

Political Science Y673: Democracy, Civilizations, and World Order

Co-Instructors: Michael McGinnis and Vincent Ostrom

Meets Wednesday 8:30-10:30 AM, 513 North Park
Spring 2000, Section 3453

Office Hours:

Prof. McGinnis: Monday, 9-11 AM (Woodburn 366) and by appointment
855-8784 (Woodburn office), 855-0441 (Workshop), mcginnis@indiana.edu

Prof. Ostrom: by appointment, 855-0441, ghiggins@indiana.edu

In this seminar we explore alternative theories of governance and apply these theories to some examples of local, national, and international politics. Obviously, we can't cover all the relevant theories or instances of governance in any single semester. Instead, we focus on an integrated set of materials that develop a few themes about the approach to research that has been developed by scholars associated with the Workshop in Political Theory and Policy Analysis.

This seminar is part of a two-semester sequence on Institutional Analysis and Development. (Either course can be taken independently of the other.) The fall semester version focuses on micro and intermediate levels of analysis and the spring semester on more macro-level patterns of governance. Processes at the micro and macro levels are, ultimately, connected in fundamental ways, but there remain important differences in the modes of analysis that are most appropriate for each level. In this seminar we examine both classic works of political philosophy and contemporary social scientific analyses. We endeavor to illustrate by example how diverse modes of understanding can be integrated.

This course is organized in two short and two long parts. After an initial introduction to basic themes and research questions, we focus on alternative theoretical conceptualizations of governance as laid out in classic works by Hobbes, Tocqueville, and the authors of the *Federalist*. (Along the way we will pause to consider their implications for the nature of conflict, world order, and civilizations.) The third part of the course consists of three two-week modules, with each module focused on applications of these frameworks to the study of governance at the local, national, and international levels. The course concludes with an overview and a mini-conference.

Each student will complete an original research paper for presentation at the Mini-Conference, to be held Saturday, April 29 and Monday afternoon, April 31. Someone other than the author will be assigned the responsibility to present and comment on each paper. The author will have an opportunity to respond to these comments, and the remainder of the time will be available for general discussion of that paper and the more general issues it may raise.

Each student should be concerned about how to revise and improve the quality of his or her paper after the seminar ends, with the goal of moving the work to publication. The mini-conference is a way of learning to participate in an intellectual community and coming to appreciate the general coherence of intellectual discourse. Since copies of each paper will be distributed to all Mini-Conference participants, papers must be completed well in advance. We give students two options: (1) If you turn in your completed paper by its due date, in class, April 19, the Workshop will pay all photocopying costs. (2) If you want an extra week you will have to submit 30 copies by class time, April 26. (Note also that students will be completing the final exam that same week, which gives an added incentive to complete the paper on time.)

In addition to completing all assigned the readings and submitting an original research paper, students will also be asked to complete three types of short written assignments.

First, in order to facilitate class discussion, students will be asked to submit short memos commenting on some important aspect of that week's readings or on other issues of basic concern (including exploring ideas for their research paper). **Please do not summarize the readings!** Instead, move directly to making some important point, worthy of further discussion in class. Each student will be asked to complete such a memo for the second week of the semester (Jan. 19), but after that the class will be divided into two groups, with each group assigned memos for alternating weeks. (Exceptions are March 1 and the last two weeks of the term.)

Second, in order to encourage students to start their research project early, students will also be asked to submit a memo (on March 1) that outlines the research question and methodology they will follow in their research paper. In most cases these papers should address some specific research question, but some students may prefer to complete a more conceptual paper. Students are encouraged to discuss their paper ideas with the instructor early and often.

Third, in hopes of helping students draw this diverse material together, they will be asked to write a memo in response to a take-home essay exam the final week (April 26). Questions will be distributed the week before.

