

# PLS 432-532

## Comparative Democratization

Nazarbayev University  
Fall 2018  
Mondays 12:00 to 2:50 PM  
Block 8, Room 322B  
Charles J. Sullivan  
Assistant Professor of Political Science and International Relations  
School of Humanities and Social Sciences  
[charles.sullivan@nu.edu.kz](mailto:charles.sullivan@nu.edu.kz)  
Office #8219; Phone: 4728  
Office Hours: Fridays 10 AM to 12 PM and By Appointment

### Course Description:

- What is a democracy and how does it come about? Why are some countries seemingly able to undergo democratization without experiencing any serious problems but not others? How does a democracy become consolidated over time? Why do some democratic systems of rule collapse, while others endure? Is democracy worth fighting for and (if so) by what means? Questions like these give us some insight into the study of democratization, one of the leading subfields within the subfield of comparative politics. This course (which consists of both undergraduate and graduate students) is designed to provide an overview of the academic literature focusing on topics of inquiry such as democratization, varieties of authoritarianism, as well as democratic consolidation and collapse, while emphasizing the comparative method. This is a reading and writing-intensive course in which all students are expected to play an impactful role in terms of stimulating discussion pertaining to material covered in assigned readings. This course meets once per week and adheres to the Socratic Method in regards to scholastic instruction.

### Course Learning Objectives:

- This course will analyze the differences between democratic and nondemocratic forms of rule; familiarize students with the academic literature on transitions from autocracy to democracy; and highlight areas of study within the democratization subfield of comparative politics, such as semi-authoritarianism, authoritarian permanence, the developmental state model, democratic consolidation, modernization theory, and the democratic peace theory. Students will study cases of democratization in Eurasia and Asia. In working independently, students will also analyze and synthesize readings in the form of critical reaction memos, develop research questions related to the study of comparative democratization, formulate hypotheses, utilize sources outside of the syllabus, and write a lengthy essay.

### Course Readings:

- The following texts are available at the Nazarbayev University Library on loan for PLS 432-532 students. Enrolled students can access all other readings through NU Library online academic databases.

- Juan J. Linz, *Totalitarian and Authoritarian Regimes* (Boulder, CO: Lynne Rienner, 2000).
- Guillermo O'Donnell and Philippe C. Schmitter, *Transitions from Authoritarian Rule: Tentative Conclusions about Uncertain Democracies* (Baltimore, MD: The Johns Hopkins University Press, 2013).
- Charles Tilly, *Democracy* (Cambridge, United Kingdom: Cambridge University Press, 2007).

### PLS 432 - Undergraduate Course Requirements

- 4 take-home quizzes will be administered over the course of the semester. The weeks on which take-home quizzes are assigned will be chosen by the professor. **Students will be tasked with responding to a question related to the assigned readings for the next upcoming class.** Students should incorporate **ALL** of the assigned readings for the next upcoming class into their written responses. Papers are to be submitted by 12:00 PM via Moodle on the day of the next class and should consist of 1,000 words (approximately 4 pages). Students are encouraged to submit a copy of their paper at the start of class on the due date via **EMAIL**. Students who do not submit their work by the start of class will receive a grade of 0. **Students must use footnotes for citations (any style), 1-inch margins, double-spaced pages, and any legible 12-point size font.** Quizzes are worth **50 points** and graded according to the following rubric:

Grading	Assessment
45-50 (A)	Student's understanding of the assigned readings is very extensive and clear; written response is cogent and creative; usage of proper citation format; question posed by the professor is answered by student in its entirety.
40-44 (B)	Student's understanding of the assigned readings is commendable yet also somewhat incomplete; written response is intelligible but lacks creativity; citation format is evident but not fully consistent either; question posed by the professor is largely answered by student.
35-39 (C)	Student's understanding of the assigned readings is intelligible but is evidently lacking; written response demonstrates that the student possesses a cursory grasp of the assigned readings; citation format is inconsistent and rather unprofessional; question posed by the professor is answered in a satisfactory manner.
30-34 (D)	Student's understanding of the assigned readings is poor and lacking; written response is largely unintelligible; question posed by the professor is largely unanswered by student.
0-29 (F)	Student's understanding of the assigned readings is very poor or nonexistent; written response is virtually unintelligible; question posed by the professor is not answered at all.

