

POLITICAL IDEOLOGY IN PARTIES, POLICY, AND CIVIL SOCIETY

Interdisciplinary Insights

Edited by David Laycock



UBC Press · Vancouver · Toronto

Contents

Acknowledgments / vii

Introduction / 3

David Laycock

Part 1: Ideology in Partisan, Policy, and Academic Contexts

- 1** Consent, Representation, and Liberty:
America as the Last Medieval Society – or a
Footnote to Louis Hartz / 21
Ivan Jankovic
- 2** Canadian Development Assistance and
Mediated Geopolitics / 41
Katherine Reilly
- 3** Right-Wing Populism, Conservative Governance,
and Multiculturalism in Canada / 61
David Laycock and Steven Weldon
- 4** Not Merely Playing: Game Theory's Subversive
Proclivities / 91
Laurent Dubuziuskis

Part 2: Ideology in the Politics of Civil Society

- 5** The Contribution of Rhetorical Analysis and Discourse Theory to the Study of Political Ideologies: The Cases of Multiculturalism and Environmentalism / 115
Ian Angus
- 6** Mobilizing Political Strategy: The Global Practices of Taxpayer Groups / 132
Kyle Willmott
- 7** Telling Their Stories: Ideology and the Subject of Prairie Agriculture / 149
Katherine Strand and Darin Barney
- 8** Laborlore and the Ideology of the British Columbia Labour Bureaucracy, 1900–2015 / 169
Mark Leier
- 9** A Reconnaissance of Everyday Working Class Ideology in British Columbia / 187
Dennis Pilon

- Conclusion / 205
David Laycock

- Contributors / 215
- Index / 218

Introduction

DAVID LAYCOCK

This volume investigates how political ideologies innovate through conceptual adaptation in a variety of social, cultural, historical, and political settings, crossing borders of time, space, and theory. Contributors share the view that ideology is a ubiquitous, continuously innovating, and ineliminable dimension of human experience that cannot be definitively understood using only one set of academic disciplinary tools. Our shared purpose is to reveal key aspects of the conceptual structure, social meaning, adaptability, and power of ideologies as they are practised in changing settings. We wish to spur development of interdisciplinary theoretical approaches to the study of political ideology that are attentive to the impact that host institutions, cultures, organizations, and social, economic, and political events have on ideological concepts and themes.

In their diverse analyses of the impacts of ideology on political life and social analysis, contributors reach across the methodological differences that separate our academic disciplines, ranging from philosophy to history, communications and sociology to political science (political theory and political behaviour), and anthropology to economic history. Methodological “cross-pollination” from various disciplines is evident in the chapters, which benefit from a range of theoretical traditions. Our hope is that this and related publications (e.g., Humphrey, Laycock, and Umbach 2019) will stimulate interdisciplinary creativity in the applied study of political ideology, adding to earlier cross-disciplinary theorization of ideology (Freeden, Sargeant, and Stears 2013).

The essays in this volume address a wide range of political ideologies, all involving some type of border crossing by concepts, the building blocks of all ideological structures. The most obvious such travel is across national boundaries, and the questions that most readily arise in such situations have to do with transformation of concepts, given specific shape by institutional and cultural contextual factors, political or other crises, political innovations, or major changes in the political competition. A variation on such cross-border travel occurs across regional and national political cultures, and across generations, sometimes skipping decades or even centuries. In North America, for example, the concept of direct democracy emerged in the United States to have a profound impact on populist movements in the 1880s and 1890s, experienced a rebirth in both the United States and Canada during the 1910–25 period, went into political hibernation across most of the continent until the mid-1970s, and roared back on both sides of the US/Canada border for the next forty years. More recently, it has appeared in the demands of populist parties and movements of the left and right in Europe.

Conceptual travel also occurs within and between the analytically distinct spheres of social, economic, cultural, and political life, as illustrated in two examples. Between spheres, the originally economic concept of “deficit” has recently been adapted to the notion of “democratic deficit” to help explain deficiencies in political representation and electoral accountability. Broadly within the political sphere, the concept of a “social contract” originated in the seventeenth century to address the problem of rational political obligation, and, with several reconceptualizations along the way, emerged again in the twentieth century in influential attempts to address the problem of social justice and the state’s role in redistributing resources and opportunities to advance that justice. This re-emergence has occurred at the level of “high theory,” with John Rawls and his commentators, and also at the level of political discourse among various political actors, policy professionals, and advocates. (See below for discussion of these “macro” and “meso” levels of ideological action and analysis.)

