

POLS 455: Democratization

Spring 2011
MWF 2:00-2:50 pm
Faner Hall, Room 1004

Instructor: Joel Olufowote
Office: 3180 Faner Hall
Office Hours: MWF 3:00-5:00pm & TR 1-3PM
Office Phone: 618-453-3185
E-mail: jolufowote@gmail.com

1) Course Description:

In the past three decades a number of countries located in the regions of Southern Europe, South America, Central America, Eastern Europe, Asia and Africa underwent a shift from autocratic/authoritarian forms of government to a more democratic means of political rule. These transitions, which took place between 1974 and 1990, are often referred to as the “Third Wave” of democratization, where the number of recognized democracies in the world tripled in number. As to be expected, a rigorous research agenda aimed at uncovering the dynamics of regime transition followed the series of events witnessed during the “Third Wave.” Although the existing literature on democratization is broad in scope, for this class we will study a significant but more specific selection. We will focus on the underlying logic of how authoritarian regimes are removed from power and how countries transition to democracy. We will then study how these newly transitioned democracies sustain their regimes and discuss the complexities involved with the *democratic consolidation* of “Third Wave” countries.

2) Course Objectives:

I have three main objectives for students taking this seminar. Although we will inevitably be leaning on the experiences of specific countries to highlight key democratization concepts and theories, this course will be strictly thematic rather than region specific. As such, the meaning of democracy vis-à-vis authoritarianism (and its forms), the dynamics entailed in transition, and the nuances of democratic consolidation will be key themes of this course. A second objective is to run this class as a seminar. I will not be lecturing much; a successful seminar relies heavily on the contribution of students. Lastly, this seminar is designed to help hone your research skills. You will produce a 20-page research project at the end of the semester establishing your expertise on the dynamics of democratization in a specific case or cases.

3) Course Requirements

- **Class Preparation & Attendance:** Your success in this class depends upon your attendance and participation. You are expected to come to class having read the day's assigned material and to synthesize the material in order to produce constructive class discussion.
- **Class Discussion:** You and a classmate (save graduate students, who must lead on their own), are expected to lead classroom discussion for a particular week of class. In doing so, you will identify the major themes consistent among the assigned readings to be covered in the three days of class time (MWF) that you and your partner are responsible for. On the Monday that your week begins, you will hand in a two-page (double-spaced) outline of topics to be covered, and days they will be covered. Students should study the course schedule below to select a topic. ****Refer to sample outline as a template to follow.**** You will begin each class period with a 7-10 minute overview of topics to be discussed, and end with thoughtful questions aimed at leading class conversation.
- **Memos:** On weeks where you **are not** responsible for leading class discussion, six of you are expected to hand in a one-page (double-spaced) paper covering the readings of the day. **** Refer to Sample Memo as a template to follow**** Although I expect substantive discussion from all students every class period, I assume those responsible for handing in memos on their scheduled day will be actively engaged in class discussion with the discussion leaders and the rest of the class.
- **Exam:** The midterm exam will take place in class on Friday, March 11. ****Refer to Midterm Ideas for more information****
- **Research Paper:** You will submit a 20-page research paper as your final for this course, and present your findings and results to the class in the way of a poster/PowerPoint presentation. Segments of your final paper will be periodically due through the semester. ****Refer to Final Paper Instructions for more information****
- **Grading:**

Attendance & Participation	15%
Leading Class Discussion	20%
Memos	15%
Midterm	25%
Research Paper/Presentation	25%

4) Course Policies

- **Absences:** Success in this course is contingent on attendance and participation; therefore, multiple absences will result in a reduction of your overall letter grade, while excessive absences will result in failure of the course. You are permitted three unexcused absences through the semester. Any absence in excess of this allowance must be supported with a written excuse or will be detrimental to your overall grade. Please plan accordingly. More than five absences (unexcused or not) will result in an automatic failing grade.
- **Missed Assignments:** Late assignments will not be accepted. Memos are due, typed, at the beginning of the class period. You may print two copies; one to hand in, and the other to aid you in class discussion for the day. Missed assignments will be counted as a 0 which will inevitably

reduce your overall grade for the course.

- **Cheating & Academic Dishonesty:** Any student found to be in violation of the university's policy on plagiarism and academic dishonesty will receive an F in this course and be reported to the appropriate authorities. If in doubt, please consult the university handbook.

