

Frederic Schaffer  
Thompson 324  
Email: [schaffer@polsci.umass.edu](mailto:schaffer@polsci.umass.edu)  
Office Hours: Tues 1-3, and by appointment.

**Political Science 710**  
**UMass Amherst**  
**Tuesday, 3:30-6:00**  
**Machmer E-53**  
**Spring 2012**

**PROSEMINAR: COMPARATIVE POLITICS**

This graduate seminar provides an introduction to the subfield of comparative politics by giving you an opportunity to read, discuss, and write about a set of canonical texts. The main goals of the class are for you to:

- Think about the arguments, question the assumptions, and mull over the implications and applications of a core set of writing that all students of comparative politics should engage.
- Acquire a sense of what it is like to do comparative politics by hearing from leading comparativists about how they themselves were trained, who they read, how they came up with their questions, and how they conduct their research.
- Discover for yourself in works of great sophistication particular methods, explanations, questions, and insights that might inform your own intellectual agenda or help you articulate and answer questions that are important to you.
- Learn to use a generic framework to make sense of the methodological and explanatory choices made in any piece of comparative politics research, and to understand the strengths and weaknesses that attend those choices.
- Begin developing more specialized knowledge in a few areas of comparative politics by writing about a focused set of works that we will not be reading together in class.
- Become prepared to begin study for the comparative politics comprehensive exam (should you wish to take it) by familiarizing you with the work of important comparativists and by providing you with basic tools to analyze any work of comparative politics.

**Readings**

Rather than read widely but superficially, I have decided to focus our attention on a smaller number of canonical texts that we will explore in depth. This way of proceeding will allow us to really engage the arguments of each text, and thus (hopefully) to learn deeper lessons about the nature of comparative politics. I call these texts canonical because they have launched research agendas, have been extensively

debated and critiqued, and are among the most likely to appear on comprehensive exam reading lists and comparative politics proseminar syllabi in graduate programs around the country.

Unfortunately, this course is only one semester long, and there are a number of texts – some equally important to the ones we will be reading – that we will not be able to cover. In making choices about which texts to include I sought to strike a balance between different methodological approaches, explanatory building blocks, substantive questions, and areas of the world. I also made personal judgements about which texts I thought students in *this department* should know. During the semester I will distribute a list of other important texts that we will not be reading together. Some of them you will be able to engage on your own in review essays that you will be writing.

The texts that we will be reading together are rich and complex. To help guide your readings, here are some generic questions that you should ask about each of them (some questions apply more directly to some readings than others; some, too, you will be writing about in prep assignments and a journal that you will be keeping):

- What methods does the author use, why does each author make the methodological choices he or she does, and what are the strengths and weaknesses of those methods?
- What explanatory building blocks does the author rely upon, and what does the use of those building blocks allow us to see or prevent us from seeing?
- In what ways does the author draw from or critique the social theorists (Smith, Marx, Weber) that we read in week 2, or the more contemporary comparativists that we read in subsequent weeks?
- What normative views are implicit in the author's argument? That is, does the author have some notion of "progress"? Does the author believe that democracy (or revolution, order, prosperity, nationalism, and the like) are in some sense "good"?
- Why do you think the text has become so important to the subfield of comparative politics? What appears to be innovative or consequential about it?
- What do *you* make of the text? Do you find it exemplary, interesting, boring, wrong-headed, confusing? Why? What questions does the text raise in your own mind?

### Required readings

It is important that you do all of the assigned readings prior to each class meeting - *and bring a copy of the readings with you to class* - since they are the foundation upon which our class discussions will be built. The reading load varies from week to week. You may want to plan ahead for reading-heavy class meetings.

Material marked with an asterisk [\*] is available on the course website in SPARK. The following required books are *not* available online, so I recommend that you purchase them. They are available at the Textbook Annex. They are also on reserve at the Du Bois Library.

- Anderson, Benedict. 2006. *Imagined Communities*, new edition (New York: Verso).

- Huntington, Samuel. 2006. *Political Order in Changing Societies* (New Haven: Yale University Press).
- Laitin, David D. 1986. *Hegemony and Culture: Politics and Religious Change among the Yoruba* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press).
- Moore, Barrington, Jr. 1993. *Social Origins of Dictatorship and Democracy* (Boston: Beacon Press).
- Munck, Gerardo L., and Richard Snyder. 2007. *Passion, Craft, and Method in Comparative Politics* (Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press).
- Putnam, Robert D. 1993. *Making Democracy Work: Civic Traditions in Modern Italy* (Princeton: Princeton University Press).
- Scott, James C. 1985. *Weapons of the Weak: Everyday Forms of Peasant Resistance* (New Haven: Yale University Press).

### Supplemental readings

Included for weeks two through eleven are supplemental reading lists. The supplemental readings connect in various ways to the required readings of the week. Some apply the theory or methods developed in the required readings to new topics or areas of the world. Others test the arguments advanced or critique them. Still others constitute alternative ways to broach the same topic. Others still are additional books written by the author in focus.

You are not expected to do the supplemental readings for your weekly class preparation, though you are, of course, invited to read as much in these lists as you like. These readings are included primarily for the two review essays that you will write – more on this below. The supplemental readings are *not* on reserve at the library (so plan ahead); however, those marked with an asterisk [\*] are available on the course website.

### Also worth a look readings

Several weeks include “also worth a look” readings. You are not expected to do these readings for your weekly class preparation, nor are you asked to cover them in your review essays. Still, you may want to do these readings (now or at some point in the future) for topics or authors of particular interest to you. These readings are not on reserve.

## **Course requirements**

There are five basic course requirements:

### 1. PREPARATORY ASSIGNMENTS

You will be required each week to complete short “prep assignments,” which you can find listed below in the class schedule.

### Purpose

The assignments are an essential component of the course since they accomplish several core goals simultaneously. They help focus and guide your reading of texts that are sometimes sprawling. They establish a shared set of questions that will serve as common ground for our class discussions. They give you practice in analyzing and (later in the semester) critiquing comparative politics research. They also train you to get to the heart of the matter and to write concisely since I have placed relatively low word limits on the assignments.

