

POLS 520
Comparative Politics Proseminar
FALL 2019

Instructor: Prof. Dr. Mala Htun

Time and Location: Monday 1.30 pm - 4.00 pm, SSCI 2069

Contact: malahtun@unm.edu

Office Hours: Tuesday 2.00-3:00pm, SSCI 2041

Overview and Objectives

Why do some countries turn into stable democracies while others remain under dictatorships? Why do some social groups enjoy more political power and influence than others? How can we account for variation in government performance and social service delivery across countries and subnational units? This course, an advanced survey of the field of comparative politics, tackles these questions and many others. Each week analyzes one of the subfield's thematic areas of inquiry including state formation, democratization, authoritarianism, political parties, institutions, collective action, racial and ethnic identities, representation, accountability, and the welfare state. The course is designed to train Ph.D. students preparing for qualifying exams in comparative politics and involves extensive reading.

Learning Objectives

This course is designed to achieve the following learning objectives:

- Evaluation of theoretical concepts
- Exploration of how concepts apply and relate to empirical data
- Critical analysis of scholarly arguments
- Comparison of different theoretical approaches to the same factual material
- Formulation and expression of original perspectives on scholarly contributions orally and in writing

Requirements

You are expected to complete the assigned readings for each session, attend course meetings, and participate actively in the discussion. Excessive use of laptops, tablets, and smartphones in class hinders achievement of course objectives.

Each student should choose one of the following for their writing assignment:

- Three short (six- to eight-page) papers on any week's reading.
 - The papers are due in class the day we will discuss the reading.
 - There are no fixed deadlines for these papers. However, I encourage you to turn in your papers as soon as possible to avoid an end-of-semester backlog and to make sure that later papers benefit from comments made on earlier papers.
 - The papers should identify the central issues raised in the assigned reading for the week, locate the various authors's position on those issues, and comment critically on the debate and the value of each contribution to it.
 - When writing your paper, bear in mind some of the following questions. What are the central theoretical issues at stake? What are the principal arguments of each author? How does each author's contribution relate to other perspectives? What are the main strengths or weaknesses of each contribution? How valuable, original, and viable is the theory or argument proposed? What is the author's methodology and is it appropriate to her question?
- One seminar-length paper (20 to 25 pages) due during exam week. You may not turn in a paper you are writing for another course. If you choose this option, you should submit a short, one-paragraph proposal describing your paper topic to me no later than September 30.

Evaluation

You are expected to arrive to class having completed the assigned reading and ready to sustain a scholarly discussion about it. Class participation will count for 30% of your grade. The short papers will each count for 20%. The long paper will count for 70%.

Academic integrity

We expect each student to maintain the highest standards of honesty and integrity in academic and professional matters. The University reserves the right to take disciplinary action, up to and including dismissal, against any student who is found guilty of academic dishonesty or otherwise fails to meet the standards. Any student judged to have engaged in academic dishonesty in course work may receive a reduced or failing grade for the work in question or for the course.

Academic dishonesty includes, but is not limited to, plagiarism; dishonesty in quizzes, tests, or assignments; claiming credit for work not done or done by others; hindering the academic work of other students; misrepresenting academic or professional qualifications within or without the University; and nondisclosure or misrepresentation in filling out applications or other University records.

Title IX

Title IX of the Federal Educational Amendments Act of 1972 prohibits sex discrimination, including various forms of sexual misconduct such as sexual assault, rape, sexual harassment, domestic and dating violence, and stalking. If you or someone you know has been harassed or assaulted and would like to receive support and academic advocacy, there are numerous confidential routes available to you. For example, you can contact the Women's Resource Center, the LGBTQ Resource Center, Student Health and Counseling (SHAC), or LoboRESPECT. LoboRESPECT can be contacted on their 24-hour crisis line, (505) 277-2911 and online at loborespect@unm.edu. You can receive non-confidential support and learn more about Title IX through the Title IX Coordinator at (505) 277-5251 and <http://oeo.unm.edu/title-ix/>. Reports to law enforcement can be made to UNM Police Department at (505) 277-2241.

