



PS240A Fall 2016

Field Seminar in Comparative Politics

<https://moodle2.sscnet.ucla.edu/course/view/16F-POLSCI240A-1>

Mon 2:00–4:50 Bunche 2150

Professor G. Blair
graeme.blair@ucla.edu
Bunche 3274
Office hrs: W 4-5p; F 1:30-2:30p
Tel: 310-426-8581

Professor M. Golden
golden@ucla.edu
Bunche 3262
Thurs 2:30-4:00
310-206-8166

Professor D. Treisman
treisman@polisci.ucla.edu
Bunche 3365
TBD
310-794-5875

Course Description: PS 240A-B is a two-course sequence designed to introduce graduate students to comparative politics. We survey a broad range of different literatures. Sometimes topics flow naturally from one week to the next, but not always. Comparative politics is a vast field. In some ways, it touches on every aspect of political science, and it overlaps with economics, sociology, and anthropology, as well as other disciplines. We cannot make this course comprehensive, and even the coverage of the topics we have chosen to address leaves out important and/or influential readings. We hope that these short introductions will whet your appetites for deeper study.

This will be a demanding course. The reading list for each week is relatively heavy, and we expect every student to be prepared to discuss any reading when called upon. You may need to read some items more than once to be able to do that. Your goal should be to come to class prepared to summarize the main point of each item assigned as well as to be able to present a brief and accurate review of the approach, argument, and evidence — all in two to three minutes. If it takes you longer than that, you haven't mastered the material.

You should access assigned published articles electronically on your own. We will upload scanned copies of book chapters and unpublished papers to the course website and organize them by week. We reserve the right to make some last-minute changes, in which case we will of course provide you information about any new readings at least a week before they are required.

Before approaching each reading, think about what the key questions are for the week and about how the questions for the week relate to what you have learned in previous weeks. Then skim over the reading to get a sense of the themes it covers, and, before reading further, jot down the questions you hope the reading will be able to answer for you. Next, read the introduction and conclusion. This is normally enough to get a sense of the big picture. Are the claims surprising? Do you believe them? Can you think of examples — places in the world, or historical events — that do not seem consistent with the logic of the argument? Next ask yourself what types of evidence or arguments you would need to be convinced of the results. Now read through the whole text, checking how the arguments used support the claims of the author. It is rare to find a piece of

writing that you agree with entirely. So, as you come across issues that you are not convinced by, write them down and bring them along to class for discussion. Also note when you are pleasantly surprised, or when the author produces a convincing argument that you had not thought of. In all cases, whenever possible you are encouraged to download this data, replicate all or some results, and use that as an exercise to probe and test the arguments you bring to class. Finally, try to articulate succinctly what you know now that you didn't know before you read the piece. Often a quick summary can draw attention to strong features you were not conscious of, or make you realize that what you were impressed by is not so impressive after all. Is the theory internally consistent? Is it consistent with past literature and findings? Is it novel or surprising? Are elements that are excluded or simplified plausibly unimportant for the outcomes? Is the theory general or specific? Are there more general theories on which this theory could draw or contribute?

Evaluation for the course will consist of two parts. First, all students will be expected to participate actively in every class meeting, including but not limited to the "cold-call" oral summaries of the readings described above. In-class performance will count for 25 percent of your grade. The other 75 percent will be based on your performance on an end-of-quarter, day-long written examination. In most other graduate programs in Political Science, students must sit comprehensive exams in two or more fields before they are permitted to move on to dissertation work. The final examinations for PS240A and for PS240B will be along the same lines, although we will hold you responsible only for the topics covered in the course each quarter and, within each topic, only for the readings that were assigned. We plan to give you a handful of the "big questions" from the literature covered during the quarter. You will be asked to choose two questions to answer in an 8-hour take-home exam.

Finally, we expect PS240 students to attend the Comparative Politics Workshop (speaker series), which will host a total of about nine speakers over the the academic year on some Mondays (12:30–2:00pm). This year, we have one speaker scheduled during fall quarter and five in the winter (as well as three in spring quarter). We may discuss these presentations in the class that follows the session. As always, your active engagement in these discussions will factor into your class participation grade.

