

POL 2700

FOUNDATIONS AND APPROACHES TO COMPARATIVE POLITICS

Professor Jacques Bertrand

jacques.bertrand@utoronto.ca

Office: Room 264S, Trinity College, 1 Devonshire Place

Office hours: Tuesday, 3:00–4:00 pm or by appointment

Professor Brendan McElroy

b.mcelroy@utoronto.ca

Office: Room 204N, Trinity College, 1 Devonshire Place

Office hours: Thursday, 10:00–11:00 am or by appointment

Format: This seminar is reading and discussion intensive. All students are expected to have covered the required readings for each session. The recommended readings listed complement the required readings and the expectation is that, together, the required and recommended readings will provide a foundation for students preparing for field examinations.

Requirements: Students are expected to attend each class and to participate actively in the class discussion. Grades will be based on the completion of weekly response papers, two essays (10–15 pages, double spaced, 12-point font), and regular participation.

Weekly response papers: Listed under each week's readings (see below) are 4–7 questions related to the readings. You should answer **one** of these questions and turn in the paper on Quercus before the start of class. Be prepared to discuss the other questions in class. The questions are very broad and are intended to force you to begin to think critically about the reading. Answers should total 1–2 pages and make *specific* references (with page numbers) to the assigned readings. **The papers will not be graded.** Instead, an A (85%) will be given as long as the paper is handed in on time and there is evidence that the reading has been done.

This course has a significant amount of reading. It is important that you try and complete all the reading; at the same time, learning how to skim effectively is an important skill in academia. See the following blog post: "How to Read and Get the Most Out of a Journal Article" *JEPS Bulletin*, <https://blog.efpsa.org/2013/02/28/how-to-read-and-get-the-most-out-of-a-journal-article/>.

Critical essays: You will be required to write two essays (10–15 pages each) on the required readings. Note that you are **not** expected to do outside readings for these essays. One of the essays is a comparative analysis of the week's required readings. The other is a book review. The first essay (book review or literature review) is due October 29 by 5:00 pm and the second (book review or literature review) is due December 7 by 5:00 pm. It is required that you do one of the assignments from weeks led by Bertrand and the other from a week led by McElroy.

One of the essays – the comparative analysis – should compare and contrast the readings from a particular week. How do the readings “talk” to each other? How are the theoretical approaches and/or methodologies different or similar? What in your view are the strengths and weaknesses of each? We advise that you focus on one or two key issues in the work (e.g., structure versus agency, use of history, epistemology) rather than trying to cover too much. You are welcome to build on one of the study questions provided for that week.

The other essay should be a book review of one of the assigned books in the course: Yashar, Wilfahrt, Lawson, Boucoyannis, Ziblatt, or Spruyt. This essay should analyze the key claims of the author and critique their methodology, theoretical or conceptual approaches.

The purpose of these written exercises is to summarize, contextualize, and critically analyze key texts in the field of comparative politics. To do this, you will need to marry two slightly different approaches. On the one hand, you should think “big.” What are the main arguments that the works advance? What are the main problems or puzzles that the author(s) address?

On the other hand, you should also think “small.” It is not sufficient to summarize the authors’ argument. Rather, we want you to “unpack” the argument and provide a critique of it. The instructors are interested in your own ideas, thoughts, and reactions. The best critiques will focus, in detail (with quotes and page numbers), on one or two key aspects of the text, such as the use of a particular concept, application of the argument to different cases, or choice of methodology. It is much better to cover a small, important part of the book in a precise and scholarly manner than to analyze broad swaths of the text in an imprecise way. Every effort should be made to critique the author in terms of the questions he or she is trying to address rather than other questions you might find more interesting. You should make sure to back up any claim with specific citations from the text. Every major concept used in the paper should be precisely defined.

It is important to emphasize that “critique” is not a synonym for “criticize.” A critique is primarily an effort to understand rather than identify problems in the text (although you are very welcome to do this).

Marking:

- Participation: 10%
- Weekly reading responses: 30%
- Two critical essays (30% each): 60%

Book review options:

Bertrand’s weeks:

- George Lawson, *Anatomies of Revolution* (New York: Cambridge University Press, 2019).
- Martha Wilfahrt, *Precolonial Legacies in Postcolonial Politics: Representation and Redistribution in Decentralized West Africa* (New York: Cambridge University Press, 2022).

- Deborah J. Yashar, *Homicidal Ecologies: Illicit Economies and Complicit States in Latin America* (New York: Cambridge University Press, 2018).

