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Vipond, Robert. Introduction: The Comparative Turn in Canadian Political Science.

Q1: Why was Canadian political science so introspective in the mid- to late twentieth century?

1. Canadian political science has long been dominated by the study of federalism + federalism scholarship was preoccupied with the ongoing crisis of national unity
2. Anti-americanism
3. The methods/preoccupations of American political science + comparative politics were not particularly helpful/useful in illuminating the core puzzles of Canadian politics

Q2: What has changed?

1. increasingly comparative approach to framing questions of Canadian politics
2. Canada continues not to attract much attention from non-Canadians

Q3 Why?

1. Canadian federalism is acknowledged to be stable
2. Fruitful marriage between federalism studies and political theory
3. Decrease of anti-americanism
4. Demographic/sociological changes (pluralism, multi-nationalism…)
5. Comparative politics has become more hospitable to Canadian intellectual tendencies (e.g. rise of institutional, ideational, and historical approaches…)

Montpetit, Éric. A Quantitative Analysis of the Comparative Turn in Canadian Political Science.

Goal: better understand the extent to which Canadian political science has taken a comparative turn (between 1985 and 2005)

2005: 898 full-time professors in Canadian political science departments + schools of public administration and policy.

Main conclusions:

* Canadian political scientists publish more in journals of foreign origin now than in the past (more than 2 times more after 1995 than before)
* Publishing in journals of foreign origins increases the diffusion potential of an article significantly
* Canadian publications in journals of foreign origin are effectively diffused to wider audiences

Cairns, Alan C. Conclusion : Are we on the right track?

Historically, we were at best “takers” of comparative theory and methods, not “makers”. This has changed. Canadian politics can now be seen as more of a giver than it formerly was… but the overall picture is disappointing. Area where Canadian scholars have made the greatest contribution: theorising justice and ethnocultural diversity (Carens, Kymlicka, Taylor, Tully)

Mid-1970s’: big debate about the “americanisation” of Canadian political science. Cairns (representatively) strongly favoured the autonomy of Canadian political science

Today: scarcely a hint of concern about any undue influence from American political science.

1960s’: political science established its own journal and professional association (e.g. CJPS, 1968)

Enduring theme: Canadian political science is a nationalist one

Robinson, Andrew. Is Canadian multiculturalism parochial? Canadian contributions to theorising justice and ethnocultural diversity.

If Canadian political scientists are more “takers”, Canadian political philosophers: clearly participants (takers and givers) in international debates (Taylor, Kymlicka, Tully, Carens…)

To what extent are Taylor’s, Kymlicka’s…. Canadian answers to Canadian questions applicable outside the Canadian context? These philosophers have taken the comparative turn, testing the applicability of their theories abroad, and amending their conclusions accordingly.

Accommodation of Quebec, Aboriginal peoples, immigrants, gays…. On the one hand, the fact that these theorists, working from a variety of foundational assumptions, have provided justifications for the more settled aspects of the Canadian model (amended bill 101) speaks to its potential universality. On the other hand, the fact that sustaining this support has sometimes required innovations to reconcile theory to practice raises doubts about the generalisability of both the Canadian model and these theories. (50-51)

Banting, Keith. Canada as a counternarrative: multiculturalism, recognition, and redistribution.

Progressive’s dilemma: how can we reconcile growing levels of multicultural diversity and the sense of a common identity that sustains the norms of mutual support and underpins a generous welfare state?

OECD countries: (1) no relationship between the proportion of the population born outside the country and growth in social spending over the last two decades of the 20th century. (2) Countries with large increases in the proportion of their population born outside the country tended to have smaller increases in social spending. The negative relationship is heavily influenced by the experience of 3 countries: the Netherlands, the United States and New Zealand.

There is no evidence of a systematic tendency for multiculturalism policies to weaken the welfare state. (Countries that adopted such programs did not experience an erosion of their welfare states or even slower growth in social spending than countries that resisted such programs).

US: politics of race: American exceptionalism. (the relationship between welfare and ethnic diversity in the US may not be generalised). Canada offers a more optimistic narrative.

The larger the presence of visible minorities in the neighbourhood, the less trusting is the majority even when one controls for other factors that influence trust levels, such as economic well-being, education, gender and age. Members of racial minorities, in contrast, are much less trusting when the majority is very dominant, and their levels of trust rise slowly with the ethnic diversity of their neighbourhood.

Yet, virtually no relationship between ethnicity and the ethnic complexion of neighbourhoods on the one hand, and support for social programs on the other.

Haddow, Rodney. How Can Comparative Political Economy Explain Variable Change? Lessons for, and from, Canada.

Three typologies of capitalist democracies:

1. Gosta Esping-Andersen’s welfare-state typology: conservative, liberal, social-democrat
2. Peter Hall and David Soskice’s production regime typology: co-ordinated market economies and liberal market economies.
3. Herbert Kitschelt’s party-system typology: multiparty system, left-party hegemony, two-party systems

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Production regime | Welfare state | Party system | Membership | Potential for neoliberal retrenchment |
| Liberal market economy | Liberal | Two-party; polarised | Anglo-saxon nations | High |
| Erstwhile nationally co-ordinated CME | Social-democratic | One party dominant: left | Scandinavia | High |
| Industry co-ordinated CME | Conservative | Three party: catholic, social-democratic, liberal | Northern Europe | Low |