

Introduction to Comparative Politics II

POLS 716
University of Wisconsin-Milwaukee
Fall 2021
W 4:30-7:00pm
Room: BOL 657

Professor: Ora John Reuter
Office: Bolton 670
Email: reutero@uwm.edu
Office Hours: By Appointment
Mode of Delivery: In-person

Description:

This is a graduate level field seminar on comparative politics. It serves as a supplement and extension to the primary graduate level field seminar that is offered by the department. The first part of the course provides an overview of the major approaches to the study of democratization. Democratization has traditionally been one of the largest research fields in comparative politics. We will focus on works that are representative of major schools of thought, including structural, process-oriented, mass-based, cultural, and institutional approaches.

The second half of the course is a survey of major topics in the study of comparative politics. Rather than attempt a comprehensive survey of this vast literature, the goal in this part of the course is to provide an overview of some of the most active research agendas in this area. We will cover topics such as political accountability, parties, political behavior, identity, mass mobilization, and the political economy of development. In this section, we will read both classic works and cutting-edge research.

This course should be seen as a complement to other seminars that are offered in the department. As such we will be avoiding topics that are covered in other departmental seminars, such as the comparative politics field seminar, the seminar on ethnic conflict, Professor Sugiyama's course on comparative public policy, and my course on authoritarian regimes. One of the main goals of the course is to help students prepare for their qualifying exams. As such, it seeks to fill gaps left by other seminars in the department.

Requirements:

1) Attend class sessions and participate

The format of this class will be discussion. Your participation includes both attendance and engagement in class discussion.

Most of our class time will be spent discussing the themes and arguments presented in our readings. Everyone should have something to say in every class. Your comments need not dazzle every time. Often times, the most productive contributions to class discussions are questions. If you don't understand something in the readings, say so. The authors we read are not perfect; one of our primary mandates in the course is to find flaws in these readings and discuss ways to improve them. Speak up and air your grievances. We will all be better for it and you will be rewarded come evaluation time. For each reading you should be prepared to discuss the following questions (if applicable):

- What is the research question? (i.e. what is the goal of the researcher?)
- Is this research question important? What is the puzzle being addressed? What is the motivation? (i.e. why was this paper written? Should we care about it?)

- What are the main concepts being discussed? Are they clear?
- What is the argument? What are its component parts? Who are the actors? Is it logically coherent? Is it novel?
- What are the observable implications of the argument?
- How is the argument tested? (i.e. what is the empirical strategy)
- How does the author measure key concepts? Are these measurements valid? Reliable?
- Does the evidence support the theory?
- What are the major hurdles to causal (or descriptive) inference in the empirical section (if applicable)? How does the author address these issues? Do they do an adequate job?

Attendance is mandatory. Our class is small, and therefore, you cannot free ride on your fellow classmates. Your absences will be noticed by all and have a palpable impact on our sessions. Each unexcused absence will result in the reduction of your participation grade by 1/3 of a letter grade.

2) Complete assigned readings before the date indicated on the syllabus

In order to participate effectively in discussion, you will need to have done the required readings for that day.

3) Six 2-4 page reaction papers/presentation

Over the course of the semester, you will write six reaction papers on a reading (or readings) of your choice from a class session.

These papers should have three components:

1) The paper should briefly (one paragraph) sum up the main argument made by the author and the evidence provided.

2) It should contain an evaluation and critique of the author's argument and evidence. Does the author's argument make sense? Why or why not? Does his evidence (if any) comport with his/her argument? Why or why not? Do you know of other evidence that undermines (or supports) the author's argument? Does one of the other readings for that day offer a perspective that is discordant with the perspective offered by the author? This section should constitute the lion's share of the paper.

3) The paper should conclude with some questions for the class that flow from your evaluation/critique.

You will give a short 5-minute presentation on your paper to kick off our discussion of that reading. Your questions should help us in our discussion.

Each week we will determine who will write reaction papers for the following week. I will ask for volunteers.

The reaction papers are due in class on the day we discuss the reading.

4) Students will write one substantial (15-30 page) research design paper.

In this paper, you will propose original research on a topic related to comparative politics. The aim of the research design is to help you learn how to write a publishable research paper in political science. It should contain all the elements of a journal-quality academic article, except the evidence itself. The research design should accomplish the following tasks.