### Procedures and grading

You will email each assignment to me on the *Monday preceding class by 5 pm* (except for prep assignment 1, which you do not need to submit). A grade of unsatisfactory, satisfactory minus, satisfactory, or satisfactory plus will be given for each assignment:

Unsatisfactory (0 points)	The assignment is incomplete. It fails to address the prep questions. It fundamentally misrepresents arguments developed in the readings. The analysis or critique is grossly oversimplified or abstract.
Satisfactory minus (1 point)	The assignment addresses the prep questions. It demonstrates basic comprehension of the readings though with missteps that are consequential. The analysis or critique is somewhat cursory, superficial, abstract, or un-tethered to the readings.
Satisfactory (2 points)	The assignment answers the prep questions directly and explicitly. It demonstrates more-or-less sound comprehension of the readings, though there may be a misstep or two. The analysis or critique is well-grounded in the readings and makes explicit reference to them.
Satisfactory plus (3 points)	All of the satisfactory criteria, though completed in a way that is particularly thoughtful, creative, or insightful.

There will be 11 preparatory assignments that you have to submit during the course of the semester. You must complete at least 9 with grades higher than “unsatisfactory” to pass the course. One preparatory assignment deemed “unsatisfactory” may be rewritten and resubmitted by the next class after it is returned. Note that late preparatory assignments will not be accepted without a reasonable excuse (illness, family emergency, or the like).

To calculate your prep assignment grade for the semester, the point-equivalent of the 11 assignment grades will be added up, and the table below will be used to determine your grade.

Semester point total	Semester prep grade
29 to 33	A+
26 to 28	A
23 to 25	A-

20 to 22	B+
17 to 19	B
14 to 16	B-
11 to 13	C
9 to 10	D
8 or less	F

Note that there is an optional extra credit assignment due on May 1, for which you can earn up to 4 extra prep assignment points. For details, look at week 13.

## 2. CLASS PARTICIPATION

This seminar is discussion-based. Talking, asking questions, and testing your ideas are essential to constructing your own understandings and assessments of the texts that we read and the arguments we encounter. For those who are shy about speaking in public, class participation also provides a safe, supportive environment to gain confidence and experience.

## 3. REVIEW ESSAYS

You will write two review essays. The purpose of these essays is to give you an opportunity to explore a topic of interest to you in greater depth than our weekly readings will allow.

Each essay should examine critically all of the supplemental readings for the week that you choose, along with the required readings for that week. For review essay 1 – which is due on Wednesday February 29 – you can choose the supplemental readings for week 2, 3, 4, or 5. For review essay 2 – which is due on Wednesday, May 9 – you can choose the supplemental readings for any week of the semester. Each essay should be between seven and nine pages in length, double-spaced, paginated, and fully referenced using a format of your choice.

The review essay should compare and contrast the positions taken in the different texts on a single question that relates to method, mode of explanation, how the political world operates, or the like. Your essay should provide answers to all of the following questions: What is the common question that the texts are addressing? On what points do they agree and/or disagree? From where do these agreements and/or disagreements stem? Which text do you think provides the most compelling answer, and why? Given the relatively short page-length of the essay, you will have to choose a topic that is narrow enough in scope for you to address these questions adequately.

A few more details:

- You do not need to discuss in your review essay all of the required readings for the week you choose. Thus for weeks three and four, you can focus only on those that are most germane to the topic you develop, for week 5 you can focus only on Gerschenkron, and the like. If ever you are unsure about which required readings you can exclude, please ask.

- You are expected to read all of the supplemental readings for the week you choose. Nevertheless, you may choose to omit from your essay discussion of one or two texts from the supplemental reading list if the text or texts do not fit the essay topic you wish to develop. In this case, for each text you exclude (maximum of two), you need to attach a one-page addendum that summarizes each text you exclude and explains why it does not fit into the topic of your essay.
- You do not need to discuss in your essay all chapters of an edited book that appears on the supplemental reading list. You only need to discuss those chapters that are most directly relevant to the topic of your essay (you do not need to provide an addendum for chapters that you do not discuss).

#### 4. JOURNAL

I want to encourage you in this class to learn deeply – to think about the arguments you encounter, to question assumptions, to mull over implications and applications. This kind of deep learning is most likely to occur if you use the course material to try to solve problems or answer questions that *you yourself* have come to regard as important or intriguing. To encourage this kind of engagement, I ask that you keep a journal in which you chronicle your own thoughts, reactions, and questions. Entries might include answers to questions like:

- What questions does this particular reading or class discussion raise with regard to my own intellectual interests and concerns?
- How does this reading or class discussion relate to things I’m learning in my other classes?
- Has anything I read given me an idea for a future project I might undertake?
- What are my future plans for using what I have learned?
- Have I changed my mind substantially about anything that I wrote in an earlier entry? How and why?

You will be required to write at least 9 journal entries during the course of the semester, though I encourage you to write more. I will collect your journals in class each Tuesday, and try to put them back in your mailboxes by Thursday. Please submit your entire journal (and not just your newest entry) each week. There is no prescribed length for each journal entry. A given entry might be a paragraph or a few pages, depending on what you have to say. I want to encourage you, in your journal writing, to take risks, explore your own perplexities, and be adventurous. Consequently, I will not grade your journal, though remember that you need to write at least 9 entries to receive a passing grade for the course.

We will devote the last class of the semester to discussing your journals, with a focus on “your future directions.”

#### Course Grade

The minimum requirements to be eligible for a passing grade in this course are (1) completion of at least 9 preparatory assignments with a grade of satisfactory minus or higher, (2) completion of the two review essays, and (3) completion of your journal with at least 9 entries.