McElroy's weeks:

- Deborah Boucoyannis, *Kings as Judges: Power, Justice, and the Origins of Parliaments* (New York: Cambridge University Press, 2021).
- Hendrik Spruyt, *The World Imagined: Collective Beliefs and Political Order in the Sinocentric, Islamic and Southeast Asian International Societies* (New York: Cambridge University Press, 2020).
- Daniel Ziblatt, *Conservative Parties and the Birth of Democracy* (New York: Cambridge University Press, 2017).

WEEKS AT A GLANCE

Week	Date	Topic	Notes
1	September 11	What is comparative politics?	
2	September 18	Critical and postcolonial approaches	
3	September 25	Indigenous approaches	
4	October 2	States and state formation	
	October 9	Thanksgiving Monday	No seminar
5	October 16	Institutionalist approaches	
6	October 23	Democracy and autocracy	
7	October 30	Culture and ideas	First critical essay due October 29, 5:00 pm
	November 6	Fall reading week	No seminar
8	November 13	Nationalism and identity	
9	November 20	Class and material interests	
10	November 27	Revolutions and resistance – two ends of a continuum?	
11	December 4	Comparative political economy / Wrapping up the semester	Second critical essay due December 7, 5:00 pm

WEEK 1 (JB/BM): WHAT IS COMPARATIVE POLITICS?

SEPTEMBER 11

Reading response questions

1. What is the difference between idiographic and nomothetic approaches? What different kinds of questions characterize each? Where do you think political science lies in the spectrum between the two? How do these different approaches value parsimony?
2. Describe the approach of King, Keohane, and Verba (KKV) to causal inference. How does it differ from that offered by Brady and Collier? For example, what is the too few cases/too many variables problem? How do KKV on the one hand and Brady and Collier on the other approach this problem?
3. What is the fundamental difference between structural and voluntarist approaches? What would be evidence that an author is relying on a structural approach? Voluntarist approach?
4. What is ethnographic research? What are the main advantages of this approach?

Required readings

Ontology, Epistemology and Methodology

Marsh, David and Furlong, Paul, "A Skin not a Sweater: Ontology and Epistemology in Political Science" in David Marsh and Gerry Stoker, eds, *Theory and Methods in Political Science*, 2nd edition (Palgrave, 2002), 17–41.

The dominant paradigm

Gary King, Robert Keohane, and Sidney Verba, *Designing Social Inquiry: Scientific Inference in Qualitative Research*: Chaps 1, 3; the rest of KKV is highly recommended.

Critiques of the dominant paradigm

Henry Brady and David Collier, *Rethinking Social Inquiry Second Edition*: Chaps. 2, 9, 10.

Qualitative vs Quantitative Research

Mahoney, J. and Goertz, G. 2006. "A Tale of Two Cultures" *Political Analysis* 14: 227-249.

Ethnography

Schatz, Edward. 2009. "Introduction: Ethnographic immersion and the Study of Politics" in Schatz, Edward (ed.), *Political Ethnography: What Immersion Contributes to the Study of Power*, Chicago: Univ of Chicago Press. Pgs. 1-22.

Structuralism vs. Voluntarism

L-Jim Mahoney and Richard Snyder, "Rethinking Agency and Structure in the Study of Regime Change", *Studies in Comparative International Development* 34: 2 (Summer 1999): 3-32.

Recommended readings

Peter Hall, "Aligning Ontology and Methodology in Comparative Politics," in James Mahoney and Dietrich Rueschmeyer, *Comparative Historical Analysis in the Social Sciences*.

Przeworski, Adam and Henry Teune. 1970. *The Logic of Comparative Social Inquiry*. New York: Wiley. Introduction and Chapter 1, pp. 3-30.

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

Sartori, Giovanni. 1991. "Comparing and Miscomparing." *Journal of Theoretical Politics* Vol.3, No.3: 243-257.

Dunning, Thad. 2008. "Improving Causal Inference: The Strengths and Limitations of Natural Experiments." *Political Research Quarterly* vol.61, no.2: pp 282-293.

Tetlock, Philip E. and Aaron Belkin. 1996. "Counterfactual Thought Experiments in World Politics: Logical, Methodological and Psychological Perspectives" in *Counterfactual Thought Experiments in World Politics*, Philip E. Tetlock and Aaron Belkin (eds.), Princeton: Princeton University Press: pp 1-38.

Gary Goertz and James Mahoney, 2012. *A Tale of Two Cultures: Qualitative and Quantitative Research in the Social Sciences*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.

Barbara Geddes, 2003. *Paradigms and Sand Castles: Theory Building and Research Design in Comparative Politics*, University of Michigan Press.