In each of these first two types of conceptual travel, one inevitably finds adaptation to specific features of the new environments as well as retention of some key features of the original conceptualization. This raises a semantic point: it is conceptualizations of enduring concepts that change by travelling, not the actual concepts themselves. This distinction flows from the approach to ideological analysis developed by Michael Freeden, which draws on the idea of “essential contestability” of all key ideological concepts to understand both conceptual variability across ideologies and the mutual

influences of all major concepts within a given ideological field (Freeden 1996, 2013a).

An overview of Freeden's promising theoretical meeting point for interdisciplinary research on ideologies is presented in this introduction, followed by summaries of the chapters in this volume as a whole. It should be emphasized that while I have adopted Freeden's broad approach to the study of ideologies in [Chapter 3](#) and other recent research (Laycock 2014, 2019; Humphrey, Laycock, and Umbach 2019), this approach was only occasionally engaged by contributors to this volume. The concluding chapter will discuss key themes in the volume as an invitation to future research and creative theorization.

* * *

The ideological structuring of cultural and organizational experience has long been acknowledged by anthropologists and sociologists in Europe and North America. Anglo-American historians and political scientists have either tended to resist structural understandings of ideology by treating it simply as a package of attitudes, orientations, and values that accompanies and somewhat shapes political and social experience, or by adopting Marxist perspectives on ideology that give social class and relations of production primary causal force in the creation of ideological perspectives in distinctive socio-political settings. Acknowledging that the more loosely structuring, often subtle power of ideology can be appreciated using analytical tools developed for the study of political philosophy, psychology, and social theory has taken a variety of methodological paths. Analytically removing the stain of either false consciousness or extremism from the idea of ideology has been especially important to these developments, but more systematic theoretical advances have also been crucial (Freeden, Sargeant, and Stears 2013; Maynard 2013). One particularly valuable and methodologically pluralistic systematic approach to ideology has been provided by English political theorist Michael Freeden.

Over the past three decades, Freeden's work has drawn on a rich variety of philosophical traditions and methodological approaches to provide an influential analytical framework for the study of ideology. Among its advantages for the student of ideologies is the set of theoretically open bridges that Freeden's theory builds to other social and human sciences. Like other conceptually focused approaches, Freeden argues that the ideologies underlying and informing social and political action are systematically structured and closely interrelated assemblages of concepts. What sets his approach apart from other conceptual approaches is his account of ideological morphology,

which is a philosophically synthetic, creative, and systematic extension of Gallie's theorization of "essentially contested concepts" (Freeden 1996). For a variety of logical, epistemological, and cultural reasons, key political concepts related to a vision of a desirable socio-political order are always open to dispute, and reasonably so; there is no definitively correct understanding of the meaning and implications of "freedom" independent of one's cultural environment and basic philosophical commitments (Gallie 1956).

Freeden explains that the meaning of an ideological concept arises from its (historically and culturally) specific relationship to other concepts in a given time and place. A concept is thus not autonomous but relational, produced and reproduced in relation to other concepts in particular, variable, and dynamic structures. The morphological, relational character of concepts allows a given concept to mean one thing in one context and another (even opposite) thing in a different context, and ensures that its meaning is "contestable" (Freeden 1996).

Citizens who share an ideology accept roughly the same specific versions of most key concepts, or what Freeden calls "decontestations" of these concepts, but they may share few precise ideological decontestations with other citizens who adhere to another ideology within the same broader ideological family. Liberalism, to take the most obvious example, is a very broad ideological family. Some liberal variants decontest key concepts like equality of opportunity and social justice in ways that border on social democratic decontestations. Other liberalisms are hard to distinguish from forms of contemporary conservatism, by virtue of how they decontest freedom, equality, and the human need for order.

Freeden's methodology emphasizes the analyst's role in carefully weighing the significance and ideology-structuring impact of different concepts. To facilitate this, he develops an analytical toolkit that allows us to identify overlapping logics that weave together prominent policy concerns, specific kinds of public appeals, understandings of social change, and underlying normative conceptual foundations within political discourse. Freeden proposes mapping the morphology of any ideology with core, adjacent, and peripheral concepts. Core concepts are typically basic normative commitments to a specific version of key ideas like equality, liberty, or solidarity that anchor an ideology over time. In some cases, an ideology's core concepts can be meta-commitments to political action or understanding, such as the conservative orientation to resist or manage social change (Freeden 1996, 333–34).