If you have successfully completed these minimum requirements, your grade will be calculated as follows: class participation (30%), prep assignments (30%), two review essays (20% each). *Note that the review essays will be penalized one third of a grade (for instance, A to A-) for each day, or portion of a day, late.*

## Spark

We will be using a SPARK course website for this class. Among other things, you will find many course readings posted there. If you have not used SPARK before, you can find instructions here:

<http://www.oit.umass.edu/spark/students/index.html>

If you are already familiar with SPARK, you can log directly into the SPARK course website by using the following URL: <https://spark.oit.umass.edu/webct/entryPageIns.dowebct>

## Academic honesty

You are expected to adhere to the university's regulations regarding academic honesty as stated in the Academic Regulations, page 6.

## CLASS SCHEDULE

### JAN 24. WEEK 1. INTRODUCTION

Prep Assignment 1

Read the course syllabus carefully.

### JAN 31. WEEK 2. HISTORY AND INTELLECTUAL ROOTS OF THE SUBFIELD

#### REQUIRED READINGS

##### Intellectual roots

\* Janos, Andrew C. 1986. "Images of Change: The Classical Paradigm." In *Politics and Paradigms: Changing Theories of Change in Social Science* (Stanford: Stanford University Press): 1-30, 158-160.

##### Three giants

\* Smith, Adam. 1981. *An Inquiry into the Nature and Causes of the Wealth of Nations* (Indianapolis: Liberty Fund): 10-36, 86-91 (par 21-28), 96 (par 36), 116-59, 264-267, 455-456 (par 9-10), 781-784 (par 50-51).

\* Smith, Adam. 1976. *The Theory of Moral Sentiments* (Indianapolis: Liberty Fund): 9-26, 50-66, 85-86 (par 1-4), 149-150 (par 30-31), 179-87.

\* Marx, Karl. 1978. *The Marx-Engels Reader*, 2<sup>nd</sup> edition (New York: W.W. Norton): “Preface to A Contribution to the Critique of Political Economy” (3-6), “The German Ideology, Part 1” (read only 146-163 and 186-200), “Manifesto of the Communist Party” (read 469-491 only), 1872 Amsterdam speech (522-524), “On Imperialism in India” (skim 653-664, focus on 658).

\* Marx, Karl. 1977. *Capital*, volume 1 (New York: Vintage): 89-93, 433 (paragraph that begins “while it is not...”).

\* Weber, Max. 1978. *Economy and Society*, volume 1 (Berkeley: University of California Press): 4-26, 212-254, 262-266.

\* Weber, Max. 2009. *The Protestant Ethic and the Spirit of Capitalism*, 4<sup>th</sup> edition (New York: Oxford University Press) pp. 69-88, 151-159.

### A short history of comparative politics

Munck, Gerardo. 2007. “The Past and Present of Comparative Politics.” In *Passion, Craft, and Method in Comparative Politics*: 32-59.

### SUPPLEMENTAL READINGS

Smith, Adam. 1981. *An Inquiry into the Nature and Causes of the Wealth of Nations* (Indianapolis: Liberty Fund): 330-349, 376-427.

Smith, Adam. 1976. *The Theory of Moral Sentiments* (Indianapolis: Liberty Fund): 126-131 (par 24-32, including additions to ed. 6), 212-217.

Marx, Karl. 1978. “Economic and Philosophic Manuscripts of 1844.” In *The Marx-Engels Reader*, 2<sup>nd</sup> edition (New York: W.W. Norton). Read 66-105 only.

Weber, Max. 2009. *The Protestant Ethic and the Spirit of Capitalism*, 4<sup>th</sup> edition (New York: Oxford University Press): 61-159, 458-551. There are many endnotes to the *Protestant Ethic*. Here are some that I find especially important: Ch 2: 10; Ch 4: 39, 169, 221; Ch 5: 39, 89, 91, 96, 133, 135, 136.

\* Weber, Max. 2004. “The ‘Objectivity’ of Knowledge in Social Science and Social Policy.” In *The Essential Weber: A Reader*, edited by Sam Whimster (New York: Routledge): 359-404.

Weber, Max. 1958. “Politics as a Vocation” and “Bureaucracy.” In *From Max Weber: Essays in Sociology*, edited by H.H. Gerth and C. Wright Mills (New York: Oxford University Press): 77-128, 196-244.



## ALSO WORTH A LOOK

### The social theories of Smith, Marx, Weber (and Durkheim)

Muller, Jerry Z. 1993. *Adam Smith in His Time and Ours* (Princeton: Princeton University Press).

Giddens, Anthony. 1971. *Capitalism and Modern Social Theory: An Analysis of the Writings of Marx, Durkheim, and Max Weber* (New York: Cambridge University Press).

### A Weberian Critique of Smith's economic psychology

Polanyi, Karl. 2001. *The Great Transformation: The Political and Economic Origins of Our Time* (Boston: Beacon): 45-58.

### Biographies

Buchan, James. 2006. *The Authentic Adam Smith: His Life and Ideas* (New York: W.W. Norton).

Radkau, Joachim. 2009. *Max Weber* (Cambridge, UK: Polity).

McLellan, David. 2006. *Karl Marx: a Biography, Fourth Edition* (New York: Palgrave Macmillan).

### If I could add two more giants: Tocqueville and Durkheim

Tocqueville, Alexis de. 2000. *Democracy in America* (New York: Perennial).

Elster, Jon. 2009. *Alexis de Tocqueville, the First Social Scientist* (New York: Cambridge University Press).

Brogan, Hugh. 2008. *Alexis de Tocqueville: A Life* (New Haven: Yale University Press).

Durkheim, Emile. 1997. *Division of Labor in Society* (New York: Free Press).

Lukes, Steven. 1985. *Emile Durkheim: His Life and Work: A Historical and Critical Study* (Stanford: Stanford University Press).

#### Tip on reading Smith, Marx, and Weber

Smith, Marx, and Weber are three founders of modern social theory whose influence on comparative politics, and political science more generally, is diffuse and profound. Some big questions to think about as you read this week's selections (in addition to the question posed in the prep assignment): What motivates human behavior? What causes societies to change? Does societal change constitute progress? What is the relationship between the economy and politics? Which methods are most appropriate to the study of society? Contemporary comparativists have been very much influenced – either in agreement or disagreement – by how Smith, Marx, and Weber answer these big questions. Since these influences will only become apparent to you in future weeks, you'll want to revisit this week's readings occasionally during the course of the semester.

