

Introduction to the Theory and Practice of Politics Political Analysis in Empirical Politics

Academic Year 2023-24

Course providers

(Theory) Daniel Butt, Balliol: daniel.butt@balliol.ox.ac.uk

(Practice) Nicholas Dickinson, Balliol: nicholas.dickinson@balliol.ox.ac.uk

(Political Analysis) Spyros Kosmidis, DPIR: spyros.kosmidis@politics.ox.ac.uk

IMPORTANT:

Section A (Theory) was substantially revised for 2015/16; Section B (Practice) was first taught and examined in its current form in 2014/15. Examination papers set before 2015 are not a good guide to the format of the First Public Examination.

Past examination papers are available online.

(1) Introduction to the Theory and Practice of Politics is composed of:

Section A (The Theory of Politics)

Section B (The Practice of Politics)

The two sections are taught through departmentally-provided lectures, delivered during Michaelmas and Hilary Terms, and college-provided tutorials and classes. They are examined together in the First Public Examination for PPE. **Political Analysis** provides an introduction to the methodology of empirical political analysis. It is taught in Hilary Term through 8 departmentally-provided lectures and 4 workshops, and is assessed by a 2000-word essay.

Examination Regulations 2023-24

(a) The Theory of Politics

Questions will be set on the following topics: (i) the nature and the grounds of rights; (ii) the nature and grounds of democracy; (iii) the role of civil society; (iv) power in the democratic state; (v) the nature and grounds of liberty; (vi) state paternalism; and (vii) free speech. Questions will also be set on the following texts: (i) John Locke, Second Treatise on Government; (ii) Jean-Jacques Rousseau, Social Contract; (iii) Alexis de Toqueville, Democracy in America; (iv) Karl Marx and Friedrich Engels, The Communist Manifesto; (v) John Stuart Mill, On Liberty.

(b) The Practice of Politics

Questions will be set on the following topics: (i) regime types; definition and measurement of variations between types of democracy; (ii) political institutions and practice outside the advanced industrial democracies; stability, state capacity and state formation; (iii) the state and its institutions (executives, legislatures, parties and party systems, electoral systems, courts, constitutions and centreperiphery relations); (iv) parties and party systems; political values and identity politics.

(It has come to our attention that there are three missing topics – revolutions or social movements, or democratic peace, and they will be added to the Regulations. In the meantime, tutors should continue to treat these topics as integral parts of the syllabus.)

SECTION A: THE THEORY OF POLITICS

Lectures: Monday at 10 am, exam schools - Please see the termly lecture lists for the most up-to-date schedules.

NEW FOR 2022-2023 – PLEASE NOTE THAT THE READINGS AND ESSAY QUESTIONS ON POWER AND THE DEMOCRATIC STATE IN SECTION 4.2 (POWER: RACE, EMPIRE, AND POLITICAL THEORY) HAVE REPLACED THE PREVIOUS SECTION 4.2 (POWER: WHO RULES?)

Aims and objectives:

Section A aims to familiarise students with major approaches to and issues in understanding political theory. Specifically, students will be encouraged:

1. to acquire knowledge and understanding of the basic concepts which inform theoretical and empirical discussion of politics, such as 'rights', 'democracy', 'power' and 'liberty';
2. to acquire knowledge and understanding of at least some of the core normative issues which concern democratic politics, such as the legitimate scope of state authority, the desirability of democracy, and the role of civil society;
3. to acquire knowledge and understanding of major theoretical frameworks used to understand the distribution and exercise of power in a state, including Marxist and pluralist approaches;
4. to acquire knowledge and understanding of, and to critically assess, the work of selected major political thinkers who have addressed major theoretical issues concerning democratic government;

Through a combination of lectures, classes and tutorials, students will acquire a basic grounding in all of these topics, though there will be considerable flexibility as to which topics students, in consultation with their tutors, elect to concentrate on in preparation for the Prelim exam.

Structure

The syllabus for Section A is organized into seven major topics. Questions will be asked on each of these topics in the Prelims exam. In addition questions will be asked on certain texts (Locke: *Second Treatise on Government* Rousseau, *Social Contract*, Tocqueville, *Democracy in America*, Mill, *On Liberty*, and Marx *The Communist Manifesto*): these are referred to as basic texts. The basic texts have a clear relationship to the major topics, and students are encouraged to study texts and topics in conjunction, e.g., a student might spend 1 or 2 tutorials on *The Social Contract* and 1 or 2 tutorials on the nature and grounds of democracy. But the texts may also be studied in their own right, and questions on the texts in the exam may invite students to discuss any significant question raised by the texts. Thorough exploration of a given topic or basic text may reasonably take up more than one class or tutorial. It is necessary, therefore, for tutors to exercise a degree of selectivity in the topics and texts they teach. They can do so, however, assured that no topic or basic text will go uncovered in the Prelim exam.

PRELIMINARY READING

These readings are divided into two sections. Section A provides some general textbook introductions to the field. Section B readings raise questions about the nature of political theory and the “canon” in the history of political thought. Both should be useful both prior to and alongside the course as a whole.

Section A

Catriona McKinnon, Robert Jubb, and Patrick Tomlin (eds.), *Issues in Political Theory* (4th edition, 2019)

Adam Swift, *Political Philosophy” A Beginners’ Guide for Students and Politicians* (4th edition, 2019)

Jonathan Wolff, *An Introduction to Political Philosophy* (3rd edition, 2015)

Section B

Charles Mills, *The Racial Contract*, Introduction (1997)

Linda Zerilli, 'Feminist Theory and the Canon of Political Thought', in Dryzek, Honig, and Phillips, *The Oxford Handbook of Political Theory* (2008)

Fred Dallmayr, 'Beyond Monologue: For a Comparative Political Theory', *Perspectives on Politics* 2 (2004), 249-57. bell hooks, 'Theory as Liberatory Practice', *Yale Journal of Law and Feminism* 1 (1991).

Penny A. Weiss, *Canon Fodder: Historical Women Political Thinkers*, Ch 1: 'The Politics of the Canon: Gatekeepers or Gatecrashers' (2009)

TUTORIAL TOPICS

*** indicates a basic text.

* indicates a reading that is particularly recommended.

1. THE NATURE AND GROUNDS OF RIGHTS:

1.1 ASSOCIATED BASIC TEXT: LOCKE’S SECOND TREATISE ON GOVERNMENT

Core Reading:

*** Locke, John, *Second Treatise of Government* **Further**

Primary Reading:

Locke, John, *First Treatise of Government*

'The Constitutions of Carolina' in John Locke, *Political Essays*, ed. M. Goldie (1997)

A Letter Concerning Toleration [1689], ed. J.H. Tully, trans. W. Popple (Indianapolis, 1983), or ed. R. Klibansky, trans. J.W. Gough (Oxford, 1968).

Secondary Reading:

* Goldie, M., 'Introduction' to *John Locke, Two Treatises of Government* (London: Dent, 1993).

* Armitage, D., 'John Locke, Carolina and the Two treatises of government', *Political Theory* 32 (2004).

Bernasconi, Robert, and Anika Maaza Mann. "The contradictions of racism: Locke, slavery, and the two treatises", In Andrew Valls (ed.), *Race and Racism in Modern Philosophy*. Cornell University Press (2005).

* Dunn, John, *Locke: A Very Short Introduction* (Oxford, 2003 [1984]).

Dunn, John, *The Political Thought of John Locke*, (1969)
 Ashcraft, Richard, *Locke's Two Treatises of Government* (1987), Esp. Chs. 5 – 8
 Farr, James. "Locke, natural law, and new world slavery" *Political Theory* 36.4 (2008): 495-522.
 Grant, Ruth, *John Locke's Liberalism: A Study of Political Thought in its Intellectual Setting*, (1987) *
 Hirschmann, Nancy J., and Kirstie M. McClure, eds. *Feminist Interpretations of John Locke* (2010).
 * Simmons, A. J, *The Lockean Theory of Rights*, (1992)
 * Tully, James, *A Discourse on Property, John Locke and his adversaries*, (1980)
 Tully, James, *An Approach to Political Philosophy: Locke in Contexts*, (1993)
 Laslett, Peter ed. *John Locke: Two Treatises of Government* (1988), Introduction
 Waldron, Jeremy, *God, Locke, and Equality: Christian Foundations of John Locke's Political Thought* (2002)
 Broad, Jacqueline. 'Mary Astell on Marriage and Lockean Slavery'. *History of Political Thought*, vol. 35, no. 4, Jan. 2014, pp. 717–38.

Essays

- Why, according to Locke, is consent necessary for state legitimacy?
- Can individuals gain exclusive property rights by mixing labour with unowned goods?

1.2 RIGHTS

Core Reading:

* Dworkin, Ronald, 'Taking rights seriously' in his *Taking Rights Seriously* (1978) and 'Rights as trumps' in J. Waldron ed., *Theories of Rights* (1984)
 Feinberg, Joel, 'The Nature and Value of Rights', *The Journal of Value Inquiry* 4 no. 4 (1970), pp. 243-260 reprinted in his *Justice and the Bounds of Liberty* (1980)
 * Kamm, Frances, 'Rights', in Jules L. Coleman, Kenneth Einar Himma, and Scott J. Shapiro (eds.), *The Oxford Handbook of Jurisprudence and Philosophy of Law* (2002).
 Waldron, Jeremy, *The Right to Private Property* (1988)

Further Reading:

Finnis, John, *Natural Law and Natural Rights* (1980) ch 8.
 Freedman, Michael, *Rights* (1991)
 * Jones, Peter, *Rights* (1994)
 Moyn, S., *The Last Utopia: Human Rights in History* (Harvard, 2010).
 O'Neill, Onora, 'The Dark Side of Human Rights'. *International Affairs* 81.2 (2005):427–439
 * Raz, Joseph, *The Morality of Freedom* (1986) ch. 7.
 Shue, Henry, *Basic Rights* (1980)
 * Waldron, Jeremy, 'Rights in Conflict', *Ethics* 99 no. 3 (1989), pp. 503-519.
 Waldron, Jeremy, 'Rights' in R. Goodin and P. Pettit (eds.), *A Companion to Contemporary Political Philosophy* (1995)
 Wenar, Leif, 'The Nature of Rights', *Philosophy and Public Affairs* 33 no. 3, pp. 223-253

Essays

- Can rights conflict?
- Can states legitimately violate the rights of their citizens?

2. THE NATURE AND GROUNDS OF DEMOCRACY

2.1 ASSOCIATED BASIC TEXT: ROUSSEAU'S THE SOCIAL CONTRACT

Core Reading:

*** Rousseau, Jean-Jacques, *The Social Contract*, 1762, especially Book 1, chapters 6-8, Book 2, Book 3, chapters 10-18, Book 4 (for example, the Oxford Classics edition, edited by C. Betts, 1994, or the Penguin edition edited by M. Cranston, 1968).

Further Primary Reading:

Rousseau, J-J, 'Discourse on the origins of inequality among men' [1755] (also known as 'The Second Discourse') in *Rousseau: The Discourses and Other Early Political Writings* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1997).

Rousseau, Jean-Jacques, 'Discourse on Political Economy', 1754 (for example in Betts, ed., *The Social Contract*, 1994).

Rousseau, J-J, *Emile, or, On Education* (multiple editions). [This is Rousseau's short novel, published in the months after *The Social Contract*. Again, it gives you key insights into how he thought a young person should be raised in his ideal society. It will also give you critical purchase on the limitations of his case, and a perspective on who his texts were written for, and who they ignored.]

Further Secondary Reading:

* Bertram, Christopher, *Rousseau and the Social Contract* (2003) [available online via SOLO]
Claussen, J., *Fugitive Rousseau: Slavery, Primitivism, and Political Freedom* (Fordham, 2014)
<https://www.jstor.org/stable/j.ctt13x0d70>

Cobban, Alfred, *Rousseau and the Modern State* (2nd ed.), (1970), especially chapters 1-3.

