete **"Week 5, Lesson 3: Political Parties"**

> Remember to complete the **short quiz** and the **reading segment** in this section.

> **Here** is a useful Crash Course video about Political Parties.

Parliament

Parliaments have been and are **different throughout the world and throughout history**, just like every political phenomenon. Nonetheless, it is possible to present some of the features that remain prominent beyond borders and eras. First of all, the **parliament can be considered an institution**, a part of the state, or even a power (as in the separation of powers). It's also possible to see it as a **political actor** in a strict sense, since it is a **collective and public entity with a leading role in the making of binding decisions** that have an impact on community life.

In simple terms, parliament can be described as **an assembly of deputies representing the people and exercising the legislative power, which is the power to issue standards and decisions that have a general effect, such as the government's budget, or a specific effect, for instance, to grant nationality to an individual**. It does so either alone or in association with

---

[41] Maurice Duverger, 'Political party', https://www.britannica.com/topic/political-party

the head of state. The parliament is an assembly for **deliberation and public decisions**. One of the main characteristics to define it is the **public debate** that occurs prior to a vote. Depending on the form of government, its relevance changes. From a liberal democracy to an **authoritarian/totalitarian regime, for instance, the change is dramatic**. But also, whether it is a presidential or a parliamentary regime makes a big difference. Political scientists often speak of parliamentarianism, which is, as Hans Kelsen defined it: the formation of the directing state by an elected assembly through universal and egalitarian suffrage, which means a majority is required to make decisions. When this form of government exists side by side with a **particracy, a form of government where the political center of gravity shifts from the governmental and parliamentary institutions to the political parties**, parliament can lose parts of its deliberative and decision-making power because, in this case parties are at the forefront of public decision-making, even if it's the parliament that eventually does the ratifying.[42]

Now complete **"Week 5, Lesson 4: Parliament"**

Remember to complete the **short quiz** and the **reading segment** in this section.

Here is an introduction to the UK parliament.

Government

In principle, and in reality, **the government is charged with executing the laws enacted by the legislative branch of power, under the scrutiny of the judiciary**. Therefore, the government is charged with developing and managing the policies put in place for its citizens. It publishes decrees or supreme decisions that are more specific or practical than laws, in order to implement laws. In concrete terms, it contributes to the **management of a country and to the terms and content of public policies**. From an organic point of view, government refers to a **group of people making decisions**: head of state, the president or the king, a government leader often called prime minister or chancellor, ministers and secretaries of state. In the United States, the title of **Secretary of State** is the equivalent of the European ministers of foreign affairs. In France or in Belgium, for instance, secretaries of state can be attached to other departments besides foreign affairs but they have fewer responsibilities than ministers. They are usually charged with a specific matter.

Another difference between English-speaking countries and countries of French or civil law tradition lies in the term 'cabinet'. In English-speaking countries, it is a **synonym of government**. Therefore, it can include the government leader and its ministers. Instead, in countries of French tradition, 'cabinet' refers to the team of political and administrative actors **assisting and counselling a minister**. In every country, no matter the form of government, the government makes decisions and executes public policies with the help of public administrations. These administrative institutions carry out what **Max Weber** called the **'impersonal and abstract management' of the political community**, they ensure that political

---

[42] Discover Political Science, 'Week 5, Lesson 4 [Part 1]: "Parliament"'

decisions are enforced where and for whom they are meant for. Notice how, today, the terms 'government' and 'governance' are often associated. **'Governance' refers to the management of collective interests**, playing down the role of the state and government and enhancing the one of **non-state actors, social or private**. This is not independent from certain ideologies. Whether the government is seen from a more liberal or participative perspective, regardless of its internal organisation, what matters in this case is the managerial, leading role of the government in the political community and on multiple levels of power.[43]

Now complete **"Week 5, Lesson 5: Government"**

Remember to complete the **short quiz** and the **reading segment** in this section.

This is a short video about Canada's government system.

For a brief history of the term 'government' and its practical application, have a look **here**.

Power: who rules our societies?

