

# **Challenges for Developing Democracies**

## **Political Studies 115**

**Fall 2018**

**Prof. Mark Schneider**  
209 Bernard Hall  
[Mark\\_schneider@pitzer.edu](mailto:Mark_schneider@pitzer.edu)  
MW 1:15-2:30pm

Office Hours MW, 2:30-4 or by appointment,

### **COURSE DESCRIPTION**

Why do many new democracies suffer from poor governance and weak accountability? What are the central challenges facing developing democracies from South Asia to Latin America to sub-Saharan Africa? Since World War II, the number of electoral democracies has increased dramatically with many new democracies being established in poorer, non-western countries with different histories of institutional and economic development than was the case with the first wave of democratization in Europe. The challenges (amid substantial progress and some backsliding) of these cases reminds us of the difficulties of providing accountable democratic governance in countries where state and political institutions can be weak, corruption can be rampant, and inequalities in wealth and information pose challenges for voters to hold their governments accountable.

This course examines the challenges developing democracies face to provide good governance to their people and considers strategies for addressing these problems. We will also contrast politics and political accountability in these contexts with those in our own country. We begin the course considering the consequences of weak electoral, party, and state institutions. Then we move onto implications of weak institutions on outcomes including corruption, political

manipulation of public policy, ethnic conflict, and democratic accountability. After spending a week diagnosing these problems (or challenges) and examining them in particular countries, we examine research on policies and social changes that address these problems in the subsequent week.

The goals of the course are as follows. First, the course is designed to encourage students to think critically about the course's overarching questions. The reading assignments are not particularly heavy, but students will be expected to have reflected carefully on all required readings and on the broad themes and applications they introduce. Second, the organization of the course—alternating between diagnosing problems and solutions—is designed to push students to think about how a conceptual understanding of the “challenges” we discuss can be employed to critically assess plausible policy solutions. Third, students will learn to connect theory to country cases through presentations that cover a course theme with attention to one country. By the end of the course, students will not only develop a vocabulary for understanding the range of difficult challenges for good governance in developing democracies but will be able to participate in debates over how to address them. Intended outcomes are provided below.

**Goals/Objectives of the Course (intended outcomes):**

1. Students will come to understand major debates underlying comparative politics.
2. Students will engage in effective written expression.
3. Students will learn about the politics of different cultures across the globe.
4. Students will learn to analyze complex political phenomena through careful engagement with theory and evidence

## COURSE REQUIREMENTS

Your final grade will be based on the following components:

**20% - Class Participation.** Since this is a seminar course, attendance is obligatory. An active role in discussions and class activities by everyone enrolled in the course is expected, as is the completion of required readings before the class session for which they are assigned. Each student is permitted one unexcused absence (i.e. without a written note from a doctor or a dean). Additional unexcused absences will affect the participation grade.

**5% - Progress in the News.** You will be asked to search for news that documents efforts to improve governance/democracy/ethnic reconciliation, etc. in a particular country. You will present your news (related to a particular class theme) in class and post your articles on sakai. In your short (2-3 minutes) presentation, be sure to explain not only what progress you have found but why it represents progress and how you define progress on that issue. Class sessions for this assignment will be assigned in Week 2.

**15% - Country Case Study Presentations** –Each student will complete a presentation that applies a class session theme to a country case. The presentation should last 10 minutes and include slides in power point or another presentation program. I will ask you to propose a country and a ranking of preferences for three class session by email before the third week's session. You may choose any class session from sessions 8 to 26. Email me a specific research question and one theory that you think addresses the research question no less than 2 weeks before the date of your presentation. All students should discuss the presentation with me in office hours no later than one week before the presentation. That means you will need to read ahead for your assigned topic.

The goal of the presentation is to get you to think about the theoretical arguments addressed in a class session and to apply this to a country case. All presentations should address one argument from a required (or a relevant outside) reading that explains an issue we address that week; and apply that argument through a case study. Presentations will be graded on their ability to connect a political science argument to the real-world case study and issue you choose.

