

Main Goals: Understand basics of Huntington and Levitsky/Way theories; since mostly freshmen, use sample paper outlining exercise to discuss authoritarianism in Middle East and China

What is the third wave? What time period are we talking about? What reasons does he give for democratization in this time period?

-(Note: p.38, he says there is no factor that explains democracy; it's a combination of causes and varies from county to country)

-Economic crisis, particularly that brought on by the oil crisis

-Economic growth destabilizing regimes → liberalization or repression, also modernization theory

-Religion: Spread of Christianity (ex of Korea); changes in doctrine, leadership, and popular involvement of the Catholic Church. Changes brought powerful social institution against regime. Second Vatican Council stressing things like need for social change and rights of individuals. Also new grassroots participation in the church. Eventually in most countries church explicitly against regime. Denounced regime, bring vast resources (economic, communication) into the opposition

-International Actors, European Community membership would help economically, but in order to join, must be dem. US also comes to stress human rights and democracy as cold war starts to wind down. USSR will no longer act to maintain dictatorships.

-Demonstration effects: media, global communication; regions of the world acted together; process itself substitutes for favorable economic and social conditions. Seeing democratization in other countries shows the ability to transition, how it could be done, and what dangers and mistakes to avoid. More in this period b/c expansion of communication and transportation, strongest among countries that were geographically and culturally proximate

What is legitimacy? Huntington says many regions lost it. Is it just economics, like a decline in per capita GDP? (Performance legitimacy). Regimes try: nationalism, repression, liberalization. Do authoritarian regimes inherently have a problem with legitimacy?

For Huntington, authoritarianism has been justified by nationalism and ideology in modern times. On the global scale, a general democratic ethos came into being. Some authoritarian regimes also faced legitimacy problems b/c past democratic experience. Whereas democratic regimes can renew legitimacy through change in government, autocratic regimes are hurt badly by poor performance (poor performance in many of these countries in the 1970's). Also, achieving goals can hurt legitimacy b/c loose purpose.

How has the end of the cold war changed the landscape of democratization? What is competitive authoritarianism? How can we tell? What strategies do incumbents use to bias outcomes?

- International developments raised the external cost of outright dictatorship; however, the international community's electoralist focus left many autocrats with considerable room to maneuver. On the one hand, outright repression is costly, but on the other hand, if incumbents allow democratic procedures to run their course, they risk losing power

- Competitive authoritarianism: competition real but unfair; electoral manipulation, unfair media access, abuse of state resources, varying degrees of harassment and violence skewing the playing field in favor of the incumbents; civilian regimes in which formal democratic institutions exist and are widely viewed as the primary means of gaining power, but in which incumbents' abuse of the state places them at a significant advantage

-Central argument focuses on two factors: ties to the West and strength of governing party and state organizations. Where linkage was low, regime outcomes hinged on incumbents' organizational power; where state and governing party organization was strong, regimes remained stable and authoritarian; where they were weak, regimes were generally unstable, although they rarely democratized

Sample essay exercise prompt: In *Political Man*, Lipset argues that economic development is beneficial for democracy. Despite this, many countries in the Middle East have maintained high levels of wealth without transitioning to or sustaining democracy. Additionally, China has experienced rapid growth in past decades without experiencing a transition to democracy. What explains the persistence of authoritarian regimes despite such economic trends? How might continued economic development impact the prospects of democracy? Feel free to focus on China, the Middle East, or both.

Before starting, it may help to do some background work:

What is the central question being asked? (Tip: it can help to frame the question as, “Under what conditions...” and/or “To what extent...”)

Are there loaded terms that need to be unpacked or clarified?

What are the key debates and/or tensions underpinning the question? (Tip: it can help to think in terms of independent variables, dependent variables, and causal mechanisms)

With all this in mind, you can start thinking about organizing a paper. Think in terms of a beginning, middle, and end (or, an introduction, body and conclusion):

Introduction:

Clearly present the question and present an organized discussion of the tension/debate surrounding the discussion (if you did your background work, this shouldn't be too difficult)

Clearly present your thesis statement, or your main argument. Ideally, this thesis will be coherent, interesting, and relatively original. (Tip: developing an interesting and original thesis can be challenging, especially given that you are only working from course materials. There are many potential strategies. To get the ball rolling, it can help to ask yourself: *what conditions are necessary and/or sufficient for the outcome of interest? Is there a variable I can pull from conflicting theories into a coherent theory of my own? Is there another crucial variable that is missing but impacts the independent variables and/or causal mechanisms of the competing theories?*)

Provide a roadmap for how you will organize your argument in the paper

Body:

What are the main points of argumentation for your thesis?

What are the key counterarguments to your thesis? Why is your argument still convincing?

What evidence (readings, cases) can you use to make your argument? (Tip: dig deep into the readings and demonstrate a clear understanding of them)

How will you organize these points so that they flow logically?

Conclusion:

Bring the main points of your paper back together into the concise main argument

Discuss the greater implications/significance of the argument, but don't introduce new arguments that you will not have the space to defend