In all three types of memo assignments students are encouraged to keep their comments in these memos (NOT papers!) brief and to the point. An e-mail distribution list will be set up, and students will be expected to read comments written by their classmates before class begins. These memoranda are due by 4:00 p.m. each Monday and are to be transmitted by email to mcginnis@indiana.edu and ghiggins@indiana.edu. We will endeavor to respond to these memos, but not in a blow-by-blow fashion. It has been our experience that weekly memos greatly enhance the quality of class discussions by giving students an opportunity to articulate their responses.

Finally, a bit of historical perspective. Over many years this seminar was developed by Vincent Ostrom, with occasional contributions from other Workshop scholars. Although Vincent officially retired several years ago, he continued to serve as instructor for this seminar. This year, for reasons of health, Vincent has decided he can no longer serve as instructor. We should, however, expect him to contribute regularly to our class discussions. Students are encouraged to engage him in intellectual discussions at any opportunity. Writing good memos for this seminar is a great way to start that conversation.

Schedule of Topics and Reading Assignments

What are the essential foundations of democratic governance? Is democracy consistent with all of the major world civilizations? If all governments became liberal democracies, would this imply a fundamental transformation in the nature of international politics? These are the sorts of questions we will explore in this seminar. This seminar's focus on *Democracy, Civilization, and World Order* reflects an effort to take a global perspective on the evolutionary development of human civilization and to consider the role of scholarship in the political sciences and professions. In recent years, many countries have established or reestablished institutions of representative democracy. Centralized national governments have "devolved" responsibilities to smaller scale units, which are presumably more responsive to community tastes as well as the ecological (time and place) exigencies in which people live out their lives.

Meanwhile, scholars studying international relations rediscovered the importance of democracy by realizing that liberal democratic governments have rarely, if ever, fought wars with other democracies. This finding has been used to justify policies to expand this "democratic zone of peace." National and international aid agencies have come to insist on the establishment of democratic institutions as a precondition for continued support. Still, the Western understanding of democracy remains under challenge, particularly by governments and peoples from the Islamic and Confucian civilizations. In too many policy and scholarly discussions, however, the term "democracy" has been equated with the specific electoral, legislative, bureaucratic, and judicial institutions found in the advanced industrial areas of North America and Western Europe. A more global perspective is necessary if we are to understand the ways in which impulses towards better governance will manifest themselves in diverse cultural settings. After all, institutions of governance can be effective only when they are closely attuned to the contingencies of physical settings and cultural contexts.

In this seminar, we explore the ramifications of conceptualizing democracy as a process of *self-governance* within the context of *polycentric orders*. Political institutions are important, but, as Tocqueville emphasized, democratic societies are vulnerable to decay as an originally self-reliant people comes to rely too heavily on central governments to resolve their

collective problems. The advantages of multiple authorities serving overlapping jurisdictions can be undermined by pressures towards consolidation and centralization of power. If democratic societies are potentially unstable, then even the universal establishment of democracy might not guarantee perpetual peace.

We will also consider issues of governance at the local and national level. One of the fundamental foundations of this seminar is the presumption that the same method of analysis can be applied to governance at any scale of aggregation. Each scale has its own special characteristics, of course, but by comparing patterns at multiple foci we can better triangulate on the fundamental nature of governance. Prof. McGinnis' research interests center on international relations, whereas the main focus of Workshop research programs has been on local and national politics, especially resource management, development, and comparative institutional analysis. This covers pretty much the entire range of governance scales.

PART 1. FRAMEWORKS AND RESEARCH QUESTIONS

We begin by embracing the artifactual nature of institutions and patterns of governance. This means that we cannot simply copy the modes of analysis that have proven successful in the physical and natural sciences. Still, it's important for social scientists to precisely formulate and rigorously test their assertions. Most of the research covered in this seminar shares a common organizing framework (the IAD framework evaluated in Elinor Ostrom's overview). However, we will also examine other modes of research to explore how connections might be drawn and our selection of research questions expanded. Nadelmann's article, for example, nicely integrates the effects of markets, morality, and power in his process model explanation of the establishment of global bans on once-accepted practices. Would his research program be strengthened by adopting the IAD framework, and vice versa?