* Cohen, Joshua, *Rousseau: A Community of Equals* (2010) [available online via SOLO] Mills, Charles, 'Rousseau, the Master's Tools, and Anti-Contractarian Contractarianism', *The CLR James Journal*, 15/1 (2009).

* Okin, Susan, *Women in Western Political Thought* (Princeton, 2013), Part III, Chs 5-8.

Rawls, John *Lectures on the History of Political Philosophy* (2007), 1st lecture on Rousseau

Schwartzberg, Melissa, 'Voting the General Will: Rousseau on Decision Rules' *Political Theory* 36/3 (2008).

Spector, Céline, *Rousseau* (2019).

Waldron, Jeremy, 'Rights and Majorities: Rousseau Revisited', in Waldron, J., *Liberal rights: collected papers, 1981-1991*, (1993).

Weiss, Penny A. "Rousseau, Antifeminism, and Woman's Nature." *Political Theory* 15.1 (1987): 81-98.

Wokler, Robert, *Rousseau and Liberty*, (1995), chapters by Mason, Wokler, Cranston, Crocker and Hampsher-Monk.

Wolff, Jonathan, *An Introduction to Political Philosophy*, (1996), chapter 3.

Two useful podcasts are the BBC Radio 4 'In Our Time' episode on The Social Contract and Professor Lane's 'Philosophy Bites' podcast on Rousseau and Civilisation:

<https://www.bbc.co.uk/programmes/b008w3xm> <http://philosophybites.com/2008/07/melissa-lane-on.html>

Essays:

- What problem is Rousseau seeking to solve in The Social Contract? To what extent does his proposal succeed in addressing this problem?
- In what senses are individual citizens in Rousseau's state 'free'?

2.2 DEMOCRACY: WHAT IS IT? IS IT DESIRABLE? Core Reading:

- * Cohen, Joshua, 'Deliberative Democracy', in Hamlin, Alan P. and Pettit, Philip, *The Good polity: normative analysis of the state*, (1989).
- * Estlund, David, *Democracy* (ed.) (2002) (esp essays by Waldron, Cohen, Estlund, Miller, and Young).
- * Schumpeter, Joseph, 'Two Concepts of Democracy', in Anthony Quinton, ed., *Political Philosophy*, 1985. or in *Capitalism, Socialism and Democracy* (1943) new ed (1996) chs XXI and XXII * Young, Iris Marion, *Inclusion and Democracy* (2000), chapter 1.

Further Reading

- * Barry, Brian, 'Is Democracy Special?', in Barry, B., *Democracy and Power: Essays in Political Theory Vol 1* (1989).
- Dahl, Robert, *On Democracy*, (1998), Parts I-III.
- * Fishkin, James S., *Democracy and Deliberation: New Directions for Democratic Reform*, (1991), chapters 1-6, 8.
- * Held, David, *Models of Democracy* (2nd edn), (1996), chapters 1-6.
- Landemore, Hélène, 'Deliberative democracy as open, not (just) representative democracy', *Daedalus* 146.3 (2017): 51-63.
- Mill, John Stuart, *On Representative Government* (for example, in the Everyman edition of John Stuart Mill, *Utilitarianism*, edited by H. Acton, 1972).
- * Rousseau, Jean-Jacques, *The Social Contract*, 1762, especially Book 1, chapters 6-8, Book 2, Book 3, chapters 10-18, Book 4 (for example, the Oxford Classics edition, edited by C. Betts, 1994, or the Penguin edition edited by M. Cranston, 1968).
- * Sanders, Lynn M., 'Against Deliberation', *Political Theory* 25.3 (1997): 347-376.
- Swift, Adam, *Political Philosophy: A Beginners' Guide for Students and Politicians* 3rd edition (2013)

Essays:

- Does a commitment to democracy require accepting the decisions of the majority regardless of the content of that decision?
- Is democracy necessary for liberty?
- How defensible is deliberative democracy?

3. THE ROLE OF CIVIL SOCIETY

3.1 ASSOCIATED BASIC TEXT: TOCQUEVILLE'S DEMOCRACY IN AMERICA

Basic reading:

Alexis de Tocqueville, *Democracy in America*,

Volume 1: Author's Introduction; Part 1, chapters 3-5; Part 2, chapters 1-9

Volume 2: Part 1, Ch 7 and 15-17; Part 2, chapters 1-13; Part 3, Ch 8 – 13, 21; Part 4, chapters 1-8.

Further Primary Reading:

de Tocqueville, 'The Social and Political Condition of France before the Revolution' in *The Ancien Regime and the Revolution* (1947).

J. S. Mill, 'Tocqueville on Democracy in America' in *Essays on Politics and Culture* Gertrude Himmelfarb (ed.) 1973 [or see here: https://oll.libertyfund.org/title/robson-the-collected-works-of-john-stuart-mill-volume-xviii-essays-on-politics-and-society-part-i#lf0223-18_head_033] A. Hamilton, J. Jay and J. Madison, *The Federalist Papers* (CUP, 2003).

Secondary Reading:

- * *The Cambridge Companion to Tocqueville*, esp essays by Villa, Richter and Gannett.
- * Pitts, Jennifer, 'Tocqueville and the Algeria Question', in Pitts, *A Turn to Empire* (Princeton NJ, 2005), ch. 7.
- * Carroll, Ross, 'The Hidden Labors of Mary Mottley, Madame de Tocqueville' *Hypatia*: <https://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/10.1111/hypa.12442>
- * Jennings, J., 'Constitutional Liberalism in France: from Benjamin Constant to Alexis de Tocqueville', in G. Stedman Jones & G. Claeys (eds), *The Cambridge History of Nineteenth-Century Political Thought* (Cambridge: 2011). [L]
[SEP]
- Okin, Susan, 'The Making of the Sentimental Family', *Philosophy and Public Affairs* 11, 65-88.
- Mathie, William. 'God, Woman, and Morality: The Democratic Family in the New Political Science of Alexis de Tocqueville'. *The Review of Politics*, vol. 57, no. 1, 1995, pp. 7–30. JSTOR.

Lively, Jack, *The Social and Political Thought of Alexis de Tocqueville*, 1965.

Siedentop, Larry, *Tocqueville*, 1994.

- * Siedentop, Larry, 'Two Liberal Traditions', in Ryan, A., ed., *The Idea of Freedom: Essays in Honour of Isaiah Berlin*, 1979.

Welch, Cheryl, *De Tocqueville*, 2001, especially chapter 2.

Essays:

- Is de Tocqueville an optimist or a pessimist about the prospects for democracy?
- What, in de Tocqueville's view, are the virtues and what are the vices of democratic government?
- What is the role of freedom in de Tocqueville's theory of democracy?

3.2 CIVIL SOCIETY Basic

reading:

Almond, Gabriel A., and Verba, Sidney, *The Civic Culture: Political Attitudes and Democracy in Five Nations*, 1965.

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

Dahl, Robert, *On Democracy*, 1998, Part IV.

- * de Tocqueville, Alexis, *Democracy in America*, Volume 1, Author's Introduction; Part 1, chapters 3-5; Part 2, chapters 6-9, Volume 2, Part 2, chapters 1-8; Part 4, chapters 1-8.

- * Deakin, Nicholas, *In Search of Civil Society*, 2001, chapters 3-4.

Gutmann, Amy, *Freedom of Association*, 1998, chapters by Gutmann, Rosenblum, Kymlicka, and Bell.

Kaviraj, Sudipta, and Khilnani, Sunil, eds., *Civil Society: History and Possibilities*, 2001, especially chapters 1, 8, 10, 12-15.

Hirst, Paul Q., *Associative Democracy: New Forms of Economic and Social Governance*, 1994. *

Putnam, Robert D., Leonardi, Robert, and Nanetti, Raffaella, *Making Democracy Work: Civic Traditions in Modern Italy*, 1993, especially chapters 3-6.

- * Putnam, Robert D., *Bowling Alone: The Collapse and Revival of American Community*, 2000, especially chapters 2-4, 8, 11-15, 21-24.

- * Rosenblum, Nancy L., *Membership and Morals: The Personal Uses of Pluralism in America*, 1998, chapters 1-3 and Conclusion.

Skocpol, Theda, 'The G.I. Bill and U.S. Social Policy, Past and Future', *Social Philosophy and Policy*, 14:(2), 1997, pp. 95-115.

* Skocpol, Theda, and Fiorina, Morris P., eds., *Civic Engagement in American Democracy*, 1999, Introduction by Skocpol and Fiorina, 'Making Sense of the Civic Engagement Debate', plus essays 'Advocates without Members: The Recent Transformation of American Civic Life', and 'Extreme Voices: The Dark Side of Civic Engagement'.

* Walzer, Michael, 'The Civil Society Argument', in Ronald Beiner, ed., *Theorizing Citizenship*, 1995.

Essays:

- Why do some political scientists think that a strong 'civil society' is essential to effective democratic government? Are they right to think so?
- In what way or ways does a vibrant associational life contribute to the health of a democratic polity?
- What is 'civic engagement'? How have political scientists attempted to explain differences across democracies and/or over time in the level and quality of civic engagement?

4. POWER IN THE DEMOCRATIC STATE

4.1 ASSOCIATED BASIC TEXT: THE COMMUNIST MANIFESTO

*** Karl Marx, *The Communist Manifesto*

Secondary Reading:

* Leopold, David, 'Karl Marx' in G. Gaus and F. D'Agostino (eds), *The Routledge Companion to Social and Political Philosophy* (2012).

Brown, Heather A., *Marx on Gender and the Family. A Critical Study* (2013).

* Stedman-Jones, Gareth, 'Introduction' to *Marx and Engels: Communist Manifesto* (Penguin, 2002).

Wolff, Jonathan, *Why read Marx today?* (Oxford, 2002).

Terrell Carver and James Farr (edited), *The Cambridge Companion to the Communist Manifesto* (Cambridge, 2015) [access online via SOLO] (Especially editors intro and essays by Leopold, Martin, Farr/Ball and Panitch.)

* Cohen, Gerald A., 'Forces and Relations of Production', in his *History, labour and freedom: themes from Marx*, 1988.

* G.A. Cohen, 'Marx's Dialectic of Labour', *Philosophy & Public Affairs*, 3/3 (1974), pp. 235-261. Marshall Berman, *Adventures in Marxism* (London, 1999) chapter 6.

* Terrell Carver and James Farr (edited), *The Cambridge Companion to the Communist Manifesto* (Cambridge, 2015).

Hal Draper, *The Adventures of the Communist Manifesto* (Almeda, 2004)

* Elster, Jon, *An Introduction to Karl Marx*, 1986. 5 Prelims 2011-12

Gareth Stedman Jones, 'Introduction' to Karl Marx and Friedrich Engels: *The Communist Manifesto* (Penguin, 2004).

Jeffrey C. Isaac (edited), *Karl Marx and Friedrich Engels: The Communist Manifesto* (Yale, 2012).

Levine, Andrew, *Engaging Political Philosophy: From Hobbes to Rawls*, 2002, chapter on Marx. Leo

Panitch and Colin Leys (edited) *Socialist Register 1998: Communist Manifesto Now* (London, 1998).

Plamenatz, John Petrov, *Man and society: a critical examination of some important social and political theories from Machiavelli to Marx*, 1966, chapter on Marx.

Robinson, Cedric J., *Black Marxism: The Making of the Black Radical Tradition* (2000).

* Wood, Allen, *Karl Marx*, 1981.