## Prep Assignment 2

Part A. Interview one of the comparativist faculty members of the department (Amel Ahmed, Sonia Alvarez, Carlene Edie, Rahsaan Maxwell, Jillian Schwedler, Fred Schaffer), and ask the following questions:

- Where were they trained and who did they study with?
- What characterizes the methodological approach they have adopted, and why did they adopt that approach?
- What two pre-1950 texts have had the most profound impact on their scholarship and how?
- What two post-1950 texts have had the most profound impact on their scholarship and how?

Write up what you found out in 300 words or less.

Part B. Comparative politics involves, obviously, comparing. Think about Smith, Marx, and Weber as comparativists. When they compare societies, what do they find? That is, what are the *major* differences between societies that each discovers? Answer in 400 words or less.

## FEB 7. WEEK 3. EXPLANATORY BUILDING BLOCKS

### REQUIRED READINGS

\* Lichbach, Mark I., and Alan S. Zuckerman. 1997. "Research Traditions and Theory in Comparative Politics: An Introduction." In *Comparative Politics: Rationality, Culture, and Structure* edited by Mark Irving Lichbach and Alan S. Zuckerman (New York: Cambridge University Press): read 3-8 only.

#### Rationality

\* Monroe, Kristen Renwick. 1991. "The Theory of Rational Action: Origins and Usefulness for Political Science." In *The Economic Approach to Politics* edited by Kristen Renwick Monroe (New York: HarperCollins): 1-31.

\* Geddes, Barbara. 2003. "How the Approach You Choose Affects the Answers You Get: Rational Choice and Its Uses in Comparative Politics." In *Paradigms and Sand Castles: Theory Building and Research Design in Comparative Politics* (Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press): 175-211.

\* An example to skim: Fearon, James D., and David D. Laitin 1996. "Explaining Interethnic Cooperation." *American Political Science Review* 90,4: 715-735.

#### Culture

\* Ross, Marc Howard. 2009. "Culture in Comparative Analysis." In *Comparative Politics: Rationality, Culture, and Structure* edited by Mark Irving Lichbach and Alan S. Zuckerman (New York: Cambridge University Press): 134-161.

\* An example to skim: Smart, Alan, and Carolyn L. Hsu. 2007. "Corruption or Social Capital? Tact and the Performance of Guanxi in Market Socialist China." In *Corruption and the Secret of Law: An Anthropological Perspective* edited by Monique Nuijten and Gerhard Anders (Burlington, VT: Ashgate): 167-189.

### Structure

\* Pierson, Paul, and Theda Skocpol. 2002. "Historical Institutionalism in Contemporary Political Science." In *Political Science: State of the Discipline* edited by Ira Katznelson and Helen V. Milner (New York: W. W. Norton): 693-721.

\* An example to skim: Hacker, Jacob S. 1998. "The Historical Logic of National Health Insurance: Structure and Sequence in the Development of British, Canadian, and U.S. Medical Policy." *Studies in American Political Development* 12: 57-130.

### SUPPLEMENTAL READINGS

Bates, Robert H., et al. 1998. *Analytic Narratives* (Princeton: Princeton University Press). Read also "Robert H. Bates: Markets, Politics, and Choice" in *Passion, Craft, and Method in Comparative Politics*: 504-55.

Green, Donald, and Ian Shapiro. 1994. *Pathologies of Rational Choice Theory: A Critique of Applications in Political Science* (New Haven: Yale University Press).

Friedman, Jeffrey, eds. 1996. *The Rational Choice Controversy: Economic Models of Politics Reconsidered* (New Haven: Yale University Press).

\* Wedeen, Lisa. 2002. "Conceptualizing Culture: Possibilities for Political Science," *American Political Science Review* 96, 4 (December): 713-772.

Pierson, Paul. 2004. *Politics in Time: History, Institutions, and Social Analysis* (Princeton: Princeton University Press).

Monroe, Kristen Renwick, ed. 2004. *Perestroika!: The Raucous Rebellion in Political Science* (New Haven: Yale University Press).

### ALSO WORTH A LOOK

Parsons, Craig. 2007. *How to Map Arguments in Political Science* (New York: Oxford University Press). Maps out the logics of structural, institutional, ideational, and psychological explanations.

### Prep Assignment 3

Part A. What are the major ways in which rationalists, culturalists, and structuralists differ in their assumptions, aims, and methods? Answer in 300 words or less.

Part B. In what big ways do rationalists walk in the footsteps of Smith? In what big ways do culturalists walk in the footsteps of Weber? In what big ways do structuralists walk in the footsteps of Marx? Answer in 300 words or less, drawing from what you take to be the most essential passages in Smith, Weber, and Marx.

Part C. What, in your judgement, are the major strengths and weaknesses of the rationalist, culturalist, and structuralist approaches? Ground your answer in specific arguments you encountered in this week's readings. Answer in 300 words or less.

## FEB 14. WEEK 4. COMPARATIVE METHODS

### REQUIRED READINGS

#### Ways of comparing

\* Gerring, John. 2001. *Social Science Methodology* (New York: Cambridge University Press): 157-163, 200-229.

#### Statistical

\* Ross, Michael. 2006. "Is Democracy Good for the Poor?" *American Journal of Political Science* 50,4: 860-874.

#### Experimental

\* Humphreys, Macartan, William A. Masters, and Martin E. Sandhu. 2006. "The Role of Leaders in Democratic Deliberations: Results from a Field Experiment in São Tomé and Príncipe." *World Politics* 58 (July): 583-622.

#### Most Similar

\* Riley, Dylan. 2005. "Civic Associations and Authoritarian Regimes in Interwar Europe: Italy and Spain in Comparative Perspective." *American Sociological Review* 70,2 (April): 288-310.

