G. Horowitz, “Notes on ‘Conservatism, Liberalism, and Socialism in Canada,” *CJPS* 11:2 (June 1978)

**Overview**

Paper is a response to criticisms made to original paper.

**Background**

* One of the most common misunderstandings of Hartz’s theory is that it is a species of the genus ‘idealistic determinism’ –
  + Hartz’s explanation of the failure of American socialism is often contraposed to economic explanation, but these two explanations are not mutually exclusive – they can and should be conjoined.
* The political culture of the new society is to be understood not simply as a product of fragmentation, but as a product of the dialectic between the fragmentation process and other processes which inhibit or interfere with the fragmentation. Hartz calls this the “tug of war between the fixity of a fragment and the energies arising out of its breakdown”
* In his 1966 paper, Horowitz was “not attempting to subvert economic explanations of the role of the state” – he argued not that toryism “caused” the use of the state, but that it was available for the legitimation of the use of the state, among other things.
* Horowitz admits that his “application of Hartz’s theory to English Canada was marred by an unfortunate confusion in its treatment to the notion of congealment of the fragment culture” – his concern was to undermine Kenneth McRae’s argument, and argued that it was difficult to put one’s finger on the pt of congealment
  + Horowitz admits to regrettably making it appear that congealment is an all-or-nothing phenomenon, and rather should have used the notion of a *degree* of congealment, which is identical with the notion of a degree of fragmentation
* Tom Truman finds Horowitz’s argument about tory roots of Cdn socialism unconvincing – as Horowitz confuses two types of toryism – (1) real, British ideological toryism, and (2) the Empire, a kind of British racism
* Truman suggests a “more plausible explanation” for the strength of Cdn toryism – that the close relationship with Britain made it easy for British ideas and British settlers to be imported and accepted
  + Horowitz notes, and its is clear, that this is not far off some Horowitz’s own suggestions in the original paper
  + Where Horowitz differs, is in not seeing this close relationship with Britain as devoid of ideological motivation or ideological meaning
* Some readers of the 1966 paper saw it as an attempt to explain the nature of Cdn political parties and of the party system in ideological terms
* According to Winn et al., Horowitz argued that “philosophical differences” are “more important than social cleavages on the input side”
  + That is, that liberal, tory, and socialist ideas are more important than class, religion, ethnicity, etc, in accounting for the existence of parties
* Horowitz states that “what Winn et al. have refuted is, of course, a gross oversimplification, almost a travesty, of [his original] argument, which was not an ideological or any other kind of explanation on the separate identities of the major parties”
  + “Ideology is not the cause of policy, but there is no such thing as a ‘non-ideological response.’ Policies must be legitimated; they must at the very least be defensible as not in conflict with accepted ideas”
* With regards to the comparison of English Canada and the US, it would be refutation of Hartzian theory to show that attitudes distinctly tory, or attitudes shared by toryism, socialism, and reform liberalism are evinced by as many Americans (proportionately) as Anglophone Cdns, for 4 reasons:

1. Attitudes distinctively tory (hierarchical, aristocratic) are dying everywhere, even in Britain
2. Attitudes common to toryism and socialism may be dying in English Canada as a result of the process of Americanization
3. In contradistinction to (2), attitudes shared by toryism and socialism my be gaining strength in the US and in other bourgeois fragments as a result of the opening of the fragments to the world
4. Survey research is not useless, but it is not the best method of testing the Hartzian theory. Survey research yields isolated responses to questionnaire items, whereas the Hartzian approach deals with the totality of the hx of the ideological outlook of a person or group, studied in a comparative way, in its pan-Western setting. It is impossible to over-emphasize the importance of the holistic, dialectical, and comparative qualities of the Hartzian approach

* Like most interesting social theories, Hartz’s is to be validated not primarily by the application of behaviourist technology, but by the extent to which his theory illuminated the phenomena

**Conclusions**

For Horowitz, the understanding of the Peron phenomenon (in Argentina) that is yielded by the fragment theory is as good a validation as any “empirical” test. Not survey research, but the Owl of Minerva, will have the last word.