
Governance and Democracy Across Borders

Victoria, B.C., Canada
October 25, 2012



Adrian Hartrick – Rapporteur
November 8, 2012

Executive Summary

On October 25, 2012, the [University of Victoria Center for Global studies](#) brought together a group of 38 scholars, activists, and students for a conference and workshop entitled “Governance and Democracy Across Borders.” The aim of the conference was to address the rapidly changing role and nature of borders, boundaries, and democracy in our world. Underpinning the conference was the assumption that the changes in the world in terms of borders and governance, as they relate to technology, resource scarcity, political revolutions, and political ideas are challenging our traditional paradigms, boundaries and perceptions of these issues.

The conference was comprised of three panel discussions and a keynote presentation by [Dr. Hamid Dabashi](#), Hagop Kevorkian professor of Iranian studies and comparative literature from [Columbia University](#). The titles of the three panel discussions were: “Borderless World-or is it?: Social Media and Web 2.0/3.0”; “Ecological Borders or Interdependent Earth?”; and “Borders and Boundary Crossing: The Dynamics of Borderlands/Border Crossing and Transnational Governance.” Dr. Dabashi’s Keynote presentation was entitled “...and the Pursuit of Public Happiness: Thinking with Hannah Arendt on the Arab Revolutions.”

While the subjects discussed in these presentations covered a wide range of topics related to governance and democracy across borders, they converged on three key points:

1. The significance, relevance, and use of traditional borders and boundaries, both physical and imagined, are in serious need of reconsideration and reconceptualization.
2. Governments and traditional political institutions are currently inadequate for dealing with these changes and are struggling to follow, let alone lead the changes.
3. Existing understandings of key concepts such as revolution, democracy, sustainability, and governance need to be overhauled and reconsidered. As Dr. Dabashi argued in his keynote speech, the current changes in the world are challenging our basic, long held

epistemological boundaries concerning world politics, and therefore “we are at the ground zero of history.”

Reviewing the three panel discussions and the keynote presentation the report will describe how the three key converging points of the conference were discussed in relation to each presentation.

“Borderless World-or is it?: Social Media and Web 2.0/3.0”

This discussion focused on the issues of internet privacy and cross border law enforcement in cyberspace. [Dr. Colin Bennett](#), from the [Political Science department](#) of the [University of Victoria](#) began the discussion by outlining the fact that the issue of privacy, which he argued is a common held value across all cultures and a basic foundation of democracy, is now being redefined and challenged by the expansion of cyberspace. The issue, he argued, is that the internet has created a new space, outside of the traditional boundaries and confines of world governance. Elaborating on this issue PhD candidate Chris Parsons explained how as the internet has moved from the relatively simple Web 1.0. to Web 2.0 (and now Web 3.0), major transnational privacy issues have sprung up especially around the issues of internet cookies and user-generated data. Big data companies like Google, and social media companies like Facebook are able to legally gather information about users regardless of where they are in the world. Therefore, laws surrounding information, privacy, and borders are circumvented by a new medium for which laws and governments are not prepared.

Given these developments Dr. Bennett concluded that the issue of privacy is now an economic issue, as internet gathered information has become a major marketing tool for companies and is now a highly valued commodity. Also, and more fundamentally, the issue of internet privacy has become a sovereignty issue and is challenging the notion of traditional transnational borders and boundaries as governments and companies are able to gather unprecedented levels of information on citizens of any country and use that information for a variety of purposes.

Picking up on inadequate governance and law enforcement implications, PhD candidate Adam Molnar emphasized that legal institutions and governments are severely behind the development of technology. While the internet has provided new opportunities for effective law enforcement, it also poses new challenges. As Dr. Bennett pointed out, states are much older than the internet, and are now having to adapt to a new medium that is challenging their traditional organs of power. Molnar described how social media has given law enforcement a new source of information, in particular “open source information”, or internet-based data, which is not user restricted and is easily available. This information can be useful for law enforcement reasons (and also detrimental to privacy), but also circumvents borders and

poses legal dilemmas about how such information can be used in the law enforcement context. Furthermore, collecting information is one thing, but analyzing and using it is an even greater issue. It is also an issue in which there is no clear legal protocol or jurisdictional definition both nationally (in Canada) and internationally. In summary Molnar emphasized the tripartite struggle between users who are sensitive about the use of their information, law enforcement agencies who either want or to restrict the use of this information, and social media companies who control the information and are often reluctant to seed control of it.