Adjacent concepts are also basic to an ideology, but less heavily weighted than its core concepts. They are often second-order normative concepts

(such as conceptions of human rights) or general institutional orientations to political practice (such as participatory democracy or group representation) that are instrumental to the achievement of core normative objectives. Peripheral concepts are typically policy positions or heavily symbolic features of, or past events in, the political system (such as those concerning immigration, trade, climate change, or constitutional rights, or a country's war experience). They may be at the centre of political debate at any given time, but ought not to distract us from the job of discovering their roots in more structurally basic core and adjacent concepts.

On Freedén's account, what makes any ideology distinctive is its system of mutual influences and relations among ideologically distinctive concepts – within the core, and across core, adjacent, and perimeter concepts. For Freedén, the dynamic character of any ideology results from the essential contestability of almost all ideological concepts. Through the combined efforts of those who produce its texts, performances, and mediated transmissions, every ideology “decontests” each of its key concepts, especially when these are actively debated outside the ideology, and always in relation to other key concepts.

In party political competition, for example, the meaning of equality is given a party-specific meaning via its connection to the party's decontested concepts of freedom, human rights, democracy, the market, and gender, all influenced by and influencing the party's (evolving) understanding of equality. Competing ideologies' proponents and carriers directly and indirectly contest the “real” meaning and policy implications of key concepts such as equality, liberty, or democracy. These remain a matter of fundamental dispute within party systems and across civil society, but a party or movement loyalist accepts the party or movement's efforts to decontest key concepts in political life. In effect, partisans and loyal political audiences share not just an enthusiasm for and attitudes towards particular policy proposals, but also an ideological vocabulary structured by a set of distinctively decontested concepts. This view of the linguistic structure of ideologies is similar to Roland Barthes's concept of an “idiolect,” which merges understandings of the concepts of “ideology” and “dialect” (Barthes 1972).

Why does Freedén's analytical framework lend itself to bridge building across various disciplines? First, it can do this because it is constructed from a variety of political and social theoretical perspectives, drawing on everything from twentieth-century hermeneutics to Antonio Gramsci's understanding of “hegemony” to Louis Althusser's idea of “interpellation,” from the post-structuralism of Foucault and Derrida to the linguistic analysis

of Gallie, Austin, and Wittgenstein, and from the “Cambridge School’s” conceptual histories to the comparative historical analysis of the *Begriffsgeschichte* school (Freeden 1996, 2013a). Second and more important, applying Freeden’s approach to analysis of ideologies’ conceptual morphologies requires serious and systematic attention to empirical details of political and social discourses and to the cultural, historical, and institutional environments in which they are deployed. In turn, these empirical details require careful and creative interpretation to generate comprehensive and nuanced understandings of ideological phenomena.

There is no clear reason why Freeden’s conceptual morphology method cannot play complementary roles with other ideology-analyzing methods that focus on conceptual structure and meanings (Skinner 2002; Ball, Farr, and Hanson 1989; Howarth, Norval, and Stavrakakis 2000; Laclau 1993, 1994; Thagard 2014) in the analysis of the overall character and impacts of particular ideologies in specific settings (Humphrey 2005). And although his own studies have eschewed strong normative positions (Freeden 2013a), some of Freeden’s analytical tools can readily be combined with various forms of social critique, as is acknowledged in [Chapters 5](#) and [8](#) in this volume.

If these approaches can combine to good analytical effect, why not Freeden’s approach combined with Freudian and Žižekian perspectives on social movement activity (Stavrakakis 1997), or with Laclau’s critical discourse theory (Finlayson 2012), or with contemporary theorization of representation (Laycock 2019)? Other theoretical blends involving diverse conceptual, discursive, and even quantitative methods are well worth considering (Maynard 2013, Farney 2019).

The point of discussing Freeden’s approach in some detail above is to broadly orient readers to the varied case studies that follow in a way that opens up theoretical space for a plurality of analytical/interpretive approaches within and across disciplines. His approach offers a theoretical orienting toolkit for this kind of multidisciplinary project, which requires openness to and compatibility with other approaches for particular case studies. Freeden’s approach was not presented to this volume’s contributors as a prescribed approach to the study of ideology. There is an important difference between such “prescription” and the provision of “orienting tools” that can share the stage with, or even yield, theoretically, to other analytical methods, as subject matter, explanatory purpose, or authorial intent require. As this volume demonstrates, such prescription would be counterproductive to building the multidisciplinary study of ideologies.