'Colonialism' in the *Stanford Encyclopaedia of Philosophy*, 'Section 4: Marxism and Leninism': <https://plato.stanford.edu/entries/colonialism/#MarLen>

Essays:

- Assess Marx's claim that the capitalist state is 'but a committee for managing the common affairs of the whole bourgeoisie'.
- Explain Marx's account of the relationship between technological and political change.
- Why should the capitalist state give way to communist society, according to Marx?
- Is Marx right to think that the state could wither away?
- Explain and evaluate Marx's theory of the 'dictatorship of the proletariat'.

4.2 POWER: RACE, EMPIRE, AND POLITICAL THEORY

Core Reading:

- * Charles Mills, *The Racial Contract*, Introduction (1997).
- * Uday Mehta, 'Liberal Strategies of Exclusion,' *Politics and Society* (1990).
- * Herman Lebovics, "John Locke, Imperialism, and the First Stage of Capitalism," in *Imperialism and the Corruption of Democracy* (2004)

Further Primary Reading:

Mill, *On Liberty* (esp. Introduction)
 Locke, *Second Treatise of Government* (esp. Chapter 5)
 Locke, "Constitutions of Carolina" (https://avalon.law.yale.edu/17th_century/nc05.asp)

Further Reading:

James Tully, "Aboriginal Property and Western Theory: Recovering a Middle Ground" (1994)
 Michael Rogin, "Liberal Society and the Indian Question" *Politics & Society* (1971)
 David Armitage, "John Locke: Theorist of Empire?" In *Empire and Modern Political Thought*, ed. Sankar Muthu (2012)
 Uday Mehta, "Progress, Civilization, and Consent," *Liberalism and Empire* (1999)
 Barbara Arneil, *John Locke and Colonialism: The Defence of English Colonialism* (1996)
 Andrew Sartori, *Liberalism in Empire* (2015), ch.1
 Hagar Kotef, "Locke's Consuming Individual: A Theory of the Mixing Body" *Theory & Event* (2022)
 Onur Ulas Ince, *Colonial Capitalism and the Dilemmas of Liberalism* (2019)
 Vine Deloria, *Custer Died for Your Sins* (1969)
 Jennifer Pitts, "James and John Stuart Mill: The Development of Imperial Liberalism in Britain," *A Turn to Empire* (2005), "Political Theory of Empire and Imperialism," *Annual Review of Political Science* (2010)
 Duncan Bell, "John Stuart Mill on the Colonies" *Political Theory* (2010)
 Inder Marwah, "Complicating Barbarism and Civilization: Mill's Complex Sociology of Human Development" *History of Political Thought* (2011)
 Dipesh Chakrabarty, "Introduction," *Provincializing Europe: Postcolonial Thought and Historical Difference* (2000)
 Edward Said "Traveling Theory Revisited" in *Reflections on Exile and Other Essays* (2000)
 Burke Hendrix, Deborah Baumold (eds), *Colonial Exchanges: Political Theory and the Agency of the Colonized* (2017)

Essays:

- John Stuart Mill's *On Liberty* is a text about general theoretical principles (e.g. the harm principle) that is also attached to particular forms of power politics (e.g. the ongoing domination of societies "in their nonage.") Why, according to Mills and/or Mehta, does this matter?
- "In the beginning, all the world was America." Discuss in relation to two of the three Core Readings (Mills, Mehta, or Lebovics).

5. THE NATURE AND GROUNDS OF LIBERTY

5.1 ASSOCIATED BASIC TEXT: MILL'S ON LIBERTY

Basic reading:

*** John Stuart Mill, *On Liberty*, 1859 (for example, the Penguin edition edited by G. Himmelfarb, 1985).

Further Primary Reading:

J.S. Mill and H.T. Mill, *The Subjection of Women*.

Secondary Sources:

The Cambridge Companion to Mill, chs 7, 8, 9, 10, 11.

K. Mantena, 'Mill and the Imperial Predicament' in *J. S. Mill's Political Thought*, ed. N. Urbinati (Cambridge, 2010).

Okin, Susan, *Women in Western Political Thought* (Princeton, 1979), chap 9.

Annas, Julia. 'Mill and the Subjection of Women'. *Philosophy*, vol. 52, no. 200, (1977), pp. 179–94.

U. S. Mehta, 'Liberal Strategies of Exclusion' *Politics and Society* 18 (1990), 427–454.

Berlin, Isaiah, 'John Stuart Mill and the Ends of Life', in Alan Ryan, ed., *Mill*, 1997, and also in Berlin, *Four Essays on Liberty*, 1969.

* Gray, John, *Mill on Liberty: A Defence* (2nd edition), 1996.

Gray, John, and Smith, G., *On Liberty in Focus*, 1991.

Gray, John, and Pelczynski, Zbigniew, eds., *Conceptions of Liberty in Political Philosophy*, 1984, chapter on Mill.

Levine, Andrew, *Engaging Political Philosophy: From Hobbes to Rawls*, 2002, chapter on Mill.

* Rees, John C., 'The Principle of Liberty', in Ryan, ed., *Mill*, 1997, and also published as 'A ReReading of Mill on Liberty', *Political Studies*, 8, 1960, pp. 113–129.

Ryan, Alan, *The Philosophy of John Stuart Mill* (2nd edition), 1998, chapter 12. Ryan, Alan, *J.S. Mill*, 1974.

Ten, C., *Mill on Liberty*, 1980

Waldron, Jeremy, 'Mill and the Value of Moral Distress', in Ryan, ed., *Mill*, 1997. Also in *Political Studies*, 35, 1987, pp. 310–423, and in Waldron, Jeremy, *Liberal Rights: Collected Papers, 1981/1991*, 1993.

Essays:

- Is Mill's harm principle a clear and plausible basis for evaluating the community's efforts to restrict individual freedom?
- How persuasive is Mill's defence of freedom of expression?
- What place does 'rationality' have in Mill's theory of liberty?
- Does Mill make a compelling case against state paternalism?
- Does Mill's celebration of individuality subvert the needs of citizenship?

5.2 THE CONCEPT OF LIBERTY

Arendt, Hannah, 'Freedom and Politics', in Miller, ed., *The Liberty Reader* (2006).

*Berlin, Isaiah, 'Two Concepts of Liberty', in Berlin, Isaiah, *Four Essays on Liberty*, 1969. Costa, Victoria, 'Is Neo-Republicanism Bad for Women?' *Hypatia*, vol. 28, no. 4, 2013, pp. 921–36. Gray, Tim, *Freedom*, 1990.

Green, T.H., 'Liberal Legislation and Freedom of Contract', in David Miller, ed., *Liberty*, 1991. * Hirschmann, Nancy J., "Toward a Feminist Theory of Freedom", in Miller, ed., *The Liberty Reader* (2006).

hooks, bell, 'Theory as Liberatory Practice' *Yale Journal of Law and Feminism* 1 (1991).

Hobbes, Thomas, *Leviathan*, chapter 21, 1651 (for example, the Penguin edition edited by C.B. MacPherson, 1968).

* MacCallum, Gerald, 'Negative and Positive Freedom', in Miller, ed., *Liberty*, 1991, also in *The Philosophical Review*, 76:3, 1967, pp. 312-334.

* Miller, David, 'Introduction', in Miller, ed., *The Liberty Reader* (2006).

Pettit, Philip, 'Republican Freedom and Contestatory Democracy', in Shapiro, Ian and HackerCordón, Casiano, eds., *Democracy's Value*, 1999.

Roberts, Neil, *Freedom as Marronage* (Chicago, 2015)

Rogers, Melvin L., 'Race, Domination, and Republicanism', in Danielle Allen and Rohini Somanathan, *Difference without Domination* (2020).

Rousseau, Jean-Jacques, *The Social Contract*, 1762, Book 1, chapters 6-8 (for example, in the Penguin edition edited by M. Cranston, 1968).

Skinner, Quentin, *Liberty Before Liberalism*, 1998, especially chapter 2.. Steiner, Hillel, 'Individual Liberty', in Miller, ed., *Liberty*, 1991.

Taylor, Charles, 'What's Wrong with Negative Liberty', in Miller, ed., *Liberty*, 1991.

Waldron, Jeremy, 'Homelessness and the issue of freedom', in Waldron, Jeremy, *Liberal Rights: Collected Papers, 1981-1991*, 1993.

Essays:

- Is there a single concept of liberty underpinning the many ways in which the term is used by political thinkers?
- Is liberty primarily about the absence of law or the authorship of law?
- How (if at all) do economic circumstances affect an individual's liberty?

6. STATE PATERNALISM:

Core Reading:

Begon, Jessica, 'Paternalism', *Analysis* 76 (2016), pp. 355-373.

* Dworkin, Gerald, 'Paternalism', in Wasserstrom, Richard A., ed., *Morality and the Law*, (1971) (on paternalism as a basis for restricting freedom). Devlin, Patrick, *The Enforcement of Morals*, (1965)

Hart, H. L. A., *Law, Liberty, and Morality* (1963)

Further Reading:

Shiffrin, Seana Valentine, 'Paternalism, unconscionability doctrine, and accommodation', *Philosophy & Public Affairs* 29 (2000), pp. 205-250.

Ten, C. L., 'Paternalism and Morality', *Ratio* 13 (1971), pp. 55-66.

Joel Feinberg, 'Legal Paternalism', *Canadian Journal of Philosophy* 1 (1971), pp. 105-24

Arneson, Richard, 'Mill versus Paternalism', *Ethics*, 90 (1980), pp. 470-89.

Husak, Douglas, 'Paternalism and autonomy', *Philosophy and Public Affairs* 10 (1981), pp.27-46

Van De Veer, Donald, *Paternalistic Intervention: The Moral Bounds of Benevolence* (1986) [Joe Soss](#), [Richard C. Fording](#), and [Sanford F. Schram](#), *Disciplining the Poor: Neoliberal Paternalism and the Persistent Power of Race* (Chicago, 2011).

Essays

- Should the state restrict people's freedom for their own good?
- Would it be wrong for citizens to disobey paternalistic laws?

7. FREE SPEECH

Core Reading:

- * Feinberg, Joel, 'Harmless Wrongdoing and Offensive Nuisances', in his *Rights, Justice, and the Bounds of Liberty: Essays in Social Philosophy*, (1980) (on offence as basis for restricting freedom).
- * MacKinnon, Catherine, *Feminism Unmodified: Discourses on Life and Law* (1987),
- * Matsuda, Mari, 'Public Response to Racist Speech: Considering the Victim's Story', *Michigan Law Review*, 78 no. 9 (1989), pp. 2320-2381

Further Reading:

- * Srinivasan, Amia and Robert Simpson, 'No Platforming' in Jennifer Lackey (ed.) *Academic Freedom* (Oxford, 2018). Available via SOLO:
<https://oxford.universitypressscholarship.com/view/10.1093/oso/9780198791508.001.0001/oso9780198791508>
- Altman, Andrew, 'Liberalism and Campus Hate Speech: A Philosophical Examination' *Ethics* 102 no. 2 (1993), pp. 302-317.
- Feinberg, Joel, *The Moral Limits of the Criminal Law: Volume 2: Offense to Others* (1988)
- Fiss, Owen M., *The Irony of Free Speech*, (1996) ch1
- * Parekh, Bhikhu, 'The Rushdie Affair: Research Agenda for Political Philosophy', 709, also in Kymlicka, Will, ed., *The Rights of Minority Cultures*, ch 14
- * Waldron, Jeremy, 'Rushdie and Religion', in his *Liberal Rights: Collected Papers, 1981 – 1991*, (1993)
- * Wolff, Jonathan, *An Introduction to Political Philosophy* ch 4
- Waldron, Jeremy, *The Harm in Hate Speech* (2012)
- Dworkin, Ronald, 'Is there a right to pornography?', *Oxford Journal of Legal Studies* 1 no. 2 (1981), pp. 177-212
- Ten, C. L., *Mill on Liberty* (1980), Ch. 8
- Baker, Edwin, *Human Liberty and Freedom of Speech* (1989)
- Lewis, Anthony, *Freedom for the Thought That We Hate* (2007)
- Hare, Ivan and Weinstein, James, *Extreme Speech and Democracy* (2009)
- Cohen, Joshua, 'Freedom of Expression', *Philosophy and Public Affairs* 22 no. 3 (1993), pp. 207-263.
- Scanlon, Tim 'A Theory of Freedom of Expression', *Philosophy and Public Affairs* 1 no.2 (1972), pp. 204-226
- White, Stuart, 'Freedom of Association and the Right to Exclude', *Journal of Political Philosophy* 5
- Fiss, Owen M., 'The Silencing Effect of Speech' in his *The Irony of Free Speech* (1998)
- Langton, Rae 'Speech Acts and Unspeakable Acts', *Philosophy and Public Affairs* 22 no. 4 (1993), pp. 293-330

SECTION B: THE PRACTICE OF POLITICS

Lectures: Wednesday and Friday at 10am, Exam Schools. Please see the termly lecture lists for the most up-to-date schedules.