Memos for the Jan. 19 session should discuss some specific ways in which these frameworks could be applied to answer the types of research questions that student is interesting in exploring. Be specific! (And be brief!)

Jan. 12. *General Orientation to Institutional Analysis*

Searle, John. 1969. "The Distinction Between Brute Facts and Institutional Facts." In *Speech Acts: An Essay in the Philosophy of Language*. New York: Cambridge University Press, 50-53.

Ostrom, Vincent. 1980. "Artisanship and Artifact." *Polycentric Governance and Development*, Chapter 16.

Tocqueville, Alexis de. 1990. "Author's Introduction," *Democracy in America*.

Ostrom, Vincent. "A Forgotten Tradition: The Constitutional Level of Analysis" *Polycentric Governance and Development*, chapter 7

Jan. 19. Polycentricity, the IAD Framework, and International Regimes

[All students submit a memo on connections to specific research questions.]

Ostrom, Vincent, Charles M. Tiebout, and Robert Warren. 1961. "The Organization of Government in Metropolitan Areas: A Theoretical Inquiry." American Political Science Review 55 (Dec.): 831-42.

[Workshop Reprint R61-1; Reprinted in Michael D. McGinnis, ed. *Polycentricity and Local Public Economies* and in Vincent Ostrom, *The Meaning of American Federalism*]

Ostrom, Elinor. 1999. "Institutional Rational Choice: An Assessment of the Institutional Analysis and Development Framework," in Paul A. Sabatier, ed. *Theories of the Policy Process*. Boulder, CO: Westview, 35-71. [Workshop Reprint R99-9]

Nadelmann, Ethan A. 1990. "Global Prohibition Regimes: The Evolution of Norms in International Society," *International Organization*, 44: 479-526.

PART II. ALTERNATIVE CONCEPTUALIZATIONS OF GOVERNANCE

In this part we examine three true classics: *Leviathan*, *Democracy in America*, and *The Federalist*. Each work provides components of an integrated perspective on research that has been developed by Workshop-affiliated scholars over the last few decades. We will pay particular attention to Vincent Ostrom's interpretations and elaborations of these works.

From Hobbes we take the basic assumptions of methodological individualism and his classic statement of the nature of unitary sovereignty. Whereas Hobbes sought a way to curtail conflict within a society, the authors of *The Federalist* sought to harness natural political conflicts to a greater good. These contrasting interpretations of conflict have intriguing implications when applied to issues of international security. What is the nature of international society? Would the universal establishment of democratic controls on executive authority eliminate all chance of war?

But democracy requires more than just a certain arrangement of political institutions. Tocqueville digs more deeply into the foundations of democracy, at least as it was practiced in 19th century America. His insights have continuing relevance for today's world (especially for students of the democratic peace!). Tocqueville points out the importance of political culture and the contribution of non-governmental organizations to patterns of democratic governance. We examine the roles played by "civilizations" in contemporary debates over international conflict and transitions to democracy, as well as examining the political consequences of religion from different perspectives.

Students seeking answerable research questions would be well-advised to carve out some more limited aspect of such grandiose concepts as democracy, civilization, or political culture. For an example, we will discuss several distinct ways in which religion can be studied, at different levels of aggregation. To encourage students to focus their research concerns, they will be asked to submit a memo summarizing the research question they plan to address in their mini-conference paper, and how they plan to go about answering that question.

Jan. 26. *The Human Animal and Its Faustian Bargain* [Memo Group A]

Hobbes, *Leviathan* [minimal readings: Introduction, Author's Introduction, chapters 1-7, 10-19, 22, 24, 29-31, 39, 43, Review and Conclusion]
Ostrom, Vincent. 1997. *The Meaning of Democracy and the Vulnerability of Democracies*, Introduction, Chapter 5.