Accessibility

In accordance with University Policy 2310 and the Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA), academic accommodations may be made for any student who notifies the instructor of the need for an accommodation. It is imperative that you take the initiative to bring such needs to the instructor's attention, as I am not legally permitted to inquire. Students who may require assistance in emergency evacuations should contact the instructor as to the most appropriate procedures to follow. Contact Accessibility Resource Center at 277-3506 or arc.unm.edu for additional information.

If you need an accommodation based on how course requirements interact with the impact of a disability, you should contact me to arrange an appointment as soon as possible. At the appointment, we can discuss the course format and requirements, anticipate the need for adjustments and explore potential accommodations. I rely on the Disability Services Office for assistance in developing strategies and verifying accommodation needs. If you have not previously contacted them I encourage you to do so.

Credit hour statement

This is a three credit-hour course. Class meets for one 150-minute session of direct instruction for fifteen weeks during the Fall 2019 semester. Students are expected to complete a minimum of six hours of out-of-class work each week.

Course Outline

Week 1 (August 19): Introduction

- Introduction to objectives, syllabus, and plan.

- Discussion of comparative politics: approaches, theory, and method.

Week 2 (August 26): Modernization theory and its critics

Lerner, D. (1958). *The passing of traditional society: Modernizing the Middle East*. The Free Press(Chs. 1-2, pages 19-75).

Lipset, S. M. (1950). *Political man: The social bases of politics*. Doubleday, New York(Ch. 2).

Huntington, S. P. (1968). *Political order in changing societies*. Yale University Press(pp. 1-92).

Valenzuela, J. S. and Valenzuela, A. (1978). Modernization and dependency: Alternative perspectives in the study of latin american underdevelopment. *Comparative politics*, 10(4):535–557.

Skocpol, T. (1973). A critical review of barrington moore’s social origins of dictatorship and democracy. *Politics & Society*, 4(1):1–34.

Inglehart, R. and Welzel, C. (2005). *Modernization, cultural change, and democracy: The human development sequence*. Cambridge University Press(Chs. 1-2, pp. 15-76).

Week 3. NO CLASS FOR LABOR DAY, SEPTEMBER 2.

Week 4 (September 9): The State

Weber, M. (1946). *From Max Weber*, chapter Bureaucracy. New York: Oxford University Press.

Tilly, C. (2017). Coercion, capital, and european states, ad 990–1990. In *Collective Violence, Contentious Politics, and Social Change*, pages 140–154. Routledge.

Krasner, S. D. (1984). Approaches to the state: Alternative conceptions and historical dynamics. *Comparative Politics*, 16(2):223–246.

Scott, J. C. (1998). *Seeing like a state: How certain schemes to improve the human condition have failed*. Yale University Press(pp. 11-52, 309-41). this book is available electronically through UNM Libraries.

Fukuyama, F. (2011). *The origins of political order: From prehuman times to the French Revolution*. Farrar, Straus and Giroux(Ch. 7).

Bates, R. H. (2015). *When things fell apart*. Cambridge University Press(pp. 3-6, 15-29, 97-139).

Week 5 (September 16): Collective Action

Schelling, T. C. (1980). *The strategy of conflict*. Harvard university press.

Olson, M. (1982/2008). *The rise and decline of nations: Economic growth, stagflation, and social rigidities*. Yale University Press(chs. 2-3).

Putnam, R. D., Leonardi, R., and Nanetti, R. Y. (1994). *Making democracy work: Civic traditions in modern Italy*. Princeton university press(chs. 1, 4, 5, 6).

Berman, S. (1997). Civil society and the collapse of the weimar republic. *World politics*, 49(3):401–429.

Nunn, N. and Wantchekon, L. (2011). The slave trade and the origins of mistrust in africa. *American Economic Review*, 101(7):3221–52.

