

International Relations 225: Politics and Policymaking in the Developing World

University of Rochester

Spring 2015

Monday and Wednesday, 11:50 AM – 1:05 PM

Harkness 210

Instructor: Adam Cohon

Phone: 585-275-5466

Email: acohon@ur.rochester.edu

Office: Harkness 307

Office hours: Tuesday 9:00am-11:00am, or by prior appointment

Throughout the developing world, citizens face issues such as poverty, crime and violence, and environmental degradation. Governments' abilities to address these problems, however, are shaped by the political institutions in which they work, the capacity of the states they lead, and the incentives that they face. In this course we examine how institutions such as party systems, federalism, clientelism, and bureaucracy affect politicians' willingness and capacity to address developmental challenges. We draw on federal country cases from around the world, including Mexico, Brazil, and India, to more closely examine these causal relationships. In the final section of the course, we shift our attention to China to study policymaking in a unique authoritarian context.

The course is highly participatory. Monday courses will provide lectures that outline topics and theories for the week. Wednesday courses will provide activities, simulations, and small group interactions that further explore the weekly theme and topic. Absences will be excused only for medical emergencies and family or personal tragedies (see attendance policy below).

Course Materials:

All course materials will be posted onto Blackboard, or available through the University of Rochester library website. Assignments and reading questions will sometimes be emailed to you before class; check your inbox.

I ask students to buy one book: Gordon Harvey's *Writing With Sources: A Guide for Students* (Cambridge, MA: Hackett Publishing Co., 2008 – older versions okay). A used copy is acceptable.

Course Requirements:

Students are expected to attend class regularly, do the assigned reading, complete all assignments, and participate in class discussions and activities. The assignments comprise in-class participation (30%), three 5-page research papers due at the beginning of class on **February 25** (20%), at the beginning of class on **April 1** (20%), and at 3 PM on **May 5** (20%) to my office or my mailbox on the third floor of Harkness Hall. Papers must be submitted in hardcopy format. There will also be a responsibility to twice be a reading liaison (10%) for which a sign-up sheet will circulate. There will be no make-ups for unexcused absences from liaison days.

Paper prompts will be handed out at least two weeks in advance of the deadline. Outside research is optional and not required.

Late work:

Assignments will be deducted 1/3 of a letter grade (from A to A-, B+ to B, etc.) for each 24 hours or fraction thereof that elapses between the due date and the submission of the assignment.

Absences:

There will be no make-up work for students who fail to turn in projects on time or miss classes. Be sure to contact your peers for class notes. I am happy to discuss the material with you, but I do not offer individual recap sessions.

Excused absences are only granted for family or medical emergencies, and I will need documentation of the event or problem.

Grading scale:

A ($93.0\% < x$)
A- ($90.0\% < x \leq 93.0\%$)
B+ ($87.0\% < x \leq 90.0\%$)
B ($84.0\% < x \leq 87.0\%$)
B- ($80.0\% < x \leq 84.0\%$)
C+ ($77.0\% < x \leq 80.0\%$)
C ($74.0\% < x \leq 77.0\%$)
C- ($70.0\% < x \leq 74.0\%$)
Non-passing grades ($x \leq 70.0\%$)

All students will receive an extra 2% on their grade if at least 95% of students in the class complete online course evaluations.

In-class participation:

I will try to lecture as little as possible, and develop in-class activities that allow students to discuss, re-consider, and critique the arguments and events we study. It is in your interest not to miss class.

Students should come to class prepared to discuss all readings assigned for that day and all previous days.

Re-grades:

Students should feel free to contact me about re-grades due to arithmetic errors. If students feel that grades were incorrectly given, they can re-submit the assignment to me with a memorandum of at least 250 words explaining why they thought they deserve a different grade. Requests for re-grades should be made within 72 hours after the results have been passed back. I reserve the right on re-grades to lower, raise, or maintain any grade.

Written work standards:

All written work should be in Times New Roman font, size 12, double-spaced, with 1" margins on all sides of the paper. Citations are mandatory, in either Chicago or MLA style. Five-page papers should be between 4.5 and 5.5 pages; points will be deducted for papers that are too short or too long. The bibliography at the end does not contribute to the page count. Place your name and paper title in a Header at the top of the page **only**.

