

Week 10. March 30, 2017.

Alford & Friedland

DISCUSSION AGENDA

1. In the triplet game/rules/moves:
 - What really is the distinction between the “game itself” and the “rules of the game”, since isn’t a game defined by its rules? (Courtney)
 - Doesn’t socialist politics also operate at the level of rules and moves? (Janaina)
2. The three institutional logics of power: market, bureaucracy, democracy:
 - Is there any implicit hierarchy of the logics and levels of power? (Youbin)
3. The three theoretical traditions -- pluralist, managerial, class analysis:
 - A&F draw an affinity between: (1) the three traditions; (2) the three levels of analysis (system, organization, situation); and Lukes’ three faces of power. Is this affinity/correspondence justified? Is systemic power really only connected to class? (Loren)
 - Is the attempt by A&F to synthesize these three theoretical traditions successful? (Masoud)
4. A&F exclude non-Western states from the analysis. Is this justified? (Kurt)
5. Systemic power
 - Can systemic power be applied to non-class contexts like race and patriarchy? (Benny)
6. How much does it really matter whether or not we can firmly establish the “class character” of the state? (Griffin)
7. How does ideology/culture/discourse fit into the analysis? (Loren)
8. A&F’s assertion that silences about capital-labor relation indicate class hegemony (Aaron)
9. The implications of the distinction between the causes of politics and the consequences of politics. (Kris)