

Regime Change (17.508)/ The Rise and Fall of Democracy (17.507)

Updated, Spring 2002

Why you should take this course

Coups, civil wars, revolutions, and peaceful political transitions are the “real stuff” of political science. They show us why politics matters, and they highlight the consequences of political choices in times of institutional crisis. This course will help you understand why democracies emerge and why they die, from ancient times to the recent wave of democratization in Southern Europe, Eastern Europe, and the developing world.

What this course is about

Few things are more dramatic than the collapse of a political system, whether through violent conflict or the peaceful negotiation of new institutions. Explaining why regimes break down, why new ones emerge, and how these new regimes become consolidated are among the most important questions in political science. Not surprisingly, regime change has obsessed scholars for centuries, from Aristotle to Machiavelli to the current theorists of democratization.

You will review several broad explanations for regime change before turning to a more detailed examination of some of history’s most famous and theoretically interesting political transitions: the collapse of the Weimar Republic in Germany; democratic breakdown, the consolidation of military dictatorship, and re-democratization in Chile; the breakdown of British colonial rule in the Massachusetts Bay Colony; and protracted political transition in Mexico. There will be shorter discussion of democratization in Spain, South Africa, and South Korea, as well as democratic collapse in Brazil, Austria, and Italy.

Please note that there are two numbers for this class, 17.508 and 17.507. Graduate students should register under 17.508; no prerequisites are required. Undergraduates should register under 17.507, unless they wish to take the graduate-level version of the class (for which you must receive my permission).

Readings

Readings are assigned for each week, including for the first week (Class #1).

Weekly reading requirements are different for graduate students and undergraduates.

Undergraduates are expected to read approximately 100 pages per week, which will focus on the central themes or cases for that week. These readings should take you about three to four hours, depending on how fast you read.

Graduate students are expected to read 100-125 additional pages that cover other cases or expand on theoretically challenging issues raised by the principal case. For instance, undergraduate readings on the rise of fascism in Europe examine the collapse of the Weimar Republic in

Germany. Additional graduate readings in that week examine the rise of fascism in Italy, as well as the case of Austria (where fascist and Nazi parties failed to take power). Graduate students should be able to complete all the readings for a typical week in about eight hours.

All readings will be placed on reserve in Dewey library, as will copies of the following books:

- Arturo Valenzuela, *The Breakdown of Democratic Regimes: Chile* (Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1978).
- Mary Helen Spooner, *Soldiers in a Narrow Land: The Pinochet Regime in Chile* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1994).
- Nathaniel Davis, *The Last Two Years of Salvador Allende* (Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1985).
- Samuel P. Huntington, *Political Order in Changing Societies* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1968).
- Samuel P. Huntington, *The Third Wave: Democratization in the Late Twentieth Century* (Norman, OK: University of Oklahoma, 1991).

Graduate students should consider purchasing these books, if they do not already own them. All students should consider purchasing at least the first two, as we will read virtually all of them.

Written requirements

You have two options: (1) one long paper of approximately 25 pages **OR** (2) five short papers of 4-5 pages each. **There will be no final exam.**

1. Long paper: Pick an instance of regime change not covered in the course, and analyze it in detail. Your topic may be a military coup, revolution, civil war, peaceful transition to democracy, or some similar instance of regime change. It may also be a period of political crisis in which regime change did not occur – e.g., a failed coup attempt or uprising. It can be very specific (e.g., the 1989 suppression of the pro-democracy movement in China's Tiananmen Square) or reasonably broad (e.g., the breakdown of democracy in Brazil in 1964). In either case, your paper must draw on at least some primary sources (newspaper articles, government documents, or interviews), as well as on secondary sources.

In analyzing your case, you should pay special attention to four questions. First, what happened in the case you are studying? The more narrow your focus, the more specific your paper should be – for instance, if you were analyzing the failure of the democracy movement in China, you should report details like which military units were deployed during the Tiananmen Square massacre, where, and when.

Second, what larger, structural factors played a role in the event you are analyzing? This portion of your paper should include a discussion of the effects of class structure, ethnic cleavages, political culture, perverse institutional arrangements, and similar background conditions. For instance, if you were studying the Brazilian military coup of 1964, you would mention factors like extreme socio-economic inequality, low levels of education, a history of military participation in government, and similar issues.

