REVISING POLITICAL IDEOLOGIES

MS SHABNA BEGUM 2014

Liberalism

Liberalism is a political ideology whose central theme is a commitment to the individual and to the construction of the society in which individuals can satisfy their interests or achieve fulfilment. The core values of liberalism are individualism, rationalism, freedom, justice and toleration. The liberal belief that human beings are, first and foremost, individuals, endowed with reason, implies that each individual should enjoy the maximum possible freedom consistent with a like freedom for all. However, although individuals are 'born equal' in the sense that they are of equal moral worth and should enjoy formal equality and equal opportunities, liberals generally stress that they should be rewarded according to their differing levels of talent or willingness to work and therefore favour the principle of meritocracy. A liberal society is characterised by diversity and pluralism and is organised politically around the twin values of consent and constitutionalism, combined to form the structures of liberal democracy.

Significant differences nevertheless exist between classical liberalism and modern liberalism. *Classical* liberalism is distinguished by a belief in a 'minimal' state, whose function is limited to the maintenance of domestic order and personal security. Classical liberals emphasise that human beings are essentially self-interested and largely self-sufficient; as far as possible, people should be responsible for their own lives and circumstances. As an economic doctrine, classical liberalism extols the merits of a self-regulating market in which government intervention is seen as both unnecessary and damaging. Classical liberal ideas are expressed in certain natural rights theories and utilitarianism, and provide one of the cornerstones of libertarianism. *Modern* liberalism (sometimes portrayed as social or welfare liberalism) exhibits a more sympathetic attitude towards the state, born out of the belief that unregulated capitalism merely produces new forms of injustice. State intervention can therefore enlarge liberty by safeguarding individuals from the social evils that blight their existence. Whereas classical liberals understand freedom in 'negative' terms, as the absence of constraints upon the individual, modern liberals link freedom to personal development and self-realisation. This creates clear overlaps between modern liberalism and social democracy.

Liberalism has undoubtedly been the most powerful ideological force shaping the Western political tradition. Indeed, some portray liberalism as the ideology of the industrialised West, and identify it with Western civilisation in general. Liberalism was the product of the breakdown of feudalism and the growth, in its place, of a market or capitalist society. Early liberalism certainly reflected the aspirations of a rising industrial middle class, and liberalism and capitalism have been closely linked (some have argued intrinsically linked) ever since. In its earliest form, liberalism was a political doctrine. It attacked absolutism and feudal privilege, instead advocating constitutional and, later, representative government. In the nineteenth century, classical liberalism, in the form of economic liberalism, extolled the virtues of *laissez-faire* capitalism and condemned all forms of government intervention. From the late nineteenth century onwards, however, a form of social liberalism emerged, characteristic of modern liberalism, which looked more favourably upon welfare reform and economic intervention. So-called 'end of ideology' theorists such as Francis Fukuyama (1992) argued that the twentieth century had culminated with the final, worldwide triumph of liberalism. This supposedly reflected the collapse of all viable alternatives to market capitalism as the basis of economic organisation and to liberal democracy as the basis of political organisation.

The attraction of liberalism is its unrelenting commitment to individual freedom, reasoned debate and the balance within diversity. Indeed, it has become fashionable to portray liberalism not simply as an ideology but as a 'meta-ideology', that is, as a body of rules that lays down the grounds upon which political and ideological debate can take place. This reflects the belief that liberalism gives priority to 'the right' over 'the good'. In other words, liberalism strives to establish the conditions in which people and groups can pursue the good life as each defines it, but it does not prescribe or try to promote any particular notion of what is good. Criticisms of liberalism nevertheless come from various directions. Marxists have argued that, in defending capitalism, liberalism attempts to legitimise unequal class power and so constitutes a form of bourgeois ideology. Radical feminists point to the linkage between liberalism and patriarchy, which is rooted in the tendency to construe

the individual on the basis of an essentially male model of self-sufficiency, thereby encouraging women to be 'like men'. Communitarians condemn liberalism for failing to provide a moral basis for social order and collective endeavour, arguing that the liberal society is a recipe for unrestrained egoism and greed, and so is ultimately self-defeating.

Liberalism	
1. What was the enlightenment?	
2. What is individualism?	
3. How does this link to atomism?	
4. What does C.B.Macpherson's phrase 'possessive individualism' mean?	
5. On what grounds does JSM accept limitations on freedom?	
6. How does John Rawls understand limitations on freedom?	
7. How does Isaiah Berlin distinguish between two different types of freedom?	
8. How do the ideas of rationalism and paternalism conflict?	
9. Why do liberals deplore the use of force and aggression?	
10. Why are the ideas of justice and equality closely linked in liberal thought?	
11. What does meritocracy mean?	
12. How do the ideas of toleration and pluralism link?	
13. What is the 'social contract' theory?	
14. Why do liberals fear the state of nature?	
15. What are the four main features of constitutionalism?	
16. Why is liberalism ambivalent towards democracy?	
17. What are 'natural rights'?	
18. How does utilitarianism understand human behaviour?	
19. Why did free market economics appeal to liberals?	
20. How was Darwin's theory of 'natural selection' used by liberals?	
21. How does neo-liberal economics differ to classical liberal economics?	

22. Why is modern liberalism sometimes known as 'twentieth century liberalism'?	
23. How does JSM 'bridge' classical and modern liberalism?	
24. How did T.H. Green's understanding of altruism affect liberal ideas about freedom?	
25. How does modern liberalism defend welfarism?	
26. Why and how did modern liberals abandon laissez faire economics?	
27. What is Keynesian demand management?	

Key references and quotations:

John Stuart Mill 'On Liberty' 1859

'The only purpose for which power can be rightfully exercised over any member of a civilised community, against his will is to prevent harm to others.'

'Self regarding actions'

'Other regarding actions'

'If all mankind, minus one, were of one opinion, and only one person were of the contrary opinion, mankind would be no more justified in silencing that one person, than he, if he had the power, would be justified in silencing mankind.'

'Over himself, over his own body and mind, the individual is sovereign.'

Thomas Paine

'The state is a necessary evil.'

John Locke 'Two Treatises of Government' 1690

'Where there is no law, there is no freedom'

"Freedom of men under government is to have a standing rule to live by, common to every one of that society, and made by the legislative power vested in it; a liberty to follow my own will in all things, when the rule prescribes not, and not to be subject to the inconstant, unknown, arbitrary will of another man."

'nightwatchman state'

Natural rights – 'Life liberty and property'

Thomas Hobbes Leviathan 1651

State of nature – 'solitary, poor, nasty, brutish and short'

Isaiah Berlin 'Two concepts of Liberty' 1958

'I am a slave to no man' – negative freedom

'I am my own master' – positive freedom

Adam Smith - 'The Wealth of Nations' 1776

Every individual... neither intends to promote the public interest, nor knows how much he is promoting it... he intends only his own security; and by directing that industry in such a manner as its produce may be of the greatest value, he intends only his own gain, and he is in this, as in many other cases, led by an invisible hand to promote an end which was no part of his intention.

It is not from the benevolence of the butcher, the brewer or the baker that we expect our dinner, but from their regard to their own interests.'

Samuel Smiles 1859

'Heaven helps those who help themselves'

Herbert Spencer The Man versus the State' 1884

The survival of the fittest, which I have here sought to express in mechanical terms, is that which Mr. Darwin has called "natural selection, or the preservation of favoured races in the struggle for life."''

Thomas Jefferson Declaration of Independence 1776

"When the people fear the government there is tyranny, when the government fears the people there is liberty."

'Natural rights are inalienable.'

Natural rights are 'Life, liberty and the pursuit of happiness'

Baron Montesquieu

'Power should be a check to power.'

"If in the interior of a state you do not hear the noise of any conflict, you can be sure that freedom is not there"

Alexis de Tocqueville

'Tyranny of the Majority'

Ortega y Gasset - The Revolt of the masses' 1930

Mass man, in other words, is a barbarian or primitive who takes for granted the intellectual labors and historical struggles that underpin the technological breakthroughs of the modern age.

Jeremy Bentham 'A fragment on Government' 1776

'The greatest happiness for the greatest number.'

John Rawls – A theory of Justice 1970

'social and economic inequalities are to be arranged so that they are both (a) reasonably expected to be to everyone's advantage, and (b) attached to positions and offices open to all.'

Thomas Jefferson

The government is best which governs least.'

John Maynard Keynes – The General Theory of Employment, Interest and Money 1936

'Aggregate demand'

Conservatism

Conservatism, as a political attitude, is defined by the desire to conserve and is reflected in a resistance to, or at least suspicion of, change. However, although the desire to resist change may be the recurrent theme within conservatism, what distinguishes conservatism as an ideology from rival political creeds is the distinctive way in which this position is upheld. The central themes of conservative ideology are tradition, human imperfection, organic society, authority and property. For a conservative, tradition reflects the accumulated wisdom of the past, and institutions and practices that have been 'tested by time'; it should be preserved for the benefit of the living and for generations yet to come. Conservatives view human nature pessimistically in at least three senses. First, human beings are limited, dependent and security-seeking creatures; second, they are morally corrupt, tainted by selfishness, greed and a thirst for power; third, human rationality is unable to cope with the infinite complexity of the world (hence the conservative faith in pragmatism and their preference for describing their beliefs as an 'attitude of mind' rather than an ideology). The belief that society should be viewed as an organic whole implies that institutions and values have arisen through natural necessity and should be preserved to safeguard the fragile 'fabric of society'. Conservatives view authority as the basis for social cohesion, arguing that it gives people a sense of who they are and what is expected of them, and reflects the hierarchical nature of all social institutions. Conservatives value property because it gives people security and a measure of independence from government, and also encourages them to respect the law and the property of others.