Aims and Objectives

These tutorials introduce you firstly to the way government is classified across democratic regimes, and to debates about the merits and drawbacks of each type: particularly the implications for political stability, and for policy performance. In this section of your tutorial work (Section I) there is an explicit link with the work you will do in the Political Analysis lectures and classes.

The next set of tutorial topics considers political institutions under a range of regimes with different governance structures (Section II) as well as exploring issues relating to race, gender and colonialism. In this section general questions are asked about the nature of the state: where it comes from, and what determines differences between states – particularly in terms of democratic and authoritarian regimes (3) and ‘state capacity’ (4). There are then two topics on political contestation, examining the roles and impacts of social movements (5) and revolutions (6) and in modern politics.

The next set (Section III) considers key government institutions, the debates surrounding each type of institution, and the issues that arise when comparing specific institutions among countries. In this section you look mainly at the key dynamic tension between legislature (7) and executive (8), though you also consider the operation of counter-powers against majoritarian government (9) (based in the judiciary, direct democracy, decentralisation etc.). Topic 10 considers whether the presence of democratic institutions determines states’ engagement in war-making.

Finally, the tutorials examine what determines the shape and operation of political parties and the party system (11 and 12), and the extent to which the values and attitudes on which political appear to be changing, why this is so, and how we might measure such changes. In this section (IV), you consider not only stable attitudes and structured partisan competition, but also more deeply divided and contested politics, and sources of populism and radicalism, and identity politics (13).

Objectives

- To introduce you to regime classification and comparison, to develop your understanding of the conditions for democratic government and political stability
- To develop your analytical skills.
- To introduce you to social science methodology in the context of historical explanation and comparative analysis.
- To provide you with a sense of the social, intellectual and geographical diversity of practices and approaches to the study of politics

TUTORIAL TOPICS

I. Constitutional variations under democracy

1. Presidentialism and Parliamentarism

What is the difference between a presidential, semi-presidential, and parliamentary system? What other variables does the real-world operation of a regime depend on, besides those found in constitutions?

Why this topic? To enable you to understand basic constitutional differences in the way power is allocated between branches of government. In stable and long-established democratic government, power is often said to derive from a constitutional agreement (usually written down, but, even when written down, qualified by conventions and understandings which may not be written down). Similarly power is said to be allocated to branches of government in patterns that vary from country to country. The topic introduces several long-established concepts: the constitutional allocation of power; the separation of powers between governmental branches and its claimed effects on legislative politics; the fusion of executive and legislature under parliamentary government; the impact of separation or fusion on executive strength; variations in the real meaning of fusion depending on legislative and party politics. In one way this is a sorting and classifying exercise to make sure you use terminology clearly, and to help you understand how political science literature uses it. Your tutor may spend some time simply working through these definitions to be sure you see how they are conventionally used. However, underlying the exercise is an implicit debate about how useful classification is, and if it is useful, what it should be based on. One part of this debate is whether a constitution and its rules are a useful power-map at all, when so much seems to depend on informal and contingent aspects of politics like the nature of party politics, or where a country is in an electoral or political cycle, or how popular a government is at any particular point, etc. If the location of political power can vary so much, do constitutions only serve as background constraints, and if so, are comparisons of how they work only of limited usefulness?

Reading:

- ***Clark, W.R., Matt Golder, and Sonia Golder, 2009. *Principles of Comparative Government*, Washington, (Chapter 11: “Parliamentary, Presidential, and Mixed Democracies”, pp. 395-461) (Introductory: start here)
- Sedelius, T. and Åberg, J., 2017. Eastern Europe’s Semi-Presidential Regimes. In Fagan, A., & Kopecký, P. (eds.) *The Routledge Handbook of East European Politics* (pp. 67-81). Routledge.
- Chaisty, P., Cheeseman, N. and Power, T., 2014. Rethinking the ‘presidentialism debate’: conceptualizing coalitional politics in cross-regional perspective. *Democratization*, 21(1), pp.72-94.
- ***Samuels, D., 2007: “Separation of Powers”. In *The Oxford Handbook of Comparative Politics*, ed. Carles Boix and Susan C. Stokes, New York.
- ***Lijphart, A., 2012. *Patterns of Democracy. Government Forms and Performance in ThirtySix Countries*, New Haven.
- Elgie, R., 1998. “The Classification of Democratic Regime Types: Conceptual Ambiguity and Contestable Assumptions” , *European Journal of Political Research*, 33: 219-38
- Chiehub, J.A., 2007. *Presidentialism, Parliamentarianism, and Democracy*, New York
- Siaroff, A., 2003. ‘Comparative Presidencies: The Inadequacy of the Presidential, SemiPresidential and Parliamentary Distinction’, *European Journal of Political Research*, 42(3), pp. 287-312.

***Van Cranenburgh, Oda “ ‘Big Men Rule’: presidential power, regime type and democracy in 30 African countries” *Democratization* 15-5 (2008)

2. Types of Democracy

What claims have been made about the merits and defects of so-called majoritarian and consensus democracies, and how have these claims been tested in scholarly research?

Why this topic? A more advanced part of the debate begun in the first tutorial topic is whether there are better ways of getting at key differences between regime types than by examining constitutional rules. One example of this, which you can only touch on lightly at this stage, is veto-player analysis, which is squarely rooted in rational-choice approaches to political analysis, and which seeks to understand political processes by examining decisions according to the number and strategic location of actors who influence outcomes by their positional or institutional power of veto (and hence their bargaining power). Proponents of this approach observe that formal constitutional power is at times a poor guide to the bargaining power observable using veto-player analysis. A further area of debate relates to assumptions about “how democracy should work” in a more purposeful sense: is democracy there to deliver clear choices between alternatives, or is it there to bargain between, reconcile, and integrate, the wide range of interests and demands that society is composed of? Here we reach the debate between majoritarian democracy and consensus democracy, which forms the empirical background question to much of the work you will do in Hilary Term in Political Analysis.

Reading:

Developing the Consensus Model

- ***Lijphart, A., (2012) *Patterns of Democracy: Government Forms and Performance in Thirty-Six Countries* (New Haven: Yale UP), Chs. 1-3, and **on key claims see** Chs. 15-16
- Lijphart, Arend. “Consociational democracy.” *World politics* 21.2 (1969): 207-225.
- Lijphart, Arend. “Typologies of democratic systems.” *Comparative political studies* 1.1 (1968): 3-44.

Examining Effects

- ***Bogaards, Matthijs. “Comparative Political Regimes: Consensus and Majoritarian Democracy.” *Oxford Research Encyclopedia of Politics*. 2017.
- ***Manatschal, Anita, and Julian Bernauer. “Consenting to exclude? Empirical patterns of democracy and immigrant integration policy.” *West European Politics* 39.2 (2016): 183-204.
- Poloni-Staudinger, Lori M. “Are consensus democracies more environmentally effective?.” *Environmental politics* 17.3 (2008): 410-430.
- Geissel, Brigitte, and Ank Michels. “Participatory developments in majoritarian and consensus democracies.” *Representation* 54.2 (2018): 129-146.
- Bogaards, Matthijs. “Kinder, gentler, safer? A re-examination of the relationship between consensus democracy and domestic terrorism.” *Studies in Conflict & Terrorism* 43.10 (2020): 886-903.
- Qvortrup, Matt. “The logic of domestic terrorism revisited: a response to a critic.” *Studies in Conflict & Terrorism* 43.10 (2020): 904-909.

Critiquing Cases

- ***Russell, Meg, and Ruxandra Serban. “The Muddle of the ‘Westminster Model’: A concept stretched beyond repair.” *Government and Opposition* (2020): 1-21.

- Strohmeier, Gerd. "Does Westminster (still) represent the Westminster model? An analysis of the changing nature of the UK's political system." *European View* 14.2 (2015): 303-315.
- "Consensus Democracy in the Netherlands" in Van Praag, Philip. *Political science and changing politics*. Amsterdam University Press, 2017.
- Jónsson, Guðmundur. "Iceland and the Nordic model of consensus democracy." *Scandinavian Journal of History* 39.4 (2014): 510-528.

II. Political institutions and practice outside of the advanced industrial democracies

3. Democracy and Authoritarianism

Can we draw a sharp distinction between regimes that are democratic and those that are not? If so, what are the criteria? If not, why not?

Why this topic? The concept of democracy is one of the most used in the study of politics and yet there exists enormous scholarly debate over what precisely constitutes 'democracy' and symmetrically, how to define non-democratic regimes. This tutorial explores the debate over conceptualizing political regimes and also touches on theories that explain transitions between regimes and variation within them. The tutorial readings begin with the classic distinction between 'thick' and 'thin' conceptions of democracy and the associated debate over measuring democracy. Some scholars argue for a multi-dimensional conception of democracy including contestation, inclusion, the separation of powers, the granting of civil liberties, and the responsiveness of government to demands. Accordingly, fine-grained scales of democracy or 'polyarchy' have been created to capture such distinctions. Conversely other scholars have argued that democracy should be considered a 'bounded whole' that is a binary 'either/or' concept. Still other scholars argue that formal democracy even in paradigmatic cases like the United States might be undermined by socioeconomic inequalities, producing oligarchy rather than democracy. The tutorial then turns to variations among authoritarian and democratic regimes, examining literature that explores the worlds of 'electoral' or 'competitive' authoritarianism. These works problematize the connection often made between holding elections and being 'democratic,' noting the ways in which authoritarian regimes might use elections to underscore rather than undermine their hold on power. Finally the tutorial concludes by examining a few cases of the contemporary challenges to democratic survival and consolidation. These readings should help students think about which structural or strategic forces hold together political regimes or split them apart.