Third, what were the short-term triggers for the event you chose to analyze? Common factors include the state of the economy, specific civil-military disagreements, incompetent or polarizing leadership, and similar variables. In the Brazilian coup, for example, you would presumably discuss the rhetoric and policies of President Goulart, leftist mobilization, and rampant inflation.

Fourth, is the incident you analyzed better explained by structural or short-term factors? What realistic options did leaders have? Were specific mistakes made that fundamentally changed the course of events? Or was the event you describe basically destined to occur (though not necessarily exactly when it did)?

If you choose to write a long paper, you must come up with a list of potential topics by Class #3. These topics should be in the form of clearly articulated questions about your case (including the time frame you will analyze), rather than simply vague expressions of interest. By Class #5, you must select one of these topics and submit a comprehensive bibliography of sources related to that topic. You must also submit a one-page summary of your topic, which indicates that you have already read some of the key sources in your bibliography. By Class #8, you must submit a two-page overview of your case that summarizes your overall conclusions and argument, as well as a 5-10 page analysis of the incident you have chosen to analyze – that is, what happened, when, etc. By Class #11, you must submit a second installment of 5-10 pages, summarizing the theoretical section of your paper – that is, why things turned out the way they did. By Class #13, you must submit a complete draft of your paper. This version should be polished and free of grammatical or stylistic errors. I will return this draft to you by the following week, and you will then have an additional week before the end of the semester to revise your paper based on my comments. In Class #17, you must then submit a final version of your paper to me and to the rest of the class (by email). In Class #18, you will be expected to present the findings of your paper in class (plan on a presentation of 10-12 minutes, with transparencies if you wish). If class discussion of your paper leads you to change your conclusions or argument in some way, you may submit a revised version any time on or before Class #19. **Please note that each of your submissions will be graded separately** (as described below).

2. Short papers: Short papers should be 1,000-1,250 words and should address issues raised by the required readings from that week in a coherent way. They should not be composites of separate critiques of the readings. Rather, they should develop a coherent argument regarding the topic of the week, support that argument with evidence from the readings, and refute potential counter-arguments. For instance, in the second week of the class, the readings cover the causes of democracy. For this week, you may wish to discuss which factors seem most important. Alternatively, you might try analyzing which of the causes of democracy discussed by Huntington and Diamond best explain why democracy was not consolidated in the cases we discussed in the first week of class (ancient Israel, Pakistan, Venezuela, Ecuador, etc.).

In the third week of the class, readings focus on “modernization theory” (the argument advanced by Lipset, Huntington, Diamond and others that economic development leads to democracy). You may wish to defend this argument, or to argue that it is fundamentally flawed. In either case, you would then summarize the argument, recapitulate the evidence presented for it, and explain why this evidence is compelling or insufficient.

As a rule of thumb, you should leave **at least** eight hours to write a good short paper, in addition to the time you spend on the readings.

Short papers are due by 4 p.m. on the Sunday before Class #4. They may also be emailed to me as a Microsoft Word attachment but must be received by 4 p.m.

I will then print them out and grade them. I’d like to practice blind grading, so please don’t include a title page or put your name in the footer; instead, put your name on a separate page after the paper. Also, at the risk of stifling self-expression and generally sounding like a pain, I ask that all essays and short papers be double-spaced and submitted in Times font. (Otherwise I learn people’s fonts after the first paper, which defeats the purpose of blind grading.)

Finally, if you choose to write short papers, you must space them out to some degree over the course of the semester. **Unless you clear it with me ahead of time, you will be expected to write at least two papers in the first six weeks of the class and at least two in the last six weeks.**

Oral requirements

Oral requirements consist of regular class participation and one or two class presentations (depending on enrollment).

1. Class participation: Students are expected to participate actively and intelligently in class discussions. As a rule of thumb, you should plan to spend about an hour or two going over your notes from the readings and preparing for class each week, after you have completed the readings.

