

**Human, Social, and Political Sciences Tripos
2020-21**

POL1: The modern state and its alternatives

Paper organiser

Helen Thompson <het20@cam.ac.uk>

Lecturers

David Runciman <dwr12@cam.ac.uk>

Helen Thompson <cb632@cam.ac.uk>

Classes

Helen Thompson <het20@cam.ac.uk>

Chris Brooke <cb632@cam.ac.uk>

Supervisors

Whilst the expectation is that supervisions will be in person, each supervisor will reserve the right according to personal circumstances to decide whether supervisions need to move online)

Christopher Brooke <cb632@cam.ac.uk> (College only)

Nicholas Devlin <nd430@cam.ac.uk>

John Dunn <jmd24@cam.ac.uk>

Sean Fleming <srf44@cam.ac.uk>

Sophie Harbour <seh220@cam.ac.uk>

Tom Hopkins <th268@cam.ac.uk> (College only)

Pieter van Houten <pjv24@cam.ac.uk> (College only)

Iza Hussin <ih298@cam.ac.uk>

Duncan Kelly <djk36@cam.ac.uk>

James Mayall <jblm2@cam.ac.uk>

Edward Murambwa <em788@cam.ac.uk>

Evaleila Pesaran <ep336@cam.ac.uk>

Thomas Peak <tp354@cam.ac.uk>

Tatiana Pignon <tp453@cam.ac.uk>

Marissa Quie <mq10000@cam.ac.uk>

Glen Rangwala <gr10009@cam.ac.uk> (Michaelmas and Easter; college only)

Joe Robinson <jpr54@cam.ac.uk>

Lucia Rubinelli <lr391@cam.ac.uk>

Ruth Scurr <rs10032@cam.ac.uk>

Helen Thompson <het20@cam.ac.uk>

Sylvana Tomaselli <st240@cam.ac.uk>

Banu Turnaoğlu <bt265@cam.ac.uk>

James Vitali <jv399@cam.ac.uk>

James Wood <jdw82@cam.ac.uk>

CONTENT

This paper seeks to understand the practical and imaginative foundations of modern politics and the reaction and resistance to them. It is structured around set texts. These texts are not there to be analysed as texts *per se* but to be considered for the arguments they contain. We have chosen these texts for this paper not because they represent a canon but because they engage with some of the fundamental questions of modern politics.

The paper begins with the modern state. The modern state is a historically contingent political phenomenon but it has become the predominant basis on which political authority and power are constructed across the world today. Where there is no modern state, there tends to be civil war or occupation by other states. Where modern states are ineffective, politics is unstable and sometimes violent, and governments struggle to manage the economy. But the modern state also is a site of violence and an instrument of power that has been used at times to inflict vast suffering on those subject to its coercive capacity at home and imperial reach abroad. The question of how the exercise of power by the modern state over its subjects can be legitimated is a perpetual one in modern politics, and the answers to it have been deeply politically contested.

The first modern states were monarchies. From the late 18th century onwards, there was in Europe and the United States a move towards what we now call representative democracy. Representative democracies have been more historically precarious than modern states and there remain alternatives to this form of government. The idea that the modern state under conditions of modern commerce leads necessarily to representative democracy has been disproved by historical experience of, especially that outside Europe and North America. As an idea representative democracy appears to offer equality, liberty and self-rule. But representative democracy also frequently disappoints in practice as it rarely does realise these values and the goods it promises frequently clash with each other. The second part of the paper looks at the contingent historical origins in the United States and the political implications of representative democracy as it spread as a form of government. It seeks to unpack the paradoxes of representative democracy as a form of government that rhetorically invokes the 'rule of the people' and the pursuit of the common good and yet gives power to those who are elected to office by seeking votes, and to consider its relationship to the conditions of material prosperity and the distribution of wealth.

The final part of the paper examines the coherence and persuasiveness of a number of political critiques of the modern state and representative democracy and the nature of disagreement in politics. It considers the critique made by Marx of the democratic modern state as the product of capitalism, Gandhi's rejection of the violence and alienated sovereignty of modern politics in search of a return to a soul-based civilisation, and Arendt's desire to return politics to its place as a meaningful sphere of free human action. And since everything in politics is mortal, it concludes by contemplating the question of how democracy itself may end.

TEACHING

LECTURES

Lectures will be available on Moodle until in-person large group teaching can resume.

Michaelmas 2020

1. Hobbes and the problem of order I
David Runciman

2. Hobbes and the problem of order II
David Runciman

3. Constant and modern liberty I
David Runciman

4. Constant and modern liberty II
David Runciman

5 Weber and political leadership I
David Runciman

6 Weber and political leadership II
David Runciman

7. Hayek and economic liberty I
David Runciman

8. Hayek and economic liberty II
David Runciman

9. Fanon and the imperial modern state I
David Runciman

10. Fanon and the imperial modern state II
David Runciman

11. MacKinnon and the state and women I
David Runciman

12. MacKinnon and the state and women II
David Runciman

13. The creation of the American federal republic I
Helen Thompson

14. The creation of the American federal republic II
Helen Thompson

15. Democratic society and democratic adaptability I
Helen Thompson

16. Democratic society and democratic adaptability II
Helen Thompson

Lent 2021

17. Representative democracy and the competitive struggle for power I
Helen Thompson

18. Representative democracy and the competitive struggle for power II
Helen Thompson

19. Parties and voters: democracy's bads or the democratic political solution? I
Helen Thompson

20 Parties and voters II: democracy's bads or the democratic political solution? ()
Helen Thompson

21 Representative democracy and material prosperity I
Helen Thompson

22 Representative democracy and material prosperity II
Helen Thompson

23 Representative democracy and the class distribution of wealth I
Helen Thompson

24 Representative democracy and the class distribution of wealth II
Helen Thompson

25: Communism I
David Runciman

26 Communism II
David Runciman

27 Self-rule
David Runciman

28 Self-rule II
David Runciman

29 Human agency and political freedom I
David Runciman

30 Human agency and political freedom II
David Runciman

31 The end of democracy I
David Runciman

32 The end of democracy II
David Runciman

SUPERVISIONS

Director of Studies will organise supervisions. The paper organiser will provide a list of supervisors for them to use. Students should have three supervisions in each of the Michaelmas and Lent terms. They should complete a piece of work for each supervision, with at least four of these pieces of work being essays. For two of the supervisions supervisors can set alternative written work, which could be, for example, an exercise based on the reading. An example of what such an exercise could be is given under the Hobbes reading.

Students should have 1 or 2 revision supervisions in the Easter term. Students should write at least one essay from each section of the papers and supervisors are asked to offer supervisions on at least two of the books published since 1960.

CLASSES

There will be revision classes in the Easter Term to help students prepare for the examination. The classes run for two weeks. Students will be divided into four or five groups (depending on the total number enrolled in the course). Whether they will be in-person or on-line will be decided at the end of Lent term.

ASSESSMENT

There will be one three-hour examination. The examination paper will be divided into **three** sections. Candidates must answer three questions taking them from at least two sections.

SAMPLE EXAMINATION PAPER

Candidates must answer **three** questions, taking one from **at least two** sections.

Section A

1. Why for Hobbes was the freedom the same whether a commonwealth be monarchical or popular?
2. Was Constant right that the circumstances of modern politics prescribe the limits of modern politics?
3. Why for Weber is political leadership mired in tragedy?
4. Why for Hayek is the individual prior to the state?
5. Why for Fanon should colonized people abandon the European model of the state?
6. Why was MacKinnon so pessimistic about women's agency under the liberal state?

Section B

7. How far is the separation of powers in the American constitution an effective remedy for the problems of republican government?
8. If Tocqueville was right and democratic success rests on adaptability, is democracy now failing?
9. What, if anything, is democratic about the electoral competition for power in modern states?
10. Are political parties good for politics?
11. Does representative democracy sustain economic development?
12. Who materially benefits from representative democracy?

Section C

13. How far was Marx's vision of politics anti-political?
14. Can politics exist without violence?
15. What, for Arendt, are the limitations of philosophical approaches to politics?
16. Can representative democracy survive the challenges of twenty-first century politics?

READING AND SUPERVISION ESSAY QUESTIONS

The paper is organised around set texts. For any topic you study, you are expected to read and know the set text/s and the reading marked with a bullet point. The supervision essay questions are suggested with those readings in mind. The reading below the marked reading is for those interested in deepening their knowledge in particular areas. There is no expectation that this reading is to be pursued anything other than selectively in relation to individual interest.

1-2: Hobbes and the problem of order

SET TEXT: Thomas Hobbes, *Leviathan*, EITHER ed. Richard Tuck (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1996) OR ed. Helen Thompson (London: Penguin Classics, 2017), Parts I and II.