Of the many theoretical and methodological traditions in the study of ideology and ideologies, a good number appear in the contributions to this volume. Some aim primarily to explain the variety of *functions* that ideologies perform in social and political life (Althusser 1971; Converse 1964; Easton 1965; Geertz 1964; Gramsci 1971; Howarth, Norval, and Stavrakakis 2000; Laclau 1994; Weber 1958; and Žižek 1994, to name a few “functionalist” theories). Others focus their explanations on the *psychological dispositions and orientations* and/or *cognitive foundations* of different ideologies’ adherents (Jost, Federico, and Napier 2013; Lakoff 1996; Haidt 2012). Still others aim to explain the connection between *attitudes, values, and policy preferences, voting, or other political behaviour*, often portrayed as unstructured by a coherent or consistent ideology (Ellis and Stimson 2012; Zaller 1992; Achen and Bartels 2016; Gidengil et al. 2012; Cochrane 2015).

Contributors to this volume all adopt, at least to some degree, a “morphological sensibility” towards ideology. That is, they all treat ideological expressions, discourses, actions, and convictions not as autonomous concepts with fixed meanings but as dynamic elements whose meaning arises from their structural relationships to other experiences, ideas, and concepts. All of them show that the study of ideology requires analytical work that is simultaneously empirical and interpretive.

Disagreements and tensions concerning the relationship between political/ideological analysis and truth have been inherent to, and often politicized in, the study of ideologies since the eighteenth century. The theoretical choices are often presented as binary: we must either argue that our critical approach to ideology leads to a return to “truth,” or contend that ideology is simply what ideologists do. There is no way of knowing whether some ideologies are “true.” Like other constructivist approaches to social and political analysis, and most post-1970s philosophy of social science, Freedén’s theory of ideologies rejects the Marxist (or perhaps just Marxist-Leninist) and positivist binary of science/ideology. Like other constructivists, Freedén also accepts that the ultimate truth value of whole ideological perspectives and their normative underpinnings is beyond “proof” by the standards of the natural sciences.

Unlike postmodern theory, however, Freedén (1996, ch. 2) also insists that there is something beyond ideology with which we can evaluate the empirical and causal claims of ideologies. He argues that it is possible to show that some ideologies, and certainly specific ideological claims, are logically inconsistent, are dependent on objectively falsifiable claims about empirical reality, and have considerably less explanatory and “rational”

political value than other ideologies – even if they come to shape many citizens’ views of political life. Donald Trump’s ideological success is by no means original in this sense. By providing us with a convincing way out of this analytically unproductive binary choice, Freedden has done analysts of ideology a considerable service.

Another important distinction to help readers navigate the chapters that follow is between the macro/canonical, meso, and micro levels of ideological expression, practice and experience. Thus we have: (1) the canonically articulated and defined, or macro level; (2) the intermediate or meso level of competitive political appeals, politically relevant public discourse, policy advocacy, and cultural criticism; and (3) the everyday or micro level of conceptual use by people making their way through ordinary life (Humphrey, Laycock, and Umbach 2019; see Freedden 2013b for a similar division between “elite, professional, and vernacular political thinking”). Briefly, these can be characterized as follows.

The macro level of ideological action is dominated by broadly influential canonical works, pitched at the level of “high theory.” It is best to think here of “canonical” works in inclusive terms: not just the writings of major philosophers but also those of influential political writers or social theorists should count as canonical, encompassing everyone from Marx or Rawls, and from Gramsci or Friedrich Hayek to Ernesto Laclau or Sigmund Freud. Their philosophical depth and/or comprehensive accounts of “the political” lend them to analysis using Freedden’s morphological approach or some other concept-centric analytical framework, such as critical discourse theory (Howarth, Norval, and Stavrakakis 2000; Van Dijk 2013), *Begriffsgeschichte* conceptual history (Koselleck 1985; Koselleck and Richter 2011), or that of Quentin Skinner and his “Cambridge School” (Skinner 2002; Ball, Farr, and Hanson 1989).