**25% - Take-Home Midterm.** Students will be required to write a take-home midterm consisting of a short answer section and longer essay (7-8 pages) section.

**35% - Take-Home Final.** Students will be required to write a take-home midterm consisting of a short answer section and longer essay (8 pages) section. Students interested completing a research paper as an alternative to the final may do so pending approval of a 1-2 page paper proposal and timeline by the instructor.

## Classroom Etiquette

To make sure that we have a hospitable learning environment, I ask students to follow three simple rules:

- 1) Arrive on time
- 2) Turn your cell phones off when you enter the class room
- 3) Unless you are speaking in groups about readings, close your laptops in class. This will help everyone focus on class discussion.
- 4) Respect your classmates. Debate is welcome but disagree respectfully by engaging ideas rather getting personal.
- 5) Coffee/beverages are fine but food is not permitted in class since it can distract your classmates.

### \*\*\*Warning on Plagiarism and Cheating\*\*\*

As goes without saying, it will not be possible to pass this course if I find any evidence of plagiarism/cheating of any kind for any assignment. At minimum, this will result in a zero for that assignment and will be referred to the Dean without exceptions. If you do the work each week, and think a lot about the material, you'll do fine.

## READINGS

All required readings are available online and can be downloaded from sakai. Recommended articles are optional based on your interest and may be useful for presentations. This course requires you to carefully read all required readings before class and be prepared to discuss them. Generally, two articles or book chapters are assigned for each class with occasional media pieces to illustrate course concepts.

Make sure you not only understand the basic argument of each reading, but also give yourself time to think critically about each reading before class so you will be prepared to participate in discussion. I encourage you to complete the reading worksheet provided at the end of this syllabus for each reading to make your work more efficient and intellectually active. I'll post discussion questions on the sakai to guide your reading as well.

## TOPICS AND READING LISTS

### PART I: INSTITUTIONS AND CHANGE

#### Session 1: Course Introduction

#### Session 2: What is Democracy

Robert Dahl. 1971. Polyarchy. New Haven: Yale University Press: Chapter 1.

### **Session 3: Democratic Consolidation**

Linz, Juan and Alfred Stepan. 1996. "Toward Consolidated Democracies." *Journal of Democracy*, 7 (2): 14-33.

Berman, Sheri. 2007. "Lessons from Europe." *Journal of Democracy*, 18 (1) 28-41.

### **Session 4: Democratic Consolidation: India Vs. Pakistan**

Varshney, Ashutosh. 1998. "Why Democracy Survives." *Journal of Democracy*, 9(3), 36-50.

Jaffrelot, Christophe. 2002. "India and Pakistan: Interpreting the divergence of two political trajectories." *Cambridge Review of International Affairs*, 15(2) 251-267.

*Recommended:* Wilkinson, Steven. 2015. *Army and Nation*. Introduction.

### **Session 5: Democratic Backsliding**

Bermeo, Nancy. 2016. "On Democratic Backsliding." *Journal of Democracy*, 27 (1) 5-19.

Esen, Berk, and Sebnem Gumuscu. 2016. "Rising Competitive Authoritarianism in Turkey." *Third World Quarterly*, 37(9) 1581-1606.

Mickey, Robert, Steven Levitsky, and Lucan Ahmad Way. 2017. "Is America Still Safe for Democracy? Why the United States Is in Danger of Backsliding." *Foreign Affairs*.

### **Session 6: State Formation and State Capacity: Europe**

Tilly, Charles. 1985. "War-Making and State-Making as Organized Crime." In Peter Evans, Dietrich Rueschemeyer, and Theda Skocpol (Eds). *Bringing the State Back In*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

*Recommended:* Weber, Max. 1978. "Bureaucracy" in *Economy and Society: An Outline of Interpretive Sociology*. Berkeley, CA: University of California Press. Pgs. 956-963.

In-Class Activity: Reading Worksheet: Tilly

### **Session 7: State Formation and State Capacity in the Developing World**

On State Building:

Herbst, Jeffrey. 1990. "War and the State in Africa." *International Security* 14 (4): 117-139.

