

Edward Epstein
Office: OSH 210 C
Phone: 581-6312
E-mail: ee Epstein@poli-sci.utah.edu

Fall 2007
Hours: Mondays, 1-1:50 p.m.
& by appointment

Political Science 6003
Approaches to the Study of Politics

This class is meant as an overview of Political Science for graduate students, with an emphasis on some of the theoretical contributions found in our discipline's standard sub fields. As such, we will be reading fairly broadly, taking into account aspects of American politics, public administration, comparative politics, international relations, and political thought.

For most of the sessions of the course, I have invited a series of professors from this department (see the schedule found below of who will come in when) where each will present readings in their field of specialty for the first part of a class session. Each has provided a set of questions related to those readings to assist you as you make your way through them prior to class. Their presence will not only facilitate the discussion of the ideas in the readings each has selected, but will also provide the opportunity for you to get to know some of the department's current faculty. After a short break, the rest of the class will provide ample time to allow students to comment on how that week's readings fit in with what we will have read in earlier class sessions.

As part of a graduate class, students will be expected to regularly attend and to actively participate.

Texts.

Only one book has been ordered from the University Bookstore for your possible purchase: Plato's *Gorgias*.

All other items hopefully should be downloadable from the Electronic Reserve at Marriott Library where you will need to present your uNID and password. To download and print copies of these readings, go to the student portal @My.Utah.edu, and click on Academics.

Grading.

1. There will be 4 short (3-4 double-spaced pages) essays based upon the study questions for each week of readings. Students will each be asked to sign up for four particular weeks during the first class meeting (4 @ 20% = 80% of grade).
2. Class participation (20% of grade).

There will be no final exam unless students demonstrate that one is needed to ensure adequate class preparation.

Warning on Academic Misconduct and Plagiarism.

The University of Utah's Code of Student Rights and Responsibilities requires that students

[a]dhere to generally accepted standards of academic honesty including, but not limited to, restraining from cheating, plagiarizing, research misconduct, misrepresenting one's work, and/or inappropriately collaborating.

All quotes must be cited as such and include a clear reference to the work from which they were drawn, including for class materials; they will otherwise be treated as plagiarism. All use of materials other than course materials must be accompanied by full citations. All work in this course is assigned as individual work where not explicitly assigned as group work. You are discouraged from seeking all but the most casual assistance with your writing from others. If you intend to submit a paper which significantly draws upon work used in another class, or if you are planning on submitting substantially similar papers to both my class and a class from another instructor, you must first receive explicit permission to do so from both myself and the other instructor. Any form of academic dishonesty may result in a failing grade for the assignment, failure for the entire course, or other disciplinary action, including academic suspension or dismissal from the University. Full information on the University's policy on academic misconduct, and further definitions, can be found at <http://www.admin.utah.edu/ppmanual/8/8-10.html>.

Disclaimer for Students with Disabilities.

The Department of Political Science seeks to provide equal access to its programs, services, and activities for people with disabilities. If you need accommodations in this class, reasonable prior notice needs to be given to the instructor and to the Center for Disability Services <http://disability.utah.edu> 162 Olpin Union Building, telephone 581-5020, to make arrangements for accommodations.

Syllabus and Reading List.

Week 1 (August 20), Introduction.

Reading:

Dryzek, John (2006). "Revolutions Without Enemies: Key Transformations in Political Science," *American Political Science Review*, 100 (4): 487-492.

This first class will also provide a discussion of various databases relevant to Political Science available through Marriott Library. For anyone having to come late, we will meet in Marriott, room 1725, at 3 p.m., with librarian Peter Kraus.

Week 2 (August 27), Political Socialization: Enduring Approach or Theoretical Dead

End? Prof. Matt Burbank.

Readings:

Greenstein, Fred I. (1960). "The Benevolent Leader: Children's Images of Political Authority." *American Political Science Review*, 54 (4): 934-943.

Ventura, Raphael. (2001). "Family Political Socialization in Multiparty Systems." *Comparative Political Studies*, 34 (6): 666-691.