Course Prerequisites: There are no prerequisites for this course.

Course Objectives: At the completion of this course, you will:

1. Be familiar with many major questions in the field of comparative politics.
2. Be familiar with important recent studies of comparative politics.
3. Have acquired a base of readings that will allow you to begin to conduct independent research in comparative politics.

Course Format: The course is designed as a mixture of lecture and discussion.

Readings: The reading load is relatively heavy. (It is heavier this year than it has been in the past few years.)

Readings use examples from countries around the world, crossing the distinction between developed and less developed countries.

You might want to print out a copy of each reading and bring it to class. You will not have access

to an electronic version during class and we may need to study specific tables or figures.

Requirement(s): To complete the course, you will sit an 8-hour open-book examination at the end of each quarter. You may take this examination anywhere you wish as long as you submit your final answers to all three instructors with a time-stamp that is within 10 minutes of when the examination is due. The dates of the exams will be set at the beginning of each quarter after consultation with students in an effort to avoid conflicts.

Course Policies:

- **General (for auditors as well as enrolled students)**

- Please come to class meetings each week **already having read** assigned material.
- Please bring written notes to class summarizing each assigned reading and be prepared to discuss every assigned reading.
- Assume that your computer will be closed during class and in particular that you will not be able to review assigned readings on your computer during class.
- You should take handwritten notes during class in order to retain the material covered.
- If you are auditing the course, please inform us so you are given access to course materials.
- Please plan to attend all class meetings except in cases of illness. Do not attend class if you have a cold or the flu.

- **Grades**

- Final examinations are to be submitted on time to be given full credit. Please ensure that the timestamp for your submission is within ten minutes of the time due.
- Final course grades will reflect class participation (25 percent) and the quality of written work submitted (75 percent).

Replication, Transparency, and Research Ethics: All work you do will be held to the highest ethical and professional standards.

UCLA Student Guide to Academic Integrity: As a student and a member of the University community, you are expected to demonstrate integrity in all of your academic endeavors.

Please carefully review the university guidelines regarding academic dishonesty. They are available at <http://www.deanofstudents.ucla.edu/Portals/16/Documents/StudentGuide.pdf>. Please also review the BITSS *Manual of Best Practices in Transparent Social Science Research* (August 11, 2015), available at <https://github.com/garretchristensen/BestPracticesManual>. Although many aspects of social scientific research will not be directly relevant to your work in this course, we urge you to begin to familiarize yourselves with the research norms used in our discipline.

PS20A FALL SYLLABUS

Week One, September 26: Methods and inference in comparative politics (all instructors)

Readings:

King, Gary, Robert Keohane and Sidney Verba. 1994. *Designing Social Inquiry: Scientific Inference in Qualitative Research*. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1994. ch. 1.

Gerber, Alan S. and Donald P. Green. *Field experiments: Design, analysis, and interpretation*. WW Norton, 2012, ch. 1.

Geddes, Barbara. “How the cases you choose affect the answers you get: Selection bias in comparative politics.” *Political Analysis*, 2, no. 1 (1990): 131–150.

Bennett, Andrew and Jeffrey T. Checkel. *Process Tracing: From Metaphor to Analytic Tool*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, ch. 1.

Dunning, Thad. *Natural experiments in the social sciences: a design-based approach*. Cambridge University Press, 2012, ch. 1.

Week Two, October 3: Fundamental sources of economic growth (Golden/Treisman)

Readings:

Diamond, Jared. 1999. “Farmer Power,” “Spacious Skies and Tilted Axes,” and “Hemispheres Colliding.” In *Guns, Germs and Steel: The Fates of Human Societies*. New York: WW Norton, pp. 85–92, 176–91 and 354–75.

Acemoglu, Daron, Simon Johnson, and James Robinson. 2001. “The Colonial Origins of Comparative Development: An Empirical Investigation.” *American Economic Review*, 91(5): 1369–1401.

