***POLS 30560 Elections in Comparative Perspective***

***TR 12:30-1:45pm***

***Classroom:* Pasquerilla Center 102**

***Instructors: Samuel Handlin (***Samuel.P.Handlin.1@nd.edu***) and Ezequiel Gonzalez Ocantos (******egonzal4@nd.edu******)***

***Office Hours: Monday 2:00-3:30, Wednesday 2:00-3:30***

***Handlin: 300 Hesburgh***

***Gonzalez Ocantos: 915 Flanner***

***Course Summary:***

Did you know that in Argentina parties hire soccer hooligans to mobilize voters? Or that in Mexico voters are given cell phone cameras to prove they voted for the party that gave them money? In countries like Mubarak’s Egypt and Putin’s Russia or Argentina and India, politicians seek power and legitimacy by winning votes, and do so by applying all sorts of tactics. If you are interested in how political campaigns differ across countries and political regimes, you should take this course. The course begins with a discussion of the role played by democratic elections in facilitating social choice and enhancing political accountability. We then embark on an empirical journey in order to study electoral practices in various world regions and evaluate how they promote or distort political representation. We first explore why parties in democracies resort to different tactics like ideological/programmatic, clientelistic and ethnic appeals in order to obtain votes. In this part of the course we look at the electoral connection between parties and citizens in Eastern Europe, Latin America, Africa, and India. The second half of the course explores the dynamics of authoritarian and competitive authoritarian elections in order to understand why non-democratic leaders decide to hold elections. We analyze the dynamics and detection of electoral fraud, the nature of competitive authoritarian elections in countries like Mexico and Egypt, and the existence of sub-national authoritarian regimes in Latin America and the Post-Communist world. The final lectures explore the connection between elections and democratization: does holding elections that are not entirely free and fair increase the likelihood of democratic transitions and consolidation?

***Objectives:***

Elections are the cornerstone of democratic politics, but they also occur under dictatorships. In this course you will learn about electoral politics around the world. By the end of the semester you will be able to:

* *Compare and contrast* elections in the United States with those of other countries, in particular, developing nations;
* *Identify* the different linkage strategies pursued by politicians in order to garner votes (e.g. programmatic, clientelistic and ethnic appeals);
* *Identify* the organizational resources parties must develop in order to effectively resort to each of these strategies;
* *Explain* the social and political conditions that favor the use of different electoral strategies;
* *Analyze the consequences* of different linkage strategies for democratization, democratic quality and political representation;
* *Describe* the characteristics of elections under authoritarian rule;
* *Explain* why autocrats choose to hold elections.

Finally, like any other class you take at Notre Dame, this course will help you develop a series of transferable skills that will be useful outside the academic world. The exams and take home assignments will always require you to think critically about the material covered in our discussions as well as to *write clearly, concisely and creatively about it*. Sometimes you will also have to do some *independent research* to enrich your written work. Whether you decide to become a lawyer, a college professor or start your own business, these are tasks that will be required of you in the future.

By the end of the semester you will have

* *Strengthened* your ability to effectively process a large amount of information in a short period of time;
* *Improved* your ability to write analytical essays that include an introduction stating the thesis and outlining the overall argument; a set of paragraphs comparing, contrasting and evaluating the different readings to support your thesis; and a conclusion summarizing the main points developed in the essay and posing thoughtful questions about politics;
* *Further developed* your oral skills during class presentations and discussions.

***Readings:***

We would like you to purchase two books. You can buy the books online or either buy them or rent them at the bookstore.

*Books:*

Bunce, V. and S. Wolchik (2011). *Defeating Authoritarian Leaders in Post-Communist Countries*. New York, NY: Cambridge University Press.

Lindberg, S. (2006). *Democracy and Elections in Africa*. Baltimore, MD: The John Hopkins University Press.

The remaining readings (journal articles and book chapters) can be found on electronic reserve here: [https://www.library.nd.edu/eresources/ereserves//course.cgi?course=2012S\_POLS\_30560\_01](https://www.library.nd.edu/eresources/ereserves/course.cgi?course=2012S_POLS_30560_01" \t "_blank)

You will need your ND Net ID and password to have access to them. During our first meeting we will show you how this is done.

The reading load will be heavier some weeks than others. However, we do not expect the readings to take more than 1.5-3 hours per week.

We encourage you to prepare summaries of the readings as you go along. Doing so will prove immensely helpful when the time comes to study for the midterm and the final exam. A good summary may include bullet points with the main arguments, historical events, etc. It could also consist of a few paragraphs explaining the text or of a chart connecting the main ideas presented by the author. There is no one way to go about summarizing texts. Just make sure that your bullets points, charts, tables or explanations are clear!