Inglehart, Ronald, and Paul R. Abramson. (1994). "Economic Security and Value Change." *American Political Science Review*, 88 (2): 336-354.

Study Questions:

1. "The study of political socialization is widely regarded as the study of children" (Sapiro 2002, 13). But, is this a topic that *ought* to command the attention of political scientists? Put bluntly -- children can't vote so why should we care about their political views? Is there real theoretical value in studying the attitudes or activities of people who are not yet adults, or should our limited resources be directed to other approaches and populations?

2. What, if anything, has the study of political socialization contributed to our general understanding of politics? Has the study of political socialization enriched our knowledge of how individuals learn and change over time? Has the study of political socialization contributed to our understanding of the differences between countries in terms of political institutions or political culture? If so, what have we learned? If not, why have we not learned more?

3. How have political scientists used empirical evidence to study the process of political socialization? What methods have been used most commonly and why? Is the empirical study of political socialization similar to other areas of research in political science or are the data and methods used unique?

4. What happened to the study of political socialization? In the 1960s and 1970s, the study of political socialization was considered to be a "growth stock" (Greenstein 1970, 969) -- there were numerous books and journal articles published in the most prominent journals on the topic. But, since the 1980s, the study of political socialization has not been the subject of intensive research or the focus of teaching. What changed and why? Where all the interesting research questions answered in a satisfactory way or did the discipline simply move on to more attractive or less difficult areas of study?

Week 3 (September 3), No Class. Labor Day Holiday.

Week 4 (September 10), Voting in American Politics, Prof. Thad Hall.

Readings:

Rosenstone, Steven J. and Raymond E. Wolfinger (1978). "The Effect of Registration Laws on Voter Turnout," *American Political Science Review*, 72 (1): 22-45.

Ansolabehere, Stephen, and David Konisky (2005). "The Introduction of Voter Registration and Its Effect on Turnout," *Political Analysis*.
http://vote.caltech.edu/media/documents/ansolabehere_konisky_political_analysis.pdf

Ansolabehere, Stephen, and Charles Stewart (2005). "Residual Votes Attributable to Technology," *Journal of Politics*, 67 (2): 365-389.

Berinsky, Adam (2005). "The Perverse Consequences of Electoral Reform in the United States," *American Politics Research*, 33, (4): 471-491.

Berinsky, Adam, Nancy Burns, and Michael Traugott (2001). "Who Votes by Mail? A Dynamic Model of the Individual-Level Consequences of Vote-By-Mail Systems," *Public Opinion Quarterly*, 65 (2): 178-197.

Alvarez, R. Michael, and Thad Hall (2006). "Are Americans Confident Their Ballots are Counted?" http://vote.caltech.edu/media/documents/wps/vtp_wp49.pdf

Study Questions:

1. Explain the differences between the analysis by Ansolabehere/Konisky and Rosenstone/Wolfinger related to the effect of registration laws on turnout.
2. How effective is Berinsky's critique of electoral reform in the United States?
3. What are the strengths and weaknesses of the various units of analysis used in the 6 studies? Are there better analyses that could be done to address these questions?
4. What are the policy implications of the articles? How should policy makers respond to the findings in the various studies?

Week 5 (September 17), Federalism and Policy-Making, Prof. John Francis.

Readings:

Obinger, Herbert, Francis Castles, and Stephen Leibfried (2005). "Introduction," *Federalism and the Welfare State*.

Wong, Kenneth, and Gail Sunderman (2007). "Educational Accountability as a Presidential Priority: No Child Left Behind and the Bush Presidency," and

Milikis, Sidney, and Jesse Rhodes (2007). "George W. Bush, the Party System, and American Federalism," both in *Publius* 37 (3): 333-350 and 478-503.

Elazar, Daniel (2001). "The United States and the European Union: Models for Their Epochs," in Kalypso Nicolaides and Robert Howse (eds.), *The Federal Vision*.