We can also identify a broadly encompassing meso or intermediate level of ideological activity, which involves highly varied “professional” efforts to shape and attach both policy and ideological specificity to political agendas, whether by governing or opposition parties, social movement organizations, or any number of other civil society actors. Such efforts are professional in the sense that they are conducted by individuals trained in persuasive presentation of policy ideas, shaping of public attitudes towards contentious policy questions, and analysis of the feedback provided to these efforts by target audiences. Freedden’s approach can be applied at this meso level, as many articles in his *Journal of Political Ideologies* attest, but so can a variety of other approaches to textual/conceptual analysis, analysis of social movement

motivations, activities, and policy processes, and efforts to place policy developments in a broader communicative and opinion-structuring context.

Finally, at the micro level of ideological action, individuals establish their own normatively oriented conceptual anchors in and perceptions of “the political,” very broadly understood to incorporate their stance towards all relations of power that they perceive to affect them. Humphrey, Umbach, and Clolow (2019) demonstrate that Freeden’s morphological approach can also be useful here. And Dennis Pilon demonstrates in [Chapter 9](#) that auto-ethnographic analysis inspired by a Marxist perspective on working class experience can achieve valuable insights at the micro level.

Such differentiation among levels of ideological action and influence helps us to identify and appreciate the virtues of a variety of conceptual, discursive, and functionalist approaches taken to analysis of ideology within and beyond this volume. Making sense of ideological action across macro, meso, and micro levels is especially complicated when the main focus is the meso level inhabited by many different types of professional writers and political speakers, performing competitively and strategically with and to many other speakers and audiences. Such actors draw primarily on non-canonical sources in direct and hence traceable ways. They also draw indirectly on ideas formulated in consciously systematic and conceptually complex written canonical products, which percolate down to the meso level in both readily identifiable and highly mediated, often anonymized and “popularized” forms. At the meso level, materials from both the macro and micro levels will directly and indirectly impinge on actors’ efforts to convey salient features of “the political” and to otherwise shape, sometimes unintentionally, citizens’ micro level perceptions of and preferences about politics.

The chapters in this volume primarily analyze ideological dimensions of politics conducted at the meso level, examining the ideological production, dissemination, and conceptual contestation activities of social movement, trade union, organized interest, and political party leaders, activists, and public intellectuals. The actors whose discourses they analyze range from intellectuals inclined to tap directly into the macro level of canonical articulations, to well-known political figures quite removed from explicit connection to macro-level ideological “work,” to figures prominent only within local and specific organizational borders. These actors are even less directly connected to canonical thinkers at the macro level, and their articulation of ideological concepts occurs primarily or exclusively at the vernacular level.

* * *

This volume is organized on a broad thematic basis to highlight the diverse and complementary perspectives brought to the study of ideology at macro, meso, and micro levels of social experience. Our contributors typically move between macro and meso levels of conceptual/discursive and functional analysis to illuminate the ideological complexity of strikingly diverse cases. These cases involve governing or opposition parties, social movement organizations, business associations, and other civil society actors. These actors' efforts are intended to recruit explicit citizen support for specific agendas or implicit, perhaps even subconscious, acquiescence, whether across a whole electorate or in a targeted, sometimes class- or group-specific constituency.

The broad thematic division among the chapters in this collection is between (1) ideology expressed via policy, partisan, or academic contests, and (2) ideology expressed through civil society organizational mobilization regarding broad domains of social change. A few words on how each chapter fits into these categories will round out this introduction.

In [Chapter 1](#), Ivan Jankovic uses a combination of historical, conceptual, and discourse analytical methods to explore British eighteenth-century "country party" ideology and its influence on the United States in the aftermath of the American Revolution. Federalists and anti-federalists then approximated political parties attempting to shape the new regime. Jankovic engages a long-standing debate on the ideological origins of pre- and immediately post-revolutionary America. He argues that this British country party ideology, already on the wane on its home turf, fuelled a libertarian resistance movement against the modern state across the Atlantic in anti-federalist and Jeffersonian doctrines in America. He contends that this movement's leaders embraced an ideology with a marked medieval touch that was skeptical not of progress and modernity as such but of the centralized and mercantilist state created by the Walpolean regime in England and emulated by Hamiltonian nationalists in the United States.

