

University of Georgia
Department of International Affairs
INTL 6300 Pre-seminar: Comparative
Political Analysis and Method

Th 3:30 – 6:15
Candler Hall 117
Office Hours (Room 308):
W: 2:00 to 4:00 p.m.
T: 11:00 to 12:00 a.m.

Fall 2018
Dr. Markus M.L. Crepaz

This is a foundational course for the study of comparative politics to which you will return when you prepare for the comprehensive exam in this subfield. The purpose of this course is to introduce you to the main “approaches” to comparative politics, of which there have been many - but few “arrivals”. This course will train you in recognizing these central approaches, understanding their advantages and disadvantages and highlight the connections between a chosen approach and the resultant findings.

This class examines structuralism, functionalism, rational choice, culture, constructivism, the new institutionalism, the logic of path dependent arguments, and grand theories of development among others. This course will provide you with a firm understanding of the concepts, powers and limits of various approaches outlined above.

Required readings: Benedict Anderson (1991) *Imagined Communities: Reflections on the Origin and Spread of Nationalism*. London (Verso) (IC)

In addition, you are required to read the articles mentioned in the detailed reading assignments below. These articles have been placed on electronic reserve in the main library (password: weber1) where you may check them out or make your own copies. Better yet, for many of these articles I have provided a hyperlink for you which only requires a click and you are right there.

Course requirements: **1.** Each student is required to write one short paper based on the weekly readings which may consist of books, parts of books or articles provided in this syllabus (no longer than five pages) **Do not just repeat the argument in the book or article! Briefly** state the argument, but then go beyond it, placing it in the larger literature, and providing **constructive criticism**. Most likely, to make a convincing case you will have to quote or cite additional material. Of the five pages, **do not spend more than one page** on summarizing the article or book; in other words, not more than 20 % of your paper should be devoted to summarizing the argument – 80 % should be devoted to breaking new ground, coming up with original claims, ideas, concepts, typologies, theories, measures, implications, etc.

The paper should contain the following parts; a substantive part clearly indicating a) the substance of the argument in the book or article (dependent/independent variables, control variables etc. where applicable)

b) its relevance to the field of comparative politics c) an original critique and possible modifications, amendments, etc. d) alternative hypotheses and additional original research questions, e) it should discuss what “approach” was used; how did you recognize this particular approach; what are its advantages, disadvantages, etc. The short paper will count for 15% of the total grade.

2. Each student is required to **produce a two page summary of the required readings for every week**. This short paper should summarize and compare and contrast the various readings. Send those short papers to me via e-mail at least one day before class. I will read all of them but will supply feedback only selectively, but so that each student will have at least received feedback on some of these assignments. This will count for **10 percent** of your grade.

3. Each student will be a **discussion leader** for one class. Imagine you’d have to teach that class for that week. What would you highlight? What questions would you ask the seminar participants? How do the readings complement/contradict each other? How do they build, or not, on the readings of previous weeks, or what you have learned in other classes?

In other words, you should take the initiative to briefly introduce the required readings, raise questions, and guide the ensuing class discussion. This will count for **10 percent** of your grade. Summarize the main points of your discussion in a **one page handout including the questions you will pose to the seminar participants! It will make sense to write your 5 page summary of the weekly readings on the same week you are the discussion leader (see above).**

4. Each student is required to write an original, analytical research paper of around 15 pages in length. Refer to the “*Edicts of Candler*” at the end of the syllabus. The research paper will count for 50% of the total grade.

The research papers are due by Dec. 6, 2018 high noon, in HARD COPY FORM!

5. Seminar participation (will count for the **remaining 15%**). Participation will be measured not only in the frequency of comments but also their quality. Clarification questions, while certainly encouraged, will not count towards seminar participation. Only informed questions and statements about the readings or other pertinent sources which directly refer to the topic at hand or to specific books or articles will count as “seminar participation”. Solid preparation for each meeting is essential as you will be called upon to provide your own assessments of the various assignments.

Reading assignments:

Aug 16: General introduction to comparative politics and the nature of the “puzzle”.

Aug 23: "In the final instance, the subject is dead" - Explorations into structuralism.

Required readings:

Charles Lindblom: "The privileged position of Business" in *Politics and Markets*, pp. 170-178.

Kennedy, Paul (1987): *The Rise and Fall of the Great Powers*. Vintage Books. (Introduction: xv - xxv).

Alexander Gerschenkron: *Economic Backwardness in Historical Perspective*, pp. 353-364.