WEEK 2: CRITICAL AND POSTCOLONIAL APPROACHES

SEPTEMBER 18

DISCUSSION LED BY PROF. MARTHA BALAGUERA

Reading response questions

1. What are discourses (including "colonial discourses") and why do you think they are important for the purposes of a critical approach to the study of politics? While Foucault defines critique as "the art of not being governed quite so much" ("What is critique?" p. 29), Chatterjee argues for a notion of "political society" concerned with the "politics of the governed" in postcolonial societies. How is "government" being theorized by Foucault and Chatterjee and how does it compare to everyday as well as conventional political science understandings of the term?
2. What are the strengths and flaws of "post-colonialism" as a category of analysis?
3. What does a critique of the "repressive hypothesis" illuminate about power and how could you apply this alternative framework to your own research?

Required readings

- Foucault, Michel. 2007. "What is Critique?" In: *The Politics of Truth*, edited by Sylvère Lotringer and Lysa Hochroth. Los Angeles: Semiotext(e).
- Brown, Wendy. 2006. "Power after Foucault." In: *The Oxford Handbook of Political Theory*, edited by John S. Drysek, Bonnie Honig, and Anne Philips. New York: Oxford University Press. pp. 65-84.
- Anne McClintock (1992), "The Angel of Progress: Pitfalls of the Term 'Post-Colonialism'," *Social Text*, No 31/32, pp. 84-98.
- Mohanty, Chandra Talpade. 2003. "Under Western Eyes: Feminist Scholarship and Colonial Discourses (1986)." In: *Feminism without Borders: Decolonizing Theory, Practicing Solidarity*. Durham: Duke, pp. 17-42.
- Partha Chatterjee. 2004. *The Politics of the Governed*. Ch. 1-3.

Recommended readings

- Butler, Judith. "What is Critique? An Essay on Foucault's Virtue."
- Said, Edward. 1978. *Orientalism*. New York: Vintage/Random House.
- Spivak, Gayatri. 1988. "Can the Subaltern Speak?" In: *Marxism and the Interpretation of Culture*, edited by Nelson and Grossberg. Basingstoke: MacMillan Education. Pp. 271-313.
- Chatterjee, Partha. 2011. *Lineages of Political Society: Studies in Postcolonial Democracy*.
- Stoler, Ann Laura. 2002. *Carnal Knowledge and Imperial Power: Race and the Intimate in Colonial Rule*. Berkeley: University of California.
- Cammack, Paul, David Pool, and William Tordoff. 1988. *Third World Politics*. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press.

WEEK 3: INDIGENOUS APPROACHES

SEPTEMBER 25

DISCUSSION LED BY PROF. CHADWICK COWIE

Reading response questions

1. What are some common threads/similarities that the authors showcase throughout the readings? Are there any?
2. Can Indigenous methodologies and approaches to research be utilized in other areas of the world and other areas of research?
3. Does decolonization and Indigenous methodologies go hand-in-hand?
4. Is "positionality" important in research, especially comparative research?

Required readings

Anderson, Chris & Maggie Walter. "Chapter 1: Deficit Indigenes." In *Indigenous Statistics: A Quantitative Research Methodology*. New York: Routledge, 2013.

Corr, Evelyn Araluen. "The Limits of Literary Theory and the Possibilities of Storywork for Aboriginal Literature in Australia." In *Decolonizing Research: Indigenous Storywork as Methodology*. Editors: Jo-Ann Archibald, Q'um Q'um Xiiem, Jenny Bol Jun Lee-Morgan, and Jason De Santolo, pp. 187–202. New York: Zed Books, 2020.

Kovach, Margaret. "Chapter 1: Indigenous and Qualitative Inquiry: A Round Dance?" In *Indigenous Methodologies: Characteristics, Conversations, and Contexts*, pp. 23–38. Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 2009.

Okalik, Looee. "Inuuunga: The Intricacy of Indigenous and Western Epistemologies in the Arctic." In *Indigenous Pathways into Social Research: Voices of a New Generation*, edited by Donna M. Martens, Fiona Cram, and Bagele Chilisa, pp. 239–249. Walnut Creek: Left Coast Press Inc, 2013.

Tuhiwai Smith, Linda. "Colonizing Knowledges." In *Decolonizing Methodologies: Research and Indigenous Peoples*, pp. 58–77. Dunedin: University of Otago Press, 1999.

Tuhiwai Smith, Linda. "Articulating an Indigenous Research Agenda." In *Decolonizing Methodologies: Research and Indigenous Peoples*, pp. 123–141. Dunedin: University of Otago Press, 1999.

Recommended readings

Anderson, Chris & Maggie Walter. "Chapter 5: Indigenous Quantitative Methodological Practice – Canada." In *Indigenous Statistics: A Quantitative Research Methodology*. New York: Routledge, 2013

Betasamosake Simpson, Leanne. "Land as Pedagogy." In *As We Have Always Done: Indigenous Freedom Through Radical Resistance*, pp. 145–173. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 2017.

