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This is the graduate field seminar in Comparative Politics. Based on a reading list that covers what is arguably the most wide-ranging, diverse literature in any field of Political Science, the course is organized to give you an overview of the substantive themes, methodological debates, and regional variations in this field. Since comparativists themselves usually specialize in only a limited subset of the countries we will address, this seminar and the field examination linked to it may be your best opportunity in graduate school to read widely in this literature. At the same time, you will find that many of the debates in comparative politics raise the same analytical and methodological questions as in the study of American politics or International Relations. Written assignments are geared toward giving you an opportunity to synthesize and analyze parts of this literature, and develop research agendas aimed at contributing to it.

The readings combine several sorts of selections. First, I have included a number of formative works that every student of comparative politics should know. In some instances, such as Barrington Moore’s *Social Origins of Dictatorship and Democracy*, these readings are required; in others, I have included classic works as recommended readings. Second, the list also stresses some of the most prominent new work, and new directions of research that are likely to play a growing role in future comparative politics. Finally, especially in the essays of the Lichbach and Zuckerman volume, you will find a number of attempts at theoretical syntheses or intellectual histories of traditions in the literature.

The initial weeks will survey current work on the scope of the contemporary field, and the methodological concerns surrounding the comparative method as an approach to the study of politics. In the following week, the substantive readings begin with works related to the theories of modernization that dominated the field in the 1960s. Thereafter, we will consider treatments of globalization, which emerged in the 1990s with a similarly defining role in the field. Subsequent sets of readings, focused on literatures in some of the most prominent areas of research over the last thirty years, combine excerpts from some of the most influential previous work on the subject with current selections that reflect state-of-the-art debates.

Throughout, in addition to evaluating a wide range of works on their own terms, we will consider several recurrent issues at the foundation of comparative politics as a field of study. What is the agenda of the field? How has that agenda evolved since the 1960s, and how is it evolving now? What has shaped this agenda? Where (if anywhere!) has comparative politics contributed to an improved understanding of the world? What types of analytic and methodological strategies have proven most effective in research, and for what purposes? Keeping questions of this sort explicitly in mind will better help us to evaluate the possibilities for research in the field today.

**Readings:**

The following required books have been ordered and should be available at the Bookstore.

Mark Lichbach and Alan Zuckerman (eds.). 1997. *Comparative Politics: Rationality, Culture and Structure*. First edition. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Ruth Berns Collier. 1999. *Paths Toward Democracy: The Working Class and Elites in Western Europe and South America*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Daron Acemoglu and James A. Robinson. 2006. *Economic Origins of Dictatorship and Democracy* (New York: Cambridge University Press).

Haggard, Steven and Kaufman, Robert. 2008. *Democracy, Development and Welfare States.* Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.

Peter Hall and David Soskice (eds.). 2001. *Varieties of Capitalism*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Haggard, Steven and Kaufman, Robert. 2008. *Democracy, Development and Welfare States.* Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.

David Held, et al. 1998. *Global Transformations*. Stanford: Stanford University Press.

Ronald Inglehart and Christian Welzel. 2005. *Modernization, Cultural Change and Democratization*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Arend Lijphart. 1999. *Patterns of Democracy.* New Haven, CT: Yale University Press.

James Mahoney. 2010. *Colonization and Post-Colonial Development.* New York: Cambridge University Press.

Barrington Moore. 1966. *Social Origins of Dictatorship and Democracy: Lord and Peasant in the Making of the Modern World.* Boston: Beacon Press.

Robert Putnam, et al. 1993. *Making Democracy Work.* Princeton: Princeton University Press.

Ashutosh Varshney. 2002. *Ethnic Conflict and Civic Life*. New Haven: Yale University Press

All of these books will also be on reserve at Leavey Library. A portion of the readings, labeled with asterisks (\*) in the readings list, will be made available on the Blackboard website in electronic form. Additional required readings will be available either online through JSTOR or the library, as marked in the reading list.

To comprehend the diversity and vast range of work in this field, you will find that a great deal of reading will be necessary. In most of the domains we will cover, the required readings only offer representative samplings from much more extensive bodies of work. To start you on the way beyond the required assignments, the reading list also includes additional recommended readings. These listings should prove especially useful for those interested in concentrating on a particular topic in greater depth for written assignments and presentations.

**Assignments**

Requirements for the course will center around the final exam and two papers of 8-12 pages that discuss readings for one or more separate weeks.

Each of your papers should either develop a critical analytical perspective on part of the readings for the relevant week, or propose a research project to address a problem relevant to those readings. Remember that the purpose is not to summarize the readings descriptively but to make an argument about them or propose a project addressed to the concerns they raise. You will also be required to give your analysis orally in a 10-minute class presentation. Presenters will also be expected to lead discussion for the week in question. Initial sign-ups for topics will take place in our first session. These papers will be due **no later than 12 noon on the Monday preceding the seminar**. By this time, in addition to leaving a copy in the instructor’s mailbox, you will be expected to post the text of your paper electronically for the other seminar participants at the Blackboard website for the course (accessible using your Unix ID and password (same as for your USC e-mail) at https://blackboard.usc.edu).

If you choose to do a research proposal as one of your papers, the object is to apply literature and concepts from the course along with additional research. The proposal should justify the project both in terms of research design and as a contribution to one of the traditions we will be examining. You will not be expected to carry out the project, but to design a project that you would carry out with the appropriate resources and time.

For those weeks in which you do not prepare a paper, you will also be expected to submit a question or comment on the readings to the Blackboard website for discussion, and (depending on the number of students enrolled) to lead discussion of one portion of the readings. Blackboard submissions will also be due **no later than 5 p.m. on the Monday before the seminar**. Timely submissions will enable all of us to prepare for and organize the seminar discussions.

The exam will be a 48-hour take-home exercise designed in the manner of the Core Examination in the field.

Weighting of assignments will be as follows:

First paper: 25%

First report/discussion leadership: 5%

Second paper: 25%

Second report/discussion leadership: 5%

Class discussion (including .5% for each weekly posting and presentation): 18%

Final Exam: 22%

This list of assignments is based on the assumption that all students will do all the required reading, attend all classes and participate regularly and constructively in discussions. Failure to do any of these tasks will be considered just cause for lowering of your final grade.

Any student requesting academic accommodations based on a disability is required to register with Disability Services and Programs (DSP) each semester. A letter of verification for approved accommodations can be obtained from DSP. Please be sure the letter is delivered to me (or to TA) as early in the semester as possible. DSP is located in STU 301 and is open 8:30 a.m. - 5:00 p.m., Monday through Friday. The phone number for DSP is (213) 740-0776.

**A Note on Other Readings**

Comparative Politics as a professional field has a relatively short history, but comparative thinking about politics, its origins and its consequences goes much farther back. Much of what political scientists read today as “political theory” continues to shape the contemporary field through seminal earlier insights. This same work still furnishes both informal empirical observations and normative questions for contemporary political scientists. Although it is not required reading in this course, you will likely find it useful at some point to acquire at least passing familiarity with the array of older works that helped shape comparative politics. Examples include:

Aristotle, *Politics*

Emile Durkheim, *The Division of Labor in Society*, *Rules of the Sociological Method*

Madison, James; Hamilton, Alexander; and Jay, John. *The Federalist Papers*.

Marx, Karl. *Eighteenth Brumaire of Louis Bonaparte*

Montesquieu, *Spirit of the Laws*

Tocqueville, Alexis de. *The Old Regime and the French Revolution*, *Democracy in America*

Weber, Max. *Economy and Society*, *The Protestant Ethic and the Spirit of Capitalism*

In the professionalized field that has emerged since World War Two, there have periodically been attempts to assemble a comprehensive overview of the field. The required Lichbach and Zuckerman volume from 1997 represents one such attempt; it was particularly successful in crystallizing alternative analytical approaches that are still highly relevant. The last several years have seen an especially intensive proliferation of subfield summaries, from a second, entirely new edition of Lichbach and Zuckerman to series of Handbooks from Oxford University Press, Sage Publications and others. These volumes are typically less integrated, comprehensive or penetrating than they appear at first glance. They usually do better at synthesizing past developments than outlining promising agendas for future inquiry. Nonetheless, they provide a quick overview of recent work and often offer broader perspectives on it than the journal literature. Undergraduate textbooks on comparative politics may also be useful for this purpose.