From eighteenth-century America, we move to twenty-first-century Canada and two accounts of the ideological complexion and agenda of the 2006–15 Conservative federal government. In [Chapter 2](#), Katherine Reilly examines efforts by the Conservatives to reorient Canada's approach to development assistance through mobilization of new imagery about Canada's role in the world. This involved reorganization of the relationship between the Canadian state and the development assistance policy community, and efforts to shift citizens' attitudes about what development assistance can and should aim to achieve. Reilly argues that this ideologically

distinctive development policy agenda can best be understood as an example of mediated geopolitics, which involves a struggle to influence historical potential in and through the international arena. This analytical perspective is deployed primarily for functional explanatory purposes, though there is some cross-over into conceptual/substantive explanation as well.

In [Chapter 3](#), David Laycock and Steven Weldon examine how populist conservatism in Canada attempted to redefine Canadian multiculturalism without relying on the nativism found in much European and American populism today. They argue that the Conservative Party and government attempted to normatively and politically detach multiculturalism from the liberal egalitarian foundations of the Canadian welfare state, while accepting the ethnic diversity of Canadian society. The Conservatives did so by selectively drawing on ideological themes from the Reform Party of Canada. The Reform Party had drawn heavily on ideological directions of the American new right, which has been successfully combining populist appeals and conservative ideology since the mid-1970s. The bulk of [Chapter 3](#) uses conceptual and discursive analytical methods, though the question of how attitudes towards multiculturalism and the welfare state shape one another is explored quantitatively for functional explanatory purposes.

Only one contributor offers an account of how a particular theoretical approach used in academic analysis has incorporated a combination of theoretical and ideological assumptions. This singularity is unusual following a century in which the sociology of knowledge played a central role in studies of ideology (Berry and Kenny 2013). Laurent Dobuzinskis ([Chapter 4](#)) gives a detailed conceptual account of how game theory evolved, developed new methods and fields of analysis, travelled across many cultural, epistemological, and ideological divides, and gained academic reach and policy influence over the past century. However, he also defends game theory against critics who see it as a poorly disguised methodological generator of neoliberal economic nostrums and scepticism about non-altruistic behaviour or state intervention in markets.

To begin the second section, Ian Angus ([Chapter 5](#)) addresses the contribution that discourse theory and rhetorical analysis can make to the study of political ideologies. One of his case studies uses the notion of a “field of discourse” to analyze the framing of early debates concerning multiculturalism in Canada. The other case study utilizes the concept of rhetorical equivalence to understand how contemporary convergence between the concepts of “ecology” and “Mother Earth” has helped to mobilize social movement constituencies. [Chapter 5](#) is also notable for its explicit theoretical statement

concerning the difference between political philosophy, political theory, and political ideology, and the importance of these differences for the study of ideology, and for its clear endorsement of the inseparability of analysis of ideologies from political critique/engagement.

In [Chapter 6](#), Kyle Willmott analyzes taxpayer advocacy groups as agents of political mobilization and ideological production. He argues that these distinct civil society organizations share a strategic imperative to provide what Foucault called “permanent political criticism” of any exercise of governing, in an attempt to encourage “taxpayer reason.” Drawing upon the broadly functionalist “governmentality studies” and policy mobility literatures, Willmott positions taxpayer groups as circulatory networks that render complex ideological principles of liberalism into a practical, critical everyday political reason, and translate the work of governments into forms of knowledge tailored for “taxpayers.” He uses ethnographic textual data to show how the ideas, strategies, and tactics of taxpayer groups circulate to globally advance “taxpayer reason” among everyday citizens.

In [Chapter 7](#), Katherine Strand and Darin Barney offer an exploration of “agricultural subjectivity” as a key axis of ideological formation and contestation in the Canadian Prairie provinces. Taking their analytical cues initially from Althusser’s functional account of ideologies as instruments for the reproduction of relations of production, Strand and Barney use critical discourse theory to compare two examples of extra-partisan cultural production that have attempted to “hail” distinct political subjects in different periods of Prairie political history. The first is a 1977 play, *Paper Wheat*, about the establishment of the Prairie wheat pools and cooperative movement; the second is *License to Farm*, a 2016 industry organization documentary that aims to promote genetically modified crops and chemical farming. The authors compare these two cultural products in Prairie experience as distinctive ideological formations intended to circulate ideological claims and mediate political subjects within a specific social class.

