



IAPSS

A large, faint, light blue circular graphic of a globe is centered in the background, showing the outlines of continents. The globe is semi-transparent, allowing the text to be clearly visible over it.

Politikon

the IAPSS Journal of Political Science



2414-6633

Volume 43: December 2019

ISSN 2414-6633

<https://doi.org/10.22151/politikon.43>

Editorial Board

Editor-in-Chief: Max Steuer (Slovakia)

Deputy Editor-in-Chief: Rafael Plancarte (Mexico)

Karla Drpić (Croatia)

Ana Magdalena Figueroa (Brazil)

Dana Rice (Australia)

Emmanuelle Rousseau (France)

Gergana Tzvetkova (Bulgaria)

Editorial Assistants

Cláudia Susana Rodrigues de Araújo
(Portugal)

Andressa Liegi Vieira Costa (Brazil)

Andrew Devine (USA)

Julia Jakus (USA)

Damla Keşkekci (Turkey)

Jesslene Lee (Singapore)

Spyridon Parthenis (Greece)

Eszter Sággy (Hungary)

Kamila Suchomel (Czech Republic
/ USA)

Bruna Veríssimo (Brazil)

Table of Contents

Editorial Note4

Articles

A Behavioural Approach to International Climate Negotiations: An Analysis of Latin American Strategies from Berlin to Paris / *Verónica Gutman*.....7

Tunisia's Institutional Change after the Revolution: Politics, Institutions and Change Agents / *Luigi Cino*.....32

Polytropic Socrates' Implicit Defence of Philosophy: Lying, Justice, and Sophistry in Plato's Lesser Hippias / *Samantha Trudeau*50

The Contemporary Turkish Government, Ideological Strategies and the Symbolic: A Psychoanalytic Approach to the Contemporary Politics of Turkey / *Yankı Doruk Doğanay*.....65

Book Review

Identity: Contemporary Identity Politics and the Struggle for Recognition by Francis Fukuyama / *Joshua Makalintal*86

Editorial Note

<https://doi.org/10.22151/politikon.43.0>

The discipline of Political Science is mature enough to celebrate anniversaries. This year, the International Political Science Association (IPSA, a prime partner of the publisher of *IAPSS Politikon*) celebrates its 70th anniversary; next year, the European Consortium for Political Research (ECPR, another important partner organization of IAPSS) celebrates 50 years since its foundation. There is, furthermore, a rich array of national disciplinary associations of various age and stages of development worldwide. This could indicate that the discipline is thriving and that its impact and relevance has grown over the last decades. At the same time, a number of criticisms have emerged especially against the very narrow specializations that may occasionally prevent ‘seeing the forest for the trees’ and make the outputs of the research irrelevant.¹ To this, a historical criticism of the ‘dark origins’ of the discipline can be added: in the United States at least, political science emerged as a discipline that had endorsed racist prejudices and practices, and many political scientists of the early 20th century were trained in ‘scholarship’ supportive of such positions. Some of them even contributed to the engineering of legislation hostile to various, especially racial, minorities, as pointed out by the Past President of the American Political Science Association (Smith, 2019).²

Few if any discipline explicitly include the study of justice, freedom, equality or (gradually and especially after the mid-20th century) human rights. Yet, it would perhaps be too much to expect that a discipline may emerge as resilient to the prevailing modes of the times in which it operates. Ralf Dahrendorf’s statement on the challenge of building a civil society as opposed to formal institutions and an economic system is well-known.³ Could his statement be applied to political science as a discipline? Creating written rules and bodies that aim to be standard-setters of the discipline is challenging but may be accomplished in a relatively short time. Creating a disciplinary *discourse*, present in specialized publications, regular meetings and other formats requires a more long-term commitment. Yet, it is the embedding of the scholarly discourse into the broader *public discourse* and the development of meaningful interactions within and beyond the scholarly circles that poses the most serious challenges, especially if the incentives from within the discipline do not necessarily require or encourage such interactions.⁴

¹ There are diverse criticisms revolving around the ‘relevance’ of the discipline (relevance in itself being a concept in need of clarification). See the collection edited by Stoker, Peters, Pierre (2015). A particular take is provided by Rothstein (2015) in his chapter (also presented at the IAPSS World Congress 2017) where he argues for relevance in terms of proposing concrete solutions to ‘bad governance’ and other problems of human well-being. These more ‘practical’ notions of relevance, when read as an encouragement to focus on small-scale policy issues, are countered by scholars who assert that ‘by attempting to become more technical in the manner in which [political scientists] choose to address policy issues [they] may be denying [their] greatest claim to relevance’ (Peters, 2014: 290).

² Obviously, the history of the discipline is much more complex, not linked to the United States only, and it cannot be covered here in full. For a historical account going back to Ancient Greece, see Almond (1998).

³ ‘It takes six months to create new political institutions; to write a new constitution and electoral laws. It may take six years to create a half-way viable economy. It will probably take sixty years to create a civil society’ (1990: 42).