In addition, an ongoing knowledge of current world events will be helpful. To supplement the often limited information available from U.S. newspapers, most comparativists turn to international publications like the *Financial Times* of London or *The Economist.*

### Class Schedule and Reading List

**(\*=items on Blackboard website)**

**August 26: NO CLASS, due to American Political Science Association Annual Meeting in Washington, D.C.**

**September 2: Introduction and Organizational Meeting**

**September 9: Concepts and Approaches I: Research Traditions in Contemporary Comparative Politics**

The Lichbach and Zuckerman essays sketch three leading alternative traditions that have shaped much of comparative politics research (rationalist, structuralist/institutionalist and culturalist), and outline ways that recent work has sought to blend these traditions. Laitin elaborates a somewhat different view that emphasizes the tensions between formalization, statistical testing and other forms of analysis.

1. What does each of the three research traditions rest on?  
a. Degree and type of generalization?  
b. Ways of defining problems?  
c. Use of evidence?  
d. Type of methods? Type of knowledge?  
e. Political bias or position?

2. What challenges have the three authors treating each of the traditions (Levi, Katznelson, Ross) found that their respective traditions confront? How do they recommend surmounting these challenges? Does any tradition, or any particular synthesis of traditions, promise a new paradigm for research?

3. Laitin reflects a widespread shift toward quantitative analysis in much of comparative politics, which has become more predominant since the original Lichbach and Zuckerman volume. What relation does statistical testing bear to the three traditions? Does it offer a superior alternative to all three?

4. Przeworski points to a cluster of problems that appear to cast doubt on most methodologies, including his own statistical work. What is the problem, and how serious is it?

Lichbach, Mark and Zuckerman, Alan (eds.). 1997. *Comparative Politics: Rationality, Culture and Structure*. First edition. New York: Cambridge University Press. Chapters 2-4.

David D. Laitin. 2002. “Comparative Politics: The State of the Subdiscipline.” In *Political Science: The State of the Discipline,* eds. Ira Katznelson and Helen V. Milner, 630-59. New York and Washington, DC: W.W. Norton & Co. and The American Political Science Association [online at [www.stanford.edu/~dlaitin/papers/Cpapsa.doc](http://www.stanford.edu/~dlaitin/papers/Cpapsa.doc)].

Adam Przeworski, Is the Comparative Science of Politics Possible?, in Carles Boix and Susan Stokes (eds.), *The Oxford Handbook of Comparative Politics* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2009).

[online at <http://as.nyu.edu/docs/IO/2800/isthescience.pdf>]

**September 16: Concepts and Approaches II: A “Comparative Method”?**

At one time the comparative method was widely taken as the core of comparative politics. It is still a critical element in the design and conduct of comparative research.

1. What are the methods of similarity and difference? How applied? How helpful?

2. How can comparative methods take time into account (Bartolini)?

3. What is process tracing and what value does it have?

4. How does “nested” analysis combine case studies with larger-n studies? What are the advantages and disadvantages of this approach?

5. How, and how far, is it possible for comparative observational studies to employ “natural experiments” as a method? What possibilities do quasi-experimental designs open up? How might such designs *limit* the possibilities for comparative analysis?

6. What constitutes a case, for comparative purposes? A country? A region? A policy sector? A year?

\*Przeworski, Adam and Teune, Henry. 1970. *The Logic of Comparative Social Inquiry*. New York: Wiley, pp. 3-13, 31-46.

Lijphart, Arend. 1971. Comparative Politics and the Comparative Method. *American Political Science Review* 65 (September): 682-693. .

\*Peter Hall. 2003. Aligning Ontology and Methodology in Comparative Historical Analysis. In Mahoney, James and Rueschmeyer, Dietrich (eds.), *Comparative Historical Analysis in the Social Sciences* (pp. 373-404) (New York: Cambridge University Press, 2003).

Bartolini Stefano. 1993. On Time and Comparative Research, *Journal of Theoretical Politics* 5(2): 131-167. .

Rolfing, Ingo. 2008. What You See and What You Get: Pitfalls and Principles of Nested Analysis in Comparative Research. *Comparative Political Studies* 41 (11):1492-1514. .

Dunning, Thad. 2008. Improving Causal Inference: Strengths and Limitations of Natural Experiments. *Political Research Quarterly* 61 (2):282-293 .

*Recommended:*

Barnes, Jeb and Weller, Nicholas. 2014. *Finding Pathways: Mixed-Method Research for Studying Causal Mechanisms*. New York: Cambridge University Press.

Henry E. Brady and David Collier, eds. 2004. *Rethinking Social Inquiry: Diverse Tools, Shared Standards*. Lanham, Md.: Rowman & Littlefield and the Berkeley Public Policy Press.

David Collier. 1993. “The Comparative Method.” In *Political Science: The State of the Discipline II,* ed. Ada W. Finifter, 105-19. Washington, DC: The American Political Science Association.

Dogan, Mattei and Pelassy, Dominique, 1984. *How to Compare Nations* Chatham, New Jersey: Chatham House.

Eckstein, Harry. 1975. Case Study and Theory in Political Science. In Fred I. Greenstein and Nelson Polsby (eds.), *Handbook of Political Science, Volume 7: Strategies of Inquiry*. Reading, MA: Addison-Wesley.

John Elster. 1989. *Nuts and Bolts for the Social Sciences*. Cambridge: Cambridge University press.

Geddes, Barbara. 1990. How the Cases You Choose Affect the Answers You Get: Selection Bias in Comparative Politics. *Political Analysis* 2: 131-150.

Keohane, Robert, and Gary King and Sidney Verba. 1994. *Designing Social Inquiry:Scientific Inference in Qualitative Research.* Princeton University Press.

Mahoney, James. 2010. After KKV: The New Methodology of Qualitative Research. *World Politics* 62(1): 120-147.

Mahoney, James and Rueschmeyer, Dietrich (eds.). 2003. *Comparative Historical Analysis in the Social Sciences.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

John Stuart Mill, “Of the Four Methods of Experimental Inquiry,” Ch. 8, Book III, and “Of Plurality of Causes, and of the Intermixture of Effects,” Ch. 10, Book III, in John Stuart Mill, *A System of Logic: Raciocinative and Inductive* (New York: Harper & Brothers Publishers, 1843/1874).

Ragin, Charles. (1987). *The Comparative Method: Moving Beyond Qualitative and Quantitative Strategie*s. University of California Press.

Sellers, Jefferey. 2010. Beyond Subnational Comparison: The Transnational Comparative Method. Paper presented at American Political Science Association Meeting, Washington, D.C.

Skocpol, Theda. 1984. Emergent Agendas and Recurrent Strategies in Historical Sociology. In Skocpol, Theda (ed.), *Vision and Method in Historical Sociology*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Snyder, Richard. 2001. Scaling Down: The Subnational Comparative Method. *Studies in Comparative and International Development.*

**September 23: Modernization**

Modernization theory, the “grand theory” that dominated much of post-WWII comparative politics, is represented by Lipset, but also the Deutsch, Inkeles and Almond readings in the recommended section. A good summary may be found in the Huntington article. The other required works generally undertake critiques of modernization theory, or sketch alternative perspectives to it. Whether they share some of the same assumptions is something we should assess. The excerpts assigned are often quite brief, and if you would like to understand each of the arguments fully you would be well advised to make your way through the remainder of each book. Here are some (relatively) specific questions.

1. What is Huntington’s argument against modernization theory? How does he construct such concepts as institutionalization? What are the micro-logics of his account? Is the argument convincing? What are the normative implications, including for democratization?

2. North: what is the qualification to modernization theory here? What are the mechanisms of historical change? How does this resemble or differ from the rationalist perspective?

3. Moore: how does Moore redefine the problem of modernization? How does his version differ from that of modernization theory, or from Marx? How convincing is the comparative analysis? Would the analysis hold up if extended to more countries and the contemporary period?

4. Polanyi: How does his version of the rise of market capitalism compare with those of North or of Moore? What is his causal argument about the relation between state and market development? How much sense does it make?

5. Greif’s more recent book applies game theory to develop an analysis of how crucial elements of modern capitalism emerged endogenously from the workings of medieval European institutions. How do the mechanisms in his account differ from those in the others? How might Moore, North or Polanyi critique this account?

Seymour M. Lipset, “Some Social Requisites of Democracy: Economic Development and Political Legitimacy,” *American Political Science Review* Vol. 53, Nº 1 (March 1959): 69-105 .

Huntington, Samuel. 1965. Political Development and Political Decay, *World Politics* 17(3): 388-430.

\*North, Douglas. 1981. *Structure and Change in Economic History* (pp. 3-31). New York: Norton.

Moore, Barrington. 1966. *Social Origins of Dictatorship and Democracy*. New York: Beacon, Chs. 1, 7- 9 (pp. 3-39, 413-483), and one other country chapter.

\*Polanyi, Karl. 1944. *The Great Transformation: The Political and Economic Origins of Our Time*, chs. 3-5 (pp. 33-67). New York: Beacon.