However, there are significant divisions within conservative thought. *Authoritarian* conservatism is starkly autocratic and reactionary, stressing that government 'from above' is the only means of establishing order, and thus contrasts with the more modest and pragmatic Anglo-American conservatism that stems from the writing of Edmund Burke (1729-97). *Paternalistic* conservatism draws upon a combination of prudence and principle in arguing both that 'reform from above' is preferable to 'revolution from below', and that the wealthy have an obligation to look after the less well-off, duty being the price of privilege. Such ideas were most influentially expressed by Benjamin Disraeli (1804-81). This tradition is most fully developed in the form of One Nation conservatism, which advocates a 'middle way' approach to state-market relations and gives qualified support to economic management and welfarism. *Libertarian* conservatism advocates the greatest possible economic liberty and the least possible government regulation of social life, echoing *laissez-faire* liberalism, but harnesses this to a belief in a more traditional, conservative social philosophy that stresses the importance of authority and duty. This tradition provided the basis for New Right theories and values.

Conservative ideas and doctrines first emerged in the late eighteenth century and the early nineteenth century. They arose as a reaction against the growing pace of economic and social change, which was in many ways symbolised by the French Revolution (1789). In trying to resist the pressures unleashed by the growth of liberalism, socialism and nationalism, conservatism stood in defence of an increasingly embattled traditional social order. Authoritarian conservatism took root in continental Europe but was increasingly marginalised by the advance of constitutionalism and democracy, and eventually collapsed with the fall of fascism, with which it had often collaborated. The Disraelian form of conservatism ultimately proved to be more successful, using Burke's notion of 'change in order to conserve', it allowed conservatism to adapt values such as tradition, hierarchy and authority to the emerging conditions of mass politics, thereby broadening its social and electoral base. Conservatism's remarkable resilience stems from its ideological caution and political flexibility, enabling it, at different times, to embrace welfarist and interventionist policies as manifestations of the One Nation ideal, and to advocate 'rolling back the state' as recommended by the New Right.

Conservative thought, however, has always been open to the charge that it amounts to nothing more than ruling class ideology. In proclaiming the need to resist change, it legitimises the status quo and defends the interests of dominant or elite groups. Other critics allege that divisions between traditional conservatism and the New Right runs so deep that the conservative tradition

has become entirely incoherent. In their defence, conservatives argue that they merely advance certain enduring, if at times unpalatable, truths about human nature and the societies we live in. That human beings are morally and intellectually imperfect, and seek the security that only tradition, authority and a shared culture can offer, merely underlines the wisdom of 'travelling light' in ideological terms. Experience and history, conservatives warn, will always provide a sounder basis for political action than will abstract principles such as freedom, equality and justice.

Conservatism	
1. How and why has conservatism been associated with authoritarianism?	
2. Why is conservatism seen as a reaction against the French Revolution?	
3. Why do conservatives defend tradition?	
4. Why is conservatism considered a philosophy of human imperfection?	
5. How does their understanding of human nature impact on their views about 'ideology'?	
6. How do conservatives understand 'freedom'?	
7. What is the 'organic society'?	
8. Why do conservatives reject social equality?	
9. Why is property so significant for conservatives?	
10. What are the main features of authoritarian conservatism?	
11. What does the term paternalism mean?	
12. What is 'one nation' conservatism?	
13. Why are libertarian conservatives not the same as classical liberals?	
14. What are the key ideas of neoliberalism?	
15. What are the key ideas of neo conservatism?	
16. What are the main tensions between these two strands?	
17. How can we find common ground between these traditions?	

Key references and quotes:

Edmund Burke – Reflections on the Revolution in France 1790

Nations 'must change in order to conserve.'

A stat without the means of some change is without the means of its conservation.'

Society is 'shaped by the law of our creator…. Natural law.'

Society is a partnership between 'those who are living, those who are dead and those who are to be born.'

G.K.Chesterton

'Tradition means giving votes to the most obscure of all classes; our ancestors. It is a democracy of the dead.'

O'Sullivan 1976

Conservatism is a 'philosophy of human imperfection.'

Thomas Hobbes Leviathan 1651

Humans are innately selfish and greedy – a desire for 'power after power.'

De Maistre - Du Pape 1817

'Man in general, if reduced to himself, is too wicked to be free.'

Benjamin Disraeli Sybil 1845

Two nations between whom there is no intercourse and no sympathy; who are as ignorant of each other's habits, thoughts, and feelings, as if they were dwellers in different zones, or inhabitants of different planets. The rich and the poor.

Thatcher

'There is no such thing as society, only individuals and their families.'

Friedrich Von Hayek – The Road to Serfdom 1944

Attack on Keynesianism: 'But when economic power is centralized as an instrument of political power it creates a degree of dependence scarcely distinguishable from slavery. It has been well said that, in a country where the sole employer is the state, opposition means death by slow starvation.'

Michael Oakeshott - Rationalism in Politics 1962

"To be conservative, then, is to prefer the familiar to the unknown, to prefer the tried to the untried, fact to mystery, the actual to the possible, the limited to the unbounded, the near to the distant, the sufficient to the superabundant, the convenient to the perfect, present laughter to utopian bliss."

Robert Nozick – Anarchy, State and Utopia 1962

Arguing in favour of a minimal state, "limited to the narrow functions of protection against force, theft, fraud, enforcement of contracts, and so on."

Socialism

Socialism is an ideology that is defined by its opposition to capitalism and its attempt to provide a more humane and socially worthwhile alternative. The core of socialism is a vision of human beings as social creatures united by their common humanity; as the poet John Donne put it, 'No man is an Island entire of itself; every man is a piece of the Continent, a part of the main'. This highlights the degree to which individual identity is fashioned by social interaction and the membership of social groups and collective bodies. Socialists therefore prefer cooperation to competition, and favour collectivism over individualism. The central, and some would say defining, value of socialism is equality, socialism sometimes being portrayed as a form of egalitarianism. Socialists believe that a measure of social equality is the essential guarantee of social stability and cohesion, and that it promotes freedom in the sense that it satisfies material needs and provides the basis for personal development. The socialist movement has traditionally articulated the interests of the industrial working class, seen as systematically oppressed or structurally disadvantaged within the capitalist system. The goal of socialism is thus to reduce or abolish class divisions.

Socialism, however, contains a bewildering variety of divisions and rival traditions. *Utopian* socialism, or ethical socialism, advances an essentially moral critique of capitalism. In short, socialism is portrayed as morally superior to capitalism because human beings are ethical creatures, bound to one another by the ties of love, sympathy and compassion. *Scientific* socialism, undertakes a scientific analysis of historical and social development, which, in the form of Marxism, suggests not that socialism 'should' replace capitalism, but predicts that it inevitably 'would' replace capitalism. A second distinction is about the 'means' of achieving socialism, namely the difference between revolution and reform. *Revolutionary* socialism, most clearly reflected in the communist tradition, holds that socialism can only be introduced by the revolutionary overthrow of the existing political and social system, usually based upon the belief that the existing state structures are irredeemably linked to capitalism and the interests of the ruling class. *Reformist* socialism (sometimes termed evolutionary, parliamentary or democratic socialism), on the other hand, believes in 'socialism through the ballot box', and thus accepts basic liberal democratic principles such as consent, constitutionalism and party competition. Finally, there are profound divisions over the 'end' of socialism, that is, the nature of the socialist project. *Fundamentalist* socialism aims to abolish and replace the capitalist system, viewing socialism as qualitatively different from capitalism. Fundamentalist socialists, such as Marxists and communists, generally equate socialism with common ownership of some form. *Revisionist* socialism aims not to abolish capitalism but to reform it, looking to reach an accommodation between the efficiency of the market and the enduring moral vision of socialism. This is most clearly expressed in social democracy.

Socialism arose as a reaction against the social and economic conditions generated in Europe by the growth of industrial capitalism. The birth of socialist ideas was closely linked to the development of a new but growing class of industrial workers, who suffered the poverty and degradation that are so often a feature of early industrialisation. For over two hundred years, socialism has constituted the principal oppositional force within capitalist societies, and has articulated the interests of oppressed and disadvantaged peoples in many parts of the world. The principal impact of socialism has been in the form of the twentieth-century communist and social-democratic movements. However, in the late twentieth century, socialism suffered a number of spectacular reverses, leading some to proclaim the 'death of socialism'. The most spectacular of these reverses was the collapse of communism in the Eastern European Revolutions of 1989-91. Partly in response to this, and partly as a result of globalisation and changing social structures, parliamentary socialist parties in many parts of the world re-examined, and sometime rejected, traditional socialist principles.

The moral strength of socialism derives not from its concern with what people are like, but with what they have the capacity to become. This has led socialists to develop utopian visions of a better society in which human beings can achieve genuine emancipation and fulfilment as members of a community. In that sense, despite its late-twentieth century setbacks, socialism is destined to survive if only because it serves as a reminder that human development can extend beyond market

individualism. Critics of socialism nevertheless advance one of two lines of argument. The first is that socialism is irrevocably tainted by its association with statism. The emphasis upon collectivism leads to an endorsement of the state as the embodiment of the public interest. Both communism and social democracy are in that sense 'top-down' versions of socialism, meaning that socialism amounts to an extension of state control and a restriction of freedom. The second line of argument highlights the incoherence and confusion inherent in modern socialist theory. In this view, socialism was only ever meaningful as a critique of, or alternative to, capitalism. The acceptance by socialists of market principles therefore demonstrates either that socialism itself is flawed or that their analysis is no longer rooted in genuinely socialist ideas and theories.