On Implications for Governance:

Berenschot, Ward. 2011. "On the Usefulness of Goondas in Indian Politics: 'Money power' and 'Muscle power' in a Gujarati Locality." *South Asia: Journal of South Asian Studies*, 34 (2) 255-275.

**Session 8: Parties and Party System Institutionalization**

Mainwaring, Scott and Timothy Scully (Eds). 1995. *Building Democratic Institutions: Party Systems in Latin America*. Chapter 1 (Introduction)

Keefer, Phillip and Stuti Khemani. 2004. "Why Do the Poor Receive Poor Services?" *Economic and Political Weekly*, 935-943.

**Session 9: Parties in the Developing World**

Levitsky, Steven. 2001. "An Organized Disorganization': Informal Organization and the Persistence of Local Party Structures in Argentine Peronism." *Journal of Latin American Studies* 33 (1) 29-66.

Rakner, Lise. 2011. "Institutionalizing the Pro-Democracy Movements: The case of Zambia's Movement for Multiparty Democracy." *Democratization*, 18 (5) 1106-1124.

**Session 10: Party-Building in Developing Countries**

LeBas, Adrienne. 2013. *From Protest to Parties: Party-building and democratization in Africa*. OUP Oxford. Selection.

Samuels, David. 2009. "From Socialism to Social Democracy: Party organization and the transformation of the workers' party in Brazil." *Comparative Political Studies*, 37 (9) 999-1024.

MIDTERM EXAM HANDED OUT

**PART 2: CHALLENGES AND CHANGE**

**Session 11: Economic Inequality and Its Consequences in the U.S.**

Hacker, Jakob and Paul Pierson. 2011. *Winner-Take-All Politics*. Tantor Media, Incorporated. Introduction.

Autor, David, 2010 "The Polarization of Job Opportunities in the U.S. Labor Market: Implications for Employment and Earnings."

*Strongly Recommended:* Winters, Jeffrey A., and Benjamin I. Page. 2009. "Oligarchy in the United States?." *Perspectives on Politics*: 731-751.

## **Session 12: Economic Inequality and Poverty in Developing Countries**

Hoffman, Kelly, and Miguel Angel Centeno. 2003. "The Lopsided Continent: Inequality in Latin America." *Annual Review of Sociology* 29 (1) 363-390.

Fisher, Max and Amanda Taub 2017. "The Social Contract Is Broken': Inequality Becomes Deadly in Mexico." *New York Times*

Available at: <https://www.nytimes.com/2017/09/30/world/americas/mexico-inequality-violence-security.html? r=0>

Krishna, Anirudh. 2017. *Broken Ladders*. Introduction.

## **Session 13: Paths Toward Equality I: Social Safety Nets and Exogenous Shocks**

Sandbrook et al. *Welfare State in the Global Periphery*. Chapter 3 (Kerala).

Kuran, Timur. 2017. "What Kills Inequality: Redistribution's Violent History." *Foreign Affairs*.

*Recommended:* Alesina, Alberto, and Edward Glaeser. 2004. *Fighting Poverty in the US and Europe: A World of Difference*. New York: Oxford University Press: Chapter 6.

### MIDTERM DUE AT THE START OF CLASS

FALL BREAK: NO CLASS 10/16

## **Session 14: Paths Toward Equality II: Anti-Poverty Programs**

Valencia Lomelí, Enrique. 2008. "Conditional Cash Transfers as Social Policy in Latin America: An assessment of their contributions and limitations." *Annual Review of Sociology*, 34: 475-499.

Dreze, Jean and Amartya Sen. 2013. *An Uncertain Glory*. Princeton: Princeton University Press: Chapter 7: 'Poverty and Social Support.

*Dasgupta, Aditya. 2014. "Quiet Revolution: The Political Logic of India's Anti-Poverty Programs." India in Transition* <available at: <https://casi.sas.upenn.edu/iit/dasgupta>>.

## **Session 15: Understanding Corruption**

Olken, Benjamin A., and Rohini Pande. 2012. "Corruption in Developing Countries." *Annual Review of Economics* 4 (1): 479-509.