Albouy, David Y. “The colonial origins of comparative development: an empirical investigation: comment.” *The American Economic Review*, 102, no. 6 (2012): 3059–76.

Fogel, Robert. 2004. *The Escape from Hunger and Premature Death, 1700–2100*. Cambridge University Press, ch. 2, pp. 20–42.

Nunn Nathan and Leonard Wantchekon. 2011. “The Slave Trade and the Origins of Mistrust in Africa.” *American Economic Review*, 101(7): 3221–52.

Ricardo Hausman, Lant Pritchett and Dani Rodrik. 2005. “Growth Accelerations.” *Journal of Economic Growth*, 10(4): 303–29.

Week Three, October 10: The state and nation building (Blair/Treisman)

Readings:

Huntington, Samuel. *Political Order in Changing Societies*. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1968, ch. 1.

Tilly, Charles. 1985. "War Making and State Making as Organized Crime." In P. Evans, D. Rueschemeyer and T. Skocpol, eds., *Bringing the State Back In*. New York: Cambridge University Press, ch. 5.

Abramson, Scott. 2016. "The Economic Origins of the Territorial State." *International Organization*, forthcoming.

Milgrom, Paul, Douglass North and Barry Weingast. 1990. "The Role of Institutions in the Revival of Trade: the Law Merchant, Private Judges, and the Champagne Fairs." *Economics and Politics*, 2: 1–23.

Olson, Mancur. 1993. "Dictatorship, Democracy and Development." *American Political Science Review*, 87 Sept.: 567–76.

De la Sierra, Raul Sanchez. 2015. "On the Origins of States: Stationary Bandits and Taxation in Eastern Congo." Working Paper.

Week Four, October 17: Democracy and its origins (Golden/Treisman)

Readings:

Acemoglu, Daron and James A. Robinson. 2006. *Economic Origins of Dictatorship and Democracy*. New York: Cambridge University Press, chs. 2 and 6.

Bates, Robert H. and Lien, Da-Hsiang Donald. "A Note on Taxation, Development, and Representative Government," *Politics & Society*, 1987.

Geddes, Barbara. 2007. "What Causes Democratization?" In Carles Boix and Susan C. Stokes, eds., *The Oxford Handbook of Comparative Politics*. New York: Oxford University Press, ch. 14.

Przeworski, Adam. 2009. "Self-Government in Our Times," *Annual Review of Political Science*, 12: 71–92.

Boix, Carles and Stokes, Susan. "Endogenous Democratization," *World Politics*, 55(4): July 2003, 517–49.

Week Five, October 24: Authoritarian regimes and partial democracies (Blair/Golden)

Readings:

Magaloni, Beatriz. 2006. *Voting for Autocracy: Hegemonic Party Survival and its Demise in Mexico*. New York: Cambridge University Press: introduction and ch. 1.

Wintrobe, Robert. 2007. "Dictatorship: Analytical Approaches." In Carles Boix and Susan Stokes, eds., *Oxford Handbook of Comparative Politics*. New York: Oxford University Press, ch. 16.

Boix, Carles and Milan W. Svobik. 2013. "The Foundations of Limited Authoritarian Government: Institutions, Commitment, and Power-Sharing in Dictatorships." *Journal of Politics*, 75(2): 300–16.

Way, Lucan, and Steven Levitsky. 2002. "The rise of competitive authoritarianism." *Journal of*

democracy, 13(2): 51–65.

Gandhi, Jennifer, and Adam Przeworski. 2007. “Authoritarian institutions and the survival of autocrats.” *Comparative Political Studies* 40(11): 1279–1301.

Week Six, October 31: Inequality (Golden/Treisman)

Readings:

Scheve, Kenneth, and David Stasavage. 2009. “Institutions, partisanship, and inequality in the long run.” *World Politics* 61(2): 215–53.

Rogowski R. and McRae D. 2008. “Inequality and institutions: what theory, history and (some) data tell us.” In *Democracy, Inequality and Representation*, ed. P. Beramendi and C.J. Anderson. New York: Russell Sage Foundation.