- Richard Tuck, *Hobbes* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1989). (Later reissued as *Hobbes: a very short introduction*.)
- John Dunn, 'Political obligation,' in *The history of political theory and other essays* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1996).
- David Runciman, 'The sovereign' in *The Oxford handbook of Hobbes* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2013).
- David Runciman, 'Hobbes' theory of representation: proto-democratic or anti-democratic?' in Ian Shapiro (ed.) *Political representation* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2010).

Richard Tuck, 'Introduction' in *Leviathan* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1996).

Chris Brooke, 'Introduction', in *Leviathan* (London: Penguin Classics, 2017).

Robin Bunce, *Thomas Hobbes* (London: Continuum, 2009).

Sophie Smith, 'The nature of politics', the 2017 Quentin Skinner lecture.

<https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=si9iG-093aY>.

Philip Pettit, *Made with words: Hobbes on language, mind and politics* (Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 2009), chs. 4-8.

Alan Ryan, "Hobbes' political philosophy," in *The Cambridge companion to Hobbes*, ed. T. Sorrell (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1996).

Gabriella Slomp, *Thomas Hobbes and the political philosophy of glory* (Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan, 2000).

Quentin Skinner, 'What is the state? The question that will not go away', <http://vimeo.com/14979551>

Quentin Skinner, 'The state,' in *Political innovation and conceptual change*, ed. Terence Ball, James Farr, and Russell Hanson (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1989).

Richard Tuck, *The sleeping sovereign: the invention of modern democracy* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2016), ch. 2.

Annabel Brett and James Tully, eds. *Rethinking the foundations of modern political thought* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2006), chs. by Richard Tuck and Kinch Hoekstra.

Nancy J. Hirschmann and Joanne H. Wright, eds, *Feminist Interpretations of Thomas Hobbes* (University Park, PA: Penn State University Press, 2012).

Quentin Skinner, *Hobbes and republican liberty* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2009).

Noel Malcolm, *Aspects of Hobbes* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2002), chs. 1, 7 and 13.

Suggested essay question

Why, according to Hobbes, should subjects obey the sovereign?

Suggested non-essay-based exercise

Answer each question briefly using a sentence for the definitions in question 1 and several sentences for each of questions 2-6.

1. What did Hobbes mean by each of these terms: the right of nature; the state of nature; the laws of nature; the sovereign; liberty; covenant; commonwealth; a representative; law; mixed government?
2. How did Hobbes distinguish between natural and artificial persons?

3. What for Hobbes is the only distinction between a commonwealth by acquisition and a commonwealth by institution?
4. In what circumstances, according to Hobbes, can subjects disobey the sovereign?
5. What six reasons does Hobbes give for saying that humankind cannot live socially with one another like bees and ants?
6. Why for Hobbes 'was there never anything so dearly bought, as these Western parts have bought the learning of the Greek and Latin tongues'?

3-4: Constant and modern liberty

SET TEXTS: Benjamin Constant, 'On the liberty of the ancients and the liberty of the moderns,' AND 'Principles of politics applicable to all representative governments' in *Constant: political writings*, ed. Biancamaria Fontana (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1988).

- John Dunn, 'Conclusions', in *Democracy: the unfinished journey 508 BC to AD 1993*, Dunn, ed. (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1993), pp. 239-266.
- Biancamaria Fontana, 'Introduction', in *Constant: political writings* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1988).
- Stephen Holmes, 'The liberty to denounce: ancient and modern' in *The Cambridge companion to Constant*, Helena Rosenblatt, ed. (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2009).
- Jeremy Jennings, 'Constant's idea of modern liberty', in *The Cambridge companion to Constant*, Helena Rosenblatt, ed. (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2009).
- John Dunn, 'Liberty as a substantive political value', in *Interpreting political responsibility* (Cambridge: Polity Press, 1996), 61-84.

Helena Rosenblatt, 'Re-evaluating Benjamin Constant's liberalism: industrialism, Saint-Simonianism and the Restoration years', *History of European Ideas*, vol. 30, no. 1 (2004), pp. 23-37.

Helena Rosenblatt, *Liberal values: Benjamin Constant and the politics of religion* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2008).

Catrine Carpenter, 'Benjamin Constant's religious politics', *History of European Ideas*, vol. 35, no. 4 (2009), pp. 503-509 (a review of Rosenblatt, *Liberal values*).

Stefano da Luca, 'Benjamin Constant and the terror' in *The Cambridge companion to Constant*, Helena Rosenblatt, ed. (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2009).

Biancamaria Fontana, 'Democracy and the French Revolution', in *Democracy: the unfinished journey*, John Dunn, ed. (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1993).

Jeremy Jennings, *Revolution and the republic: a history of political thought in France since the 18th century*, (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2011).

Background to the French Revolution

William Doyle, *The French Revolution: a very short introduction* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2001).

Constant's novel exploring the perils of modern liberty

Benjamin Constant, *Adolphe* (Harmondsworth: Penguin Classics, 1964).

Helena Rosenblatt, 'Reinterpreting *Adolphe*: the sexual politics of Benjamin Constant', *Historical Reflections-Réflexions Historiques*, vol. 28, no. 3 (2002), pp. 341-360.

Athenian democracy in practice

Thucydides, *History of the Peloponnesian War* (London: Penguin, 1972).

Suggested essay question

What challenge did Constant think that modern liberty posed to representative government?

5-6: Weber and political leadership

SET TEXT: Max Weber, 'The profession and vocation of politics', in Weber, *Political writings*, Peter Lassman and Ronald Speirs, eds. (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1994), pp. 309-369.

- Raymond Geuss, *History and illusion in politics* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2001), ch. 1 (sections 3, 6).
- David Runciman, 'Tony Blair and the politics of good intentions' in *The politics of good intentions: history, fear and hypocrisy in the new world order*, (Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 2006), pp. 31-53.
- Peter Lassman, 'The rule of man over man: politics, power and legitimation,' in *The Cambridge companion to Weber*, Stephen Turner, ed. (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2000).
- Jan-Werner Müller, *Contesting democracy: political ideas in twentieth century Europe* (New Haven, CT: Yale University Press, 2013), ch. 1.

Mark E. Warren, 'Max Weber's liberalism for a Nietzschean World', *American Political Science Review*, vol. 82, no. 1 (1988), pp. 31–50.

Max Weber, 'Science as a vocation' in Max Weber, *The vocation lectures*, (London: Hackett Publishing, 2004).

Geoffrey Hawthorn, 'Max Weber', *Proceedings of the British Academy* vol. 101 (1999), pp. 191-207.

David Beetham, *Max Weber and the theory of politics* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1985).

Tracy Strong, *Politics without vision: thinking without a banister in the twentieth century* (Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press), chapter 3 and interlude.

Robert Eden, *Nihilism and leadership: study of Weber and Nietzsche* (Gainesville, FL: University of Florida Presses, 1989).

Raymond Aron, 'Max Weber and power politics', in *Max Weber and sociology today*, O. Stammer, ed. (Oxford: Blackwell, 1971), pp. 83-100.

Wolfgang Mommsen, *Max Weber and German politics 1890-1920* (London: University of Chicago Press, 1984), chs. 3 and 10.

Rune Slagstad, 'Liberal constitutionalism and its critics: Carl Schmitt and Max Weber', in *Constitutionalism and democracy*, Jon Elster and Rune Slagstad, eds. (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1988).

Peter Breiner, *Max Weber and democratic politics* (Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press, 1996).

Bradley E. Starr, 'The structure of Max Weber's ethic of responsibility', *Journal of Religious Ethics*, vol.27 no.3 (1999), pp. 407-434.

Tom McClean, Jason Xidias and William Brett, *Max Weber's Politics as a Vocation* (London: Taylor and Francis, 2017).

Sam Whimster and Scott Lash, *Max Weber, rationality and modernity* (London: Routledge, 2006).

Suggested essay question

Why, according to Weber, does politics pose specific ethical difficulties?

7-8 Hayek and economic liberty

SET TEXT: Friedrich Hayek, *The road to serfdom* (London: Routledge, 1986).

- Andrew Gamble, *Hayek: The iron cage of liberty* (Cambridge: Polity Press, 1996).
- John Gray, *Hayek on liberty*, 3rd ed. (London: Routledge, 1998).

Jeremy Shearmur, 'Hayek's politics', in *The Cambridge companion to Hayek*, Edward Feser, ed. (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2006).

Robert Skidelsky, 'Hayek and Keynes: the road to reconciliation', in *The Cambridge companion to Hayek*, Edward Feser, ed. (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2006).