- Students are to come to class well-prepared to engage in discussion about the assigned readings. Students are permitted to bring laptops to class. All electronic devices are to be silenced prior to the start

of class. **On the days in which a take-home quiz is assigned, students who are absent from class and without a valid medical excuse will not be able to submit their work the following week for grading. Consequently, such students will receive a grade of 0 for the assignment.** The professor also reserves the right to revise/update readings on the syllabus throughout the course of the semester.

- Students will be tasked with writing an essay of 2,000 words (approximately 8 pages) in the form of a critical reaction memo focusing on **ALL** of the assigned readings for a given week. Students must sign-up for the week that they wish to write their memos starting on **August 13, 2018** (the sign-up sheet will be posted outside of the professor’s office). No more than **2** undergraduate students may write their memos on a given week and no one is permitted to write on Weeks 3, 5, 7, and 11. Students must use footnotes for citations (any style), 1-inch margins, double-spaced pages, and any legible 12-point size font. Students only need to critically analyze and synthesize all of the assigned readings for a given week. **It is not necessary to conduct a literature review of other scholarly works outside of the syllabus for this assignment and doing so will not help your overall grade.** Critical reaction memos are to be submitted by 12:00 PM via Moodle on the Monday of the week for which students have signed up to write their memos. Students are encouraged to submit a copy of their memos at the start of class on the due date via **EMAIL**. All critical reaction memos submitted after the aforementioned deadline will receive a grade of 0. Students must include a bibliography of all references at the end of their memos (please note that your bibliography will not count towards the overall word limit for this assignment).
- Students will be tasked with writing a research essay of 3,500 words (approximately 14 pages) on a topic concerning some aspect of comparative democratization. Students will select **two case studies** and formulate a research question related to a theme covered during this semester. Students are encouraged to correspond with the professor to discuss topic ideas. Students must use footnotes for citations (any style), 1-inch margins, double-spaced pages, and any legible 12-point size font. All research essays require an introduction, a research question, a literature review, hypotheses, research findings, and a conclusion. Papers are to be submitted by 12:00 PM on **November 26, 2018** via Moodle. **All late research essays will be penalized a full letter grade EACH DAY after passage of the deadline.** Students are encouraged to submit a copy of their research essay at the start of class on the due date via **EMAIL**. Students must include a bibliography of all references at the end of their research essays (please note that your bibliography will not count towards the overall word limit for this assignment).
- The critical reaction memo and the research essay will be graded according to the following rubric:

Grading	Assessment
135-150 (A)	Student writes in a very coherent and creative manner; usage of proper citation format; paper has a full introduction and a conclusion; few or no grammatical and/or spelling errors in student’s work; student references scholarly articles/texts outside of syllabus readings and critically analyzes the works of other scholars.
120-134 (B)	Student writes in an intelligible manner but his/her work is also lacking in creativity; citation format is evident but not fully consistent either; cursory introduction and conclusion; noticeable grammatical/spelling errors; student references some scholarly articles/texts outside of syllabus in the form of

	a literature review to supplement his/her work; critical analysis of scholarly works is adequate.
105-119 (C)	Student barely writes in a satisfactory manner; paper is largely lacking in terms of an introduction and conclusion; citation format is inconsistent; grammatical/spelling errors are prevalent; references to scholarly articles/texts outside of syllabus are quite lacking; critical analysis of other scholarly works is inadequate.
90-104 (D)	Student writes in a largely unintelligible manner; citation format suffers from serious flaws; brief/no introduction and/or conclusion; many grammatical/spelling errors; virtually no references to articles/texts outside of the syllabus or critical analysis of scholarly works.
0-89 (F)	Student writes in an unintelligible manner; citation format is nearly nonexistent; multiple grammatical/spelling errors; few/no references to scholarly articles/texts outside of syllabus; critical analysis is wholly inadequate in scope.