#### Most Different

\* Tarrow, Syndey. 2010. "The Strategy of Paired Comparison: Toward a Theory of Practice." *Comparative Political Studies* 43,2: read only 233-38.

#### Case Study

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

## SUPPLEMENTAL READINGS

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

\* Green, Donald P. and Alan S. Gerber. 2002. "Reclaiming the Experimental Tradition in Political Science." In *Political Science: State of the Discipline* edited by Ira Katznelson and Helen V. Milner (New York: W. W. Norton): 805-832.

Yanow, Dvora, and Peregrine Schwartz-Shea, eds. 2006. *Interpretation and Method: Empirical Research Methods and the Interpretive Turn* (Armonk, NY: M.E. Sharpe).

Gerring, John. 2007. *Case Study Research: Principles and Practices* (Cambridge University Press).

Schatz, Edward., ed. 2009. *Political Ethnography: What Immersion Contributes to the Study of Power* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press).

Collier, David, and Henry E. Brady, eds. 2010. *Rethinking Social Inquiry: Diverse Tools, Shared Standards, 2<sup>nd</sup> Edition* (Lanham, MD: Rowman and Littlefield). Read also "David Collier: Critical Junctures, Concepts, and Methods" in *Passion, Craft, and Method in Comparative Politics*: 556-600.

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

## ALSO WORTH A LOOK

### An example of QCA

Hicks, Alexander, Toya Misra, and Tang Hah Ng. 1995. "The Programmatic Emergence of the Social Security State." *American Sociological Review* 60,3 (June): 329-349.

### Theorizing counterfactuals

Fearon, James. 1991. "Counterfactuals and Hypothesis Testing," *World Politics* 43, 2: 127-145.

#### Prep Assignment 4

Using the Gerring and Tarrow readings as a guide, identify in 800 words or less the major strengths and weaknesses of the research conducted by Ross, Humpreys et al, Riley, Tocqueville, and Ziblatt.

**FEB 21. WEEK 5. ALEXANDER GERSHENKRON: WORLD TIME, PATHS OF DEVELOPMENT, AND POLITICAL ECONOMY**

REQUIRED READINGS

Intellectual roots, continued

\* Janos, Andrew C. 1986. "Neo-Classicism: Variations on a Theme." In *Politics and Paradigms: Changing Theories of Change in Social Science* (Stanford: Stanford University Press): 31-64, 160-164.

One road

\* Lipset, Seymour Martin. 1963. "Economic Development and Democracy." In *Political Man: The Social Bases of Politics* (New York: Anchor, 1963): 27-63.

Different roads

\* Fishlow, Albert. 2003. "Review of Alexander Gerschenkron, *Economic Backwardness in Historical Perspective: A Book of Essays*." EH.Net Economic History Services, Feb 14. Fishlow was one of Gerschenkron's favorite students.

\* Nicholas Dawidoff. 2002. "The Advantages of Backwardness." In *The Fly Swatter: Portrait of an Exceptional Character* (New York: Pantheon): 170-187. Dawidoff is Gerschenkron's grandson. Note that "Shura" is one of Gerschenkron's nicknames.

\* Gerschenkron, Alexander. 1962. "Economic Backwardness in Historical Perspective" and "The Approach to European Industrialization: A Postscript" In *Economic Backwardness in Historical Perspective: A Book of Essays* (Cambridge: Harvard University Press): 5-30, 353-364. The "Economic Backwardness" essay was originally written in 1951.

SUPPLEMENTAL READINGS

\* Hirschman, Albert O. 1968. "The Political Economy of Import-Substituting Industrialization in Latin America." *Quarterly Journal of Economics* 82,1 (February): 1-32.

Collier, David, ed. 1979. *The New Authoritarianism in Latin America* (Princeton: Princeton University Press). Read also "David Collier: Critical Junctures, Concepts, and Methods" in *Passion, Craft, and Method in Comparative Politics*: 556-600.

Hall, Peter. 1986. *Governing the Economy: The Politics of State Intervention in Britain and France* (New York: Oxford University Press).

\* Evans, Peter B. 1989. "Predatory, Developmental, and Other Apparatuses: A Comparative Political Economy Perspective on the Third World State." *Sociological Forum* 4,4 (December): 561-587.

Bates, Robert H. 1989. *Beyond the Miracle of the Market: The Political Economy of Agrarian Development in Kenya* (New York: Cambridge University Press). Read also "Robert H. Bates: Markets, Politics, and Choice" in *Passion, Craft, and Method in Comparative Politics*: 504-555.

\* Gootenberg, Paul. 2001. "Hijos of Dr. Gershenkron: 'Latecomer' Conceptions in Latin American Economic History." In *The Other Mirror: Grand Theory through the Lens of Latin America*, edited by Miguel Angel Centeno and Fernando López-Alves (Princeton: Princeton University Press).

Amsden, Alice. 2001. *The Rise of "The Rest": Challenges to the West from Late-Industrializing Economies* (New York: Oxford University Press).

Kohli, Atul. 2004. *State-Directed Development: Political Power and Industrialization in the Global Periphery* (New York: Cambridge University Press).

Mahoney, James. 2010. *Colonial and Postcolonial Development: Spanish America in Comparative Perspective* (New York: Cambridge University Press).

Prep Assignment 5

Part A. In 250 words or less, describe what you take to be Gershenkron's major finding, and how it challenged the unilinear theory of modernization described by Janos and exemplified by Lipset.

Part B. In 250 words or less, describe (i) the explanatory building blocks Gershenkron utilizes, using the categories we encountered in week 3, and (ii) Gershenkron's method, using the categories we encountered in week 4.

Part C. In 250 words or less, describe the major strengths and weaknesses of the explanatory and methodological choices made by Gershenkron, drawing on arguments we encountered in weeks 3 and 4.