Simply put, the panel discussion foregrounded the way in which old laws are now interacting with new technologies and it is now the challenge of governments to learn and keep up to date with technology, and to find new ways of governing these new spaces. If, for example, a Big Data company decides to store their data offshore, outside of state jurisdiction (which some companies are contemplating), then the foundation of borders, governance, and sovereignty would be compromised and require redefinition.

“Ecological Borders or Interdependent Earth?”

The second panel focused on the cross border nature of valuable natural resources such as water, and ecological issues like climate change and environmental degradation. Three key points were discussed in relation to these issues: a) the shifting nature and use of borders and boundaries; b) inadequate governance and ecological challenges; c) re-conceptualizing old ideas.

The Shifting Nature and Use of Borders and Boundaries

Discussing the issue of the Enbridge Pipeline, [Dr. Harry Swain](#), Director of the [Canadian Institute for Climate Studies](#), declared that there are many kinds of borders. In the case of the Enbridge pipeline, it crosses jurisdictional borders between British Columbia and Alberta, Canada and China, Canada and the United States; it crosses ecological borders between the prairies and the mountains, land and sea; and it crosses lands significant to the First Nations populations. With Enbridge, he argued there are also many cross-border interdependencies: Canada-US and the Dutch Disease, North American “energy security”, corporate profitability in Alberta and the United States, economic impacts on Central British Columbia, and the satisfaction of China’s need to turn its massive reserves of US dollars into tangible hard goods before the predicted decline of the dollar. This assessment sums up nicely the panel’s conclusions about ecological cross-border issues in that it describes the multidimensional nature of borders and boundaries.

In a similar vein, [Oliver Brandes](#), Co-Director of the [POLIS Project on Ecological Governance](#), declared that managing water resources at the watershed (the water source) level, rather than within given state borders, is the only sustainable solution to transnational water resource management. He said it is not a matter of *if* management will focus on the watershed level, but *when*.

In discussing the pressing issue of water politics in the Middle East, [Steve Lonergan](#) of the [University of Victoria's Geography Department](#) pointed out that trans-boundary water basins, and trans-boundary groundwater are major sources of water in the region and thus emphasize the need to reconsider cross-border politics and view potential solutions from a regional, rather than state based perspective. [Dr. Kelly Bannister](#) of the Center for Global Studies POLIS Project on Ecological Governance summed up the dilemma of resource governance by saying that nature has no boundaries, so how do we deal with governance issues that do?

Inadequate Governance and Ecological Challenges

There was categorical agreement between all of the panelists that governance around resource management is outdated and in need of serious reconceptualization. Oliver Brandes argued that the top-down method of water governance is ineffective and unsustainable. Instead, grassroots, ground-up education and management is a more sustainable and lasting alternative. One of the big problems facing governance and resource issues is that resource law is not based on the protection of ecological resources and systems, but on the extraction of resources. Therefore, there is little or no legal framework for the sustainable use of resources.

Steve Lonergan discussed that in the Middle East, and in most countries around the world, there is a tension between a given state's internal development plans and regional water management. That is, a country like Turkey will damn a river to boost its energy supplies at the expense of those down river in Iraq and Syria. This has regional ecological consequences and gives only short-term benefit to the beneficiaries. In the case of Enbridge, Swain argued that the Canadian government's outdated approach to indigenous politics is neglecting First Nations concerns with the pipeline and also threatening those very communities.

Speaking on the issue of bio-piracy and bio-cultural ethics, Kelly Bannister concluded that what is needed are new bio-ethical codes of conduct which focus on the rights and importance of ecosystems and the inhabitants of those ecosystems, and thus guide new approaches to ecological governance.

