Implicit in the phrase “comparative government/politics” is the assumption that not only is one studying politics, but one is doing so in a particular manner, namely, by comparing. The point therefore, is not just to study the subject matter that comprises “politics” (or even “government”) but also to reflect on the manner in which one goes about doing so. This course will therefore involve as much reflection on ontological or meta-theoretical questions (what models of human behavior are assumed in explanations, and why? Are humans ‘rational,’ if so, in what sense; in other words how does one define rationality? What is culture, and how does it explain behavior, if it does so at all? How are cultural explanations different from other kinds of explanations? Do human beings make ‘choices’? If so, in what sense; and how constrained are these choices? Finally, what does it mean to ‘explain’ in political science or the other social sciences, for that matter?), as about the immediate subject matter of politics, broadly defined (state formation, democratization, nationalism, economic development, revolutions and civil wars). Indeed, I believe that we’ll quickly discover that the first set of questions is intimately related to the second set of topics and issues: in fact, one’s positions on the former imply certain answers to questions asked about the latter. Conversely answers to questions asked about the second set presume/imply positions on the first set of questions. In the course of the semester you should self-consciously try to approach the subject matter through the various meta-theoretical lenses mentioned, though the readings will often explicitly note this.

The first half of the course will mostly be taken up with an examination—though not exhaustive—of various topics traditionally falling within the domain of ‘Comparative Politics/Government.’ In the second half, (some) topical readings will be paired with more theoretical and abstract pieces that address the various metatheoretical issues alluded to above. Given the scope of the class, certain topics traditionally within the ambit of comparative politics, such as legislative institutions and electoral systems, may not be covered this semester. Even among the topics covered, what you read will be less than the proverbial tip of the iceberg (indeed, each week could be easily expanded into a whole semester-long class to do the topics a modicum of justice). Therefore I encourage you to further explore the topics that pique your interest. I will be happy to direct you to further readings or classes. Thus, note finally, that the point here is not an exhaustive coverage of each and every issue mentioned above—an improbable task, to put it very mildly—but the provision of a set of intellectual ‘orientation devices’—for lack of a better word/phrase—with which to approach the study of politics, and other social sciences, for that matter.
Course Requirements

- **Participation, and comments on research proposal drafts (20% of the grade):** This course is a discussion seminar. As part of discussion, I will make an effort to contextualize the various works and offer readings of obscure passages. Nevertheless, the purpose of the seminar is to encourage you to engage these texts independently. Your thoughtful and well-prepared participation in class discussions will be decisive in whether or not the course is a success for you. If you are not keeping up with the readings, which are of necessity heavy, you will neither enjoy the course, nor benefit from it (it goes without saying—but I’ll mention it—that all this presumes that the readings are completed **before class** each week). Therefore, to further facilitate or even incentivize keeping up with the readings, I’ll require paper writers to circulate their papers by email to the entire class (including me), and for the class to come prepared to discuss questions raised in the paper(s). Each person, who writes a weekly response will summarize their arguments.

  You will also comment on the preliminary drafts of each other’s research proposals. Specifically, each of you will receive two sets of comments, and in turn will comment on two proposals. For more information see the last item on this list. **The draft proposals will be circulated on April 1, and comments will be due on April 8.**

- **8 short papers addressing a particular week’s readings (40% of the grade):** The papers should be about 3 pages in length, double-spaced (around 750 words). The purpose of these papers is to 1) delve deeper into the structure of the individual arguments 2) draw connections across the several arguments that you encounter and 2) formulate a critical reaction to them. You may want to delineate and adjudicate a dispute between two authors, or analyze a particular argument in light of others, or relate one or more of the week’s readings to earlier ones. You are encouraged to discuss your ideas for these papers with the instructors either by making an appointment or on e-mail. Please bear in mind that your task is to produce an argument of your own, and in this task summary of others’ arguments is a means to an end, not an end in itself. You may choose the sessions for which you would like to write a paper, but please try to space the papers throughout the semester rather than leaving them for the end. **All papers are due by 4:00 pm the day before class by email.**

- **Research Proposal (40%):** This proposal will be between 2500 and 3000 words on a topic of your choice. The research proposal will generally consist of the following components:
  
  - A statement of the research question, which addresses the following questions: (1) why is the question important, given the present state of knowledge? (2) How does the question fit into current conversations/arguments; if it does not, why should the question be included?
  - A literature review, which succinctly summarizes what, if anything, has been written about the question, and what have been some of the approaches to answering it (if any). The review should also point out—if possible—some of the shortcomings of the extant ways of either looking at/conceptualizing and/or answering the question.
  - A summary of the alternative argument that explains how it improves on or adds to the existing debate. Remember that this does not have to be the “final” argument; it can be an interesting alternative argument that illuminates a new aspect of the question or makes one think differently about it (of course you will have to say why it should be “interesting”).
  - A description of how the project will be completed, which addresses the following questions: (1) what kind of evidence will be advanced to support the argument (for instance, will there be a case study, or some kind of comparative study)? (2) Why is such evidence appropriate for the question asked? (3) How will such evidence be collected?
The proposal will be judged by the following criteria:

- Does it contain the components enumerated above? If not, is there a good reason not to include all of them?
- Is the question clear? Is it precisely stated?
- Is the project realistically achievable, say as a part of a senior, or master’s (even doctoral) thesis?
- Is the writing clear and coherent? Are all the works properly cited?