Conceptualizing Democracy: Thick vs Thin Conceptions

- William R Clark, Matt Golder and Sonia Golder, *Principles of Comparative Politics*, CQ Press, Washington, 2013/2017, (Chaps 5 and 10). i.e. the chapters on "Democracy and Dictatorship: Conceptualizing and Measurement" and "Varieties of Dictatorships"
- Robert Dahl (1971) *Polyarchy: Participation and Opposition* (New Haven: Yale UP), p. 1-16
- Dahl, R. 'What political institutions does large-scale democracy require?' *Political Science Quarterly*, 120, 2, 2005 <http://www.jstor.org/stable/20202514>,
- ***Philippe Schmitter and Terry Lynn Karl (1991), "What Democracy Is... and Is Not" *Journal of Democracy* 2:3 (Summer): 75-88
- Ahmed, Amel. *Democracy and the politics of electoral system choice: engineering electoral dominance*. Cambridge University Press, 2013.
- Jeffrey Winters and Benjamin Page (2009), "Oligarchy in the United States?" *Perspectives on Politics* 7:4 (December): 731-751

Hybrid and Authoritarian Regimes

- Collier, David, and Steven Levitsky. 1997. "Democracy with adjectives: Conceptual innovation in comparative research." *World Politics* 49.03: 430-451.
- Art, David. 2012. "What do we know about authoritarianism after ten years?" *Comparative Politics* 44.3: 351-373.
- Ahram, Ariel I., and J. Paul Goode. 2016. "Researching Authoritarianism in the Discipline of Democracy." *Social Science Quarterly* 97.4: 834-849.
- Gilbert, Leah "Beyond Authoritarianism: The Conceptualization of Hybrid Regimes." *Studies in Comparative International Development*, 46(3). 270-297

Contemporary challenges to democracy

- Robert Lieberman et al "The Trump Presidency and American Democracy: A Historical and Comparative Analysis," *Perspectives on Politics* 17, no. 2 June 2019
- Rogers M Smith & Desmond King, "White Protectionism in America: *Perspectives on Politics* 19 (2021), no 2.
- Julius Maximilian Rogenhofer & Ayala Panievsky (2020) "Antidemocratic populism in power: comparing Erdoğan's Turkey with Modi's India and Netanyahu's Israel", *Democratization*, 27:8, 1394-1412 • Vaishnav, M. (2021). Interview: Dr. Milan Vaishnav on the Threats to India's Democracy. *Georgetown Journal of International Affairs* 22(1), 76-79.
- Larry Diamond, 'Democratic regression in comparative perspective' *Democratization* 28-1 (2021)

4. State strength

What is state strength? What determines how strong a state is?

Why this topic? The state is one of the fundamental units of political life in modern politics. Why do states exist? This question has intrigued political theorists, scholars of international relations, and comparative political scientists. Scholars looking at the rise of the state in Europe (and elsewhere), often locate its origins in both the need for decisive action in the face of military conflict and the need for tax revenue to fund it. Yet, we continue to explore the historical origins of the state, in part because we continue to debate both the rationale for the state and what explains variation in state structure; recent scholarship has emphasised the historical impacts and ongoing legacies of empire. Literature looking at more recent state building, particularly outside of Europe but also in the postSoviet context, points to quite different constellations of factors affecting the development and structure of states, raising further questions. While states as political units share a number of factors, scholars have pointed to wide variation among states. Political scientists often apply adjectives such as "high capacity" "low capacity" "strong" and "weak" to describe the role of states. This work points to both the institutional and social origins of state variation. States often possess highly varying bureaucratic structures, which are in part the product of their internal structure as well as their relationship to social groups. Can states promote beneficial societal outcomes through the right institutions? Can states withstand lobbying (or corruption) from societal elites without becoming predatory?

Readings

State formation in Europe:

- ***Clark, Golder and Golder. "The Origins of the Modern State" Chapter 4.
- Charles Tilly. 1990. *Coercion, Capital, and European States, AD 990 1990*. Cambridge, Mass.: B. Blackwell. Chapters 1, 3, 5 and 6.
- Tuong Vu. 2010. "Studying the State through State Formation" *World Politics*. 62(01)

- Hendryk Spruyt, 2002. "The Origins, Development, and Possible Decline of the Modern State." *Annual Review of Political Science* 5:127-49
- David Stasavage. "Cities, constitutions, and sovereign borrowing in Europe, 1274-1785." *International Organization*, 61:489-525, Summer 2007).
- **Kantola, J., 2006. Gender and the State: Theories and Debates. In *Feminists Theorize the State* (pp. 1-21). Palgrave Macmillan, London.
- Sudhir Hazareesingh, "Haughty Dirigistes", *London Review of Books*, Vol 41 No 10 (23 May 2019) (on the modern French technocratic state)
<https://www.lrb.co.uk/thepaper/v41/n10/sudhir-hazareesingh/haughty-dirigistes> *State formation outside of Europe:*
- **Scott, James. 1998. *Seeing Like a State: How Certain Schemes to Improve the Human Condition Have Failed*. New Haven: Yale University Press.
Jeffrey Herbst. *States and Power in Africa: Comparative Lessons in Authority and Control*. Princeton University Press.
- Miguel A. Centeno. 1997. "Blood and Debt: War and Taxation in Nineteenth-century Latin America." *American Journal of Sociology*, 102(6)
- Victoria Hui, 2005. *War and State Formation in Ancient China and Early Modern Europe*. New York: Cambridge University Press.

State capacity in contemporary times

- **Darren Acemoglu and James Robinson. 2012. *Why Nations Fail: The Origins of Power, Prosperity and Poverty*. Profile Books (or Acemoglu, Johnson and Robinson).
- **Joe Turner, 2018. "Internal colonisation: the intimate circulations of empire, race and liberal government", *European Journal of International Relations* 24-4.
- Atul Kohli. 2006. *State Directed Development: Political Power and Industrialization in the Global Periphery*. Cambridge University Press.
- Robert Putnam. 1993. *Making Democracy Work*. Princeton, N.J.: Princeton University Press.
- Robert Bates. 2008. "State Failure" *Annual Review of Political Science*. Vol. 11 1-2.
- Elcin Kurbanoglu, "Feminist conceptualisations of the state", *Global Journal of HumanSocial Science* 12-10 (2012)
- **Keeanga-Yamahtta Taylor, "Of course there are protests. The State is Failing Black People." *New York Times* 29 May 2020.

5. Social Movements

What have social movements contributed to modern political practice?

Why this topic? Political action such as strikes, demonstrations, and manifestations of civic engagement most often take place outside of traditional political institutions such as political parties. The purpose of this topic is to help understand what drives individuals, groups, and movements to mobilize in this way, and whether these kinds of collective civil practices are different in form and nature; whether they can successfully win gains for groups who have traditionally been excluded from political power and formal institutions; ; how social movements cut across national boundaries; under what conditions these groups interact with formal institutional processes (for example elections), and with what effects; and some of the conditions under which this kind of collective action may be successful. There are also significant debates about whether these different forms of collective action can be regrouped under the heading of 'contentious politics', and whether they can be defined according to "rational" theories. There are discussions about social movements' impact and success, and the extent to which they contribute to wider political socialization. The study of

social movements is an important prism for understanding how politics is experienced at grass-roots and national levels, and how forms of institutionalized political power– in democracies and nondemocracies - may be challenged from below.

Readings:

- ***Sidney Tarrow, *Power in Movement*, 1996, pp. 1-36, 95-181, 183 – 215 • William Gamson, “Defining Movement ‘Success’”, in Jeff Goodwin and James Jasper (eds), *The Social Movements Reader: Cases and Concepts*, Blackwell, 2003, ch. 31
- Vittorio Sergi and Markos Vogiatzoglou, “Think Globally Act Locally? Global Repertoires in the Tunisian Uprising and the Greek Anti-Austerity Mobilizations,” in *Understanding European Movements: New Social Movements, Global Justice Struggles*, Routledge, 2013. • Marshall Ganz, “Why David Sometimes Wins: Strategic Capacity in Social Movements.” in Jeff Goodwin and James Jasper (eds.), *Rethinking Social Movements: Structure, Meaning and Emotion*, 2009.
- K. T. Andrews, “Social Movements and Policy Implementation: The Mississippi Civil Rights Movement and the War on Poverty, 1965 to 1971”. *American Sociological Review*, 66(1), 2001, pp 71-95
- ***Charles Tilly and Sidney Tarrow, *Contentious Politics*, 2007.
- ***Reny, Tyler T. and Benjamin J. Newman. 2021. “The Opinion-Mobilizing Effect of Social Protest against Police Violence: Evidence from the 2020 George Floyd Protests,” *American Political Science Review*, 2021, 1–9
- ***Stephanie Urdang, ‘Women in National Liberation Movements’, in *African Women South of the Sahara*, eds. Jean Hay, et al, New York, Longman, 1995.
- Joanna Allan, ‘Women’s Resistance and Gender in Spanish Guinea’, in *Silenced Resistance: Women, Dictatorships and Genderwashing in Western Sahara and Equatorial Guinea*, Madison, Wisconsin University Press, 2019.
- Alicia Garza, *The purpose of power* (London, 2020) (by the co-founder of Black Lives Matter)
- ***Keeanga-Yahmatta Taylor ‘Five years later, Do Black Lives Matter?’ *Jacobin* 30 September 2019 <https://jacobinmag.com/2019/09/black-lives-matter-laquan-mcdonald-mike-brown-eric-garner>

6. Revolutions

How and why do revolutions either succeed or fail?

Why this topic? Political orders and regimes are sometimes transformed comprehensively, for example from a monarchy to a republic, from an authoritarian regime to a democracy, or from a colonial to a post-colonial state. The purpose of this topic is to help understand how, why, and under what circumstances this sort of political change happens, and what it tells us more widely about politics. The important issues addressed are the causes of revolutions (what kind of factors make for their occurrence, and how they are to be prioritized), the processes of revolutions (what happens during the revolutionary moment); and the consequences of revolutions (the nature of the political change – partial change or complete rupture; the type of new political order; its impact on society). In thinking about its consequences, one relevant aspect is time, which can be distinguished between short, medium, and long-term factors. There are substantive contemporary debates in politics about historical revolutions (the French Revolution of 1789, the Haitian revolution 1791-1804, and the Russian revolution of 1917) and their relation to modern ones. There are different analytical frameworks in the literature on revolutions, which stress the varying importance of structural factors, such as class, race, and material conditions, the role of conjuncture, and the contributions of social actors, ideas, and ideology. Among the main debates around modern revolutions are the identification of the causes, and whether they can be generalized; the range of factors, and in particular the role of

revolutionary ideas and political culture; how and why revolutions succeed or fail, and how this can be assessed. **Readings:**

- *** Jack Goldstone *Revolutions: a very short introduction*, Oxford, 2014
- *** John Foran, *Taking Power: On the Origins of Third World Revolutions*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2005. Pp. 33-130.
- *** Theda Skocpol, *States and Social Revolutions*, Cambridge, 1979. (Introduction and Conclusion).
- Hannah Arendt: "Introduction on War and Revolution", and Chapter 1. "The Meaning of Revolutions" in, *On Revolution*, Penguin, 1990. Pp 11-20, 21-58. • David Armitage "Every Great Revolution is a Civil War", in Kenneth Baker, Edelstein, eds. *Scripting Revolutions, the Comparative Study of Revolutions*, Stanford, 2015, pp 57-70. *** Robin Blackburn, "Haiti, slavery, and the age of democratic revolution", *William and Mary Quarterly*, October 2006
- Henry Hale, 'Regime change cascades: what we have learned from the 1848 Revolutions to the 2011 Arab uprisings' *Annual Review of Political Science* 16 (2013) Natalya Vince, *The Algerian war, the Algerian Revolution* (Palgrave, 2020)
- Neil Ketchley, *Egypt in a time of revolution: contentious politics and the Arab spring* (Cambridge, 2017)
- Abdelrahman, Maha. (2013) In Praise of Organization: Egypt between Activism and Revolution, *Development and Change*. 44 (3)
- *** Frantz Fanon, *The wretched of the earth* (London, 2001 ed.)
- *** Angela Davis, *Freedom is a constant struggle* 2016 (ch. 3 "We have to talk about systemic change")
- Charles Kurzman. *The Unthinkable Revolution in Iran*. By Harvard University Press, 2004. Ch 7 "A viable movement: anti-explanation, Winter 1978-1979"
- Ottaway, Marina. 1976. "Social Classes and Corporate Interests in the Ethiopian Revolution." *The Journal of Modern African Studies* 14 (3): 469–486.
<https://doi.org/10.1017/S0022278X00053520>

III. The Institutions of the Democratic State

7. Legislatures "Judgments about the effectiveness of legislatures can only be made in the context of specific political cultures and state traditions. There are no absolute standards of judgment". Discuss

Why this topic?