In [Chapter 8](#), Mark Leier considers the importance of informal expression in labour movement ideology by examining jokes, songs, stories, and culture in British Columbia’s labour movement. Leier draws on a diverse literature on working class history generally compatible with Freeden’s injunction to analyze political concepts “through locating them within the patterns in which they actually appear.” He argues that this “laborlore” has both supported and contested the movement’s official ideologies as well as supporting and undermining its solidarities. The chapter focuses on the functions performed by informal ideologies associated with class, race, and

gender in shaping the province's labour and left movements, arguing that they were as important as any manifesto or platform.

In [Chapter 9](#), Dennis Pilon utilizes auto-ethnographic techniques and Eagleton's Marxist analysis of ideology to explore everyday ideology among working class people in British Columbia. Through a critical self-examination of his own "residual working class identity" and that of his parents and grandparents, Pilon sheds light on a broad area of practical, everyday ideological thinking that often fails to register with academics who tend to recognize ideology only as the product of political theorists or militant political actors. His objective in telling such stories – about himself and his union organizer and lifelong socialist grandparents – is to link such "ways of seeing" with the contexts that helped inform and sustain them. Though his broad view of this experience fits within a functionalist Marxist theoretical perspective, his fine-grained micro analysis also draws on conceptual and discursive analytical approaches.

The chapters in this volume provide new insights into historical and contemporary expressions of political ideology in North American political parties, public policy, and civil society actors' experiences. Taken together, they also make a case for studying ideology through a diverse range of disciplinary perspectives and methods.

References

- Achen, Christopher, and Larry Bartels. 2016. *Democracy for Realists*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.
- Althusser, Louis. 1971. "Ideology and Ideological State Apparatuses." In *Lenin and Philosophy and Other Essays*, ed. Louis Althusser, 121–76. New York: Monthly Review Press.
- Ball, Terence, James Farr, and Russell Hanson, eds. 1989. *Political Innovation and Conceptual Change*. New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Barthes, Roland. 1972. *Mythologies*. New York: Hill and Wang.
- Berry, Craig, and Michael Kenny. 2013. "Ideology and the Intellectuals." In *The Oxford Handbook of Political Ideologies*, ed. M. Freeden, L.T. Sargeant, and M. Stears, 251–70. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Cochrane, Christopher. 2015. *Left and Right: The Small World of Political Ideas*. Montreal and Kingston: McGill-Queen's University Press.
- Converse, Philip E. 1964. "The Nature of Belief Systems in Mass Publics." In *Ideology and Discontent*, ed. David Apter, 206–61. New York: Free Press of Glencoe.
- Easton, David. 1965. *A Systems Analysis of Political Life*. New York: John Wiley.
- Ellis, Christopher, and James Stimson. 2012. *Ideology in America*. New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Farney, Jim. 2019. "Cross-border influences or parallel developments? A process-tracing approach to the development of social conservatism in Canada and the USA." *Journal of Political Ideologies* 24: 2, 139–57.
- Finlayson, Alan. 2012. "Rhetoric and the Political Theory of Ideologies." *Political Studies* 60: 751–67.

© UBC Press 2019

All rights reserved. No part of this publication may be reproduced, stored in a retrieval system, or transmitted, in any form or by any means, without prior written permission of the publisher.

Library and Archives Canada Cataloguing in Publication

Title: Political ideology in parties, policy, and civil society :
interdisciplinary insights / edited by David Laycock.

Names: Laycock, David H., 1954– editor.

Description: Includes bibliographical references and index.

Identifiers: Canadiana (print) 20190092955 | Canadiana (ebook) 2019009303X |
ISBN 9780774861311 (hardcover) | ISBN 9780774861335 (PDF) |
ISBN 9780774861342 (EPUB) | ISBN 9780774861359 (Kindle)

Subjects: LCSH: Ideology—Political aspects—Canada. | LCSH: Political
science—Canada.

Classification: LCC JA84.C3 P65 2019 | DDC 320.50973—dc23

Canada

UBC Press gratefully acknowledges the financial support for our publishing program of the Government of Canada (through the Canada Book Fund), the Canada Council for the Arts, and the British Columbia Arts Council.

Set in Futura and Warnock by Apex CoVantage, LLC

Copy editor: Frank Chow

Proofreader: Caitlin Gordon-Walker

Indexer: Noeline Bridge

Cover designer: David Drummond

UBC Press

The University of British Columbia

2029 West Mall

Vancouver, BC V6T 1Z2

ubcpres.ca