WEEK 4 (BM): STATES AND STATE FORMATION

OCTOBER 2

Reading response questions

1. Describe the main similarities and differences between the authors' conceptualization of state strength. What dimensions does each focus on? What does it mean for the state to be "strong" according to each? What indicators do the different authors use to measure strength/weakness?
2. What are the defining features of the "Westphalian" international order, as described by Spruyt? How does it differ from the international orders that existed in East and

Southeast Asia before European colonialism? For that matter, how accurately does the “Westphalian” ideal type describe early modern Europe?

3. What role does war play in the construction of the state for Tilly? What critiques of this argument and alternative explanations for state formation do other authors provide?
4. What is the relationship between state strength/weakness and regime in the different works? What type of state is required for successful democratization or the rise of representative institutions?
5. How does Tilly’s narrative of European state formation differ from the model advanced by von Friedeburg and Morrill? Can the two be reconciled? Does von Friedeburg and Morrill’s revisionist account of European state-building have any implications for how we ought to study state formation in other parts of the world?

Required readings

Deborah Boucoyannis, *Kings as Judges: Power, Justice, and the Origins of Parliaments* (New York: Cambridge University Press, 2021), chaps. 1, 4–6.

Robert von Friedeburg and John Morrill, “Introduction,” in von Friedeburg and Morrill, eds., *Monarchy Transformed: Princes and Their Elites in Early Modern Western Europe* (New York: Cambridge University Press, 2017), pp. 1–17.

Paul Frymer, *Building an American Empire: The Era of Territorial and Political Expansion* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2017), introduction.

Dan Slater, *Ordering Power: Contentious Politics and Authoritarian Leviathans in Southeast Asia* (New York: Cambridge University Press, 2010), introduction.

Hendrik Spruyt, *The World Imagined: Collective Beliefs and Political Order in the Sinocentric, Islamic and Southeast Asian International Societies* (New York: Cambridge University Press, 2020), chaps. 1–4.

Charles Tilly, “War Making and State Making as Organized Crime,” in Peter B. Evans, Dietrich Rueschemeyer, and Theda Skocpol, eds., *Bringing the State Back In* (New York: Cambridge University Press, 1985), chap. 5.

Recommended readings

Miguel Angel Centeno, *Blood and Debt: War and the Nation-State in Latin America* (University Park, PA: Penn State University Press, 2002), chaps. 1, 3.

Jeffrey Herbst, *States and Power in Africa: Comparative Lessons in Authority and Control*, 2nd ed. (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2014).

Margaret Levi, *Of Rule and Revenue* (Berkeley, CA: University of California Press, 1988).

Daniel H. Nexon, *The Struggle for Power in Early Modern Europe: Religious Conflict, Dynastic Empires, and International Change* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2009).

Theda Skocpol, *States and Social Revolutions* (New York: Cambridge University Press, 1979), chap. 4.

Hillel Soifer, *State Building in Latin America* (New York: Cambridge University Press, 2015), introduction.

Vadim Volkov, *Violent Entrepreneurs: The Use of Force in the Making of Russian Capitalism* (Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press, 2002)

Yuhua Wang, “State and society 2.0: Toward fourth-generation theories of the state,” *Comparative Politics* 54.1 (2021), pp. 175–198.

Yuhua Wang, *The Rise and Fall of Imperial China* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2022).

Max Weber, “Politics as a Vocation,” in Debbie Owen and Tracy B. Strong, eds., *The Vocation Lectures* (Indianapolis and Cambridge, MA: Hackett Publishing Company, 2004), pp. 32–94.

WEEK 5 (JB): INSTITUTIONALIST APPROACHES

OCTOBER 16

Reading response questions

1. What does it mean to take an institutionalist perspective? What is the range of definitions of institution – what if anything unites institutionalists?
2. How do different approaches theorize obedience to institutional rules?
3. How do different approaches theorize institutional origins?
4. What is the difference between an institution and an organization?
5. How does Pepinsky view institutions in authoritarian contexts? What are the potential criticisms of the institutional approach?

Required readings

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

Historical institutionalism

Thelen, Kathleen. 1999. “Historical Institutionalism in Comparative Politics,” *Annual Review of Political Science*, 2: pp 369-404.

Rational Choice Institutionalism

Barry Weingast, “Rational-Choice Institutionalism.” in Ira Katznelson and Helen V. Milner, eds. *Political Science: State of the Discipline* (New York: W.W. Norton, 2002): pp. 660-692.