Elected legislatures at national level are a key part of our understanding of how modern democracies operate, and have made centralized representative government, (rather than direct democracy or highly decentralized systems of government), one of democracy's key legitimizing components. We have already seen in topic 1, above, that the role of a legislature varies a great deal between presidential and parliamentary systems, with legislatures interacting with both the constitutional structure, and the nature of the party system, to produce different patterns of governance. This has generated a range of concerns about what legislatures "ought" to be delivering in a democracy, as perceptions have ebbed and flowed about their effectiveness in particular contexts.

Sometimes the concern has been about the "decline of legislatures" while at other times it has been about "over-mighty" or excessively fragmented legislatures. The central issue is whether a legislature can fulfill a variety of sometimes contradictory tasks at the same time. We think that legislatures should be representative; that they should sustain the executive's legitimacy, particularly in parliamentary regimes; that they should scrutinise the work of the executive and bureaucracy; they should appropriate resources, especially financial, for the other branches of government to do their work; and perhaps most of all they legitimate the laws of the polity through their internal procedures.

So we want them to contribute to cohesive and purposive government (in the case of parliamentary government by creating and sustaining a parliamentary majority; in the case of presidential government, by retaining sufficient programmatic cohesion to enable a directly-elected executive to do so without the enforcing cohesion provided by a parliamentary confidence-relationship) while at the same time performing the role of holding the executive to account, scrutinizing its performance, and making national political debate meaningful to citizens.

The way the two demands are reconciled in any given country will depend on how members of legislatures are socialized into expectations about the roles they are to perform, on the rules governing the legislature and its relationship with the rest of the national institutions, and on the operation of the party system. Increasingly, scholars have also recognised the importance of understanding legislative politics from the perspective of excluded or underrepresented groups. While legislatures in advanced democracies have improved their 'descriptive' representation of diverse populations in recent

decades, recent feminist scholarship on representative democracy in particular asks deeper questions about what a 'good' legislature really is.

What for example does it mean for a legislature to be representative? Geographically, demographically, ideologically, federally...? How is this related to structure? How many chambers should a legislature have for these purposes? Given how differently these factors are configured even in otherwise similar democracies, claims about legislative effectiveness are likely to remain very difficult to confirm or refute. Nevertheless comparative study of their role and operation, helping us understand them in some of the most highly-studied contexts (the USA, UK, France, Germany), is important in understanding where there are common functional imperatives in democracies, and where culture, history and state tradition continue to affect operation.

Reading:

Structure and Function

- ***Cox, Gary, "The organization of democratic legislatures" in B.R Weingast and D.A. Wittman (eds) *The Oxford Handbook of Political Economy*, OUP, 2006
- ***Laver, M., "Legislatures and Parliaments in Comparative Context", *The Oxford Handbook of Political Economy* OUP, 2006
- ***Strom, K., "Parliamentary Democracy and Delegation" in Strøm, K., et al. *Delegation and Accountability in Parliamentary Democracies*, Oxford University Press 2003

Feminist and Minority Representation

- ***Lovenduski, Joni. 2019. "Feminist Reflections on Representative Democracy." In *Rethinking Democracy*, edited by Andrew Gamble and Tony Wright, 18–35. Chichester, UK: John Wiley & Sons.
- Celis, Karen, and Sarah Childs. *Feminist democratic representation*. Oxford University Press, 2020. chs. 1&2
- Hänni, Miriam. "Presence, representation, and impact: how minority MPs affect policy outcomes." *Legislative Studies Quarterly* 42.1 (2017): 97-130.
- Reher, Stefanie. "Do disabled candidates represent disabled citizens?." *British Journal of Political Science* (2021): 1-15.
- Lea Ewe Bönsch, "What Factors Shape the Substantive Representation of Lesbians, Gays and Bisexuals in Parliament? Testing the Impact of Minority Membership, Political Values and Awareness", *Parliamentary Affairs*, 2021
- *Knock Down the House*. Directed by Rachel Lears. Jubilee Films, 2019. Available via Netflix (<https://www.netflix.com/title/81080637>), see also <https://knockdownthehouse.com/>

Class, 'Professional' Politics and Socialisation

- ***Bovens, Mark, and Anchrit Wille. *Diploma democracy: The rise of political meritocracy*. Oxford University Press, 2017. ch.7
- O'Grady, Tom. "Careerists versus coal-miners: Welfare reforms and the substantive representation of social groups in the British Labour party." *Comparative Political Studies* 52.4 (2019): 544-578.
- Erikson, Josefin, and Cecilia Josefsson. "Does higher education matter for MPs in their parliamentary work? Evidence from the Swedish parliament." *Representation* 55.1 (2019): 65-80.
- Crewe, Emma (2015) *The House of Commons: an anthropology of MPs at work*. Manchester. Manchester University Press. chs. 1, 4 and 7
- Dickinson, Nicholas. "Advice giving and party loyalty: An informational model for the socialisation process of new British MPs." *Parliamentary Affairs* 71.2 (2018): 343-364.
- Country Case Studies
- Simone Burkhart & Matthias Lehnert (2008) "Between Consensus and Conflict: Law-Making Processes in Germany", *German Politics*, 17:3, 223-231
- Hennis, Wilhelm. "Reform of the Bundestag: The Case for General Debate" in *British & French Parliaments in Comparative Perspective*. Routledge, 2017. 97-110.
- Dodd, Lawrence C., and Bruce Ian Oppenheimer. *Congress Reconsidered*. 11th ed. Thousand Oaks, California, 2017. Print. chs.1-2
- Vernon Hewitt & Shirin M. Rai (2010) ch. 3 'The Indian Parliament' in Niraja Gopal Jayal & Pratap Bhanu Mehta (eds.) *The Oxford Companion to Politics in India*. 2010.
- Morgenstern & Nacif (2010) *Legislative Politics in Latin America*, especially chs. 6, 8 & 11
- Joel Barkan (ed.) (2009) *Legislative Power in Emerging African Democracies* ch. 1
- Helen Drake et al. (2020) *Developments in French Politics* 6, chapter on France by Rainbow Murray
- Demarest L. (2021), Men of the people? Democracy and prebendalism in Nigeria's Fourth Republic National Assembly, *Democratization* 28(4): 684-702.
- Collord, Michaela. "Pressuring MPs to act: parliament, organized interests and policymaking in Uganda and Tanzania." *Democratization* 28.4 (2021): 723-741.

8. Executives

Executive power has a personal quality linked to popular support and party-based authority that sits alongside its formal, constitutionally-derived, qualities. How in practice do the two elements interact in real-world contexts?

Why this topic? The role of the executive, especially chief executives, is difficult to compare across countries. How can political science establish grounds for comparison between presidents, prime ministers, chancellors and their subordinates in different regimes? How do chief executives wield power and become effective leaders in different polities? Is this a function of the institutional structure of the executive? Or should we consider contingent factors like the scope for 'charismatic' leadership? Some models of executive power consider it to be wielded in a command-and-control way, and judge success by how far the chief executive 'wins' in a contest with others. Alternatively, executive power is a bargaining process, acknowledging that the chief executive can only succeed in achieving goals by working collaboratively with others. In newer democracies, problems of winnertake-all executive competition can cause problems with democratic stability.

Reading:

- ***Arend Lijphart *Patterns of Democracy: Government Forms and Performance in 36 Countries* ch. 7

- *** Rudy Andeweg et al. (eds.). *The Oxford Handbook of Political Executives* (2020) (chs by Doyle on measuring power, Beckwith on feminist approaches, and O'Brien on women)
- ***George Tsebelis *Veto Players: How Political Institutions Work* chs. 1-4
- Mark Garnett, *The British Prime Minister in age of upheaval* (2021)
- Grotz, F., Müller-Rommel, F., Berz, J., Kroeber, C. and Kukec, M., 2021. How Political Careers affect Prime-Ministerial Performance: Evidence from Central and Eastern Europe. *Comparative Political Studies*, DOI: [10.1177/0010414021997174](https://doi.org/10.1177/0010414021997174)
- Gillian Peele et al. (eds.) *Developments in American Politics* 8 (2018) ch. 1
- Robert Elgie 'Duverger, Semi-presidentialism and the Supposed French Archetype' *West European Politics* 32(2) 2009
- ***Helen Drake et al., *Developments in French Politics* 6 (2020), chs 1-3 on French presidency
- Juan Linz 'The Perils of Presidentialism' in *Journal of Democracy* 1 (1) 1990
- ***Gabrille Lynch (ed.) *The Routledge Handbook of Democratisation in Africa* (2021) (ch.8 on executive power)

9. Counter-majoritarian powers

Democracies usually provide a range of counter-powers to majoritarian power, including judicial review, decentralisation of power, bi-cameralism, a permanent professionalized bureaucracy, direct democracy, and the media. Consider, in the case of any two, what the effectiveness of such counter-powers depends on, and how we would measure and compare effectiveness.

Why this topic? Democratic government is widely thought to require a balance between *purposive government* that is capable of identifying and addressing policy problems, and *restraints on government*. These restraints seek to ensure that power is exercised within agreed limits, and under agreed rules, that proper deliberation precedes key decisions, that different voices are heard as policy is being made, and that where possible (a big qualification) decision-making power is devolved to levels close to those most affected by it. Such checks and balances supplement the central tension between the executive and the legislature, which is itself potentially (though not always) a check on power. With the exception of the role of the media, the role of these restraints is usually described in a constitution, though they are not all present in every constitution, and the use of the constitution in understanding how power is wielded varies a good deal from country to country. (In rare cases there is no formal constitution at all). They have come to be known in much modern comparative political analysis as *institutional veto players*. The most fundamental restraint on executive power is constitutional: the commitment of government itself to be governed by a set of authoritative rules and principles. Constitutionalism requires a codified constitution that describes both the powers of different branches of government and a bill of rights. It also seems to require an umpire: a constitutional court, though an activist court's behaviour may become so engaged in the political process that it can start to resemble a participant in the policy-making process as well as an umpire. The question of the relationship between constitutional courts and other political actors is especially pertinent in young democracies where the constitution seeks to promote social transformation. In a federal state, sovereignty is split constitutionally between different levels – usually the federal and state levels – so that each has at least some final authority in given policy areas. Bi-cameral legislatures are those with two distinct assemblies, usually based on the representation of different territorial entities. The actual power of each assembly varies as does the effect of various experiments in federalism and devolution on different forms of inequality and marginalisation. Less common in constitutions, and in general less dramatic in their effects, are those procedures that bring public opinion to bear on decision-makers through routes other than elected ones. Provisions for referendums and plebiscites are obviously constitutional, while others – for example factors which facilitate a free and pluralistic media – generally have non-constitutional roots.

Finally, there is the impact of a permanent, professionalized bureaucracy. Since it lacks democratic roots, and is by some regarded as thwarting the effectiveness of policy action, bureaucracy may not immediately seem to fall into the category of a democratic check. However its professional expertise, set against impulsive and inexperienced politicians, may allow it to be a type of check and its strategic role in decision-making certainly makes it a potential veto-player. The trade offs between technocracy versus democracy have been extensively debated in aid-dependent states.

Given the range of counter-powers to the power exercised through the central institutions of legislature and executive, there are no simple ways of assessing the functionality of checks and balances as a whole. Each particular institution needs first to be understood in its own national context, and comparisons then need to be made across jurisdictions focusing on individual institutions. Conceptually however all these institutions have certain common features and effects, and beyond asking how well each operates in a national context against the purposes set for it, comparative political analysis (in more advanced courses than the Prelim, however) can also assess, through formal veto-player theory, how much concentration or dispersal of power a particular jurisdiction displays.