Re-conceptualizing Old Ideas

Panel members agreed that the solution to ecological governance problems require a reconceptualization of how these issues are dealt with in a trans-boundary sense. Cooperation and regional solutions, rather than individual state solutions are mandatory. Steve Lonergan made the point that the old adage “whisky is for drinking, water is for fighting” is a largely “Hollywood” idea which is generally untrue; there has actually been much more cooperation than fighting over water in history. The emphasis on shifting to a focus on ecosystem rights and sustainability was a recurring idea amongst the panelists. Oliver Brandes took this further, by saying that we must not only manage the watersheds, but we must manage people in watersheds. Watershed management is not just an ecological problem, but also a social problem. People must respect and support watersheds if watersheds are to survive. Brandes also argued that from an economic standpoint, managing people in watersheds is much cheaper and more sustainable than trading and transporting bulk water, which is costly and unsustainable. In essence, International and regional, ground-up solutions, rather than intrastate, top-down approaches must be the new approach to solving ecological governance issues.

“Borders and Boundary Crossing: The Dynamics of Borderlands/Border Crossing and Transnational Governance.”

The purpose of this panel was to examine the nature of transnational democratic change throughout the globe over the past 30 years. While the panelists discussed changes in Latin America, Europe, and the Middle East, it was the Middle East which had particular prominence in the concluding discussion, given its current relevance. Within this third panel discussion the three key points discussed were: a) the shifting nature and use of borders and boundaries; b) inadequate governance and democratic transition; c) and reconceptualizing democratic transition.

The Shifting Nature and Use of Borders and Boundaries

[Dr. Martin Bunton](#) from the [History department of the University of Victoria](#) began the third panel discussion by asking where we place the Middle East revolutions and how we define them? He asked if by referring to these series of events in the Middle East as the “Arab Spring”, are we defining them as something inherently Arab, or something inherently Middle Eastern? He declared that, while there were definite symbolic and political links between the various revolutions in the Middle East, we must recognize that what is ultimately taking place in these countries is still being acted out in a national context. For example, Mohammed Morsi’s Muslim Brotherhood government in Egypt has thus far demonstrated itself to be focused inward in Egypt and not trying to export Islamic Revolution to other places in the

region. In this sense, the idea of an “Islamist winter” is reductionist and draws a false geography about the events taking place. Saying that the events are inherently inter-related because of cultural and geographical similarities does not tell the whole story.

Dr. Hamid Dabashi replied to these ideas by stating that we must dispose of our “linear” and traditional ways of categorizing these events. He argued that while the “Arab Spring” was happening in the Middle East, there were similar movements in Sub-Saharan Africa, which went unnoticed because they were not classified as “Arab.” He emphasized that at the same time the Middle East revolutions were happening, the occupy movement was gathering steam in North America, the Quebec student protests were happening, and the economic protests in Greece and Spain were occurring. Therefore, we must dispose of the East/West, Middle East/Europe binary when we draw intellectual borders around these phenomena. These events are happening at the same time in parallel, not in a linear one-after-the-other succession.

Inadequate Governance and Democratic Transition

When examining the progress made in democratic transitions in the past thirty years, the panel concluded that inadequate and failing governance was a consistent problem. [Dr. Michelle Bonner](#), a Latin American studies specialist from the University of Victoria’s Political Science department discussed how more people have been killed in Brazil in police related violence in the post-dictatorship period than during the dictatorship period. She noted that across Latin America, despotic dictatorships have been replaced by corrupt neo-liberal regimes, which have had free, fair, and competitive elections, but still reinforce and exacerbate problems of corruption, inequality and violence. Along with this, neo-liberal spending policies have lead to underfunded judiciaries, which have lead to increased vigilantism when dealing with crime and thus increased criminality and lawlessness. So-called democratic governments have exploited the fear of crime to justify heavy-handed police measures and trample basic citizenship rights. Furthermore, Dr. Bonner pointed out that the concept of the citizen in many post-dictatorial Latin American societies has become based on the idea of the citizen as a consumer. That is, your value as a citizen is based on your ability to spend money in the economy; if you cannot afford to spend you have no value and thus no rights.