My somewhat odd habit is to assign all students a letter grade for each class session, which makes grading overall class participation less arbitrary. Please notify me at the beginning of the class if, for whatever reason, you are unprepared to participate in class discussion that day. Also, if you must miss a class, please let me know in advance. Each student is entitled to one unexcused absence or “unprepared” over the course of the semester; any more will count against your class participation grade.

2. Presentation(s): Each class will begin with a brief (5-15 minute) presentation discussing and critiquing the readings. You should choose a week -- or, in the case of enrollment under twelve people, two weeks -- for your presentation. Bear in mind that the goal of your presentation is to refresh people’s memories about the readings, to highlight the key areas of disagreement, and to tee up questions for class discussion; you should not feel

compelled to mechanically summarize every article. As a rule of thumb, you should plan to spend an extra hour preparing for class on the day of your presentation(s).

Those of you writing longer papers will be expected to present the results of your findings in Class #18. This presentation will count as part of your paper grade (below).

Other assignments

In addition to papers and readings, you will have a handful of small assignments over the course of the semester. For the second week of the semester, for instance, you must register to vote. If you actively wish not to register you may instead submit a 100-word statement on how politics is relevant to their life. If you are not a citizen and thus cannot register in the United States, you may either show proof of registration in your home country or write the 100-word statement.

In several weeks, readings are supplemented by popular films or documentaries. These are intended to convey the flavor of the times and the feel of everyday life in the cases we study; they are also very good films in their own right. They are not intended to oppress you with further work. Keep in mind, however, that the Chile documentaries are quite long (over 2 hours each), so be sure to leave time in your schedule. I will arrange for a group screening of the films; they will also be on reserve in case you cannot make that time.

For the week on the American Revolution in Boston, you will be asked to walk the Freedom Trail instead of watching a movie. It will be spring then, and this should be fun. In any case, make sure you do this even if you have already done so.

The most important small assignment is due on Class #4 (when we discuss modernization theory). For this assignment, you are expected to review data on democracy available through the course website (or, if you wish, some other data set). You will be expected to present your findings in class, so make sure to come prepared. Plan on spending at least two hours on data analysis.

Overall workload

Combining the readings, class preparation, class presentation(s), small assignments, written work, and actual time in class, **undergraduates should plan to devote approximately eight hours per week to the class on average, over a thirteen week semester. Graduate students should plan to devote about twelve hours per week.**

Grading

Twenty-five percent (25%) of your grade will be based on class participation, including your presentation(s). Each presentation grade will count as the equivalent of six sessions of regular class participation. The other 75% of your grade will be based on your written work – i.e., either one long paper or five short papers. Short papers will all count equally (15% each); if you are feeling ambitious and want to write more than the requisite number of papers, your best five papers will be counted.

Components of the long paper (if you choose that option) will be graded as follows: list of potential topics (5%), 1-page summary of topic and comprehensive bibliography (10%), first installment of paper (15%), second installment of paper (10%), completed draft of paper (10%),

completed paper (15%), and presentation of paper in class (10%). If you submit a revised version of your paper in response to suggestions from your classmates, any improvement will be reflected in the grade for your completed paper.

The purpose of this grading system is to spread work for the long papers evenly over the semester, and thus to ensure that research and writing is not rushed. It also reflects my view that much of the writing of a good research paper, like a good experiment in the hard sciences, lies in the design and set-up. For this reason, I take the early submissions seriously and will grade them that way. For instance, a list of potential topics that demonstrates a conscientious attempt to identify researchable cases of regime change will be graded highly; a cursory list assembled at the last minute will be graded harshly. Similarly, a bibliography that lacks theoretical or empirical sources relevant to the topic will be graded harshly, while one that comprehensively covers the literature (including articles in academic journals, chapters edited books, primary sources, etc.) will be graded well.

Grading standards for the longer papers are different for graduate students and undergraduates. A good undergraduate research paper, for instance, should present a solid description of a particular case and a compelling explanation for why things turned out the way they did. A good graduate research paper should do these same things, but it should also situate your case in the context of broader scholarly debates on regime change, and it should demonstrate why your case is theoretically relevant to those debates. In other words, undergraduate research papers should explain trend (that is, why things turned out the way they did); graduate research papers should explain variation (that is, why things turned out one way in certain countries and differently in others). Put another way, a good undergraduate paper should tell me something new; a good graduate paper should tell me something that is both new and theoretically interesting.