- 1) Specify an interesting and important research question.
- 2) Justify the research question in light of existing literature and/or conventional wisdom. What is the relevant literature and/or research program that this question addresses? Many of your papers will be motivated by some “puzzle.” A social scientific puzzle is a manifestation of a political phenomenon (a case, set of data, observation, or example) that is puzzling in light of intuition, existing literature, or existing empirical results. Puzzles push social scientific inquiry forward. Identifying interesting puzzles is one of the most difficult tasks in all of social science. It requires creativity and an awareness of your sub-field’s overarching goals. It’s really hard. Practice is the best way to learn how to do it.
- 3) Articulate a theoretical argument to help answer the research question.
- 4) Describe the empirical implications of the argument. That is, derive hypotheses from the argument.
- 5) Delineate alternative explanations and what we would expect to see in the data if they are true
- 6) Set forth a plan for testing these hypotheses. What will the dependent variable be? Independent variables? How will you address problems of inference?

Each of you should meet individually with me about your paper topic before October 15. A two page outline is due on November 3. The final version of the paper will be due by email on December 23.

- 5) Complete one take-home final exam. Due by email on December 15.

Evaluation Scheme:

Class Attendance and Participation: 20%
Reaction Papers: 30%
Research Paper: 30%
Final Exam: 20%

Late Assignment Policy

All assignments are due on the assigned date. Response papers are due on the day that a reading is covered in class. I do not accept late assignments. Exceptions are made only in the most severe and extraordinary circumstances.

Academic Honesty:

All assignments and activities associated with this course must be performed in accordance with the University of Wisconsin-Milwaukee's academic misconduct policy. Plagiarism will not be tolerated in this course and any plagiarism on any assignment will result in a failing grade for the course.

When in doubt, cite. If you have questions about attribution, please see me. I am here to help! More information is available at http://www.uwm.edu/acad_aff/policy/academicmisconduct.cfm

September 8—Structural Approaches: Long-run development. Class conflict. Industrialization. Democratization in Western Europe.

Required:

Moore, Barrington. 1966. *Social Origins of Dictatorship and Democracy: Lord and Peasant in the Making of the Modern World*. Boston, MA: Beacon Press. Chapters 1-2, 7-9.

Gregory M. Luebbert. 1987. "Social Foundations of Political Order in Interwar Europe," *World Politics* 39(4): 449-478.

Daniel Ziblatt. 2008. "Does Landholding Inequality Block Democratization? A Test of the Bread and Democracy Thesis and the Case of Prussia," *World Politics* 60(4): 610-641.

September 15—Economic Approaches: Distributive Conflict. Economic Autonomy.

Required:

Boix, Carles. 2003. *Democracy and Redistribution*. New York: Cambridge. Pp 1-129.

Ansell, Benjamin and David Samuels. 2010. "Inequality and Democratization: A Contractarian Approach" *Comparative Political Studies* 43(2).

Haggard, Stephen and Robert R. Kaufman. 2016. *Dictators and Democrats: Masses, Elites, and Regime Change*. Chapters 1 and 2.

McCann, Kelly. 2006. *Economic Autonomy and Democracy*. New York: Cambridge. Chapters 1, 2, and 5.

September 22—Elites and Masses: Process-oriented approaches. “Transitology.” The role of contingency. Strategic interaction. Mass mobilization and protest.

Required:

Przeworski, Adam. 1991. *Democracy and the Market: Political and Economic Reforms in Eastern Europe and Latin America*. Chicago: University of Chicago. pp51-99

Collier, Ruth Berins. 1999. *Paths Toward Democracy: The Working Class and Elites in Western Europe and Latin America*. New York: Cambridge University Press, Chapter 1 and Chapter 5.

Bratton, Michael and Nicolas Van de Walle. 1994. Neopatrimonial Regimes and Political Transitions in Africa. *World Politics*. 46.

Wood, Elisabeth. 2000. *Forging Democracy from Below: Insurgent Transitions in South Africa and El Salvador*. New York: Cambridge. Chapters 1-5.

September 29—Culture and Mass Preferences: Modernization theory revisited. The “civic culture.” Religion and democracy.

Required:

Inglehart, Ronald and Wayne E. Baker. 2000. “Modernization, Globalization, and the Persistence of Tradition: Empirical Evidence from 65 Societies.” *American Sociological Review*. 65(1).

