

POL 2028: Approaches to Political Theory Fall 2018

Time: Tuesday 2:10-4:00

Place:

Instructor: Joseph H. Carens

Office: Sidney Smith Hall 3044

**Office Hours: Tuesdays 4:15-6:00
or by appointment**

**Telephone: 416-978-8521
e-mail: jcarens@chass.utoronto.ca**

Course goals

This course will introduce graduate students to some alternative approaches to political theory in the early 21st century and help them reflect upon what these approaches can or cannot contribute to their own work in political theory. The course satisfies the department's qualitative methods requirement for Ph.D. students whose primary field is political theory. The course is open to MA students but not to undergraduates. Auditors are welcome and encouraged (but not required) to submit the reaction pieces.

The premise of the course is that the most helpful way to engage with methodological questions in political theory is to see how such questions emerge from, or are presupposed in, the work that political theorists actually do. So, we will use the work of twelve of the political theorists in our department to reflect upon some of the ways in which one can approach political theory. Each week a different theorist will come to the class. Prior to the class, students will be asked to read two sorts of background materials: (1) a methodological piece – either one written by the theorist himself or herself or one written by another author that talks about an approach that has influenced the way the week's theorist does his or her work; (2) a substantive example of the theorist's own work (i.e., a piece in which he or she actually does some political theory rather than talking about how to do it). At the beginning of class, the theorist will talk for 15 or 20 minutes. The rest of the class will be devoted to discussion. I have asked my colleagues to present a brief intellectual autobiography, sketching how they came to be political theorists and what sorts of work they have done over their careers. I have also asked them to reflect upon issues like the following in their presentations:

- What sorts of questions do you address in your work?
- How do you go about answering these questions?
- Are there other theorists who think about similar questions or topics in very different ways, and, if so, why do you adopt your approach instead?
- Are there any who do things quite differently whom you particularly admire?
- What does your approach permit you to see that you think other approaches might miss?
- What is your approach in danger of missing that other approaches might see?
- How do you decide what to read (and what to ignore), what to consider (and what to set aside)?
- What counts as evidence in the sort of inquiry you conduct?

- What distinguishes a good analysis or argument from a bad one (or are those the wrong categories from your perspective)?
- What sort of audience do you have in mind for your work and how does that affect the way you think and write?

You are encouraged to press each theorist to provide explicit answers to these questions in the class discussion to the extent that you cannot see the answers emerging from the week's readings or from the presentation.

In the discussion we will explore the connections and dissonances between the methodological piece and the theorist's own substantive work and between both of those and the oral presentation. My hope is that these discussions will work somewhat differently from the standard model of academic interaction, however. The usual form of intellectual exchange in our profession is for someone to present a paper which is followed by a discussion in which the audience poses objections or asks questions, usually with the goal of revealing some flaw in the presentation. This approach to learning has virtues and defects, but it is not likely to be fruitful in the context of this course. The goal of our class discussions should be for you to see how each theoretical approach opens up certain avenues of intellectual inquiry.

The presentation each theorist makes in this course is not supposed to be an argument, an *apologia pro vita sua*, but a reflective meditation on paths taken (and not taken). The underlying presupposition of the course is a kind of epistemological pluralism, i.e., that there are many good ways of doing political theory. Each of the theorists in the department (including those not appearing in the course this year) pursues political theory in a somewhat different way and yet there is a high level of mutual respect and appreciation among the theorists in our department. We all think that what every other theorist in our department does is worth doing, though we don't always say why to one another. This course offers a way of bringing that mutual respect and appreciation to consciousness in order to reflect upon it. The fundamental objective of the course is to enable you to understand more fully what different theorists in the department do and why. To be sure, understanding involves questioning and you should come to each session with questions in mind. And questions may involve challenges, but the main goal of the questions and challenges should be to understand more fully why a given theorist works in the way that he or she does rather than to provide a critique.

Understanding what each of the theorists does is not enough, however. I do not want the course simply to provide a survey of alternative approaches that you can digest passively. One important purpose of the course is to help you in your own work in political theory. To that end, you are encouraged to think about the connections between each week's materials and the questions you are trying to ask as a political theorist. Over the course of the semester, I hope to build a conversation about how to do political theory that will draw connections between the different approaches of the faculty members and will help each of you to think more deeply about your own approach to political theory.

Course requirements

1) Class participation and short reaction pieces: 20%

- (a) You are expected to attend regularly, to do the assigned readings, to read the reaction pieces of your colleagues posted on the class website, and to participate actively in the discussion.
- (b) You are expected to submit 6 short reaction pieces. In the 6 short pieces, you should use your reactions to the assigned readings to raise questions about the approach a theorist is taking. You may pose objections, if you wish, but the main goal should be to see what you can learn from each week's readings and so to ask questions that help you to think further about what kind of work you want to do as a theorist. You are especially encouraged to think about the various questions posed in bullet points on the first page of the syllabus and to use these questions to probe more deeply into the readings.

The papers should be between half a page and one page, single spaced, (12" font; 1" margins). They must be distributed to the entire class through posting on the class website by 5:00 p.m. on Monday evening, the night before class. I will forward the papers to the week's presenter. The papers will be graded on a pass-fail basis.

The class will be randomly divided into 2 groups (A and B), with one of the groups expected to respond to the week's readings. You may exchange weeks with a colleague in the other group, but only if you do so in advance and send me an e-mail informing me about this.