\*Avner Greif. 2006. Institutions, History and Development. In Greif, Avner, *Institutions and the Path to the Modern Economy* (pp. 379-405). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

*Recommended:*

Almond, Gabriel and Powell, Bingham. 1966. *Comparative Politics: A Developmental Approach.* Boston: Little, Brown.

Robert Dahl. 1971. *Polyarchy*. New Haven: Yale University Press.

Deutsch, Karl. 1961. Social Mobilization and Political Development, *American Poltiical Science Review* 55(3): 493-515.

Larry Diamond. 1992. “Economic Development and Democracy Reconsidered,” *American Behavioral Scientist* 35 (4/5): 450-99.

Alexander Gerschenkron. 1962. *Economic Backwardness in Historical Perspective*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.

Huntington, Samuel. 1969. *Political Order in Changing Societies.* New Haven: Yale University Press.

Inkles, Alex and David H. Smith. 1974. *Becoming Modern: Individual Change in Six Developing Countries*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Guillermo O’Donnell. 1973. *Modernization and Bureaucratic Authoritarianism: Studies in South American Politics*. Berkeley, Cal.: Institute of International Studies/University of California.

Skocpol, Theda. 1973. A Critical Review of Barrington Moore’s Social Origins of Democracy and Dictatorship, *Politics and Society* 4(1): 1-34.

Skocpol, Theda. 1979. *States and Social Revolutions*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Gerschenkron, Alexander. 1962. *Economic Backwardness in Historical Perspective*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.

Anderson, Perry. 1974. *Lineages of the Absolutist State.* London: New Left Books.

Wallerstein, Immanuel. 1974. *The Modern World System I: Capitalist Agriculture and the Origins of the European World-Economy in the Sixteenth Century*. New York: Academic Press.

**September 30: Globalization and International Influences**

Globalization is sometimes regarded as separate from comparative politics, but in the literature has become intrinsically linked to it. In the last decade the problems posed by globalization have provided a similar set of unifying themes to the ones modernization theory provided an earlier generation of comparative politics. The Frieden article represents one of the first major research programs to grapple with domestic economic policymaking and global influences. The recent volume by Mahoney on colonial legacies in Latin American examines perhaps the most important historical episode of globalization. Both illustrate how comparativists have approached the relations between domestic and international influences.

1. What is globalization? Do the elements associated with this idea fit together in a master theory?

1. How does globalization (or transnationalization) differ from modernization theory? Can you recognize elements of modernization theory in accounts of globalization?

1. What is the appropriate level of analysis to examine global influences? Can the findings of Mahoney about variations in Spanish America, for instance, be effectively captured in an analysis without country units? Without subnational units?
2. Can the comparative method be applied in the study of globalization? If so, how?
3. Do the answers to these questions differ according to the domain (Political economy, governmental organizations, culture?)

Gourevitch, Peter. 1978. The Second Image Reversed: The International Sources of Domestic Politics, *International Organization* 32(4): 881-912 .

Jeffrey Frieden. 1991. Invested Interests: The Politics of National Economic Policies in a World of Global Finance. *International Organization* 45(4): 425-451 .

David Held and Anthony McGrew, David Goldblatt and Jonathan Perraton. 1999. *Global Transformations* (pp. 1-85, 327-375, 414-452). Stanford: Stanford University Press.

James Mahoney. 2010. *Colonization and Post-Colonial Development: Spanish America in Comparative Perspective.* New York: Cambridge University Press, pp. 20-34, 253-270.

Farrell, H., & Newman, A. L. (2014). Domestic Institutions beyond the Nation-State: Charting the New Interdependence Approach. *World Politics, 66*(02), 331-363.

*Recommended:*

Berger, Suzanne and Dore, Ronald. 1996. *National Diversity and Global Capitalism*. Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press.

Hintze, Otto. 1975. Military Organization and the Organization of the State. In Gilbert, Felix (ed.), *The Historical Essays of Otto Hintze*. New York: Oxford University Press.

Geoffrey Garrett. 1995. Capital Mobility, Trade and the Domestic Politics of Economic Policy. *International Organization* 49(4): 657-687.

Geoffrey Garrett. 2000. *Partisan Politics in the Global Economy*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Peter Gourevitch. 1986. *Politics in Hard Times: Comparative Responses to International Economic Crises*. Ithaca: Cornell University Press.

Lopez-Cordova, J. Ernesto and Meissner, Christian. 2008. Trade Openness and Democracy: A Long-Run Perspective. *World Politics* 60 : 539–75.

Milner, Helen and Keohane, Robert O. 1996. *Internationalization and Domestic Politics*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Motyl, Alexander. 2006. Is Everything Empire? Is Empire Everything? *Comparative Politics* 38(2): 229-249.

Mitchell Orenstein and Hans Peter Schmitz. 2006. The New Transnationalism and Comparative Politics. *Comparative Politics* 38(4): 479-500 .

Richard Price. 2003. Transnational Civil Society and Advocacy in World Politics *World Politics* 55(4): 579-606 .

Rodrik, Dani. 1997. *Has Globalization Gone Too Far?* Washington, DC: Institute for International Economics.

Rogowski, Ronald. 1998. *Commerce and Coalitions*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.

**October 7: The State as Institution and Cultural Artifact**

This week's readings offer a quick tour through several scholarly generations of literature on the state.

1. First up is the theory of political elites, represented by Putnam. Although more recent literature has rarely gone back to this approach, consider what it can deliver. This approach was often portrayed in the “behavioralist revolution” of the 1960s and 1970s as a more empirically sound correction to overly formalistic approaches in earlier political science. Are there still advantages to this behavioralist-style work?

2. Compare Putnam with the first-generation neoinstitutionalist contributions summarized by Krasner and developed in Thelen and Steinmo. The latest turn of institutionalist accounts may be found in Helmke and Levitsky’s call for attention to “informal institutions”. Does this approach bring improvements? What analytical and methodological problems does it introduce? What does it do best ? (See the Lupu and Carnes paper in the recommended readings for a recent return to the questions Putnam raises.)

3. Steinmetz points toward a more recent set of approaches that incorporate what might be called culturalist stances (see also Migdal’s synthesis in the Lichbach and Zuckerman volume). Does this bring about an improved approach? What can it explain better, or worse?

4. How has work on state-society relations in comparative politics diverged from approaches to the state that have grown out of the study of “governance” (Sellers)? What is at stake in these divergences? What approaches to the state can best bridge these approaches?

\*Krasner, Stephen. 1984. Approaches to the State: Alternative Conceptions and Historical Dynamics, *Comparative Politics* 16 (January): 223-246.

\*Thelen, Kathleen and Steinmo, Sven. 1992. Historical Institutionalism in Comparative Politics. In Steinmo, Sven, Thelen, Kathleen and Longstreth, Frank (eds.), *Structuring Politics* (pp. 1-32). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

\*Steinmetz, George. 1999. Introduction: Culture and the State. In Steinmetz, George (ed.), *State/Culture: State Formation After the Cultural Turn* (pp. 1-35). Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press.

Helmke, Gretchen, & Levitsky, Steven. 2004. Informal Institutions and Comparative Politics: A Research Agenda. *Perspectives on Politics*, 2(04), 725-740.

\*Putnam, Robert.1976. *The Comparative Study of Political Elites*, pp. 1-44. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall.

\*Sellers, “State-Society Relations,” in Bevir, Mark (ed.), *Sage Handbook of Governance*. London: Sage, 2010.

*Recommended:*

*(The State)*

Aberbach, Joel, Putnam, Robert and Rockman, Bert. 1981. *Bureaucrats and Politicians in Western Democracies.* Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Perry Anderson. 1974. *Lineages of the Absolutist State*. London: Verso.

Carnes, N., & Lupu, N. (2014). Rethinking the Comparative Perspective on Class and Representation: Evidence from Latin America. *American Journal of Political Science*, (early view online).

Deutsch, Karl. 1953. *Nationalism and Social Communication*s: *An Inquiry Into the Foundations of Nationality*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press, 1953.

Ernest Gellner. 1983. *Nations and Nationalism*. Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press.

Laitin, David. 1997. The Cultural Identities of a European State, *Politics and Society* 25(3): 277-302.

Marks, Gary, *et al.* 1999. *Governance in the European Union*. London: Sage.

Gianfranco Poggi. 1978. *The Development of the Modern State: a Sociological Introduction* (Stanford: Stanford University Press).

Skocpol, Theda. 1985. Bringing the State Back In: Strategies of Analysis in Current Research. In Evans, Peter B., Rueschmeyer, Dietrich and Skocpol (eds.), *Bringing the State Back In*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Theda Skocpol. 1979. *States and Social Revolutions*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Hendrik Spruyt. 1994. *The Sovereign State and Its Competitors*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.