Points will be deducted for papers not conforming to guidelines set in *Writing with Sources*.

Studying and work outside of class:

You are encouraged to discuss class readings and your papers with classmates for the examinations, and send me any questions. You may even trade drafts and outlines with your peers. All final work, however, should be your own. You will be held responsible for errors in citation and attribution.

Accommodations:

If you are entitled to accommodations, please coordinate these with the Center for Excellence in Teaching and Learning early in the semester. Their information and policies can be found at <http://www.rochester.edu/college/cetl/undergraduate/index.html> **I cannot make these arrangements for you; you must contact CETL (formerly LAS) yourself.**

Academic Honesty:

Conduct in class, during assignment, and in writing coursework should conform to the University's policies on academic honesty. The policy can be found at <http://www.rochester.edu/college/honesty>

Be sure to cite all your sources. When in doubt, add a footnote or endnote. In-text citations are acceptable. All papers should contain a bibliography at the end. Wikipedia is not considered a reliable source of information for this class, and should never be cited as an authority.

Any instance of plagiarism will result in zero credit for the assignment and referral of the student(s) involved to the College Board on Academic Honesty.

Course Outline

I reserve the right to drop or replace readings to better direct learning and sharpen the focus of the course. I will probably do so. All readings are required unless otherwise noted.

I. Case background: Post-Transition and Post-Colonial Democracies

1. January 14

Introduction: The connection between politics and public policy

Franceschet, Susan and Jordi Díez. 2012. "Thinking about Politics and Policy-making in Contemporary Latin America," in Jordi Díez and Susan Franceschet, eds. *Comparative Public Policy in Latin America*. Toronto, ON: University of Toronto Press. p. 3-33.

January 19

NO CLASS – Martin Luther King, Jr. Day

2. January 21

Introduction: Country backgrounds

Skidmore, Thomas E. and Peter H. Smith. 2001. *Modern Latin America*. Fifth Edition. New York: Oxford University Press. pp. 155-176, 237-258.

Sharma, Shalendra. 2010. "Indian Politics" in Neil Devotta, ed. *Understanding Contemporary India*. Boulder, CO: Lynne Reiner Publishers. Pp. 63-92.

II. Politics

Interest representation

1. January 26

Wilkinson, Steven. 2007. "Explaining Changing Patterns of Party-Voter Linkages in India," in Herbert Kitschelt and Steven Wilkinson, eds. *Patrons, Clients, and Policies*. New York: Cambridge University Press. pp. 110-140

Lawson, Chappell. 2000. "Mexico's Unfinished Transition: Democratization and Authoritarian Enclaves in Mexico," *Mexican Studies/Estudios Mexicanos* 16(2): 267-287.

2. January 28

Harbers, Imke. 2007. "Democratic Deepening in Third Wave Democracies: Experiments with Participation in Mexico City," *Political Studies*. 55(1): 38-58.

Goldfrank, Benjamin and Aaron Schneider. 2006. "Competitive Institution Building: The PT and Participatory Budgeting in Rio Grande do Sul," *Latin American Politics and Society* 48(3): 1-31.

Electoral systems and political parties

3. February 2

Mainwaring, Scott. 1999. *Rethinking Party Systems in the Third Wave of Democratization*. Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press. Ch. 5.: "Weak Parties and Autonomous Politicians: Party Organization in the Catch-All Parties."

Randall, Vicky and Lars Svasand. 2002. "Party Institutionalization in New Democracies," *Party Politics* 8(1): 5-29.

4. February 4

Klesner, Joseph L. 2005. "Electoral Competition and the New Party System in Mexico," *Latin American Politics and Society* 47(2): 103-142.

Chhibber, Pradeep and Ken Kollman. 1998. "Party Aggregation and the Number of Parties in India and the United States," *American Political Science Review* 92(2): 329-342.

Legislators and legislative success

5. February 9

Alston, Lee and Bernardo Mueller. 2006. "Pork for Policy: Executive and Legislative Exchange in Brazil," *Journal of Law, Economics and Organization* 22(1): 87-114.