Study Questions:

1. Analytically can we classify federal unions as either cooperative or conflictual? Explain what you mean.

2. Observers note that policy change in a federal system is harder to achieve than in non-federal systems. If you agree why and if you disagree why not.
3. Is federalism of declining importance in the understanding of American politics?
4. To what extent do federal institutional arrangement largely serve to provide “venue shopping” for political interests which promote either a national or a state public policy solution depending on the comparative sympathy for the policy position they favor?

Week 6 (September 24), Public Administration in the U.S., Prof. Richard Green.

Readings:

Morgan, Douglas F., Richard T. Green, Craig Shinn, and Kent Robinson (forthcoming 2008). “Administrative Ethics and Responsibility,” *The Foundations of American Public Administration*.

Morgan, Douglas, et al., (2008). “A Political History of Public Personnel Administration,” *The Foundations of American Public Administration*.

Green, Richard, Robert Forbis, Anne Golden, Stephen Nelson, and Jennifer Robinson (2006). “On the Ethics of At-Will Employment in the Public Sector,” *Public Integrity*, 8 (4): 305-328.

Rohr, John (1986). “Executive Supremacy: The Brownlow Report,” *To Run a Constitution: The Legitimacy of the Administrative State*.

Rosenbloom, David (2000). “Legislative-Centered Public Administration,” *Building a Legislative-Centered Public Administration: Congress and the Administrative State, 1946-1999..*

Study Questions:

1. Based on these readings, explain why public administration theory is in essence a type of political theory.
2. How has the content of "merit" in public employment evolved in American public administration?
3. Why is the expansion of public “at-will” employment troublesome in the context of our governing system?
4. Why is administrative responsibility so difficult to sort out in the American governing system?

5. Given our constitutional system, explain why it is both inappropriate and dangerous to treat public administration as synonymous with executive power?
6. Explain why and how U.S. legislative bodies actually participate in running public agencies, going far beyond merely conducting oversight.

Week 7 (October 1), Comparing Transitions to Democracy. Prof. Edward Epstein.

Readings:

O'Donnell, Guillermo, and Philippe Schmitter (1986). "Opening (and Undermining) Authoritarian Regimes," and "Negotiating (and Renegotiating) Pacts," in *Transitions from Authoritarian Rule: Tentative Conclusions about Uncertain Democracies*.

Rueschmeyer, Dietrich, Evelyne Huber Stephens, and John Stephens (1992). "Capitalist Development and Democracy: A Theoretical Framework," *Capitalist Development and Democracy*.

Haggard, Stephen, and Robert Kaufman (1995). "Comparing Authoritarian Withdrawals," *The Political Economy of Democratic Transitions*.

Linz, Juan, and Alfred Stepan (1996). "The Implications of Prior Regime Type for Transition Paths and Consolidation Tasks," *Problems of Democratic Transition and Consolidation*.

Study Questions:

1. Under what conditions might the negotiation of a transitional pact be possible in an authoritarian regime? How much depends on the bargaining skills of the negotiating groups?
2. Describe the type of argument that the possibilities for a successful democratic transition depend on the class structure that exists in a particular society and the possibilities for a relative balance in the power of social forces.
3. What are the possible effects of an economic crisis in a democratic transition? How might its existence place limits on any new democracy emerging?
4. What is "path dependency" and how might it condition any possible democratic transition?

Week 8 (October 8): No Class. Fall Break.

Week 9 (October 15), Historical Institutionalism. Prof. Nicole Richardt.

Reading:

Immergut, Ellen A. (1998). "The Theoretical Core of the New Institutionalism," *Politics and Society*, 26 (1), 5-24.

Mahoney, James, and Dietrich Rueschemeyer (2003). "Comparative Historical Analysis: Achievements and Agendas," *Comparative Historical Analysis in the Social Sciences*.

Streeck, Wolfgang, and Kathleen Thelen (2005). *Beyond Continuity. Institutional Change in Advanced Political Economies*, pp. 1-39.