5) Textbooks & Class Materials

- There are four required textbooks for this course. They are available for rent, or for full purchase at the University Bookstore. Please make sure you are in possession of these texts by the second week of classes as we will be reading extensively from these texts.

These are:

- 1) Conteh-Morgan, Earl. 1997. *Democratization in Africa: The Theory and Dynamics of Political Transitions*. Westport: Praeger Publishers
 - 2) Dahl, Robert A. 1971. *Polyarchy: Participation and Opposition*. Yale: Yale University Press
 - 3) Haerpfer et al. 2009. *Democratization*. Oxford: Oxford University Press
 - 4) Pridham, Geoffrey. 2000. *The Dynamics of Democratization*. London: Continuum Publishers.
- Additional reading assignments will be posted on Blackboard. Please refer to the course schedule for assigned readings for the week.

6) Course Schedule and Reading Assignments

Week 1: Political Science Basics and Research Tips

Monday, January 17: (No Class; MLK Day)

Wednesday, January 19: Theory, Hypotheses, and Variables

- Van Evera, Stephen. 1997. *Guide to Methods for Students of Political Science*. Ithaca: Cornell University Press (Pp 7-21).

Friday, January 21: Issues of Measurement: Validity and Reliability

- Shively, W. Phillips. 1998. *The Craft of Political Research*. New Jersey: Prentice-Hall, Incorporated. (Chapter 4)

Week 2: Introduction to the Study of Democratization

Monday, January 24:

- Dahl, Robert A. 1971. *Polyarchy: Participation and Opposition*. Yale: Yale University Press (pp 1-16).

Wednesday, January 26:

- Philippe C. Schmitter and Terry Lynn Karl, "What Democracy Is ... and Is Not," Ch. 4 in *The Global Resurgence of Democracy* (pp. 49-62).

Friday, January 28:

- Haerpfer et al. 2009. *Democratization*. Oxford: Oxford University Press (pp 11-17).

Week 3: Authoritarianism

Monday, January 31: **(Paper 1: Research Idea Due)**

- Przeworski, Adam et al. 2000. *Democracy and Development: Political Institutions and Well-Being in the World, 1950-1990*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press (Pp 13-33).
- Huntington, Samuel P. 1993. *The Third Wave: Democratization in the Late Twentieth Century*. Norman: University of Oklahoma Press (Pp 109-121).

Wednesday, February 2:

- Hyden, Goran. 2006. *African Politics in Comparative Perspective*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press (Pp 95-106).

Friday February 4:

- Pridham, Geoffrey. 2000. *The Dynamics of Democratization*. London: Continuum Publishers (Chapter 3).
- O'Donnell, Guillermo and Philippe Schmitter. 1986. *Transitions from Authoritarian Rule: Tentative Conclusions about Uncertain Democracies*. Baltimore: John Hopkins University Press (Chapter 2).

Week 4: Transitions to Democracy: Effects of Institutions (T)

Monday, February 7:

- Haerpfer et al. 2009. *Democratization*. Oxford: Oxford University Press (Chapters 13 &14).

Wednesday February 9:

- Pridham, Geoffrey. 2000. *The Dynamics of Democratization*. London: Continuum Publishers (Chapter 4-begin).

Friday, February 11:

- Pridham, Geoffrey. 2000. *The Dynamics of Democratization*. London: Continuum Publishers (Chapter 4- end).

Week 5: Transitions to Democracy: Effects of Institutions (E)

Monday, February 14:

- Bratton M. & Nicolas Van de Walle. 1994. *Neopatrimonial Regimes and Political Transitions in Africa*. World Politics, Vol. 46, No. 4 (Pp. 453-489).

Wednesday, February 16:

- Conteh-Morgan, Earl. 1997. *Democratization in Africa: The Theory and Dynamics of Political Transitions*. Westport: Praeger Publishers (Pp. 53-72).

Friday February 18:

- Jørgen Elklit and Palle Svensson, "What Makes Elections Free and Fair," Ch. 15 in *The Global Divergence of Democracies* (Pp. 200-214).

Week 6: Transitions to Democracy: Socio-Economic Preconditions (T)

Monday, February 21: (**Paper 2: Effect of Institutions Due**)

- Dahl, Robert A. 1971. *Polyarchy: Participation and Opposition*. Yale: Yale University Press (Pp 62-80).