King, G., Pan, J., and Roberts, M. E. (2013). How censorship in china allows government criticism but silences collective expression. *American Political Science Review*, 107(2):326–343.

Week 6 (September 23): Institutions

Lijphart, A. (2012). *Patterns of democracy: Government forms and performance in thirty-six countries*. Yale University Press.

North, D. C. (1990). *Institutions, institutional change and economic performance*. Cambridge university press(pp. pp. 3-10, 107-117).

Hall, P. A. and Taylor, R. C. (1996). Political science and the three new institutionalisms. *Political studies*, 44(5):936–957.

Streeck, W. and Thelen, K. (2005). Introduction: Institutional change in advanced political economies. *Beyond continuity: Institutional change in advanced political economies*, pages 1–39.

Brinks, D. M., Levitsky, S., and Murillo, M. V. (2019). *Understanding Institutional Weakness: Power and Design in Latin American Institutions*. Cambridge University Press.

Przeworski, A. (2004). Institutions matter? *Government and opposition*, 39(4):527–540.

Week 7 (September 30): Democratization

Dahl, R. A. (1973). *Polyarchy: Participation and opposition*. Yale University Press(chapters 1 (pp. 1-16), 3-7 (pp. 33-123), 9-10 (pp. 189-207)).

Przeworski, A. (1991). *Democracy and the market: Political and economic reforms in Eastern Europe and Latin America*. Cambridge University Press(pp. 1-40).

Paxton, P. (2000). Women's suffrage in the measurement of democracy: Problems of operationalization. *Studies in Comparative International Development*, 35(3):92–111.

Przeworski, A. and Limongi, F. (1997). Modernization: Theories and facts. *World politics*, 49(2):155–183.

Boix, C. and Stokes, S. C. (2003). Endogenous democratization. *World politics*, 55(4):517–549.

Ziblatt, D. (2017). *Conservative Political Parties and the Birth of Modern Democracy in Europe*. Cambridge University Press(Chs. 1, 2,10, 11 (pp. 1-53; 334-368)).

No class Week 8, 9

Week 10 (October 21): Authoritarianism

Linz, J. J. (2000). *Totalitarian and authoritarian regimes*. Lynne Rienner Publishers.

Stepan, A. C. (1988). *Rethinking military politics: Brazil and the Southern Cone*. Princeton University Press.

Geddes, B. (1999). What do we know about democratization after twenty years? *Annual review of political science*, 2(1):115–144.

Magaloni, B. (2008). Credible power-sharing and the longevity of authoritarian rule. *Comparative Political Studies*, 41(4-5):715–741.

Ross, M. L. (2001). Does oil hinder democracy? *World politics*, 53(3):325–361.

Slater, D. (2010). *Ordering power: Contentious politics and authoritarian leviathans in Southeast Asia*. Cambridge University Press(pp. 1-27).

Gandhi, J. and Lust-Okar, E. (2009). Elections under authoritarianism. *Annual review of political science*, 12:403–422.

Week 11 (October 28): Parties and Party Systems

Downs, A. et al. (1957). An economic theory of democracy(chs. 7-8).

Aldrich, J. H. (1995). *Why parties?: The origin and transformation of political parties in America*. University of Chicago Press(pp. 3-61).

Lipset, S. M. and Rokkan, S. (1967). *Party systems and voter alignments: Cross-national perspectives*, volume 7. Free press(pp. 1-64).

Schlesinger, J. A. (1984). On the theory of party organization. *The Journal of Politics*, 46(2):369–400.

Mainwaring, S. (1999). *Rethinking party systems in the third wave of democratization: the case of Brazil*. Stanford University Press(pp. 21-60).

Chandra, K. (2005). Ethnic parties and democratic stability. *Perspectives on Politics*, (2):235.

Week 12 (November 4): Racial and Ethnic Identity Politics

Brubaker, R., Loveman, M., and Stamatov, P. (2004). Ethnicity as cognition. *Theory and society*, 33(1):31–64.