'In "The Concept of Power" (1957), his first major contribution to the field of political science, Robert Dahl developed a **formal definition of power** that was frequently cited as an important (though incomplete) insight into the phenomenon. According to Dahl, "**A has power over B to the extent that he can get B to do something that B would not otherwise do**." Dahl gave as an example a professor threatening a student with a failing grade if he did not read a certain book during the holidays. In this case, the amount of power held by the professor can be conceived as the difference between the probability that the student would read the book before receiving the threat and the probability that he would read it after receiving the threat. Dahl argued that **his definition could be used to compare the power of political actors** in a given sphere—for instance, the influence of different U.S. senators on questions of foreign policy. Critics, such as the social theorist Steven Lukes, argued that Dahl's definition **failed to capture other important dimensions of power, such as the capacity of an actor to shape the norms and values held by others**.

In his best-known work, *Who Governs?: Democracy and Power in an American City* (1961), a study of power dynamics in New Haven, Connecticut, Dahl argued that **political power in the United States is pluralistic***. He thus rebutted power-elite theorists such as C. Wright Mills and Floyd Hunter, who had described the United States as a country ruled by a small group of interconnected individuals occupying key positions of power. In his study, Dahl found that **while power was distributed unequally in New Haven, it was also dispersed among a number of groups in competition with each other**, rather than monopolized by a single elite group.

---

[43] Discover Political Science, 'Week 5, Lesson 5 [Part 1]: "Government"'

Dahl introduced the term **polyarchy*** to characterize **American politics and other political systems that are open, inclusive, and competitive** (*Polyarchy*, 1971). The concept allowed him to make a distinction between an ideal system of democracy and institutional arrangements that approximate this ideal. Thus, **polyarchies are based on the principle of representative rather than direct democracy and therefore constitute a form of minority rule**, yet they are also (imperfectly) **democratized systems** that limit the power of elite groups through institutions such as regular and free elections.[44]

> ***Pluralistic** - 'relating to or advocating a system in which two or more states, groups, principles, sources of authority, etc., coexist'

> ***Polyarchy** - 'lit. "rule by many"; describes the process of democratization, in contrast to democracy itself'

Now complete **["Week 6, Lesson 1: Who is ruling our societies?"](link)**

Remember to complete the **learning quiz** in this section.

[This](link) is an interesting video about what young people in the US think about power in society.

How is power exercised in politics?

> **Percolation-Up Model:** Political power rests with the **citizens**. In turn, citizens grant political power to their leaders through elections. This view appeals to our democratic sensibilities, but it may not be correct. After all, throughout most of human history—and in many parts of the world today—strong and stable governments ignored their citizens.

> **Drip-Down Model:** Political power rests with the **leaders**, who organize society and impose order. Nevertheless, citizens retain the power to **overthrow the government** by electing new leaders.

Political scientists use both of these views in different circumstances. Sometimes change happens in a society because of a **genuine grassroots effort**. In other cases, government **leaders create a policy and impose it** on the people. And sometimes both happen.

---

[44] André Munro, 'Robert A. Dahl', https://www.britannica.com/biography/Robert-A-Dahl

For example: the **civil rights movement** in the United States had elements of both percolation-up and drip-down models of power. Much of the original push for the movement came from African Americans, who were angry about their status as second-class citizens. They **organized and staged a variety of protests to bring about change** - an example of the percolation-up model in action. After it became apparent that many state governments (especially, but not only, in the South) would resist giving African Americans equal rights, the **federal government began asserting its power** to enforce laws and court decisions - an example of the drip-down model in action.[45]

      Now complete **"Week 6, Lesson 2: How is power exercised in politics?"**

      Remember to complete the **learning quiz** in this section.

      Here is a video explaining how to understand power.

Legitimate Power

Legitimacy is necessary for both the **governed and the governors**. In essence, the governed need to feel like they have consented to submit to the power. In other words, they want to **believe that their obedience is meaningful**. As for the rulers, they seek the **consent** of the governed to their power. As Max Weber argues, "all dominations seek (...) to awaken and maintain the belief in their legitimacy".

Weber is the author of a typology containing various **types of legitimacies** that has become a classic in political science. He draws a distinction between three types of dominations or legitimacies: **traditional** legitimacy, **charismatic** legitimacy and **rational legal** legitimacy, all of which refer to a series of criteria according to which such power is considered to be appropriate, well founded and justified. As its title suggests, a power based on traditional legitimacy is also based on **tradition and custom**.