Roland Kley, *Hayek's social and political thought* (Oxford, Oxford University Press 1995).
 R. Walther, 'Economic liberalism', *Economy and Society*, vol. 13, no. 2 (1984), pp. 178-207.
 John Maynard Keynes, 'The end of *laissez-faire*', in *Essays in persuasion: the collected works of John Maynard Keynes*, vol. 9, Donald Moggridge, ed. (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1978).
 Matt Ridley, *The rational optimist: how prosperity evolves* (London: Fourth Estate 2011).
 David Linden and Nick Broten, *Friedrich Hayek's The Road to Serfdom* (London: Taylor & Francis, 2017)
 Sandra Peart and David Levy, *F. A. Hayek and the modern economy: economic organization and activity* (New York, NY: Palgrave Macmillan, 2013).
 Norman Barry, *Hayek's serfdom revisited: essays by economists, philosophers and political scientists on The Road to Serfdom after 40 years* (London: Institute of Economic Affairs, 1984).
 Steve Fleetwood, *Hayek's political economy: the socio-economics of order* (London: Taylor and Francis, 1995).
 Peter Boettke, 'Hayek's *The Road to Serfdom* revisited: Government Failure in the Argument against Socialism', *Eastern Economic Journal* vol. 21, no. 1 (1995), pp. 7–26.

Suggested essay question

Why for Hayek was state planning the road to serfdom?

9-10: Fanon and the imperial modern state

SET TEXT: Frantz Fanon, *The wretched of the earth*, new ed. (Harmondsworth: Penguin Classics, 2001).

- Jean-Paul Sartre, 'Preface', in Frantz Fanon, *The wretched of the earth* (Harmondsworth: Penguin Classics, 2001).
- Alice Cherki, *Frantz Fanon: a portrait*, Nadia Benabid, trans. (Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press, 2006).
- Michael Azar, 'In the name of Algeria: Frantz Fanon and the Algerian Revolution', in *Frantz Fanon: critical perspectives*, Anthony C. Alessandrini, ed. (London: Routledge, 1999), pp. 21-33.
- Robert J. C. Young, *Postcolonialism: a very short introduction* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2003).

Other works by Frantz Fanon

Frantz Fanon, *Black skin, white masks* (New York, NY: Grove Press, 2008).

Frantz Fanon, *Toward the African revolution: political essays* (New York, NY: Monthly Review Press, 1967), part IV.

Frantz Fanon, *Alienation and freedom* (London: Bloomsbury, 2018), part IV.

Further reading

Ato Sekyi-Out, *Fanon's dialectic of experience* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1996).

Denean T. Sharpley-Whiting, *Frantz Fanon: conflicts and feminisms* (Lanham, MD: Rowman & Littlefield, 1997)

Aimé Césaire, *Discourse on colonialism* (New York, NY: Monthly Review Press, 1972).

Albert Memmi, *The colonizer and the colonized* (London: Earthscan, 2003).

Edward Said, *Orientalism* (London: Vintage, 1979), ch. 3.

Basil Davidson, *The black man's burden: Africa & the curse of the nation state* (Oxford: James Currey, 1992).

Mahmood Mamdani, *Citizen and subject: contemporary Africa and the legacy of late colonialism* (Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 1996).

Lawrence Freedman, *Strategy* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2013), ch. 25, 'Black power and white anger'.

Adom Getachew, *Worldmaking after empire: the rise and fall of self-determination* (Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 2019).

Robert Vitalis, *White world order, Black power politics: the birth of American international relations* (Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press, 2015)

Further watching

Gillo Pontecorvo, *The Battle of Algiers* [film] (1966), via: <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=6vgoH5IPK-c>.

Suggested essay question

How for Fanon do our existing political institutions embody illicit forms of domination?

11-12: MacKinnon and the state and women

SET TEXT: Catharine A. MacKinnon, *Toward a feminist theory of the state* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1989).

- Drucilla Cornell, 'Sexual difference, the feminine, and equivalency: a critique of MacKinnon's *Toward a feminist theory of the state*', *Yale Law Journal*, vol. 100, no. 7, article 12. <https://digitalcommons.law.yale.edu/yj/vol100/iss7/12>.
- Denise Schaeffer, 'Feminism and liberalism reconsidered: the case of Catharine MacKinnon', *American Political Science Review*, vol. 95, no. 3 (2001), pp. 699-708. (Also MacKinnon's reply: "'The case' responds', pp. 709-711.)
- Michael L. Ferguson, 'Choice feminism and the fear of politics', *Perspectives on Politics*, vol. 8, no. 1 (2010), pp. 247-253.

Other works by Catharine A. MacKinnon

Catharine A. MacKinnon, *Sexual harassment of working women: a case of sex discrimination* (New Haven, CT: Yale University Press, 1979).

Catharine A. MacKinnon, *Feminism unmodified: discourses on life and law* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1988).

Catharine A. MacKinnon, *Only words* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1993).

Catharine A. MacKinnon, 'Crimes of war, crimes of peace', in *On human rights: the Oxford Amnesty Lectures 1993*, Stephen Shute and Susan Hurley, eds. (New York, NY: Basic Books, 1993), pp. 83-109.

Catharine A. MacKinnon, *Are women human? and other international dialogues* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 2006).

Further reading

Feminist Philosophy Quarterly, special issue on *Toward a feminist theory of the state after 25 years*: essays by Natalie Nenadic, Susan J. Brison, Elena Ruíz & Kristie Dotson, and Clare Chambers, together with a reply by Catharine A. MacKinnon: <https://ir.lib.uwo.ca/fpq/vol3/iss2/>.

Wendy Brown, *States of injury: power and freedom in late modernity* (Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 1995), esp. chs. 3 and 4.

Clare Chambers, *Sex, culture, and justice: the limits of choice* (University Park, PA: Penn State University Press, 2008).

Kimberlé Crenshaw, 'Demarginalizing the intersection of race and sex: a black feminist critique of antidiscrimination doctrine, feminist theory and antiracist politics', *University of Chicago Legal Forum*, volume 1989, no. 1, article 8. <http://chicagounbound.uchicago.edu/uclf/vol1989/iss1/8>.

Carole Pateman, *The sexual contract* (Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press, 1988).

Elizabeth Anderson, 'Recent thinking about sexual harassment: a review essay', *Philosophy & Public Affairs*, vol. 34, no. 3 (2006), pp. 284-312.

Suggested essay question

What for MacKinnon were the main challenges facing the development of a feminist theory of the state?

13-14: Representative democracy and the creation of the American republic

SET TEXT: James Madison, Alexander Hamilton, and John Jay, *Federalist papers* nos. 1, 10, 14, 37-39, 47-48, 51, 57-58, 63, 78 and Brutus, 'Letters', I-VII, and XI, in James Madison, Alexander Hamilton,

and John Jay, *The Federalist with letters of 'Brutus'* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2003).

- Terence Ball, 'Introduction,' in James Madison, Alexander Hamilton, and John Jay *The Federalist with letters of 'Brutus'*, (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2003).
- Ross Harrison, *Democracy* (London: Routledge, 1993), ch. 5.
- George William van Cleve, *A slaveholders' union: slavery, politics and the constitution in the early American republic* (Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press, 2010), part two.

Gordon Wood, 'The American revolution', in *Democracy: the unfinished journey 508AD to 1993*, ed. John Dunn (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1993), 91-105.

Gordon Wood, *The American revolution: a history* (New York: Modern Library, 2002).

Bernard Bailyn, *The ideological origins of the American revolution* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1971).

Gordon Wood, *The creation of the American republic 1776-1787* (Chapel Hill, NC: University of North Carolina Press, 1969).

Jacob T. Levy, 'Beyond Publius: Montesquieu, liberal republicanism and the small-republic thesis', *History of Political Thought*, vol. 27, no. 1 (2006), pp. 50-90.

David Runciman, 'Two revolutions, one revolutionary' in *The politics of good intentions: history, fear and hypocrisy in the new world order*, (Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 2006), pp. 155-74.

H. Storing, *What the anti-Federalists were for: the political thought of the opponents of the constitution* (Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press, 1981).

David Waldstreicher, *Slavery's constitution from revolution to ratification* (New York, NY: Hill and Wang, 2010).

George William van Cleve, *A slaveholders' union: slavery, politics and the constitution in the early American republic* (Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press, 2010), part two.

Paul Finkelman, *Slavery and the founders: race and liberty in the age of Jefferson* (London: Routledge 2014).

Carl van Doren, *The great rehearsal: the story of the making and ratifying of the American constitution*, (Westport, CT: Greenwood Press, 1982).

Russell Hanson, *The democratic imagination in America: conversations with our past* (Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 1985).

Bernard Manin, 'Checks, balances and boundaries: the separation of powers in the constitutional debate of 1787', in *The invention of the modern republic*, Biancamaria Fontana, ed. (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1994), pp. 27-62.

Robert A. Dahl, *How democratic is the constitution?* 2nd ed. (New Haven, CT: Yale University Press, 2003).