2) Research paper: 16-20 pages 80%

The paper can be on any topic related to the question of what approaches to use in political theory. You are encouraged to use this opportunity to explore the methodological issues that you will face in your own research, but you are not required to do so. You may use the paper to discuss readings from the class or you can focus on sources of your own, though you are expected to engage with at least some of the course readings. You must discuss your paper topic with me in advance – preferably in person -- and get formal confirmation of its acceptability via e-mail. It is your responsibility to send a followup e-mail after our conversation confirming what we have agreed upon.

Please note that we will be scheduling one extra class on November 23. This is not an optional class but part of the normal course requirement.

Readings

The readings for the course will be posted on the class website or will be available online at the U of T library. **Please note. Some of the readings listed below may change. Be sure to check each week to see what readings have been posted on the class website.**

SCHEDULE

September 11: Introduction

September 18: Joe Carens (Group A)

Joseph H. Carens, "Appendix: Presuppositions and Political Theory" from *The Ethics of Immigration* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2013)

Joseph H. Carens, "Chapter 11: The Case for Open Borders" from *The Ethics of Immigration* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2013)

Recommended: Joseph H. Carens, "A Contextual Approach to Political Theory," *Ethical Theory and Moral Practice* Vol. 7, No. 2 (April 2004): 117-132.

Joseph H. Carens, "Normative Analysis and Empirical Research" (unpublished)

September 25: Ryan Balot (Group B)

Ryan Balot, "Recollecting Athens," *Polis, The Journal for Ancient Greek Political Thought* 33 (2016) 92-129.

Ryan Balot, "Revisiting the Classical Ideal of Citizenship: A Dialectical Approach."

Ryan Balot, "Courage and Democracy."

October 2: Rebecca Kingston (Group A)

Rebecca Kingston, "Montesquieu and Plutarch: Reflections on Historical Analysis in Broader Social Scientific Comparison." In *A Companion to Enlightenment Historiography*, eds. S. Bourgault and R. Sparling (Leiden: Brill, 2013): 133-152.

Rebecca Kingston, "Montesquieu's Rhetoric of Freedom without Equality," In *The Oxford Handbook of Rhetoric and Political Theory*, ed. Dilip Gonkar (Oxford: Oxford University Press, forthcoming).

Recommended:

Hubert L. Dreyfus, "Comments on Jonathan Lear's Radical Hope (Harvard: 2006)," *Philosophical Studies* (2009) 144:63–70

October 9: Cliff Orwin (Group B)

Leo Strauss, "Persecution and the art of writing," in *Persecution and the Art of Writing*. (Glencoe, IL: The Free Press, 1952): 22-37.

Leo Strauss, "On a forgotten kind of writing," in *What is Political Philosophy? and Other Studies* (New York: The Free Press, 1959): 21-32.

Arthur Melzer, "Esoteric writing and the critique of historicism," *APSR* Vol. 100, No. 2 (2006): 279-95

Clifford Orwin, "Rousseau's Socratism," *Journal of Politics* Vol. 60, No. 1 (1998): 175-87.

Clifford Orwin, "Rousseau and the Veneration of Authenticity." (Forthcoming in a German translation by Wolfram Eilenberg in *Philosophie-Magazin* (Berlin)

October 16: Torrey Shanks (Group A)

Bonnie Honig, "Declarations of Independence: Arendt and Derrida on the Problem of Founding a Republic," *American Political Science Review* 85, 1 [March 1991]: 97-113.

Torrey Shanks, "The Rhetoric of Self-Ownership" (*Political Theory*, online first).

October 23: Andy Sabl (Group B)

Readings to be determined

October 30: Ronnie Beiner (Group A)

Ronald Beiner, "First Prologue: Horizons of Political Reflection" from *Political Philosophy: What It Is and Why It Matters* (Cambridge : Cambridge University Press, 2014): ix-xxvii.

"Symposium on *Political Philosophy: What It Is and Why It Matters*" in *Review of Politics* 78 (2016): 285-315. (Six critics and a response by Ronald Beiner).

November 6: Fall Break (no class)

November 13: Emily Nacol (Group B)

Readings to be determined

November 20: Melissa Williams (Group A)
Readings to be determined

November 23: Peggy Kohn (Group B)

Hans Sluga, *Politics and the Search for the Common Good* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2014) chap. 1 "From normative theory to diagnostic practice", pp. 12-40.

Margaret Kohn, "The Critique of Possessive Individualism: Solidarism and the City," *Political Theory* forthcoming

November 27: Ruth Marshall (Group A)

Michel Foucault, "The Subject and Power" in *Michel Foucault: Beyond Structuralism and Hermeneutics*, eds. Hubert Dreyfus and Paul Rabinow (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1982): 208-226.

Michel Foucault, "Questions of Method," in *The Essential Foucault: Selections from the Essential Works of Foucault, 1954-1984*, eds. Paul Rabinow and Nikolas Rose (New York: New Press, 2003): 73-86.

Ruth Marshall, "The Sovereignty of Miracles: Pentecostal Political Theology in Nigeria," *Constellations* Vol. 17, No 2 (2010): 197-223.

Recommended: Michel Foucault, *History of Sexuality Vol. II: The Use of Pleasure* Chapters 1-3 (New York: Vintage, 1990): 1-25

December 4: Courtney Jung (Group B)

Judith Butler, "Contingent Foundations: Feminism and the Question of Postmodernism" in Judith Butler and Joan Scott, *Feminists Theorize the Political* (Routledge, 1992): 3-21.

Courtney Jung, "Stepping behind the claims of culture," chapter 1 of *The Moral Force of Indigenous Politics* (New York: Cambridge University Press, 2008): 34-78.

Courtney Jung, "Reconciliation is a practice," proposal for Jackman Humanities Institute Fellowship.