Why obey a certain leader or comply with such a rule? Following his 'traditional legitimacy' typology, Weber contends: "because it is **customary**. Because it has always been like that, and because we cannot imagine it being otherwise in the future" Weber then distinguishes the **charismatic legitimacy of the Greek "charisma"**, which means grace or gift. Here, the power of a leader rests precisely on a "gift", an **exceptional talent** that makes people obey him. Finally, according to the third type of legitimacy, we choose to obey not because of tradition, nor because we have faith in a charismatic leader, but because the power **complies with a legal order**, conceived according to human reason: this is legitimacy to rational- legal domination.

---

[45] SparkNotes, 'Sources of Political Power', https://www.sparknotes.com/us-government-and-politics/political-science/politics-and-political-science/section4/

For example: "what does the law say? What does the regulation say?" Here we are obeying the President or other leader because he/she exercises the mandate of president under the **powers bestowed on him/her by law**. The rules here are **impersonal and autonomous** in relation to individuals. In the context of a **rational-legal domination**, the chief himself must follow the rules that establish his/her power, if he/she fails to do so, he/she might risk seeing his/her power become illegitimate, since it would be illegal.[46]

Now complete **"Week 6, Lesson 3: Is any power legitimate?"**

Remember to complete the **learning quiz** in this section and **watch the interviews** in the next section.

This is a clip from an old British TV show that demonstrates several types of power and types of leadership.

---

[46] Discover Political Science, 'Week 6, Lesson 3: Is any power legitimate?'

Chapter 5 - Classical Sociological Theory

You're probably wondering why a Sociology course is in a Political Science module. Well, there is a lot of overlap between politics and sociology, and this MOOC provides a fantastic overview of important sociological thinkers and their main ideas. From Mandeville to Weber, this course provides you with a comprehensive foundation in sociological theory to help support your Political Science studies. It is also a feature in most universities' Political Science courses so it is worth completing!

An Introduction

This course begins with an overview of sociological theory. Dr. van Heerikhuizen notes that classical sociologists focused not only on human societies but also on the fundamental social change that occurred as a result of the Industrial Revolution in Europe. The main interest of sociologists during this time and in the aftermath of industrialisation was the transition from traditional to modern societies: the growing influence of modern sciences, the modern metropolis, the process of secularisation and the development of new political systems. This course discusses a range of approaches to these social and political changes, beginning in the 18th century.

Now complete **"Week 1: An Introduction"**

Complete the **practice quiz** at the end of this session to get a feel for what is expected in the graded quizzes.

Here is a short introductory video to Sociology.

Bernard Mandeville and Adam Smith

Mandeville (1670-1733) is predominantly known for his ideas on morality and economic theory. Controversially, Mandeville argued that many of the actions 'commonly thought to be virtuous were, instead, self-interested at their core and therefore vicious'.[47] In his most famous publication, *The Fable of the Bees*, Mandeville explains why human societies cannot prosper without a certain degree of undesirable behaviour: 'private vices, public benefits'. A prominent example of this 'private vice, public benefit paradox' is as follows:

> 'pride is a vice, and yet **without pride there would be no fashion industry**, as individuals would **lack the motivation to buy new and expensive clothes** with which to try and impress their peers. If pride were eradicated tomorrow, the result would leave hundreds of companies bankrupt, **prompt mass unemployment**, risk the collapse of industry, and in turn **devastate both the economic security and with it the military power of the British commercial state**'.[48]

---

[47] 'Bernard Mandeville (1670-1733)', http://www.iep.utm.edu/mandevil/
[48] 'Bernard Mandeville (1670-1733)', http://www.iep.utm.edu/mandevil/

In short, Mandeville contends that a healthy social and economic life can not be sustained without a degree of illegality.

Smith (1723-1790) was influenced by some of Mandeville's work. He expands upon Mandeville's notion of **private actions contributing to a public outcome**. For example, Smith argues that the selfish act of protecting and furthering your own interests has, in one way or another, a positive knock-on effect for the whole of society. A family must feed themselves, so they will buy food from a supermarket, in turn helping the profits of the supermarket which in turn helps boost the economy.

Smith's most influential publication is the book *An Inquiry into the Nature and Causes of the Wealth of Nations* (1776). In this book, Smith discusses the benefits of division of labour in the context of the Industrial Revolution that was well underway in Western Europe. His observations of effective divisions of labour would significantly increase the rate of production, which would subsequently benefit economic growth.

Now complete **"Week 2: Bernard Mandeville and Adam Smith"**

What period and context is Smith writing in? Why is this significant?