Key deadlines

Class #1:	Readings will be discussed in class.
Class #3:	Those writing a long paper must submit list of potential paper topics (or single topic, which subsequently cannot be changed).
Class #5:	Those writing a long paper must submit a one-page summary of their topic and full bibliography (at least 20 sources).
Class #8:	Those writing a long paper must submit a 2-page introduction to their paper that summarizes their findings and conclusions) plus a 5 to 10-page account of what happened in their case.
Class #11:	Those writing a long paper must submit a 5 to 10-page theoretical section (i.e., an analysis of why things turned out the way they did).
Class #13:	Those writing a long paper must submit completed draft.
Class #17:	Those writing a long paper must submit their completed final paper, and must email a copy to all students in the class.
Class #18:	Class presentations on paper topic.
Class #19:	Those writing a long paper may submit a rewrite.

All deadlines are for 4 p.m. on the day specified, and all will be strictly enforced. Late submissions will be marked down 1/3 of a grade (i.e., A to A-) for each day they are late.

Class Schedule

Class #1. From the First Political Transition to the Third Wave of Democracy

IN CLASS: Review of course requirements. Class discussion: What is a political regime? What is democracy? What is regime change?

READINGS

I Samuel, 8:1-8:22, in *The New Oxford Annotated Bible*.

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

The Economist, "Pakistan's New Rulers," October 16, 1999.

The New York Times, "Dangerous Coup in Pakistan," October 13, 1999, p. 24.

The Economist, "Oh, Pakistan," October 16, 1999.

Paula R. Newberg, "Pakistan: The Choice is not between Democracy and Chaos," *Los Angeles Times*, October 17, 1999, p. M1.

The New York Times, Celia W. Dugger, "Fixing What Ails Pakistan: Can the Coup Leader Deliver on His Promises," October 19, 1999, p. 12.

The Economist, "The Chavez enigma," June 5, 1999.

The Economist, "Chavez stirs things up," July 10, 1999.

The Economist, "Chavez cleans the slate," July 31, 1999.

The Economist, "Caribbean Jacobinism," August 14, 1999.

The Economist, "Chavez's power grab," August 28, 1999.

The Economist, "Chavez's muddled new world," November 20, 1999.

The New York Times, Editorial, "Ecuador's Endangered Democracy," January 25, 2000.

The New York Times, Larry Rohter, "Bitter Indians Let Ecuador Know Fight Isn't Over," January 27, 2000.

The New York Times, Larry Rohter, "Ecuador's Coup Alerts Region to a Resurgent Military," January 30, 2000.

ASSIGNMENT

None.

Class #2. The Causes of Democracy

IN CLASS: In class: The causes of democracy.

READINGS

Samuel P. Huntington, *The Third Wave: Democratization in the Late Twentieth Century* (Norman, OK: University of Oklahoma, 1991): 3-5, 13-26, 34-108.

Larry Diamond, *Developing Democracy: Toward Consolidation* (Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1999): 1-2, 24-63, 261-78.

ADDITIONAL READINGS FOR GRADUATE STUDENTS:

Samuel P. Huntington, *The Third Wave: Democratization in the Late Twentieth Century* (Norman, OK: University of Oklahoma, 1991): 280-316.

Stephan Haggard and Robert R. Kaufman, *The Political Economy of Democratic Transition* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1995): 25-44.

Dietrich Rueschemeyer, Evelyne Huber Stephens, and John D. Stephens, *Capitalist Development and Democracy*: (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1992): 1-31.

Robert Dahl, *Democracy and Its Critics* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1989): 244-64.

Nicolò Machiavelli, *The Discourses*, Book 1, Chapters 1-4, in Peter Bondanella and Mark Musa, eds., *The Portable Machiavelli* (New York: Penguin Books, 1979): 167, 171-85. [Originally published in 1531.]