Bates, R. H. (1983). Modernization, ethnic competition, and the rationality of politics in contemporary africa. *State versus ethnic claims: African policy dilemmas*, 152:171.

Dancygier, R. M. (2017). *Dilemmas of inclusion: Muslims in European politics*. Princeton University Press(Chs.1-2).

Hooker, J. (2005). Indigenous inclusion/black exclusion: Race, ethnicity and multicultural citizenship in latin america. *Journal of Latin American Studies*, 37(2):285–310.

Htun, M. (2004). Is gender like ethnicity? the political representation of identity groups. *Perspectives on Politics*, 2(3):439–458.

Posner, D. N. (2004). The political salience of cultural difference: Why chewas and tumbukas are allies in zambia and adversaries in malawi. *American Political Science Review*, 98(4):529–545.

Miguel, E. and Gugerty, M. K. (2005). Ethnic diversity, social sanctions, and public goods in kenya. *Journal of public Economics*, 89(11-12):2325–2368.

Week 13 (November 11): Representation and Accountability

Hirschman, A. O. (1970). *Exit, voice, and loyalty: Responses to decline in firms, organizations, and states*, volume 25. Harvard university press.

Przeworski, A., Stokes, S. C., and Manin, B. (1999). *Democracy, accountability, and representation*, volume 2. Cambridge University Press.

Mansbridge, J. (2003). Rethinking representation. *American political science review*, 97(4):515–528.

Schmitter, P. C. (1974). Still the century of corporatism? *The Review of politics*, 36(1):85–131.

Kitschelt, H., Wilkinson, S. I., et al. (2007). Citizen-politician linkages: an introduction. *Patrons, clients, and policies: Patterns of democratic accountability and political competition*, pages 1–49.

Calvo, E. and Murillo, M. V. (2013). When parties meet voters: Assessing political linkages through partisan networks and distributive expectations in argentina and chile. *Comparative Political Studies*, 46(7):851–882.

Thachil, T. (2014). Elite parties and poor voters: Theory and evidence from india. *American Political Science Review*, 108(2):454–477.

Week 14 (November 18) Welfare States

Esping-Andersen, G. (1990). *The three worlds of welfare capitalism*. Princeton University Press(Chs. 1-3).

Iversen, T. and Soskice, D. (2006). Electoral institutions and the politics of coalitions: Why some democracies redistribute more than others. *American Political Science Review*, 100(2):165–181.

Iversen, T. and Rosenbluth, F. (2006). The political economy of gender: Explaining cross-national variation in the gender division of labor and the gender voting gap. *American Journal of Political Science*, 50(1):1–19.

Garay, C. (2016). *Social policy expansion in Latin America*. Cambridge University Press.

Singh, P. (2015). Subnationalism and social development: A comparative analysis of indian states. *World Politics*, 67(3):506–562.

Hacker, J. S. and Pierson, P. (2010). Winner-take-all politics: Public policy, political organization, and the precipitous rise of top incomes in the united states. *Politics & Society*, 38(2):152–204.

Week 15 (November 25): The Comparative Method

Skocpol, T. and Somers, M. (1980). The uses of comparative history in macrosocial inquiry. *Comparative studies in society and history*, 22(2):174–197.

Simmons, E. S. and Smith, N. R. (2017). Comparison with an ethnographic sensibility. *PS: Political Science & Politics*, 50(1):126–130.

Falleti, T. G. and Lynch, J. F. (2009). Context and causal mechanisms in political analysis. *Comparative political studies*, 42(9):1143–1166.

Wood, E. J. (2007). Field research. In Boix, C. and Stokes, S., editors, *The Oxford handbook of comparative politics*. Oxford University Press.

Mosley, L. (2013). *Interview research in political science*. Cornell University Press(Introduction).

Teele, D. L. (2014). *Field experiments and their critics: Essays on the uses and abuses of experimentation in the social sciences*. Yale University Press(Introduction).

Week 16 (December 2): Conclusion