### Grading:

4 Take-Home Quizzes	200 (50 Points Each)
Critical Reaction Memo	150
Research Essay	150
Total	500 Points

### Scale:

	A: 475-500	A-: 450-474
B+: 425-449	B: 400-424	B-: 375-399
C+: 350-374	C: 325-349	C-: 300-324
D+: 275-299	D: 250-274	F: 249 and below

### Additional Class Policies

- Students who fall ill on/near the due dates of assignments need to contact the professor. In certain cases, the professor **MAY** grant an extension. Students who fall ill and miss class will need to provide SHSS administration with a valid medical note from a doctor within **3 business days** upon returning to class.
- All students are expected to treat one another with dignity and respect in the classroom. Students are encouraged to voice their opinions on various political issues, albeit in a polite and courteous manner.

### Attendance Notice:

Any student who misses more than **1** class meeting without a valid medical excuse will receive a grade of **F** for the course. Students need to submit a valid medical note to SHSS within **3 business days** of missing any class.

### Academic Integrity:

- Students are required to ensure that the work which they submit for grading is their own. **Students must provide citations in the form of footnotes when referencing the works of other scholars.** Instances of plagiarism will not be tolerated and will result in receiving a score of 0 for an assignment. All instances in which plagiarism is suspected will be referred to SHSS for disciplinary committee review. Copying, rephrasing of text without citations, and/or submitting unoriginal work constitutes plagiarism.

---

---

### PLS 532 - Graduate Course Requirements

- Active participation in class is essential at the graduate level. As such, students will be tasked with writing **TWO** discussion questions for **10 weeks** throughout the course of the semester. Students may choose the weeks on which they write their discussion questions. Questions should demonstrate that a student has read the assigned readings for a particular week. This assignment is designed to further enhance students' critical analytical skills. In writing questions, students should (a) demonstrate that they comprehend the main arguments of the assigned readings, and (b) pose questions designed to force the authors of assigned readings to possibly rethink their conclusions. Students' questions should follow their brief overviews of the assigned readings. Discussion questions are to be submitted by 12:00 PM via **EMAIL** on the day **PRIOR** to class, and the professor will incorporate questions into class discussion.
- Students will write a book review for one of two texts for this course. Students are to respond to a question posed by the professor about the text for which they have signed up as well as provide a critical analysis of its main argument. Students must sign-up for the week that they wish to write their book reviews starting on **August 13, 2018** (the sign-up sheet will be posted outside of the professor's office). No more than **8** graduate students may write their book reviews on a given week. Book reviews will consist of approximately 2,000 words (approximately 8 pages). Students must use footnotes for citations (any style), 1-inch margins, double-spaced pages, and any legible 12-point size font. **It is also required of students to incorporate other book reviews of the selected text into their own book review for this assignment.** Book reviews are to be submitted by 12:00 PM via Moodle on the Monday of the week for which students have signed up to write. All book reviews submitted after the deadline will receive a grade of 0. All submitted book reviews will be graded according to the following rubric.

<b>Grading</b>	<b>Assessment</b>
90-100 (A)	Student's understanding of the textbook's main argument is very extensive and clear; written response is cogent and creative; usage of proper citation format; question posed by the professor is answered by student in its entirety; critical analysis of the textbook is exemplary.
80-89 (B)	Student's understanding of the textbook's main argument is commendable yet also somewhat incomplete; written response is intelligible but lacks creativity; citation format is evident but

	not fully consistent either; question posed by the professor is largely answered by student; critical analysis of the textbook is adequate.
70-79 (C)	Student's understanding of the textbook's main argument is intelligible but is evidently lacking; written response demonstrates that the student possesses a cursory grasp of the text's main argument; citation format is inconsistent and rather unprofessional; question posed by the professor is answered in a satisfactory manner; critical analysis of textbook is lacking.
60-69 (D)	Student's understanding of the textbook's main argument is poor and lacking; written response is largely unintelligible; question posed by the professor is largely unanswered by student; critical analysis of textbook is unsatisfactory.
0-59 (F)	Student's understanding of the textbook's main argument is very poor or nonexistent; written response is virtually unintelligible; question posed by the professor is not answered at all; student does not critically analyze textbook.

