

Chapter 1 : Symbolic Politics | New Internationalist

A symbolic politics approach contends that the meanings policy proposals convey, and the audiences they attract, may matter more than whether they become law. Yet, we know little about the sociopolitical conditions prompting.

Ready to fight back? Sign up for Take Action Now and get three actions in your inbox every week. You can read our Privacy Policy here. Thank you for signing up. For more from The Nation, check out our latest issue. Support Progressive Journalism The Nation is reader supported: Travel With The Nation Be the first to hear about Nation Travels destinations, and explore the world with kindred spirits. Sign up for our Wine Club today. Did you know you can support The Nation by drinking wine? I grew up believing there would never be a black president of the United States. Not only was I proven wrong, but it happened when I was just barely old enough to legally buy liquor, melting away some of the cynicism that had shaped my political identity up to that point. The country had changed. President Obama is a symbol of that progress. Obama did what he does best: He told a story of the America in which the country is always becoming better. Because symbols, as powerful as they can be in some respects, are largely a distraction. President Obama perhaps even more than usual, because his symbolism as the first black president made the country even more unwilling to deal with its legacy of racism, having satisfied itself with the progress made by electing Obama. None of this has anything to do with Obama himself. Any black person who entered this office at this time would have produced a similar effect. Those who argue for the power of symbolic politics often say that a political leader who represents a marginalized community is more likely to prioritize their needs, but the Obama presidency produced more rhetoric about rising tides lifting all boats than redress around specific racist injury. We were told this would be more effective. We needed a movement to wake us up from that delusion. Nowhere in that vision was an articulation of how the United States can uproot racism. Rather, he appeared uninterested. To fail to elevate the discourse happening around racism and white supremacy right now to the level of importance implied in the State of the Union—the last one he will deliver—says something of how he regards it. Symbols will always disappoint. Obama is a complicated symbol, though, because he is such an impressive man on his own merits. The Obama presidency is proof enough. To get beyond progress, to create the kind of transformational change we need, we have to start by questioning the very core of what has built the American identity. But she will carry with her the hopes of symbolism her politics will not be able to live up to. She will, as Obama has, as every president does, disappoint on a number of fronts, but her ascendance to the position of president will still be lauded as progress. To submit a correction for our consideration, click here. For Reprints and Permissions, click here. Comment 1 Leave a Comment In order to comment, you must be logged in as a paid subscriber.

Chapter 2 : Indian Political Parties and their Leaders and Symbols

A symbolic politics approach contends that the meanings policy proposals convey, and the audiences they attract, may matter more than whether they become law. Yet, we know little about the sociopolitical conditions prompting lawmakers to engage in symbolic politics.