**FEB 28. WEEK 6. BARRINGTON MOORE, JR: DEMOCRACY, DICTATORSHIP, REVOLUTION, AND COMPARATIVE HISTORICAL ANALYSIS**

REQUIRED READINGS

"Barrington Moore, Jr.: The Critical Spirit and Comparative Historical Analysis." In *Passion, Craft, and Method in Comparative Politics*: 86-112.

Moore, *Social Origins of Dictatorship and Democracy* (originally published in 1966): foreword; preface; chapter 1; chapter 2 pp. 40-45, 108-110; chapter 3 pp. 111-115, 141 "to sum up...", 149-155; part two note pp. 159-161; chapters 4-5; chapter 6 pp. 314-317, 385-410; chapters 7-9, 486-487.

Also reread Janos, Andrew C. 1986. "Neo-Classicism: Variations on a Theme." In *Politics and Paradigms: Changing Theories of Change in Social Science* (Stanford: Stanford University Press): 58-62 only.

SUPPLEMENTAL READINGS

Skocpol, Theda. 1979. *States and Social Revolution* (New York: Cambridge University Press). Read also "Theda Skocpol: States, Revolutions, and Comparative Historical Imagination" in *Passion, Craft, and Method in Comparative Politics*: 649-707.

Collier, Ruth Berins, and David Collier. 1991. *Shaping the Political Arena* (Princeton: Princeton University Press). Read also “David Collier: Critical Junctures, Concepts, and Methods” in *Passion, Craft, and Method in Comparative Politics*: 556-600.

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

McAdams, Doug, Sidney Tarrow, and Charles Tilly. 2001. *Dynamics of Contention* (New York: Cambridge University Press).

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

#### ALSO WORTH A LOOK

##### A few good review essays

Skocpol, Theda. 1973. “A Critical Review of Barrington Moore’s *Social Origins of Dictatorship and Democracy*.” *Politics and Society* 4: 1-35.

Ertman, Thomas. 1998. “Democracy and Dictatorship in Interwar Western Europe Revisited.” *World Politics* 50,3: 475-505.

Mahoney, James. 2003. “Knowledge Accumulation in Comparative Historical Research: The Case of Democracy and Authoritarianism.” In *Comparative Historical Analysis in the Social Sciences* edited by James Mahoney and Dietrich Rueschemeyer (New York: Cambridge University Press).

A more critical view of scholars like Gershenkron, Moore, and Lipset; and the relationship of comparativist scholarship to American foreign policy interests.

Oren, Ido. 2003. *Our Enemies and US: America’s Rivalries and the Making of Political Science* (Ithaca: Cornell University Press).

#### Prep Assignment 6

Part A. Create a causal diagram (complete with boxes, arrows, etc.) that shows the divergent paths to democracy, fascism, and communism. Include as much detail as you can fit on one page.

Part B. In 250 words or less, describe (i) the explanatory building blocks Moore utilizes, using the categories we encountered in week 3, and (ii) Moore’s method, using the categories we encountered in week 4.

Part C. In 250 words or less, describe the major strengths and weaknesses of the explanatory and methodological choices made by Moore, drawing on arguments we encountered in weeks 3 and 4.

**WED FEB 29 (YES, IT’S A LEAP YEAR!) REVIEW ESSAY 1 DUE, 2 PM**

Put a hard copy in my mailbox and email an electronic copy to me at [schaffer@polsci.umass.edu](mailto:schaffer@polsci.umass.edu)



## MARCH 6. WEEK 7. SAMUEL HUNTINGTON: ORDER AND DECAY

### REQUIRED READINGS

“Samuel P. Huntington: Order and Conflict in Global Perspective.” In *Passion, Craft, and Method in Comparative Politics*: 210-233.

Huntington, *Political Order in Changing Societies* (originally published in 1968): foreword; preface; chapter 1; chapter 2 pp. 93-98; chapter 3 pp. 177-191; chapters 4 and 5; chapter 6 pp. 362-396; chapter 7.

Also reread Janos, Andrew C. 1986. “Neo-Classicism: Variations on a Theme.” In *Politics and Paradigms: Changing Theories of Change in Social Science* (Stanford: Stanford University Press): 58-64 only.

### SUPPLEMENTAL READINGS

Rosberg, Carl G., and Robert H. Jackson. 1982. *Personal Rule in Black Africa: Prince, Autocrat, Prophet, Tyrant* (Berkeley: University of California Press).

Kohli, Atul. 1990. *Democracy and Discontent: India's Growing Crisis of Governability* (New York: Cambridge University Press).

Uvin, Peter. 1998. *Aiding Violence: The Development Enterprise in Rwanda* (West Hartford, CT: Kumarian).

Waldner, David. 1999. *State Building and Late Development* (Ithaca: Cornell University Press).

Przeworski, Adam. 2000. *Democracy and Development: Political Institutions and Well-Being in the World, 1950-1990* (New York: Cambridge University Press). Read also “Adam Przeworski: Capitalism, Democracy, and Science” in *Passion, Craft, and Method in Comparative Politics*: 456-503.

\* Domínguez, Jorge, I. 2001. “Samuel Huntington and the Latin American State.” In *The Other Mirror: Grand Theory through the Lens of Latin America*, edited by Miguel Angel Centeno and Fernando López-Alves (Princeton: Princeton University Press).

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

### ALSO WORTH A LOOK (A CRITIQUE)

Tilly, Charles. 1973. “Does Modernization Breed Revolution?” *Comparative Politics* 5,3: 425-447.

Prep Assignment 7

Part A. Huntington states boldly on page 1 of *Political Order* that “the most important political distinction among countries concerns not their form of government but their degree of government.” What does he mean, and why does this claim matter? Do you think he is right? Answer in 250 words or less.

Part B. In 250 words or less, describe (i) the explanatory building blocks Huntington utilizes, using the categories we encountered in week 3, and (ii) Huntington’s method, using the categories we encountered in week 4.

Part C. In 250 words or less, describe the major strengths and weaknesses of the explanatory and methodological choices made by Huntington, drawing on arguments we encountered in weeks 3 and 4.