Reading:

- ***William R Clark, Matt Golder and Sonia Golder, *Principles of Comparative Politics*, CQ Press, Washington, 2009, (Chaps 5 and 10).
- '***Arendt Lijphart, *Patterns of Democracy. Government Forms and Performance in ThirtyThree Democracies*, New Haven, 2012.
- ***George Tsebelis, "Decision-making in Political Systems: Veto-players in Presidentialism, Multi-cameralism and Multi-partysim", *British Journal of Political Science*, 25, 1995, 289-326
- Sarah Binder "The Dynamics of Legislative Gridlock", *American Political Science Review*, 93, 1999: 519-533
- Walter Murphy et al, *Courts, Judges and Politics: an Introduction to the Judicial Process*, McGraw-Hill, New York, 2001.
- Alec Stone-Sweet, "Constitutions and Judicial Power", in Daniele Caramini (ed) *Comparative Politics*, New York OUP, 2008

Constitutional courts in young democracies: agents of transformation?

- Gibson, James L., and Gregory A. Caldeira. "Defenders of democracy? Legitimacy, popular acceptance, and the South African Constitutional Court." *The Journal of Politics* 65.1 (2003): 1-30.
- Theunis Roux (2003) Legitimizing transformation: political resource allocation in the South African constitutional court, *Democratization*, 10:4, 92-111, DOI: 10.1080/13510340312331294047

Federalism and devolution:

- **Hassan, Mai. "Federalism and devolution." *Routledge Handbook of Democratization in Africa*. Routledge, 2019. 91-103.
- Johnson, Kimberley S. "Hurricane Katrina, Racial Federalism, and the American State: A Tale Foretold?." In *The Federal Nation*, edited by Iwan W. Morgan and Philip J. Davies. Palgrave Macmillan, New York, 2008. P. 129-145.
- Miller, Lisa L. "The invisible black victim: How American federalism perpetuates racial inequality in criminal justice." *Law & Society Review* 44.3-4 (2010): 805-842.)

Technocracy vs. democracy:

- Kenneth J. Meier, “Bureaucracy and Democracy: The Case for More Bureaucracy and Less Democracy”, *Public Administration Review*, 57, 3, 1997, 193-199
- Mkandawire, Thandika. 1998. “Crisis Management and the Making of ‘choiceless Democracies’ in Africa.” In *State, Conflict, and Democracy in Africa*, edited by Richard A. Joseph. Boulder, Colo.: Lynne Rienner Pub.
- Bangura, Yusuf. “Technocratic Policy Making and Democratic Accountability.” UNRISD Research and Policy Brief 3.1 (2004): 1-4. The UNRISD project of the same name has numerous series papers exploring this issue in different contexts.
<https://www.unrisd.org/publications/rpb3e>

10. War and Peace

Is there a distinctively democratic way of waging war?

Why this topic? The absence of a world government has led many analysts of International Relations (IR) to believe that all countries exist within a constant state of war and insecurity. As Thomas Hobbes famously put it in *Leviathan*, ‘in all times kings and persons of sovereign authority, because of their independency, are in continual jealousies, and in the state and posture of gladiators, having their weapons pointing, and their eyes fixed on one another’. However, one of the most robust empirical findings of IR scholarship over the last fifty years has been that democracies are different, in that they do not seem to fight wars with other democracies (although, of course, they do continue to fight wars against non-democracies). Many have drawn the conclusion that, while the Hobbesian state of war continues in the rest of the world, a ‘zone of peace’ now exists among democratic states, and that regions such as the Middle East would be more peaceful if more regimes within them were democratic. This belief has been a major theme within recent US foreign policy although the collapse of the US-supported regime in Afghanistan in 2021, after two decades of war and intervention in the region, has perhaps closed this cycle.

Several controversies remain. For a start, some dispute the empirical claims of the ‘democratic peace thesis’, arguing that it rests on excessively narrow ways of conceptualising democracy, war and peace, or that its findings are statistically insignificant. But perhaps the largest literature has emerged around the question of why the democratic peace exists. Is it a result of the institutions within democratic political systems, such as the publicness of decision-making, or the checks and balances that inhibit the executive? Or is it the result of liberal values and a culture of bargaining and compromise that are unique to democratic states? Or might it even be due to some other factor that has less to do with democracy as such, such as high levels of economic interdependence among liberal democracies, or the hegemonic influence of the United States? There are also disagreements about the conclusion that democratisation will make the world a more peaceful place: perhaps the pacific qualities of democracy in the western world will not travel to new democracies elsewhere, while some believe that newly democratising states are exceptionally belligerent during the unstable process of political transition, which implies that the dangers of promoting democratisation may outweigh the possible benefits of a more democratic world. Finally, the tendency to focus on explaining the democratic peace has attracted criticisms that it has led to the neglect of other important aspects of the relationship between democracies and war: for example, their continuing tendency to make war against non-democracies, or the fact that they mobilise their forces and actually fight their wars in different ways from non-democratic states.

Reading:

- ***Barkawi, Tarak and Mark Laffey (eds.). 2001. *Democracy, Liberalism and War: Rethinking the Democratic Peace Debate* (Boulder: Lynne Rienner).
- ***Brown, Michael E., Sean M. Lynn-Jones and Steven E. Miller (eds.) 1999. *Debating the Democratic Peace* (Cambridge: MIT Press). [Contains excerpts from several of other pieces on reading list.]

- ***Russett, Bruce. 1993. *Grasping the Democratic Peace: Principles for a Post-Cold War World* (Princeton: Princeton University Press).
- ***Joslyn Barnhart et al., "The suffragist peace", *International Organisation* 74-4 Fall 2020 pp.633-670
- **The Costs of War project <https://watson.brown.edu/costsofwar/>
- ***Allison, Graham. "The Thucydides trap: are the US and China headed for war?." *The Atlantic* 24.9 (2015): 2015.
- Gat, Azar. 2011. *The Changing Character of War*, in Hew Strachan and Sibylle Scheipers (eds.), *The Changing Character of War* (Oxford: Oxford University Press).
- Coker, Christopher. 2012. *The Collision of Modern and Post-Modern War*, in Yves Boyer and Julian Lindley-French (eds.), *The Oxford Handbook of War*, pp. (Oxford: Oxford University Press).
- Lipson, Charles. 2003. *Reliable Partners: How Democracies Have Made a Separate Peace* (Princeton: Princeton University Press).
- Mansfield, Edward D. and Jack Snyder. 1995. *Democratization and the Danger of War*. *International Security* 20 (1): 5-38.
- *International Politics*. 2004. Special Issue on the democratic peace. 41 (4), especially articles by Hasenclever and Wagner, MacMillan, Müller, and Owen.
- Reiter, Dan and Allan C. Stam. 2002. *Democracies at War* (Princeton: Princeton University Press).
- Rosato, Sebastian. 2003. *The Flawed Logic of Democratic Peace Theory*. *American Political Science Review* 97 (4): 585-602. See also Forum on Rosato's argument, in APSR Vol. 99, No. 3 (2005).
- Wood, Elizabeth, et al. "Roots of Russia's war in Ukraine." *Roots of Russia's War in Ukraine*. Columbia University Press, 2015.
- Elkins, Caroline. *Britain's gulag: the brutal end of empire in Kenya*. Random House, 2005.

IV. Parties, party systems, values, identity politics

11. Party systems

- a) What are the sociological and institutional determinants of party systems? What are the major weaknesses of these explanations?**
- b) To what extent are party systems in developing world democracies based on social cleavages? Why this topic?**

To understand a key body of literature seeking to explain the sociological determinants of party systems across all democracies, from the emergence of mass democracy to the third wave of democratisation. In addition, to understand how political institutions, particularly the type of electoral system, shape the party system, thereby augmenting the sociological approach. A key interpretation of modern party systems in the advanced industrial democracies is that parties (thanks also to the freezing effect of strong party organisation) were frozen in the mould established in the late 19th and early 20th century, with the transition to mass democracy, raising the barrier to entry for new parties. From this perspective therefore, parties present in any particular advanced democracy primarily reflect the underlying social cleavages, which were important in the period of mass democratisation. With the third wave of democratization in the early 1980s, we also witnessed the emergence of new democracies from Latin America, Africa, Asia and Eastern Europe. While the literature on party systems in Western Europe sees party competition as programmatic, and the bases for it as social and ideological, work on party systems in other parts of the world often highlight competition, which is not rooted in social cleavages and stress alternatives to programmatic links, in particular clientelism. This topic introduces the concept of a party system, of political cleavages and party organization. It

also highlights the differences between party systems in the advanced industrial democracies and newer, developing world democracies.

However, political parties vary a good deal, both within and between countries, across advanced and developing democracies, and in the extent to which they are rooted in strong and distinct social identities. Many look as if they are not built on social identities at all. The rate of formation of new parties in recent decades seems to have increased in several advanced democracies, and their sociological origins are often difficult to pin down. What is more, in developing democracies, party systems often do not appear to reflect social cleavages at all. Since Maurice Duverger's (1954) seminal work, observers have pointed to the effect of institutions on the shape of the party system, most notably the electoral system and more recently, the format of the executive. This topic introduces the mechanical and psychological effects of electoral systems on party systems. It also contrasts the effect of majoritarian electoral systems and proportional representation on party systems, and examines the interaction of electoral systems and cleavage structures.

The hypothesis that parties in the advanced industrial democracies reflect social cleavages, and that party systems are frozen in time, is much contested on several levels. The thesis of long-term historical continuity in party systems often requires a very stretched interpretation of "continuity", even across the period from the 1880s to the 1960s, let alone subsequently. Parties vary a good deal, both within and between countries, in the extent to which they are rooted in strong and distinct social identities, and many look as if they are not built on social identities at all. The rate of formation of new parties in recent decades seems to have increased in several advanced democracies, and their sociological origins are often difficult to pin down. Although this does not render the sociological thesis of Lipset and Rokkan redundant, it does raise questions about its utility as an explanation for the contemporary party systems of the advanced democracies.

Secondly, this sociological thesis also struggles as a framework of understanding for party systems outside of the advanced industrial democracies. Party systems in these countries often have not followed the evolutionary development pattern of the Western European party systems described by Stein and Rokkan. Rather the development of party systems outside of the advanced industrial democracies has tended to be discontinuous; reflect divergent responses to expanded political mobilization; or simply reflect long-standing historical elite divisions. In many of these party systems as a consequence, competition, is often not based on programmatic policy proposals, but on catch-all parties cantered upon personality and clientelism.

Finally, while it is widely agreed that the relationship between electoral and party systems is mutual, nearly all work has been focused on the effect of electoral systems on party systems, and a general consensus exists on this topic. However, electoral institutions may shape party systems, but these institutions also emerge from party systems. How party systems shape electoral systems remains completely underdeveloped and under-theorised and no clear consensus yet exists on this issue.

Readings

Introducing party-voter linkages: How do parties connect with voters and why does it matter?

- Morgan, Jana. 2011. *Bankrupt Representation and Party System Collapse*. Penn State UP. Ch. 1, 3, 10, and 11.

Sociological Determinants

- Gallagher, Michael, Michael Laver and Peter Mair. 2011. *Representative Government in Modern Europe* (5th ed.) London. Chapter 9.
- ***Mair, Peter. 1997. *Party System Change: Approaches and Interpretations*, Oxford University Press. Chapters 1-4.
- Kitschelt, Herbert. 1992. "The Formation of Party Systems in East-Central Europe," *Politics and Society* 20 (1): pp. 7-50.
- Dix, Robert H. 1989. "Cleavage Structures and Party Systems in Latin America," *Comparative Politics*, 22 (1), pp. 23-37.
- ***Hagopian, Frances. 2009. "Parties and Voters in Emerging Democracies." In *The Oxford*

Handbook of Comparative Politics, eds. Carles Boix and Susan C. Stokes. Oxford: Oxford University Press, pp. 582-603.