We will be happy to take a look at your summaries during office hours, but they will not count towards your final grade.

We do not mind if you join forces with another student in the class to work together on the summaries. Each one of you could be in charge of producing a summary of one book chapter or article each week.

We believe that working in groups can often be a great opportunity for you to discuss the readings, clarify doubts, compare authors’ different takes on the subject and make coursework more manageable and enjoyable.

However, this does not mean that you are exempted from reading all the articles or book chapters. The main purpose of working in groups is to make sure that if for some reason (sickness, travel, heavier than normal workload, etc.) you are not able to read everything before class, you will still know the main ideas in every text and be able to participate in our discussions. In addition, at the end of the course your summaries will prove extremely useful as you prepare for the final exam.

It is up to you whether you work in groups or not and it is also up to you to form these groups. We just want to make it clear that we support this kind of initiative.

***Grading:***

Your final grade will be calculated as follows.

Participation: 5%

Midterm: 25%

8-9 page paper: 30%

Final Exam: 30%

In class oral presentation and response paper: 10%

If you hand in an assignment late or take an exam later than everybody else, we will deduct half a letter grade for each day late unless you have a valid excuse (University athletic commitments or sickness are the only ones we can really think of!). If we return graded papers or exams before you hand in your assignment or take the exam, we will not give you a passing grade.

*Midterm, Take-Home paper and Final Exam*

All of these assignments will require you to write analytical essays. We think that writing essays constitutes a much better learning experience than asking you to memorize facts or answer multiple-choice questions. Although we do not expect you to know every detail (dates, names, places, etc.) of the political parties and electoral processes we will study, to put together coherent answers to the essay questions you will have to know key events, political actors and circumstances.

In-class exams will ask you to answer one or two essay questions and the take-home paper will ask you to answer one question. You will always be able to choose among a list of several essay topics.

A great essay (letter grades A, A-) will present an answer showing a very clear understanding and a high degree of accuracy, and provide a cogent and well-structured argument focused on the question. To get an A or an A- you need to offer thoughtful comparisons between the different authors and case studies, and connect those comparisons to a general thesis. The thesis will usually be presented in the first paragraph of the essay, where you will also clearly outline the main points developed in the rest of the paper. The essay should also include a conclusion restating the thesis and summarizing the points put forward to support it.

Like an A-level essay, a B-level essay (B, B+) will display a high degree of accuracy in its presentation of the reading and lecture materials. Unlike an outstanding essay, however, this kind of essay will not present original comparisons of the case studies or authors, or critiques of the material, i.e. it will be more descriptive than analytical.

Essays deserving grades inferior to a B will be those that either do not answer the question or that do so inadequately by presenting inaccurate descriptions of the cases or the arguments developed by the different authors. The degree of inaccuracy will determine the exact letter grade.

*Oral presentation and response paper*

In addition to a midterm exam, an 8-9 page take-home paper and a final exam, we expect you to give one oral presentation during the semester.

The presentation will consist of a general summary of that day’s readings. You will also be expected to pose interesting questions regarding the texts, making thoughtful connections/comparisons with other readings covered that week or earlier in the semester. Presentations should be between 5 and 10 minutes long.

In addition to evaluating your oral presentation, we will also grade a 1-2 page response paper in which you will briefly summarize the readings and pose interesting questions for discussion.

We will ask you to sign up for the class presentations during the first week of class.

*Class Participation*

Given the small size of the class we will greatly value your input during our meetings. A high participation grade will be awarded to students who regularly come to class, answer questions, ask questions, make interesting comparisons, criticize the readings and openly disagree with us!

We understand that not all students are equally comfortable doing all of these things. Therefore, we will also greatly value alternative forms of participation such as sending thoughts, comments, questions, interesting/relevant newspaper articles by email. If you decide to participate in this way, you will send us an email and we will distribute it to the class.

While students may understandably miss a few classes over the semester, missing a significant number of classes would open them up to loses points in that area.

***Organization of the course***

*Classes*

Classes will consist of both discussions and lectures. We expect you to ask questions, answer our questions and comment on the readings and the material presented during the lecture. Your oral presentations will always initiate our discussions.

*Q&A sessions*

As you can see in the syllabus, before the midterm exam we will have a Q&A session. We will also organize a revision session before the final exam. We expect you to come to these sessions armed with questions.