Again, **the draft proposals will be circulated on April 9, and comments will be due on April 18. The final research proposal will be due on the 9th of May.**

**Comparative Politics Field Exam**

**In addition to this course** MA students are also required to take a field exam in comparative government, which I shall be administering. This course should help you to prepare for the field exam, by among other things, leading you to additional readings and sources. This exam can be given at the end of the semester. I will email exam-takers questions, the answers to which should be emailed back to me within a week. If for any reason you cannot take the exam during the designated time period, please let me know, and I shall try to make alternative arrangements. **Again, this exam is separate from (the assignments of) this particular course (it is a requirement for the M.A. degree).**

**Readings**

The following books will be used in the seminar. You need not buy all of them, though I strongly recommend buying the starred ones. All other readings should be available either though online databases such as Jstor (it’s your responsibility to find them; you have on-campus access to databases, or if off-campus, through a proxy server), or though electronic course reserves. We can discuss other ways of making readings available, such as placing books on the library reserve etc, in class.

- Clifford Geertz, *The Interpretation of Cultures* (Basic Books, 1977)*
- Jon Elster, *Nuts and Bolts for the Social Sciences* (Cambridge)
- Theda Skocpol, *States and Social Revolutions* (Cambridge, 1979)*

**Suggestions on effective reading**

Graduate students should self-consciously guard against the dangers of passive reading, where one seemingly glances at, or even reads, the words on a page without actually making sense of the information gleaned, or being able to recall arguments and one’s reactions to them. Given the amount of reading we will do in this course, I recommend spacing out
the readings in reasonable increments. Thoughtful reading takes time and energy. It is less taxing and more productive to read over several days than to compress all the reading into a couple of nights.

Next, think about what you are reading during the process; if you find yourself turning pages numbly, take a break, and then refocus on the author’s chain of thought. When reading, look for the author’s argument and the evidence she uses to support it: What is the main claim she makes? With whom is she disagreeing? Then consider your reactions to the author’s work: Does this make sense to you? Why or why not? What are the weaknesses of the argument? Write down thoughts you want to raise in class. Use highlighters only as a supplemental tool. Write your reactions to the text in the margins. Then archive your notes, such as by keeping a log on your computer or notebook—a useful way for returning to the information later when you are preparing for comps or composing a thesis prospectus. At some point after you have read, taken notes, organized them, and set them aside, see if you can summarize the author’s argument in a few sentences. You may then want to take five minutes and write down this summary, particularly if you are reading several different texts in a given week. Remember that the goal of close reading is not just to have touched the pages, but to be able to say something about the material and evaluate it.

Some further tips (involves restatements of some of the things mentioned above):

1. You may want to look at short reviews of books published in scholarly journals prior to reading the actual book. This might help you in quickly getting to the fundamental arguments of the book.

2. Use diagrams to map out arguments, if necessary.

3. You may want to form discussion groups to collectively go over the readings. In graduate school, learning from each other outside class is often as important as (learning from) class discussions.

4. You may also want to use a reading worksheet. Such a worksheet should consist of short answers—often a sentence or three—to the following questions: (a) what is the central question the reading addresses? (b) What is the central argument(s) defended in the paper in response to this question? (c) 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? (d) Do you find the claims of the reading convincing? What do you see as the main gaps that need to be filled? (e) Do you agree with the main claims? What are your hesitations? (This may simply involve restatement of previous points.) (f) Identify one or two implicit premises or background assumptions in the paper that you think are especially controversial or objectionable. (g) 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.).

Professional Forums and Journals

The principal professional forms of interest to comparative political scientists include: the American Political Science Association (APSA) (www.apsanet.org); the Midwest Political Science Association, which meets in the Spring (http://www.indiana.edu/~mpsa/); the International Studies Association (http://www.isanet.org) as well as regional conferences; the Summer Methods conference (http://web.polmeth.ufl.edu/conferences.html); as well as the several
conferences organized around regions or topics of interest (e.g. Association of Asian Studies (http://www.aasianst.org/); American Association for the Advancement of Slavic Studies (http://www.fas.harvard.edu/~aaass); African Studies Association  http://www.africanstudies.org/); Council for European Studies http://www.europenet.org/frames/overall.html) etc. It would be a good idea to find out about these associations from faculty in your area of interest and think of attending and presenting papers at their annual conferences.

The standard professional journals/newsletters of interest to comparative political scientists include: Comparative Politics, World Politics, APSA-CP (the newsletter of the Comparative Politics Section of the American Political Science Association), the American Political Science Review, Comparative Political Studies, Politics and Society, Journal of Democracy, and several multidisciplinary journals that focus on regions or topics of interest, such as East European Politics and Societies; Asian Survey; Journal of Asian Studies; Journal of Latin American Studies etc. You are encouraged to keep up with research in the journals of interest to you.