ASSIGNMENT

Register to vote **OR** write a 100-word statement on why politics is relevant to your life.

Class #4. Modernization Theory and its Critics

IN CLASS: Review of data on democratization and critique of Przeworski, et al.; class discussion of findings from data.

READINGS

Seymour Martin Lipset, "Economic Development and Democracy," in *Political Man: The Social Bases of Politics* (Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1981): 27-63.

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

Adam Przeworski, Michael Alvarez, José Antonio Cheibub, and Fernando Limongi, "What Makes Democracies Endure?" in Larry Diamond, Marc F. Plattner, Yu-han Chu, and Hung-mao Tien, eds., *Consolidating the Third Wave Democracies* (Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1997): 295-311.

ADDITIONAL READINGS FOR GRADUATE STUDENTS:

Larry Diamond, "Economic Development and Democracy Reconsidered," Gary Marks and Larry Diamond eds., in *Reexamining Democracy: Essays in Honor of Seymour Martin Lipset* (Newbury Park, California: Sage, 1992): 93-139.

ASSIGNMENT:

Review cross-national data on democracy (posted on web site). Graduate students should also review other data sets. Using this data, a subset of it, or any other data you wish to gather, evaluate some of the hypotheses discussed in class and in the readings about the causes of democracy. You may wish to focus on a particular country, a region, or a larger group of countries, and on one hypothesis or on several. Come to class prepared to present your findings and to discuss those of your colleagues.

Class #6. Is it how modern you are or how you modernize?

IN CLASS: Lecture: Modernization, social conflict, and authoritarianism

READINGS

Barrington Moore, *The Social Origins of Dictatorship and Democracy* (Boston: Beacon Press, 1966): xiv-xvii.

Samuel P. Huntington, *Political Order in Changing Societies* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1968): 1-11, 32-59, 72-92, 140-66.

Robert Dahl, *Polyarchy: Participation and Opposition* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1971): 105-6.

ADDITIONAL READINGS FOR GRADUATE STUDENTS:

Barrington Moore, *The Social Origins of Dictatorship and Democracy* (Boston: Beacon Press, 1966): 413-52.

Karl Marx and Frederick Engels, *Manifesto of the Communist Party: Part I*, in Robert C. Tucker, ed., *The Marx-Engels Reader* (New York: W.W. Norton, 1978): 473-83.

David Collier, ed., *The New Authoritarianism in Latin America* (Princeton, N.J.: Princeton University Press, c1979), p. 19-32.

Hyug Baeg-Im, "The Rise of Bureaucratic Authoritarianism in South Korea," *World Politics*, January 1987, 39 (2): 231-257.

ASSIGNMENT

See the movie *Z: A Political Tragedy in Greece*.

Class #7. Crisis, Choice, and Regime Change

IN CLASS: Lecture: The Machiavellian moment and the politics of greatness.

READINGS

John Higley and Richard Gunther, eds., *Elites and Democratic Consolidation in Latin America and Southern Europe* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1992): 20-24.

Dankwart Rustow, "Transitions to Democracy," *Comparative Politics*, 1970 (3): 337-65.

Guillermo O'Donnell, Philippe C. Schmitter, and Laurence Whitehead, eds., *Transitions from Authoritarian Rule: Tentative Conclusions about Uncertain Democracies* (Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1986), p. 3-5.

Nicolò Machiavelli, *The Discourses*, I: 9-10, in Peter Bondanella and Mark Musa, eds., *The Portable Machiavelli* (New York: Penguin Books, 1979 [1531]): 200-207.

Seymour Martin Lipset, "George Washington and the Founding of Democracy," *Journal of Democracy*, October 1998, 9(4): 24-38.

Jeffrey Herbst, "Prospects for Elite-Driven Democracy in South Africa," *Political Science Quarterly*, Winter 1998, 112 (4): 595-615.

ADDITIONAL READINGS FOR GRADUATE STUDENTS:

Michael Burton and John Higley, "Political Crises and Elite Settlements," in Mattei Dogan and John Higley, eds., Lanham, MD: Rowman & Littlefield, 1998): 47-70.