Frederick Jackson Turner (1921) *The Frontier in American History*. Read chapter 9: “Contributions of the West to American Democracy”. You can find it here: <http://xroads.virginia.edu/~Hyper/TURNER/>

Hibbs, Douglas, et. al. (2004) “Geography, Biogeography and Why Some Countries are Rich and Others are Poor”, *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences* 101:3715-3720. You can find it here: <http://www.pnas.org/content/101/10/3715.full.pdf>

Diamond, Jared (1998). *Guns, Germs and Steel*, Prologue, “Yali’s Question”, and Epilogue, “The Future of Human History as a Science”.

“The plough and the now”, July 21, 2011. *Economist*.
<http://www.economist.com/node/18986073>

“No use crying – Milk and economic development”. *Economist*, March 28, 2015.
<http://www.economist.com/news/finance-and-economics/21647352-ability-digest-milk-may-explain-how-europe-got-rich-no-use-crying>

Recommended readings:

Theda Skocpol: *States and Social Revolutions: A Comparative Analysis of France, Russia, and China*. pp. 3-43.

Kennedy, Paul (1987): *The Rise and Fall of the Great Powers*. Vintage Books. (Introduction: xv - xxv).

Ira Katznelson (2009) "Strong Theory, Complex History: Structure and Configuration in Comparative Politics Revisited", in: *Comparative Politics, Rationality, Culture, and Structure* (Eds. March I. Lichbach and Alan S. Zuckerman) Second Edition. Cambridge University Press.

Aug 30: The "needs" and "requirements" of social organisms - The debate over Functionalism.

Required Readings:

Huntington, Samuel P. (1965) Political Development and Political Decay. *World Politics*. Vol. 17: 386-430

Wittfogel, Karl, A (1957). *Oriental Despotism*. Chapter 2: "Hydraulic Economy - a managerial and genuinely political economy" (pp. 22-42) and Chapter 3: "A state stronger than society" (pp. 49-54).

Rosamond, Ben (2000) Neofunctionalism in: Rosamond (ed.) *Theories of European Integration*, pp. 50-73. (Palgrave, New York).

Barber, Bernard (1956) "Structural Functional Analysis: Some Problems and Misunderstandings", *American Sociological Review*, Vol: 21: 129-135. Can be found here: <http://www.jstor.org/stable/2088512?seq=1>

Recommended readings:

Jürgen Habermas. (1976) *Legitimation Crisis*. London. Heineman. (Part I: chap. 1-4, pp. 1-32)

Almond, Gabriel (1965). A Developmental Approach to Political Systems. *World Politics*. 17: 183-214.

Sep 6: "The ties that bind" - The Power of Common Forms of Life. Culture as a mode of understanding human behavior.

Required Readings:

Clifford Geertz: "Thick Description: Toward an Interpretive Theory of Culture", in: *The Interpretation of Cultures*, pp. 3-32.

Greif, Avner. 1994. "Cultural Beliefs and the Organization of Society: A Historical and Theoretical Reflection on Collectivist and Individualist Societies." *The Journal of Political Economy* 102(5):912-950.

Sheri Berman (1997) Civil Society and the Collapse of the Weimar Republic. *World Politics* 49: 401-429.

Markus M. L. Crepaz (2008) "Trust in Diverse Societies" (pp. 93-133) in: *Trust Beyond Borders. Immigration, the Welfare State and Identity in Modern Societies*, by Markus M. L. Crepaz. Ann Arbor, The University of Michigan Press.

Robert Putnam (2007) *E Pluribus Unum: Diversity and Community in the Twenty First Century*. The 2006 Johan Skytte Prize Lecture. Scandinavian Political Studies, Vol: 30, No. 2, 137-174.

Norton M.I and D. Ariely (2011) "Building a Better America – one Wealth Quintile at a Time". (BBA) Can be found here:

<http://www.people.hbs.edu/mnorton/norton%20ariely%20in%20press.pdf>

Markus M. L. Crepaz, et. al. (2014) Trust Matters. The Impact of In-group and Out-group Trust on Nativism and Civicness. *Social Science Quarterly*, Vol: 95:938-959

Recommended Readings:

Herman Kahn. "The Confucian Ethic and Economic Growth", pp. 219-222.

Bo Rothstein and Eric Uslaner (2005). "All for All. Equality, Corruption and Social Trust". *World Politics*, 58 (October 2005) pp. 41-72.

Marc Hooghe and Dietlind Stolle (2003) *Generating Social Capital. Civil Society and Institutions in Comparative Perspective*. Palgrave. New York.