Sociological institutionalism

Streeck, Wolfgang. “Beneficial Constraints” in Hollingsworth, J. R., & Boyer, R. (1997). *Contemporary capitalism: the embeddedness of institutions*. Joseph R. Hollingsworth & R. Boyer, eds. Cambridge University Press.

Intended and Unintended Consequences of Institutional Change

Rachel Brule Women, *Power and Property: The Paradox of Gender Equality Laws in India*. New York: Cambridge University Press, 2020. Introduction, pp. 1-18.

Critiquing the institutional approach

Thomas Pepinsky, "The institutional turn in comparative authoritarianism" *British Journal of Political Science* 44, (2014) No. 3.

Recommended readings

Lijphart interview in Munck and Snyder, *Passion, Craft, and Method* (chapter 8).

Jonathan Rodden, "Back to the Future: Endogenous Institutions and Comparative Politics," in Mark I. Lichbach and Alan S. Zuckerman, eds. *Comparative Politics: Rationality, Culture, and Structure* (New York: Cambridge University Press, 2009): pp. 333-357.

Pierson, Paul. 2000. "Increasing Returns, Path Dependence, and the Study of Politics." *American Political Science Review*, vol.94, no. 2: pp 251-267.

Immergut, Ellen M. 1998. "The Theoretical Core of the New Institutionalism" *Politics and Society*, vol.26, no.1: pp 5-34.

Tilly, Charles. 1984. *Big, Structures, Large Processes, Huge Comparisons*. New York: Russell Sage Foundation.

Skocpol T, Pierson P. "Historical Institutionalism in Contemporary Political Science". In: Katznelson I, Milner *Political Science: State of the Discipline* (New York: W.W. Norton, 2002): pp. 693-721.

North, Douglass. 1990. *Institutions, Institutional Change and Economic Performance* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Douglass C. North and Barry R. Weingast, "Constitutions and Commitment: The Evolution of Institutions Governing Public Choice in Seventeenth Century England," *Journal of Economic History* 49, No 4 (December 1989): pp 803-832.

Pontusson, Jonas. 1995. "Putting Political Institutions in Their Place and Taking Interests Seriously." *Comparative Political Studies*, vol.28, no.1: pp 117-148.

Mahoney, James. 2000. "Path Dependence in Historical Sociology." *Theory and Society* vol.29, no.4: pp 507-548.

Rueschemeyer, Dietrich, and John D. Stephens. 1997. "Comparing Historical Sequences: A Powerful Tool for Causal Analysis." *Comparative Social Research* 16: pp 55-72.

Pierson, Paul. 2004. *Politics in Time: History, Institutions and Social Analysis* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press: pp 79-132.

Peter Hall, "Politics as a Process Structured in Space and Time." In O. Fioretois, T. Falleti and A. Sheingate eds. *The Oxford Handbook of Historical Institutionalism*. Oxford University Press, 2016.

James Mahoney, Khairunnisa Mohamedali and Christoph Nguyen, "Causality and Time in Historical Institutionalism." In O. Fioretois, T. Falleti and A. Sheingate eds. *The Oxford Handbook of Historical Institutionalism*. Oxford University Press, 2016.

WEEK 6 (BM): DEMOCRACY AND AUTOCRACY

OCTOBER 23

Reading response questions

1. What are the advantages and disadvantages of the “minimal” or proceduralist definitions of democracy advocated by Dahl and Schmitter and Karl? Should standard comparative politics definitions of democracy be deepened, and if so, how?
2. What are the advantages and disadvantages of studying long-run trends in regime development – for instance, “settled” versus “unsettled” democratization, as Ziblatt proposes – rather than discrete transitions from autocracy to democracy and *vice versa*?
3. Do you find Ziblatt’s argument that “settled” democratization requires the accommodation of conservative old-regime elites convincing? Are there any alternative strategies for dealing with conservative elites he overlooks? How might Moore respond to Ziblatt? What, if any, are the implications of Ziblatt’s argument for understanding recent democratic backsliding?
4. Does stable democracy have a social-economic basis? To what extent can class preferences over democracy be generalized across contexts?
5. Is “illiberal democracy” a useful conceptual category? Should it be understood to mean an intermediate form – a hybrid of democratic and authoritarian elements – or does it differ qualitatively from both liberal democracy and authoritarianism?

Required readings

Daron Acemoglu and James A. Robinson, *Economic Origins of Dictatorship and Democracy* (New York: Cambridge University Press, 2006), chaps. 1–2.

Robert A. Dahl, *Polyarchy: Participation and Opposition* (New Haven, CT, and London: Yale University Press, 1971), chaps. 1, 3.

Barrington Moore, Jr. *Social Origins of Dictatorship and Democracy: Lord and Peasant in the Making of the Modern World* (Boston: Beacon Press, 1966), chaps. 1, 7.