Adam Przeworski, "Some Problems in the Study of the Transition to Democracy," in Guillermo O'Donnell, Philippe C. Schmitter, and Laurence Whitehead, eds., *Transitions from Authoritarian Rule: Comparative Perspectives* (Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1991): 47-63.

Hennie J. Kotzé, "South Africa: From Apartheid to Democracy," in Mattei Dogan and John Higley, eds., Lanham, MD: Rowman & Littlefield, 1998): 213-222.

Juan J. Linz and Alfred Stepan, *Problems of Democratic Transition and Consolidation: Southern Europe, South America, and Post-Communist Europe* (Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1996): 87-115.

John A. Peeler, "Elite Settlements and Democratic Consolidation: Colombia, Costa Rica, and Venezuela," in John Higley and Richard Gunther, eds., *Elites and Democratic Consolidation in Latin America and Southern Europe* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1992): 81-112.

Barry Weingast, "The Political Foundations of Democracy and the Rule of Law," *American Political Science Review* June 97 (91): 245-63.

Class #9. The Collapse of Weimar and the Rise of the Third Reich

IN CLASS: Lecture: From the breakdown of Weimar to the consolidation of Nazi rule.

READINGS

Seymour Martin Lipset, "'Fascism' – Left, Right, and Center," in *Political Man: The Social Bases of Politics* (Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1981): 127-152.

Ursula Hoffmann-Lange, "Germany: Twentieth Century Turning Points," in Mattei Dogan and John Higley, eds., Lanham, MD: Rowman & Littlefield, 1998): 170-74.

M. Ranier Lepsius, "From Fragmented Party Democracy to Government by Emergency Decree and National Socialist Takeover: Germany," in Juan J. Linz and Alfred Stepan, *The Breakdown of Democratic Regimes: Europe* (Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1978): 34-79.

Henry Ashby Turner, *Hitler's Thirty Days to Power: January 1933* (New York: Addison-Wesley, 1996): 1-2, 163-183.

Alan Bullock, *Hitler: A Study in Tyranny* (New York, Harper & Row, 1962), p. 61-64, in John L. Snell, ed., *The Nazi Revolution: Germany's Guilt or Germany's Fate?* (Boston: D.C. Heath and Company): 1-3.

Alan Bullock, "The Dictator," in Nathaniel Greene, ed., *Fascism: An Anthology* (Arlington Heights, IL: AHM Publishing Company, 1968): 207-216.

ADDITIONAL READINGS FOR GRADUATE STUDENTS:

Seymour Martin Lipset, "'Fascism' – Left, Right, and Center," in *Political Man: The Social Bases of Politics* (Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1981): 152-79.

John Weiss, *The Fascist Tradition* (New York: Harper & Row, 1967): 1-7, 31-64.

Walter B. Simon, "Democracy in the Shadow of Imposed Sovereignty: The First Republic of Austria," in Juan J. Linz and Alfred Stepan, *The Breakdown of Democratic Regimes: Europe* (Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1978): 80-121.

Paolo Farneti, "Social Conflict, Parliamentary Fragmentation, Institutional Shift, and the Rise of Fascism: Italy," in Juan J. Linz and Alfred Stepan, *The Breakdown of Democratic Regimes: Europe* (Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1978): 3-32.

ASSIGNMENT

See Leni Riefenstahl's *Triumph of the Will* (a pro-Nazi propaganda film).

Those writing short papers must have submitted at least two papers.

Class #10. Democratic Breakdown in Chile

IN CLASS: Lecture: Class conflict, polarization, and the demise of democracy in Chile.

READINGS FOR UNDERGRADUATES

Arturo Valenzuela, "Chile: Origins, Consolidation, and Breakdown of a Democratic Regime," in Larry Diamond, Juan Linz, and Seymour Martin Lipset, *Democracy in Developing Countries: Latin America* (Boulder: Lynne Rienner, 1989): 191-216.

Arturo Valenzuela, *The Breakdown of Democratic Regimes: Chile* (Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1978), p. xi-xiii, 3-110.

ADDITIONAL READINGS FOR GRADUATE STUDENTS

Nathaniel Davis, *The Last Two Years of Salvador Allende* (Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1985): 16-20, 41-61, 79-93, 114-23, 137-205, 402-07.