Tilly, Charles. 1975. Reflections on the History of European State-Making. In Tilly (ed.), *The Formation of National State*s *in Western Europe*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.

Charles Tilly. 1990. *Coercion, Capital, and European States. A.D. 990-1990*. London: Basil Blackwell.

*(Nationalism)*

Karl Deutsch. 1953. *Nationalism and Social Communication*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Smith, Anthony. 1971. *Theories of Nationalism.* London: Duckworth.

Weber, Eugen. 1976. *Peasants Into Frenchmen.* Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press.

Ernest Gellner. 1983. *Nations and Nationalism*. Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press.

Benedict O’G. Anderson. 1991. *Imagined Communities: Reflections on the Origins and Spread of Nationalism.* New York: Verso.

Brubaker, Rogers. 1992. *Citizenship and Nationalism in France and Germany.* Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Greenfeld, Liah. 1992. *Nationalism: Five Roads to Modernity.* Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press.

Calhoun, Craig. 1997. *Nationalism*. Buckingham: Open University Press.

Vertovec, Steven. 1999. Conceiving and researching transnationalism, *Ethnic and Racial Studies* 22 (2): 447-62.

Mark Beissinger. 2002. *Nationalist Mobilization and the Collapse of the Soviet State.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Kuzio, Taras. 2002. The myth of the civic state: a critical survey of Hans Kohn's framework for understanding nationalism. *Ethnic and Racial Studies, 25*(1), 20-39.

Marx, Anthony W. 2002. The Nation-State and Its Exclusions, *Political Science Quarterly* 117(1): 103-126.

Kunovich, Robert M. 2009. The Sources and Consequences of National Identification. *American Sociological Review, 74*(4), 573-593.

Pippa Norris and Ronald Inglehart. 2009. *Cosmpolitan Communications: Cultural Diversity in a Globalized World.* New York: Cambridge University Press.

Wright, Matthew. 2011. Policy Regimes and Normative Conceptions of Nationalism in Mass Public Opinion. *Comparative Political Studies, 44*(5), 598-624.

**October 14: Political Regimes and Types of Democracy**

Institutions and forms of democracy are the subjects of one of the biggest literatures in comparative politics. Most typologies of democracies to date have been based on large-scale differences in institutional configurations. Systems of executive-legislative relations,

1. Lijphart gives an overview of several institutional categorizations as well as an analytic perspective on them.  
   a. What are the types that he tests? How does he arrive at designation of the types?  
   b. What is the role of culture and structure in his typologies?  
   c. Why do the types appear to perform differently?
2. Tsebelis and veto points: What does he demonstrate about the strengths and limitations of a rational choice approach?
3. Cox and McCubbins lay out an approach to institutional differences and their effects that can be found reflected in much of the recent literature. How does this approach differ from Lijphart’s and Tsebelis’? Is it an improvement?
4. (Gerring, Thacker and Moreno) What are the implications of the more recent centripetal theory? How different is it from the others?
5. (Munck and Verkuilen) What sorts of methodological problems does comparing democracies entail? Do these problems also apply to the other works for this week?

Lijphart, Arend. 1999. *Patterns of Democracy* (esp. 1-47, 243-309)*.*  New Haven, CT: Yale University Press.

Tsebelis, George. 1995. Decision-making in Political Systems: Veto Players in Presidentialism, Parliamentarism, Multicamerialism and Multipartyism. *British Journal of Political Science* 25: 289-325 (accessible online through HOMER).

\*Gary Cox and Matthew McCubbins. 2001. Institutional Determinants of Economic Policy, in Stephen Haggard and Matthew McCubbins (eds.), *Presidents, Parliaments and Policy*. New York: Cambridge University Press. (available online at <http://mccubbins.us/mccubbins_files/ARTB19.PDF>.)

John Gerring, Strom Thacker and Carola Moreno. (2005). Centripetal Democratic Governance: A Theory and Global Inquiry. *American Political Science Review*, 99(04), 567-581 .

Munck, Gerald and J. Verkuilen. 2002. Conceptualizing and Measuring Democracy: Evaluating Alternative Indices. *Comparative Political Studies* 34(1): 5-34 (accessible online through HOMER).

*Recommended:*

Collier, David and Levitsky, Steven. 1997. Democracy with Adjectives: Conceptual Innovation in Comparative Research, *World Politics* 49: 430-451.

Collier, David, and Adcock. 1999. Democracy and Dichotomies: A Pragmatic Approach to Choices About Concepts. *Annual Review of Political Science* 2: 537-65.

Gary Cox. 1997. *Making Votes Count: Strategic Coordination in the World’s Electoral Systems*. New York: Cambridge University Press.

Dahl, Robert. 1971. *Polyarchy*. New Haven: Yale University Press.

John Huber and Charles Shipan. 2002. *Deliberate Discretion?* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Kaiser, André . 1997. Types of Democracy: From Classical to New Institutionalism. *Journal of Theoretical Politics* 9(4), 419-44.

Grofman, Bernard. 2005. Arend Lijphart and the “New Institutionalism”. Online paper at < http://www.democ.uci.edu/publications/papersseriespre2001/grofman.html >.

Arend Lijphart. 1968. *The Politics of Accommodation: Pluralism and Democracy in the Netherlands*. Berkeley, Cal.: University of California.

Linz, Juan. 1998. *Authoritarian and Totalitarian Regimes*. Boulder, CO: Lynne Riemer.

Juan Linz. 1994. “Presidential or Parliamentary Democracy: Does It Make a Difference?” In Juan Linz and Arturo Valenzuela (eds.), *The Failure of Presidential Government*, pp. 3-74. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1994.

Mainwaring, Scott and John Carey. 1998. Juan Linz, Presidentialism and Democracy: A Critical Appraisal. *Comparative Politics* 29 (4): 449-472.

Mueller, John. 1999. *Capitalism, Democracy and Ralph’s Pretty Good Grocery*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.

Roberts, Andrew. 2005. The Quality of Democracy. *Comparative Politics* 37(3): 357-376.

Rein Taagepera and Shugart, Matthew. 1989. *Seats and Votes*. New Haven, CT: Yale University Press.

George Tsebelis. 2002. *Veto Players: How Political Institutions Work*, Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.

Matthew S. Shugart and John Carey. 1992. *Presidents and Assemblies*. New York: Cambridge University Press.

**October 21: Authoritarianism and Democratic Transitions**

This area of research was defined by work on democratic breakdowns up to the 1980s. Subsequently, the “third wave” of democratization redefined the leading questions as matter of transitions to democracy. Despite recent new attention to enduring authoritarianism or partial authoritariansm (see Morse, and Levitsky and Way in the recommended readings), this remains the predominant preoccupation. Suggested analytical questions on democratization:

1. Does work on democratic transitions make a “teleological” assumption in considering the transition to democracy and capitalism as an analytical focus? What should be the focal point? What normative or analytical issues are at stake in this choice?

3. Acemoglu and Robinson employ game theory and statistical analysis to develop an answer to a question very similar to the one Barrington Moore asked. In what respects does his account improve on Moore’s? Where does it fall short (see the alternative accounts of Boix and Stokes and Ansell and Samuels)?

4. By contrast, Collier’s theory is more in the structuralist/comparative historical tradition of Weber. How successful is her account by comparison with Acemoglu and Robinson’s? Does Kurtz’s account convincingly alter her conclusions?

5. Explicitly culturalist analysis has played a less prominent role in democratization studies than these other traditions. Why might this be? What could a culturalist analysis add (or not add)?

6. Authoritarianism in the Middle East was assumed up to the Arab Spring to be deeply embedded, as the 2004 article by Bellin demonstrates. How do analyses like Bellin’s need to be revised? (See the recommended article by Zubaida from the website *openDemocracy*)*.*

Collier, Ruth Berns. 1999. *Paths Toward Democracy: The Working Class and Elites in Western Europe and South America*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, pp. 1-32, 166-198, and skim other chapters.

Daron Acemoglu and James A. Robinson. 2006. *Economic Origins of Dictatorship and Democracy* (New York: Cambridge University Press), pp. 1-89, 173-220, 321-360.

Carles Boix and Susan Stokes. 2003. “Endogenous Democratization.” *World Politics* 55, no. 4 (July): 517-49 .

Ansell, B., & Samuels, D. (2010). Inequality and Democratization: A Contractarian Approach. *Comparative Political Studies, 43*(12), 1543-1574.

Bellin, Eva. 2012. Reconsidering the Robustness of Authoritarianism in the Middle East: Lessons from the Arab Spring. *Comparative Politics, 44*(2), 127-149.

