

X-Sender: beale@popserver.sfu.ca
Date: Mon, 15 Dec 2003 10:03:21 -0800
To: aaginam@sfu.ca, neena@sfu.ca
From: Alison Beale <beale@sfu.ca>
Subject: Arthur comp questions from Alison
Cc: yzhao@sfu.ca

Dear Arthur, as promised here are five questions, from which you should write essays on two, to be submitted to me, Zhao and Neena by 10 :30 a.m. on Wednesday Dec. 17. Good luck and I hope to speak to you before the holidays, Alison

1. You, and many critics including some you review, tend to suggest that Habermas's procedural public sphere evades the question of social differences inherent to civil society in capitalism. Is it possible to interpret this public sphere as overcoming the limitations of this civil society rather than simply denying these limitations? What aspects of Habermas's work support this argument?
2. In European-based legal systems communication is treated as property and as human right. It could be argued that this account of communication in the law ignores the fact of communication as "publicity", modeled on the "performance", (manifestations, declarations and celebrations) of the monarch's rule that both confirm and constitute that rule (this is discussed in early chapters of *The Structural Transformation of the Public Sphere*). Could it be argued that this downplaying of the communicative nature and substance of authority helps to mask the relations of power in communication, and that until the intimate association of authority with communication is accounted for no procedural public sphere, especially one that takes the discursive rules of the law as its model, can meet its own objectives?
3. As you discuss, "civil society" has many meanings, even if some critics like Kean have tried to sort these meanings into groups. As you also state, the nationalist movements of the oppressed and other forms of objection to the legitimacy of the state are treated by mainstream theorists as standing outside civil society. Discuss how such theorists of "multicultural" society as Charles Taylor and Iris Marion Young interpret such movements WITHIN the framework of civil society and where their interpretations may fit into Kean's typology. Is this typology adequate to account for them?
4. Discuss the ways in which the various interpretations of the role of the nation-state in globalization intersect with the major accounts of civil society. In your discussion identify the features of the political economy, regulation and cultural role of communication that support or contradict such links.
5. Given the numerous theoretical arguments and evidence for counterpublics, and the international nature of their legitimacy claims and the communicative and legal forums they employ, how would you, and in what institutions would you locate a global civil society? What features of civil society are accounted for in nation-state models and debates that global civil society also needs to account for?