Jorge Nef looks at how terrorist actions alter the political environment and may pave the way to a right-wing backlash. But the word has always been shrouded in discomforting ambiguity. It connotes both something evil and immoral as well as a feeling of uncontrollable, earthshaking fear. In its basic sense, terrorism is the management, or politics, of scare-mongering. Its logic is fairly simple. It aims to create obedience or disobedience by profoundly altering the political frame of reference and circumstances of human behaviour through acute fear and uncertainty. Terrorism has been used by movements of the right, left and centre. It has been employed by nationalists, anarchists, authoritarians; by insurgents opposing a particular government and by governments opposing supposed threats to state security. But there is much more to terrorism than the use of scare tactics as a political technique. The essence of terrorism is that it is always related to semantics and psychological warfare. It is a form of symbolic politics, a sticky label used to delegitimize and erode an opponents objectives, morals or credibility. Likewise, an act of terrorism like a bombing or torture is meant to convey a brutal and immoral symbolism. To a large extent all politics is intended to provoke either mass arousal on one hand or quiescence on the other. Terrorism is unique because it is almost entirely in the realm of posturing and theatrics. In this sense, doing the unthinkable, committing especially callous and immoral acts, is oriented to achieve maximum effect: There is always an enormous discrepancy between the actual military damage resulting from a terrorist outrage and its wider psychological effects. The number of terrorist casualties on a global scale averages a few hundred yearly - a tiny fraction of those killed by common crime, not to mention conventional warfare. However, the political impact of a single terrorist act, for instance the hijacking of the Achille Lauro cruise ship, is far-reaching. The immediate target and the ultimate target are not the same. Terrorism by governments can range from the assassination of dissidents Benigno Aquino in the Philippines or Father Popieluszke in Poland to the disappearances and torture so common throughout Latin America. In both cases the goal is to increase obedience by the larger population. Especially in the case of insurgent terrorism there is an unwitting but symbiotic relationship between terrorists and the media. A barbarous and dramatic deed, such as a hostage-taking, or a skyjacking, is ideal media fodder. So is the attempt at a rescue. The multiplier takes effect: Although there may seem to be a fairly rational relationship between political ends and terrorist means, terrorist methods are rarely rational. Nor do they always succeed in their political purposes. The historical evidence is mixed. The use of terrorism in Israel, Algeria, Kenya or Cyprus was successfully combined with other forms of national struggle. However, terror also seems to precede the collapse of dictators like the Shah in Iran or Ferdinand Marcos in the Philippines. Advert Revolutionary terrorism appears even less successful. There is not a single instance where insurgents have been able to bring about social revolution through terror. Usually the effect is exactly the opposite - government repression increases. Terrorism is inherently political. It is about power - the influence over the actions of individuals and groups within a given system of rules. However, by altering these rules through violent, disorienting behaviour, terrorists force their targets to operate within a radically altered environment This constitutes a more pervasive form of power, what some analysts call metapower - the ability to manipulate an outcome in the power game by altering the very language of politics. In this context of semantics, terrorism is an attempt to use fear and violence to alter meaning. But there is another more elusive and more important aspect that also needs to be explored: Terrorism is more than a fact, it is also being turned into an ideological tool by the New Right Terrorism and counter-terrorism are broader, more appealing labels to substitute for the old Cold War slogans. Propagandists like Claire Sterling, Robert Moss and Arnaud de Borchgrave have helped shape a view of a global terrorist conspiracy which portrays each and every one of us at bay. This perspective has become the norm in Washington. President Reagan emphasizes dark, satanic, evil forces behind all terrorism and even domestic dissent and moral anarchy. This friend-or-foe approach is