Nacif, Benito. 2006. "The Fall of the Dominant Presidency: Lawmaking under Divided Government in Mexico," *CIDE Documentos de Trabajo, Número 185*. Mexico, DF: CIDE.

6. February 11

Singh, Mahendra P. and Douglas Verney. 2003. "Challenges to India's Centralized Parliamentary Federalism," *Publius* 33(4): 1-20.

In-class writing workshop

7. February 16

Bhavnani, Rikhil. 2009. "Do Electoral Quotas Work After They are Withdrawn? Evidence from a Natural Experiment in India," *American Political Science Review* 103(1): 23-35.

Miguel, Luis Felipe. 2012. "Policy Priorities and Women's Double Bind," in Susan Franceschet, et al., eds., *The Impact of Gender Quotas*. New York: Oxford University Press. Ch. 7.

8. February 18

Domínguez, Jorge I. 2012. "Mexico's Campaigns and the Benchmark Elections of 2000 and 2006," in Roderic Ai Camp, ed. *The Oxford Handbook of Mexican Politics*. Oxford, UK: Oxford University Press.

Wilkinson, Steven. 2004. *Votes and Violence: Electoral Competition and Ethnic Riots in India*. New York: Cambridge University Press. Ch.1.: "The Electoral Incentives for Ethnic Violence"

Federalism: divided authority

9. February 23

Rodden, Jonathan. 2008. *Hamilton's Paradox: The Promise and Peril of Fiscal Federalism*. New York: Cambridge University Press. Ch. 8

Stepan, Alfred. 1999. "Federalism and Democracy: Beyond the US Model," *Journal of Democracy* 10(4): 19-34.

10. February 25

Essay Number 1 due in paper form at the beginning of class, February 25

Samuels, David and Fernando Luiz Abrucio. 2000. "Federalism and Democratic Transitions: The 'New' Politics of the Governors in Brazil," *Publius: The Journal of Federalism* 30(2): 43-62.

Parikh, Sunita and Barry Weingast. 1997. "A Comparative Theory of Federalism: India," *Virginia Law Review* 83(7): 1593-1615.

State capacity

11. March 2

Evans, Peter and James E. Rauch. 1999 "Bureaucracy and Growth: A Cross-National Analysis of the Effects of 'Weberian' State Structures on Economic Growth," *American Sociological Review* 64(5): 748-765.

Michael Mann. 1984. "The Autonomous Power of the State: Its Origins, Mechanisms, and Results," *Archives Europeennes de Sociologie* 25: 185-213. Reprint.

12. March 4

Geddes, Barbara. 1990. "Building 'State' Autonomy in Brazil, 1930-1964," *Comparative Politics* 22(2): 217-235.

Jayal, Niraja Gopal. 1999. *Democracy and the State: Welfare, Secularism, and Development in Contemporary India*. New Delhi: Oxford University Press. Ch. 4: "The Developmental State"

--- *SPRING BREAK* -----

III. Public policies

Social inclusion policy

1. March 16

Valencia Lomeli, Enrique. 2008. "Conditional Cash Transfers as Social Policy in Latin America: An Assessment of their Contributions and Limits," *Annual Review of Sociology* 14: 475-499.

Hunter, Wendy and Natasha Borges-Sugiyama. 2009. "Democracy and Social Policy in Brazil: Advancing Basic Needs, Preserving Privileged Interests," *Latin American Politics and Society* 51(2): 29-58.

2. March 18

Gaiha, Raghav, Ganesh Thapa, Katsushi Imai, Vani S. Kulkarni. 2007. "Wages, prices and anti-poverty interventions in rural India," Economics Discussion Paper Series EDP-0723, University of Manchester, UK

Jensen, Robert and Emily Oster. 2009. "The Power of TV: Cable Television and Women's Status in India," *The Quarterly Journal of Economics* 124(3): 1057-1094.

Environmental policy

3. March 23

Mueller, Bernardo. 2009. "The Fiscal Imperative and the Role of Public Prosecutors in Brazilian Environmental Policy," *Law and Policy* 32(1): 104-126.