Phillippe C. Schmitter and Terry Lynn Karl, “What democracy is... and is not,” *Journal of Democracy* 2.3 (1991), pp. 75–88.

Daniel Ziblatt, *Conservative Parties and the Birth of Democracy* (New York: Cambridge University Press, 2017), chaps. 1–3.

Recommended readings

Ben W. Ansell and David J. Samuels, *Inequality and Democratization: An Elite-Competition Approach* (New York: Cambridge University Press, 2014).

Sheri Berman, “Modernization in historical perspective: The case of imperial Germany,” *World Politics* 53.3 (2001), pp. 431–462.

Juan J. Linz and Alfred Stepan, *Problems of Democratic Transition and Consolidation: Southern Europe, South America, and Post-Communist Europe* (Baltimore, MD: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1996), chap. 1–3.

Guillermo O'Donnell and Philippe C. Schmitter, *Transitions from Authoritarian Rule: Tentative Conclusions about Uncertain Democracies* (Baltimore, MD: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1986, new ed. 2013).

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

David Stasavage, *The Decline and Rise of Democracy: A Global History from Antiquity to Today* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2020).

Milan W. Svobik, *The Politics of Authoritarian Rule* (New York: Cambridge University Press, 2012).

Steven Levitsky and Lucan A. Way, *Competitive Authoritarianism: Hybrid Regimes after the Cold War* (New York: Cambridge University Press, 2010).

WEEK 7 (JB): CULTURE AND IDEAS

OCTOBER 30

Reading response questions

1. What is a cultural explanation in political science?
2. How is culture different from norms and ideas?
3. Is culture a residual category?
4. What distinguishes a semiotic approach from one that focuses on political culture?
5. How do traditions, legacies, or moral authority explain political outcomes? Are these ideas, norms, or culture?

Required readings

Wedeen, Lisa. 2002. "Conceptualizing Culture: Possibilities for Political Science," *APSR* 96(4): 713-728.

Berman, Sheri. 2001. "Ideas, Norms and Culture in Political Analysis," *Comparative Politics* 33(2): 231-250.

Blyth, M. (2003). "Structures Do Not Come with an Instruction Sheet: Interests, Ideas, and Progress in Political Science". *Perspectives on Politics*, 1(4): 695-706).

Culture and symbols: the semiotic approach

Wedeen, Lisa. 1998. "Acting "As If": Symbolic Politics and Social Control in Syria" *Society for the Comparative Study of Society and History* vol. 40., no 3: 503-523.

Political culture and the Civic culture approach

Welzel, C., & Dalton, R. J. (2014). *The civic culture transformed: from allegiant to assertive citizens* (C. Welzel & R. J. Dalton, Eds.). Cambridge University Press.

Precolonial or traditional legacies?

Wilfahrt, Martha. "Precolonial legacies and institutional congruence in public goods delivery: Evidence from decentralized West Africa." *World Politics* 70.2 (2018): 239-274.

Baldwin, Kate, and Katharina Holzinger. "Traditional Political Institutions and Democracy: Reassessing Their Compatibility and Accountability." *Comparative Political Studies* 52, no. 12 (October 1, 2019): 1747–74.

Religion and "Moral Authority"

Gryzmala-Busse, Anna. (2015) *Nations Under God*. Princeton University Press. Intro and Chap. 1.

Recommended readings

Baldwin, Kate. (2016) *The Paradox of Traditional Chiefs in Democratic Africa*. Cambridge Studies in Comparative Politics. New York: Cambridge University Press.

Marc Howard Ross, Culture in comparative political analysis, in Lichbach, M., & Zuckerman, A. (2009). *Comparative Politics: Rationality, Culture, and Structure* (2nd ed., Cambridge UP).

Ross, M. (2007). *Cultural Contestation in Ethnic Conflict* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press).

Rueschemeyer, Dietrich. 2006. "Why and How Ideas Matter". In Robert Goodin and Charles Tilly, eds. *The Oxford Handbook of Contextual Political Analysis*. Oxford University Press. Chapter 12.

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

Inglehart, Ron. 1988. "The Renaissance of Political Culture." *American Political Science Review*, 82 (4): 1203-1230.

Almond, G. and S. Verba. 1965. *The Civic Culture: Political Attitudes and Democracy in Five Nations*. Little Brown. Final Chapter.

Almond, G. and S. Verba. 1980. *The Civic Culture Revisited*. Little Brown.

Dalton, Russell J. 2000. "Citizen Attitudes and Political Behaviour." *Comparative Political Studies*, vol.33, no.7: 912-940.

Putnam, Robert. 2001. *Bowling Alone: The Collapse and Revival of American Community*. New York: Simon and Schuster.