already explicit in the rhetoric of the New Right and of Mr Reagan himself. In this updated but more encompassing version of s anti-communism, the logic of terrorism has come full circle. Once accepted as a thesis, the diagnosis of the terrorist disease is simple. The cause is the collapse of moral authority; and so the solution is the creation of an all-encompassing national security regime to restore authority at home and abroad. True, terrorism and terrorist organizations do exist and they do pose a danger. But the whole world is not at bay. Nor is civilization in more danger from terrorism than from Third World poverty or nuclear arms. The greatest danger is not terrorism itself but the inability to recognize that there are as many causes of terrorism as there are political strains. That is the main problem with the present Western line on counter-terrorism. The solutions proffered are all technical, meeting force with force - and they are far from neutral. They reflect an implicit ideological bias. The technical is given pre-eminence over the political, the tactical over the strategic. Rambo-type action rather than creative thought have been paramount Likewise, the general emphasis has been on containment rather than on prevention, which always carries with it the above-mentioned logic of escalation and the body-counts of tit-for-tat This pattern has already been established in the Middle East, while the American actions in Libya clearly imply a cycle of spiralling retaliation. This self-fulfilling prophecy, in turn, legitimizes the moral enterprise of the anti-terrorist establishment, making terror truly systemic. Even from a purely technical viewpoint and leaving aside the perilous effects on civil liberties national-security packages generally encourage rather than deter terrorism. Only a serious effort to understand the causes of terrorism can provide enlightened ways of controlling and stopping it. But you might be having the wool pulled over your eyes. Each month the NI invites one author to justify their style of argument. You equate insurgent terrorism with state terrorism. But are they really the same thing? On the contrary, state terrorism and state-sponsored acts of violence are undoubtedly part of the same problem as insurgent terrorism, By excluding these, which quantitatively and qualitatively are the most important aspects of terrorism we are not only making the definition less precise, but also accepting the absurd and biased proposition that only insurgent terrorism threatens our lives and is morally unacceptable. In fact, by failing to address the complexity of the issue, we end up accepting an Orwellian-type half-truth. Far from obscuring our understanding, I feel that a concept such as metapower serves to add clarity and precision to the analysis. By adhering to a more conventional discourse we may end up losing the richness of reality or describing things inappropriately. I think that terrorism changes the routine of political interaction by creating a profoundly altered political and psychological environment. Name dropping might impress some people. But how can we believe your charges about right-wing propagandists without proof? By now it should be clear that the anti-terrorism industry and the myriad think tanks related to it reflect a very slanted view of the world. They are involved in the production and propagation of an explicit ideology of national security. A simple look at their publications will make this point. What are we supposed to do in the mean time? I am not saying that containment is a waste of time and that it should be abandoned. I am saying, however, that containment without a clear understanding of the problem and the existence of a clear preventative policy is of little use. Fire-fighting without fire prevention is almost a losing proposition. Most of the literature on terrorism tends to over-emphasize a standard containment package which I see as most dangerous to democratic liberties. It is a typical case of having a solution before asking probing questions about the problem to be solved. This article is from the July issue of New Internationalist. You can access the entire archive of over issues with a digital subscription. Please support us with a small recurring donation so we can keep it free to read online.

Chapter 3 : List of ideological symbols - Wikipedia

Note: Citations are based on reference standards. However, formatting rules can vary widely between applications and fields of interest or study. The specific requirements or preferences of your reviewing publisher, classroom teacher, institution or organization should be applied.

Substantive Representation [3] Formalistic views of representation identify political representation with the formal procedures e. Pitkin distinguishes two formalistic views on political representation - the authorization and accountability views. Under the authorization view, a representative is an individual who has been authorized to act on the behalf of another or a group of others. Theorists who take the accountability view argue that a representative is an individual who will be held to account. The descriptive and symbolic views of political representation according to Pitkin describe the ways in which political representatives "stand for" the people they represent. Descriptive representatives "stand for" to the extent that they resemble, in their descriptive characteristics e. Hence Pitkin proposes a substantive view of representation. In this view of political representation, representation is defined as substantive "acting for", by representatives, the interests of the people they represent. Mansbridge argues that each of these views provides an account of both how democratic political representatives "act for" the people they represent and the normative criteria for assessing the actions of representatives. For Mansbridge, promissory representation, preoccupied with how representatives are chosen authorized and held to account through elections, is the traditional view of democratic political representation. Anticipatory, surrogate and gyroscopic representation, on the other hand, are more modern views that have emerged from the work of empirical political scientists. Anticipatory representatives take actions that they believe voters the represented will reward in the next election. Surrogate representation occurs when representatives "act for" the interest of people outside their constituencies. Finally, in gyroscopic representation, representatives use their own judgements to determine how and for what they should act for on behalf of the people they represent. This is not to say that Rehfeld argues that democratic political representatives can be representatives without being elected or be said to represent the represented without substantively acting for their interests, they do. Rather, Rehfeld only seeks to point out that political representation is not limited to the democratic case. The rules by which a relevant audience judges whether or not a person is a representative can be either democratic or non-democratic. In a case where the selection agent , relevant audience and the represented are the same and the rules of judgment are democratic e. Burke[edit] British politician Edmund Burke in his Speech to the Electors at Bristol at the Conclusion of the Poll was noted for his articulation of the principles of representation against the notion that elected officials should be delegates who exactly mirror the opinions of the electorate: It ought to be the happiness and glory of a representative to live in the strictest union, the closest correspondence, and the most unreserved communication with his constituents. Their wishes ought to have great weight with him; their opinion, high respect; their business, unremitting attention. It is his duty to sacrifice his repose, his pleasures, his satisfactions, to theirs; and above all, ever, and in all cases, to prefer their interest to his own. But his unbiased opinion, his mature judgment, his enlightened conscience, he ought not to sacrifice to you, to any man, or to any set of men living. These he does not derive from your pleasure; no, nor from the law and the constitution. They are a trust from Providence, for the abuse of which he is deeply answerable. Your representative owes you, not his industry only, but his judgment; and he betrays, instead of serving you, if he sacrifices it to your opinion. These interests are largely economic or associated with particular localities whose livelihood they characterize, in his over-all prosperity they involve. This is not always practical for historical and current political reasons, and sometimes is impractical purely on the basis of logistics, as in regions where travel is difficult and distances are long[citation needed]. The shortened term "rep-by-pop" is used in Britain but is relatively uncommon in U. S[citation needed] Historically rep-by-pop is the alternative to rep-by-area. However, in the colonial countries, the geographic realities made a necessity of low-population electoral districts in order to give meaningful representation to remote communities, and only in urban and suburban areas has there been any success with applying rep-by-pop more or less evenly[citation needed] In the United

