



Editorial Board

Co-Editors

Scott Fitzsimmons and Alex McDougall
University of Calgary

Administrative & Financial Editor

David Coletto
University of Calgary

Review Editor

Evan Wilson
University of Calgary

Web Editor

Dan Fitzsimmons
University of Calgary

Advisory Committee

Faculty Advisor

Lisa Young
University of Calgary

André Blais
Université de Montréal

John Courtney
University of Saskatchewan

Allan Kornberg
Duke University

David E. Smith
University of Saskatchewan

Alan Cairns
University of Waterloo

Michael Cox
University of Wales

Sylvia Bashevkin
University of Toronto

Jennifer Smith
Dalhousie University

Innovations: A Journal of Politics is published by the Department of Political Science at the University of Calgary. All Rights Reserved. No part of this publication may be reproduced or transmitted in any form or by any means, electronic, mechanical, photocopying, recording or otherwise, or stored in any retrieval system of any nature, without the express written permission of the Co-Editors, *Innovations: A Journal of Politics*. The views expressed are those of the individual authors and are not to be taken as representing the views of the Editorial Board, Advisory Committee, or the University of Calgary.

Innovations is registered with an International Standard Serial Number (ISSN) at the National Library of Canada.

All correspondence concerning *Innovations* should be directed to: Co-Editors, *Innovations: A Journal of Politics*, Department of Political Science, University of Calgary, 2500 University Drive, N.W., Calgary, Alberta, Canada. T2N 1N4. Email: innovate@ucalgary.ca web: <http://www.ucalgary.ca/~innovate> phone: (403)-220-5920

ISSN 1480 – 6339

© 2009 *Innovations: A Journal of Politics*

Index

EDITORIAL FORWARD	iii
<i>Scott Fitzsimmons & Alex McDougall</i>	
NOTES ON CONTRIBUTORS	vi
ARTICLES	
Notwithstanding the Override: Path Dependence, Section 33, and the Charter	1
<i>David Snow</i>	
Boy Scouts No Longer: A Sociological Institutional Analysis of the Canadian Forces	16
<i>Daniel Fitzsimmons</i>	
Gender Mainstreaming in Canadian Human Security Policy: The Limitations of Bureaucratic and Security Discourses	34
<i>Shelina Ali</i>	
The Intervention Imperative: Contradictions between Liberalism, Democracy, and Humanitarian Intervention	59
<i>Wilfrid Greaves</i>	
Political Myth and Action in Pericles' Funeral Oration	73
<i>Shawna Ritchie</i>	
Domestic Experience and its Effects on Democracy Promotion	86
<i>Eric Jardine</i>	
Culture Clash: The Influence of Behavioural Norms on Military Performance in Asymmetric Conflicts	99
<i>Scott Fitzsimmons</i>	
CALL FOR PAPERS.....	143

Forward

On behalf of the Editorial Board of *Innovations: A Journal of Politics*, it gives us great pleasure to welcome readers to our 2008-2009 edition. *Innovations* is an interdisciplinary, refereed journal committed to publishing the finest student work in politics. The articles contained in this issue reflect this commitment and offer seven examples of exemplary scholarship.

The first article, by David Snow, entitled *Notwithstanding the Override: Path Dependence, Section 33, and the Charter*, evaluates arguments put forward to explain the infrequent use of the notwithstanding clause contained in the *Canadian Charter of Rights and Freedoms*. Of all the explanations offered, it finds the historical-institutionalist concept of “path dependence” most compelling, arguing that, ever since the Quebec government used the notwithstanding clause in response to *Ford v. Quebec* (1988), subsequent Prime Ministers have demonized the clause in order to gain political capital. It goes on to argue that the depiction of section 33 as inherently antithetical to the logic of a *Charter of Rights* has been so successful that few political leaders will risk using the clause, even when public opinion is in favour. Finally, it argues that, with the *Charter* being seen as a “symbolic rights-giver,” this demonization has led to the gradual erosion of section 33’s legitimacy as an acceptable legislative instrument.

Following this is Daniel Fitzsimmons’ article, entitled *Boy Scouts No Longer: A Sociological Institutional Analysis of the Canadian Forces*, which seeks to explain the process of institutional transformation within the armed forces of a democracy. It offers an ideational explanation for this process, which is grounded in sociological institutionalism. Specifically, it argues that one of the most important and powerful factors that can drive institutional transformation within national armed forces are radical shifts in how senior political decision-makers perceive the appropriate “institutional role” of their military forces. To illustrate this process, the paper examines the recent and radical transformation of the Canadian Forces, from an institution structured to specialize in peacekeeping operations to an institution structured to specialize in counter-insurgency war fighting.

Shelina Ali’s *Gender Mainstreaming in Canadian Human Security Policy: The Limitations of Bureaucratic and Security Discourses* assesses how feminist literature on bureaucratic discourse and human security can contribute to a greater understanding of the challenges of gender mainstreaming within policy on human security and conflict management. Its particular focus on gender is linked to the reality that gender power relations are consistently present within all societies internationally, most often resulting in the subordination of femininity and by consequence, women. Feminist critiques of the bureaucracy make a strong argument for why there is such difficulty in establishing a gendered security policy, by addressing the gender biased nature of bureaucratic structure, knowledge, and discourse. The paper hopes to shed light on the barriers and access points available within the Canadian bureaucracy in terms of gender mainstreaming in human security policy. Past studies have focused on what gendered aspect of conflict and security policy have ignored, but not why they have ignored these aspects. This paper attempts to further uncover the why, and what feminist theory can contribute towards understanding the difficulty of gender mainstreaming in Canadian human security policy.