Feb. 2. *Constitutional Order in the United States* [Memo Group B]

Hamilton, Jay, and Madison, *The Federalist* [minimal readings 1-11, 14-17, 24-26, 39-40, 51, 53, 55, 58, 70-73, 78]
Ostrom, Vincent. *The Political Theory of a Compound Republic: Designing the American Experiment*, 2nd edition.

Feb. 9. *Conflict, International Society, and the Democratic Peace* [Memo Group A]

Follett, Mary Parker. 1940. "Constructive Conflict." In *Dynamic Administration*, eds. H. C. Metcalf and L. Urwick, 30-49. New York: Harper & Row Publishers.
Boulding, Kenneth. 1963. "Toward a Pure Theory of Threat Systems." *American Economic Review* 53 (May): 424-34.
Carr, E. H. 1964 [1939] *The Twenty Year's Crisis 1919-1939*. "The Nature of Politics" and "Power in International Politics," chapters 7-8, pp. 95-145.
Bull, Hedley. 1977. *The Anarchical Society: A Study of Order in World Politics*. New York: Columbia University Press, chapters 1, 3, pp. 1-22, 53-76.
Russett, Bruce. 1993. *Grasping the Democratic Peace*, Princeton University Press, chapter 3, "Why Democratic Peace?"
Owen, John M. 1994. "How Liberalism Produces Democratic Peace," *International Security*, Fall. [Russett and Owen included in Brown, ed., *Debating the Democratic Peace*]

Feb. 16. *Deeper Foundations of American Democracy* [Memo Group B]

Tocqueville, *Democracy in America*, Volume I

Feb. 23. *Dilemmas of Sustaining American Democracy* [Memo Group A]

Tocqueville, *Democracy in America*, volume II

Ostrom, Vincent. 1997. *The Meaning of Democracy and the Vulnerability of Democracies*, Introduction, Chapters 1-4.

Ostrom, Vincent. "Problems of Cognition as a Challenge to Policy Analysts and Democratic Societies," *Polycentric Governance and Development*, ch. 17

March 1. *Civilizations, Religion, and Polycentricity*

[All students complete a memo on the topic of their research paper.]

Ostrom, Vincent. 1997. The Meaning of Democracy and the Vulnerability of Democracies, Parts 3-4, Chapters 6-11

Berman, Harold J. 1983. *Law and Revolution: The Formation of the Western Legal Tradition*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press. Preface, Introduction (pp. 1-10, 33-45), "Mercantile Law" (Chapter 11, 333-56), "Beyond Marx, beyond Weber" (538-58)

Smith, Adam, *Wealth of Nations*, "Of the Expense of the Institutions for the Instruction of People of All Ages," Volume Two, Book V, Chapter 1, Article 3. Modern Library Edition, pp. 740-66; U. Chicago Press edition, ii, 309-38.

Huntington, Samuel. 1993. "The Clash of Civilizations," *Foreign Affairs*. (Summer): 22-49.

PART III. APPLICATIONS TO DIFFERENT SCALES OF GOVERNANCE

(Scheduling Note: These readings are arranged in two-week modules, which may be re-arranged in order to schedule guest appearances by Workshop scholars.)

In this part of the course we (temporarily) accept standard distinctions among the different sub-disciplines of political science, by examining local, national, and international politics in separate two-week periods. But an attentive student will observe exactly the same theoretical concerns and modes of empirical research recurring throughout these diverse contexts.

The first major empirical research program implemented by Workshop-affiliated scholars concerned evaluation of the effectiveness of local police forces in metropolitan areas of the United States. Later research programs have been directed at issues of resource management and development throughout the world. We are just beginning to apply these same modes of

research to questions of international security. In this seminar we will also discuss two new and important books in the fields of development and conflict, books based on very different premises but which have important lessons for our study of institutions and governance.

