

## **C-5 Expanding the Definition of International Studies: Contending Perspectives for Understanding the World**

Chair: **Mary Ann Tétreault**, Trinity University [moontyger@earthlink.net](mailto:moontyger@earthlink.net)

### **ABSTRACT:**

In a graph drawn by an economist, the important thing to note is where the lines cross. As a world region, the Middle East it is the place where many key geopolitical lines cross. The papers on this panel look at the intersection of domestic and global politics in two Middle Eastern states, Kuwait and Turkey. Both countries have strong Islamist movements whose impact on domestic governance continues to grow. Kuwait has been the target of external as well as internal pressures to open its economy and political system, while Turkey has made a strong bid for membership in the European Union that has mobilized key domestic constituencies on both sides. How these issues are resolved will be important elements in determining the future of how governments and populations in this pivotal world region engage with the west — and the rest.

**George Cox**, Georgia Southern University [gcox@georgiasouthern.edu](mailto:gcox@georgiasouthern.edu)

The Use of Political Parables in the Novels of Jose Saramago

### **ABSTRACT:**

This paper examines the use of political parables in the novels of Jose Saramago, using a story as a means of analyzing social institutions. A story teller uses a parable or allegory to lift experience out of the distracting context of a particular place and time. In this sense, the imagination creates a context for the characters that is more real than the mundane reality of everyday life. In the modern novel *Aegypt* (Bantam, 1987), the novelist John Crowley has a young professor note that “Stories are what the history not made out of time is made of.” The moral of a story is made clearer once irrelevant circumstances are stripped away. Saramago’s work has been critically acclaimed; he was awarded the Nobel Prize in Literature in 1998. His stories contain vivid imagery; each builds a simplified but compelling world of its own. The experiences of characters reveal the ways in which society’s institutions try to corrupt the human spirit. The four novels selected for this analysis are *Blindness*, 1995; *All the Names*, 1997; *The Cave*, 2000; and *Seeing*, 2004. The characters and situations portrayed in Saramago’s narratives provide intimate glimpses of life, and in the process the reader becomes immersed in the politics of an imaginary world.

**Russell E. Lucas**, Florida International University [lucasr@fiu.edu](mailto:lucasr@fiu.edu)

Form Versus Function in Middle East Regime Types

### **ABSTRACT:**

Scholars labor amidst definitional confusion when analyzing the various types of authoritarianism in the Arab world. A variety of conceptualizations of authoritarianism indicate that politics in the Middle East is far from monolithic. However such diversity also hinders making meaningful generalizations about the survival of authoritarian regimes and the prospects for democracy. In some respects, scholars of Latin American and Eastern Europe have encountered similar problems in clarifying regime types. Thus, this paper seeks to clarify some of the major debates between definitions of authoritarianism derived from the institutional form of the state and definitions based on the functioning of those institutions. The paper argues that the institutional form of the state creates the conditions that both enable and constrain certain patterns of regime behavior. While most functions remain possibilities under certain types of forms, the probability of their likelihood vary. Secondly, scholars generally treat institutional forms as categorical variables - at the most basic level republican or monarchical (but with further distinction possible). In contrast, scholars measure regime behavior on a continuum from liberalized (or even democratized) to fully repressive. However, recent (and probable) hereditary succession in the republics of Syria, Egypt and Libya has led to the notion of "presidential monarchies." Should we be thinking of institutional forms as a continuum as well? While more theoretical and conceptual in approach, the paper makes recourse to empirical examples from the range of Arab states from Morocco to Yemen.

**Daniel Kuthy**, Georgia State University [dkuthy1@student.gsu.edu](mailto:dkuthy1@student.gsu.edu)

Power, Legitimacy, and International Institutions

### **ABSTRACT:**

Power is vital to the shape of state actions and the nature of the international system. Most theorists across the spectrum of international relations hold this assertion true. Even constructivists will not deny the existence of power; rather they will dispute its construction, understanding, and utility. However, as beneficial as power is in achieving one's goals, it can also pose a threat to others. In 1939 E.H. Carr wrote that legitimacy cannot exist without power, but no power can survive in the long-term without legitimacy. Sixty years later, Ikenberry wrote that institutions serve as a vehicle to bind and legitimize the power. This essay focuses on the relationship between power and legitimacy in the framework of international institutions. Institutionalist will argue that by granting legitimacy to international actors, institutions increase cooperation and limit conflict. Beyond this, international institutions at times can even play a role in granting or revoking the very sovereignty of states- their most basic form of legitimacy to the outside world. This paper examines how legitimacy is created and defined, as well as the question of how institutions utilize the power of international actors to create and support a general concept of legitimacy in the state system. It further looks at how legitimacy is used to promote small and large states' interests. This paper provides a glimpse into the complicated mechanism of institutions, where the concepts of legitimacy and power interact in the current configuration of international environment.

**Jeffrey Meiser**, The Johns Hopkins University [jmeiser1@jhu.edu](mailto:jmeiser1@jhu.edu)

Memories of War: Civil War Theory and the American Civil War

**ABSTRACT:**

During recent debates over the severity of the conflict in Iraq, several public intellectuals and Bush administration officials have cited the American Civil War to support their respective positions. These comments suggest that important opinion makers and policy makers see the American Civil War as a useful point of reference for understanding contemporary internal conflicts. This assumption is supported by a current push to integrate the study of 'old' and 'new' civil wars (see Kalyvas 2004). Using a 'most likely' method of comparison, I show that current theories of the causes of civil wars do not effectively explain the causes of one of the most important 'old' civil wars, the United States Civil War, 1860-1865. This finding has theoretical and policy relevance. First, unlike international relations theory, theories of internal war are time-bound. It is striking that modern theories of internal war cannot explain one of the most important civil wars of the past 200 years. Second, policy makers and analysts should not allow the memory of the American experience with internal conflict affect their understanding of current civil wars. Viewing modern civil wars through the lens of the American Civil War obfuscates more than it clarifies. Finally, this paper helps build bridges between the disciplines of political science and history as well as the sub-disciplines of international relations and American politics.

Discussant: **Mary Ann Tétreault**, Trinity University