***Honor Code***

We expect every student in the class to be familiar with the Notre Dame honor code and to abide by it. You will get 0 points for an assignment that violates the honor code. Make sure you always cite your sources and NEVER copy other student’s work. As you write your take-home papers, make sure that you do not copy/paste from the summaries you shared with other people since you may all end up with the same paragraphs or sentences.

If you are not familiar with the Honor Code:

http://www.nd.edu/~hnrcode/docs/handbook.htm

The Honor Pledge: “As a member of the Notre Dame community, I will not participate in or tolerate academic dishonesty.”

**What is Political Representation?**

In the first 3 classes we will analyze the concept of political representation. What is political representation in modern democracies? What role do elections play in linking citizens with politicians? What are the different ways in which politicians seek to establish an electoral connection with potential voters?

**January 17th**

**Introduction**

No readings for this class

**January 19th**

**What is Political Representation?**

Manin, B. (1997). *The Principles of Representative Government*. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press. **CHAPTERS 5 and 6**

*Recommended:*

Przeworski, A., S. Stokes and B. Manin eds. (1999). *Democracy, Accountability, and Representation*. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press. **CHAPTER 1**

**January 24th**

**Types of Electoral Linkages**

Kitschelt, H. (2000). “Linkages Between Citizens and Politicians in Democratic Polities,” *Comparative Political Studies*, 33(6-7): 845–79.

**Programmatic, Clientelistic and Ethnic Appeals Around the World**

Politicians seek votes by appealing to voters’ ideological inclinations and ethnic identities, and sometimes even try to buy support with money or individual gifts. In this part of the course we study each of these different linkage strategies. We first look at programmatic linkages in Western Europe and Latin America to explore how ideological electoral competition increases the quality of political representation. We then move on to study the other two types of linkages (clientelistic and ethnic) in Latin America, Africa and India. How do parties enforce vote-buying exchanges in the presence of the secret ballot? How does the existence of a market for votes affect democratic quality? Does political competition on ethnic grounds reflect natural divisions in society or do politicians manufacture ethnic cleavages to maximize electoral gains? This section of the course ends with an analysis of the negative consequences of parties’ failure to build stable and effective electoral connections with voters. The lectures emphasize the risks that democracies run when political representation is in crisis.

**January 26th**

**Programmatic Linkages in the US and Western Europe**

Dalton, R. (1985). “Political Parties and Political Representation,” *Comparative Political Studies*, 18(3): 267–99.

*Recommended:*

Mayhew, D. (1974). *Congress: The Electoral Connection*. New Haven, CT: Yale University Press. Chapter 1

**January 31st**

**Programmatic linkages in the Developing World**

Luna, J.P. and E. Zechmeister (2005). “Political Representation in Latin America: A Study of Elite-Mass Congruence in Nine Countries,” *Comparative Political Studies*, 38(4):388-416

Linzer, Drew (2011). “The Left-Right Ideological Spectrum in Global Mass Opinion.” Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Political Science Association, Seattle, WA.

**February 2nd**

**Political Clientelism**

Stokes, S. (2007). “Political Clientelism,” in Boix, C. and S. Stokes (eds). The Oxford *Handbook of Comparative Politics*. Oxford, UK: Oxford University Press.

*Recommended:*

Stokes, S. (2007) “Is Vote Buying Undemocratic?” in Schaffer, F. (ed). *Elections for Sale*. Boulder, CO: Lynne Rienner Publishers.

**February 7th**

**Political Clientelism in Africa**

Wantchekon, L. (2003). "Clientelism and Voting Behavior: Evidence from a Field Experiment in Benin," *World Politics*, 55(3):399-422.

Van de Walle, N. (2007). “Meet the New Boss, Same as the Old Boss? The Evolution of Political Clientelism in Africa,” in Kitschelt, K. and S. Wilkinson (eds). *Patrons, Clients, and Policies: Patterns of Democratic Accountability and Political Competition*. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.

*Recommended:*

Bratton, M. (2008). “Vote Buying and Violence in Nigerian Election Campaigns,” *Afrobarometer Working Paper Series*. No. 99.

**February 9th**

**Political Clientelism in Latin America**

Brusco, V., M. Nazareno, and S. Stokes. (2004). “Vote Buying in Argentina,” *Latin American Research Review* 39(2):66-88.

Auyero, J. (2000) “The Logic of Clientelism in Argentina: An Ethnographic Account,” *Latin American Research Review*, 35(3):55-81.