Alfred Stepan, "Political Leadership and Regime Breakdown: Brazil," in *The Breakdown of Democratic Regimes: Latin America* (Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1978): 110-37.

ASSIGNMENT

See *The Battle for Chile* by Patricio Guzmán, Part I.

Class #12. The Consolidation of Personalistic Military Rule in Chile

IN CLASS: Lecture: How to consolidate a personalistic dictatorship.

READINGS FOR UNDERGRADUATES

Arturo Valenzuela, "Chile: Origins, Consolidation, and Breakdown of a Democratic Regime," in Larry Diamond, Juan Linz, and Seymour Martin Lipset, *Democracy in Developing Countries: Latin America* (Boulder: Lynne Rienner, 1998): 216-226.

Mary Helen Spooner, *Soldiers in a Narrow Land: The Pinochet Regime in Chile* (Berkeley: University of California press, 1994): 1-5, 56-77, 83-104, 113-159.

Genaro Arraigada, *Pinochet: The Politics of Power* (London: Unwin Hyman, 1988), p. 123-69.

ADDITIONAL READINGS FOR GRADUATE STUDENTS

Nathaniel Davis, *The Last Two Years of Salvador Allende* (Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1985): 227-29, 467-74.

Stephan Haggard and Robert R. Kaufman, "Surviving Crisis: Pinochet's Chile," in Stephan Haggard and Robert R. Kaufman, *The Political Economy of Democratic Transition* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1995): 76-83, 93-4.

Karen L. Remmer, "Neopatrimonialism: The Politics of Military Rule in Chile, 1973-87," *Comparative Politics*, January 1989, 21 (2):149-70.

Alfred Stepan, *Rethinking Military Politics: Brazil and the Southern Cone* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1988), p. 13-29.

Larry Diamond, *Developing Democracy: Toward Consolidation* (Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1999): 64-116.

ASSIGNMENT

See *The Battle for Chile* by Patricio Guzmán, Part II.

Class #14. Re-democratization in Chile

IN CLASS: The breakdown of the old regime and constrained transition to democracy.

READINGS FOR UNDERGRADUATES

Mary Helen Spooner, *Soldiers in a Narrow Land: The Pinochet Regime in Chile* (Berkeley: University of California press, 1994): 163-267.

Arturo Valenzuela, "Chile: Origins, Consolidation, and Breakdown of a Democratic Regime," in Larry Diamond, Juan Linz, and Seymour Martin Lipset, *Democracy in Developing Countries: Latin America* (Boulder: Lynne Rienner, 1989): 227-240.

ADDITIONAL READINGS FOR GRADUATE STUDENTS

Manuel Antonio Garretón, "The Political Evolution of the Chilean Military Regime and Problems in the Transition to Democracy," in Guillermo O'Donnell, Philippe C. Schmitter, and Laurence Whitehead, eds., *Transitions from Authoritarian Rule: Latin America* (Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1986): 95-122.

Alfred Stepan, *Rethinking Military Politics: Brazil and the Southern Cone* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1988), p. 30-67.

Juan Linz and Alfred Stepan, *Problems in Democratic Transition and Consolidation: Southern Europe, South America, and Post-Communist Europe* (Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1996), p. 151-218 (Uruguay, Brazil, Argentina, and Chile).

ASSIGNMENT

None.

Class #15. The Breakdown of British Colonial Rule in the Massachusetts Bay Colony
IN CLASS: Lecture: The causes of the American Revolution in Boston, 1763-1775.

READINGS

John Adams, "But what do we mean by the American Revolution?" Letter to Hezekiah Niles, Quincy, Massachusetts, February 13, 1818 in Richard J. Hooker, ed., *The American Revolution: The Search for Meaning* (New York: Wiley & Sons, 1970): 9-12.

Esmond Wright, *The Search for Liberty: A History of the United States of America* (Cambridge: Blackwell, 1995): 412, 432-52.

Robert Middlekauff, *The Glorious Cause: The American Revolution, 1763-1789* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1982): 26-42, 49-52, 83-93, 153-73, 193-207, 208-209, 212-239, 251-73.