Marcus Kurtz. 2004. The Dilemmas of Democratization in the Open Economy: Lessons From Latin America. *World Politics* 56: 262-302 .

Morse, Yonatan. 2012. The Era of Electoral Authoritarianism. *World Politics* 62(1): 161-198 .

*Recommended:*

Eva Bellin. 2004. The Robustness of Authoritarianism in the Middle East: Exceptionalism in Comparative Perspective. *Comparative Politics* 36(2): 139-158 .

Boix, Carles. 2003. *Democracy and Redistribution*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Capoccia, Giovanni and Ziblatt, Daniel. 2010. The Historical Turn in Democratization Studies: A New Research Agenda for Europe and Beyond. *Comparative Political Studies* 43:931-968.

Diamond, Larry, Linz, Juan J, and Lipset, Seymour Martin (eds.). 1990. *Democracy in Developing Countries.* Boulder, CO: Lynne Rienner.

Friedman, Elisabeth Jay and Hochstetler, Kathryn. 2002. Assessing the Third Transition in Latin American Democratization: Representational Regimes and Civil Society in Argentina and Brazil. *Comparative Politics* 34(1).

Stephen Haggard and Robert Kaufman. 1995. *The Political Economy of Democratic Transitions*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.

Howard, M. M., & Walters, M. R. (2014). Explaining the Unexpected: Political Science and the Surprises of 1989 and 2011. *Perspectives on Politics, 12*(02), 394-408.

Huntington, Samuel. 1991. *The Third Wave: Democratization in the Late Twentieth Century*. Norman, OK: University of Oklahoma Press.

Jacoby, Wade. 2006. Inspiration, Coalition and Substitution: External Influences on Democratic Transitions. *World Politics* 58: 623-51.

Steven Levitsky and Lucan Way. 2010. *Competitive Authoritarianism: Hybrid Regimes After the Cold War.* New York: Cambridge University Press.

Juan Linz. 2000. *Authoritarian and Totalitarian Regimes*. Boulder, CO: Lynne Riemer.

Linz, Juan and Stepan, Alfred. 1996. *Problems of Democratic Transition and Consolidation*. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, pp. 1-83.

Guillermo O’Donnell and Philippe Schmitter. 1986. *Transitions from Authoritarian Rule*. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press.

Adam Przeworski, *Democracy and the Market. Political and Economic Reforms in Eastern Europe and Latin America* (New York: Cambridge University Press, 1991), Ch. 2.

Przeworski, Adam, *et al*. 2000. *Democracy and Development*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Przeworski, Adam and Lomongi, Fernando. 1997. Modernization: Theories and Facts, *World Politics* 49 (January): 155-183.

Dietrich Rueschemeyer, John D. Stephens and Evelyne Huber Stephens. 1992. *Capitalist Development and Democracy*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Wood, Elisabeth Jean. 2001. An Insurgent Path to Democracy: Popular Mobilization, Economic Interests and Regime Transition in South Africa and El Salvador. *Comparative Political Studies* 34(8): 862-888.

Zubaida, Sami. 2011. The “Arab Spring” in historical perspective, *openDemocracy* (October 21), accessed at <http://www.opendemocracy.net/sami-zubaida/arab-spring-in-historical-perspective>)

**October 28: Parties and Elections**

The topic of elections and parties encompasses one of the largest, most important literatures in the subfield.  Beyond the overview from the 1990s by Barnes, the chapters by Lipset and Rokkan and by Kitschelt present perspectives on party and electoral development in developed countries. Sellers et al. analyze a set of previously underexamined contextual influences on parties and elections that are rooted in metropolitan geographies. Hagopian sketches an overview of the frontier of electoral research in developing countries. Wong, Baker and Greene consider the situation of the Left there.

1.  (Based on Barnes)  What mix of traditions fits the field of elections and parties best?  What is the place of rational choice and cultural analysis? What are the current gaps in work in this area?

2.  Compare Lipset and Rokkan's classic account of European party histories with Kitschelt's analysis from the 1990s and Kriesi et al’s from the 2000’s.  How did the conditions and dynamics of party systems shift between these three accounts?  Why?  Do the changes have methodological implications for the way that electoral politics should be studied?

3. (Sellers et al.) How much of the changing culture of parties and elections be explained by geographic shifts? Which aspects are more susceptible to explanation through this approach? How does it address, and how does it stop short of addressing, the emerging agendas for party and electoral research that Barnes defines?

4. How are the dynamics of party politics in transitional countries different from those in older democracies? How much of the hypotheses and analytical methods be from one be exported to the other?

Samuel Barnes, “Electoral Behavior and Comparative Politics,” in Lichbach and Zuckerman, pp. 115-141.

\*Lipset, Seymour and Rokkan, Stein. 1968. Cleavage Structures, Party Systems and Voter Alignments: An Introduction. In Seymour Lipset and Stein Rokkan (eds.), *Party Systems and Voter Alignments: Cross-National Perspectives* (pp. 1-64). New York: Free Press.

\*Kitschelt, Herbert. 1994. *The Transformation of European Social Democracy*, pp. 40-66. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Kriesi, Hanspeter et al. 2006. Globalization and the Transformation of the National Political Space: Six European Democracies Compared. *European Journal of Political Research* 45: 921-956 .

\*Hagopian, Frances. 2010. Parties and Voters in Emerging Democracies. In Carles Boix and Susan Stokes (eds.), *Oxford Handbook of Comparative Politics* (pp. 582-603). Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Lupu, N., & Riedl, R. B. (2013). Political Parties and Uncertainty in Developing Democracies. *Comparative Political Studies, 46*(11), 1339-1365.

Wong, Joseph. 2004. Democratization and the Left: Comparing East Asia and Latin America. *Comparative Political Studies* 37(10): 1213-1217.

Baker, Andy and Greene, Kenneth F. 2011. The Latin American Left’s Mandate: Free-Market Policies and Issue Voting in New Democracies. *World Politics* 63(1): 43-77 .

*Recommended:*

Barnes, Samuel, et al. 1979. *Political Action: Mass Participation in five Western Democracies*. Beverly Hills, CA: Sage.

Calvo, Ernesto, & Murillo, Maria 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

Ruth Berins Collier and David Collier. 1991. *Shaping the Political Arena: Critical Junctures, the Labor Movement, and Regime Dynamics in Latin America*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.

Dalton, Russell J., Flanagan, Scott, and Beck, Paul (eds.). 1984. *Electoral Change: realignment and Dealignment in Advanced Industrial Societies*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.

Duverger, Maurice. 1964. *Political Parties.* New Yo*rk,* NY: Wiley.

Epstein, Leon. 1980. *Political Parties in Western Democracies*. New Brunswick, NJ: Transaction Books.

Janda, Kenneth. 1980. *Political Parties: A Cross-National Survey.* New York, NY: Free Press.

Kitschelt, Herbert. (2000). Linkages between Citizens and Politicians in Democratic Polities. *Comparative Political Studies*, 33(6-7), 845-879.

Kitschelt, Herbert, et al. 2010. *Latin American Party Systems*. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.

Kreuzer, Marcus and Vello Pettai. 2004. Political Parties and the Study of Political Development: New Insights from the Postcommunist Democracies. *World Politics* 56, 608-33.

Michels, Robert. 1962. *Political Parties: A Sociological Study of the Oligarchical Tendencies of Modern Democracy*. New York: Free Press.

Przeworski, Adam and John Sprague. 1986. *Paper Stones: A History of Electoral Socialism*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Rae, Douglas. 1962. *The Political Consequences of Electoral Laws*. New Haven, CT: Yale University Press.

Karen L. Remmer and François Gélineau. 2003. Subnational Electoral Choice: Economic and Referendum Voting in Argentina, 1983-1999 *Comparative Political Studies* 36 (7):801-821.

Stein Rokkan with Angus Campbell, Per Torsvik and Henry Valen. 1970. *Citizens, Elections, Parties: Approaches to the Comparative Study of the Processes of Development.* New York: David McKay Company.

Sartori, Giovanni. 1976. *Party and Party System*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Sellers, Jefferey, et al. (eds). 2013. *The Political Ecology of the Metropolis* (Cochester: ECPR Press).

Shefter, Martin. 1977. Party and Patronage: Germany*,* Italy, England. *Politics and Society* 7 (4): 403-451.

Taagepera, Rein and Shugart, Matthew. 1989. *Seats and Votes*. New Haven, CT: Yale University Press.

Verba, Sidney, Nie, Norman and Kim, Jae-On. 1978. *Participation and Political Equality*. Chicago: University of Chicago, pp.63-142, 286-309.

**November 4: Political Economy of (Post)Industrial Capitalism**

Although the Hall and Soskice volume remains the dominant theoretical statement in this area, Blyth and Mares identify numerous strains of work at variance with it and/or its metholodolgy.

