

## Section 3

### Announcements:

- Papers
  - THEY SHOULD BE ANONYMOUS. They should not have your name on them, only your Harvard ID.
  - Prompts go out on Tuesday
  - Papers will be due two weeks from today, on October 10 in lecture
  - **I HIGHLY recommend that you see the handout from the writing session last night. It had great advice on it. Also, there is an example of an A paper on the website.**
  - Amanda, the writing fellow, is willing to read drafts. She will have office hours that you can sign up for on the website. You will be able to sign up once the prompts are handed out.
  - The papers should be 6-8 pages double-spaced. I will penalize you if you go over.
  - I will have extra office hours that you will be able to sign up for via doodle.
  - Questions about the paper?

### Modernization Theory

- 1) Lipset ("Political Man")
  - a. What is the argument?
    - i. Economic development (industrialization, urbanization, wealth, and education) → democracy
    - ii. (what's the iv and dv?)
  - b. How does it work? Lipset focuses on wealth and education.
    - i. If wealthier:
      1. Less inequality
        - a. less relative deprivation and no class struggle, won't advocate as much redistribution and so less radical parties → no class struggle
        - b. also larger middle class which "rewards moderate and democratic parties"
      2. Less poverty
        - a. With a lower standard of living, upper class regards poor as inferior
      3. Can redistribute more easily
    - ii. If more educated:
      1. Men more tolerant, less extremist, can make rational electoral choices
      2. Will support democratic values

- 3. If better off and educated, will have time to join associations (Civil society)
- iii. Lerner quote: urbanization → literacy and media growth (which are self-reinforcing) → demands to vote
- What kind of a theory is this?
  - **Add to structuralist side**

\*\*\*\*\*Critiques of modernization theory

- c. Are there problems with modernization theory?
  - i. **Overly deterministic → what about leaders!**

## LEADERS

- 2) Other criticisms of modernization theory?
  - a. Too deterministic – neglects leaders
  - b. Lipset shows us that George Washington was crucial to legitimizing the government, helping stabilize the new institutions, peaceful succession
    - i. People wanted him to be king, president for life
    - ii. Functioned as a symbol of the new nation
    - iii. Integrated dif religions

\*\*\*\*\*Critiques of modernization theory

- c. Are there problems with modernization theory?
  - i. Overly deterministic → what about leaders!
  - ii. **The data doesn't support it.**

- 3) Przeworski and Limongi → modernization revised
  - a. So what do they find that makes us rethink modernization theory?
    - i. Wealth *sustains* democracy, doesn't cause it
      - 1. Rich democracies can sustain economic crises
      - 2. Argentina only case of rich democracy falling
      - 3. Dem can occur at any level of development
    - ii. Wealth sustains whatever regime → rich authoritarian regimes are also more stable
    - iii. ***Where should we add this? Maybe to structuralist, but maybe it's just saying that the theory is wrong and doesn't really have a theory of it's own (doesn't have a "this causes this")***

\*\*\*\*\*Critiques of modernization theory

- a. Are there problems with modernization theory?
  - iv. Overly deterministic → what about leaders!
  - v. The data doesn't support it.
  - vi. **There are poor democracies and rich autocracies OR this disregards the building of institutions**

4) What about India? → poor

- a. Varshney → points out the role of external players, institutions, leaders and movements
  - i. Experience of British rule and freedom movement
    - 1. Through the independence struggle, the National Congress gained a mass base and so was safe (didn't have competition)
    - 2. Many of these people had governing experience
    - 3. It united all of india
  - ii. Urban savings and foreign aid provided the funds needed for industrialization prior to the green revolution
    - 1. (cause ag needed for labor, food, and savings in rural industrializing society)
  - iii. Ethnic cleavages locally specific
  - iv. Nehru legitimized the institutions (using them and not attacking them when they disagreed with his policies)
  - v. ***Add to voluntarist side (but maybe not all the way, since institutional component and ethnicity)***