Bernard Manin, *The principles of representative government* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1997), pp. 102-131.

Pauline Maier, *Ratification: the people debate the constitution, 1787-88* (New York, NY: Simon & Schuster, 2011).

Sean Wilentz, *The rise of American democracy, Jefferson to Lincoln* (New York: W. W Norton, 2007).

The continuing constitutional debate

Francis Fukuyama, 'America in decay: the sources of political dysfunction,' *Foreign Affairs*, vol. 93, no. 5 (2014), pp. 5-26.

Alan Brinkley, Nelson W. Polsby, and Kathleen S. Sullivan, eds., *New federalist papers: essays in defence of the constitution* (London: W.W. Norton, 1997), chs. 3 4,13, 15, and 19.

E. Corrin, *The constitution and what it means today*, 4th ed. (Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 1978).

James MacGregor Burns, *Government by the people* (London: Prentice Hall, 1995).

J. Zvesper, 'The separation of powers in American politics: why we fail to accentuate the positive', *Government and Opposition* vol. 34, no. 1 (1999), pp. 3-23.

Akhil Reed Amar, *America's constitution: a biography* (New York, NY: Random House, 2006).

Colin Campbell, 'Clinton's encounter with the separation of powers' *Government and Opposition*, vol 36 no 2 (2001), pp. 157-183.

Representation

- Hanna F. Pitkin, *The concept of representation* (Berkeley, CA: University of California Press, 1967).
- David Runciman, 'The paradox of political representation', *The Journal of Political Philosophy*, vol 15, no. 1 (2007) pp. 93-114.
- Monica Brito Vieira and David Runciman, *Representation* (Cambridge: Polity Press, 2013).
- Susan Mendus, 'Losing the faith: feminism and democracy', in *Democracy: the unfinished journey*, John Dunn, ed. (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1993).
- Anne Phillips, 'Democracy and representation: or, why should it matter who our representatives are?' in *Feminism and Politics* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1998), pp. 224–240.

Suggested essay question

Are representation and the separation of powers the 'republican remedy for the diseases most incident to republican government' that Madison supposed?

15-16 Democratic society and democratic adaptability

SET TEXT: Alexis de Tocqueville, *Democracy in America* (London: Fontana Press, 1994). vol 1, part I, chs 3-6; part II, chs. 1, 4, 6-10: vol. 2, part II, chs. 1, 5-9, 13; part III, 21-26; part IV, chs. 1-8.

- David Runciman, *The confidence trap: a history of democracy in crisis from the First World War to the present*, (Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press), introduction and epilogue.
- Nathan Glazer, 'Race and ethnicity in America', *Journal of Democracy*, vol. 11, no. 1 (2000).
- Stephen Holmes, 'Tocqueville and democracy' in *The idea of democracy*, David Copp, Jean Hampton and John E. Roemer, eds. (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1995).
- John Dunn, *Setting the people free: the story of democracy* (London: Atlantic, 2005), ch. 4.
- John Micklethwait and Adrian Wooldridge, *The fourth revolution: the global race to invent the state* (Harmondsworth: Penguin, 2014), Parts 2 and 3.

Jon Elster, *Tocqueville: the first social scientist* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2009), ch. 8.

David Runciman, 'Can democracy cope?' *Political Quarterly*, vol 82, no 4 (2011), pp. 536-545.

John Dunn, 'Conclusion' in *Democracy: the unfinished journey* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1993).

Larry Siedentop, *Democracy in Europe* (Harmondsworth: Penguin, 2000), chapter 3.

Adam Przeworski et al, 'What makes democracies endure', *Journal of Democracy*, vol. 7, no. 1 (1996), pp. 39-55

Charles Kupchan, 'The democratic malaise: globalisation and the threat to the west,' *Foreign Affairs*, vol. 91, no. 1 (2012).

Matthew Flinders, *Defending politics: why democracy matters in the twenty-first century* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2012).

Slavery, race, and Native Americans

Gustave de Beaumont, *Marie, or slavery in the United States: a novel of Jacksonian America* (Baltimore, MD: John Hopkins University Press, 1998).

Margaret Kohn, 'The other America: Tocqueville and Beaumont on race and slavery', *Polity*, vol. 35, no. 2 (2002), pp. 169-193.

Laura Janara, 'Brothers and others: Tocqueville and Beaumont: US genealogy, democracy and racism,' *Political Theory*, vol 32, no. 6 (2004), pp. 773-800.

Alison McQueen and Burke Hendrix, 'Tocqueville in Jacksonian context: American expansionism and discourses of American Indian nomadism in *Democracy in America, Perspectives on Politics*, vol. 15, no. 3 (2017), pp. 663-677.

Secondary reading on Tocqueville

Harvey C. Mansfield, Jr, *Tocqueville: a very short introduction* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2010).

Larry Siedentop, *Tocqueville* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1994).

Cheryl Welch, *De Tocqueville* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2001).

- Jon Elster, 'Consequences of constitutional choice: reflections on Tocqueville', in *Constitutionalism and democracy* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1988).
- Jennifer Pitts, 'Empire and democracy: Tocqueville and the Algeria question', *Journal of Political Philosophy*, vol. 8, no. 3 (2000), pp. 295-318.
- Alan Ryan, *On politics: a history of political thought from Herodotus to the present* (London: Allen Lane 2012), ch. 20.
- Debra Satz 'Tocqueville, commerce and democracy' in *The idea of democracy*, David Copp, Jean Hampton and John E. Roemer, eds. (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1995).
- Sheldon Wolin, *Tocqueville between two worlds: the making of a theoretical life* (Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 2003).
- Cheryl Welch, ed., *The Cambridge companion to Alexis de Tocqueville* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2006).
- Jill Locke and Eileen Hunt Botting, eds., *Feminist interpretations of Alexis de Tocqueville* (University Park, PA: Pennsylvania State University Press, 2009).
- Alan S. Kahan, *Aristocratic liberalism: the social and political thought of Jacob Burckhardt, John Stuart Mill and Alexis de Tocqueville* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1992).
- Jack Lively, *The social and political thought of Alexis de Tocqueville* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1962).
- Larry Siedentop, 'Two liberal traditions', in *The idea of freedom: essays in honour of Isaiah Berlin*, Alan Ryan, ed. (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1979).
- Hugh Brogan, *Alexis de Tocqueville: prophet of democracy in the age of revolution* (New Haven, CT: Yale University Press, 2007).
- Aurelian Craitu, *Tocqueville on America after 1840: Letters and other writings* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2009).

Suggested essay question

Is democracy's strength its adaptability to change?

17- 18: Representative democracy and the competitive struggle for power

SET TEXT: Joseph Schumpeter, *Capitalism, socialism and democracy* (London: Routledge, 1994), part iv.

- Adam Przeworski 'The minimalist conception of democracy: a defence' in *Democracy's value*, Ian Shapiro, ed. (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1999).
 - Christopher H. Achen and Larry Bartels, *Democracy for realists: why elections do not produce responsive government* (Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 2016), chs. 1-2.
 - Peter Mair, *Ruling the void: the hollowing out of western democracy* (London: Verso, 2013), chs. 1-3.
- E. E. Schattschneider, *The semi-sovereign people: a realist's view of democracy in America* (New York, NY: Wadsworth, 1960).
- Ian Shapiro, *The state of democratic theory* (Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 2005), ch. 3.
- John Dunn, *Western political theory in the face of the future*, 2nd ed. (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1993), ch. 1.
- Hanna F. Pitkin, *The concept of representation* (Berkeley: CA: University of California Press, 1967).
- Adam Przeworski, *Democracy and the limits of self-government* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2010).
- Bernard Manin, *The principles of representative government* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1997), chapters 5-6.
- Randall Collins, 'Weber and Schumpeter,' in *Weberian sociological theory*, Randall Collins, ed. (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1986).
- John Medearis, *Joseph Schumpeter's two theories of democracy* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 2001).
- Gerry Mackie, 'Schumpeter's leadership democracy,' *Political Theory* vol. 37, no 1 (2009), pp. 128-153.

Carole Pateman, *Participation and democratic theory* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1976).
 Robert Michels, *Political parties: a sociological study of the oligarchical tendencies of modern democracy* (New York, NY: The Free Press, 1962).
 Jürgen Habermas, 'Popular sovereignty as procedure,' in *Deliberative democracy*, James Bohman and William Rehg, eds. (Cambridge, MA: MIT Press, 1997).
 Gerry Mackie, 'All men are liars: is democracy meaningless?', in *Deliberative democracy*, Jon Elster, ed. (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1998).
 Alan Ryan, *On politics: a history of political thought from Herodotus to the present* (London: Allen Lane 2012), ch. 26.
 Max Weber, 'Suffrage and democracy in Germany' in Weber, *Political writings*, Peter Lassman and Ronald Speirs, eds. (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1994).