1. What are the varieties of capitalism? Why have they come about and why do they persist? What role do institutions, including law, play? What traditions fit best in this approach? How does globalization factor into this literature?   
  
2. What problems confront this approach? Is it convincing? Can it account for variations in the successful construction of welfare states (Mares)?   
  
3. Korpi, an earlier proponent of the power resources approach, contends that differences in class power account for welfare state and capitalist differences. Paster offers an alternative analysis based on the assertion of power by business interests. Which approach is more convincing, and more consistent with the varieties of capitalism approach? (See also the defense by Iversen and Soskice, in the recommended readings.)

4. Blyth advocates an alternative “ideational” approach to political economy as an alternative to the prevailing rationalist and structural approaches. What can this approach explain? How convincing is his case for it?

5. Does Thatcher’s case study effectively challenge the presumptions of distinct capitalist varieties?

\*Mares, Isabela, The Comparative Political Economy of the Welfare State, in Lichbach and Zuckerman (Second edition, 2009), pp. 358-375.

\*Blyth, Mark, An Approach to Comparative Analysis or a Subfield Within a Subfield?: Political Economy, in Lichbach and Zuckerman (Second edition, 2009), pp. 193-219.

Hall, Peter and Soskice, David. 2001. *Varieties of Capitalism*. Pp. 1-103, 275-306.

Korpi, Walter. 2006. Power Resources and Employer-Centered Approaches in Explanations of Welfare States and Varieties of Capitalism. *World Politics* 58: 167-206 .

Paster, Thomas. (2013). Business and Welfare State Development: Why Did Employers Accept Social Reforms? *World Politics, 65*(03), 416-451.

Thatcher, Mark. 2004. Varieties of Capitalism in an Internationalized World: Domestic Institutional Change in European Telecommunications. *Comparative Political Studies* 37(7): 751-780.

*Recommended:*

Symposium on *Varieties of Capitalism*, *Comparative European Politics* 1(2) 2003.

Boix, Carles. 1999. *Political Parties, Growth and Equality*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Calmfors, Lars and Drifill, John. 1988. Bargaining Structure, Corporatism and Macroeconomic Performance. *Economic Policy* 6: 13-61.

Cameron, David. 1984. Social Democracy, Corporatism, Labor Quiescence and the Representation of Economic Interest in Advanced Capitalist Society. In Goldthorpe, John (ed.), *Order and Conflict in Contemporary Capitalism*.

Esping-Andersen, Gøsta. 1990. *The Three Worlds of Welfare Capitalism*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.

Garrett, Geoffrey. 1998. *Partisan Politics in the Global Economy*. New York: Cambridge University Press.

Hall, Peter. 1986. *Governing the Economy*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Douglas Hibbs. 1977. Political Parties and Macroeconomic Policy. *American Political Science Review* 71 (4): 1467-1487.

Howell, Chris. 2003. Varieties of Capitalism: And Then There Was One. *Comparative Politics* 38(1).

Huber, Evelyne and Stephens, John. 2001. *Development and Crisis of the Welfare State* Chicago: University of Chicago Press, pp. 1-79, 202-345.

Iversen, Torben and Soskice, David. 2008. Distribution and Redistribution. *World Politics* 61(3):, 438–86.

Iversen, Torben and Cusack, Thomas. 2000. The Causes of Welfare State Expansion: Deindustrialization or Globalization? *World Politics* 52(3): 313-349.

Katzenstein, Peter. 1985. *Small States in World Markets: Industrial Policy in Europe* (Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press.

Lange, Peter and Garrett, Geoffrey. 1985. The Politics of Growth: Strategic Interaction and Economic Performance, 1974-1980. *Journal of Politics* 47: 792-782.

Manow, Philip. 2009. Electoral rules, class coalitions and welfare state regions, or how to explain Esping-Andersen with Stein Rokkan. *Socio-Economic Review* 7:101-121.

Schmitter, Philippe C. 1979. Still the Century of Corporatism? In Philippe C. Schmitter and Gerhard Lehmbruch (eds.), *Trends Toward Corporatist Intermediation* (pp. 7-52). Beverly Hills, CA: Sage.

Torsten Persson and Guido Tabellini. 2003. *The Economic Effects of Constitutions. What Do The Data Say?* Cambridge, Mass.: MIT Press.

Schmidt, Vivien. 2009. Putting the Political Back Into Political Economy by Bringing the State Back in yet Again. *World Politics* 61(3): 516-545.

Swenson, Peter. 1991. Bringing Capital Back In, or Social Democracy Reconsidered: Employer Power, Cross-Class Alliances, and Centralization of Industrial Relations in Denmark and Sweden *World Politics* 513-45.

**November 11: Political Economy of Developing and Transitional Countries**

This week the politico-economic focus shifts to the developing world and Newly Industrialized Countries (NICs). The focus of the literature here is quite different.  
  
1.        What are the “varieties of capitalism” in the developing world? Are the categories for developing countries useful for understanding developing and transitional countries? Why or why not?

2.        In the 1970s, dependency theory marked a countermovement to modernization theory. Do current theoretical approaches to developing countries in the global economy replicate the critique of dependency theory, or do current accounts differ in any way?

3.        Why did the Newly Industrialized Countries (NICs) succeed in late industrialization? What does their success (and their paths since 1997) tell us about the prerequisites for other countries to join the industrialized club? What path is China following and why, and will the consequences be similar to those for the NICs?

4.        Why have African and Latin American economies developed less where the NICs succeeded? What is driving neoliberal reforms in these countries, and will these reforms enable them to overcome the obstacles to development?

5. Recent work on the political economy of developing countries, as exemplified by Haggard and Kaufman, has focused increasingly on policies like those of the welfare state. How different does this literature show policymaking to be in these countries from parallels in the developed world? What are the sources of any differences? Has there been convergence?

Smith, Tony. 1981. The Logic of Dependency Theory Revisited. *International Organization* 35: 755-761.

Wade, Robert. 1992. East Asia’s Economic Success: Conflicting Perspectives, Partial Insights, Shaky Evidence. *World Politics* 44(2): 270-320.

Manzetti, Luigi. 2003. Political Manipulations and Market Reforms Failures. *World Politics* 55 (April 2003), 315-60.

Schneider, Ben Ross. 2009. Hierarchical Market Economies and Varieties of Capitalism in Latin America. *Journal of Latin American Studies*, 41(03), 553-575.

Gallagher, Mary Elizabeth. 2002. “Reform and Openness”: Why China’s Economic Reforms Have Delayed Democracy. *World Politics* 54(3): 338-372

\*Van de Walle, Nicolas. 2001. *African Economies and the Politics of Permanent Crisis, 1979-1999.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, pp. 271-286.

Haggard, Steven and Kaufman, Robert. 2008. *Democracy, Development and Welfare States.* Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, pp. 1-24, 346-365 (intro chapter online at http://press.princeton.edu/chapters/i8775.pdf).

Lee, Cheol-Sung. (2012). Associational Networks and Welfare States in Argentina, Brazil, South Korea, and Taiwan. *World Politics, 64*(03), 507-554

*Recommended:*

Bates, Robert. 1981. *Markets and States in Tropical Africa: The Political Bases of Agricultural Politics*. Berkeley, CA: University of California Press.

Bates, Robert. 1997. *Open Economy Politics*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.

Cardoso, Hernando Henrique and Faletto, Enzo. 1979. *Dependency and Development in Latin America*. Transl. Marjory MattinglyUrquidi. Berkeley, CA: University of California Press.

Cook, Linda. 2007. Negotiating Welfare in Postcommunist States. *Comparative Politics* 39(1): 41-62.

Davis, Diane E. (2004). *Discipline and development*: Cambridge University Press.

Evans, Peter. 1979. *Dependent Development: The Alliance of Multinational, State, and Local Capital in Brazil*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.

Haggard, Stephen and Kaufman, Robert. 1989. The Politics of Stabilization and Structural Adjustment. In Sachs, Jeffrey D. (ed.), *Developing Country Debt and Economic Performance, Volume 1*: *Developing Country Debt* (pp. 209-254). Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Heo, Uk and Tan, Alexander C. 2003. Political Choices and Economic Outcomes: A Perspective on the Differential Impact of the Financial Crisis on South Korea and Taiwan. *Comparative Political Studies* 36(6): 679-698.

Huber, E., & Stephens, J. D. (2012). Democracy and the Left. *Social Policy and Inequality in Latin America.* Chicago: The University of Chicago Press.

Murillo, Victoria. 2002. Political Bias in Policy Convergence. Privatization Choices in Latin America. *World Politics* 54.