Remember to complete the **graded quiz** at the end of this section.

Here is a brief video about Adam Smith and his main contributions to sociological thought.

Auguste Comte

Despite growing up in a strict Catholic family in France, Comte (1798-1857) became committed to building a Republican country based on science rather than religion; he was heavily influenced by the Enlightenment thinkers of the 18th century. Unlike many other rationalist philosophers, Comte tried to understand how scientific knowledge was related to and borne out of pre-existing religious knowledge. He attempted to **reconcile religion with the Enlightenment, science-based era**. This makes him an important thinker to study.

Later in his troubled life, Comte developed his own religion: the 'Religion of Humanity'. This "religion" was arguably the culmination of his **appreciation *and* his criticisms** of religion. Crucially, Comte respected religion's ability to provide moral guidance for its followers. Thus, the 'Religion of Humanity' would educate its disciples on the morally correct ways to conduct oneself in public and private life.

Now complete **"Week 3: Auguste Comte"**

What are the main points in Comte's 'Law of the Three Stages of the Human Mind'?

Remember to complete the **graded quiz** at the end of this section.

Here is a video summarising Comte's key arguments.

Alexis de Tocqueville

Tocqueville (1805-1859) is most known for his book *Democracy in America* that he completed after a trip around America in the early 1800s. He identified **five main areas of concern:**

- "Democracy breeds materialism" → money was the only achievement on which Americans judged success.
- "Democracy breeds envy and shame" → inequality is more stark in democratic society and therefore the greatest inequalities go unnoticed.
- "The tyranny of the majority" → democracy undermines free thought and limits debate.
- "Democracy turns us against authority" → democracy is 'fatally biased towards mediocrity' and thus rejects expertise.
- "Democracy undermines freedom of mind" → Americans had given up on critical thinking; falling into the grips of commercialisation had led to a fear of alienating potential customers by stepping out of line.[49]

Despite this negative outlook, Tocqueville was in fact an advocate of democracy. He just insisted upon expectation management of what democracy could achieve.

Now complete **"Week 4: Alexis de Tocqueville"**

In what ways does Tocqueville draw comparisons between the American and French revolutions?

Remember to complete the **graded quiz** at the end of this section.

Here is a video with more information on the points above.

Karl Marx

Marx (1818-1883) is perhaps one of the most well-known of the thinkers covered in this module. His writing on class struggle and inequality have influenced thinkers and politicians

---

[49] The School of Life, 'SOCIOLOGY - Alexis de Tocqueville',
https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=Rzr3AOtFA8o

alike, and continues to do so today. However, his vision of a **socialist utopia** has influenced a number of leaders to commit atrocities against their own populations, such as in the Soviet Union and some parts of Central America during the Cold War era.

Marx's ideas themselves, though, do not lend themselves to violence and authoritarianism. His work, instead, generally revolves around his **critique of capitalism**. The capitalist system began to emerge during the Industrial Revolution in Europe in the late 1700s. Marx's theory was developed on the basis of his view that all changes in the society, political institutions and in history itself, are '**driven by a process of collective struggle on the part of groups of people with similar economic situations** in order to realize their material or economic interests'.[50]

Marx's concept of **alienation** is linked to his criticism of capitalism. 'The first of these critiques maintains that **capitalism is essentially *alienating***. The second of these critiques maintains that **capitalism is essentially *exploitative***.'[51] Marx divides the population of capitalist society into two categories: those who own the means of production (eg. factory owners) are the *bourgeoisie*, and the workers are the *proletariat.* Marx calls for an end to such inequality and predicts that the workers will rise up and create a socialist society.

Now complete **"Week 5: Karl Marx"**

What are the underlying causes of class struggle, in Marx's opinion?

Remember to complete the **graded quiz** at the end of this section.

Here is a video overview of Marx's life and work. **This** is an interesting video about his ongoing significance today.

Émile Durkheim

Durkheim (1858-1917) devised an approach to social science that used Adam Smith's notion of **division of labour to explain changes in societal cohesion**. Durkheim refers to the cohesive, undifferentiated societies of the pre-Industrial Revolution era as *mechanical*, while the societies differentiated by complex divisions of labour are *organic*.