ADDITIONAL READING FOR GRADUATE STUDENTS

Gary B. Nash, *The Urban Crucible: Social Change, Political Consciousness, and the Origins of the American Revolution* (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1979): 233-234, 253-56, 271-82, 292-300, 325-27, 337-42, 351-62.

Robert E. Brown, *Middle Class Democracy and the Revolution in Massachusetts, 1761-1780* (Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1955): 401-406.

Philip McFarland, *The Brave Bostonians: Hutchinson, Quincy, Franklin and the Coming of the American Revolution* (Boulder: Westview Press, 1998): 28-36.

Gregory Nobles, "Yet the Old Republicans Still Persevere: Samuel Adams, John Hancock, and the Crisis of Popular Leadership in Revolutionary Massachusetts, 1775-90," in Ronald Hoffman and Peter J. Albert, eds., *The Transforming Hand of Revolution: Reconsidering the American Revolution as a Social Movement* (Charlottesville: University Press of Virginia, 1995): 258-85.

RECOMMENDED READING (ON RESERVE) FOR THOSE WRITING SHORT PAPERS:

Peter Oliver, *The Origins and Progress of the American Rebellion: A Tory View*, Douglass Adair and John Schutz eds. (Stanford: Stanford University Press, 1961): vii-xvii, 27-121. [Originally published in 1781.]

Merrill Jensen, *The American Revolution within America* (New York: New York University Press, 1974): 1-49.

ASSIGNMENT

Walk the "Freedom Trail" in downtown Boston.

Class #16. Protracted Political Transition in Mexico

IN CLASS: Lecture: Partial regimes, subnational political change, and democratization.

READINGS

Chappell Lawson, "Mexico's Unfinished Transition: Democratization and Authoritarian Enclaves in Mexico," *Estudios Mexicanos/Mexican Studies*, Summer 2000: 267-87.

Daniel C. Levy and Kathleen Bruhn, with Emilio Zepadua, *Mexico: The Struggle for Democratic Development* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 2001): 66-111.

Jorge I. Domínguez, "The 2000 National Elections in Mexico: The Voter as Protagonist," *ReVista*, Fall 2001: 6-7.

Chappell Lawson, "What's New about the 'New' Mexico? Reflections on the July 2 Election" *ReVista*, Fall 2001: 8-10.

P.J. O'Rourke, "Of Lunch and War," *Rolling Stone*, November 3, 1994, p. 83-90.

ADDITIONAL READINGS FOR GRADUATE STUDENTS:

Wayne Cornelius, Todd Eisenstadt, and Jane Hinley, eds., *Subnational Politics and Democratization in Mexico* (La Jolla: Center for U.S.-Mexican Studies, UCSD, 1999): 3-16.

Denise Dresser, "Mexico: The Decline of Dominant Party Rule," in Jorge I. Domínguez and Abraham F. Lowenthal, eds., *Constructing Democratic Governance: Mexico, Central America, and the Caribbean in the 1990s* (Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1996): 159-84.

Juan Molinar Horcasitas, "Changing the Balance of Power in a Hegemonic Party System: The Case of Mexico," in Arend Lijphart and Carlos H. Waisman, eds., *Institutional Design in New Democracies: Eastern Europe and Latin America* (Boulder, CO.: Westview, 1996): 137-59.

Kevin Middlebrook, "Political Liberalization in an Authoritarian Regime," in Guillermo O'Donnell, Philippe C. Schmitter, and Laurence Whitehead, eds., *Transitions from Authoritarian Rule: Latin America* (Baltimore, MD: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1986): 123-45.

Enrique Krauze, *Mexico: Biography of Power: A History of Modern Mexico, 1810-1996* (New York: HarperPerennial, 1997): 549-557.

ASSIGNMENT:

See movie, *La ley de Herodes (Herod's Law)*

Class #18. Conclusions

IN CLASS: Lecture: The future of regime change. Class presentations and discussion of individual research.

READINGS

Class papers.

Paper by Lawson, TBA (if I finish it in time).

ASSIGNMENT:

Final papers due. Class presentations on research topics.