Nölke, A., & Vliegenthart, A. (2009). Enlarging the varieties of capitalism: The emergence of dependent market economies in East Central Europe. *World Politics, 61*(4), 670-702.

Rudra, Nita, and Stephan Haggard. 2005. Globalization, Democracy and Effective Welfare Spending in the Developing World. *Comparative Political Studies* 38(9): 1015-1049.

Hector Schamis. 1999. Distributional Coalitions and the Politics of Economic Reform in Latin America. *World Politics* 51.

Schneider, B. R., & Soskice, D. (2009). Inequality in developed countries and Latin America: coordinated, liberal and hierarchical systems. *Economy and Society, 38*(1), 17-52.

Velasco, Andres. 2002. Dependency Theory a Generation Later. *Foreign Policy* (November/December) Online at http://www.cid.harvard.edu/cidinthenews/articles/FP\_11-1202.pdf

Haggard, Stephen. 1991. *Pathways from the Periphery.*  Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press.

Tsai, Kellee. 2006. Adaptive Informal Institutions and Endogenous Institutional Change in China. *World Politics* 59: 116-41 .

**November 18: Political Culture**

Political culture has recently experienced a revival in comparative politics. Two very different works are represented here. On the one hand, a strain of literature focused on “social capital” that grows out of Putnam et al. (1993) has revived some of the concerns and arguments of an older literature on the “civic culture” (e.g., Almond and Verba 1963). On the other hand, large-scale mass survey research on culture has become increasingly global in scope, and has been at the center of arguments about cultural traditions as well as global cultural change.

1. Ross: what are the best analytical and methodological means for analysis of political culture? Can structural or rationalist traditions aid in explaining political culture? How can analysis of political culture be integrated with these nonculturalist approaches?

2.        (Putnam) What is the content of “social capital”? Cultural or organizational? Individual or collective? What’s the difference? What fosters or erodes social capital?

3.        Inglehart: What are the advantages and disadvantages of mass datasets like this one for the comparative study of political culture? Is I’s analysis using this data compelling? (See Ross)

(reread) Ross, Marc Howard, “Culture and Identity in Comparative Politics,” in Lichbach and Zuckerman, pp. 42-80.

Ronald Inglehart and Christian Welzel. 2005. *Modernization, Cultural Change and Democracy*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, pp. 15-172, 231-271, 285-300.

Edward N. Muller and Mitchell Seligson. 1994. “Civic Culture and Democracy: The Question of Causal Relationships,” *American Political Science Review* Vol. 88, 3 (September): 635-52 .

Putnam, Robert. 1993. *Making Democracy Work*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.

Rothstein, Bo, & Stolle, Dietlind. (2008). The State and Social Capital: An Institutional Theory of Generalized Trust. *Comparative Politics*, 40(4), 441-459 (online).

*Recommended:*

Almond, Gabriel and Verba, Sidney. 1963. *The Civic Culture: Attitudes and Democracy in Five Nations*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.

Banfield, Edward. *The Moral Basis of a Backward Society*. Glencoe: Free Press.

Harry Eckstein. 1988. "A Culturalist Theory of Political Change." *American Political Science Review* 82, 3: 789-804.

Flanagan, Scott, and Lee, Aie-Rie. 2003. The New Politics, Culture Wars and the Authoritarian-Libertarian Value Change in Advanced Industrial Democracies. *Comparative Political Studies* 36(3): 235-270.

Geertz, Clifford. 1973. Thick Description: Toward an Interpretive Theory of Culture. In Geertz, Clifford, *The Interpretation of Cultures* (pp. 3-30). New York: Harper and Row.

Ronald Inglehart. 1988. “The Renaissance of Political Culture,” *American Political Science Review* 82: 1203-30.

Inglehart, Ronald. 1990. *Culture Shift in Advanced Industrial Society*. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1990.

R. W. Jackman and R. A. Miller, 1996. “A Renaissance of Political Culture?” *American Journal of Political Science* 40, 3: 632-59.

James Johnson. 2003. “Conceptual Problems as Obstacles to Progress in Political Science: Four Decades of Political Culture Research,” *Journal of Theoretical Politics* Vol. 15: 87-115.

Laitin, David and Wildavsky, Aaron. 1987. Choosing preferences by Constructing Institutions: A Cultural Theory of Preference Formation. *American Political Science Review* 81(1): 3-21.

Lane, Ruth. 1992. "Political Culture: Residual Category or General Theory?" Comparative Political Studies 25 (3):362(26).

Pippa Norris (ed.) 1999. *Critical Citizens: Global Support for Democratic Government*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Norris, Pippa and R. Inglehart 2002. "Islamic Culture and Democracy: Testing the ˜Clash of Civilizations' Thesis", Comparative Sociology 1(3-4):235-63

Mitchell Seligson. 2002. “The Renaissance of Political Culture or the Renaissance of the Ecological Fallacy?” *Comparative Politics* 34(3): 273-92.

Tarrow, Sidney. 1996. Making Social Science Work Across Space and Time: A Critical Reflection on Robert Putnam's *Making Democracy Work* *American Political Science Review* 90(2), 389-397.

Verba, Sidney. 1980. On Revisiting the Civic Culture: A Personal Postscript. In Almond, Gabriel and Verba, Sidney (eds.), *The Civic Culture Revisited*. Boston: Little, Brown.

Weber, Max. 1958. *The Protestant Ethic and the Spirit of Capitalism.* New York: Charles Scribner’s Sons.

Lipset, Seymour Martin. 1960. *Political Man*. Garden City, NY: Anchor.

**November 25: Federalism, Decentralization and the Rule of Law**

Two types of institutional shifts in governing arrangements throughout much of the world have each given rise to growing literatures. Decentralized institutions, including federalism, have increasingly become recognized as growing components of national states. Legal institutions, including courts but also other cultural and institutional elements of law, have increasingly been recognized as significant elements in democratic and nondemocratic states. Although systematic comparative studies of these institutions have only recently begun to appear, they often make a significant difference for participation and policy performance..

1. Why has there been a shift toward subnational authority around the world? What is the significance of this shift for the character of policy and politics?

2. What effects does decentralization have on economic policy, on welfare states or other basic patterns in comparative politics?

3. What roles do courts and legal institutions play in the political and policymaking process? How is it possible to compare their role in different countries?

4. What is the rule of law? Is it cultural or institutional? How can it be compared among different countries?

Eaton, Kent. 2008. Federalism in Europe and Latin America: Conceptualization, Causes and Consequences. *World Politics* 60: 665–98 (HOMER).

Henry E. Hale. 2004. Divided We Stand: Institutional Sources of Ethnofederal State Survival and Collapse. *World Politics* 56, 165-93 .

Faletti, Tulia G. A Sequential Theory of Decentralization: Latin American Cases in Comparative Perspective. *American Political Science Review* 99(03), 327-346 .

Sellers, Jefferey and Lidstrom, Anders. 2007. Decentralization, Local Government and the Welfare State. *Governance*, 20(4): 609-632 .

Brinks, D. M. (2003). Informal Institutions and the Rule of Law: The Judicial Response to State Killings in Buenos Aires and São Paulo in the 1990s. *Comparative Politics, 36*(1), 1-19 .

Cichowski, Rachel A. (2006). Introduction: Courts, Governance and Democracy. *Comparative Political Studies*, 39(1), 3-21 .

Helmke, Gretchen, & Rosenbluth, Frances. (2009). Regimes and the Rule of Law: Judicial Independence in Comparative Perspective. *Annual Review of Political Science*, 12(1), 345-366 .

Ginsburg, Tom, Elkins, Zachary, & Melton, Tom. (2009). *The Endurance of National Constitutions* (pp. 1-11). New York: Cambridge University Press. (online at <http://works.bepress.com/tom_ginsburg/44/>)

*Recommended:*

*(Federalism and decentralization)*

Bednar, Jenna. (2005). Federalism as a public good. *Constitutional Political Economy, 16*(2), 189-205.

Leff, Carol. 1999. Democratization and Disintegration in Multinational States. *World Politics* 51 (January): 205-35.

Lieberman, Evan. 2006. *Race and Regionalism in the Politics of Taxation in Brazil and South Africa.* New York: Cambridge University Press.

Lijphart, Arendt. Consociational Democracy. 1974. *World Politics* 2(1): 207-225.

Lijphart, Arend. 1968. *The Politics of Accomodation. Pluralism and Democracy in the Netherlands*. Berkeley: University of California Press.

Nordlinger, Eric. 1972. *Conflict Regulation in Divided Societies*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Center for International Affairs.

Herbert Obinger, Stephan Leibfried and Francis G. Castles (eds.). 2005. *Federalism and the Welfare State: New World and European Experiences.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Remick, Elizabeth J. 2002. The Significance of Variation in Local States: The Case of Twentieth Century China. *Comparative Politics* 34(4).