Laitin, David. 1995. The Civic Culture at 30." *American Political Science Review* 89(1).

Colton, Timothy and Michael McFaul. 2002. “Are Russians Undemocratic?” *Post-Soviet Affairs*. 18(2).

Kalyvas, Stathis. 2000. “Commitment Problems in Emerging Democracies: The Case of Religious Parties” *Comparative Politics*. 32(4).

Claassen, Christopher. 2020. “Does Public Support Help Democracy Survive?” *American Journal of Political Science*. 64(1).

October 6—Institutions and Democratization: What kind of institutions stabilize democracy? Elite-led transitions. Commitment problems.

Required:

Albertus, Michael and Victor Menaldo. 2018. *Authoritarianism and the Elite Origins of Democracy*. Chapters 1-4

Haggard, Stephen and Robert R. Kaufman. 2016. *Dictators and Democrats: Masses, Elites, and Regime Change*. Chapters 5 and 6

Nalepa, Monika. 2010. “Captured Commitments: An Analytic Narrative of Transitions with Transitional Justice” *World Politics*.

October 14—Democratic Consolidation and Democratic Backsliding: Democratic breakdown. New debates on democratic stability.

Ziblatt, Daniel. 2017. *Conservative Parties and the Birth of Democracy*. Selections.

Graham, Benjamin, Michael Miller, and Kaare Strøm. 2017. “Safeguarding Democracy: Powersharing and Democratic Survival,” *American Political Science Review* 111(4).

Perez-Linan, Anibal. 2019. “Presidential Hegemony and Democratic Backsliding in Latin America, 1925-2016.” *Democratization*.

Mainwaring, Scott and Anibal Perez-Linan. 2014. *Democracies and Dictatorships in Latin America: Emergence, Survival and Fall*.

Recommended:

Waldner, David and Ellen Lust. 2018. “Unwelcome Change: Coming to Terms with Democratic Backsliding” *Annual Review of Political Science*. [Good for reviewing the democratization literature and drawing connections]

October 20—Representation and Accountability: Obstacles to representation and accountability. Veto players. Credibility. Political Parties

Required:

George Tsebelis. 1995. ‘Decision Making in Political Systems: Veto Players in Presidentialism, Parliamentarism, Multicameralism, and Multipartyism.’ *British Journal of Political Science*.

De La O, Ana and Jonathan Rodden. 2008. “Does Religion Distract the Poor? Income and Issue Voting Around the World.” *Comparative Political Studies*.

Kramon, Eric. 2016. “Electoral Handouts as Information: Explaining Unmonitored Vote Buying” *World Politics*.

Zielinski, Jakub, Kazmierz M. Slomczynski and Goldie Shabad. 2005. “Electoral Control in New Democracies: The Perverse Incentives of Fluid Party Systems” *World Politics*. 57(3).

Kluver, Heike and Jae-Jae Spoon. 2014. “Who Responds? Voters, Parties, and Issue Attention” *British Journal of Political Science*.

October 27---Political Parties: Development and decline.

Spoon, Jae-Jae and Heike Klüber. 2019. "Party Convergence and Vote Switching: Explaining Mainstream Party Decline Across Europe." *European Journal of Political Research*.

Chhibber, Pradeep and Ken Kollman. 1998. "Party Aggregation and the Number of Parties in India and the United States" *American Political Science Review*.

Mainwaring, Scott. 1999. *Rethinking Party Systems in the Third Wave of Democratization*. Stanford: Stanford UP. Chapters 1, 2, and 11

Lupu, Noam. 2014. "Brand Dilution and Breakdown of Political Parties in Latin America" *World Politics*.

November 3---Political Participation. Turnout. Resources and SES. Collective action and abstention.

Required:

Stokes, Susan and S. Erdem Aytac. 2019. *Why Bother? Rethinking Participation in Elections and Protests*.

Brady, Henry, Sidney Verba, and Kay Lehman Schlozman. 1995. "Beyond SES: A Resource Model of Political Participation" *American Political Science Review*.

Eggers, Andrew. 2015, "Proportionality and Turnout: Evidence from French Municipalities," *Comparative Political Studies*

Nathan, Noel. 2016. "Does Participation Reinforce Patronage? Policy Preferences, Turnout and Class in Urban Ghana" *British Journal of Political Science*.