Alvaredo, Facundo, Anthony B. Atkinson, Thomas Piketty, and Emmanuel Saez. 2013. “The Top 1 Percent in International and Historical Perspective.” *Journal of Economic Perspectives* 27(3): 3–20.

Ansell, Ben and David Samuels. 2010. “Inequality and democratization: A contractarian approach.” *Comparative Political Studies* 43(12): 1543–74.

Week Seven, November 7: Ethnic Politics (Blair/Golden)

Readings:

Chandra, Kanchan. 2006. “What is ethnic identity and does it matter?” *Annu. Rev. Polit. Sci.*, 9, pp. 397–424.

Anderson, Benedict. *Imagined communities: Reflections on the origin and spread of nationalism*. Verso Books, 2006. 1–65.

Habyarimana, James, Macartan Humphreys, Daniel N. Posner, and Jeremy M. Weinstein. 2007. “Why does ethnic diversity undermine public goods provision?” *American Political Science Review* 101(4): 709–25.

Bates, Robert. 1973. “Modernization, Ethnic Competition and the Rationality of Politics in Contemporary Africa.” In Donald S. Rothchild and Victor A. Olorunsola, eds. *State versus Ethnic Claims: African Policy Dilemmas*. Boulder, CO: Westview Press: 152–71.

Fearon, James D., and David D. Laitin. “Explaining interethnic cooperation.” *American political science review* 90, no. 4 (1996): 715–35.

Week Eight, November 14: Civil wars (Blair/Treisman)

Readings:

Collier, Paul and Anke Hoeffler. 1998. “On Economic Causes of Civil War.” *Oxford Economic Papers* 50: 563–73.

Fearon , James D. and David D. Laitin. 2003. “Ethnicity, Insurgency, and Civil War.” *American Political Science Review*, 97(1): 75–90.

Blattman, Christopher and Edward Miguel. 2010. “Civil War.” *Journal of Economic Literature*, 48(1): 3–57.

Weinstein, Jeremy M. *Inside rebellion: The politics of insurgent violence*. Cambridge University Press, 2006, ch. 1, pp. 27–60.

Kalyvas, Stathis N. *The logic of violence in civil war*. (2006), chs. 5 and 6.

Kalyvas, Stathis N. “New and old civil wars.” *World Politics*, 54, no. 1 (2001): 99–118.

Lyall, Jason. “Does indiscriminate violence incite insurgent attacks? Evidence from Chechnya.” *Journal of Conflict Resolution* (2009).

Week Nine, November 21: Political violence (Blair/Golden)

Readings:

Collier, Paul, and Pedro C. Vicente. “Violence, bribery, and fraud: the political economy of elections in Sub-Saharan Africa.” *Public Choice* 153, no. 1–2 (2012): 117–47.

Valentino, Benjamin A. “Why we kill: The political science of political violence against civilians.” *Annual Review of Political Science*, 17 (2014): 89–103.

Davenport, Christian. “State repression and political order.” *Annu. Rev. Polit. Sci.*, 10 (2007): 1–23.

Marten, Kimberly. “Warlordism in Comparative Perspective,” *International Security* 31, no. 3 (Winter 2006/7): 41–73

Week Ten, November 28: Social movements, protest, and riots (Golden/Treisman)

Readings:

Kuran, Timur. 1991. “Now Out of Never: The Element of Surprise in the East European Revolution of 1989.” *World Politics* 44(1): 7–48.

Chenoweth, Erika and Maria Stephan. 2008. “Why Civil Resistance Works: The Strategic Logic of Nonviolence.” *International Security* 33(1): 7–44.

Wilkinson, Steven. 2009. “Riots.” *Annual Review of Political Science*, 12: 329–43.

Chenoweth, Erika and Jay Ulfelder. 2015. “Can Structural Conditions Explain the Onset of Nonviolent Uprisings?” *Journal of Conflict Resolution*.

Take-home final examination to be scheduled for exam week