Wilfrid Greaves' *The Intervention Imperative: Contradictions between Liberalism, Democracy, and Humanitarian Intervention* begins with the premise that some ideals and practices, such as humanitarian intervention, exist at the interstice between democracy and liberalism, deriving their roots from one or both yet in conflict with some element of either liberal or democratic foundational principles. The paper argues that, despite its liberal-democratic origins, humanitarian intervention reveals tensions between these political and moral frameworks, highlighting the contradictions between them and calling into question the very practice of humanitarian intervention by liberal democratic states. Specifically, it argues that these tensions manifest themselves in three different ways. First, with respect to the basic principles underlying the practice of intervention, liberalism and democracy are not in accord. Second, the two frameworks diverge in their understandings of the appropriate method for authorizing the decision to stage an intervention, resulting in a democratic deficit in the conduct of global politics. Third, even an effective intervention raises serious issues resulting from contradictions between the moral imperatives of liberalism and the democratic right of peoples to self-determination. The paper concludes that, while these tensions are not irreconcilable, they demand hard questions of liberal, democratic, or liberal-democratic states that would undertake military intervention for humanitarian reasons.

In *Political Myth and Action in Pericles' Funeral Oration*, Shawna Ritchie argues that Pericles' funeral oration, one of the most famous passages in Thucydides' *History of the Peloponnesian War*, is the clearest expression of the myth of Athens both because it articulates ancient democratic theory and because the picture of democracy it describes serves as a model for democratic states even today. As a starting point, the paper utilizes Clifford Orwin's argument that Pericles' third speech, delivered to the Athenian populace after the outbreak of the plague represents Pericles' true funeral oration. Orwin argues this because the plague represented a real crisis. The link Orwin makes between these two speeches is illuminating and casts a new, unprecedented light on Pericles' later speech. This paper goes on to argue that the connection Orwin articulates between the two speeches is essential for a proper understanding of both, but also that he misrepresents the relationship between the speeches. The paper argues, rather, that Pericles' final speech is not the true funeral speech, but represents a pragmatic instruction manual for how the Athenians can embody the myth of Athens, as articulated in the funeral speech proper. This is demonstrated by examining the traditional understanding of Pericles' funeral oration, Orwin's argument and the common themes in both speeches.

Eric Jardine's *Domestic Experience and its Effects on Democracy Promotion* argues that a country's democracy promotion efforts will be underwritten by its domestic experience with democratic governance. It compares the statements of public officials from the United States, Great Britain and Canada, as well as the implicit assumptions which the National Endowment for Democracy (NED), the Westminster Foundation for Democracy (WFD), and Canada's Rights and Democracy (R&D) maintain are necessary for the longevity and health of democratic governments. It demonstrates that the NED emphasizes the presence of a virulent pro-democratic civil society, the WFD emphasizes the growth of party links and a strong party system, and R&D emphasizes the governance of diversity. The paper argues further that all of these points of emphasis coincide with each respective country's domestic experience with democratic governance.

Finally, Scott Fitzsimmons argues in *Culture Clash: The Influence of Behavioural Norms on Military Performance in Asymmetric Conflicts* that military forces that strongly emphasize norms encouraging creative thinking, decentralized authority, personal initiative, technical proficiency, and group loyalty, should exhibit greater militarily effectiveness than forces that deemphasize these norms. The paper reasons that military forces exhibiting greater military effectiveness should experience greater battlefield military performance than less effective groups, all else equal. Taking this into account, the paper predicts that the materially weaker party in an asymmetric conflict should only be able to defeat its materially stronger opponent if the weaker party emphasizes behavioural norms that encourage it to perform a wide range of tactical behaviour – that is, be very militarily effective – and the stronger party does not emphasize these norms because this should allow the weaker party to exploit the weaknesses and counter the strengths of the stronger party and, through this, defeat it. On the other hand, the paper predicts that, in asymmetric conflicts where neither party emphasizes behavioural norms encouraging them to perform a wide range of tactical behaviour, neither party should be capable of exploiting the weaknesses and countering the strengths of the other and, as a result, the balance of material capabilities should allow the materially stronger party to prevail.

The production of this journal would not be possible without the generosity of the Department of Political Science at the University of Calgary. On behalf of the Editorial Board, we would like to recognize and give thanks for all their support. This forward would not be complete if we did not thank the anonymous reviewers who generously gave their time and effort in reviewing the many articles considered for publication. Their efforts, along with those of our many dedicated volunteers, allowed us to put forward a superior issue.

Sincerely,

Scott Fitzsimmons
PhD Candidate
Department of Political Science
University of Calgary

&

Alex McDougall
PhD Candidate
Department of Political Science
University of Calgary

Notes on Contributors

David Snow is an MA candidate in the Department of Political Science at the University of Calgary.

Daniel Fitzsimmons is a PhD student in the Department of Political Science at the University of Calgary.

Shelina Ali is an MA candidate in the Department of Political Science at Concordia University.

Wilfrid Greaves is an MA candidate in the Department of Political Science at the University of Calgary.

Shawna Ritchie is an MA candidate in the Department of Political Science at the University of Calgary.

Eric Jardine is an MA candidate in the Department of Political Science at Carleton University.

Scott Fitzsimmons is a PhD candidate in the Department of Political Science at the University of Calgary.