- Students will be tasked with writing an essay of 2,500 words (approximately 10 pages) in the form of a critical reaction memo focusing on **ALL** of the assigned readings for a given week. Students must sign-up for the week that they wish to write their memos starting on **August 13, 2018** (the sign-up sheet will be posted outside of the professor's office). No more than **3** graduate students may write their critical reaction memos on a given week and no one is permitted to write on Weeks 3 or 5. Students must use footnotes for citations (any style), 1-inch margins, double-spaced pages, and any legible 12-point size font. Students only need to critically analyze and synthesize all of the assigned readings for a given week. **It is not necessary to conduct a literature review of other scholarly works outside of the syllabus for this assignment and doing so will not help your overall grade.** Critical reaction memos are to be submitted by 12:00 PM via Moodle on the Monday of the week for which students have signed up to write their memos. Students are encouraged to submit a copy of their paper at the start of class on the due date via **EMAIL**. All critical reaction memos submitted after the aforementioned deadline will receive a grade of 0. Students must include a bibliography of all references at the end of their memos (please note that your bibliography will not count towards the overall word limit for this assignment).
- Students will be tasked with writing a research essay of 4,000 words (approximately 16 pages) on a topic concerning some aspect of comparative democratization. Students will select **two case studies** and formulate a research question related to a theme covered during this semester. Students are encouraged to correspond with the professor to discuss topic ideas. Students must use footnotes for citations (any style), 1-inch margins, double-spaced pages, and any legible 12-point size font. All research essays require an introduction, a research question, a literature review, hypotheses, research findings, and a conclusion. Papers are to be submitted by 12:00 PM on **November 26, 2018** via Moodle. **All late research essays will be penalized a full letter grade EACH DAY after passage of the deadline.** Students are encouraged to submit a copy of their research essay at the start of class on the due date via **EMAIL**. Students must include a bibliography of all references at the end of their research essays (please note that your bibliography will not count towards the overall word limit for this assignment).

- The critical reaction memo and the research essay will be graded according to the following rubric:

<b>Grading</b>	<b>Assessment</b>
135-150 (A)	Student writes in a very coherent and creative manner; usage of proper citation format; paper has a full introduction and a conclusion; few or no grammatical and/or spelling errors in student's work; student references scholarly articles/texts outside of syllabus readings and critically analyzes the works of other scholars.
120-134 (B)	Student writes in an intelligible manner but his/her work is also lacking in creativity; citation format is evident but not fully consistent either; cursory introduction and conclusion; noticeable grammatical/spelling errors; student references some scholarly articles/texts outside of syllabus in the form of a literature review to supplement his/her work; critical analysis of scholarly works is adequate.
105-119 (C)	Student barely writes in a satisfactory manner; paper is largely lacking in terms of an introduction and conclusion; citation format is inconsistent; grammatical/spelling errors are prevalent; references to scholarly articles/texts outside of syllabus are quite lacking; critical analysis of other scholarly works is inadequate.
90-104 (D)	Student writes in a largely unintelligible manner; citation format suffers from serious flaws; brief/no introduction and/or conclusion; many grammatical/spelling errors; virtually no references to articles/texts outside of the syllabus or critical analysis of scholarly works.
0-89 (F)	Student writes in an unintelligible manner; citation format is nearly nonexistent; multiple grammatical/spelling errors; few/no references to scholarly articles/texts outside of syllabus; critical analysis is wholly inadequate in scope.