Socialism	
1. What does the socialist idea about community tell us about their views on human nature?	
2. What does the term 'collectivism' mean?	
3. How do socialists understand 'cooperation'?	
4. What does the term 'egalitarianism' mean?	
5. How does the socialist understanding of equality differ to the liberal and conservative view?	
6. How do different strands of socialism disagree about what 'equality' means?	
7. How and why have socialists regarded class as an important social division?	
8. How has the emphasis on class changed in the mid-twentieth century?	
9. Why have socialists criticised the idea of 'private property'?	
10. What kind of economy do socialists envisage if private property is abolished?	
11. How and why did evolutionary socialism develop?	
12. What were Fabian Ideas?	
13. How did Bernstein contribute to the ideas of 'gradualism'?	
14. Why was gradualism considered 'inevitable'?	
15. How have socialists explained the declining socialist character of the working class?	
16. Who were the 'Utopian socialists'?	
17. What does the term 'dialectical materialism' mean?	
18. What is the 'materialist conception of history'?	

19. What were the four stages in Marx's teleological view of history?	
20. What does the term 'alienation' mean?	
21. How does Marx's understanding of 'surplus value' inform his view of capitalism?	
22. Why did Marx believe revolution was 'inevitable'?	
23. Why was the 'dictatorship of the proletariat' deemed necessary?	
24. How does social democracy depart from orthodox socialism in terms of *means* and *ends*?	
25. How did Bernstein revise Marx's ideas about the development of capitalism?	
26. What three objectives did social democracy have in the 1950s?	
27. How did Anthony Crosland revise the social democratic understanding of capitalism?	
28. What was the 'crisis of social democracy'?	
29. What was Anthony Giddens' contribution to the developing ideas of social democracy?	
30. What were the key elements of the 'third way'?	

Key references and quotes:

John Donne

'No man is an island; every man is a piece of the continent, a part of the main…'

Karl Marx Communist Manifesto 1848

'From each according to his ability, to each according to his needs.'

'The history of all hitherto existing societies is the history of class struggle.'

'Workers of the world unite; you have nothing to lose but your chains.

The theory of Communism may be summed up in one sentence: Abolish all private property.

The history of all previous societies has been the history of class struggles.

The ruling ideas of each age have ever been the ideas of its ruling class.

Eduard Bernstein – Evolutionary Socialism 1898

Drew attention to the 'steady advance of the working class.'

Vladimir Lenin – The State and Revolution 1917

Stated a commitment to the 'insurrectionary road' and rejected 'bourgeois parliamentarianism'

Rosa Luxemburg – Reform or Revolution? 1900

On the need for revolution: 'the proletariat must seize political power and suppress completely the capitalist system.'

Anthony Crosland 'The Future of Socialism' 1956

Crosland argued that post-war capitalism had fundamentally changed, meaning that the Marxist claim that it was not possible to pursue equality in a capitalist economy was no longer true. Crosland wrote that:

" The most characteristic features of capitalism have disappeared - the absolute rule of private property, the subjection of all life to market influences, the domination of the profit motive, the neutrality of government, typical laissez-faire division of income and the ideology of individual rights.'

Anthony Giddens The Third Way 1998

"Socialism is dead as an economic doctrine. So what we must do is create a more humane capitalist society that continues the values of the left - equality, solidarity, protection of the weak - and that recognises the role of active government in achieving this.'

Anarchism

Anarchism is an ideology that is defined by the central belief that political authority in all its form, and especially in the form of the state, is both evil and unnecessary (anarchy literally means 'without rule'). Anarchists believe that the state is evil because, as a repository of sovereign, compulsory and coercive authority, it is an offence against the principles of freedom and equality, the core value of anarchism being unrestricted personal autonomy. The state and the accompanying institutions of government and law are therefore rejected as corrupt and corrupting. However, the belief that the state is unnecessary is no less important to anarchism. Anarchists reject 'political' order but have considerable faith in 'natural' order and spontaneous social harmony, ultimately underpinned by optimistic assumptions about human nature. Government, in other words, is not the solution to the problem of order, but its cause.

Nevertheless, the anarchist preference for a stateless society in which free individuals manage their own affairs through voluntary agreement and cooperation has been developed on the basis of two rival traditions: socialist communitarianism and liberal individualism. Anarchism can thus be thought of as a point of intersection between socialism and liberalism: a form of both 'ultra-socialism' and 'ultra-liberalism'. This is reflected in two rival anarchist traditions, collectivist anarchism and individualist anarchism. *Collectivist* anarchism, or classical anarchism, is rooted in the idea of social solidarity or what Peter Kropotkin (1842-1912) called 'mutual aid', the belief that the natural and proper relationship amongst people is one of sympathy, affection and harmony. Collectivist anarchists have typically stressed the importance of social equality and common ownership, supporting Pierre-Joseph Proudhon's (1809-69) famous assertion that 'Property is theft', most radically expressed in the form of anarcho-communism. *Individualist* anarchism is based upon the idea of the sovereign individual, the belief that individual conscience and the pursuit of self-interest should not be constrained by any collective body or public authority. Individualist anarchism overlaps with libertarianism and is usually linked to a strong belief in the market as a self-regulating mechanism, most obviously manifest in the form of anarcho-capitalism.

Anarchism is unusual amongst political ideologies in that it has never succeeded in winning power, at least at a national level. As no society or nation has been re-modelled according to anarchist principles, it is tempting to regard anarchism as an ideology of lesser significance. As a political movement, anarchism has suffered from three major drawbacks. First, its goal, the overthrow of the state and all forms of political authority, is often considered to be simply unrealistic. The most common criticism of anarchism is that it is an example of utopianism in its negative sense, in that it places excessive faith in 'human goodness' or in the capacity of social institutions, such as the market or social ownership, to maintain order and stability. Second, in viewing government as corrupt and corrupting, anarchists have rejected the conventional means of political activism, such as forming political parties, standing for elections and seeking public office, and have had to rely instead upon the capacity of the masses to engage in spontaneous rebellion. Third, anarchism does not constitute a single, coherent set of political ideas, apart from anti-statism, anarchists disagree profoundly about the nature of an anarchic society and particularly about property rights and economic organisation.

However, the significance of anarchism is perhaps less that it has provided an ideological basis for acquiring and retaining political power, and more that it has challenged, and thereby fertilised, other political creeds. Anarchists have highlighted the coercive and destructive nature of political power, and in so doing have countered statist tendencies within other ideologies, notably liberalism, socialism and conservatism. In this sense, anarchism has had growing influence upon modern political thought. Both the New Left and New Right, for instance, have exhibited libertarian tendencies, which bear the imprint of anarchist ideas. Indeed, the continuing importance of anarchism is perhaps merely concealed by its increasingly diverse character. In addition to, and in some ways in place of, established political and class struggles, anarchists have come to address issues such as ecology, transport, urban development, consumerism, new technology and sexual relations. To argue that anarchism is irrelevant because it has long since lost the potential to become

a mass movement maybe misses the point. As the world becomes increasingly complex and fragmented, it may be that it is mass politics itself that is dead.

Anarchism	
1. How do anarchists understand the role of the state?	
2. How does this compare and contrast to the liberal view of the state?	
3. In what ways could the anarchist view of human nature be said to be 'utopian'?	
4. In what respects are anarchists pessimistic about human nature?	
5. In what ways have anarchists been 'utopian' and how has this informed their understanding of human nature?	
6. What is anti-clericalism?	
7. In what ways have anarchists understood economic freedom?	
8. How is collectivism defined by its understanding of 'mutual aid'?	
9. What are the similarities between collectivism and Marxism?	
10. Where do the similarities end?	
11. What is 'mutualism' and how did Proudhon contribute to it?	
12. What is 'anarcho-syndicalism' and how did Sorel contribute to it?	
13. What is 'anarcho-communism' and how did Kropotkin and Malatesta contribute to it?	
14. How do anarchists push the liberal idea of individualism to its extreme?	
15. In what ways do anarchists depart from liberal ideas about individualism?	
16. What is 'egoism' and how did Max Stirner contribute to these ideas?	
17. What is 'Libertarianism' and how did Tucker and Thoreau contribute to these ideas?	
18. What is 'anarcho-capitalism' and how did Rothbard, Friedman and Rand contribute to these ideas?	
19. Why have anarchists been described as 'antipolitical'?	
20. Why and how have anarchists advocated revolutionary violence?	
21. Why and how have anarchists advocated direct action?	
22. Why and how have anarchists advocated non-violent protest?	

Key references and quotes:

Pierre Proudhon - What is Property? 1840

'I am an anarchist.'

To be governed is to be watched, inspected, spied upon, directed, law-driven, numbered, regulated, enrolled, indoctrinated, preached at, controlled, checked, estimated, valued, censured, commanded, by creatures who have neither the right nor the wisdom nor the virtue to do so.

'Property is theft.'

Sebastian Faure - Encyclopedi anarchiste 1925

Defined anarchism as the 'negation of the principle of authority.'

Emma Goldman 1869-1940

The government is symbolised by 'the club, the gun, the handcuff or the prison.'

The most absurd apology for authority and law is that they serve to diminish crime. Aside from the fact that the State is itself the greatest criminal, breaking every written and natural law, stealing in the form of taxes, killing in the form of war and capital punishment, it has come to an absolute standstill in coping with crime. It has failed utterly to destroy or even minimize the horrible scourge of its own creation.

Lord Acton 1956

'Power tends to corrupt and absolute power corrupts absolutely.'

William Godwin – An Enquiry concerning Political Justice 1773

Above all we should not forget that government is an evil, a usurpation upon the private judgement and individual conscience of mankind.

Lysander Spooner

A man is no less a slave because he is allowed to choose a new master once in a term of years.

Mikhail Bakunin

'The abolition of the church and state must be the first and indispensable condition of the true liberation of society.'

Where the state begins, individual liberty ceases, and vice versa.

If there is a State, then there is domination, and in turn, there is slavery.

Peter Kropotkin

Have not prisons - which kill all will and force of character in man, which enclose within their walls more vices than are met with on any other spot of the globe - always been universities of crime?

The means of production being the collective work of humanity, the product should be the collective property of the race. Individual appropriation is neither just nor serviceable. All belongs to all.

