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Fact-value dichotomy
- can we always distinguish “what is” from “what ought to be”?
  o is “Islamic democracy” possible?
    ▪ What do we mean by Islamic democracy?
      • Religious parties take part
      • legislation is limited to what is compatible with Islam (Afghan constitution)
      • standards of Islam are used to evaluate law by legislators
    ▪ Claim: Religious-based rule is incompatible with liberal representative democracy;
      • specific religious mores and rules, if legislated, will infringe on liberties of others (e.g., ban on pork or alcohol)
      • democratic politics ought to be secular in order to remain liberal
      • but are Christians-majority countries free of Christian-influenced political movements?
        o “Christian Democratic” parties in Europe
        o religious themes in US politics: abortion, gay marriage, drug prohibition
Claim: Islamic democracy will produce fanatical, repressive and violent regime

- What evidence do we have?
- Buruma: beware equating fanaticism with religion; the secular can be extremist as well (see WebCT)
- How liberal is politics in secular governments in North America and Europe?

...No person ought to be punished simply for being drunk; but a soldier or a policeman should be punished for being drunk on duty. Whenever, in short, there is a definite damage, or a definite risk of damage, either to an individual or to the public, the case is taken out of the province of liberty, and placed in that of morality or law.10

But with regard to the merely contingent, or, as it may be called, constructive injury which a person causes to society, by conduct which neither violates any specific duty to the public, nor occasions perceptible hurt to any assignable individual except himself; the inconvenience is one which society can afford to bear, for the sake of the greater good of human freedom. (J. S. Mill, On Liberty, Chap. IV, par.10-11)
Multiple-Causation
- Few social events have a single cause
  o Multiple causes mean events are more contingent
  o Sequence matters

- Civil War as Hobbes v. Schmitt (S. Kalyvas)
  o Hobbessian, or greed model
    ▪ Breakdown of central “authority” and ensuing anarchy
    ▪ privatization of violence: private groups – clans, ethnic factions, bandits – use force to enrich themselves (looting)
    ▪ struggle over resources: warlords as crime bosses
  o Schmittian, or grievance model
    ▪ Prior group loyalties and beliefs transform abstract enmities into private hatreds
    ▪ Ideology of enmity is centrally created and directed
    ▪ Struggle over identities: ancient hatreds and political grievances
  o Both are right and wrong (Kalyvas)
    ▪ Micro-studies (journalists, anthropologist, historians) find that motives at local level are often different from master cleavage (Serb v. Croat; Communist v. Capitalists; Imperialist v. Nationalist)
    ▪ Locals often exploit national-level conflict to advance their own local grievances
      • Alliances between local and central actors
      • greed and grievance are intertwined
      • “Side-switching” better explained
Mechanisms and Processes v. Narratives and Stories (Tilly)
- e.g., “democracy without democrats”
- democracy as a result of …
  o modernization
  o bargaining to achieve mutually satisfactory but not mutually desired outcome