November 10—Social Mobilization and Rebellion: Mass protest. Social movements. Nationalist mobilization.

Required:

Pfaff, Steven and Michael Hechter. 2020. *The Genesis of Rebellion: Governance, Grievance and Mutiny in the Age of Sail*. Selections.

Kenneth Roberts. 2006. "Populist Mobilization, Socio-Political Conflict, and Grass-Roots Organization in Latin America," *Comparative Politics* 38(2).

Robertson, Graeme. 2007. "Strikes and Labor Organization in Hybrid Regimes" *American Political Science Review*. 101(4).

Humphreys and Weinstein, 2008, "Who Fights? The Determinants of Participation in Civil War," *American Political Science Review*

November 17—Political Identity: Approaches to studying identity. Nationalism. Ethno-Federalism

Required:

Anderson, Benedict. 1991. *Imagined Communities: Some Reflections on the Origin and Spread of Nationalism*. London: Verso. [Selections]

Bates, Robert H. 1983. "Modernization, Ethnic Competition, and the Rationality of Politics in Contemporary Africa." In Donald Rothchild and Victor A. Olunsorola, eds., *State versus Ethnic Claims: African Policy Dilemmas*. Boulder, CO: Westview Press.

Varshney, Ashtoush. 2001. "Ethnic Conflict and Civil Society: India and Beyond", *World Politics*

Hale, Henry. 2004. "Divided We Stand: Institutional Sources of Ethnofederal State Survival and Collapse," *World Politics*, 56(2).

Posner, Daniel 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).

November 24 Inequality and Redistribution: The political causes and consequences of economic inequality.

Required:

Rueda, David and Daniel Stegmueller. 2020. *Who Wants What? Redistribution Preferences in Comparative Perspective*. Selections.

Bonica, Adam, Nolan McCarty, Keith Poole, and Howard Rosenthal. 2013. "Why Hasn't Democracy Slowed Rising Inequality?" *Journal of Economic Perspectives*.*

Anderson, Lisa, Jennifer Mellor, and Jeffrey Milyo. 2008. "Inequality and Public Good Provision: An Experimental Analysis" *Journal of Socio-Economics**

Gimpelson, Vladimir and Daniel Treisman. 2018. "Misperceiving Inequality" *Economics and Politics**

Alesina, Alberto, Edward Glaeser, and Bruce Sacerdote. 2001. "Why Doesn't the United States Have a European-Style Welfare State?" *Brookings Papers on Economic Activity*. 2 pg 1-3 22-61

December 1—"New" Perspectives on Growth: Re-examining institutions. Rule of law. Political Selection. Human Capital. State-led development.

Required:

Frye, Timothy. 2004. "Credible Commitment and Property Rights: Evidence from Russia" *American Political Science Review*. 98(3).

Evans, Peter. 1995. *Embedded Autonomy: States and Industrial Transformation* Princeton: Princeton UP, pp 3-73.

Besley, Timothy. 2005. "Political Selection" *Journal of Economic Perspectives*. 19(3).

Nunn, Nathan. 2008. "The Long-Term Effects of Africa's Slave Trades" *Quarterly Journal of Economics*. 123(1).

Jones, Benjamin. and Benjamin A. Olken. 2005. Do Leaders Matter? National Leadership and Growth Since World War II. *The Quarterly Journal of Economics*

December 8—Corruption: Causes and Consequences. *Advances in Causal Inference*.

Required:

Treisman, Daniel. 2007. "What Have We Learned about the Causes of Corruption from Ten Years of Cross-National Research?" *Annual Review of Political Science* 10.

Szakonyi, David. 2018. "Businesspeople in Elected Office: Identifying Private Benefits from Firm-Level Returns" *American Political Science Review*.

Hanna, Rema and Shing Yi Wang, "Dishonesty and Selection into Public Service," NBER Working Paper 19649

Hellman, Joel. 1998. "Winners Take All: The Politics of Partial Reform in Postcommunist Transitions" *World Politics*.

Ferraz, Claudio and Frederico Finan. 2008. Exposing corrupt politicians: The effects of Brazil's publicly released audits on electoral outcomes. *The Quarterly Journal of Economics*