**MARCH 13. WEEK 8. BENEDICT ANDERSON: NATIONALISM**

REQUIRED READINGS

\* Interview with Benedict Anderson by Lorenz Khazaleh, December 15, 2005  
<<http://www.culcom.uio.no/english/news/2005/anderson.html>>.

Anderson, *Imagined Communities* (originally published in 1983, revised in 1991).

SUPPLEMENTAL READINGS

\* Breuilly, John. 1985. “Reflections on Nationalism.” *Philosophy of the Social Sciences* 15 (March): 65-75.

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

Chatterjee, Partha. 1993. *The Nation and Its Fragments: Colonial and Postcolonial Histories* (Princeton: Princeton University Press).

Roy, Srirupa. 2007. *Beyond Belief: India and the Politics of Postcolonial Nationalism* (Durham: Duke University Press).

Gellner, Ernest. 2008. *Nations and Nationalism*, 2<sup>nd</sup> edition (Ithaca: Cornell University Press).

Wedeen, Lisa. 2008. *Peripheral Visions: Publics, Power, and Performance in Yemen* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press).

ALSO WORTH A LOOK (A CRITICAL APPRECIATION)

Culler, Jonathan, and Pheng Cheah, eds. 2003. *Grounds of Comparison: Around the Work of Benedict Anderson* (New York: Routledge).

Prep Assignment 8

Part A. What, exactly, does Anderson mean by “imagined community” and what are the various ways by which “national” imagined communities have arisen? Answer in 250 words or less.

Part B. In 250 words or less, describe (i) the explanatory building blocks Anderson utilizes, using the categories we encountered in week 3, and (ii) Anderson’s method, using the categories we encountered in week 4.

Part C. In 250 words or less, describe the major strengths and weaknesses of the explanatory and methodological choices made by Anderson, drawing on arguments we encountered in weeks 3 and 4.

**MARCH 20. NO CLASS SPRING RECESS**

**MARCH 27. WEEK 9. JAMES SCOTT: RESISTANCE AND POWER**

REQUIRED READINGS

“James C. Scott: Peasants, Power, and the Art of Resistance.” In *Passion, Craft, and Method in Comparative Politics*: 351-391.

Scott, *Weapons of the Weak: Everyday Forms of Peasant Resistance* (1985). Read the entire book, but pay closest attention to the preface, chapters 1-2 and 6-8.

SUPPLEMENTAL READINGS

Scott, James C. 1976. *The Moral Economy of the Peasant: Rebellion and Subsistence in Southeast Asia* (New Haven: Yale University Press).

Popkin, Samuel L. 1979. *The Rational Peasant: The Political Economy of Rural Society in Vietnam* (Berkeley: University of California Press).

\* Mitchell, Timothy. 1990. “Everyday Metaphors of Power.” *Theory and Society* 19,5: 545-577.

Scott, James C. 1998. *Seeing Like a State: How Certain Schemes to Improve the Human Condition Have Failed* (New Haven: Yale University Press).

Wedeen, Lisa. 1999. *Ambiguities of Domination: Politics, Rhetoric, and Symbols in Contemporary Syria* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press).

Wood, Elisabeth Jean. 2003. *Insurgent Collective Action and Civil War in El Salvador* (New York: Cambridge).

Scott, James C. 2009. *The Art of Not Being Governed* (New Haven: Yale University Press).

ALSO WORTH A LOOK (A KEY READING ON HEGEMONY)

Gramsci, Antonio. 1971. *Selections from the Prison Notebooks* (New York: International Publishers).

Prep Assignment 9

Part A. What are the different “everyday forms of resistance” that Scott discovers in the Malay village he studied? Answer in 250 words or less.

Part B. Scott critiques Gramsci’s concept of hegemony. What, exactly, is his critique and do you think Scott is right? Answer in 250 words or less. The arguments of chapter 8 are here especially relevant.

Part C. In 250 words or less, describe (i) the explanatory building blocks Scott utilizes, using the categories we encountered in week 3, and (ii) Scott’s method, using the categories we encountered in week 4.

Part D. In 250 words or less, describe the major strengths and weaknesses of the explanatory and methodological choices made by Scott, drawing on arguments we encountered in weeks 3 and 4.

**APRIL 3. WEEK 10. DAVID LAITIN: CULTURE, RATIONALITY, AND THE STATE**

REQUIRED READINGS

“David D. Laitin: Culture, Rationality, and the Search for Discipline.” In *Passion, Craft, and Method in Comparative Politics*: 601-648.

Laitin, *Hegemony and Culture: Politics and Religious Change among the Yoruba* (1986).

SUPPLEMENTAL READINGS

\* Laitin, David D., and Aaron Wildavsky. 1998. “Political Culture and Political Preferences.” *American Political Science Review* 82,2: 589-596.

\* Wildavsky, Aaron. 1987. “Choosing Preferences by Constructing Institutions: A Cultural Theory of Preference Formation.” *American Political Science Review* 81,1: 3-21.

Katzenstein, Peter J. 1998. *Cultural Norms and National Security: Police and Military in Postwar Japan* (Ithaca: Cornell University Press).

Nasr, Seyyed Vali Reza. 2001. *Islamic Leviathan: Islam and the Making of State Power* (New York: Oxford University Press).

Posner, Daniel N. 2005. *Institutions and Ethnic Politics in Africa* (New York: Cambridge University Press).

Chandra, Kanchan. 2007. *Why Ethnic Parties Succeed: Patronage and Ethnic Head Counts in India* (New York: Cambridge University Press).

Laitin, David D. 2007. *Nations, States, and Violence* (New York: Oxford University Press).

ALSO WORTH A LOOK (THE CONGRUENCE THEORY CRITICIZED BY LAITIN)

Eckstein, Harry. 1966. *Division and Cohesion in Democracy* (Princeton: Princeton University Press).

Prep Assignment 10

Part A. On page 8 of *Hegemony and Culture* Laitin asks “under what conditions does a single cultural divide in a society come to be seen as deep, while other cultural divides come to be seen as unimportant for collective political action”? In 250 words or less, summarize Laitin’s answer to this question.