As soon as we study animals — not in laboratories and museums only, but in the forest and prairie, in the steppe and in the mountains — we at once perceive that though there is an immense amount of warfare and extermination going on amidst various species, and especially amidst various classes of animals, there is, at the same time, as much, or perhaps even more, of mutual support, **mutual aid**, and mutual defence amidst animals belonging to the same species or, at least, to the same society. Sociability is as much a law of nature as mutual struggle.

Georges Sorel - Reflections on Violence 1908

The importance of myths as "expressions of will to act".

Errico Malatesta – Anarchy 1891

"In all times and in all places, whatever may be the name that the government takes, whatever has been its origin, or its organization, its essential function is always that of oppressing and exploiting the masses, and of defending the oppressors and exploiters.'

We anarchists do not want to emancipate the people; we want the people to emancipate themselves.

Wolff 1998

The autonomous man, insofar as he is autonomous, is not subject to the will of another.'

Max Stirner –The Ego and his Own 1845

Nothing is more to me than myself!

Henry David Thoreau – Civil Disobedience 1849

That government is best which governs not at all.'

Benjamin Tucker

This brings us to Anarchism, which may be described as the doctrine that all the affairs of men should be managed by individuals or voluntary associations, and that the State should be abolished.

'labour for labour' exchange and 'time stores'

Ayn Rand

In a capitalist society, all human relationships are voluntary. Men are free to cooperate or not, to deal with one another or not, as their own individual judgments, convictions and interests dictate.

Murray Rothbard 1978

If citizens were permitted privately owned courts and armies, then they would possess the means to defend themselves against invasive acts by the government as well as by private individuals.

Nationalism

Nationalism can broadly be defined as the belief that the nation is the central principle of political organisation. As such, it is based upon two core assumptions: first, that humankind is naturally divided into distinct nations, and second, that the nation is a political community in the sense that it is the most appropriate, and perhaps only legitimate, unit of political rule. There is, nevertheless, disagreement about whether nationalism is a doctrine or an ideology. The doctrine of nationalism, or what is seen as 'classical' political nationalism, is the belief that all nations are entitled to independent statehood, suggesting that the world should consist of a collection of nation-states. This doctrine may, in turn, be reworked or reinterpreted when it is absorbed into one of a number of political ideologies. However, if nationalism is regarded as an ideology in its own right, it is seen to encompass a diverse range of forms, political, cultural and ethnic. *Political* nationalism includes any attempt to use the nation ideal to further specifically political ends, which may be highly diverse, as explained below. *Cultural* nationalism emphasises the regeneration of the nation as a distinctive civilisation, and thus stresses the need to defend or strengthen a national language, religion, or way of life rather than achieve overt political ends. *Ethnic* nationalism overlaps with cultural nationalism, but as ethnic groups are seen, correctly or incorrectly, to have descended from common ancestors, it implies a stronger and perhaps more intense sense of distinctiveness and exclusivity.

Political nationalism is a complex and diverse phenomenon. Its major forms are liberal nationalism, conservative nationalism, expansionist nationalism and anticolonial nationalism. *Liberal* nationalism assigns to the nation a moral status similar to that of the individual, meaning that nations have rights, in particular the right to self-determination. As liberal nationalism holds that all nations are equal, it proclaims that the nation-state ideal is universally applicable. *Conservative* nationalism is concerned less with the principled nationalism of self-determination and more with the promise of social cohesion and public order embodied in the sentiment of national patriotism. From this perspective, patriotic loyalty and a consciousness of nationhood is largely rooted in the idea of a shared past, turning nationalism into a defence of traditional values and institutions that have been endorsed by history. *Expansionist* nationalism is an aggressive and militaristic form of nationalism that is invariably associated with chauvinistic beliefs and doctrines, which tends to blur the distinction between nationalism and racialism. In its extreme form, sometimes referred to as 'integral' nationalism, it arises from a sentiment of intense, even hysterical nationalist enthusiasm. *Anticolonial* nationalism links the struggle for 'national liberation' in Africa and Asia in particular to the desire for social development, and was typically expressed through socialist doctrines, most commonly through the vehicle of revolutionary Marxism. However, developing-world nationalism has since the 1970s assumed a postcolonial character, which has been expressed most clearly through religious fundamentalism.

It would be difficult to overestimate the significance of nationalism to modern politics. For over two hundred years, nationalism has helped to shape and re-shape history in all parts of the world, making it perhaps the most successful of political creeds. The rising tide of nationalism re-drew the map of Europe in the nineteenth century as autocratic and multinational empires crumbled in the face of liberal and nationalist pressures. This process was continued in the twentieth century through the Treaty of Versailles (1919) and culminated in 1991 with the collapse of the political successor to the Russian Empire, the USSR. Both the First and Second World Wars were arguably the result of an upsurge in aggressive nationalism, and most regional and international conflicts are to some extent fuelled by nationalism. The political face of the developing world has been transformed since 1945 by the rise of anticolonialism and a subsequent postcolonial process of 'nation building', both of which are essentially manifestations of nationalism On the other hand, there have been claims since the late twentieth century that nationalism is becoming an anachronism. These claims are variously based upon the fact that nationalism has achieved its aim in that the world is now mainly composed of nation-states; that nation-states are themselves losing authority as a result of globalisation and the growth of supranationalism; and that ethnic and regional political identities are displacing national ones.

The normative character of nationalism is notoriously difficult to judge. This is because nationalism has a schizophrenic political character. At different times, nationalism has been progressive and reactionary, democratic and authoritarian, rational and irrational, and left-wing and right-wing. Nationalists argue that a 'higher' loyalty and deeper political significance attaches to the nation than to any other social group or collective body because nations are natural political communities. Nationalism is merely the recognition of this fact given ideological form. Supporters of nationalism, moreover, view nationalism as a means of enlarging freedom and defending democracy, since it is grounded in the idea of self-government. Such a defence of nationalism is most easily developed in relation to liberal nationalism and anticolonial nationalism. However, opponents of nationalism argue that it is implicitly and sometimes explicitly oppressive, and that it is invariably linked to intolerance, suspicion and conflict. Nationalism is oppressive both in the sense that it submerges individual identity and conscience within that of the national whole, and because of the potential it gives political leaders and elites to manipulate and control the masses. The argument that nationalism is inherently divisive stems from the fact that it highlights difference amongst humankind and legitimises an identification with, and preference for, one's own people or nation; in short, it breeds tribalism. This may be implicit in conservative nationalism and explicit in expansionist nationalism, but all forms of nationalism may harbour a darker face that is essentially chauvinistic and potentially aggressive.

Nationalism	
1. What is political nationalism	
2. What is cultural nationalism	
3. Why has nationalism been called 'schizophrenic'?	
4. What is the basic definition of nation?	
5. What are the 'objective' factors by which the nation has been described?	
6. Why is the 'objective' definition flawed?	
7. What is meant by the 'subjective' definition of nation?	
8. Outline the liberal view of the nation (p175)	
9. Outline the conservative view of the nation (p175)	
10. Outline the socialist view of the nation (p175)	
11. Outline the fascist view of the nation (p175)	
12. What does the term 'exclusive citizenship' mean?	
13. What does the term 'inclusive citizenship' mean?	
14. What does the term 'civic nationalism' mean?	
15. How do primordialists conceptualise the nation?	

16. How do modernists conceptualise the nation?	
17. How do constructivists conceptualise the nation?	
18. What does Rousseau's idea about the 'general will' contribute to nationalism?	
19. What is the 'nation-state'?	
20. How is the nation-state connected to unification and independence?	
21. Why is 'cultural nationalism' considered to be mystical?	
22. What is Herder's idea about 'Volkgeist' and how does it relate to nationalism?	
23. What is 'ethnic' nationalism?	
24. What are the key ideas/thinkers of liberal nationalism?	
25. What are the key ideas/thinkers of conservative nationalism?	
26. What are the key ideas/thinkers of expansionist nationalism?	
27. What does the term imperialism mean?	
28. What does the term patriotism mean?	
29. What does the term jingoism mean?	
30. What are the key ideas/thinkers of anti-colonial nationalism?	

Key references and quotes:

Anthony Smith (1986)

'The nation was always there, indeed it is part of the natural order, even when it was submerged in the hearts of its members.'

Ernest Gellner (1983)

'It is nationalism which engenders nations, and not the other way round.'

Benedict Anderson (1983)

'I propose the following definition of the nation: it is an imagined political community - - and imagined as both inherently limited and sovereign.'

Eric Hobsbawm

Nations are based on 'invented traditions.'

Rousseau

"Each of us puts his person and all his power in common under the supreme direction of the general will, and, in our corporate capacity, we receive each member as an indivisible part of the whole."

Woodrow Wilson (1918)

14. A general association of nations must be formed under specific covenants for the purpose of affording mutual guarantees of political independence and territorial integrity to great and small states alike.

Enoch Powell

As I look ahead, I am filled with foreboding; like the Roman, I seem to see "the River Tiber foaming with much blood."

Hitler

"Truly, this earth is a trophy cup for the industrious man. And this rightly so, in the service of natural selection. He who does not possess the force to secure his Lebensraum in this world, and, if necessary, to enlarge it, does not deserve to possess the necessities of life. He must step aside and allow stronger peoples to pass him by."

Frantz Fanon

"Imperialism leaves behind germs of rot which we must clinically detect and remove from our land but from our minds as well."

Feminism

Feminism is a political movement and ideology that aims to advance the social role of women. Feminists have highlighted what they see as the political relationship between the sexes: the supremacy of men and the subjection of women in most, if not all, societies. Feminist ideology is therefore characterised by two basis beliefs. First, women and men are treated differently because of their sex, and second, that unequal treatment can and should be overturned. Although most feminists therefore embrace the goal of gender equality, it is misleading to define feminism in terms of this goal as some feminists distinguish between liberation and equality, arguing that the latter implies that women should be 'like men'. The central concept in feminist analysis is patriarchy, which draws attention to the totality of oppression and exploitation to which women are subject. This, in turn, highlights the political importance of gender, understood to refer to socially imposed rather than biological differences between women and men. Most feminists view gender as a political construct, usually based upon stereotypes of 'feminine' and 'masculine' behaviour and social roles.