Durkheim argues that in mechanical societies, people have similar interests and values and will therefore forge a '**collective conscience that works internally in individual members to cause them to cooperate**'.[52] On the other hand, in organic societies '**social integration arises out of the need of individuals for one another's services**'.[53] In organic society, contracts and

---

[50] 'The Manifesto of the Communist Party: Summary',
http://www.sparknotes.com/philosophy/marx/section2/
[51] Dan Lowe, 'Karl Marx's Conception of Alienation',
https://1000wordphilosophy.com/2015/05/13/karl-marxs-conception-of-alienation/
[52] 'Mechanical and Organic Solidarity',
https://www.britannica.com/topic/mechanical-and-organic-solidarity
[53] 'Mechanical and Organic Solidarity',
https://www.britannica.com/topic/mechanical-and-organic-solidarity

laws are more common because there is greater attention paid to 'regulating the relations between different groups and persons'.

Now complete **"Week 6: Émile Durkheim"**

What is the main difference between organic and mechanic solidarity?

Remember to complete the **graded quiz** at the end of this section.

Here is an overview of Durkheim's ideas. **This** is an introductory video to his notion of egoistic and altruistic suicide.

Max Weber

Weber (1864-1920) developed the idea of social action. He argues that there are four types of ideal social action:

1. **Traditional Social Action:** actions controlled by traditions, "the way it has always been done".
2. **Affective Social Action:** actions determined by one's specific affections and emotional state, you do not think about the consequences.
3. **Value Rational Social Action:** actions that are determined by a conscious belief in the inherent value of a type of behavior (ex: religion).
4. **Instrumental-Rational Social Action:** actions that are carried out to achieve a certain goal, you do something because it leads to a result.

Weber contends that modern societies encourage instrumental-rational social action, for example 'we are encouraged to do things in the most efficient way (e.g. driving to work) rather than thinking about whether driving to work is the right thing to do (which would be value-rational action)'.[54]

His critique of modern society focussed on what he regarded as an **obsession with efficiency**. The constant desire to modernise and "getting things done" was detrimental to society's ability to acknowledge and discuss questions of ethics, values and traditions. Weber claimed that this was having a terrible effect on the collective health of society and would eventually lead to serious social problems.

Now complete **"Week 7: Max Weber"**

---

[54] 'Max Weber's Social Action Theory',
https://revisesociology.com/2017/01/26/max-webers-social-action-theory/

What does Weber say about what effect 'goal-rational social action' has on individuals?

Remember to complete the **graded quiz** at the end of this section.

Here is a video about Weber's main ideas.

Norbert Elias

Elias (1897-1990) focused predominantly on the concept of civilisation. Elias examines changes in etiquette and manners to chart the significant changes in society from Medieval Europe to the 20th century. What this looks like is 'an **increasing centralisation of authority in the state** (moving away from a feudal system wherein individual lords and barons would fight over territory *within* the state), moving conflicts from within states to between states. It looks like a consolidation of power on the part of the state, such that it forms a **monopoly on legitimate violence**. This essentially means that it became unacceptable for people to use force as a matter of course in their everyday lives, with functions like policing and military action increasingly becoming the exclusive responsibility of specialised agents of the state'.[55]

Put simply, Elias tried to understand three main things:

1. The **relationship between state formation and changing attitudes towards behaviours** like sex, nudity, hygiene and violence in Western Europe.
2. He wanted to look at changes in **division of labour** as a result of **urbanisation, monetization and marketisation**.
3. The **transformations of personalities** as people became **more interconnected with one another**.[56]

Now complete **"Week 8: Norbert Elias"**

How has the 'civilising process' changed humankind and society?

Remember to complete the **graded quiz** at the end of this section.

This is a useful summary of Elias' views on civilisation.

---

[55] Tim Squirrell, 'Understand Norbert Elias' "The Civilising Process"',
https://www.timsquirrell.com/blog/2018/2/20/understanding-norbert-elias-the-civilizing-process
[56] Squirrell, 'Understand Norbert Elias' "The Civilising Process"',
https://www.timsquirrell.com/blog/2018/2/20/understanding-norbert-elias-the-civilizing-process

Sources

Chapter 1 - Introduction to Political Philosophy

'Hecralitus', https://www.iep.utm.edu/heraclit/#H6

Dr. Almon Leroy Way, Jr., 'Political Power', http://www.proconservative.net/CUNAPolSci201PartOneC.shtml

'Political Legitimacy', https://plato.stanford.edu/entries/legitimacy/

Chapter 2 - Revolutionary Ideas: Utility, Justice, Equality, Freedom

Frank Devita, 'Hobbes' Concept of Felicity', https://frankdevita.wordpress.com/2012/08/06/hobbes-concept-of-felicity/

Alexander Guerrero, 'Happiness, Thomas Hobbes & the State of Nature' (MOOC).