Inside democratic politics

Jonathan Powell, *The new Machiavelli: how to wield power in the modern world* (London: Bodley Head, 2010), chs 7-8.
 George Stephanopoulos, *All too human: a political education* (London: Hutchinson, 1999).
 Michael Ignatieff, *Fire and ashes: success and failure in politics* (Cambridge MA: Harvard University Press, 2013).

Suggested essay question

What follows if representative democracy is the rule of professional politicians?

19-20 Parties and voters: democracy's bads or the democratic solution to politics?

SET TEXTS: Nancy Rosenblum, *On the side of angels: an appreciation of parties and partisanship* (Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 2008), chs. 3, 7-9 and conclusion AND
 Bryan Caplan, *The myth of the rational voter: why democracies choose bad policies*, new ed. (Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press 2008), introduction, and chs. 1-2, 4-7.

- John Ferejohn, 'Must preferences be respected in a democracy?' in *The idea of democracy*, David Copp, Jean Hampton and John E. Roemer, eds. (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1995).
- Russell Hardin, 'Democracy and collective bads', in *Democracy's edges*, Ian Shapiro, ed. (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press 1999).
- Seymour Martin Lipset, 'What are parties for?', *Journal of Democracy*, vol. 7, no. 1 (1996), pp. 169-175.
- Nadia Urbinati, *Democracy disfigured: opinion, truth, and the people* (Cambridge MA: Harvard University Press, 2014), ch 3.

David Hume, 'Of parties in general' in Hume, *Political essays*, Knud Haakonssen, ed. (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1994), pp. 33-34.

Susan Stokes, 'What do policy switches tell us about democracy?' in *Democracy, accountability and representation*, Adam Przeworski, Susan C. Stokes and Bernard Manin, eds. (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press 1999).

Russell Hardin, 'Public choice versus democracy' in *The idea of democracy*, David Copp, Jean Hampton and John E. Roemer, eds. (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1995).

Harvey C. Mansfield, Jr, 'Whether party government is inevitable', *Political Science Quarterly*, vol. 80, no 4 (1965), pp. 517-542.

Paul J. Quirk and Joseph Hinchcliffe, 'The rising hegemony of mass opinion,' *Journal of Policy History*, vol. 10, no. 1 (1998), pp. 6-28.

Giovanni Sartori, *Parties and party systems* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1976).

Jonathan White and Lea Ypi, *The meaning of partisanship* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2016).

Cass R. Sunstein 'Democracy and shifting preferences' in *The idea of democracy*, David Copp, Jean Hampton and John E. Roemer, eds. (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1995).

Lawrence Jacobs and Robert Schapiro, *Politicians don't pander: political manipulation and the loss of democratic responsiveness* (Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press, 2000).

Kenneth J. Arrow, *Social choice and individual values*, 3rd ed. (New Haven, CT: Yale University Press, 2012).

James Buchanan and Gordon Tullock, *The calculus of consent: logical foundations of constitutional democracy* (Indianapolis, IN: Liberty Fund, 2004).

James Surowiecki *The wisdom of crowds* (London: Anchor 2005), ch. 12.

Bernard R. Berelson, Paul F. Lazarsfeld and William N. McPhee, *Voting: a study of opinion formation in a presidential campaign* (Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press, 1954).

Philip Converse, 'The nature of belief systems in mass publics' in *Ideology and discontent*, David E. Apter ed. (New York, NY: The Free Press, 1964).

Michael Carpini Delli and Scott Keeter, *What Americans know about politics and why it matters* (New Haven, CT: Yale University Press, 1996).

Martin Gilens, 'Political ignorance and collective policy preferences', *American Political Science Review*, vol. 95, no. 2 (2001), pp. 379-96.

Suggested essay question

Do voters choose bad policies?

21-22 Representative democracy and material prosperity

SET TEXT: Daron Acemoglu and James Robinson, *Why nations fail: the origins of power, prosperity and poverty* (London: Profile 2013).

- Robert C. Allen, *Global economic history: a very short introduction* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2011).
- Jiwei Ci, *Democracy in China: the coming crisis*, part one (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2019).
- John Micklethwait and Adrian Wooldridge, *The fourth revolution: the global race to invent the state* (Harmondsworth: Penguin, 2014), parts 2 and 3.

C.A. Bayly, *The birth of the modern world 1780-1914* (Oxford: Blackwell, 2004), chs. 1-3.

Francis Fukuyama, *The origins of political order: from prehuman times to the French Revolution* (London: Profile, 2011), parts IV and V.

Kenneth Pomeranz, *The great divergence: China, Europe, and making of the modern world economy* (Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 2001).

Robert Kaplan, *The revenge of geography: what the map tells us about coming conflicts and the battle against fate* (New York, NY: Random House, 2012).

Lee Yuan Yew, *From third world to first: Singapore and the Asian economic boom* (London: Harper Business, 2011).

Prassanan Parthasarathi, *Why Europe grew rich and Asia did not* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2011).

Niall Ferguson, *The cash nexus: money and power in the modern world 1700-2000*, new ed. (Harmondsworth: Penguin 2002), introduction and conclusion.

Daron Acemoglu and James Robinson, 'Democracy what is it good for',

<http://whynationsfail.com/blog/2014/3/25/democracy-what-is-it-good-for.html>.

Adam Przeworski, 'Democracy and economic development' in *The evolution of political knowledge*, E. D. Mansfield and R. Sissons, eds., (Columbus, OH: Ohio State University Press, 2004).

Samuel P. Huntington, *Political order in changing societies* (New Haven, CT: Yale University Press, 2006).

M. Mandelbaum, *The ideas that conquered the world: peace, democracy, and free markets in the twenty-first century* (New York, NY: Public Affairs, 2002).

Mancur C. Olson, *The rise and decline of nations: economic growth, stagflation, and social rigidities* (New Haven, CT: Yale University Press, 1984).

Jared Diamond, *Guns, germs and steel* (London: Vintage 1998), ch. 18 and epilogue.

Eric L. Jones, *The European miracle: environments, economies and geo-politics in the history of Europe and Asia*, 3rd ed. (New York, NY: Cambridge University Press, 2003).

David Landes, *The wealth and poverty of nations: why some are so rich and some so poor* (New York, NY: W. W. Norton, 1999).

Max Weber, 'On the situation of constitutional democracy in Russia' in Weber, *Political writings*, Peter Lassman and Ronald Speirs, eds. (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1994), pp. 29-74.
Max Weber, *The Protestant ethic and the spirit of capitalism* (Harmondsworth: Penguin 2002).

Suggested essay question

Does representative democracy explain the historical divergence in the prosperity of countries?

23-24: Representative democracy and the class distribution of wealth

SET TEXT: Martin Gilens, *Affluence and influence: economic inequality and political power in America* (Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press 2012)

- Jeffrey Winters and Benjamin Page 'Oligarchy in the United States?' *Perspectives on Politics*, vol. 7, no. 4 (2009), pp. 731-751.
- Jacob S. Hacker and Paul Pierson 'Winner-take-all politics: public policy, political organisation and the precipitous rise of top incomes in the United States,' *Politics and Society*, vol 3 no 2 (2010), pp. 152-204.
- John Ferejohn and Frances Rosenbluth, 'Electoral representation and the aristocratic thesis' in *Political representation*, Ian Shapiro *et al.* eds. (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2010).
- J. Soss and L. R. Jacobs 'The place of inequality: non-participation in the American polity', *Political Science Quarterly*, vol. 124, no. 1 (2009), pp. 95-125.
- Peter K. Enns, 'Relative policy support and co-incidental representation,' *Perspectives on Politics*, vol. 13, no. 4 (2015), pp. 1053-1064.

Lee Drutman, *The business of America is lobbying: how corporations became politicized and politics became more corporate* (New York, NY: Oxford University Press, 2015).

Jeffrey A. Winters, *Oligarchy* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2011).

Thomas Hayes, 'Responsiveness in an era of inequality: the case of the U.S. Senate', *Political Research Quarterly*, vol. 66, no. 3 (2013), pp. 585-599.

A. Bonica *et al.*, 'Why hasn't democracy slowed rising inequality?', *The Journal of Economic Perspectives* vol. 27, no. 3 (2013), pp. 103-124.

C. Wright Mills, *The power elite* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1956).

Martin Gilens, 'Affluence and influence', <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=HhCatZYsAqI>

Martin Gilens, 'The insufficiency of 'democracy by coincidence: a response to Peter Enns,' *Perspectives on Politics*, vol 13, no 4 (2015), pp. 1065-1071.

Jeffrey A. Winters, *Oligarchy* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2011), ch.5.