Part B. In 250 words or less, critically assess Laitin’s critique of congruence theory (see page 76). Do you think his evidence supports his conclusion?

Part C. In 250 words or less, describe (i) the explanatory building blocks Laitin utilizes, using the categories we encountered in week 3, and (ii) Laitin’s method, using the categories we encountered in week 4.

Part D. In 250 words or less, describe the major strengths and weaknesses of the explanatory and methodological choices made by Laitin, drawing on arguments we encountered in weeks 3 and 4.

**APRIL 10. WEEK 11. ROBERT PUTNAM: SOCIAL CAPITAL**

REQUIRED READINGS

ECPR News. 2000. “Leaders of the Profession: Robert Putnam – Interview with Ken Newton.” *ECPR News* 11, 2.

Putnam, *Making Democracy Work: Civic Traditions in Modern Italy* (1993): preface, chapters 1, 4, 5, and 6.

SUPPLEMENTAL READINGS

\* Fox, Jonathan. 1996. “How Does Civil Society Thicken? The Political Construction of Social Capital in Rural Mexico.” *World Development* 24, 6 (June): 119-149.

\* Levi, Margaret. 1996. “Social and Unsocial Capital: a Review Essay of Robert Putnam’s *Making Democracy Work*.” *Politics & Society* 24 (March): 45-55.

\* Berman, Sheri. 1997. “Civil Society and the Collapse of the Weimar Republic.” *World Politics* 49,3: 401-429.

\* \_\_\_\_\_. 2001. “Civil Society and Political Institutionalization.” In *Beyond Tocqueville: Civil Society and the Social Capital Debate in Comparative Perspective* edited by Bob Edwards, Michael W. Foley, and Mario Diani (Hanover, NH: University Press of New England).

Varshney, Ashutosh. 2002. *Ethnic Conflict and Civic Life: Hindus and Muslims in India*, 2<sup>nd</sup> edition (New Haven: Yale University Press).

Jamal, Amaney A. 2007. *Barriers to Democracy: The Other Side of Social Capital in Palestine and the Arab World* (Princeton: Princeton University Press).

Tsai, Lily L. 2007. *Accountability Without Democracy: Solidarity Groups and Public Goods Provision in Rural China* (New York: Cambridge University Press).

MacLean, Lauren M. 2010. *Informal Institutions and Citizenship in Rural Africa: Risk and Reciprocity in Ghana and Cote d'Ivoire* (New York: Cambridge University Press).

Prep Assignment 11

Part A. In 250 words or less, reconstruct Putnam's reasons for believing that membership in horizontal associations like bird watching groups or sports clubs makes democracy "work." Key here is the argument he develops in chapter 6.

Part B. In 250 words or less, critique one of the assumptions that underlies Putnam's argument.

Part C. In 250 words or less, describe (i) the explanatory building blocks Putnam utilizes, using the categories we encountered in week 3, and (ii) Putnam's method, using the categories we encountered in week 4.

Part D. In 250 words or less, describe the major strengths and weaknesses of the explanatory and methodological choices made by Putnam, drawing on arguments we encountered in weeks 3 and 4.

**APRIL 17. NO CLASS. MONDAY SCHEDULE OF CLASSES.**

**APRIL 24. WEEK 12. CONCLUDING REFLECTIONS**

REQUIRED READINGS

How Do Various Methods and Explanations Fit Together?

A personal trajectory: from case study to social science?

\* Bates, Robert H. 2007. "From Case Studies to Social Science: A Strategy for Political Research." In *The Oxford Handbook of Comparative Politics* edited by Carles Boix and Susan C. Stokes (New York: Oxford University Press): 172-185. Read also "Robert H. Bates: Markets, Politics, and Choice" in *Passion, Craft, and Method in Comparative Politics*: 504-555.

A tripartite division of labor?

\* Laitin, David. 2002. "Comparative Politics: The State of the Subdiscipline." In *Political Science: State of the Discipline* edited by Ira Katznelson and Helen V. Milner (New York: W. W. Norton): 630-659. Reread "David D. Laitin: Culture, Rationality, and the Search for Discipline." In *Passion, Craft, and Method in Comparative Politics*: 601-648.

A set of creative confrontations?

\* Lichbach, Mark Irving. 1997. "Social Theory and Comparative Politics." In *Comparative Politics: Rationality, Culture, and Structure* edited by Mark Irving Lichbach and Alan S. Zuckerman (New York: Cambridge University Press): 239-276.

An eclectic messy center?

\* Kohli, Atul, et al. 1995. "The Role of Theory in Comparative Politics: A Symposium." *World Politics* 48,1: 1-49.

### The Craft of Comparative Research: Taking Chances

Snyder, Richard. "The Human Dimension of Comparative Research" in *Passion, Craft, and Method in Comparative Politics*: 1-31.

#### Prep Assignment 12

Bates, Laitin, Lichbach, and the symposium participants offer several different ways to think about the relationship between the various methods and explanations now ascendant in comparative politics. Which of these ways (if any) do you find most compelling, and why? Answer in 500 words or less.

## **MAY 1. WEEK 13. YOUR FUTURE DIRECTIONS**

### Discussion of journals

Optional Extra Credit Assignment (worth up to 4 prep assignment points) [due in class]

#### Gendering comparative politics

In 2000 to 2500 words, use at least at least 2 different chapters or articles from the readings below to critique any one or two required or supplemental readings on this syllabus.

Geertz, Gary, and Amy G. Mazur., eds. 2008. *Politics, Gender, and Concepts: Theory and Methodology*. (New York: Cambridge University Press).

\* Beckwith, Karen, et al. 2010. "A Comparative Politics of Gender" Symposium. *Perspectives on Politics* 8,1: 159-278.

## **WED. MAY 9. REVIEW ESSAY 2 DUE, 2 PM**

Put a hard copy in my mailbox and email an electronic copy to me at [schaffer@polsci.umass.edu](mailto:schaffer@polsci.umass.edu)