Pierson, Paul (2003). "Big, Slow-Moving, and ... Invisible: Macrosocial Processes in the Study of Comparative Politics," in James Mahoney and Dietrich Rueschemeyer (eds.): *Comparative Historical Analysis in the Social Sciences*.

Study Questions:

1. Two decades ago, scholars working out of different theoretical traditions were announcing the virtues of "new" institutional approaches to the study of comparative politics. What, if anything, has been gained by the new or renewed emphasis on institutions? Your answer may focus on any version of "new institutional" approaches that you wish, but should anchor your theoretical argument with illustrations and evidence from empirical studies.

2. New historical institutionalism has explained well continuity through "path dependency" and radical change through "critical junctures". Discuss critically what the strength and weaknesses of the new historical institutionalism approach are in explaining institutional continuity and change. Can the latest work by Kathleen Thelen and Wolfgang Streeck address the challenges new historical The theory of institutionalism faces in explaining change? To support your theoretical argument use illustrations and evidence from empirical cases you are familiar with.

3. Discuss critically the different approaches to explaining continuity and change by Paul Pierson and Kathleen Thelen/Wolfgang Streeck. What are the similarities and what are the key differences? Use evidence from empirical studies you are familiar with to illustrate your theoretical argument.

Week 10 (October 22), Perspectives on International Relations. Prof. Howard Lehman.

Readings:

Morgenthau, Hans (1993). "A Realist Theory of International Politics," and "Political Power," *Politics Among Nations*.

Waltz, Kenneth (1979). "Anarchic Orders and Balances of Power," *Theory of International Politics*.

Keohane, Robert, and Joseph Nye (2001). "Interdependence in World Politics" and "Realism and Complex Interdependence," *Power and Interdependence*.

Wendt, Alexander (1992). "Anarchy is What States Make of It," *International Organization*, 46 (2): 391-425.

Held, David, et al. (1999). "The Globalization Debate," *Global Governance*, 5 (4): 483-96.

Study Questions:

1. What are the fundamental assumptions of political realism, as argued by Morgenthau and in what way are they relevant today?
2. In what way does complex interdependence break from classical realism and in what way is it similar?
3. Wendt states that "all theories of international relations are based on social theories of the relationship between agency, process, and social structure." What does he mean by this assertion?
4. How would realism, liberalism, or constructivism explain contemporary globalization?

Week 11 (October 29), Politics of Gender. Prof. Peri Schwartz-Shea.

Readings:

Allen, Amy (1998). "Rethinking Power," *Hypatia* 13 (1): 22-40.

Burns, Nancy (2007). "Gender in the Aggregate, Gender in the Individual, Gender and Political Action," *Politics & Gender*, 3 (1): 104-124.

Dahlerup, Drude (2006). "The Story of the Theory of Critical Mass," *Politics & Gender*, 2 (4): 511-522.

Guy, Mary Ellen, and Meredith A. Newman (2004). "Women's Jobs, Men's Jobs: Sex Segregation and Emotional Labor?," *Public Administration Review*, 64(3): 289-308.

Hawkesworth, Mary (2003). "Congressional Enactments of Race-Gender: Toward a Theory of Raced-Gendered Institutions," *American Political Science Review*, 97 (4): 529-50.

Junn, Jane (2007). "Square Pegs and Round Holes: Challenges of Fitting Individual-Level Analysis to a Theory of Politicized Context of Gender," *Politics & Gender*, 3 (1): 124-134.

Norton, Noelle (1995). "Women, It's Not Enough to Be Elected: Committee Position Makes a Difference," 115-140 in Georgia Duerst-Lahti, and Rita Mae Kelly, eds., *Gender Power, Leadership, and Governance*.

Schwartz-Shea, Peregrine (2002). "Theorizing Gender for Experimental, Game Theory: Experiments with 'Sex Status' and 'Merit Status' in an Asymmetric Game." *Sex Roles*, 47, (7/8): 301-319.