⁴ Polemics on these issues continue among contemporary scholars and they would benefit from a more elaborate scrutiny than the selective overview presented in this Note.

By upholding its general focus instead of identifying a gap in the existing set of specialized publications, and by speaking to the political science student community, *IAPSS Politikon* aims to contribute to such discourse not only topic-wise but also by involving student and junior scholar voices with a strong interest and potential to contribute to the discussions within and beyond the narrow confines of the ‘core’ of the discipline. The current issue of the journal once again features timely contributions from different subfields. If one were to identify ‘labels’ for them, they would fall into political philosophy, public policy and the study of political institutions. Fortunately, however, all articles successfully resist the confinement to a very narrow subfield.

Thus, Verónica Gutman’s piece on the reasons why Latin American countries gradually embraced more extensive commitments of the international climate regime speaks to a range of subfields: political economy, international relations, international law and Latin American studies, to name a few. Her content analysis spanning two decades of the United Nations Climate Change Conferences generates a range of hypotheses for further research that may provide novel empirical support for theories of the influence of global governance bodies and of the transnational legal process.

Luigi Cino’s work speaks more directly to a particular theoretical account, the diverse traditions in the study of political institutions. He analyses the case of the Tunisian revolution through institutionalist lenses, trying to apply a number of typologies from existing literature in order to better understand the characteristics of the institutional change that took place after the Arab Uprisings. Again, his findings may be of interest beyond students of political institutionalisms such as constitutional scholars studying the MENA region or policy analysts of the developments in Tunisia.

Samantha Trudeau goes back to the ever-fruitful discussions of Greek philosophy, placing under scrutiny the rarely discussed (in political science at least) Plato’s dialogue ‘Lesser Hippias’. With its philosophical approach, her article maintains an interdisciplinary focus. The perhaps most relevant finding for *political* philosophy is its reconciliation of Socrates’ seemingly deceptive actions in the dialogue and his intentions that are found to be fundamentally in line with the conventional perception of Socrates as possessing deep understanding of truth and justice. The article’s interpretation makes a distinction between different audiences, thus contributing to modern studies of rhetoric as well by highlighting the dynamics of interactions between the speakers and their (often contrasting) audiences (such as Hippias and Socrates’ students). The result makes an interesting read for political communication enthusiasts as well, even more commendable in times of growing popular concerns about a ‘post-truth world’.

Lastly, Yankı Doruk Doğanay’s paper takes us geographically to Turkey and conceptually to a higher level of abstraction as it offers an unconventional analysis of the sources of support of the contemporary Turkish government. This methodology allows to uncover how several components of the Turkish political leaders’ discourse contribute to cementing their support, even though conventionally they would be seen as sources of weakness. Some of these techniques go beyond ‘mainstream’ studies of populist rhetoric and thus offer original

perspectives on how a counter-discourse with higher prospects of success (recognizing the institutional limitations caused by limited political rights) may be developed. Clearly, the paper's approach speaks to inquiries in political psychology as well as in critical theory and Turkish studies.

In addition, readers may find it stimulating to think about the review of Francis Fukuyama's new book ('Identity: Contemporary Identity Politics and the Struggle for Recognition') written by Joshua Makalintal, which assesses the book's main theses from the angle of contemporary critical theory.

The Editorial Board continues to welcome submissions to the journal on a rolling basis, noting that the 14 original articles published in the four issues of 2019 automatically enter the competition for the journal's 2020 Best Article Award. More information on that is to follow in the new year.

Max Steuer
Editor-in-Chief

References

Almond, Gabriel A. (1998): 'Political Science: The History of the Discipline', in Goodin, Robert E. and Hans-Dieter Klingemann (eds.) *A New Handbook of Political Science*. Oxford: Oxford University Press. pp. 50–96. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1093/0198294719.003.0002>

Dahrendorf, Ralf (1990): 'Has the East Joined the West?', *New Perspectives Quarterly* 7(2): pp. 41–43.

Peters, B Guy (2014): 'Further Thoughts on the Relevance of Political Science – A Response to Matthew Wood', *Politics* 34(3): pp. 287–90. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1111/1467-9256.12060>

Rothstein, Bo (2015): 'Guilty as Charged? Human Well-Being and the Unsung Relevance of Political Science', in Stoker, Gerry, B. Guy Peters and Jon Pierre (eds.) *The Relevance of Political Science*. Basingstoke & New York: Red Globe Press. pp. 84–103. DOI: https://doi.org/10.1007/978-1-137-50660-3_6

Smith, Rogers (2019): APSA President addresses Ralph Bunch Summer Institute 2019, Department of Political Science, Duke University. Accessible at: <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=gnmEtMY4SOg> (15 November 2019).

Stoker, Gerry, B. Guy Peters and Jon Pierre (eds.) (2015): *The Relevance of Political Science*. Basingstoke: Red Globe Press. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1007/978-1-137-50660-3>