'Utilitarianism: John Stuart Mill', http://www.sparknotes.com/philosophy/utilitarianism/section7/

Alexander Guerrero, 'Distributive Justice' (MOOC).

'Jeremy Bentham', https://plato.stanford.edu/entries/bentham/

Herbert J. Gans, 'Some Problems of Equality', https://www.dissentmagazine.org/article/some-problems-of-equality

'Positive and Negative Liberty', https://plato.stanford.edu/entries/liberty-positive-negative/

Chapter 3 - Revolutionary Ideas: Borders, Elections, Constitutions, Prisons

'Imagined Community', https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Imagined_community

'Constitutional Limits on Government: Essential Principles', http://democracyweb.org/constitutional-limits-essential-principles

Chapter 4 - Discover Political Science

Global Policy Forum, 'What is a "State"?', https://www.globalpolicy.org/nations-a-states/what-is-a-state.html

K. Minogue, H. Girvetz, T. Ball and R. Dagger, 'Liberalism', https://www.britannica.com/topic/liberalism

Jeffrey Glen, 'Communism v Socialism',
http://www.businessdictionary.com/article/1030/communism-vs-socialism-d1412/

André Munro, 'Christian democracy', https://www.britannica.com/topic/Christian-democracy

Hans Kohn, 'Nationalism', https://www.britannica.com/topic/nationalism

The WritePass Journal, 'Nationalism Essay',
https://writepass.com/journal/2017/08/nationalism-essay/#Ethnic_Nationalism

Logan Albright, 'The Political Spectrum, Explained',
https://freethepeople.org/the-political-spectrum-explained/

Encyclopaedia Britannica, 'Citizenship', https://www.britannica.com/topic/citizenship

National Democratic Institute, 'Citizen Participation',
https://www.ndi.org/what-we-do/citizen-participation

Center for Society Orientation, 'Advocacy and Lobbying',
https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=aTbtKRdYbYo

LobbyIt.com, 'Advocacy vs. Lobbying: Understanding the Difference',
http://lobbyit.com/advocacy-vs-lobbying-understanding-difference/

Maurice Duverger, 'Political party', https://www.britannica.com/topic/political-party

André Munro, 'Robert A. Dahl', https://www.britannica.com/biography/Robert-A-Dahl

SparkNotes, 'Sources of Political Power',
https://www.sparknotes.com/us-government-and-politics/political-science/politics-and-political-science/section4/

Chapter 5 - Classical Sociological Theory

'Bernard Mandeville (1670-1733)', http://www.iep.utm.edu/mandevil/

The School of Life, 'SOCIOLOGY - Alexis de Tocqueville',
https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=Rzr3AOtFA8o

'The Manifesto of the Communist Party: Summary',
http://www.sparknotes.com/philosophy/marx/section2/

Dan Lowe, 'Karl Marx's Conception of Alienation',
https://1000wordphilosophy.com/2015/05/13/karl-marxs-conception-of-alienation/

'Mechanical and Organic Solidarity',
https://www.britannica.com/topic/mechanical-and-organic-solidarity

'Max Weber's Social Action Theory',
https://revisesociology.com/2017/01/26/max-webers-social-action-theory/

Tim Squirrell, 'Understand Norbert Elias' "The Civilising Process"',
https://www.timsquirrell.com/blog/2018/2/20/understanding-norbert-elias-the-civilizing-process

Legal Disclaimer

This document contains links and references to original copies of copyrighted and open access material, the use of which has not always been specifically instructed or authorized by the copyright owner. In accord with our nonprofit mission, we are providing links to these resources to support Kiron students in their studies, which is already in line with the legal disclaimers and privacy policies of the content owners. Please refer to the Kiron Privacy Policy for the details.

Kindly note that none of the authors, contributors, administrators or anyone else connected with Kiron in any way can be responsible for your use of the information contained in or linked from the additional third party resources.

Contributors:

Maria Blöcher

Responsible for Content:

Kiron Open Higher Education gGmbH

Herzbergstraße 82-84

10365 Berlin