Wednesday, February 23:

- Seymour, Martin Lipset. 1959. *Some Social Requisites of Democracy: Economic Development and Political Legitimacy*. The American Political Science Review Vol. 53, No. 1 pp. 69-105 (Begin)

Friday, February 25:

- Seymour, Martin Lipset. 1959. *Some Social Requisites of Democracy: Economic Development and Political Legitimacy*. The American Political Science Review Vol. 53, No. 1 pp. 69-105 (Finish)

Week 7: Transitions to Democracy: Socio-Economic Preconditions (E)

Monday, February 28:

- Evelyne Huber, Dietrich Rueschemeyer, John D. Stephens. 1993. *The Impact of Economic Development on Democracy*. The Journal of Economic Perspectives, Vol. 7, No. 3, (Pp. 71-86).

Wednesday, March 2:

- Przeworski, Adam & Fernando Limogi. 1997. *Modernization: Theories and Facts*, World Politics, Volume 49, No. 2 (Pp 155-183).

Friday, March 4:

- Karl, Terry. 1997. *The Paradox of Plenty*. Berkeley: University of California Press. Chapter 1.

Week 8: Transitions to Democracy: Role of Actors (T)

Monday, March 7: (**Paper 3: Effect of Socioeconomic conditions due**)

- O'Donnell, Guillermo and Philippe Schmitter. 1986. *Transitions from Authoritarian Rule: Tentative Conclusions about Uncertain Democracies*. Baltimore: John Hopkins University Press. (Chapter 3).

Wednesday, March 9:

- Actor Centered Theory of Democratization (ACT)

Friday, March 11:

- **Midterm**

Week 9: SPRING BREAK (March 14-18)

Week 10: Transitions to Democracy: Role of Actors (E)

Monday, March 21:

- ACT

Wednesday, March 23:

- Karl, Terry. 1987. *Petroleum and Political Pacts: The Transition to Democracy in Venezuela*. Latin American Research Review Vol. 22, No. 1 (1987), (Pp. 63-94).

Friday, March 25:

- Jung, Courtney & Ian Shapiro. 1995. *South Africa's Negotiated Transition: Democracy, Opposition, and the new Constitutional Order*. Politics & Society, Vol. 23 Issue 3, (Pp 269- 309).

Week 11: Transitions to Democracy: Political Culture

Monday, March 28: (**Paper 4: Role of political actors due**)

- Samuel P. Huntington. 1991. *The Third Wave: Democratization in the Late Twentieth Century* Norman: University of Oklahoma Press, (Pp. 1-30, 72-85).

Wednesday, March 30: **

- Mattes, Robert & Michael Bratton, 2007. *Learning about Democracy in Africa: Awareness, Performance, and Experience*. American Journal of Political Science Vol. 51, No. 1, (Pp. 192-217).

Friday, April 1: **

- Robert A. Dahl, "Development and Democratic Culture," Ch. 3 in *Consolidating the Third Wave Democracies* (Pp. 34-39).

Week 12: Transitions to Democracy: International Influences

Monday, April 4:

- Haerpfer et al. 2009. *Democratization*. Oxford: Oxford University Press. (Pp. 92-103).

Wednesday, April 6:

- Conteh-Morgan, Earl. 1997. *Democratization in Africa: The Theory and Dynamics of Political Transitions*. Westport: Praeger Publishers. (Pp. 143-167).

Friday, April 8:

- Pridham, Geoffrey. 2000. *The Dynamics of Democratization*. London: Continuum Publishers. (Pp 285-298).

Week 13: Democratic Consolidation: Issues and Debates

Monday, April 11:

- Larry Diamond and Marc F. Plattner, eds., *The Global Divergence of Democracies* (Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 2001) Pp 93-112

Wednesday, April 13:

- Larry Diamond and Marc F. Plattner, eds., *The Global Divergence of Democracies* (Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 2001) Pp 113-139

Friday, April 15:

- Larry Diamond and Marc F. Plattner, eds., *The Global Divergence of Democracies* (Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 2001) Pp 140-166

Week 14: Consultations for Final Paper/Presentations

Monday, April 18: **(Paper 5: International Influences/Prospects of Consolidation Due)**

Wednesday, April 20: *Office Hours Only*

Friday, April 22: *Office Hours Only*

Week 15: Presentations of Final Research

Monday, April 25: Presentations

Wednesday, April 27: Presentations

Friday, April 29: Presentations

Week 16: Presentations of Final Research

Monday, May 2: Presentations

Wednesday, May 4: Presentations

Friday, May 6: Presentations

Week 17: Final Research Paper Due

Monday, May 9- Friday, May 13.