*Recommended*:

Auyero, J. (2000). *Poor People’s Politics: Peronist Survival Networks and the Legacy of Evita*. Durham, NC: Duke University Press. **CHAPTERS 3 and 5**

**February 14th**

**Ethnic Appeals in India**

Chandra, K. (2004). *Why Ethnic Parties Succeed: Patronage and Ethnic Head Counts in India*. New York, NY: Cambridge University Press. **CHAPTER 7.**

Wilkinson, S. (2004). *Votes and Violence: Electoral Competition and Ethnic Riots in India.* New York: Cambridge University Press. **CHAPTER 5**

*Recommended:*

Chandra, K. (2011). “What is an Ethnic Party?,” *Party Politics* 17(2):151–169.

**February 16th**

**Ethnic Appeals in Africa**

Dunning, T. and L. Harrison (2010). “Cross-cutting Cleavages and Ethnic Voting: An Experimental Study of Cousinage in Mali,” *American Political Science Review* 104(1):1-19.

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

**February 21st**

**Ethnic Appeals in Latin America**

Madrid, R. (2005). “Indigenous Parties and Democracy in Latin America,” *Latin American Politics and Society* 47(4):161-179.

Van Cott, D. L. (2005). *From Movements to Parties in Latin America: The Evolution of Ethnic Politics*. New York, NY: Cambridge University Press. **CHAPTER 3**

**February 23rd**

**When Representation Fails: Party system collapse in Peru and Venezuela**

Levitsky, S. and M. Cameron (2003) “Democracy without Parties? Political Parties and Regime Change in Fujimori’s Peru,” *Latin American Politics and Society* 45(3):1-33.

Roberts, K. (2003). “Social Correlates of Party System Demise and Populist Resurgence in Venezuela,” *Latin American Politics and Society*, 45(3):35-57.

*Recommended:*

Tanaka, M. (2006) “From Crisis to Collapse of the Party Systems and Dilemmas for Democratic Representation: Peru and Venezuela’” in Mainwaring, S. et al (eds). *The Crisis of Political Representation in the Andes*. Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press.

**February 28th**

**When Representation Fails: Party adaptation and survival in Argentina**

Levitsky, S. (2003). *The Transformation of Labor Based Parties: Argentine Peronism in Comparative Perspective*. New York, NY: Cambridge University Press. Pages 144-185 and 217-230

**March 1sT**

**When Representation Fails: Anti-party candidates in the Post-Communist World**

Pop-Eleches, G. (2010) “Throwing Out the Bums: Protest Voting and Unorthodox Parties After Communism,” *World Politics* 62(2):221-260.

Hale, H. (2006). *Why Not Parties in Russia?* New York, NY: Cambridge University Press. **Chapter 4**

**March 6th Q&A BEFORE MID TERMS**

**March 8th MIDTERM EXAM**

**March 10th-18th SPRING BREAK**

***Elections in Competitive Authoritarian and Authoritarian Regimes***

In this part of the course we move away from the world of democratic politics and begin to look at elections under non-democratic regimes. What are the main characteristics of authoritarian regimes that hold elections? Unlike democratic elections, elections in these contexts are not defined by *ex ante* uncertainty about winners and losers. Why do non-democratic leaders hold elections that are not free and fair? We first look at the politics of electoral fraud in 19th century Latin America and in contemporary developing countries. How is fraud perpetrated? What are the costs involved in rigging elections? How can we detect electoral fraud? We then study the cases of Mexico under the PRI and Egypt under Mubarak to analyze the logic behind and the dynamics of contemporary authoritarian elections. Finally, we investigate the dynamics of authoritarianism at the sub-national level in Latin America and the Post-Communist world.

**March 20th**

**Authoritarian Elections: Competitive Authoritarian Regimes**

Levitsky, S. and L. Way (2010). *Competitive Authoritarianism: Hybrid Regimes After the Cold War*. New York, NY: Cambridge University Press. **CHAPTERS 1 and PAGES 54-74**

**March 22nd**

**Authoritarian Elections: Why Elections?**

Schedler, A. (2002.) “The Menu of Manipulation,” *Journal of Democracy* 13(2): 36-50.

Gandhi, J. and E. Lust-Okar (2009). “Elections Under Authoritarianism,” *Annual Review of Political Science* 12: 403-422.

**March 27th**

**The Politics of Electoral Fraud in 19th Century Latin America**

Posada Carbo, E. (2000). “Electoral Juggling: A Comparative History of the Corruption of Suﬀrage In Latin America, 1830-1930,” in [*Journal of Latin American Studies*](http://journals.cambridge.org/action/displayFulltext?type=1&fid=59530&jid=LAS&volumeId=32&issueId=03&aid=59529&bodyId=&membershipNumber=&societyETOCSession=) , 32: 611-644.