Díez, Jordi. 2006. *Political Change and Environmental Policymaking in Mexico*. New York: Routledge, Ch. 4

4. March 25

Greenstone, Michael and Rema Hanna. 2014. "Environmental Regulations, Air and Water Pollution, and Infant Mortality in India," *American Economic Review* 104(10): 3038-3072.

Mawdsley, Emma. 2004. "India's Middle Classes and the Environment," *Development and Change* 35(1): 79-103.

Economic and industrial policy

5. March 30

Narula, Ranjeesh and John Dunning. 2000. "Industrial Development, Globalization and Multinational Enterprises: New Realities for Developing Countries," *Oxford Development Studies* 28(2): 141-167.

Rodrik, Dani. 2004. "Industrial Policy for the Twenty-First Century," manuscript, Harvard University.

6. April 1

Essay Number 2 due in paper form at the beginning of class, April 1

Saad Filho, Alfredo and Lecio Morais. 2012. "Neo-Developmentalism and the Challenges of Economic Policy-Making under Dilma Rousseff," *Critical Sociology* 38(6): 789-798.

Levy, Santiago. 2008. *Good Intentions, Bad Outcomes: Social Policy, Informality, and Economic Growth in Mexico*. Washington: Brookings Inst. Press. Ch. 1, 3, 8, 9

Security policy

7. April 6

Tierney, Julia. 2012. "Peace Through the Metaphor of War: From Police Pacification to Governance Transformation in Rio de Janeiro," M.A. Thesis in Urban Planning, MIT. Ch. 1-3

Rios, Viridiana. 2012. "Why are Mexican Traffickers Killing Each Other? Government Coordination and Violence Deterrence in Mexico's Drug War," manuscript, Department of Government, Harvard University, September 16.

8. April 8

Raghavan, R.K. 2003. "The Indian Police: Problems and Prospects," *Publius* 33(4): 119-134.

Verma, Arvind and Manish Kumar. 2008. "The Etiology of Crime in India? An Exploration," *International Journal of Criminal Justice Sciences* 3(2): 138-157.

IV. Politics and Policymaking in China

Country Background

1. April 13 and April 15

Saich, Anthony. *Governance and Politics of China*. New York: Palgrave-Macmillan. Ch. 4-7.

Economic policy

2. April 20

Huang, Yasheng. 2003. *Selling China: Foreign Direct Investment During the Reform Era*. New York: Cambridge University Press. Ch. 2-3, 6.

3. April 22

Zweig, David. 2002. *Internationalizing China: Domestic Interests and Global Linkages*. Ch. 1-3.

Environmental policy

4. April 27

Stern, Rachel. 2010. "On the Frontlines: Making Decisions in Chinese Civil Environmental Lawsuits," *Law & Policy* 32(1): 79-103.

Matsuzawa, Setsuko. 2012. "Citizen Environmental Activism in China: Legitimacy, Alliances, and Rights-based Discourses," *ASIANetwork Exchange* 19(2): 81-91.

5. April 29

Zhang, Kun-min and Zong-guo Wen. "Review and Challenges of Politics of Environmental Protection and Sustainable Development in China," *Journal of Environmental Management* 88(4): 1249-1261

Liu, Lingxuan, Bing Zhang and Jun Bi. 2012. "Reforming China's Multi-level Environmental Governance: Lessons from the 11th Five-Year Plan," *Environmental Science and Policy* 21(1): 106-111.

Essay Number 3 is due to my faculty box or office in Harkness Hall by 2 PM on May 8th, the final exam date set by the Registrar.

Grading rubric for weekly participation grades

	A (Above Standards)	B (Meets Standards)	C (Approaching Standards)	D (Below Standards)	E (No credit)
	100%	90%	80%	70%	0%
Reading (50 points)	Student has carefully read and understood the readings as evidenced by familiarity with main ideas, supporting evidence and secondary points. Comes to class prepared with questions and critiques of the readings.	Student has read and understood the readings as evidenced by grasp of the main ideas and evidence. Comes prepared with questions and critiques of the readings.	Student has read the material, but comments often indicate that he/she misunderstood or forgot many points or has not thought about questions or critiques of the readings.	Student comes to class unprepared, as indicated by unwillingness or inability to answer basic questions or contribute to discussion.	Non-attendance
Listening (50 points)	Always attends to what others say as evidenced by regularly building on, clarifying, or responding to their comments.	Generally attends to what others say as evidenced by periodically building on, clarifying, or responding to their comments.	Does not regularly listen well as indicated by the repetition of comments or questions presented earlier, or frequent non sequiturs.	Behavior frequently reflects a failure to listen or attend to the discussion as indicated by repetition of comments and questions, non sequiturs, off-task activities.	Non-attendance