APPENDICES

Seminar Scheduling of Class Discussant Leaders & Memo Writers

WEEK 1 : Authoritarianism	WEEK 2: Transitions to Democracy: Effects of Institutions (T)
Beasley, Kristen D Kennedy, Stephanie L	Merrell, Brandon C. Prince, Matthew
<u>Monday, January 31st 2011</u> El Badrawy, Abdelrahman Graham, Sean Harla, Christopher A. Lawson, Ebony N. Luttrell, Nicholas L. Reitenbach, Richard D.	<u>Monday, February 7th 2011</u> Harla, Christopher A. Lawson, Ebony N. Luttrell, Nicholas L Reitenbach, Richard D Kennedy, Stephanie L Beasley, Kristen D
<u>Wednesday, February 2nd 2011</u> Macaulay, Oreoluwa N. Merrell, Brandon C. Morgan, Brittany D. Murray, Timothy M. Prince, Matthew A. Rinderer, Marshall	<u>Wednesday February 9th 2011</u> Macaulay, Oreoluwa N. Morgan, Brittany D. Murray, Timothy M. Rinderer, Marshall El Badrawy, Abdelrahman Graham, Sean
<u>Friday, February 4th 2011</u> Sarver, Joseph Z. Schlinkmann, Eric K Serapin, Joseph L. Shlah, William G. Weiss, Ari B. Westendorf, Nick	<u>Friday, February 11th 2011</u> Sarver, Joseph Z. Schlinkmann, Eric K Serapin, Joseph L. Shlah, William G. Weiss, Ari B. Westendorf, Nick

WEEK 3: Transitions to Democracy: Effects of Institutions (E)	WEEK 4: Transitions to Democracy: Socio-Economic Preconditions (T)
El Badrawy, Abdelrahman Luttrell, Nicholas L	Harla, Christopher Morgan, Brittany
<p><u>Monday, February 14th 2011</u></p> <p>Lawson, Ebony N. Reitenbach, Richard D Beasley, Kristen D Kennedy, Stephanie L Prince, Matthew A Merrell, Brandon C.</p> <p><u>Wednesday February 16th 2011</u></p> <p>Harla, Christopher A Macaulay, Oreoluwa N. Morgan, Brittany D. Murray, Timothy M. Rinderer, Marshall Graham, Sean</p> <p><u>Friday, February 18th 2011</u></p> <p>Sarver, Joseph Z. Schlinkmann, Eric K Serapin, Joseph L. Shlah, William G. Weiss, Ari B. Westendorf, Nick</p>	<p><u>Monday, February 21st, 2011</u></p> <p>El Badrawy, Abdelrahman Graham, Sean Lawson, Ebony N. Luttrell, Nicholas L Reitenbach, Richard D Kennedy, Stephanie L</p> <p><u>Wednesday, February 23rd 2011</u></p> <p>Beasley, Kristen D Macaulay, Oreoluwa N. Merrell, Brandon C. Murray, Timothy M. Prince, Matthew A. Rinderer, Marshall</p> <p><u>Friday, February 25th 2011</u></p> <p>Sarver, Joseph Z. Schlinkmann, Eric K Serapin, Joseph L. Shlah, William G. Weiss, Ari B. Westendorf, Nick</p>