[Dr. Oliver Schmidke](#), the [Centre for Global Studies](#) interim director and European studies specialist from the University of Victoria’s Political Science department, also discussed how post-communist governments in Central and Eastern Europe have been far from adequate in the transition to democracy and that we must dispel the notion that the changes in Europe were overnight successes. He discussed how in many ways they were not

even full revolutions; much of the communist elite maintained positions of power and readily adapted to “govern” in the post-communist era. Also, the changes in many of these countries have brought with them increased inequality and deep-rooted corruption. Dr. Schmidke fundamentally argued that elections don’t make democracy, and that the transitions in Europe were not the glowing example on the hill they are sometimes made out to be. His case and point was Hungary, a country which is considered a “mature democracy”, yet has recently elected a government that is in the process of making deep constitutional changes. These changes are being made without public consent and are curtailing basic democratic institutions, like the media.

Re-conceptualizing Democratic Transition

Taking into account the fact that democratic transitions in Europe and Latin America have been anything but smooth, the panelists jointly concluded that we must re-conceptualize the phenomena in the Middle East, as well as democratic transition in general. Both Dr. Dabashi and Dr. Schmidke argued that we must end the triumphalist discourse of western liberal democracy triumphing across the globe. This thinking is “colonial in nature,” argued Dr. Schmidke. Dr. Dabashi sarcastically asked, if western liberal democracy is what we hope for in Egypt, then are we hoping to see an Egyptian Romney and Obama in two hundred years? Dabashi’s point was that even western democracies have much work to do, and therefore constantly conceptualizing non-western democratic transitions in relation to western democracy is fundamentally flawed. In this respect, he said, there is “no model” for democracy and we are at the “ground-zero of history.” That is, new paths and ways of conceptualizing democracy and revolution must be pursued if we are to see true change. Furthermore, Dabashi stated that we must recognize that “pessimism is being sold as realism” and liberate ourselves from this binary when examining the changes around us.

Continuing in the vein of conceptions and ideas of revolution and democracy, Dr. Bunton raised the issue of what exactly these terms can mean for various peoples. He pointed out that in Central and Eastern Europe there was an economic element to the revolutions, which called for more economic liberalism along western lines. In the Middle East, and particularly in Egypt, Tunisia, and Yemen, there has been a backlash against the liberalist cronyism of western backed leaders. Furthermore, there has been a big emphasis on ideas like dignity and rights, therefore illustrating differences in conceptions of democracy and challenging the idea that these revolutions should be measured against each other. Bunton also, wanted to dispel the notion that technology was the only major driving force in the Middle East revolutions. While this was true, he argued that labor unions and grassroots face-to-face organizations had a very crucial and unsung role as well.

Ultimately Bunton, Dabashi, Bonner, and Schmidke all argued, in their own ways, that we must not think of revolution as a short and absolute event. As this comparative discussion presented, revolutions are ongoing, continuous, and open-ended.

Keynote Presentation: Dr Hamid Dabashi: “...and the Pursuit of Public Happiness: Thinking with Hannah Arendt on the Arab Revolutions.”

The conclusion of the “Borders and Boundaries” panel, that revolutions are long lasting and continuous, set the stage for [Dr. Hamid Dabashi’s](#) keynote speech. Dr. Dabashi’s speech tied together many of the issues discussed throughout the day, including perceptions of boundaries, revolutions, and democracy. Using Hannah Arendt’s work *On Revolution* as his theoretical backing, and the Egyptian revolution as his example he expanded on his “ground-zero” idea and explained how our very preconceptions about revolution, democracy, and boundaries (both real and imagined) are being challenged by the changes taking place in the world.

Before delving into the Arab revolutions, Dr. Dabashi, in a similar vein to Dr. Bunton, called into question the words “Arab” and “Revolution.” He asserted that although it is necessary to name the phenomenon, and there are some important relationships between the various revolutions in the Arab world, we must be careful when using them. This is because the words “Arab”, and “Muslim” cover an extremely diverse spectrum of people, “from the fat Kuwaiti Sheikh watching his cholesterol in a French restaurant, to the Algerian bus boy washing his dishes in the same restaurant.” Furthermore, as he mentioned earlier in the day, by using the term “Arab” we are discounting other social movements and changes taking place elsewhere in the world that are equally important. Additionally, the word “Revolution” implies the complete dismantling of a regime in order to bring about change. Dabashi argued that we must be careful with this word because it does not necessarily describe every event that is taking place. He asserted that the 2009 Green Movement in Iran was not a revolution (nor is Iran an Arab country), but instead a civil rights movement whose key demands were basic civil liberties and political rights, not the complete dismantling of the Iranian regime.