Sep 13: The cult of the "subject" - the radical subjectivism of rational choice.

Required Readings:

Margaret Levi (2009) Reconsiderations of Rational Choice, in Lichbach and Zuckerman.

John Ferejohn and Debra Satz (1995) Unification, Universalism and Rational Choice Theory, in: *The Rational Choice Controversy*, (Jeffrey Friedman, Editor) Yale University Press.

Margaret Levi: A Model, a Method, and a Map: Rational Choice in Comparative and Historical Analysis, in Lichbach and Zuckerman. pp. 19-42

Morris Fiorina (1995). Rational Choice, Empirical Contributions and the Scientific Enterprise. *The Rational Choice Controversy*, (Jeffrey Friedman, Editor), Yale University Press

Stanley Kelley (1995). The Promise and Limitations of Rational Choice Theory, in: *The Rational Choice Controversy*, (Jeffrey Friedman, Editor) Yale University Press.

Sep. 20: Fixing the cracks in the edifice of rational choice - using institutions for glue. On the priority of political institutions, culture and structure, and the political economy of shirking, stealing and lying. Moral hazard, adverse selection, principal agent problems and how to deal with these challenges.

Required Readings:

Riker and Ordeshook (1968) "[A Theory of the Calculus of Voting](#)", in: *American Political Science Review* 62:25-42.

A. K. Sen: "Introduction", in: *Choice, Welfare and Measurement*, pp. 1-3

Kristen Monroe, M.C. Barton, and U. Klingemann: "Altruism and the Theory of Rational Action: An Analysis of Rescuers of Jews in Nazi-Europe", in: *The Economic Approach to Politics*: pp. 317-352.

Tversky, A. and Kahnemann D. (1986). "The Framing of Decisions and the Psychology of Choice". in: *Rational Choice*, (edited by: Jon Elster). New York University Press. pp. 123-141.

George A. Akerlof (1970): "The Market for Lemons: Qualitative Uncertainty and the Market Mechanism", in: *Quarterly Journal of Economics*.

Dale T. Miller (1999). "The Norm of Self-Interest", in: *American Psychologist*, Vol. 54, pp. 1053-1060.

Skim their rejoinder: Donald Green and Ian Shapiro (1995). *Pathologies Revisited: Reflections on our Critics*, in: *The Rational Choice Controversy*, (Jeffrey Friedman, Editor) Yale University Press

Recommended readings/videos:

<http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=9X68dm92HVI> (Ted talk by Dan Ariely)

Jeremy Rifkin, The empathic civilization (watch this video)
<http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=l7AWnfFRc7g>

"More Kirk than Spock" *Economist* May 9, 2015.

<http://www.economist.com/news/finance-and-economics/21650588-behavioural-economics-has-made-headway-still-has-long-way-go-more-kirk>

“Poor Behaviour” Dec. 6, 2014 *Economist*.

<http://www.economist.com/news/finance-and-economics/21635477-behavioural-economics-meets-development-policy-poor-behaviour>

A Wuffle (1999) Credo of a ‘Reasonable Choice’ Modeler, in: *Journal of Theoretical Politics*, 11:203-206

<http://journals.sagepub.com/doi/10.1177/0951692899011002003>

Sep 27: Functional and Historical Institutionalism and the possibilities of "constitutional engineering".

Required Readings:

Paul Milgrom, Douglas North, and Barry Weingast (1990). "The Role of Institutions in the Revival of Trade: The Law Merchant, Private Judges, and the Champagne Fairs", in: *Economics and Politics*

Benoit, Kenneth (2007). "Electoral Laws as Political Consequences: Explaining the Origins and Change of Electoral Institutions." *Annual Review of Political Science* **10**(1): 363-390.

Arend Lijphart (1994) Democracies: Forms, Performance, and Constitutional Engineering, *European Journal of Political Research*, 25:1-17.

Matthijs Bogaards (2017) [Comparative Political Regimes: Consensus and Majoritarian Democracy](#). Oxford Research Encyclopedia of Politics.

Quade, Quentin (1993). PR and Democratic Statecraft. in: L. Diamond and M.F. Plattner (eds.) *The Global Resurgence of Democracy* (pp. 165-170). Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press.

Kumlin, Staffan, and Bo Rothstein. "Making and Breaking Social Capital: The Impact of Welfare State Institutions." *Comparative Political Studies* **38** (4) (2005): 339-365.