WEEK 5: Transitions to Democracy: Socio-Economic Preconditions (E)	WEEK 6: Transitions to Democracy: Role of Actors (T)
Graham, Sean Lawson, Ebony N	Murray, Timothy M Macaulay, Oreoluwa N
<p><u>Monday, February 28th 2011</u></p> <p>El Badrawy, Abdelrahman</p> <p>Harla, Christopher A.</p> <p>Luttrell, Nicholas L</p> <p>Reitenbach, Richard D</p> <p>Kennedy, Stefanie</p> <p>Beasley, Kristen</p> <p><u>Wednesday, March 2nd 2011</u></p> <p>Macaulay, Oreoluwa N.</p> <p>Merrell, Brandon C.</p> <p>Morgan, Brittany D.</p> <p>Murray, Timothy M.</p> <p>Prince, Matthew A.</p> <p>Rinderer, Marshall</p> <p><u>Friday, March 4th 2011</u></p> <p>Sarver, Joseph Z.</p> <p>Schlinkmann, Eric K</p> <p>Serapin, Joseph L.</p> <p>Shlah, William G.</p> <p>Weiss, Ari B.</p> <p>Westendorf, Nick</p>	<p><u>Monday, March 7th 2011</u></p> <p>El Badrawy, Abdelrahman</p> <p>Graham, Sean</p> <p>Harla, Christopher A.</p> <p>Lawson, Ebony N.</p> <p>Luttrell, Nicholas L</p> <p>Reitenbach, Richard D</p> <p><u>Wednesday, March 9th 2011</u></p> <p>Merrell, Brandon C.</p> <p>Morgan, Brittany D.</p> <p>Prince, Matthew A.</p> <p>Rinderer, Marshall</p> <p>Kennedy, Stefanie</p> <p>Beasley, Kristen</p> <p><u>Friday, March 11th 2011</u></p> <p>Sarver, Joseph Z.</p> <p>Schlinkmann, Eric K</p> <p>Serapin, Joseph L.</p> <p>Shlah, William G.</p> <p>Weiss, Ari B.</p> <p>Westendorf, Nick</p>

WEEK 7 : Transitions to Democracy: Role of Actors (E)	WEEK 8: Transitions to Democracy: Political Culture
Shlah, William G Sarver, Joseph Z	Reitenbach, Richard D. Serapin, Joseph
<u>Monday, March 21st 2011</u> El Badrawy, Abdelrahman Graham, Sean Harla, Christopher A. Lawson, Ebony N. Luttrell, Nicholas L Reitenbach, Richard D	<u>Monday, March 28th 2011</u> El Badrawy, Abdelrahman Graham, Sean Harla, Christopher A. Lawson, Ebony N. Luttrell, Nicholas L Murray, Tim
<u>Wednesday, March 23rd 2011</u> Macaulay, Oreoluwa N. Merrell, Brandon C. Morgan, Brittany D. Murray, Timothy M. Prince, Matthew A. Rinderer, Marshall	<u>Wednesday March 30th 2011 **</u> Merrell, Brandon C. Morgan, Brittany D. Prince, Matthew A. Rinderer, Marshall Kennedy, Stefanie Beasley, Kristen
<u>Friday, March 25th 2011</u> Schlinkmann, Eric K Serapin, Joseph L. Weiss, Ari B. Kennedy, Stefanie Beasley, Kristen Westendorf, Nick	<u>Friday, April 1st 2011 **</u> Sarver, Joseph Z. Schlinkmann, Eric K Ore Shlah, William G. Weiss, Ari B. Westendorf, Nick

WEEK 9: Transitions to Democracy: International Influences	WEEK 10: Democratic Consolidation: Issues and Debates
Schlinkmann, Eric K Weiss, Ari B.	Rinderer, Marshall Westendorf, Nick
<p><u>Monday, April 4th 2011</u></p> <p>El Badrawy, Abdelrahman</p> <p>Graham, Sean</p> <p>Harla, Christopher A.</p> <p>Lawson, Ebony N.</p> <p>Luttrell, Nicholas L</p> <p>Reitenbach, Richard D</p>	<p><u>Monday, April 11th 2011</u></p> <p>El Badrawy, Abdelrahman</p> <p>Graham, Sean</p> <p>Harla, Christopher A.</p> <p>Lawson, Ebony N.</p> <p>Luttrell, Nicholas L</p> <p>Reitenbach, Richard D</p>
<p><u>Wednesday, April 6th 2011</u></p> <p>Macaulay, Oreoluwa N.</p> <p>Merrell, Brandon C.</p> <p>Morgan, Brittany D.</p> <p>Murray, Timothy M.</p> <p>Prince, Matthew A.</p> <p>Rinderer, Marshall</p>	<p><u>Wednesday, April 13th 2011</u></p> <p>Macaulay, Oreoluwa N.</p> <p>Merrell, Brandon C.</p> <p>Morgan, Brittany D.</p> <p>Murray, Timothy M.</p> <p>Prince, Matthew A.</p> <p>Shlah, William G.</p>
<p><u>Friday, April 8th 2011</u></p> <p>Sarver, Joseph Z.</p> <p>Serapin, Joseph L.</p> <p>Shlah, William G.</p> <p>Westendorf, Nick</p> <p>Beasley, Kristen</p> <p>Kennedy, Stefanie</p>	<p><u>Friday, April 15th 2011</u></p> <p>Sarver, Joseph Z.</p> <p>Serapin, Joseph L.</p> <p>Schlinkmann, Eric K</p> <p>Weiss, Ari B.</p> <p>Beasley, Kristen</p> <p>Kennedy, Stefanie</p>