Feminist theory and practice is highly diverse, however. Distinctive liberal, socialist/Marxist and radical forms of feminism are conventionally identified. *Liberal* feminism reflects a commitment to individualism and formal equality, and is characterised by the quest for equal rights and opportunities in 'public' and political life. *Socialist* feminism, largely derived from Marxism, highlights links between female subordination and the capitalist mode of production, drawing attention to the economic significance of women being confined to the family or domestic life. *Radical* feminism goes beyond the perspectives of established political traditions in portraying gender divisions as the most fundamental and politically significant cleavages in society, and in calling for the radical, even revolutionary, restructuring of personal, domestic and family life. Radical feminists proclaim that 'the personal is the political'. However, the breakdown of feminism into three traditions – liberal, socialist and radical – has become increasingly redundant since the 1970s as feminism has become yet more sophisticated and diverse. Amongst its more recent forms have been black feminism, psychoanalytic feminism, eco-feminism and postmodern feminism.

The so-called 'first wave' of feminism was closely associated with the women's suffrage movement, which emerged in the 1840s and 1850s. The achievement of female suffrage in most Western countries in the early twentieth century meant that the campaign for legal and civil rights assumed a lower profile and deprived the women's movement of a unifying focus. The 'second wave' of feminism arose during the 1960s and expressed, in addition to the established concern with equal rights, the more radical and revolutionary demands of the growing Women's Liberation Movement. Since the early 1970s, feminism has undergone a process of de-radicalisation, leading some to proclaim the emergence of post-feminism. This was undoubtedly linked to a growing backlash against feminism, associated with the rise of the New Right, but it also reflects the emergence of more individualised and conventionalised forms of feminism, characterised by an unwillingness any longer to view women as 'victims'.

The major strength of feminist ideology is that it has exposed and challenged the gender biases that pervade society and which have been ignored by conventional political thought. As such, feminism has gained growing respectability as a distinctive school of political thought. It has shed new light upon established concepts such as power, domination and equality, but also introduced a new sensitivity and language into politics related to ideas such as connection, voice and difference. Feminism has nevertheless been criticised on the grounds that its internal divisions are now so sharp that feminist theory has lost all coherence and unity. Postmodern feminists, for example, even question whether 'woman' is a meaningful category. Others suggest that feminism has become disengaged from a society that is increasingly post-feminist, in that, largely thanks to the women's movement, the domestic, professional and public roles of women, at least in developed societies, have undergone a major transformation.

Feminism	
1. What was 'first wave' feminism?	
2. What was 'second wave' feminism?	
3. What does 'redefining the political' mean?	
4. What does the term 'patriarchy' mean?	
5. What does the term 'sex' mean?	
6. What does the term 'gender' mean?	
7. Why are feminists so eager to differentiate the two?	
8. What does the term 'androgynous' mean?	
9. What is a 'difference feminist' and how does it relate to the idea of 'essentialism'?	
10. Why do difference feminists reject 'equality feminism'?	
11. What is 'pro-woman' feminism?	
12. What are the key ideas/thinkers of liberal feminism?	
13. What was the key aim of Wollstonecraft's 'A vindication of the rights of women.'?	
14. What was Betty Friedan's idea of 'The feminine Mystique'?	
15. What does the term 'personhood' mean and why has it been criticised by other feminists?	
16. Why has liberal feminism been criticised?	
17. What are the key ideas/thinkers of socialist feminism?	
18. How does Engels link patriarchy and capitalism?	
19. What is the 'world historical defeat of mother right'?	
20. What ideas have utopian socialist contributed to the debate?	
21. How do socialist feminists propose to overcome patriarchy?	
22. In what ways has socialist feminism been criticised?	
23. What are the key ideas/thinkers of radical feminism?	

24. How does radical feminism rethink the traditional understanding of patriarchy?	
25. What is pro-woman feminism?	
26. What are the key ideas/thinkers of third-wave feminism?	
27. What deficiencies does the branch of feminism see in previous branches?	
28. How has post-structuralism influenced third wave feminism?	
29. What does the term 'new feminism' mean?	

Key references and quotes:

Betty Friedan 'The Feminine Mystique' 1963

'The problem with no name.'

'Personhood'

'Mystique of motherhood'

Kate Millett (1970)

Politics exists where 'power structured relationships, arrangements whereby one group of persons is controlled by another.'

'Patriarchal government' is an institution whereby 'that half of the populace which is female is controlled by the half that is male.'

Patriarchy contains two principles: 'male shall dominate female, elder male shall dominate younger.'

The family is 'patriarchy's chief institution'

'consciousness raising'

Simone de Beauvoir 1949

'Women are made, they are not born.'

Mary Wollstonecraft A Vindication of the Rights of Women 1792

She claimed 'distinction of sex' would become unimportant

John Stuart Mill & Harriet Taylor On the Subjection of Women 1869

Society should be organised on the principle of 'reason'' and 'accidents of birth' should be irrelevant.

Engels The Origins of the Family, Private Property and the State (1884)

'mother right'

'bourgeois family'

'reserve army of labour'

'wage slaves'

Susan Brownmiller 1975

Men have created 'an ideology of rape' which amounts to a 'conscious process of intimidation by which all men keep all women in a state of fear.'

Ti-Grace Atkinson

Feminism is the theory; lesbianism is the practice'

Natasha Walter 1999

Drew attention to the strengthening cultural sexism through the 'hyper-sexualization' of girls and women.

Ecologism

Ecologism takes ideological thinking in novel and challenging directions. Its starting place is largely or entirely ignored by other political ideologies: the idea of an intrinsic relationship between humankind and nature (or non-human nature, to avoid confusion with the notion of 'human nature'). Of course, there is nothing new about this belief. The idea that human society is part of, or at least intimately connected to, the natural world is taken for granted in most traditional cultures and is a core belief of pagan religions and most Eastern religions. However, such ideas only gained an ideological character when they were invested with political significance. This occurred due to the tendency of industrialisation to divorce humankind from nature, the latter increasingly being seen merely in economic terms, as a resource available to satisfy human ends. In that sense, ecologism emerged as, and has always constituted, a critique of industrial civilisation. As urban and industrial life spread in the 19ᵗʰ century, thinkers such as the UK libertarian socialist William Morris (1834-96) and the Russian anarcho-communist Peter Kropotkin (1842-1921) developed a form of socialist pastoralism that prefigured later eco-socialism. During the twentieth century, pastoral sentiments were most likely to surface in right-wing political doctrines, not least in the 'blood and soil' ideas of the German Nazis. Though starkly different in other respects, both left- and right-wing pastoralism tended to subscribe to an organic theory of society that highlighted parallels between social and natural structures and so implied a connectedness between humankind and nature.

Such thinking, nevertheless, only acquired a fully ideological character through the rise of the green or environmental movement in the 1960s and 1970s. By the end of the 1970s, ecologism was widely viewed as an ideology in its own right, due to three main theoretical developments. First, a greater emphasis on the principle of ecology encouraged thinkers to construct ideas about interconnectedness, holism and natural balance that went beyond a mere pressure-group-like concern for the environment, commonly called 'environmentalism'. Ecology, in other words, provided the basis for an ecocentric 'world view'. Second, there was a growing recognition that the threat to the environment had an important ideological dimension in the form of anthropocentrism, the human-centred bias that characterises conventional ethical thinking and philosophical belief. Third, the emergence of so-called 'deep' ecology, which embraced a fully ecocentric worldview that rejected anthropocentrism altogether, established a form of ecological thinking that could not be accommodated within existing ideologies, or within hybrid ideological forms such as eco-socialism, eco-anarchism or eco-feminism. In shifting ideological thinking onto radically new terrain, deep ecology has a significance that parallels that of radical feminism within the feminist tradition.

Ecologism – key concepts

Ecology: As a distinct branch of biology, ecology focuses on the ways in which plants and animals are sustained by self-regulating natural systems – ecosystems – composed of both living and non-living elements. Ecology implies both interconnectedness and equilibrium, as all ecosystems tend towards a state of harmony through a system of self-regulation.

Ecocentrism: An approach to understanding that prioritises the maintenance of ecological balance over the achievement of human ends. Only deep ecologists fully embrace ecocentrism.

Anthropocentrism: Human-centredness; the belief that human needs and interests are of overriding moral and philosophical importance. Anthropocentrism is the opposite of eco-centrism.

Shallow ecology: A green ideological perspective that harnesses the lessons of ecology to human needs and ends, and is associated with values such as sustainability and conservation; humanist ecology.

Deep ecology: A green ideological perspective that rejects anthropocentrism and gives priority to the maintenance of nature, and is associated with values such as biocentric equality, diversity and decentralisation.

Holism: A belief that the whole is more important that its parts; holism implies that understanding is gained by studying relationships between the parts.

Industrialism: A term used by green theorists to refer to economic arrangements, reflected in both capitalism and socialism, that favour large-scale production, the accumulation of capital and relentless growth.

Environmentalism: A concern about the natural environment and particularly the desire to reduce environmental degradation; a policy orientation rather than an ideological stance (unlike ecologism).

Pastoralism: A belief in the virtues of rural existence: simplicity, community and a closeness to nature, in contrast to the corrupting influence of urban and industrialised life.

The politics of sensibilities

What new ideological terrain has ecologism uncovered? How has ecologism extended ideological thought? Through the nineteenth and for much of the twentieth century, political ideology had a strong economic focus. The classical ideologies, notably liberalism and socialism, engaged in what can be called the *politics of material distribution*. They offered contrasting answers to the question: 'who should get what?' Ideological debate therefore tended to boil down to a clash between rival economic models: capitalism and socialism. By contrast, most of the so-called 'new' ideologies that have emerged since the 1960s – second-wave feminism, ethnocultural nationalism, religious fundamentalism and multiculturalism – subscribe to the *politics of identity*. In offering alternative answers to the question 'who are we?', they have emphasised the political importance of, variously, gender, ethnicity, religion and culture.