Adam Przeworski 'Democracy, equality and redistribution' in *Political judgement*, Richard Bourke and Raymond Geuss, eds. (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2009).

Gary W. Cox, 'Swing voters, core voters, and distributive politics' in *Political representation*, Ian Shapiro *et al.* eds. (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2010).

Daron Acemoglu *et al.*, 'Democracy, redistribution and inequality,' *NBER Working Paper Series #19746*, (2013). <http://www.nber.org/papers/w19746.pdf>.

Noam Lupu and Jonas Pontusson, 'The structure of inequality and the politics of redistribution,' *American Political Science Review*, vol. 105, no. 2 (2011), pp. 316-336.

Thomas Piketty, *Capital in the twenty-first century* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 2014).

Ferdinand Mount, *The new few: or a very British oligarchy* (London: Simon and Schuster 2012).

Larry Bartels, *Unequal democracy: the political economy of the new gilded age* (Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 2008).

Michael J. Graetz and Ian Shapiro, *Death by a thousand cuts: the fight over taxing inherited wealth* (Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 2005).

Sheldon Wolin *Politics and vision: continuity and innovation in western political thought*, new ed. (Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 2006) ch. 17.

J. Hopkin and K. A. Shaw, 'Organized combat or structural advantage? The politics of inequality and the winner-take-all economy in the United Kingdom', *Politics & Society*, vol. 44, no. 3 (2016), pp. 345-371.

Suggested essay question

Is representative democracy now the rule of the rich?

25-26: Communism

SET TEXTS: Karl Marx and Friedrich Engels, *The communist manifesto*, Stedman Jones, ed. (Harmondsworth: Penguin 2004).

- Gareth Stedman Jones 'Introduction' in Karl Marx and Friedrich Engels, *The communist manifesto*, Stedman Jones, ed. (Harmondsworth: Penguin 2004).
- Jonathan Wolff, *Why read Marx today?* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2003), ch. 3.
- Hannah Arendt, *The promise of politics* (New York, NY: Schocken Books, 2003), pp. 70-80.
- Neil Harding. 'The Marxist-Leninist detour', in *Democracy: the unfinished journey*, John Dunn, ed, (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1993).
- Isaiah Berlin, 'The pursuit of the ideal', in Berlin, *The proper study of mankind*, Henry Hardy and Roger Hausheer, eds. (London: Pimlico, 1998).

Further Marx writings

Karl Marx, 'The eighteenth Brumaire of Louis Bonaparte' in Marx, *Later political writings*, Terrell Carver, ed. (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1996).

Karl Marx, 'The civil war in France' in Marx, *Later political writings*, Terrell Carver, ed. (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1996).

Karl Marx and Friedrich Engels, *The German ideology* (London: Prometheus Books, 1998).

On Marx

Gareth Stedman Jones, *Karl Marx: greatness and illusion* (London: Allen Lane, 2016).

Terrell Carver, *Marx* (Cambridge, Polity, 2017).

Gregory Claeys, *Marx and Marxism* (London: Pelican, 2018).

Jon Elster, *Making sense of Marx* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1985).

Socialism after Marx

F. A. Hayek, *The fatal conceit: the errors of socialism* (Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press, 1988).

Donald Sassoon, *One hundred years of socialism: the west European left in the twentieth century* (London: Fontana, 1997).

Janos Kornai, *The socialist system: the political economy of communism* (Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 1992).

Terry Eagleton, *Why Marx was right* (New Haven, CT: Yale University Press, 2011).

Alec Nove, *The economics of feasible socialism* (London: Allen & Unwin, 1983).

G. A. Cohen, *Why not socialism?* (Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 2009).

Alex Callinicos, 'Contradictions of austerity', *Cambridge Journal of Economics*, vol. 36, no. 1 (2012), pp. 65-77.

Emile Perreau-Saussine, 'What remains of socialism?', in *Values in public life: aspects of common goods*, Patrick Riordan, ed. (Berlin: LIT Verlag, 2007).

Suggested essay question

Does socialism rest upon an illusory optimism about the possibilities of politics?

27-28: Self-rule

SET TEXT: M.K. Gandhi, 'Hind swaraj' in Gandhi, *Hind swaraj and other writings*, Anthony Parel, ed. (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1997).

- Anthony Parel, 'Introduction' in Gandhi, *Hind swaraj and other writings*, Anthony Parel, ed. (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1997).
- Gandhi and Nehru, 'Letters Gandhi to Nehru and Nehru to Gandhi', in Gandhi, *Hind Swaraj and other writings*, Anthony Parel, ed. (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1997), pp. 149-156.
- Gandhi and Tolstoy, 'Letters' in Gandhi, *Hind Swaraj and other writings*, Anthony Parel (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1997).
- Gandhi, 'Gandhi's political vision: the pyramid versus the oceanic circle' in Gandhi, *Hind Swaraj and other writings*, Anthony Parel, ed. (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1997).
- Karuna Mantena, 'Another realism: the politics of Gandhian non-violence,' *American Political Science Review*, vol. 106, no 2. pp 45-70.
- Lawrence Freedman, *Strategy* (Oxford: Oxford University Press), ch. 23.
- Sunil Khilnani, 'Introduction' to M.K. Gandhi, *An autobiography: or the story with my experiments of truth*, (Harmondsworth: Penguin, 2001).
- George Orwell, 'Reflections on Gandhi' in George Orwell, *Essays* (Harmondsworth: Penguin 2000).
http://www.orwell.ru/library/reviews/gandhi/english/e_gandhi.

B.R. Ambedkar, *Annihilation of caste*, (London: Verso, 2016).

Bhikhu Parekh, *Gandhi: a very short introduction* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2001).

Bhikhu Parekh, *Gandhi's political philosophy: a critical examination* (Basingstoke: Macmillan, 1991).

M.K. Gandhi, *An autobiography: or the story with my experiments of truth* (Harmondsworth: Penguin, 2001).

Judith M. Brown, 'Gandhi and civil resistance in India, 1917-47: key issues', in *Civil resistance and power politics: the experience of non-violent action from Gandhi to the present*, Adam Roberts and Timothy Garton Ash, eds. (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2009).

Joseph Kip Kosek, 'Richard Gregg, Mohandas Gandhi and the strategy of non-violence,' *The Journal of American History*, vol. 91, no. 4 (2005), pp .1318-1348.

Suggested essay question

If 'self-rule' is impossible in the modern world, what price is paid?

29-30: Human agency and political freedom

SET TEXT: Hannah Arendt, *The human condition*, 2nd ed. (Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press, 1998).

- Margaret Canovan, 'Introduction' to Hannah Arendt, *The human condition* (Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press, 1998).
- Patricia Owens, 'Hannah Arendt: violence and the inescapable fact of humanity', in *Hannah Arendt and international relations*, Anthony F. Lang and John Williams, eds. (New York, NY: Palgrave Macmillan, 2005), pp. 41-65.
- Patricia Owens, *Between war and politics: international relations and the thought of Hannah Arendt* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2009), chs 1-2.

Jürgen Habermas, 'Hannah Arendt's communications concept of power', *Social Research*, vol. 44, no 1 (1977), pp. 3-24.

Craig Calhoun and John McGowan, eds., *Hannah Arendt and the meaning of politics*, (Minneapolis, MN: University of Minnesota Press, 1997), pp. 263-296.

Philip Baehr and Philip Walsh, eds., *The Anthem companion to Hannah Arendt* (London: Anthem Press).

Sheldon S. Wolin, *Fugitive democracy: and other essays*, Nicholas Xenos, ed. (Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 2016).

Elisabeth Young-Bruehl, *Why Arendt matters* (London: Yale University Press, 2006).

Andrew Norris, 'On public action: rhetoric, opinion and glory in Hannah Arendt's *The human condition*', *Critical Horizons*, vol. 14, no. 2 (2013), pp. 200-224.
Mary Dietz, *Turning operations: feminism, Arendt, and politics*. (New York, NY: Routledge, 2002).
Sahar Aurore Saeidnia and Anthony Lang, *Hannah Arendt's The human condition*. (London: Macat Library, 2017).
Hannah Arendt, *Thinking without a bannister: essays in understanding 1953–1975*, Jerome Kohn, ed. (New York, NY: Schocken Books, 2018).

Suggested essay question

What, in Arendt's judgement, are the conditions that make politics possible, and what are its distinctive properties?

31-32 The end of democracy

SET TEXTS: David Runciman, *How democracy ends* (London: Profile, 2018) AND
Steven Levitsky and Daniel Ziblatt, *How democracies die* (London: Viking, 2018)

• Nancy Bermeo, 'On democratic backsliding', *Journal of Democracy*, vol. 27 (2016), pp. 5-19.