All students are expected to the uphold the standards of academic honesty as stipulated by the university Student Conduct Code.

Note: This syllabus—especially the parts on effective reading—has borrowed from syllabi of courses taught by Jason Brownlee at the University of Texas, Kurt Weyland at the University of Texas, and previous courses taught at MIT by David Woodruff and Kanchan Chandra.

Disability Services

The University of Montana assures equal access to instruction by supporting collaboration between students with disabilities, instructors, and Disability Services for Students. If you have a disability that requires an accommodation, contact either of us at the beginning of the semester so that proper accommodations can be provided. Please contact Disability Services for Students if you have questions, or call Disability Services for Students (DSS) for voice/text at 406.243.2243. You may also fax the Lommasson Center 154 for more information at 406.243.5330.
Schedule of Classes (May be subject to minor changes)

Week 1, January 15: Overview of the field and the class
No Readings

Week 2, January 22: On explanations of human behavior, and the methods and subject matter of Comparative Politics

- Stanley Leiberson, Small Ns and Big Conclusions: an Examination of the Reasoning in Comparative Studies Based on a Small Number of Cases,” *Social Forces*, 70:2 (December 1991)
- Douglas Dion, “Evidence and Inference in the Comparative Case Study,” *Comparative Politics* 30 (January 1998): 127-146

Week 3, January 29: On (one kind of) Social Order: The State (as a concept first)


Week 4, February 5: On the origins of the state: theoretical explanations and empirical investigations
• Charles Tilly, *Coercion, Capital and European States* (Blackwell, 1992), chapters 1-4

**Week 5, February 12:** *From States to Regimes: Conceptual Issues*

• Joseph Schumpeter, *Capitalism, Socialism, and Democracy* (Harper, 1942), Part IV, pp. 240-296

**Week 6, February 19:** *Origins of regimes/democratization, Modernization Theory and (some) evidence*

• Sheri Berman, “Civil Society and the Collapse of the Weimar Republic,” *World Politics* 49 (April 1997), pp. 401-429

**Week 7, February 26:** *Continued*

• Carles Boix, *Democracy and Redistribution* (Cambridge, 2003), pp. 1-59

**Week 8, March 4: The state in crisis: revolutions**

• Theda Skocpol, *States and Social Revolutions* (Cambridge, 1979), pp.3-161
• Jeff Goodwin. Why We Were Surprised (Again) by the Arab Spring. Swiss Political Science Review 17:4 (December 2011), pp. 452-456

**Week 9, March 11: The State in Crisis: civil wars and ethnic conflict**

• Stathis N. Kalyvas, “Civil Wars,” in Boix & Stokes: *The Oxford Handbook of Comparative Politics*

**Spring Break, March 16-20**

**Week 10, March 25: Nationalism**
• Ernst Gellner, *Nations and Nationalism* (Cornell, 1983), 1-62
• Benedict Anderson, *Imagined Communities* (Verso, 1983), 1-65
• Eric Hobsbawm, *Nations and Nationalism* (Cambridge, 1989), 46-130

**OR**

*Political Parties, and Elections*

• Herbert Kitschelt “Party Systems,” in *The Oxford Handbook of Political Science*, Robert Goodin (ed)

**Week 11, April 1: The State, the market (among other institutions) and economic development**

• Karl Polanyi, *The Great Transformation* (Beacon, 1944), pp. 43-85
• Vivek Chibber, Locked in Place: State Building and Late Industrialization in India (Princeton, 2003) pp.1-49

**Week 12, April 8: Institutions, markets, and economic development; or is it culture?**


**Week 13, April 15:** *Meta)theoretical reflections; on the various ways of explaining human behavior: rationality, the individual and the collective.*


• Jon Elster, “Rational Choice History: A Case of Excessive Ambition,” *The American Political Science Review* 94:3 (2000), pp. 691-695 (note that you’re not required to read the entire article; just these 5 pages)


**Week 14, April 22:** *More on rationality. And culture*

• Marc Howard Ross, “Culture and Identity in Comparative Political Analysis,” in Mark Lichbach and Alan Zuckerman, *Comparative Politics, Rationality, Culture, and Structure* (Cambridge, 1997)


• Mark Lichbach, “Social Theory and Comparative Politics,” in Lichbach and Zuckerman (eds)

• Clifford Geertz, *Interpretation of Cultures*, pp. 1-54 (and chapter 15, recommended)


Week 15, April 29 (mostly to be decided; below are some suggestions):

• Alisdair McIntyre, “Is a Science of Comparative Politics Possible,” in Allan Ryan (ed), The Philosophy of Social Explanation
• Charles Taylor, “Interpretation and the Science of Man,” in Fred Dallmayr and Thomas McCarthy, eds, Understanding and Social Inquiry
• Alan S. Zuckerman, “Reformulating Explanatory Standards and Advancing Theory in Comparative Politics,” in Lichbach and Zuckerman (eds)

Research proposal due, by email by May 1st (5 pm)