Tickner, J. Ann (2005). "What is Your Research Program? Some Feminist Answers to International Relations Methodological Questions," *International Studies Quarterly*, 49: 1-21.

Study Questions:

1. What are the key concepts in the study of the politics of gender?
2. What are the central questions in the study of the politics of gender?
3. What is the relationship between “feminism” and the study of the politics of gender?
4. What are the methods are used to study gender? What are the methodological implications of “gender?”

Week 12 (November 5), Social Movements and Political Participation. Prof. Claudio Holzner

Readings:

Gurr, Ted Robert (1968). “Psychological Factors in Civil Violence,” *World Politics*, 20 (2): 245-278.

Olson, Mancur (1982). “The Logic,” *The Rise and Decline of Nations*.

Jenkins, J. Craig (1983). “Resource Mobilization Theory and the Study of Social Movements,” *Annual Review of Sociology*, 9: 527-553.

Tarrow, Sidney (1998). “Print and Association” and “Political Opportunities and Constraints,” *Power in Movement: Social Movements and Contentious Politics*.

Verba, Sidney, Henry Brady, and Kay Lehman Schlozman (1995). “Resources, Engagement, and Political Activity,” *Voice and Equality: Civic Voluntarism in American Politics*.

Study Questions:

1. Are grievances enough to explain where and when social movements emerge and who participates in them?
2. What is the role of the state in motivating and shaping protest movements?
3. Given what you have learned about the institutional causes of protests, critique Verba, Brady and Schlozman's explanation of who is most likely to participate in politics.

Week 13 (November 12), Economic Statecraft and the Problem of Power in International Relations. Prof. Benjamin Judkins.

Readings:

Hufbauer, Gary, Jeffrey Schott and Kimberly Elliott (1991). Chapter 5, *Economic Sanctions Reconsidered*.

Lenway, Stefanie Ann (1988). "Between War and Commerce: Economic Sanctions as a Tool of Statecraft." *International Organization*, 42 (2): 397-426.

Pape, Robert A. (1997). "Why Economic Sanctions Do Not Work," *International Security*, 22, (2): 90-136.

Baldwin, David A. (1999). "The Sanctions Debate and the Logic of Choice," *International Security*, 24 (3): 80-107.

Study Questions:

1. Hufbauer, Schott and Elliot (HSE) focus much more on the question of "whether" sanctions work than "how" they work. Yet there does seem to be an implicit theory of how economic statecraft effects the actions of decision makers in their theory. What do you think it is?
2. Pape tries to improve the quality of the debate by shoring up its empirical foundations. To this end he recodes a number of cases in the HSE database. Are there problems with the new coding process that he used? How might these affect how we think about his conclusions?
3. Baldwin is concerned that both HSE's original study and Pape's criticisms of it have not taken the issue of "selection bias" sufficiently in to account. According to Baldwin, what class of cases are these scholars selecting against? What is it about the nature of "power analysis" that would lead a bunch of pretty bright researchers to make a mistakelike this? Or was it really a mistake at all?
4. What other sorts of research areas in political science might show the same sorts of "selection bias" that Baldwin is interested in. I am especially interested in examples from fields other than International Political Economy.

Week 14 (November 19), Neoclassical Realism. Prof. Steven Lobell.

Readings:

Taliaferro, Jeffrey, Steven Lobell, and Norrin Ripsman (2007). "Introduction," *Neoclassical Realism, the State, and Foreign Policy*.

Lobell, Steven (2007). "Neoclassical Realism and Threat Assessment: British Assessments of Germany Before the First World War," in Taliaferro, et al., *Neoclassical Realism, the State, and Foreign Policy*.

Ripsman, Norrin (2007). "Neoclassical Realism and Domestic Interest Groups: Domestic and Systematic Constraints on Grand Strategy in Four 'Worlds'," in Taliaferro, et al., *Neoclassical Realism, the State, and Foreign Policy*.

Taliaferro, Jeffrey (2007). "Neoclassical Realism and the Resource-Extractive State: State Building for Future Wars," in Taliaferro, et al., *Neoclassical Realism, the State, and Foreign Policy*.