- Elischer, Sebastian. 2013. *Political Parties in Africa. Ethnicity and Party Formation*. New York: Cambridge University Press. Ch. 1, 6, and 7.

Institutional Determinants

- ***Cox, Gary W. 1997. *Making Votes Count: Strategic Coordination in the World's Electoral Systems*. Cambridge University Press. Chapters 1-3.
- Amorim Neto, Octavio and Gary Cox, 1997. "Electoral Institutions, Cleavage Structures, and the Number of Parties." *American Journal of Political Science*, 41 (1): pp. 149-174.
- ***Ahmed, Amel. 2012. *Democracy and the Politics of Electoral System Choice. Engineering Electoral Dominance*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press (introduction, Ch. 5 on the UK, and Ch. 7 on Belgium).
- Teele, Dawn Langan. 2020. "Women & the Vote." *Deadalus*, 149(1), pp. 25-39.
- Samuels, David J. and Matthew S. Shugart. 2010. *Presidents, Parties and Prime Ministers: How the separation of powers affects party organization and behaviour*. Cambridge University Press. Chapters 1 and 2.
- Posner, Daniel. 2005. *Institutions and Ethnic Politics in Africa*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, pp. 1-20, 179-250.
- ***Nikolenyi, Csaba. 2014. "Party System Institutionalization in India." In *Party System Institutionalization in Asia*, eds. Allen Hicken and Erik Martinez Kuhonta. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press, pp. 189-211.
- Kitschelt, Herbert, and Regina Smyth. 2002. "Programmatic Party Cohesion in Emerging Postcommunist Democracies. Russia in Comparative Context." *Comparative Political Studies* 35(10): 1228-1256.
- Bishop, Matthew Louis, Jack Corbett, and Wouter Veenendaal. 2020. "Labor Movements and Party System Development: Why Does the Caribbean Have Stable Two-Party Systems, but the Pacific Does Not?" *World Development* 126 (February): 104719. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.worlddev.2019.104719>.

12. Parties and Voters

Do voters still exhibit stable links to established parties in contemporary democracies, and if not why not?

Why this topic?

Perhaps the single most important notion in the study of voting behavior is that of party identification, which denotes an affective orientation towards a political party. It is thus hardly surprising that the observed trend towards weaker party attachments over the last half century has featured as a key issue in the study of voting behavior. Almost any textbook of party politics dedicates a lengthy section to explain the loosening of partisan ties in advanced democracies at least since the 1960s. The stylized picture that emerges from this literature is one of partisan dealignment, whereby party loyalties have eroded, electoral volatility has increased and turnout has decreased. By delving into this literature, this topic allows us to assess the generalizability of these conclusions and unpack the underlying mechanisms of electoral change. Consider, for example, the contrast between this dealigning pattern described above and the pattern of increased partisan polarization and sorting in American politics. What accounts for this divergence within advanced democracies? Why does party seem to be becoming less important in Europe and more important in the US? What are the implications of dealignment for individual voting behavior and party competition? How have parties' strategies

changed as a result of this change? These questions addressed in this topic. We will focus both on topdown factors of political change driven by party competition, and on bottom-up developments from partisan dealignment.

As a way to explain electoral change, it is not always good practice to perceive the electorate as a single homogeneous entity. Electoral change may not therefore be the result of unanimous opinion shifts among the electorate. It may be driven by disproportionate change among specific age groups, which become more influential through generational turnover. The concept of generational turnover enables us to examine more systematically the sources of dealignment and its prospects for the future. In so doing, we will touch upon the distinction between dealignment and realignment and discuss how these concepts help us understand the dynamics of party competition in contemporary democracies. **Reading:**

Introducing foundations of people's vote choice

- ***Clarke, Harold, David Sanders, Marianne C. Stewart and Paul Whiteley. 2004. *Political Choice in Britain*, Oxford University Press, Ch. 2.
- Stokes, Susan C. 2006. "Do Informal Rules Make Democracy Work? Accounting for Accountability in Argentina." In *Informal Institutions and Democracy. Lessons from Latin America*, eds. Gretchen Helmke and Steven Levitsky. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, pp. 125-139.

Stability and variation in programmatic party-voter linkages

- ***Van der Eijk, Cees and Mark Franklin. 2012. *Elections and Voters*, Palgrave Macmillan: Political Analysis Series, Ch. 7.
- Dalton, Russell J. 2019. *Citizen Politics: Public Opinion and Political Parties in Advanced Industrial Democracies*. Washington: CQ Press, Ch. 8, 9, and 10.
- Inglehart, Ronald. 1981. Post-Materialism in an Environment of Insecurity, *American Political Science Review*, 75(4): 880-900.
- Evans, Geoffrey. 2000. The Continued Significance of Class Voting. *Annual Review of Political Science*, 3: 401-17.
- ***Letki, Natalia. 2013. "Do Social Divisions Explain Political Choices? The Case of Poland." In *Political Choice Matters. Explaining the Strength of Class and Religious Cleavages in Cross-National Perspective*, eds. Geoffrey Evans and Nan Dirk de Graaf. Oxford: Oxford University Press, pp. 337-358.
- Junn, Jane, and Natalie Masuoka. 2019. "The Gender Gap is a Race Gap. Women Voters in US Presidential Elections." *Perspectives on Politics* 18(4): 1135-1145.
- Stoker, Laura and Kent Jennings. 2009. Of Time and the Development of Partisan Polarization, *American Journal of Political Science* 52(3): 619-35.
- Levendusky, Matthew. 2012. *The Partisan Sort: How Liberals became more Democrats and Conservatives Became Republicans*. London: The University of Chicago Press, Ch. 1, 3, 5 & 6.
- Hobolt, Sara B., Thomas J. Leeper, and James Tilley. 2020. "Divided by the Vote. Affective Polarization in the Wake of the Brexit Referendum." *British Journal of Political Science*, pp. 1-18, doi:10.1017/S0007123420000125.

Stability and variation in non-programmatic linkages • Yildirim, Kerem and Herbert Kitschelt. 2020. "Analytical Perspectives on Varieties of Clientelism." *Democratization* 27(1): 20-43.

- Auyero, Javier. 2001. *Poor People's Politics*. Durham: Duke University Press, pp. 1-17, 152-182.
- Chandra, Kanchan. 2007. "Counting Heads. A Theory of Voter and Elite Behavior in Patronage Democracies." In *Patrons, Clients and Policies. Patterns of Democratic Accountability and Political Competition*, eds. Herbert Kitschelt and Steven Wilkinson. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, pp. 84-109.
- Wantchekon, Leonard. 2003.

“Clientelism and Voting Behavior. Evidence from a Field Experiment in Benin.” *World Politics* 55(3): 399-422.

- Munoz, Paula. 2018. *Buying Audience. Clientelism and Electoral Campaigns When Parties Are Weak*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, Ch. 1, 4, and 6.

13. Populism and Radicalism

What are the causes of populism and radicalism in contemporary democracies?

Why this topic?

The rise of populism in advanced industrial societies is, in large part, a reaction to the inability of traditional parties to respond adequately in the eyes of the electorate to a series of phenomena such as economic and cultural globalization, immigration, the decline of ideologies and class politics, and the exposure of elite corruption. In Western Europe the phenomenon is also directly connected to the speed and direction of European integration. One of the important issues to be analyzed is how far the different cases in Europe are comparable, and should be seen as manifestations of the same underlying phenomena; also how far European populisms can be compared to their American counterpart.

More generally, the question of populism opens up a discussion of the current ‘political malaise’ in advanced industrial societies, manifested in steadily falling turnouts across Western Europe, declining party memberships, and ever-greater numbers of citizens in surveys citing a lack of interest and distrust in politics and politicians. This perception has in turn affected electoral behaviour as increasing numbers of de-aligned and disillusioned voters either simply do not bother participating or become available and open to new, and sometimes more radical, alternatives.

This topic seeks to understand the underlying social and cultural sources of these phenomena, and to establish how far populist claims that politics has become more convoluted, distant and irrelevant to people’s lives can be defended. The aim is also to assess how far populist politics represents a serious challenge to established political institutions, and whether populism marks the emergence of a new dimension of politics which transcends the classic Left-Right divide.

Reading

Populism – conceptual issues

- *Albertazzi, Daniele and McDonnell, Duncan (eds), *Twenty-First Century Populism. The Spectre of Western European Democracy*, Basingstoke, Palgrave, 2008
- *Halikiopoulou, Daphne et al., ‘The Paradox of Nationalism: The Common Denominator of Radical Right and Radical Left Euroscepticism’, *European Journal of Political Research*, 51 (4), 2012, 504-539.
- Mudde, Cas and Cristobal Rovira Kaltwasser, “Populism”, in *Oxford Handbook of Political Ideologies* (2012)
- Peters, B. Guy and Jon Pierre, “A typology of populism”, *Democratization* 27-6 (2020)
- Weyland, Kurt. "Clarifying a contested concept: Populism in the study of Latin American politics." *Comparative politics* (2001): 1-22.
- Jan-Werner Müller *What is populism?* University of Pennsylvania Press, 2016
- Wuttke, Alexander, Christian Schimpf, and Harald Schoen. 2020. "When the whole is greater than the sum of its parts: On the conceptualization and measurement of populist attitudes and other multidimensional constructs." *American Political Science Review* 114.2: 356-374.
- Sarah Engler, Bartek Pytlas & Kevin Deegan-Krause (2019) Assessing the diversity of antiestablishment and populist politics in Central and Eastern Europe, West European Politics,

42:6, 1310-1336, DOI: 10.1080/01402382.2019.1596696

- Louise Vincent (2011) Seducing the people: Populism and the challenge to democracy in South Africa, *Journal of Contemporary African Studies*, 29:1, 1-14, DOI: [10.1080/02589001.2011.533056](https://doi.org/10.1080/02589001.2011.533056) 4

•

Cases of right-wing populism

- * Sobolewska, Maria, and Robert Ford, *Brexitland. Identity, diversity and the reshaping of British politics* (Cambridge University Press, 2020)
- Temelkuran, Ece. How to lose a country : the 7 steps from democracy to dictatorship. 2019. London : 4th Estate.
- *Crépon, Sylvain et Nicolas Lebourg, ‘2000-2017. From father to daughter, shifts and constants in the Le Pen strategy’, in Helen Drake et al. (eds) *Developments in French Politics* 6 (2020)
- Julius Maximilian Rogenhofer & Ayala Panievsky (2020) “Antidemocratic populism in power: comparing Erdoğan’s Turkey with Modi’s India and Netanyahu’s Israel”, *Democratization*, 27:8, 1394-1412
- Van Kessel, Stijn. "Explaining the electoral performance of populist parties: the Netherlands as a case study." *Perspectives on European Politics and Society* 12.1 (2011): 68-88.
- *Norris, Pippa and Ronald Inglehart, *Cultural backlash. Trump, Brexit and authoritarian populism* (Cambridge, 2019)

Radicalism

- Bordignon F. and Ceccarini C. (2013). “Five Stars and a Cricket. Beppe Grillo Shakes Italian Politics”. *South European Society and Politics*, 18 : 4, 427-449
- Tsakatika, M. and Eleftheriou, C. (2013). “The Radical Left's Turn toward Civil Society in Greece. One Strategy, Two Paths”. *South European Society and Politics*, 18 : 1, pp. 81 – 99.
- March, Luke. *Radical left parties in Europe*. London: Routledge, 2011.
- Mouffe, Chantal, *For a Left populism* London; Verso, 2018.