Olivier de Sardan, J.P. 1999. "A Moral Economy of Corruption in Africa?" *Journal of Modern African Studies*, 37 (1) 25-52.

## **Session 16: Corruption: Cases**

Vaishnav, Milan. 2017. *When Crime Pays*. Yale University Press, Chapter 2 ("The Rents Raj").

Bertrand, Marianne, Simeon Djankov, Rema Hanna, and Sendil Mullainathan. 2008. "Corruption in Driving Licensing Process in Delhi." *Economic and Political Weekly*, 71-76.

### **Session 17: Fighting Corruption: Low-Hanging Fruit**

Olken, Benjamin. 2005. "Monitoring Corruption: Evidence from a Field Experiment in Indonesia." *Journal of Political Economy*, 115 (2), 200-249.

Muralidharan, Karthik "Lessons from Andhra Pradesh: Building State Capacities for Welfare." *Mint* (3/12/2014).

<available at: <http://www.livemint.com/Opinion/ZhNl5vVuZMTcz6Rv0npMjN/Lessons-from-Andhra-Pradesh-building-state-capacities-for-w.html>>

*Recommended:* Bussell, Jennifer. 2012. *Corruption and Reform in India: Public Services in the Digital Age* (Cambridge: Cambridge Press): "Chapter 8: Do Reforms Affect the Quality of Services?"

### **Session 18: Fighting Corruption: Institutional Reform**

Collier, Paul. 2000. 'How to Reduce Corruption', *African Development Review*, 12 (2) 191–205.

### **Session 19: Clientelism and Vote Buying**

Kitschelt, Herbert and Steven Wilkinson. 2007. "Citizen-Politician Linkages: An Introduction" in Herbert Kitschelt and Steven Wilkinson eds. *Patrons, Clients, and Policies*. New York: Cambridge University Press: Chapter 1.

Schneider, Mark. 2014. "Can Benefits Be Tied to the Vote?" *The Hindu Business Line*. <Published: 13 January 2014>.

*Available at:* <http://www.thehindubusinessline.com/opinion/can-benefits-be-tied-to-the-vote/article5574065.ece>

### **Session 20: Clientelism on the Ground**

Auyero, Javier. 2000. "The Logic of Clientelism in Argentina: An Ethnographic Account." *Latin American Research Review*, 35 (3) 55-82.

Chauchard, Simon. "Why Provide Electoral Handouts? Theory and Micro-Level Evidence from Mumbai." Manuscript.

### **Session 21: Moving from Clientelism to Programmatic Politics**

Weitz-Shapiro, Rebecca. 2012. "What Wins Votes: Why Some Politicians Opt Out of Clientelism." *American Journal of Political Science*, 56 (3) 568-83.



Stokes, Susan. 2013. "What Killed Vote Buying in Britain and the United States?" In Stokes, Susan C., et al. *Brokers, Voters, and Clientelism: The Puzzle of Distributive Politics*. Cambridge University Press.

*Recommended:* Fried, Brian. 2013. "Rise of the Bureaucrats." Dissertation Chapter, Yale University.

### **Session 22: Where Does Ethnic Polarization Come From?**

Posner, Daniel N. 2004. "The Political Salience of Cultural Difference: Why Chewas and Tumbukas Are Allies in Zambia and Adversaries in Malawi." *American Political Science Review*, 98(4) 529-545.

Chandra, Kanchan. 2005. "Ethnic Parties and Democratic Stability." *Perspectives on Politics*, 3 (2) 235-252 [Focus on her discussion of the out-bidding model in the first half of the article].

### **Session 23: When Does Ethnic Polarization Lead to Ethnic Violence?**

Wilkinson, Steven. 2002. "Putting Gujarat in Perspective." *Economic and Political Weekly*, 1579-1583.

Kaufman, Stuart J. 1996. "Spiraling to Ethnic War: Elites, masses, and Moscow in Moldova's civil war." *International Security*, 21(2) 108-138.

### **Session 24: Strategies for Reducing Ethnic Conflict: Consociationalism**

Lijphart, Arend. 2004. "Constitutional Design for Divided Societies." *Journal of Democracy*, 15 (2): 96-109.