WEEK 8 (JB): NATIONALISM AND IDENTITY

NOVEMBER 13

Reading response questions

1. How do different authors theorize the origins of nationalism? Is it a modern phenomenon?
2. What are the main differences in Gellner, Smith and Anderson's explanation of nationalism?
3. How and why did nationalism spread, according to these different approaches?
4. Does Greenfeld's distinction between civic and ethnic nationalism help understand the origins, spread or expression of nationalism?
5. How do Brubaker and Roeder link institutions to the emergence and outcomes of nationalism?

Required readings

Gellner, Ernest. *Nations and Nationalism*. Cornell University Press, 2013, Chapter 1 (1-7), chapters 4-5 (39-62).

Greenfeld, Liah. *Nationalism: Five Roads to Modernity*. Harvard University Press, 1992, Introduction, pp. 1-26.

Smith, Anthony D. *The Ethnic Origins of Nations*. Oxford: Blackwell, 1998. Introduction, Chap. 1, Chap. 2 (1-46)

Anderson, Benedict. *Imagined Communities: Reflections on the Origin and Spread of Nationalism*, Revised ed. New York: Verso, 1991. Chaps 1, 3-5, 7.

Brubaker, Rogers. *Nationalism Reframed: Nationhood and the National Question in the New Europe*, Cambridge University Press, Chap. 1-2 (13-54)

Roeder, Philip G. *Where Nation-States Come from Institutional Change in the Age of Nationalism*. Course Book. Princeton: University Press, 2007. Introduction (3-41), chap. 10 (290-340)

Recommended readings

Yack, Bernard. *Nationalism and the Moral Psychology of Community*. University of Chicago Press, 2012, Chapter 1.

Hobsbawm, Eric. *Nations and Nationalism Since 1780: Programme, Myth, Reality*. Cambridge University Press, 1992.

Hutchinson, John and Anthony Smith, eds. *Nationalism*. Oxford University Press, 1994.

Smith, Anthony D. *Nationalism and Modernism: A Critical Survey of Recent Theories of Nations and Nationalism*. Routledge, 1998

Connor, Walker. *Ethnonationalism: The Quest for Understanding*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 2018.

WEEK 9 (BM): CLASS AND MATERIAL INTERESTS

NOVEMBER 20

Reading response questions

1. What is class analysis, according to the various authors? What are the main differences between their approaches?
2. Does the ruling class rule? Describe and compare different models of how class and business interests shape policymaking. How does the account of business power in Hertel-Fernandez differ from that of Fred Block? What might explain this difference?
3. What are the tensions between ruling class power and democracy?
4. What are the roles of agency and structure in Hertel-Fernandez's discussion of business power? Do you agree with his argument?
5. What strategies do the various authors adopt to measure class and to empirically establish the impact of business power on policy outcomes? To what extent are these strategies able to convincingly rule out alternative explanations?

Required readings

Fred Block, "The ruling class does not rule: Notes on the Marxist theory of the state," *Socialist Revolution* 7.3 (1977), pp. 6–28.

Fernando Henrique Cardoso and Enzo Faletto, *Dependency and Development in Latin America*, trans. by Marjory Mattingly Urquidí (Berkeley, CA: University of California Press, 1979), chaps. 1–2.

Alexander Hertel-Fernandez, *State Capture: How Conservative Activists, Big Business, and Wealthy Donors Reshaped the American States – and the Nation* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2019), chaps. 1–6.

Recommended readings

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

Robert Brenner, "Agrarian class structure and economic development in pre-industrial Europe," *Past & Present* 70 (1976), pp. 30–75.

Tom O'Grady, "Careerists versus coal-miners: Welfare reforms and substantive representation of social groups in the British Labour Party," in *Comparative Political Studies* 52.4 (2019), pp. 544–578.

Erik Olin Wright, "Beneficial constraints: Beneficial for whom?" in *Socio-Economic Review* 2 (2004), pp. 407–414.

Erik Olin Wright, "Foundations of a Neo-Marxist Class Analysis" in Wright, ed., *Approaches to Class Analysis* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2005), chap. 1.

WEEK 10 (JB): REVOLUTIONS AND RESISTANCE – TWO ENDS OF A CONTINUUM?

NOVEMBER 27

Reading response questions

1. How does Skocpol differentiate her theory of revolution from previous ones? What are its core features?
2. Does Kurzman's argument on revolution challenge previous approaches?
3. How do Goodwin and Lawson add new theoretical insights to explain revolution?
4. What are the different generations of explanation of revolutions? How are this week's authors situated in these generations?
5. What explains resistance according to Scott?
6. Is it useful to think of resistance on a continuum with revolution at the other end? How can we situate these phenomena and differentiate them from other forms of contentious mobilization?