Study Questions:

1. Compare and contrast the different theoretical assumptions of Neorealism, Classical Realism, and Neoclassical Realism?
2. What is the state and how does this concept fit into Neoclassical Realism?
3. What is the relationship between domestic and systemic forces according to Neoclassical Realism, and when will the former or latter dominate?
4. According to Neoclassical Realism, what are some of the constraints on how states identify threats, extract and mobilize resources, and select to emulate or innovate?

Week 15 (November 26), The Study of Political Thought, Past and Present. Prof. Mark Button.

Readings:

Plato, *Gorgias* (1952), trans. W.C. Hembold.

J. Peter Euben (1996). "Reading Democracy: 'Socratic' Dialogues and the Political Education of Democratic Citizens"; and

Benjamin Barber (1996). "Misreading Democracy: Peter Euben and the *Gorgias*," both from Josiah Ober and Charles Hedrick, eds., *Democratia*.

Study Questions:

1. What is the *Gorgias* really about? That is to say, what divides Callicles and Socrates in this dialogue?
2. What does it mean that a dialogue that is to a substantial degree about the necessary conditions for having a dialogue breaks down almost entirely? Plato wrote it this way; why did he do so?
3. Do the arguments of the *Gorgias* still have relevance for us today? Why or why not?

4. Who has the most persuasive account of the “Socrates” in the *Gorgias*, Euben or Barber? Explain your answer. What is really at stake in this debate?

5. More broadly: what do these contending accounts of the *Gorgias* and of Plato tell us about the nature (and the art) of political theory? What kind of a field of inquiry is this? What are its goals?

Week 16 (December 3), The Interpretive Turn Toward Embedded Knowledge.
Prof. Luke Garrott.

Readings:

Taylor, Charles (1991). “Cross-Purposes: The Liberal-Communitarian Debate”.
Oakeshott, Michael (1991). "Rationalism in Politics," *Rationalism in Politics and Other Essays*.

Oakeshott, Michael (2001). "Learning and Teaching," *The Voice of Liberal Learning*.

Study Questions:

1. Oakeshott (in “Rationalism in Politics”) says of the rationalist, “Much of his political activity consists in bringing the social, political, legal and institutional inheritance of his society before the tribunal of his intellect” (8). “But unfortunately he will never quite succeed. He began too late and on the wrong foot. His knowledge will never be more than half-knowledge, and consequently he will never be more than half-right” (36).

What is missing, according to the author? What are the consequences of this view first for “public administration,” i.e., the operation of good government, and also for the study and “science” of politics?

2. Oakeshott, (in “Learning and Teaching”) states, “It is the Sage, the teacher, who is the agent of civilization” (39). Furthermore, “Teaching is the deliberate and intentional initiation of a pupil into the world of human achievement” (ibid.). And check out the large paragraph on p. 42. If this does not inspire your graduate studies, I don’t know what will...

How does he proceed to define knowledge? What is the role of 1) *information* and 2) *judgment* in the educational process? And how about the goal of *style*?

3. Taylor’s article is not only an excellent review of a touchstone debate for political theory, but a cogent introduction to very useful categories of thought. After reading this piece, the following statement should be coherent to you:

“Taking an ontological position doesn’t amount to advocating something; but at the same time, the ontological does help to define the options it is meaningful to support by advocacy: The latter connection explains how ontological theses can be far from

innocent. Your ontological proposition, if true, can show that your neighbor's favorite social order is an impossibility or carries a price he or she did not count with. But this should not induce us to think that the proposition *amounts to* the advocacy of some alternative" (183).

Are you an "atomist" or a "holist"? Has this affected the choices you've made in your political science career? How about the choices that have been made in the American polity? Which do we believe in more, ontological atomism or holism? What consequences does this have for advocacy of "the good life"? Finally, does "holist individualism" (185) have a chance in any regime other than the participatory self-rule advocated by Taylor?