Dekmejian, Richard Hrair. 1978. "Consociational Democracy in Crisis: the case of Lebanon." *Comparative Politics* 10(2) 251-265.

### **Session 25: Strategies for Reducing Ethnic Conflict: Ethno-Federalism**

Roeder, Philip G. 2009. "Ethno-Federalism and the Mismanagement of Conflicting Nationalisms." *Regional & Federal Studies* 19(2) 203-219

Ahuja, Amit, and Ashutosh Varshney. 2005. "Antecedent Nationhood, Subsequent Statehood: Explaining the relative success of Indian federalism." *Sustainable Peace: Power and democracy after civil wars*.

## FINAL EXAM HANDED OUT

### **Session 27: Improving Governance: Information and Accountability (12/4)**

Lieberman, Evan, Daniel Posner, and Lily Tsai. 2013. "Does Information Lead to More Active Citizenship? Evidence from an Education Intervention in Rural Kenya." *MIT Manuscript*.

Björkman, Martina, and Jakob Svensson. 2009. "Power to the People: Evidence from a Randomized Field Experiment on Community-Based Monitoring in Uganda." *The Quarterly Journal of Economics*, 124 (2) 735-769.

## **Session 28: Conclusion and Review (12/6)**

### **Reading Skills:**

As you manage the reading for this and other graduate courses, you are likely to find, if you have not already, that there is no correlation between effort and outcome. It is entirely possible to spend several hours reading something without "getting it." And it is equally possible to spend less than a half-hour reading something else and getting to the heart of the argument. You will have to devise for yourselves ways to read efficiently. These are some devices that may help:

1. Figure out what the heart of an argument is before you read deeply: skim, read the abstracts, the jacket blurbs, often short reviews published elsewhere. When you know where the center of gravity is, you read more efficiently.
2. Read actively: do not simply soak up the reading for what the author wants to tell you, but approach it with questions, and try to answer them for yourself as you make your way through.
3. Use other peoples' skills: you do not have to do all the work yourself. It is not "cheating" if you talk through the argument with someone else before or after you delve in, or look at reviews for explication, or form reading groups where you can discuss the argument with each other.
4. Write in order to read. The response papers for this class and the (non-graded) worksheet attached should help.
5. Use diagrams if necessary: often, the structure of an argument can be most clearly expressed if you "draw" it, using arrows and lines, than by trying to understand it in words.
6. Organize your notes in a way that makes retention and information retrieval possible: you could use index cards, annotated bibliographies, database programmes like Filemaker Pro etc. These rules may be obvious to some and not to others. Basically do whatever works for you. But be self-conscious about the reading process as a skill that has to be learned and not necessarily as an ability that either comes naturally or does not.

## Reading Worksheet

*For each book, chapter, or article assigned in this course, you should fill out the following (non-graded) worksheet. Many of these points can be addressed in a sentence or two (e.g. Questions 1 and 2; in some cases answers will not need even to be full sentences (e.g., Question); and in some cases the answers may overlap. These worksheets should be retained: they will be useful for future reference.*

1. State the central question that the reading addresses.
2. State the central argument(s) defended in the paper in response to this question.
3. What type of reasoning or evidence is used to support these arguments? If it is an analytical paper, what is the logic that undergirds the argument? If an empirical paper, what type of data is employed? Are there other data sources that you think might be more appropriate?
4. Do you find the claims of the reading convincing? What do you see as the main gaps that need to be filled?
5. Why (if at all) is the reading interesting?
6. Do you agree with the main claims? What are your hesitations? (This may simply involve restatement of previous points.)
7. Identify one or two implicit premises or background assumptions in the paper that you think are especially controversial or objectionable.
8. In light of your answers to the previous questions, write an abstract for the article of no more than 100 words. (Feel free to repeat formulations given in response to earlier questions.)
9. When you have done this for individual readings, take some time to think about the various readings you have been assigned in relation to each other. See if you can write or imagine a summary table for all the readings taken together which compares and contrasts them.