Ecologism, for its part, differs from both the politics of material distribution and the politics of identity. Indeed, in important ways, ecologism has both a post-material and a post-identity orientation. It is post-material in that, to a greater or lesser degree, it views economics as the enemy of ecology, materialism being a form of intellectual and spiritual corruption that results in an alienation from nature. As a form of post-identity politics, ecologism transcends conventional conceptions of identity because, by questioning, and trying to weaken, the divide between the human and natural worlds, it dispenses with human-centred notions of selfhood, whether individual or collective. So what kind of politics does ecologism practice? Ecologism is deeper and, in a sense, more radical than other political ideologies because it practises the *politics of sensibilities*, sensibilities referring to levels of awareness or discernment. By attempting to re-orientate people's relationship with, and appreciation of, the non-human – the world 'out there' – ecologism sets out to do nothing less than transform human consciousness and expand the range of our moral responsibilities. As such, ecologism, especially in the form of deep ecology, deals with issues of ontology, that is, issues concerning the nature of being, existence or reality in general.

However, not all ecologists think alike. Ecologism can be divided into three broad categories, as follows:

- Modernist ecology
- Social ecology
- Deep ecology.

Modernist ecology

Modernist ecology has an essentially reformist character, in that it seeks to reconcile the principle of ecology with the central features of capitalist modernity (individual self-seeking, materialism, economic growth and so on). It is thus very clearly a form of 'shallow' or humanist ecology. The key feature of modernist ecology is the recognition that there are 'limits to growth', in that environmental degradation (in the form, for instance, of pollution or the use of non-renewable resources) ultimately threatens prosperity and economic performance. The watchword of this form of ecologism is therefore sustainable development, sustainability being the capacity of a system to maintain its health and continue in existence over a period of time. In economic terms, this means 'getting richer slower'. Modernist ecology thus extends moral and philosophical sensibilities only in modest directions. Indeed, it is often condemned by more radical ecologists as hopelessly compromised: part of the problem rather than part of the solution.

Nevertheless, influenced by modern liberalism, it practices what can be called 'enlightened' anthropocentrism, encouraging individuals to take account of long-term, and not merely short-term, interests and to favour 'higher' pleasures (such as an appreciation of nature) over 'lower' pleasures (such as material consumption). Similarly, the idea of sustainable development is supported by a theory of intergenerational justice in which the present generation has obligations towards future

generations (in particular, to ensure that they enjoy at least the same levels of material prosperity). Such thinking has been influenced by, amongst other things, a traditional conservative, and specifically Burkean, notion of tradition in which society is viewed as a partnership between the living, the dead and the yet-to-be-born. However, there are important differences within modernist ecology, particularly over the proper balance between the state and capitalism. Whereas most modernist ecologists favour state intervention (on the grounds that environmental degradation is an externality or a 'social cost', unrecognised by the market), some even calling for the construction of an authoritarian 'green state', others champion the cause of so-called 'green capitalism', which basically relies on market forces to dictate a shift towards more ecologically-sound consumption and production patterns.

Social ecology

Social ecology is a term coined by the US anarchist social philosopher, Murray Bookchin (1921-2006), to refer to the idea that ecological principles can and should be applied to social organisation, in which case an anarchist commune can be thought of as an ecosystem. However, the term can be used more broadly to refer to a range of ideas that each recognise that the destruction the environment is dictated by, or linked to, existing social structures. The advance of ecological principles therefore requires a process of radical social change. However, social ecology, thus defined, encompasses three distinct ecological traditions:

- Eco-socialism
- Eco-anarchism
- Eco-feminism

Eco-socialism advances an environmental critique of capitalism: in short, capitalism is the enemy of nature, while socialism is its friend. In this view, capitalism's anti-ecological bias derives from a number of sources. For instance, private property encourages the belief that humans have domination over nature; the market economy 'commodifies' nature in the sense that it turns it into something only has use-value and can be bought and sold; and the capitalist system breeds materialism and consumerism and so leads to relentless growth. Most green parties, in their early years, thus followed the pioneering example of the German Greens, in trying to reconcile 'red' and 'green' priorities. However, as the often appalling environmental record of state socialist societies were more widely recognised, eco-socialism gradually lost its appeal.

Eco-anarchism advances an environmental critique of hierarchy and authority: in short, domination over other people is linked to domination over nature. Decentralisation, self-management and direct democracy are therefore a recipe for an ecological balance within society as well as for a balance between humankind and nature. Anarchist sensibilities have influenced the green movement in a variety of ways, ranging from a general suspicion of authority and leadership structures (green

parties have often favoured the idea of collective leadership) to a willingness, at times, to employ tactics of direct action.

Eco-feminism advances an environmental critique of patriarchy: in short, domination over women leads to domination over nature. Most eco-feminists believe that there are essential (biologically-rooted and not merely cultural) differences between men and women. Men are the enemy of nature because their reliance on instrumental reason allows them to understand the natural world only in terms of use-value, while women live in harmony with nature by virtue of their ability to engage with it at a deeper psycho-emotional level. Eco-feminism is therefore the point at which feminist essentialism overlaps with deep ecology.

Deep ecology

The term deep ecology was coined by the Norwegian philosopher Arne Naess (1912-2009), to distinguish ecological philosophy ('ecosophy') from 'shallow' or humanist ecology. Deep ecology emphasises the need for paradigm change, that is, for a change in our core thinking and assumptions about the world. Specifically, it calls for the adoption of a radically new philosophical and moral perspective to replace conventional mechanistic and atomistic thinking. It advocates a radical holism that dispenses altogether with anthropocentric ideas and assumptions. Interconnectedness is the central theme of all forms of deep ecology, but these have been constructed on a variety of bases, ranging from the new physics (particularly quantum mechanics) and systems theory to Eastern mysticism and especially Buddhism and Taoism. Such ecocentric paradigms have encouraged deep ecologists to extend moral and philosophical thinking in a number of radical directions.

Buddhism as a basis for deep ecology

Growing interest in deep ecology has coincided with a greater awareness of forms of Eastern mysticism. The philosophy of Mahayana Buddhism (the form of Buddhism that is practiced in countries such as Tibet, China and Japan) has been particularly influential in this respect, because of its stress on interconnectedness and impermanence. This is most clearly expressed through the idea of 'emptiness', the belief that all entities lack own-being, in the sense that they have not concrete existence in and of themselves. This applies to doctrines and theories, as well as to animate and inanimate objects, including individual human beings – hence the idea of 'no-self'. Emptiness is explained by the notion of dependent co-origination, which holds that, as everything is changing and dependant on something else, there is nothing solid in which we can trust. Such thinking is radically holistic, and, in ecological terms, places an emphasis on the 'web of life', rather than on the interests of any single species.

Deep ecologists, for example, champion the cause of biocentric equality, in which all species share a 'universal right to bloom and flourish' (Naess). This suggests that any attempt to place the interests of humans above those of animals or other species is an example of 'speciesism', an irrational

prejudice akin to racism or sexism. Furthermore, deep ecologists emphasise the intrinsic value of nature (value-in-nature), highlighting the idea that ethical value derives from nature itself, particularly when it is unspoilt by human interference, by contrast with conventional moral thinking which bases value on nature's ability to satisfy human ends. The economic thinking of deep ecology tends to favour 'strong' sustainability - not merely the desire to prevent present actions from imperilling the prosperity of future generations but, rather, a rejection of growth-for-its-own-sake in favour of an acceptance of more meagre living standards based on a desire to reduce our 'ecological footprint'. Finally, deep ecologists have re-evaluated selfhood and the nature of human happiness. Through ideas such as the 'ecological self', they have portrayed human beings as more as perceiving subjects (defined by what they experience) rather than as perceived objects (defined by their name, family status, gender, nationality, occupation and so on). Such an 'inter-subjective' model of the selfhood allows for no distinction between the self and 'the other', or the world 'out there', thus collapsing the distinction between humankind and nature. In this light, happiness should be defined in terms of 'being' rather than 'having', human fulfilment stemming more from an appreciation of nature 'as it is', instead of from manipulating and exploiting nature for economic benefit.

Ecologism	
1. What is the difference between 'environmentalism' and 'ecologism'?	
2. What does the term 'ecocentrism' mean and how does it differ to 'anthropocentrism'?	
3. Distinguish between 'shallow' and 'deep' ecology?	
4. How does 'holism' differ to the traditional mechanistic view of the world?	
5. Why have some ecologists drawn inspiration from eastern mysticism?	
6. What is the 'Gaia hypothesis'?	
7. What does the term 'industrialism' mean?	
8. What does Boulding's idea of 'spaceship earth' refer to?	
9. Distinguish between 'closed' and 'open systems'	
10. What is the 'tragedy of the commons'?	
11. What does the term 'sustainability' mean?	
12. What is 'Buddhist economics' and how does it inform ecological thinking?	
13. Distinguish between modernist and radical ecologists.	
14. How have some ecologists challenged conventional ethics?	

15. Why do ecologists challenge materialism?	
16. Why do ecologists critique the 'having' attitude?	
17. What is modernist ecology?	
18. Outline the key ideas and thinkers of liberal modernist ecologism.	
19. Outline the key ideas and thinkers of conservative modernist ecologism.	
20. What is social ecology?	
21. Outline the key ideas and thinkers of ecosocialism.	
22. Outline the key ideas and thinkers of ecoanarchism.	
23. Outline the key ideas and thinkers of ecofeminism.	
24. What is deep ecology?	
25. Why have the other branches of ecologism criticised deep ecologism?	