States and other democracies, typically the lower house of a bicameral two-chamber system is based on population—more or less—while the upper House is based on area. Or, as it might be put in the United Kingdom, on title to land, as was originally the case with the old pre-Reforms House of Lords. Representation by area[edit] The principle of rep-by-pop, when brought in and promoted publicly, removed many archaic seats in the British House of Commons although some northern and rural counties necessarily still have variably lower populations than most urban ridings. Former British colonies like Canada and Australia also have rural and wilderness areas spanning tens of thousands of square miles, with fewer voters in them than a tiny urban-core riding. In the most extreme case, one riding of the Canadian parliament covers more than 2 million square kilometres , Nunavut , yet has less than one third the average number of voters for a riding, with a population of about 30, Making the riding larger would be difficult for the elected member, as well as for campaigning and also unfair to remotely rural constituents, whose concerns are radically different from those of the medium-sized towns that typically dominate the electorate in such ridings. The American Constitution has built into it a series of compromises between rep-by-pop and rep-by-area: In Canada, provinces such as Prince Edward Island have unequal representation in Parliament in the Commons as well as the Senate relative to Ontario, British Columbia, and Alberta, partly for historical reasons, partly because those electoral allotments are constitutionally guaranteed, and partly because governments have simply chosen to under-represent certain voters and over-represent others. In the United States, Baker v. The area of the riding was about the size of New Brunswick and Nova Scotia combined, and larger than many American states. In practicality, the voters of the tiny communities scattered across the subarctic landscape, less than the population of a city block, had as much electoral clout as two Fraser Valley municipalities totaling up to 60, in population. The population imbalance between largely rural areas and overwhelmingly urban areas is one reason why the realities of representation by area still have sway against the ideal of representation by population. Descriptive and substantive representation[edit] This section needs additional citations for verification. Please help improve this article by adding citations to reliable sources. Unsourced material may be challenged and removed. July Learn how and when to remove this template message Under representative democracy, substantive representation in contrast to descriptive representation is the tendency of elected legislators to advocate on behalf of certain groups. Conflicting theories and beliefs exist regarding why constituents vote for representatives. Descriptive representation is the idea that elected representatives in democracies should represent not only the expressed preferences of their constituencies or the nation as a whole but also those of their descriptive characteristics that are politically relevant, such as geographical area of birth, occupation, ethnicity, or gender. Sometimes voting systems that obtain proportional representation may achieve descriptive representation as well. However this can be guaranteed only to the extent that voting patterns reflect descriptive characteristics of the voters. If a particular trait is not a concern for voters or prospective candidates for instance, eye color , then, if the system does not introduce other biases, an elected body will resemble a random sampling of the voters instead. Supporters of this argument point out that as descriptive representation increases, distrust decreases. Opponents of such logic argue that political interests as already addressed by the political system may play a larger role. Candidates who run for legislative office in an individual constituency or as a member of a list of party candidates are especially motivated to provide dyadic representation. The most abundant scientific scholarship on dyadic representation has been for the U. Congress and for policy representation of constituencies by the members of the Congress. Miller and Stokes presented the seminal research of this kind in an exploratory effort to account for when alternative models of policy representation arise. Their work has been emulated, replicated, and enlarged by a host of subsequent studies. The most advanced theoretical formulation in this body of work, however, is by Hurley and Hill and by Hill, Jordan, and Hurley who present a theory that accounts well for when belief sharing representation, delegate representation, trustee representation, responsible party representation, and party elite led representation will arise. Collective representation[edit] The concept of collective representation can be found in various normative theory and scientific works, but Weissberg , offered the first systematic characterization of it in the scientific literature and for the U. Stimson, MacKuen, and Erikson , offer the most advanced theoretical exposition of such representation for the U. And the latter work was extended in Erikson,