Garman, Christopher, Stephen Haggard and Eliza Willis. 2001. Fiscal Decentralization: A Political Theory with Latin American Cases. *World Politics* 53(2), 205–236.

William H Riker. 1975. “Federalism.” In *Handbook of Political Science* Vol. 5, eds. Fred Greenstein and Nelson W. Polsby, 93-172. Reading, Mass: Addison-Wesley.

Riker, William. 1964. *Federalism*. Boston: Little, Brown and Company.

Rodden, Jonathan. 2005. *Hamilton’s Paradox.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Rodden, Jonathan and Wibbels, Erik. 2002. Beyond the Fiction of Federalism: Macroeconomic Management in Multitiered Systems. *World Politics* 54(3): 494-531.

Alfred Stepan, “Toward a New Comparative Politics of Federalism, Multinationalism, and Democracy,” pp. 29-84, in Edward Gibson (ed.), *Federalism and Democracy in Latin America* (Baltimore, Md.: The Johns Hopkins University Press, 2004).

Watts, Ronald L. 1999. *Comparing Federal Systems*. Second Edition. Kingston, Ontario: Queen’s University.

Weingast, Barry. 1995. The Economic Role of Political Institutions: Market-Preserving Federalism and Economic Development. *Journal of Law, Economics and Organization* 11(1):1-31.

*(Courts and Law):*

Brinks, D. M., & Gauri, V. (2014). The Law’s Majestic Equality? The Distributive Impact of Judicializing Social and Economic Rights. *Perspectives on Politics, 12*(02), 375-393.

Charles Epp. 1988. *The Rights Revolution.* Princeton: Princeton University Press.

Epstein, Lee, Jack Knight, and Olga Shvetsova. 2001. The role of constitutional courts in the establishment and maintenance of democratic systems of government. *Law & Society Review* 35:117-63.

Hilbink, Lisa. (2012). The Origins of Positive Judicial Independence. *World Politics, 64*(04), 587-621.

Gretchen Helmke. 2002. The Logic of Strategic Defection: Judicial Decision- Making in Argentina Under Dictatorship and Democracy *American Political Science Review* 96(2): 291-30.

Herbert Jacob (ed.). 1994. *Courts and Law in Comparative Perspective.* New Haven, CT: Yale University Press.

Robert Kagan. *Adversarial Legalism.* Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Maravall and Przeworski (eds.). 2003.  *Democracy and the Rule of Law* (New York: Cambridge University Press.

Renteln, Alison. 2006. *The Cultural Defense.* Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Shane, Peter M. 2006. “Analyzing Constitutions,” pp. 191-216, in R.A.W. Rhodes, Sarah A. Binder and Bert A. Rockman (eds), *The Oxford Handbook of Political Institutions* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2006).

Martin Shapiro. 1986. *Courts: A Comparative and Political Analysis.* Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Colomer, Josep M. 2006., “Comparative Constitutions,” pp. 217-38, in R.A.W. Rhodes, Sarah A. Binder and Bert A. Rockman (eds), *The Oxford Handbook of Political Institutions* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2006).

Brinks, Daniel. 2008. *The Judicial Response to Police Killings in Latin America*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Elkins, Zachary, Tom Ginsburg and Melton, James. 2009., *The Endurance of National Constitutions* (New York: Cambridge University Press, 2009).

Stone, Alex Sweet. 2000. *Governing with Judges: Constitutional Politics in Europe.* Oxford: Oxford University Press.

**December 2: State-Society Relations and Ethnic Conflict**

Other recent lines of work have stressed activism and organized activity of citizens and other actors outside the state and formal political institutions. A number of related approaches, drawn from such diverse subfields as governance studies and urban politics, have stressed the mutual synergies between other actors and the state. Contentious politics scholarship provides another approach that builds on the study of social movements and revolution. Varshney, building on the concept of social capital but moving beyond Putnam, focuses on the prevention of ethnic violence.

Questions:

1. What are the sources of what Wang calls “mutual empowerment” between state and society? How do these approaches resemble or differ from social capital and attitudinal approaches?

2. What are the sources of the “social capital” that Varshney finds has successfully defused ethnic conflict in India? Is this account compatible with Putnam’s?

3. (Adam, Tilly and Tarrow) What aspects or issues does a contentious politics approach highlight that are neglected in other approaches? What is it likely not to explain as well?

4. Are there institutionalized systems of local state-society relations? What causes different configurations to persist in different countries or localities?

Xu Wang. 1999. Mutual Empowerment of State and Society, *Comparative Politics* 31(2): 231-249 .

Tsai, Lily. (2007). Solidary Groups, Informal Accountability, and Local Public Goods Provision in Rural China. *American Political Science Review, 101*(02), 355-372 .

Ashutosh Varshney. 2002. *Ethnic Conflict and Civic Life*. New Haven: Yale University Press, pp. 1-51, 113-115, 262-199, and skim either 119-215 or 171-262.

Douglas McAdam, Sidney Tarrow and Charles Tilly, “Toward an Integrated Perspective on Social Movements and Revolution,” in Lichbach and Zuckerman (1997), pp. 142-173.

Sellers, Jefferey M. and Anders Lidstrom (2014). “Multilevel Democracy, Civil Society and the Development of the Modern State”. Paper presented at APSA Annual Meeting, online at: <http://papers.ssrn.com/sol3/papers.cfm?abstract_id=2451974>

*Recommended:*

Agrawal, Arun and Ribot, Jesse. 1999. Accountability in Decentralization: A Framework with South Asia and West African Cases. *Journal of Developing Areas* 33: 473-502.

El Mahdi, Rabab. 2009. Enough! Egypt’s Quest for Democracy. *Comparative Political Studies* 42(8): 1011-1029 .

Faguet, J.-P. (2012). *Decentralization and popular democracy: governance from below in Bolivia*. Ann Arbor, MI: University of Michigan Press.

James D. Fearon, David D. Laitin. Explaining Interethnic Cooperation. *American Political Science Review* *90*(*4* )( 1996): 715-735.

James D. Fearon, and David D. Laitin. 2003. “Ethnicity, Insurgency, and Civil War.” American Political Science Review 97, no. 1 (February): 75-90.

Benjamin Goldfrank. 2007. The Politics of Deepening Local Democracy: Decentralization, Party Institutionalization and Participation. *Comparative Politics* 38(2): 147-168.

Goldstone, Jack. *Revolution and Rebellion in the Early Modern World*. Berkeley, CA: University of California Press.

Horowitz, Donald. *Ethnic Groups in Conflict.* Durham, NC: Duke University Press.

James Habyarimana, Macartan Humphreys, Daniel Posner and Jeremy Weinstein. (2007). Why Does Ethnic Diversity Undermine Public Goods Provision? *American Political Science Review* 101(04), 709-725 .

Markus, S. (2012). Secure Property as a Bottom-Up Process: Firms, Stakeholders, and Predators in Weak States. *World Politics, 64*(02), 242-277 .

McAdam, Doug, and Sidney Tarrow. 2001. *Dynamics of Contention* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press) (e-book, linked through HOMER).

O’Brien, Kevin and Lianjiang Li. 2005. Popular Contention and Its Impact in Rural China. *Comparative Political Studies* 38(3): 235-259 .

Ostrom, Elinor, 1990. *Governing the Commons*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Roeder, Philip G. 2003. Clash of Civilizations and Escalation of Domestic Ethnopolitical Conflicts. *Comparative Political Studies* 36(5): 509-540.

Scott, James. 1985. *Weapons of the Weak: Everyday Forms of Peasant Resistance*. New Haven, CT: Yale University Press.

Sellers, Jefferey M. 2002. *Governing From Below: Urban Regions and the Global Economy.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Slater, D. (2009). Revolutions, Crackdowns, and Quiescence: Communal Elites and Democratic Mobilization in Southeast Asia. *American Journal of Sociology, 115*(1), 203-254.

Susan Stokes. 2010. Political Clientelism. In Carles Boix and Susan Stokes (eds.), *Oxford Handbook of Comparative Politics* (pp. 604-627)*.* Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Tarrow, Sidney. 1998. *Power in Movement*. Second Edition. New York: Cambridge University Press.

Tilly, Charles. 1978. *From Mobilization to Revolution*. Reading, MA: Addison-Wesley.

Tilly, Charles, Louise Tilly and Richard Tilly. *The Rebellious Century*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.

Tsai, Lily. 2007. *Accountability Without Democracy: Solidary Groups and Public Goods Provision in Rural China.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

**Final Exam: due December 16, 5:00 p.m. (to be e-mailed to instructor)**