Kathleen Thelen (1999) [Historical Institutionalism in Comparative Perspective](#), *Annual Review of Political Science*, 2:369-404

Recommended Readings:

Lijphart, Arend (1993). Double Checking the Evidence. in: L. Diamond and M.F. Plattner (eds.) *The Global Resurgence of Democracy*. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press.

G. Bingham Powell (2007). The ideological congruence controversy: the impact of alternative conceptualizations and data on the effects of election rules. Presented at the 2007 Meeting of the American Political Science Association Meeting. Can be found here:

<http://cps.sagepub.com/content/early/2009/03/03/0010414009332147.full.pdf>

Anthony M. McGann and Michael Latner (2013). The Calculus of Consensus Democracy. *Comparative Political Studies*. Can be found here:

<http://cps.sagepub.com/content/46/7/823.abstract>

Oct 4: Shaping ideas – making outcomes: constructivist approaches to comparative politics.

Required Readings:

Ernest Renan: Qu'est ce qu'une nation? In: *Nationalism*, Hutchinson and Smith (eds.), p. 17-18, Oxford. Oxford University Press.

Martin Gilens (1999). Why Americans Hate Welfare. Introduction pp.1-10. Chicago University Press.

Samuel Huntington (2004). Who Are We? The Challenges to America's National Identity. Chapters 1 and 2.

Anthony Marx (1996) Race Making and the Nation State. *World Politics*, 48:180-208) https://www.jstor.org/stable/25053960?seq=1#page_scan_tab_contents

APSA-CP newsletter (Volume 12, 1 Winter 2001): [Symposium: Cumulative Findings in the Study of Ethnic Politics](#) (p. 7-25).

Jane Elliott (1968). The blue eyes/brown eyes experiment. Go to this website: <http://www.pbs.org/wgbh/pages/frontline/shows/divided/etc/view.html>

Benedict Anderson (IC) entire.

Franklin D. Gilliam (1999) The Welfare Queen Experiment. The Nieman Foundation for Journalism at Harvard University. Vol: 53, No. 2. Can be found here: <https://escholarship.org/uc/item/17m7r1rq#page-1>

Recommended Readings:

Martha Finnemore and Kathryn Sikkink (2001). "Taking Stock: the Constructivist Research Program in International Relations and Comparative Politics", in: *Annual Review of Political Science*. Vol: 4:391-416.

Oct 11: Approaches to political development: Agency, Culture, and Structure (among others):

Francis Hagopian (2000) [Political Development, Revisited](#). *Comparative Political Studies*, 33:880-911.

David S. Landes (2006) [Why Europe and the West? Why not China?](#) *Journal of Economic Perspectives*, 20:3-22.

Peter Gourevitch (2008) [The Role of Politics in Economic Development](#), *Annual Review of Political Science*, 11:127-159.

James Robinson (2002), [States and Power in Africa: Comparative Lessons in Authority and Control](#), in: *Journal of Economic Literature*, XL: 510-519

Ricardo Hausman (2009) [Prisoners of Geography](#), *Foreign Policy*.

Nathan Nunn and Leonard Wantchekon, "[The Slave Trade and the Origins of Mistrust in Africa](#)" *American Economic Review* 101 (December 2011): 3221–3252

Oct. 18: On the "real" politics of development: neo-colonialism in the form of western ideas; state capacity, and corruption.

Skim this piece: Dani Rodrik (2006). "[Goodbye Washington Consensus, Hello Washington Confusion? A Review of the World Bank's Economic Growth in the 1990s: Learning from a Decade of Reform](#)". *Journal of Economic Literature*, 44:937-987.

Christoph Herman (2016) [Another Lost Decade? Crisis and Structural Adjustment in Europe and Latin America](#). *Globalizations*, 14:519-534

Seymour Martin Lipset (1959) [Some Social Requisites of Democracy: Economic Development and Political Legitimacy](#). *American Political Science Review*, 53:69-105

M. Martin and H. Solomon (2017) [Understanding the Phenomenon of 'State Capture' in South Africa](#). *Southern African Peace and Security Studies*, 3:21-34

Stephen M. Marglin (2003) [Development as Poison. Rethinking the Western Model of Modernity](#). *Harvard International Review*

R.A. Badeeb, et. al. (2016). [The Evolution of the natural resource curse thesis: a critical literature survey](#). *Resources Policy* 51:124-134.