MacKuen, and Stimson In most Parliamentary political systems with strong or ideologically unified political parties and where the election system is dominated by parties instead of individual candidates, the primary basis for representation is also a collective, party based one. The foundational work on assessing such representation is that of Huber and Powell and Powell

Chapter 4 : Political Symbols

The Seductive Danger of Symbolic Politics The Seductive Danger of Symbolic Politics Symbols, as powerful as they can be, are largely a distraction. My frustration with Obama's State of the

By Sara Groves This story is featured in Montana Outdoors March-April issue How do you represent to the rest of the world a state like Montana, with its diverse landscape, plants, animals, and people? Montanans have been trying for nearly yearsâ€”from the creation of our state seal in to recent but unsuccessful efforts to designate an official Montana state pancake. Symbols have been promoted by schoolchildren, garden clubs, legislators, and others. Some were decided via statewide vote, others were picked by the legislature, and a few just sort of snuck in. Each symbol tells an interesting story about Montana to the rest of the world. Even more interesting are the stories of how Montanans selected these particular symbols over other popular candidates. Committee chairman Frank M. Underneath, as a motto, the words Oro el Plata. The Seal shall be two inches in diameter and surrounded by these words: That same year Governor Sidney Edgerton signed a bill approving the territorial seal. Thompson sent a crude sketch to an engraver, who produced the seal with a bison on the banks of the Missouri River, as per the wishes of the territorial delegates. The seal was to be shared by the governor and the territorial secretary. However, in enterprising Secretary James Callaway decided to augment his salary by charging to affix the seal to documents. He took physical possession of the seal, forcing Governor Benjamin Franklin Potts to commission a new one, which ended up without a bison, to use on newly issued territorial bonds and other documents. Over the next year, both men used their respective seals on territorial papers. Six years later, delegates decided to have that seal destroyed and commission a new one, which was entrusted to the territorial secretary. In an engraver replacing the worn-out seal changed the mountains, removed the clouds, added trees, and put the sun in the sunset position. He moved the trees, altered the Great Falls and the Missouri River, and redesigned the mountains. Brown, a distinguished professor, fisheries researcher, and author of Fishes of Montana. Utah is the laughing stock of ichthyologists and fish biologists and sportsmen for designating the rainbow trout the state fish, which is native only to the Pacific coast states and is a true exotic to Utah. Just as this fish requires a quality habitat if he is to survive, Montanans as a people are striving for a quality of life already lost in many parts of this nation. Students voted in a primary election and narrowed their choices to the grizzly bear and the elk. The general election was scheduled for a month later. Students across Montana heard an earful from the two campaigns on why they should vote one way or the other. Adults also weighed in. Others opposed the grizzly because it was a predator and had only a few years earlier been given federal protection under the Endangered Species Act, which ended grizzly hunting and closed some trails and roads. More than 1, children attended the grizzly bear designation hearings, and the bill passed by wide margins in both houses. Governor Ted Schwinden, decked out in a grizzly cap, signed the bill into law in Zacek, a range conservationist with the Soil Conservation Service, mention that Montana had no state grass, even though 75 percent of the landmass was composed of rangeland. Hagener wrote to Zacek that a local community development group she chaired might be interested in promoting an official state grass. She asked which native grass would best qualify: Zacek replied that blue gamma was not highly regarded by ranchers. The legislative body complied in Ponderosa pine forests, found throughout Montana, are highly valued for their commercial timber. Ponderosa pine forests are used by a wide range of wildlife, including birds such as western tanagers and great horned owls, and mammals such as grizzly bears and mule deer. This tree also helped build the West, supplying timber for mine braces, railroad ties, and residential homes. But not until , after a yearlong campaign by the Montana Federation of Garden Clubs on behalf of the ponderosa, did the legislature finally make the designation official. Peterson and schoolchildren wrote letters to Governor Ted Schwinden, legislators, and other schools in Montana. They wrote songs and stories and made and distributed brochures and T-shirts. The House unanimously passed the bill in February The Senate passed it after debating whether the Tyrannosaurus rex would be more appropriate. A few weeks later, the governor visited Livingston to sign the state fossil bill. But sixth-graders twice in one year? Well, why risk it? Many people denounced the oddly shaped forb. It has no stem. But 3,