Required readings

Revolutions

Skocpol, Theda. 1979. *States and Social Revolutions*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press; Intro, chap. 1, conclusion.

Charles Kurzman, *Unthinkable Revolution in Iran*. Harvard UP, chapter 7, 125-162.

Jeff Goodwin, *No Other Way Out: States and Revolutionary Movements, 1945-1991*. Cambridge University Press, 2001: chapter 2, 35-64

Lawson, George. *Anatomies of revolution*. Cambridge University Press, 2019, intro, chaps 1-3

Resistance

James Scott, 1990. *Domination, and the Arts of Resistance: Hidden Transcripts*, Yale University Press. Chapter 1 (pp.1-16), and Chapter 7 (183-201).

James Scott, 1985. *Weapons of the Weak: Everyday Forms of Resistance*. Yale University Press, pp. 1-47.

Recommended readings

Bunce, Valerie. *Subversive Institutions: The Design and the Destruction of Socialism and the State*. Cambridge University Press, 1999.

Kuran, Timur. "Now out of never: The element of surprise in the East European revolution of 1989." *World politics* 44(1), 1991: 7-48.

Hobsbawm, E. J. *The Age of Revolution, Europe 1789-1848*. London: Weidenfeld and Nicolson, 1962.

Goldstone, Jack. "Theories of Revolution: The Third Generation," *World Politics* 32(3), 1980: 425-443.

Taylor, Michael. "Rationality and Revolutionary Collective Action," in Michael Taylor (ed.) *Rationality and Revolution*. Cambridge University Press, 1998, 63-97.

Beissinger, Mark R. "The semblance of democratic revolution: Coalitions in Ukraine's orange revolution." *American Political Science Review* 107(3), 2013: 574-592

WEEK 11 (BM): COMPARATIVE POLITICAL ECONOMY / WRAPPING UP THE SEMESTER

DECEMBER 4

Reading response questions

1. Are there distinct varieties of capitalism? Both "liberal" and "coordinated" market economies in Varieties of Capitalism theory are said to have deep historical roots, but to what extent are national models of capitalism stable and persistent over time?
2. What are the advantages and disadvantages of using the national state as the principal unit of analysis for studying capitalism, as opposed to examining capitalism as a global system?
3. The classical East Asian developmental states emerged in a specific geopolitical context, and arguably had specific historical preconditions, most of which cannot be replicated elsewhere. Can any "meaningful policy lessons" (Haggard) be extracted from these cases and applied elsewhere? In particular, is a democratic developmental state possible, and if so, under what circumstances?
4. How does Streeck's formula for a state that can deliver "high economic performance" (cf. week 5) differ from the developmental state formula? Do the two models have any similarities?

Required readings

"Advanced" capitalism and the Varieties of Capitalism debate

Peter A. Hall and David Soskice, "An Introduction to Varieties of Capitalism," in Hall and Soskice, eds., *Varieties of Capitalism: The Institutional Foundations of Comparative Advantage* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2001), chap. 1.

Jonas Pontusson, "Varieties and Commonalities of Capitalism," in David Coates, ed., *Varieties of Capitalism, Varieties of Approaches* (Houndmills, Basingstoke, Hampshire: Palgrave Macmillan, 2005), chap. 9.

Kathleen Thelen, “Varieties of capitalism: Trajectories of liberalization and the new politics of social solidarity,” in *Annual Review of Political Science* 15 (2012), pp. 137–159.

Political economy of development

Pranab Bardhan, “State and development: The need for a reappraisal of the current literature,” in *Journal of Economic Literature* 54.3 (2016), pp. 862–892.

Richard F. Doner and Ben Ross Schneider, “The middle-income trap: More politics than economics,” in *World Politics* 68.4 (2016), pp. 608–644.

Stephan Haggard, *Developmental States* (New York: Cambridge University Press, 2018).

Recommended readings

Lucio Baccaro and Chris Howell, *Trajectories of Neoliberal Transformation: European Industrial Relations Since the 1970s* (New York: Cambridge University Press, 2017).

Peter Evans, *Embedded Autonomy: States and Industrial Transformation* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1995), chaps. 1–4.

Mushtaq H. Khan and Jomo Kwame Sundaram, eds., *Rents, Rent-Seeking and Economic Development: Theory and Evidence in Asia* (New York: Cambridge University Press, 2000).

Karl Polanyi, *The Great Transformation: The Political and Economic Origins of Our Time* (Boston: Beacon Press, 2001 [1944]).

Wolfgang Streeck, “How will capitalism end?” *New Left Review* 87 (May–June 2014), pp. 35–64.