Oct 25: Present preliminary thoughts, puzzles, and general discussion

Nov. 1: The path you take matters: path dependency and punctuated equilibria:

Paul Pierson (2000). Increasing returns, path dependence and the study of politics. *American Political Science Review*, Vol: 94, no. 2, 251-267.
Can be found here: <http://www.jstor.org/pss/2586011>

David, Paul A., "Clio and the Economics of QWERTY" (in Economic History: A Necessary Though Not Sufficient Condition for an Economist), *American Economic Review*, Vol. 75, No. 2, Papers and Proceedings of the Ninety-Seventh Annual Meeting of the American Economic Association. (May, 1985), pp. 332-337. Can be found here:
<http://www.econ.ucsb.edu/~tedb/Courses/Ec100C/DavidQwerty.pdf>

Thelen, Kathleen. "Conclusions: Empirical and Theoretical." In *How Institutions Evolve: The Political Economy of Skills in Germany, Britain, the United States and Japan*, Kathleen Thelen, 278-96. New York:Cambridge University Press, 2004.

Down the Wrong Path: Path Dependence, Increasing Returns, and Historical Institutionalism: Herman Schwartz: here:
<http://people.virginia.edu/~hms2f/Path.pdf>

Gourevitch, Alexander (1986) *Politics in Hard Times*. (chapter 1 and 2). Cornell University Press.

Nov 8: The duality of State and Society: the challenge to the state from “below” and “above”.

Mancur Olson (1982) *The Rise and Decline of Nations*. pp.1-74

Charles Tilly. War Making and State Making as Organized Crime in: Evans, Rueschemeyer and Skocpol, *Bringing the State Back in* (Cambridge University Press: Cambridge), 1985, pp. 169-191.

J.P. Nettl (1968). “The state as a conceptual variable” *World Politics* 20.

Paul James (2005) “[Arguing Globalizations: Propositions towards an investigation of Global Formations](#)”, *Globalizations* 2:193-209

The Guardian (July 2017): [Globalization: the rise and fall of an idea that swept the world.](#)

Michael Cox (2017) [The rise of populism and the crisis of globalization: Brexit, Trump, and Beyond.](#) *Irish Studies in International Affairs*, 28:9-17

Nov 15: Presentation of research papers

Nov 22: **Thanksgiving Holiday**

Nov. 29: Presentation of research papers

Dec. 6: **Final Research Paper is due, at high noon in my office in hardcopy form.**

THE EDICTS OF CANDLER HALL

MARKUS M. L. CREPAZ

THE BIG TEN

Below you find the most crucial elements of a successful research paper. They should all be there to reduce the “B.S. factor”. Here are the steps you should follow in order to write a logically compelling research paper.

- 1) RESEARCH QUESTION or PREMISE: It’s what your research revolves around, it’s central argument.
- 2) LITERATURE REVIEW: Here you are taking stock – what is it that others have written about your subject. This is the place for showing off how much have you have read and understood about the material and drop names.
- 3) UNIT OF ANALYSIS: What is the “unit” that you are examining? Is it elections, individuals, countries, etc.? In the example below, the unit of analysis is “cat”.
- 4) HYPOTHESIS: What is your hypothesis? Remember a hypothesis contains three things: first it indicates the object of observation; second, the dependent an independent variables, and third, the direction of their relationship. For example: “the more I’m feeding my cat, the fatter she gets”. “Cat” is the object of observation, “food” is the cause, cat getting “fat” is the effect, and the direction of the relationship is positive (because its’ “the more...the more”).
- 5) THEORY: Why should the cat get fat if fed a lot? If more calories enter her body that she can burn, her body will on the basis of biological processes begin to store the energy contained in the food in terms of fat. Process tracing should in detail describe the various steps how things move from cause to effect.
- 6) TEMPORAL AND SPATIAL PARAMETERS: Over what time period and what location are you applying your theory? Are you making a CROSS-SECTIONAL or TIME SERIES argument, or BOTH?
- 7) DEPENDENT AND INDEPENDENT VARIABLES: Which ones are they? How much do they vary?
- 8) OPERATIONALIZATION OF CONCEPTS: Your hypotheses will contain concepts, i.e. names of things. You will have to translate these concepts into things that can be measured such as: how do we know that the cat is fat? We can weigh her. How do we know what “more feeding” means: well we could measure the amount of food in the number of teaspoons of fancy feast the cat gets. This is what is called, turning a concept into a measure, or more technically, operationalization.

9) CAUSAL MECHANISM: How do you know that your argument is causal rather than correlational?

10) CONCLUSIONS AND IMPLICATIONS: After you have done your research and presented your evidence, are you accepting or rejecting your hypothesis? What do these findings mean? How do they affect the reigning theories? Do they question them, or confirm them? What new questions do arise? Where does future research go from here?