Dr. Dabashi began his talk by discussing how Arendt, based on her reading of the American Revolution (in juxtaposition to the French revolution) re-conceptualized the idea of revolution as something which takes place in the public domain. For Arendt, freedom is defined as the ability to participate in politics in the public domain. It is this idea of the public domain that Dabashi used as his entry point to his discussion on the Arab revolutions. Based on the concept of public space, Dr. Dabashi laid out three dispositions derived from Arendt’s work which he argued comprised the

Egyptian Revolution and which are necessary for us to reconceptualize revolutions in general. The first was the cosmopol, or the collective consciousness of the people. The second was Kamp, which is the complete opposite of cosmopol; the idea of the “naked man.” The third is the idea of Tahrir Square (the physical focal point of the Egyptian revolution), which is the public domain in which people practice their political freedom and rediscover the cosmopol. Dabashi explained that it is the strategy of a police state to control its people by defusing the cosmopol and driving barriers between citizens. In this context, Tahrir then becomes the public sphere where citizens rediscover their collective consciousness, or cosmopol. According to Dabashi, it is this unifying, energizing factor of the cosmopol which is the essence of a revolution. Dabashi applied this model not only to Egypt, but across the globe to places including the United States.

Based on the dispositions he laid out, Dabashi argued that in the case of Egypt, the people had “liberated” Tahrir square with mass numbers and had thus created the public space in which the cosmopol was rediscovered. Even after the square was stormed by Mubarak’s thugs on camels, people insisted on staying in the square as a unified force. Furthermore, when the barrier of fear began receding, rather than storm the center of power down the road in the presidential palace, Egyptians insisted on staying in Tahrir Square and maintaining it as a “liberated zone.” This emphasized, in Dabashi’s view, the reconceptualization of revolution as an act in the public sphere, and allowed for the maintenance of the sense of unity and euphoria of being part of a public, which fuelled the revolution. Dabashi emphasized the significance of the public space by pointing out that the symbolic image of the Egyptian revolution was not a Che Guevara like individual, but instead mass crowds.

Once this cosmopol and mass euphoria are rediscovered, Dabashi stated that the challenge then becomes how to maintain this euphoria and translate it into action. This echoed what Dr. Schmidke had said earlier in the day, which is that one of the biggest challenges of revolution and democratization is turning ideals into action. Hannah Arendt argued that societal “wards” are the basic unit of the revolution. These wards create a buffer between the state, who may try and centralize power and take the power of the revolution away, and individuals, who may wish to derail the revolution in their own way.

Building on this idea, Dr. Dabashi discussed that he has identified three basic wards or voluntary organizations in Arab and Muslim societies which he sees as essential for maintaining positive change. The first ward, or unit, is labor unions. Labor unions organize and continue to mobilize large economic classes of citizens who ensure the maintenance of the spirit of the revolution. The second unit is women’s rights organizations. The reason women’s rights organizations are seen as important is that women have been traditionally told put their demands on hold, until after a revolution

“succeeds.” However, Dabashi argued, this was counterintuitive, as a revolution cannot succeed until it has encompassed the majority of the people. Women make up half the population, therefore it is imperative that they play an active role in maintaining the revolution. The third unit for maintaining a revolution is student assemblies. The most important reason for student involvement is the trans-generational maintenance of the revolution. With student involvement, Dabashi argues that subsequent generations would not have to reinvent the democratic achievements of their forbearers.

Dr. Dabashi proposed that with these three units maintained, the majority of the citizens become involved and invested in maintaining the revolution. Importantly, the angle of the revolution shifts away from the state to the society. In this context Dabashi injected the idea of an open ended revolution, as maintaining a revolution means constantly questioning power and maintaining the cosmopol in the face of any power which may try to impose itself. With open-ended revolution and the three units of revolution, the revolution is not centralized in one place. There is no single person or center of power where the revolution takes place. The revolution is maintained and acted out at the grassroots, or cosmopolitan level. When a revolution is decentralized in such a manner, it becomes harder to stop. Dabashi declared, “there is no Gemal Abdl Nasser in this [Egyptian] revolution, and we are lucky for that fact.”