Sample Outline

Course Outline: Week 2

Introduction to the Study of Democratization

Instructions

- a) Identify main theme consistent among readings for the week
- b) Give ***brief*** overview of articles/books
- c) Locate any inconsistencies and contradictions between texts
- d) Provide an opinion of the strengths and weaknesses of the readings
- e) What are the most insightful points of the assigned readings? What are the least?
- f) Formulate questions (10-15), that will help guide class discussion for the week.

Monday, January 24:

- Dahl, Robert A. 1971. *Polyarchy: Participation and Opposition*. Yale: Yale University Press (pp 1-16)

Wednesday, January 26:

- Philippe C. Schmitter and Terry Lynn Karl, "What Democracy Is ... and Is Not," Ch. 4 in *The Global Resurgence of Democracy* (pp. 49-62)

Friday, January 28:

- Haerpfer et al. 2009. *Democratization*. Oxford: Oxford University Press (pp 11-17).

What is Democracy?

The concept of democracy, how this form of governance differs from other types of rule and the specific attributes needed for a country to be deemed democratic is at the fore-front of this week's readings and will provide the thematic template upon which discussion will be focused.

As is evinced through the respective readings this week, the reference to Dahl's conception of "Polyarchy" is repeated by Haerpfer et al's and Schmitter and Karl's initial attempts in defining what it is to be a democracy. As such, commencing my course outline with a brief discussion of Dahl's concept of polyarchy is seemingly the correct way to proceed in light of the seminal nature of his work.

Dahl proposes an ideal-type conceptual parameter of what it is to be a democracy where he posits many attributes and qualifications are necessary, yet insufficient to comprise of what he refers to as a full or complete democracy. A 'polyarchy' on the other hand, is a regime that contains some of the core attributes and requirements a polity must be in possession of in order to be characterized as a "full" democracy. The necessary yet insufficient conceptual claims in

Dahl's reasoning, I find to be especially important due to the stress put on the exhaustiveness of the specific attributes needed for inclusion. The author here is well aware that no one polity can be in possession of such an extensive list of elements, and thus concedes or rather leverages his argument in the claim that only those (none) that are in possession of ALL attributes shall be referred to as complete or full democracies, and the rest of the "incompletely democratized" regimes be deemed "Polyarchies" (8).

Clearly Dahl's work has resonated in the democratization literature for a variety of reasons. One of the more thought-provoking elements found here however, is the seemingly problematic nature of a crisp, concise *definition* of the *concept* of democracy. Democracy, a term which has come to occupy a significant place in everyday vocabulary, cannot be so elusive of a concept that it takes over twenty specific attributes to capture its true essence; or, can it? Schmitter and Karl seem to grapple with the ambiguity of Dahl's conceptual framework of "democracy" and "polyarchy" by an outright statement of the author's "vain" attempt in achieving greater conceptual precision. However, in the authors' attempts here at delineating between the conceptual parameters of the term, the procedures which make democracy possible and operational principles that guide behavior, I am unsure whether the authors here clarify their primary objections to Dahl's work or simply further muddy the waters. Their contribution, I find is implicit in their discussion of 'What democracy is not' as it sheds light more on the opposite tack of the discussion of 'What democracy is' Although, I am left unsure as to exactly how the authors here elucidate the concept of Dahl's definition of democracy by *adding* two conditions of their own to further capture its essence.

The discussion of categorical differences between minimalist and broader definitions of democracy brought to light in Haerpfer et al's overview text is suggestive of the view that *there*

is a simple and concise conception of democracy, of which the other readings for the week seem to gloss over. Elections, as a defining feature seems to be a component the author's here stress as a starting point to the conception of democracy (13-14), although this is rebuked as a distinguishing feature and referred to as a "fallacy" by Schmitter and Karl (52).