Sabato, H. (2001). *The Many and the Few: Political Participation in Republican Buenos Aires*. Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press. **CHAPTERS 4 and 5.**

*Recommended:*

Lehoucq, F. (2003) “Electoral Fraud: Causes, Types, and Consequences,” *Annual Review of Political Science* 6:233-56 .

**March 29th**

**Detecting Electoral Fraud in Developing Countries**

Alvarez, R.M., T. Hall, and S. Hyde (2008). *Election Fraud: Detecting and Deterring Electoral Manipulation*. Washington, DC: Brookings. **Introduction and Chapter 11**.

**April 3rd**

**Authoritarian Elections in Mexico**

Greene, K. (2007). *Why Dominant Parties Lose: Mexico’s Democratization in Comparative Perspective*. New York, NY: Cambridge University Press. **CHAPTER 3, PAGES 71-115.**

Bruhn, K. (1997). *Taking On Goliath: The Emergence of a New Left Party and the Struggle for Democracy in Mexico*. University Park, PA: Pennsylvania State University Press. **PAGES 31-44.**

**April 5th**

**Authoritarian Elections in Egypt**

Blaydes, L. (2010). *Elections and Distributive Politics in Mubarak’s Egypt*. New York, NY: Cambridge University Press. **CHAPTERS 2 and 3.**

**April 6th-9th Fri - Mon EASTER HOLIDAY**

**April 10th**

**Authoritarian Elections in Egypt**

Blaydes, L. (2010). *Elections and Distributive Politics in Mubarak’s Egypt*. New York, NY: Cambridge University Press. **CHAPTERS 6 and 8.**

**April 12th**

**Sub-National Authoritarianism in Latin America**

Behrend, J. (2011). “The Uneveness of Democracy at the Subnational Level: Provincial Closed Games in Argentina,” *Latin American Research Review* 46(1): 150-176.

Gibson, E. (2005). “Boundary Control: Subnational Authoritarianism in Democratic Countries” in *World Politics* 58(1):101-132.

**April 17th**

**Sub-National Authoritarianism in Russia**

Gel’man, Vladimir (2010). “The Dynamics of Subnational Authoritarianism: Russia in Comparative Perspective,” in Gel’Man, V. and C. Ross (eds). *The Politics of Subnational Authoritarianism in Russia*. Surrey, UK: Ashgate.

Panov, Petr (2010). “Electoral Practices at the Subnational Level in Contemporary Russia,” in Gel’Man, V. and C. Ross (eds). *The Politics of Subnational Authoritarianism in Russia*. Surrey, UK: Ashgate.

***Elections and Democratization***

Does holding elections that are not free and fair promote democracy? Do these elections train societies in the art of democratic politics or do they institutionalize an aversion towards the inherent uncertainty of competitive elections by entrenching practices such as fraud, coercion, voter suppression and vote buying? These questions have important implications for democracy promotion efforts and the distribution of international aid to transitioning and democratizing countries. Should aid be conditioned on the fairness of electoral processes or should it not be conditioned in this way precisely because there is an electoral path to democratization? In this part of the course we explore the relationship between elections and democratization. In order to do so we will look at several Post-Communist countries and Africa.

**April 19th**

**Defeating authoritarian incumbents in the Post-Communist World**

Bunce, V. and S. Wolchik (2011). *Defeating Authoritarian Leaders in Post-Communist Countries*. New York, NY: Cambridge University Press. **CHAPTERS 4 and 5.**

**April 24th**

**Defeating authoritarian incumbents in the Post-Communist World**

Bunce, V. and S. Wolchik (2011) *Defeating Authoritarian Leaders in Post-Communist Countries*. New York, NY: Cambridge University Press. **CHAPTERS 8 and 9.**

**April 26th**

**The Positive Consequences of Elections in Africa**

Lindberg, S. (2006) *Democracy and Elections in Africa*. Baltimore, MD: The John Hopkins University Press. **CHAPTERS 1, 3 and 4.**

**May 1st**

**The Positive Consequences of Elections in Africa**

Lindberg, S. (2006) *Democracy and Elections in Africa*. Baltimore, MD: The John Hopkins University Press. **CHAPTERS 5 and 6.**

**May 3rd Q&A Before FINAL EXAM**

**May 7th-11th NO CLASS, FINAL EXAMS WEEK**