Dabashi moved on to say that the Middle East revolutions represent the final abandonment of post-colonial domination in the Middle East. That is, the regimes that are now being overthrown, were not regimes which liberated their peoples from colonial tyranny, but regimes that simply mimicked what their colonial masters had done to them. Along with the death of these colonial regimes comes the death of the colonial ideas that come with them. The ideas of a monolithic “Islam” and the so-called “West” are some of those ideas. Dabashi asked rhetorically, where is the ‘West’ when infant mortality rates in Harlem, New York are worse than Bangladesh?

On this note Dabashi returned to his earlier point that we are at the “ground zero of history.” That is, the East/West binary is dead and we are now facing a “major epistemic shift” in terms of boundaries and ideas in world politics. The ground zero of history and democracy is no longer the west, but now Tahrir square. He argues that we are in need of new knowledge generation. Part of this, is what he has coined, “Liberation Geography.” That is, we (the West) must liberate ourselves from the traditional narratives and confines surrounding our views of the world in order to see the new reality in front of us. The border does not have to be Europe and the Middle East. It can be the Mediterranean and the Sub-Saharan, the mountains and the lowlands, or no boundaries at all.

Responses to Dr. Dabashi's Presentation

In response to Dabashi's conclusions, [Dr. Andrew Wender](#), from the University of Victoria's Political Science and History Departments agreed with Dr. Dabashi and elaborated on some points. Essentially he agreed that there is a bursting forth of social democratic movements outside of the traditional boundaries of western perceptions of democracy. He proposed that these movements and ideas are trans-boundary in nature, and mean that we must move away from reductionist and top-down Hobbesian ways of thinking about statehood and political space.

[Dr. Gregory Blue](#) of the University of Victoria's History department then offered his own assessment. Dr. Blue essentially agreed with Dr. Dabashi and showed a particular interest in the role of labor unions, women's rights organizations, and student movements. As an historian, he offered two historic analogies: one being the failed 1848 revolutions in Europe, which signified that the future has not yet been lived and there is still much to come in the current revolutions; and the other the Irish revolution, in which the British government granted some of the demands of some revolutionaries as means of satisfying the Irish elite in order to demobilize the working masses. He summarized his conclusion by saying that there are now threats to the gains of the revolutions as well as hope, and cosmopolitanism is one of those hopes.

Student respondents Kaveh Bavand and Adrian Hartrick also offered insights with each expressing concerns based on Arendt's theory on violence in revolution. The theory argues that violent revolution can destroy the positive end it was hoping to achieve. Both Bavand and Hartrick questioned the likelihood of positive change in places like Syria, where the "Chinese solution" is being applied. That is, revolutions in which violence is rampant, like the revolution in Syria, are destroying the very improved society, and open-ended revolution that they are hoping to achieve.

Conclusion

The changes in the world in terms of borders and governance as they relate to technology, resource scarcity, political revolutions, and political ideas are forcing us to rethink our traditional paradigms, boundaries and perceptions in real time, as they happen. It is not just one change of ideas, but a continuous flow of changes that are continuous and open ended in nature, and forcing us to strive for new knowledge generation.

The basic conclusion of the conference was that cooperation, based on dynamic and cosmopolitan new paradigms of thinking is key to addressing these changes. Around the world, in revolutions, ecological problems, and technological changes, we are seeing the nature and role of borders and boundaries changing. Along with this change is the apparent problem that

governing bodies, both national and trans-national are ill equipped to adapt to these changes. As a result, the participants at this conference concluded that our understanding of boundaries, as well as the boundaries themselves must be fundamentally reconsidered and include the wisdom of civil, grassroots, cosmopolitan, ground-up governance and action.

As keynote speaker Dr. Hamid Dabashi argued, it is imperative that we liberate ourselves from the traditional confining narratives of borders and associations; it is no longer western liberal democracy and eastern liberal tyranny, linear domino theories of democratic revolution, and Che Guevara figures leading the way. We are living in a world of multiple changes happening in concert with one another, within and across different kinds of borders, interacting and reacting to one another. We are facing a major “epistemic shift” and in this sense, Dabashi argued, “we are at the Ground-Zero of history.”