One theme that recurs, in different forms, at all three scales of aggregation concerns the roles that nonprofit, non-governmental organizations play in governance. For the most part, the study of such organizations has been neglected by both political scientists and economists, but their importance in democratic governance is now widely recognized. Still, they face dilemmas of their own, and cannot be expected to do everything. We need to come to a realization of governance as something that is accomplished by a complex array of private, public, and voluntary organizations.

III-A. Local Governance and Public Policy

March 8. *Research on Police Services and Metropolitan Governance* [Memo Group B]

McGinnis, Michael, ed. *Polycentricity and Local Public Economies* (entire)

SPRING BREAK

March 22. *Overview of Local Governance* [Memo Group A]

Oakerson, Ron. 1999. *Governing Local Public Economies*, ICS Press.

Salamon, Lester M. 1992. "What is the Nonprofit Sector and Why Do We Have It?," In Lester M. Salamon, *America's Nonprofit Sector: A Primer*, pp. 3-11.

Bickers, Kenneth. 1998. "Social Welfare Provision in American Communities: The Role of Nonprofit Organizations," paper presented at APSA (or paper TBA)

III-B. National Governance and Development

March 29. *Research on Development* [Memo Group B]

McGinnis, Michael, ed. 1999. *Polycentric Governance and Development*, Introduction and Parts II-III (chapters 7-15)

Anheier, Helmut K., and Lester M. Salamon, eds. 1998. *The Nonprofit Sector in the Developing World: A Comparative Analysis*, Chapters 1 and 7, pp. 1-50 and 348-373. New York: Manchester University Press.

April 5. *Beyond Freedom and Development* [Memo Group A]

Sen, Amartya. 1999. *Development as Freedom*.

III-C. International Governance and Conflict Resolution

April 12. *Conflict Systems and Their Transformations* [Memo Group B]

Barbara Walter and Jack Snyder, ed. 1999. *Civil Wars, Insecurity, and Intervention*, (entire)

Michael McGinnis and Vincent Ostrom. 1999. "Democratic Transformations: From the Struggle for Democracy to Self-Governance?," paper prepared for WOW 2.

April 19. *Humanitarian Assistance and Conflict*

[Mini-Conference Paper Due; No weekly memo]

[Questions for Final memo (take-home exam) to be distributed]

Lindenberg, Marc. 1999. "Complex Emergencies and NGOs: The Example of CARE," In Jennifer Leaning, Susan M. Briggs, and Lincoln C. Chen, eds. *Humanitarian Crises: The Medical and Public Health Response*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, pp. 211-245.

McGinnis, Michael D. 2000. "Policy Substitutability in Complex Humanitarian Emergencies: A Model of Individual Choice and International Response," *Journal of Conflict Resolution*, Vol. 44, No. 1, (February 2000), pp. 62-89.

McGinnis, Michael D. 2000. "Conflict Dynamics in a Multi-Level Game: A Model of Local, National, and International Conflict in the Horn of Africa," revised version of paper presented at the Peace Science Society (International) Meeting, Ann Arbor, Michigan, October 1999.

PART IV. EVALUATION AND MINI-CONFERENCE

What does the future hold? This final part of the course focuses on prospects for future research projects. Questions for the take-home final will ask students to evaluate the potential for future developments, and student research papers will provide concrete illustrations of forthcoming results.

April 26. *Course Evaluation and Discussion of Final Memos*

[Final memo due; Last chance to turn in research paper (30 copies)]

McGinnis, Michael. 1999. "Institutional Analysis and the Future of the Workshop: Toward a Tocquevillian Synthesis of the Social Sciences?" WOW 2 plenary paper

Saturday, April 29 (all day) and Monday, May 1 (afternoon). *Mini-Conference*

No meeting Wednesday of Finals Week (May 3)

Note: This list of readings is subject to revision. Changes will be announced well in advance.