Edward N. Luttwak, *Coup d'état: a practical handbook* (Harmondsworth: Penguin, 1968).
Jan-Werner Müller, *What is populism?* (London: Penguin, 2017).
Jan-Werner Müller, 'Is this really how it ends?', *The Nation*, 22 April 2019.
<https://www.thenation.com/article/how-democracies-dies-how-democracy-ends-book-review/>.
Colin Kidd, 'In a frozen crouch', *London Review of Books*, vol. 40, no. 17 (13 September 2018).
<https://www.lrb.co.uk/v40/n17/colin-kidd/in-a-frozen-crouch>.
Francis Fukuyama, *Political order and political decay: from the industrial revolution to the globalization of democracy*, (London: Profile, 2014).
Francis Fukuyama, 'The future of history: can liberal democracy survive the decline of the middle class?' *Foreign Affairs*, vol. 91, no. 1 (2012).
Nadia Urbinati, *Democracy disfigured: opinion, truth, and the people* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 2014).
Joshua Kurlantzick, *Democracy in retreat: the revolt of the middle class and the worldwide decline of representative government* (New Haven, CT: Yale University Press, 2013).
Martin Rees, *Our final century? Will the human race survive the twenty-first century?* (London: Heinemann, 2003).
S. M. Amadae, *Prisoners of reason: game theory and neoliberal political economy* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2016).
Helen Margetts, Peter John, Scott Hale, & Taha Yasseri, *Political turbulence: how social media shape collective action* (Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 2015).
E. M. Forster, 'The machine stops', in *The eternal moment and other stories* (London: Sidgwick & Jackson, 1928).
The Economist, 'What's gone wrong with democracy?' (2014).
<http://www.economist.com/news/essays/21596796-democracy-was-most-successful-political-idea-20th-century-why-has-it-run-trouble-and-what-can-be-do>

Suggested essay question

What is the most plausible scenario about the death of representative democracy, and how plausible is it?

APPENDIX A: Past Tripos papers

What follows are the 2019, 2018, and 2017 POL1 Tripos papers. Please note that the syllabus is revised each year, and so a small number of questions do not correspond to topics on this 2020-21 paper guide: Q4, Q16 in 2019, 2018, and 2017; Q15 in 2018 and 2017; and Q6 in 2018 and 2017 was also not just a question about Fanon). In all cases, the rubric is the same: 'Candidates must answer three questions. Questions should be chosen from at least two sections.'

2019

SECTION A

1. Why for Hobbes is civil war always worse than a tyrannical sovereign?
2. What for Constant made the conjunction of the modern state and ancient liberty so dangerous?
3. What kinds of politicians are needed in the modern party system according to Max Weber?
4. Why for Schmitt is it necessary for the state to make distinctions between friends and enemies?
5. What role did Friedrich von Hayek envisage for the state in a society which respects the principle of economic liberty?
6. According to Fanon, why does the European model of the state not serve as an inspiration for the post-colonial world?

SECTION B

7. Was Hamilton justified in thinking that the American constitution "ought to be preferred" to democratically-passed laws when they appear to clash?
8. Was Tocqueville right to say that in the United States the republic has "deeper roots" than the Union?
9. Can a "popular will" be manufactured by politicians?
10. Do policies decided in democracies necessarily harm people?
11. Is material prosperity enhanced by democratic government?
12. Has democratic politics become oligarchic?

SECTION C

13. Can the modern state be anything other than a device for administering the common affairs of the bourgeois class?
14. Is Gandhian 'self-rule' a solution to contemporary problems such as criminal violence and environmental catastrophe?
15. Under what conditions can political freedom be established, according to Hannah Arendt?
16. What can we learn from Jonathan Haidt about the nature of political disagreement in contemporary democratic societies?

2018

SECTION A

1. Why did Hobbes believe that life without a state was more dangerous than life with a state?
2. How did Constant understand the relationship between public and private life in a modern state?
3. What for Weber were the most important qualities of responsible political leadership?
4. Why did Schmitt believe that decision-making was the essence of politics?
5. Why did Hayek see state planning as such a threat to personal freedom?
6. Is it possible to control the violence of the state?

SECTION B

7. Does the American constitution offer an effective means of containing the problem of factions?
8. Does democracy require a socially united society?
9. Can the people ever rule in democracy?
10. Does democracy sacrifice good policy outcomes to partisanship and irrationality?
11. What does the form of government in modern politics explain about national economic outcomes?
12. How far does political influence in representative democracy turn on income and wealth?

SECTION C

13. Was Marx right to think that the modern state would eventually face a crisis it could not overcome?
14. How did Gandhi understand the connection between modern politics and modern technology?
15. Why did Nietzsche think that democracy was a slavish form of politics?
16. Why is politics so tribal?

2017

SECTION A

1. What for Hobbes was the basis of the sovereign's authority to rule?
2. What role did Constant think public opinion played in a modern state?
3. Why did Weber believe that politics was a 'vocation'?
4. Why was Schmitt so adamant that politics should not be confused with economics?

5. How did Hayek believe it was possible to escape 'the road to serfdom'?

6. Is violence essential to modern politics or inimical to it?

SECTION B

7. Is the separation of powers the guarantee of liberty which the Federalists supposed?

8. Is democracy a set of political rules, or a social commitment of its citizens?

9. Can politicians manufacture opinion in democratic politics?

10. Can democracy escape EITHER the deleterious consequences of partisanship OR irrationality?

11. Is economic history on the side of representative democracy?

12. How far does deep inequality of wealth corrode democracy?

SECTION C

13. Is Marx right that the fundamental conflicts of politics transcend the boundaries of the nation-state?

14. Does Gandhi offer a viable alternative to representative democracy?

15. What sort of politics did Nietzsche think was possible 'beyond good and evil'?

16. Why are political differences so resistant to being settled by facts?

APPENDIX B: Past Examiner's reports

At the conclusion of the Examining process each year, the Examiner responsible for overseeing the marking of the POL1 paper writes a formal report reflecting on the paper and on how candidates attempted the various questions. The three Examiner's reports that correspond to the three papers in Appendix A appear below. As with the exam papers themselves, do note that the syllabus changes from year to year, and so some of the discussion that follows is not directly relevant to the content of this year's paper.

2019

POL1 remains a very popular paper. 151 HSPS candidates took the paper this year, as did 38 in History & Politics, and 9 from other Triposes. The overall standard of the scripts was commendably high. The average mark for the paper was 66 for HSPS candidates and 67 for History and Politics candidates. In HSPS, 21% were awarded a 1st, 72% were awarded a 2.1, with 7% securing a 2.2. The highest agreed mark awarded to a script was 82, the lowest 53.

As usual a handful of topics and themes attracted the most attention, though every question elicited at least one answer (the lowest in the HSPS exam attracted 3 answers, the highest 76 answers). In Section A, the question on Hobbes attracted by far the most HSPS responses (76), with Weber (42) and Fanon (42) also proving popular. The other three questions all attracted a substantial number of responses: Hayek (26), Constant (20), Schmitt (13). In Section B, the most popular question, by a considerable margin, was a thematic one on the general will (42). The question on oligarchy and democracy was answered by 28 candidates, while that on material prosperity and democratic government attracted 22 answers. The other three questions were less popular: Tocqueville and American society (3); harm and

politics (5), and Hamilton and the American constitution (11). Answers in Section 3 were likewise unevenly distributed, with Gandhi attracting the most (42). The question on Arendt was answered by 36 candidates, followed by the moral psychology of Jonathan Haidt (18) and Marxist theories of the state (14).

The best scripts were very impressive, demonstrating an excellent grasp of the materials under discussion, a good understanding of relevant historical and/or political contexts, and the ability to develop a cogent and sophisticated line of argument. Weaker scripts lacked one or more of these virtues. Some scripts were too short to include enough relevant information to secure a good mark. It is worth stressing that the use of examples – whether historical, contemporary, or even hypothetical – can help to illuminate theoretical arguments, whether Hobbes's account of Leviathan, Schmitt's critique of liberalism, Gandhi's understanding of nonviolence, or Arendt's conception of the *vita activa*. The best scripts on these (or similar) topics tended to mix conceptual analysis with some examples. Most scripts that addressed historical topics – and above all the Hobbes, Weber and Schmitt answers – failed to provide enough historical detail to locate the thinkers and their arguments in time. This was true of both HSPS and History and Politics students. Although the examiners are not looking for long and involved discussion of historical context, it is important to recognize what the thinkers were doing when they wrote their texts, and to do that some historical contextualization is necessary. The authors did not write in a vacuum.

Overall, then, this was a good year for POL1. The average standard of the exam scripts was commendable. The majority of students demonstrated a good grasp of the course material, and only a small percentage were awarded 2.2s. The best scripts were a pleasure to read, showing a very impressive level of understanding for this stage in the Tripos.