Grading rubric for all presentations

	A (Above Standards)	B (Meets Standards)	C (Approaching Standards)	D (Below Standards)
	100%	90%	80%	70%
Completeness (10 points)	All parts of the assignment are addressed.	A minor part of the assignment is unaddressed or it is unclear how the speaker is addressing it.	A major part of the assignment is unaddressed or it is unclear how the speaker is addressing it.	Two or more major parts of the assignment are unaddressed or it is unclear how the speaker is addressing them.
Clarity (10 points)	Ideas are provided in a logical order that makes it easy to follow the speaker's train of thought.	Ideas are provided in a fairly logical order that makes it reasonably easy to follow the speaker's train of thought.	A few ideas are not in an expected or logical order, making the presentation a little confusing.	Many ideas are not in an expected or logical order, making the presentation confusing.
Point of view (30 points)	The presentation has an argument and a thorough discussion of accurate, relevant evidence and examples bolstering that argument.	The presentation has an argument. There is discussion of accurate, relevant evidence and examples bolstering that argument but key evidence is missing or inaccurate.	An argument and at least one piece of accurate, relevant evidence is offered.	There is no argument in the presentation or the evidence and examples are inaccurate, vague and/or irrelevant and/or are not explained.
Creativity and energy (40 points)	The presentation engages the audience and highlights all important facts and ideas in a memorable manner.	The presentation mostly engages the audience and highlights many important facts and ideas in a memorable manner.	The presentation does not engage the audience, although it does present information.	The presentation is unengaging and uninformative.
Q&A (10 points)	Provides thoughtful answers to audience questions.			Provides inadequate answers to audience questions.

Grading Rubric for Written Work

	A (Above Standards)	B (Meets Standards)	C (Approaching Standards)	D (Below Standards)
	100%	90%	80%	70%
Completeness (25 points)	All parts of the assignment are addressed	A minor part of the assignment is unaddressed or it is unclear how the author is addressing it.	A major part of the assignment is unaddressed or it is unclear how the author is addressing it.	Two or more major parts of the assignment are unaddressed or it is unclear how the author is addressing them.
Clarity (25 points)	Ideas are provided in a logical and organized order that makes it easy to follow the author's argument and thoughts. The author provides guidance to readers. Minimal errors.	Ideas are provided in a fairly logical order that makes it not too hard for readers to follow the argument. Grammatical and spelling errors occur.	Ideas are not presented in an organized or logical order, making the argument difficult to follow. Grammatical and spelling errors occur.	Many ideas are not in an expected or logical order, making the essay confusing. Grammatical and spelling errors are frequent.
Support (20 points)	Every point in the argument is supported with valid inferences from evidence or logic.	Minor points are unsupported or supported with invalid or tendentious inferences from evidence or logic.	At least one major point is unsupported or supported with invalid or tendentious inferences from evidence or logic.	Many major points are unsupported or supported with invalid or tendentious inferences from evidence or logic.
Research (20 points)	More than five sources, of which at least three are peer-reviewed journal articles or scholarly books, are used. Sources include both general background sources and specialized sources. Politicized or popular sources are acknowledged when used.	Five sources, of which at least two are peer-reviewed journal articles or scholarly books, are used. Politicized or popular sources are mostly acknowledged as such when used.	Five sources, of which at least two are peer-reviewed journal articles or scholarly books, are used. Politicized or popular sources are used without acknowledgement.	Fewer than five sources are used, or fewer than two of the minimum five sources used are peer-reviewed journal articles or scholarly books.
Source Documentation (10 points)	Correct attributions are provided for all quotations, esoteric facts, and original research.			Correct attributions are not provided for quotations, non-trivial facts, and original research.