**Grading:**

20 Discussion Questions	100 (Each Question is Worth 5 Points)
Book Review	100
Critical Reaction Memo	150
Research Essay	150
<b>Total</b>	<b>500 points</b>

**Scale:**

	A: 475-500	A-: 450-474
B+: 425-449	B: 400-424	B-: 375-399
C+: 350-374	C: 325-349	C-: 300-324
D+: 275-299	D: 250-274	F: 249 and below

**Additional Class Policies**

- Students who fall ill on/near the due dates of assignments need to contact the professor. In certain cases, the professor **MAY** grant an extension. Students who fall ill and miss class will need to provide SHSS administration with a valid medical note from a doctor within **3 business days** upon returning to class.
- All students are expected to treat one another with dignity and respect in the classroom. Students are encouraged to voice their opinions on various political issues, albeit in a polite and courteous manner.

**Attendance Notice:**

Any student who misses more than **1** class meeting without a valid medical excuse will receive a grade of **F** for this course. Students need to submit a valid medical note to SHSS within **3 business days** of missing any class.

**Academic Integrity:**

- Students are required to ensure that the work which they submit for grading is their own. **Students must provide citations in the form of footnotes when referencing the works of other scholars.** Instances of plagiarism will not be tolerated and will result in receiving a score of 0 for an assignment. All instances in which plagiarism is suspected will be referred to SHSS for disciplinary committee review. Copying, rephrasing of text without citations, and/or submitting unoriginal work constitutes plagiarism.

=====

**Class Schedule:**

Week 1: Introduction

**Monday (8-13)**

- Course Introduction.

Week 2: Democracy in Ancient and Modern Times



## **Monday (8-20)**

- A.H.M. Jones, “The Athenian Democracy and Its Critics,” *Cambridge Historical Journal* 11.1 (1953): 1-26.
- John North, “Politics and Aristocracy in the Roman Republic,” *Classical Philology* 85.4 (1990): 277-287.
- Saul K. Padover, “The World of the Founding Fathers,” *Social Research* 25.2 (Summer 1958): 191-214.
- Jack N. Rakove, “The Madisonian Moment,” *The University of Chicago Law Review* 55.2 (Spring 1988): 473-505.
- David Beetham, “Freedom as the Foundation,” *Journal of Democracy* 15.4 (2004): 61-75.

## Week 3: Democracy in the Contemporary Era

## **Monday (8-27)**

- Tilly, *Democracy* (2007).
- Steven Levitsky and Lucan Way, “Why Democracy Needs a Level Playing Field,” *Journal of Democracy* 21.1 (2010): 57-68.
- Dietrich Rueschemeyer, “Addressing Inequality,” *Journal of Democracy* 15.4 (2004): 76-90.
- Guillermo O’Donnell, “Why the Rule of Law Matters,” *Journal of Democracy* 15.4 (2004): 32-46.

## Week 4: Varieties of Authoritarianism

## **Monday (9-3)**

- Linz, *Totalitarian and Authoritarian Regimes* (2000), pp. 49-171.
- Jennifer Gandhi and Adam Przeworski, “Authoritarian Institutions and the Survival of Autocrats,” *Comparative Political Studies* 40.11 (2007): 1279-1301.
- Benjamin Smith, “Life of the Party: The Origins of Regime Breakdown and Persistence under Single-Party Rule,” *World Politics* 57.3 (2005): 421-451.
- Bruce J. Dickson, “Cooptation and Corporatism in China: The Logic of Party Adaptation,” *Political Science Quarterly* 115.4 (Winter 2000-2001): 517-540.
- Jason Brownlee, “Hereditary Succession in Modern Autocracies,” *World Politics* 59.4 (2007): 595-628.

## Week 5: The Transition Paradigm

## **Monday (9-10)**

- O’Donnell and Schmitter, *Transitions from Authoritarian Rule* (2013).
- Thomas Carothers, “The End of the Transition Paradigm,” *Journal of Democracy* 13.1 (2002): 5-21.
- Michael McFaul, “The Fourth Wave of Democracy and Dictatorship: Noncooperative Transitions in the Post-Communist World,” *World Politics* 54.2 (2002): 212-244.