Duncan Bell

2018

178 undergraduates in HSPS, 38 in History & Politics and 13 in other Triposes were registered to sit this paper. The quality of the scripts was generally good as was their presentation: 38 achieved Firsts and the average was 65. Most were easily legible; 'separation' was the only word that was repeatedly misspelled.

Most candidates chose at least one question from Section A. The question on Hobbes attracted by far the most responses (86), that on Weber (78), Constant (29), Violence and Power (27), Hayek (22), and Schmitt (9).

In Section B, Q9, 'Can the people ever rule in democracy?' was the most popular (53 responses), followed by Q7, 'Does the American constitution offer an effective means of containing the problem of factions?' (34), Q12 on the political influence of income and wealth in representative democracy (27), Q11, 'What does the form of government in modern politics explain about national economic outcomes' (23), Q8 'Does democracy require a socially united society?' (11), and Q10, 'Does democracy sacrifice good policy outcomes to partisanship and irrationality' (8).

In Section C, Q14, 'How did Gandhi understand the connection between modern politics and modern technology?' dominated (with 50 responses), followed by Q15 'Why did Nietzsche think that democracy was a slavish form of politics?' (28), Q13, 'Was Marx right to think that the modern state would eventually face a crisis it could not overcome?' (26), and Q16, 'Why is politics so tribal?' (8)

The average mark for each of the questions was between 64 and 68. The most interesting essays genuinely engaged with the questions and the issues they raised, demonstrated careful reading of the primary texts and relevant literature, referred to them succinctly and precisely, and revealed further reading. Those essays provided specific pertinent political examples or illustrations to bolster their argument, which was made clear from the onset. They were well-structured and balanced, flowed well to the end and the argument was evenly sustained throughout.

The attractiveness of questions from Section A did not mean that candidates knew the primary texts. All too few candidates seemed to have read them. In some cases, Hobbes or Constant's very own and most famous pronouncements were attributed to the lecturer for POL1; thus Professor Runciman became the author of the description of life in the state of nature 'as nasty, brutish and short'. Many of the answers on

Hobbes consisted of disproportionately long descriptions of his account of the state of nature thereby leaving little time to reflect on life in civil society and its specific character. Only one candidate reflected on Hobbes' view of the relationship between states and violence between states. Too few answers on Weber assessed the relative importance of the qualities of responsible political leadership. Many answers on Hayek lacked specificity. Too many answers to the question of state violence gave what was deemed to be Arendt or Fanon's treatment of the subject rather than answering the question using these or other relevant authors. All too often, it was not clear what controlling the violence of the state might be taken to mean.

Similar comments might be made about many of the answers to the questions in Section B and C. What could be understood by a 'socially united society', 'the people ever rul[ing]', 'good policy' or 'irrationality' was not explained in a number of scripts. Answers to Qs 11 and 12 were often little more than a precis of one or two key texts on the subjects, and these were not always accurate. The answer to the question on Gandhi required a specific assessment of his views of modern technology and politics and of his view of their interconnection. That on Nietzsche called for more than a summing up of his view of Christianity and morality. Answers to Q16 needed to probe the various ways in which politics might seem tribal and the ways in which it might not.

This said, there were some exceptionally good scripts; indeed, some exceeded even the highest expectations one might have of first year undergraduates. Beautifully written, they showed their authors to have benefitted from the lecture series as a platform from which to explore the literature and the issues for themselves, thereby enabling them to respond to the questions in a nuanced and informed manner, but also a personal and distinctive one.

Sylvana Tomaselli

2017

POL1 was again a popular paper this year, though numbers were slightly down on 2015 and 2016: in the end 161 students sat the examination, including eight PBS and Economics students who borrowed the paper. As in previous years, we adopted a practice of open double-marking, with the first marker blind-marking the script and the second marker acting as a moderator. I am grateful to the assessors, Evaleila Pesaran and Paul Sagar, for taking on this task and for turning around a large number of scripts so quickly and efficiently.

The range of material covered in POL1 makes it a challenging paper, and as usual students performed at a variety of different levels. There were 16 first-class marks (10%), 121 upper seconds (75%), 23 lower seconds (14%) and one third (1%); the highest mark awarded was 75 and the mean mark for all candidates was 63.9. As in previous years, the rule requiring students to choose questions from at least two of the three sections did not prevent them clustering around a few core thinkers. In general, those candidates who stuck to the familiar topics of Weber, Hobbes, and Gandhi (which between them accounted for more than 40% of all answers) did less well than those who ranged more widely. It is not always in students' best interest to shy away from what appear to be the most challenging questions.

In Section A, the most popular question was on Weber, which received 70 answers, closely followed by Hobbes (69), with Hayek (24), Constant (23), violence (14), and Schmitt (9) markedly less popular. Although there were some strong answers on these thinkers, many candidates were wrong-footed by the specificity of this year's questions. On Hobbes, for instance, weaker candidates simply rehearsed Hobbes' rationale for leaving the state of nature without discussing the relationship between authority and power (a distinction which Hobbes, admittedly, sometimes collapses) or the specific nature of the covenant. On Weber, the best answers used the concept of 'vocation' to interrogate the meaning of 'Beruf' and Weber's complex attitude towards full-time politicians, but others became bogged down in a generic discussion of the ethics of conviction and responsibility. Most of the candidates who answered on Hayek were able to rehearse his basic arguments, but only a few had much to say about how he thought the 'road to serfdom' could be avoided, or about the tensions between his constitutionalism and his belief in spontaneous order. Constant answers fell into the same trap: those that were able to say something specific about public opinion did well, but many were not.

The answers on violence and Schmitt tended to be somewhat stronger than other Section A answers: indeed, the average marks for these questions were the highest on the paper. Students who were able to adjudicate between Fanon and Arendt and to challenge the simple binary proposition of the violence question did well; so too did those who pointed out that Schmitt subsumed economics into politics. The broad normative terms of the violence question sit rather uncomfortably with the narrower textual focus of other topic in this section, and there might be a case for moving it to Section C in future years.

Answers to Section B were less sharply clustered than in other sections, with Schumpeter and the economic history question each attracting 36 takers. 28 candidates answered on democracy and inequality, 20 on the Federalists and the separation of powers, 11 on Tocqueville and 11 on partisanship. Some students seem to have been confused by the fact the Tocqueville and Schumpeter questions were not more clearly signalled, but the more common problem was a tendency to regurgitate supervision essays irrespective of the question. The best answers on the separation of powers looked at both the Federalists' intentions and the subsequent historical record; likewise, the strongest answers on Schumpeter thought seriously about what it would mean for politicians to 'manufacture' opinion (though no one mentioned the difficulties this creates for rational choice theorists). Few candidates saw that the Tocqueville question was a fairly straightforward invitation to discuss the relationship between democratic values and democratic institutions. As in 2016, the question on partisanship was answered very poorly, with only one or two candidates managing to see how Caplan and Rosenblum's arguments could be applied to the question.

The questions on economic history and democracy and inequality were quite capably done, though many students launched into formulaic answers without picking up on the strength of the causal claims: what does it mean for economic history to be 'on the side of representative democracy', or for democracy to be 'corroded' by inequality? Too many candidates gave predictable run-throughs of *Why Nations Fail* and assumed that 'inclusive political institutions' could simply be equated with representative democracy. Better responses made a more serious attempt to interrogate the question, brought other thinkers into the discussion (such as Przeworski and Olson), and made more careful and focussed use of empirical detail. Likewise, strong answers to the inequality question (of which there were several) thought carefully about what it might mean for democracy to be corroded, questioned whether representative democracy had even really been based on material equality, or talked about how institutional design could help contain the influence of the very wealthy.

Almost half the answers to section C were on Gandhi (63 answers), but Haidt (28), Nietzsche (21), and Marx (19) also attracted reasonable numbers of takers. The spread of marks here was relatively large, with a number of very strong answers (especially on Nietzsche and Marx) but also some weak efforts by candidates who were running out of time or caught out by a limited grasp of the texts. The Marx and Gandhi questions seem to have been seen by candidates as fairly safe bets, but those who reproduced their supervision essays were inevitably penalized. Better candidates thought hard about how 'the fundamental conflicts of politics' have been shaped by national states, and how far Gandhi's critique of western civilization was matched by a positive political vision. The Nietzsche question was a difficult one, and candidates tackled it in very different ways. The best answers used the text to discuss Nietzsche's attitude to equality, democracy, and popular sovereignty, sometimes drawing on Hugo Drochon's recent work, but many retreated to a basic discussion of the genealogy of morals. Answers to the Haidt question were also highly variable, though most candidates were able to deploy the core readings to reasonably good effect. The most interesting answers brought other set thinkers such as Weber and Schmitt into the discussion, and asked whether a technocratic consensus based on 'facts' is really so desirable.

Peter Sloman