Montanans disagreed, and that year they made the bitterroot the clear winner in a statewide contest. The evening primrose and the wild rose took distant second and third places with and votes, respectively. The melodic prairie bird was first recorded for science by the explorer on June 22, , when the Corps of Discovery portaged around the Great Falls of the Missouri River. The following year, the state legislature made it official. In several lawmakers proposed to replace the meadowlark with the magpie. They argued, unsuccessfully, that unlike the songbird, which flies south each fall for warmer climes, the magpie stays in Montana year-round and is more deserving of the state bird honor. But it didâ€™at least for one state representative. In all members of the Montana House except Representative Brad Newman voted to make the mourning cloak the state butterfly. The mourning cloak is a handsome insect. Its wings of dark brown the color of mourning cloaks once worn to funerals are edged in bright blue and yellow. Newman took issue with the blue and yellow, which he believed too closely resembled the school colors of Montana State University. Sara Groves, Helena, is a writer and the marketing and communications coordinator for the Montana State Library.

Chapter 5 : The Seductive Danger of Symbolic Politics | The Nation

Symbolic politics Beneath the brutality, the posturing and the theatrics of a kidnapping or a hostage-taking is a subtle political process. Jorge Nef looks at how terrorist actions alter the political environment and may pave the way to a right-wing backlash.

Chapter 6 : Symbolic Power, Politics, and Intellectuals: The Political Sociology of Pierre Bourdieu, Swartz

"In Symbolic Power, Politics, and Intellectuals, David Swartz makes a convincing case that the social theory of Pierre Bourdieu is indispensable for understanding politics. Swartz helpfully outlines Bourdieu's distinctive contribution to the study of power, the political field, and the state, and offers a rich account of Bourdieu's view.

Chapter 7 : The Symbolic Uses of Politics - Murray Jacob Edelman - Google Books

We use cookies to make interactions with our website easy and meaningful, to better understand the use of our services, and to tailor advertising.

Chapter 8 : Monuments, schools and holidays: 1, symbols of the Confederacy in the US - CNNPolitics

Political symbolism is symbolism that is used to represent a political standpoint. The symbolism can occur in various media including banners, acronyms, pictures, flags, mottos, and countless more.

Chapter 9 : Representation (politics) - Wikipedia

The symbolic nature of political discourses and political emblems are of course open to manipulation, which is often referred to as image politics. In fact the Canadian media theorist Marshall McLuhan proposed that "Politics will eventually be replaced by imagery.