## Week 6: Semi-Authoritarianism

### **Monday (9-17)**

- Larry Diamond, "Thinking about Hybrid Regimes," *Journal of Democracy* 13.2 (2002): 21-35.
- Steven Levitsky and Lucan Way, "The Rise of Competitive Authoritarianism," *Journal of Democracy* 13.2 (2002): 51-65.
- Paul Collier, "The Dictator's Handbook," *Foreign Policy* 172 (May/June 2009): 146-149.
- Lucan Way, "Authoritarian State Building and the Sources of Regime Competitiveness in the Fourth Wave: The Cases of Belarus, Moldova, Russia, and Ukraine," *World Politics* 57.2 (2005): 231-261.
- A. Schedler, "Authoritarianism's Last Line of Defense," *Journal of Democracy* 21.1 (2010): 69-80.

## Week 7: Democratic Collapse

### **Monday (9-24)**

- Sheri Berman, "Civil Society and the Collapse of the Weimar Republic," *World Politics* 49.3 (1997): 401-429.
- Steven Levitsky and Maxwell A. Cameron, "Democracy without Parties? Political Parties and Regime Change in Fujimori's Peru," *Latin American Politics and Society* 45.3 (Autumn 2003): 1-33.
- Guillermo O'Donnell, "Delegative Democracy," *Journal of Democracy* 5.1 (1994): 55-69.
- Amy Chua, "A World on the Edge," *Wilson Quarterly* 26.4 (Autumn 2002): 62-77.
- Christian Houle, "Why Inequality Harms Consolidation But Does Not Affect Democratization," *World Politics* 61.4 (2009): 589-622.

## Week 8: Modernization Theory

### **Monday (10-1)**

- Seymour M. Lipset, "Some Social Requisites of Democracy: Economic Development and Political Legitimacy," *American Political Science Review* 53.1 (1959): 69-105.
- Adam Przeworski and Fernando Limongi, "Modernization: Theories and Facts," *World Politics* 49.2 (1997): 155-183.
- Carles Boix and Susan C. Stokes, "Endogenous Democratization," *World Politics* 55.4 (2003): 517-549.
- Sheri Berman, "Modernization in Historical Perspective: The Case of Imperial Germany," *World Politics* 53.3 (2001): 431-462.
- Ronald Inglehart and Christian Welzel, "How Development Leads to Democracy," *Foreign Affairs* 88.2 (March/April 2009): 33-48.
- Bruce Bueno de Mesquita and George W. Downs, "Development and Democracy," *Foreign Affairs* 84.5 (September/October 2005): 77-86.

## FALL BREAK

### Week 9: Color Revolutions

#### **Monday (10-15)**

- Michael McFaul, “Transitions from Post-Communism,” *Journal of Democracy* 16.3 (2005): 5-19.
- Lucan Way, “The Real Causes of the Color Revolutions,” *Journal of Democracy* 19.3 (2008): 55-69.
- Valerie Bunce and Sharon Wolchik, “Getting Real About ‘Real Causes’,” *Journal of Democracy* 20.1 (2009): 69-73.
- Scott Radnitz, “What Really Happened in Kyrgyzstan?” *Journal of Democracy* 17.2 (2006):132–146.
- Henry E. Hale, “Regime Cycles: Democracy, Autocracy, and Revolution in Post-Soviet Eurasia,” *World Politics* 58.1 (2005): 133-165.
- Serhiy Kudelia, “The House that Yanukovych Built,” *Journal of Democracy* 25.3 (2014): 19-34.

### Week 10: Arab Spring: Democratic Breakthroughs and Rollbacks

#### **Monday (10-22)**

- Eva Bellin, “The Robustness of Authoritarianism in the Middle East: Exceptionalism in Comparative Perspective,” *Comparative Politics* 36.2 (2004): 139-157.
- Larry Diamond, “Why Are There No Arab Democracies?” *Journal of Democracy* 21.1 (2010): 93-104.
- Filipe R. Campante and Davin Chor, “Why Was the Arab World Poised for Revolution? Schooling, Economic Opportunities, and the Arab Spring,” *The Journal of Economic Perspectives* 26.2 (Spring 2012): 167-187.
- Erica Chenoweth and Maria J. Stephan, “Drop Your Weapons,” *Foreign Affairs* 93.4 (July/August 2014): 94-106.
- Nathan J. Brown, “Egypt’s Failed Transition,” *Journal of Democracy* 24.4 (2013): 45-58.