\*\*\*\*\*Critiques of modernization theory

- b. Are there problems with modernization theory?
  - vi. Overly deterministic → what about leaders!
  - vii. The data doesn't support it.
  - viii. There are poor democracies and rich autocracies OR this disregards the building of institutions
  - ix. **There are multiple paths to democracy**

5) There are multiple paths → Dahl

- a. What is a polyarchy? ***Draw on one side of the board***
  - i. Full contestation (y-axis) and full inclusiveness/participation (x-axis)
  - ii. Contestation/liberalization = the right to oppose, contest for control of the government
  - iii. Participation/inclusiveness = how many people can vote
- b. Is this the same as democracy?

- i. No. "I would like to reserve the term "democracy" for a political system one of the characteristics of which is the quality of being completely or almost completely responsive to all its citizens" (2). Unclear whether this exists or ever has.
- c. What are the types?
  - i. Closed hegemonies
  - ii. Competitive oligarchies
  - iii. Inclusive hegemonies
  - iv. Polyarchies
- d. What are the paths?
  - i. Liberalization precedes inclusiveness
    - 1. U.S. under British rule (closed hegemony) → democratization → eventually polyarchy (Path I)
  - ii. Inclusiveness precedes liberalization
    - 1. Mexico under Porfirio Diaz → Mexico under the PRI (people could vote but elections weren't really fair. Nobody else could reasonably contest) → Mexico now
  - iii. Hegemony abruptly becomes polyarchy
    - 1. French Revolution
- e. What does Dahl think determines whether a competitive oligarchy or hegemonic regime will become a polyarchy?
  - i. Costs of toleration and repression → whether there is mutual security for the government and the opposition
  - ii. And what determines these?
    - 1. Socioeconomic resources (economic resources, means of communication, processes of education and political socialization) and access to violence
  - iii. Example where socioeconomic resources favored a transition from competitive oligarchy, closed or inclusive hegemonic regime to a polyarchy?
    - 1. Maybe the Northern U.S. → was a competitive oligarchy, socioeconomic resources and access to violence not monopolized by those in power → could expand participation gradually without fear for mutual security
    - 2. Southern U.S. → also a competitive oligarchy, but socioeconomic resources and access to violence monopolized by ruling part of the population → fear for mutual security. High costs to toleration so hard to become a polyarchy
- f. ***Add somewhere in the middle (has structuralist elements like resources but also voluntarist elements like whether mutual security can be established which is sort of institutional)***

\*\*\*\*\*Critiques of modernization theory

- c. Are there problems with modernization theory?
  - i. Overly deterministic → what about leaders!
  - ii. The data doesn't support it.

- iii. There are poor democracies and rich autocracies OR this disregards the building of institutions
- iv. There are multiple paths to democracy
- v. **Modernization might not lead to democracy. Can lead to other things**

6) Moore

- a. What is the theory:
  - i. With commerce and demands for taxes from king → need money
    - 1. So want to upgrade ag
  - ii. They either repress peasants or free them and start selling ag (commercial agriculture)
    - 1. **If repress → leaves big mass of peasants that can rise up and turn to communism (Russia and China)**
  - iii. If the landed class becomes independent of the crown and somewhat bourgeoisie in this process, good for democracy (through changes in attitude, changes in habit)
    - 1. “the political hegemony of the landed upper class had to be broken or transformed” (429)
    - 2. **Democracy**
  - iv. **If strong landed elite and bourgeoisie come together, fascism (but our excerpt doesn't get much into that) (junker Germany and Japan)**
- b. ***Add to structuralist side (class structure)***

Problems with this argument?

- Pretty deterministic
  - c. To what extent does this agree or not with modernization theory?

Quickly at the end: Where would we put Huntington's argument that certain non-western cultures provide obstacles to democracy, especially Confucianism and Islam?

→ ***Add to structuralist side***