I end my course discussion outline with a number of questions I feel can help guide our weekly discussion of democracy and what exactly it is:

- 1) According to Dahl, what is a Polyarchy?**

- 2) Dahl posits the notion of Contestation and Inclusiveness, as a way to differentiate specific types of political regimes and places a 'polyarchy' at the upper right corner. Why?**
- 3) How does Dahl's discussion of a polyarchy increase, or further our knowledge of what it is to be a democracy?**
- 4) Why is Dahl's study of "Polyarchy" such a seminal book in the study of democracy? What does he advocate that resonates with many democratization scholars after him?**
- 5) According to Schmitter & Karl, how do concepts, procedures and operative principles differ when defining democracy? Is this a necessary distinction?**
- 6) Why does 'society' play a role in the type of democracy witnessed in an area? S&K suggest this may be the case (also Dahl). Shouldn't democracy look the same everywhere?**
- 7) What common attributes and features do Dahl and S&K mutually accept as inclusive in democracy? Which ones do they disagree about?**
- 8) Let's think of democracy as a concept, that has 5 specific attributes. What would they be and why?**
- 9) How does a minimalist definition, as opposed to one that is broader in construct help or hinder our understanding of democracy?**
- 10) How does the 'stretching' of democracy as a concept occur; and, why is this considered undesirable?**

Sample Memo

Instructions

- a) Identify theme of reading
- b) Present a response/argument about the reading
- d) What are the most insightful points of the assigned readings? What are the least?

Monday, January 24:

- Dahl, Robert A. 1971. *Polyarchy: Participation and Opposition*. Yale: Yale University Press (pp 1-16)

Chapter 1 of 'Polyarchy,' by Robert Dahl takes an in-depth look into the contours of the conceptual parameters of 'Democracy' and 'Democratization.' I find this chapter to be particularly interesting because of two main reasons. First, Dahl creates a notion of democracy that is unattainable, an ideal-type concept which he refers to as complete and full democracies. He adopts the term 'polyarchy,' to explain incomplete democracies that are yet to reach (and may never- according to Dahl) the extensive requirements *necessary but not sufficient* of a full democracy. Secondly, Dahl explains his process of democratization through a parsimonious two dimensional figure that illustrates changes in regime type through two variables of choice: participation and contestation.

Although Dahl presents an exhaustive list of conditions required for democracy, he seems to key upon two main variables of choice to illustrate the democratization process. Ideal type theorizing, as Dahl uses to define democracy tends to encourage the inclusion of an infinite number of attributes and features to conceptually define a term. However, the author's focus on just two main components of democratization leads me to believe, or rather question the validity of his attempt in promoting an ideal-type concept of democracy. It seems through Dahl's illustration of democratization, the variables of contestation and participation reign paramount, not only in describing how democratization occurs, but also in discussing what essential (necessary & sufficient) features define democracy.

It strikes me that based on Dahl's dimensional portrayal of democratization- a more straight forward approach can be taken to define what democracy is, by focusing on key elements of the process such as: participation and contestation.

Midterm Ideas

As a class (I included), we will collectively vote on our choice of Midterm Evaluations for this course. The options below are tentative ideas and not the gamut of the options we have available for consideration. I will take Midterm suggestions through Week 3 of the syllabus, at which point we will then democratically decide.

The current options are:

- Sit down exam (Essay)
- Sit down exam (Multiple Choice)
- Book report on a text (about democracy) of choice.
- Oral Presentation of an Authoritarian country
- Debate on a topic of choice (Week 1-8)

Final Paper Instructions

A) For your final research paper, as a primary objective you will be responsible for evaluating the prospects of democratization of a given country according to the respective theoretical traditions we explore this semester. Naturally, the country you choose will be considered authoritarian according to our predetermined definition of democracy.

B) A second objective of your research paper will be to assess the propensity for the democratic consolidation of your country, if democracy is found to be a foreseeable phenomenon in your country. If this is not the case, you will be expected to show how consolidation *would* occur in your country, and what specific evidence, traits and features you can point to in arguing your case.

C) Throughout the course of the semester you will provide me with a one-two page paper that review each theory discussed in class. For example, next week Monday, you will provide me with a country of your choosing you wish to write your final paper on, provide background information on the country, and illustrate why it is not democratic. On Monday, February 21st, you will provide me with a one page paper on the effect of institutions as it pertains to the process of democratization in your country. With this method, you will have written most (if not all) of your research paper before it is due at the end of the semester.

D) You will present your research findings through poster illustrations by highlighting the dynamics of democratization in your country and detailing the prospects of democratic consolidation in that case.