### Week 11: Imposing Democracy

#### **Monday (10-29)**

- G. John Ikenberry, “Why Export Democracy?” *Wilson Quarterly* (Spring 1999): 56-65.
- Mark Peceny, “Forcing Them To Be Free,” *Political Research Quarterly* 52.3 (1999): 549-582.
- Bruce Bueno de Mesquita and George W. Downs, “Intervention and Democracy,” *International Organization* 60.3 (Summer 2006): 627-649.
- Eva Bellin, “The Iraqi Intervention and Democracy in Comparative Historical Perspective,” *Political Science Quarterly* 119.4 (Winter 2004-2005): 595-608.
- Alexander B. Downes and Jonathan Monten, “Forced to Be Free? Why Foreign-Imposed Regime Change Rarely Leads to Democratization,” *International Security* 37.4 (Spring 2013): 90-131.

## Week 12: The Developmental State and the Resource Curse

### **Monday (11-5)**

- Z. Oniş, “Review: The Logic of the Developmental State,” *Comparative Politics* 24.1 (1991): 109-126.
- David C. Kang, “Bad Loans to Good Friends: Money Politics and the Developmental State in South Korea,” *International Organization* 56.1 (2002): 177-207.
- Samuel P. Huntington, “Political Development and Political Decay,” *World Politics* 17.3 (1965): 396-430.
- Michael Ross, “Does Oil Hinder Democracy?” *World Politics* 53 (2001): 325-361.
- José León García-Rodríguez, Francisco J. García-Rodríguez, Carlos Castilla-Gutiérrez, and Silvério Adriano Major, “Oil, Power, and Poverty in Angola,” *African Studies Review* 58.1 (2015): 159-176.
- Charles J. Sullivan, “Kazakhstan at a Crossroads,” *Asia Policy* 13.2 (April 2018): 121-136.

## Week 13: Civil Society and Developmental Aid

### **Monday (11-12)**

- Larry Diamond, “Toward Democratic Consolidation,” *Journal of Democracy* 5.3 (1994): 4-17.
- Timur Kuran, “Now Out of Never: The Element of Surprise in the East European Revolution of 1989,” *World Politics* 44.1 (1991): 7-48.
- Robert D. Putnam, “Tuning In, Tuning Out: The Strange Disappearance of Social Capital in America,” *Political Science and Politics* 28.4 (1995): 664-683.
- Michael Bernhard and Ekrem Karakoç, “Civil Society and the Legacies of Dictatorship,” *World Politics* 59.4 (2007): 539-567.
- Steven E. Finkel, “Can Democracy Be Taught?” *Journal of Democracy* 14.4 (2003): 137-151.
- Thomas Carothers, “Democracy Aid at 25: Time to Choose,” *Journal of Democracy* 26.1 (2015): 59-73.

## Week 14: Democratic Peace Theory

### **Monday (11-19)**

- Michael W. Doyle, “Kant, Liberal Legacies, and Foreign Affairs,” *Philosophy and Public Affairs* 12.3 (Summer 1983): 205-235.
- Bruce Bueno de Mesquita, James D. Morrow, Randolph M. Siverson, and Alastair Smith, “An Institutional Explanation of the Democratic Peace,” *American Political Science Review* 93.4 (1999): 791-807.
- Christopher Layne, “Kant or Cant: The Myth of the Democratic Peace,” *International Security* 19.2 (Autumn 1994): 5-49.
- Sebastian Rosato, “The Flawed Logic of Democratic Peace Theory,” *American Political Science Review* 97.4 (2003): 585-602.