Key references and quotes:

David Ehrenfeld (1978)

Conventional ideologies have sought to make humans the centrepiece of existence – 'the arrogance of humanism'

John Locke

'the masters and possessors of nature'

Arne Naess

'shallow ecology'

'deep ecology'

'Just as we need not morals to make us breathe … so if your "self" in the wide sense embraces another being, you need no moral exhortation to show care … You care for yourself without feeling any moral pressure to do it—providing you have not succumbed to a neurosis of some kind, developing self-destructive tendencies, or hating yourself.'

Fritjof Capra The Turning Point 1982

'Cartesian-Newtonian paradigm'

'Newtonian world machine'

Jan Smuts 1926

'holism'

James Lovelock

'Gaia'

The 'earth's biosphere, atmosphere, oceans and soil' exhibit precisely the kind of self regulating behaviour that characterises other forms of life.

Gaia is an 'ecological ideology'

It all depends on you and me. If we see the world as a living organism of which we are a part—not the owner, nor the tenant; not even a passenger—we could have a long time ahead of us and our species might survive for its "allotted span."

Kenneth Boulding 1966

'cowboy building'

Makes parallels with American West with 'reckless, exploitative and violent behaviour'

E.F.Schumacher 1973 'Small is beautiful'

Humans have made mistake of regarding energy as 'income' and 'natural capital'

Man is now too clever to survive without wisdom.'

Peter Singer 1975

'Animal rights'

Speciesism'

Goodin 1992

'Green theory of value'

Murray Bookchin Our Synthetic Environment 1962

'Social ecology'

"If we recognise that every ecosystem can also be viewed as a food web, we can think of it as a circular, interlacing nexus of plant animal relationships (rather than a stratified pyramid with man at the apex)... Each species, be it a form of bacteria or deer, is knitted together in a network of interdependence, however indirect the links may be."

Social ecology is based on the conviction that nearly all of our present ecological problems originate in deep-seated social problems. It follows, from this view, that these ecological problems cannot be understood, let alone solved, without a careful understanding of our existing society and the irrationalities that dominate it.

On deep ecology: 'Eco la la' and 'vulgar Californian spiritualism'

Rudolph Bahro 1982

Capitalism 'commodifies nature'

Mary Daly Gyn/Ecology 1979

'female nature'

Aldo Leopold Sand County Almanac 1948

'A thing is right when it tends to preserve the integrity, stability and beauty of the biotic community.

It is wrong when it tends otherwise'

Henry David Thoreau 1854

'wilderness ethic'

Multiculturalism

Although the UK has never (unlike Canada and Australia) formally embraced multiculturalism as a basis for inter-communal relations, multiculturalism has been accepted, particularly since the 1980s, as the prevailing ethos in much of British public life. This has been evident in developments as diverse as the advance of bilingualism in Wales, the emphasis on 'equality and diversity' in the public services, the spread of so-called 'faith schools' and the Lord Chief Justice's (Lord Phillips) willingness to accept Sharia courts as a legitimate means of settling certain disputes between British Muslims. Such developments have nevertheless not gone unchallenged. Indeed, it has become increasingly fashionable to declare that multiculturalism has 'gone too far', or has 'had its day', a view expressed not least by Trevor Phillips, the chair of the Equality and Human Rights Commission. But what exactly is multiculturalism? What assumptions and thinking lie behind multiculturalism, and what different forms does it take? Finally, what are the main objections to multiculturalism and the wider politics of culture?

What is multiculturalism?

Some continue to use the term 'multiculturalism' empirically; that is, simply to refer to the existence of diverse cultures, values and traditions within the same society. Multiculturalism, however, is not the same as cultural diversity. Rather, it is a particular *approach* to dealing with the challenges of cultural diversity and, in particular, to bringing about the advancement of marginalised or disadvantaged groups. However, multiculturalism adopts a novel approach to such matters, one that departs from conventional approaches to social advancement, especially as represented by republicanism and social reformism.

Republicanism (associated with classical liberalism) is primarily concerned with the problem of legal and political exclusion, the denial to certain groups of rights that are enjoyed by their fellow citizens. The key idea of republicanism is the principle of universal citizenship, the belief that all members of society should enjoy the same status and the same entitlements. Republican thinking was, for example, reflected in first-wave feminism, in that its campaign for female emancipation focused on the struggle for votes for women and on equal access to education, careers and public life in general. It is also evident in anti-discrimination legislation, such as the Race Relations Act (1976), which prohibits discrimination on the grounds of race, colour and ethnic or national origin. Republicanism can, in this sense, be said to be 'difference-blind': it views difference as 'the problem' (because it leads to discriminatory or unfair treatment), and proposes that difference be banished or transcended in the name of equality. Republicans therefore believe that social advancement can be brought about through legal egalitarianism.

Social reformism (associated with modern liberalism or social democracy) arose out of the belief that universal citizenship and formal equality are not sufficient, in themselves, to tackle the problems of subordination and marginalisation. People are held back not merely be legal and political exclusion, but also, and more importantly, by social disadvantage - poverty, unemployment, poor housing, lack of education, and suchlike. The key idea of social reformism is the principle of equality of opportunity, the belief in a 'level playing-field' that allows people to rise or fall in society strictly on the basis of personal ability and their willingness to work. Such social egalitarianism can only be brought about through a system of social engineering that aims to alleviate poverty and overcome disadvantage, in part through the identification of difference. For instance, the stress in the Race Relations Act (2000) on the promotion of equal opportunities forces schools, colleges and universities formally to monitor issues such as staff recruitment and promotion and student performance on the basis of ethnic or racial origin. This, nevertheless, amounts to only a provisional or temporary acknowledgement of difference, in that different groups are identified only to expose (supposedly) unfair practices and eradicate them.

Multiculturalism, for its part, developed out of the belief that group marginalisation often has yet deeper origins. It is not merely a legal, political or social phenomenon, but is, rather, a cultural phenomenon, one that operates through stereotypes and values that structure how people see themselves and are seen by others. Universal citizenship and equality of opportunity, in other words, do not go far enough. Egalitarianism, in both its legal and social forms, has limited value, and may even be part of the problem. Multiculturalism, by contrast, is distinguished by an emphasis on difference over equality. This is reflected in its central theme: a positive endorsement, even celebration, of cultural difference, allowing marginalised groups to assert themselves by reclaiming an authentic sense of cultural identity. Multicultural rights are therefore specific to the group concerned, as opposed to 'equal' or 'universal' rights. They include:

- *The right to (public) recognition and respect*. Cultural groups, defined by characteristics such as religion, language, ethnicity or national origin, should somehow be accepted as legitimate actors in public life. Such rights may include the right not to be offended, protecting the sacred or core beliefs of a group from being attacked or insulted.

- *Minority, 'special' or 'polyethnic' rights*. These are legal privileges or exclusions that enable particular cultural groups to maintain their identities and their distinctive ways of life. (Examples in the UK include the exclusion of Sikhs from the requirement to wear motor-cycle helmets, the exclusion of Jewish shopkeepers from Sunday trading legislation, and exemptions for Muslim and Jewish butchers from laws regulating the slaughter of animals and birds.)

- *The right, in certain circumstances, to some degree of self-determination*. This enables groups to exert some control, or at least influence, over the rules by which they live. Liberal multiculturalists, such as Will Kymlicka (1995), tend to restrict the right to self-determination to indigenous peoples and tribes (who have become minority groups through conquest or colonialism), excluding minority groups that have developed as a result of immigration (where some level of consent can be assumed).

Contrasting approaches to social advancement				
Approach	*Main obstacle to advancement*	*Key theme*	*Attitude to difference*	*Manifestations*
Republicanism	Legal and political exclusion	Universal citizenship	Difference-blindness — politics of *in*difference	• Formal equality (legal and political rights) • Ban discrimination • Prohibit use of ethnic/cultural categories (France)
Social reformism	Social disadvantage	Equality of opportunity	Difference highlighted, but in order to 'transcend'	• Social rights • Welfare and redistribution • Positive discrimination (?)
Multiculturalism	Cultural marginalization	Group self-assertion	Celebrate difference — difference is permanent and ineradicable	• Right to (public) recognition and respect • Minority (polyethnic) rights • Group self-determination (?)

The politics of cultural self-assertion

Multiculturalism has been shaped by a larger body of thought that holds that culture is basic to political and social identity. In that sense, multiculturalism is part of a wider politics of cultural self-assertion. The origins of this form of politics can be traced back to the counter-Enlightenment and, in particular, the ideas of the German poet and philosopher, Herder (1744-1803), often portrayed as the 'father' of cultural nationalism. However, in its modern form, cultural politics has been shaped by two main forces: identity politics and communitarianism.

Identity politics is a broad term that encompasses a wide range of political trends and ideological developments. What all forms of identity politics have in common is that they view liberal universalism as a source of oppression, even a form of cultural imperialism, which tends to marginalise and demoralise subordinate groups and peoples. It does this because, behind a façade of universalism, the culture of liberal societies is constructed in line with the interests of its dominant groups – men, whites, the wealthy and so forth. Subordinate groups and peoples are either consigned an inferior or demeaning stereotype or they are encouraged to identify with the values and interests of dominant groups, their oppressors. Edward Said (2003) tried to expose this through the notion of 'orientalism', highlighting the extent to which European colonialism had been upheld through stereotypical fictions that belittled and demeaned non-western people and culture. However, identity politics also views culture as a source of liberation and empowerment. Social and political advancement can be achieved through a process of cultural self-assertion aimed at cultivating a 'pure' or 'authentic' sense of identity. Embracing such an identity is therefore a political act, a statement of intent, a form defiance. This is what gives identity politics its typically combative character and imbues it with considerable psycho-emotional force. Identity politics fuses the personal and the political.