Participants List on Next Page

Name	Affiliation	Contact
Abbott, Clint	Centre for Global Studies	cabbott@uvic.ca
Anastasiou, Michaelangelo	Pacific and Asian Studies	anastasiouma@gmail.com
Baavand, Kaveh	Student, Department of Political Science & History	baavand@hotmail.com
Baltutis, Jesse	Researcher & Water Policy and Governance Project Coordinator, POLIS Project on Ecological Governance, Water Sustainability Project	water@polisproject.org
Bannister, Kelly	Co-Director, POLIS Project on Ecological Governance and Research Associate, Centre for Global Studies	kel@uvic.ca
Bennett, Colin	Professor, Department of Political Science	cjb@uvic.ca
Bonner, Michelle	Associate Professor, Department of Political Science	mbonner@uvic.ca
Brandes, Laura	Communications Director, POLIS Project on Ecological Governance, Water Sustainability Project	communications@polisproject.org
Brandes, Oliver	Co-Director, POLIS Project on Ecological Governance and Senior Research Associate, Centre for Global Studies	omb@uvic.ca
Brown, Christopher	Professor, Department of Political Science	racbrown@uvic.ca
Bunton, Martin	University of Victoria	mbunton@uvic.ca
Crelinsten, Ron	Centre for Global Studies	crelinst@uvic.ca
Dabashi, Hamid	Hagop Kevorkian Professor of Iranian Studies and Comparative Literature at Columbia University, New York	gb2192@caa.columbia.edu
Dobell, Rod	Research Associate, Centre for Global Studies	rdobell@uvic.ca
Grover, Brian	Department of Geography	brian.grover@shaw.ca
Hartrick, Adrian	Graduate of Political Science & History	amhartrick@gmail.com
Herbert, Tracey	Executive Director at First Peoples' Heritage, Language and Culture Council	tracey@fpcc.ca
Hilmy, Hanny	Ph.D. Candidate, Department of History	hilmyh@uvic.ca
Dessertine, Jordan	Graduate Student, Environmental Studies	jdesser@uvic.ca
Froekjaer-Jensen, Julie	Graduate Candidate, Indigenous Governance	juliefroekjaer@yahoo.com
Livshits, Rita	Department of Pacific & Asian Studies	rita.livshits@gmail.com

Name	Affiliation	Contact
Lonergan, Steve	Professor Emeritus, Department of Geography	lonergan@uvic.ca
Molnar, Adam	Ph.D. Candidate, Department of Political Science	apm@uvic.ca
Moore, Michele-Lee	Assistant Professor, Department of Geography	mlmoore@uvic.ca
Motz, Shelley	Masters student, Department of Political Science	shelley.motz@shaw.ca
Mueller, Miriam	Student, Department of Political Science	miriam.mueller@fu-berlin.de
O'Riordan, Jon	Strategic Water Policy Advisor, POLIS Project on Ecological Governance	joriorda@shaw.ca
Ozkut, Iffet	Centre for Global Studies	
Parsons, Chris	PhD Candidate, Department of Political Science	parsons@uvic.ca
Ross, Christopher	SSHRC Postdoctoral Fellow & Assistant Professor, Department of History	cnbr@uvic.ca
Schmidtke, Oliver	Interim Director, Centre for Global Studies	ofs@uvic.ca
Sedky Goode, Mona	Coordinator Middle East and Islamic Consortium of BC (MEICON-BC)	goodems@uvic.ca
Shaban, Tania	INTD PhD Candidate, Department of Political Science & History	tshaban@uvic.ca
Swain, Harry	Centre for Global Studies	swain.h@telus.net
Swift, Jennifer	Project Coordinator, Centre for Global Studies	jswift@uvic.ca
Walsh, Jodie	Research Coordinator, Centre for Global Studies	jodie@uvic.ca
Wender, Andrew	Sessional Instructor, Departments of History & Political Science	amwender@uvic.ca
Williams, Lorna	CRC Indigenous Knowledge and Learning Associate Professor EDCI, LING; Chair: First Peoples Heritage, Language and Culture Council	lornawil@uvic.ca
Yoon, Sunju	Masters student, Department of Political Science	sunjuy@uvic.ca