Identity politics

Identity politics is a style of politics that seeks to advance the interest of a particular group, in the face of actual or perceives injustice, oppression or marginalisation, by strengthening its members' awareness of their collective identity and common experiences. Many 'new' social movements and ideologies can be seen as part of a larger trend towards the politics of identity. These include second-wave feminism, the gay liberation movement, the disabilities rights movement, ethnic and cultural nationalism, religious fundamentalism and multiculturalism. The rise of identity politics is widely viewed as a consequence of the breakdown of conventional class and ideological solidarities, and particularly of the decline of universalist philosophies, especially liberalism and socialism (in its various forms) to ones that practice the 'politics of difference', highlight the importance of factors such as gender, ethnicity, race, nationality, culture and religion.

Communitarianism is the belief that the self or person is constituted through the community, in the sense that individuals are shaped by the communities to which they belong and thus owe them a debt of respect and consideration. Communitarianism arose as a philosophical revolt against liberal universalism, the belief that, as individuals, people in all societies and all cultures have essentially the same 'inner' identity. Communitarian philosophers such as Alisdair MacIntyre (1981) and Michael Sandel (1982) portrayed this idea of the abstract individual – the 'unencumbered self' – as a recipe for rootless atomism. Instead, individuals must be embedded in a particular social, institutional, moral or ideological context, as only 'external' factors are able to give people a genuine sense of moral identity and purpose. During the 1980s and 1990s a major debate raged in philosophy between liberals and communitarians, one of the consequences of which was a greater willingness amongst many liberal thinkers to acknowledge the importance of culture. This, in turn, made liberalism more open to the attractions of multiculturalism.

Varieties of multiculturalism

One of the myths of multiculturalism is that it is merely a political stance: the belief that cultural diversity should be recognised or even celebrated. Rather, it is an ideological space which encompasses a variety of approaches to the challenge of diversity. All forms of multiculturalism are characterised by a belief in 'diversity within unity', the idea that the public recognition of cultural difference can and should be contained within a single political society. However, rival multiculturalist traditions are divided over the respective importance of diversity and unity. The most important of these traditions are:

- Liberal multiculturalism
- Pluralist multiculturalism
- Cosmopolitan multiculturalism

Liberal multiculturalism is a complex ideological phenomenon. It amounts to an attempt by liberals to distance themselves from universalism and, as far as possible, embrace pluralism. This has largely been done by embracing the idea of moral neutrality, the notion that liberalism does not prescribe any particular set of values but allows individuals and groups to make their own moral decisions. Nevertheless, this diversity tends to be 'diversity within a liberal framework', as liberals find it difficult and perhaps impossible to endorse cultural practices that are in themselves illiberal and oppressive. Moreover, as liberals generally stress the importance of civic unity, they tend to argue that diversity should be confined to the 'private' sphere, leaving the 'public' sphere as a realm of integration. Finally, liberals believe that liberal democracy has the unique advantage that it protects personal autonomy and thus offers the only political system in which diversity can be protected.

Pluralist multiculturalists place a greater emphasis on diversity than on unity. Diversity is a viewed as value in itself, based on an acceptance of value pluralism, the idea that different moral beliefs – and therefore different cultures – are equally legitimate. Nevertheless, as pluralist multiculturalism is the form of multiculturalism that most clearly embraces identity politics, it is usually associated with attempts to defend 'oppressed' cultures and minority groups and has, at best, an equivocal relationship with liberalism. At the very least, it refuses to 'absolutise' liberalism, rejecting the idea that liberal values or liberal-democratic structures have any priority over their rivals. Pluralist multiculturalists also argue that only a strong and public recognition of cultural belonging enables people to participate fully in their society, thus embracing the idea of differentiated citizenship.

Finally, multiculturalist ideas have been generated by theorists sympathetic to cosmopolitanism. Cosmopolitan multiculturalists have been particularly keen to defend the rights and cultures of indigenous peoples, often within the parameters of the wider global justice movement. One of the characteristic themes of cosmopolitan multiculturalism is an emphasis on hybridity or multiple identities, the recognition that personal identity is complex and multifaceted. This, in turn, can lead to an emphasis on the merits of cultural mixing (evident, for example, in the idea of 'world music'), seen as a way of broadening people's political horizons and ultimately providing the basis for global citizenship. Cosmopolitan multiculturalism has been portrayed as a kind of 'pick and mix' multiculturalism, or as 'multiculturalism lite', implying that cultural identity is more a lifestyle choice (or a series of lifestyle choices) than something that is deeply rooted in society and history.

Types of multiculturalism			
Type	*View of diversity*	*Basis for integration*	*Key criticisms*
Liberal multiculturalism	Diversity within a liberal framework (must be compatible with toleration and autonomy)	Cultural diversity contained by overarching civic unity – universal citizenship within context of liberal democracy	Preserves dominance of western liberalism; denies legitimacy of non- or anti-liberal cultures
Pluralist multiculturalism	Diversity a value in its own right; all	Sense of cultural belonging provides basis	Results in plural monoculturalism and

	cultures equal, manifestations of different aspects of human nature	for civic participation – differentiated citizenship, recognizing polyethnic and other rights	absence of civic cohesion
Cosmopolitan multiculturalism	Diversity strengthens hybridity (multiple identities); a post-liberal stance, but must be compatible with global justice	Cultural mixing promotes an awareness of other peoples and of the wider world – global citizenship	A 'pick and mix' multiculturalism that undermines cultural distinctiveness and weakens cultural authenticity

Objections to the politics of cultural self-assertion

The 'cultural turn' in politics has not been without its critics, however. Cultural politics has been criticised from a variety of perspectives which, in turn, have generated specific attacks on multiculturalism. The most significant of these criticisms include the following:

- Culture as reductionism
- Culture as captivity
- Culture as conflict

Sociologists and others have questioned whether cultural groups can ever be seen are meaningful political entities, since cultures themselves are never homogeneous but are always complex, differentiated and fluid. Cultural politics is therefore based on a reductionist view of culture, in that it defines cultural membership in terms of a supposedly dominant characteristic and implies that the people who share that characteristic belong to the same 'community'. Critics have therefore argued that there is not such thing as, say, the 'Muslim community' or the 'Somali community', any more than there is a 'gay community'. 'Communities', in this sense, are political inventions, imagined communities not organic or living communities.

Culture may also be viewed as a form of oppression or captivity. This is a view advanced by universalist liberals, who portray cultural politics as a personal and political dead-end. This applies because culture is very largely passed down from one generation to the next through a process of socialisation. Unless it is based on free and informed choice (which is rarely the case), cultural identity amounts to an affront to individuality and personal autonomy; it reflects what J. S. Mill called the 'despotism of custom'. In the feminist version of a similar argument, multiculturalism is seen as little more than a concealed attempt to bolster male power, as the cultural beliefs it seeks to preserve or strengthen are all too often deeply patriarchal. The politics of cultural recognition may therefore be used to legitimise continued female subordination.

Finally, cultural politics has been associated with division and conflict. Such thinking has been expressed in two contrasting critiques of multiculturalism. First, nationalists, and particularly conservative nationalists, have taken issue with the core multiculturalist idea that increased cultural diversity does not threaten political unity. For nationalists, the unrivalled capacity of the nation to provide the basis for legitimate political rule stems precisely from the fact it ensures that cultural identity and political identity overlap. In this view, multiculturalism is a recipe for civic strife and political instability. The second version of this argument is advanced by socialists, who argue that the politics of cultural recognition undermines the idea of a common humanity, limiting people's sense of moral responsibility to members of their own cultural group. Such a tendency tends to undermine support for the politics of welfare and redistribution, which relies on a wider and 'difference-blind' sense of altruism across society.

Multiculturalism	
What are the historical origins of multiculturalism?	
What is the politics of recognition?	
How does it differ to other approaches to social advancement?	
What does Edward Said's idea about 'Orientalism' contribute to multiculturalism?	
How can you define culture?	
How does communitarianism contrast to individualism?	
What are the three different types of minority right identified by Kymlicka?	
How have multiculturalists defended these minority rights?	
Why have minority rights been considered controversial?	
How and why do multiculturalists defend diversity?	
Outline the key ideas of liberal multiculturalism.	
In what ways has liberal multiculturalism been criticised?	
Outline the key ideas of pluralist multiculturalism.	
In what ways has pluralist multiculturalism been criticised?	
Outline the key ideas of cosmopolitan multiculturalism.	
In what ways has cosmopolitan multiculturalism been criticised?	
In what ways have liberals been critical of multiculturalism?	
In what ways have conservatives been critical of multiculturalism?	
In what ways have feminists been critical of multiculturalism?	
In what ways have social reformists been critical of multiculturalism?	

Key references and quotes:

Edward Said Orientalism 1978

Examples of stereotypes include ideas such as the 'mysterious East' 'inscrutable Chinese' and lustful Turks'

Alasdair MacIntyre 1981

Portrayed the idea of the abstract individual – 'the unencumbered self' is a recipe for rootless atomism.

Will Kymlicka 1995

Certain 'collective rights' of minority cultures are consistent with liberal democratic principles.

Taylor 1994

'harm' can be seen as a 'failure of recognition'

California v Bakke 1978 – Supreme court upheld the principle of 'reverse discrimination'

John Rawls

Liberalism is 'difference blind'

Isaiah Berlin 1969

'Value pluralism'

John Gray 1995

'post liberal stance'

Bhikhu Parekh 2005

Multiculturalism doesn't simply mean numerical plurality of different cultures, but rather a community which is creating, guaranteeing, encouraging spaces within which different communities are able to grow at their pace. At the same time it means creating a public space in which these communities are able to interact, enrich the existing culture and create a new consensual culture in which they recognize reflections of their own identity."

Amartya Sen 2006

'plural monoculturalism'

Attacked 'solitaristic' theory

'minituarisation of humanity'

Multiculturalism breeds 'ghettoization'

Samuel Huntington 1996

Predicted a 'clash of civilizations'

Jeremy Waldren 1995

'pick and mix' multiculturalism

Individual identity exists as a 'melange'