

This version of the syllabus, for the web, will be supplemented by charts and other minor changes in the paper edition for students who take the seminar.

PRINCETON UNIVERSITY: Politics Department & Woodrow Wilson School

WWS 565/Pol 527, Autumn 2004

**STATE, SOCIETY, AND  
DEVELOPMENT**

Lynn White

Tuesdays, 1:30. Meeting room t.b.a, hopefully 101 Marx Hall.

A .pdf version of the syllabus and agendas may be posted at

[http://www.wws.princeton.edu/lynn/wws565\\_ssd\\_F04syl.pdf](http://www.wws.princeton.edu/lynn/wws565_ssd_F04syl.pdf)

To reach Lynn at home, never hesitate to phone 924-1665.

In Office: Thursdays, 2:00-4:00, 221 Bendheim Hall.

The aim of this seminar is to give students a sense of basic options in ways of thinking about development. To what extent is the state or the market "natural," and when do intellectual and business elites conflict? Will modern development make all societies democratic? Even if they do, can cultural patterns of unevenness be identified in this process? How can women or minority groups exert influence to make development serve everyone? Under what conditions should or do political or economic thinking have priority? What does it mean to do a "systems analysis"? If that is always different from a "symbolic analysis," how do the two approaches relate to each other? What should happen, if they imply different solutions to the same problem? In what kinds of ways do leaders acquire or keep followers? Under what conditions do social groups (especially ethnic groups and classes) conflict or harmonize? Is long-term growth mostly a matter of capital, or labor, or responses to bottlenecks, or entrepreneurship, or luck, or some specifiable combination? Can any current economic theory predict development over a span longer than a few years? What, if anything, can classics about past change in Europe and North America tell us about change in the quickly developing countries now?

The instructor pays particular attention to indigenous not just international sources of development, partly because many other courses have the opposite emphasis. Long-term factors and large countries (e.g., China, Indonesia, India, Russia, the USA) will be in focus here — but each seminar member is strongly encouraged to contribute on the basis of whatever particular regional interests he or she has. A simplified version of this syllabus may be put on the web at [http://www.wws.princeton.edu/courses/syllabi\\_f2004/wws565.pdf](http://www.wws.princeton.edu/courses/syllabi_f2004/wws565.pdf), but probably without the charts of appendices. *This syllabus should interest Americanists and IR specialists as well as developers/comparativists.* Our work will require vetting values; so full participation by all is essential to the seminar's success. The course uses both classic and recent texts, and it complements other seminars that students can take at Princeton.

## **Requirements**

This seminar is for reading and discussion. The main work is: studying basic texts, participating in careful oral analysis of them to compare the ideas of our syllabus authors with those of seminar members, and offering to the whole seminar two 2-or-3-page précis of other texts that students choose. No final exam will be held, but other means will be found to assure that students can vet major concepts from the texts. A short end-of-term essay covers a topic of interest to the writer. Participation and reading will be expected of every person around the

table. Normally each student should try to speak several times in each session (with the shy going first). It is anticipated that each student will refer to syllabus authors at least once during each session. Live comments are crucial in this seminar, especially when members can be bold enough to reverse the premises of the syllabus readings.

These texts raise recurrent, endemic issues of social science. Most are exceptionally well-written; they are "literature" properly speaking. They are not so long as the number of pages in this syllabus may imply. For many required texts, the syllabus suggests just a few selected pages that offer sufficient gist. Advanced undergraduates who have selected themselves into this seminar in some past years have contributed successfully, but the size of the whole group must and will be kept small to ensure good discussions. Graduate students in the WWS, Politics, Sociology, History, and East Asian Studies have taken the seminar in previous years. The nub of the course will be careful reading and analysis of very provocative texts.

### BOOKS AND PROCEDURES

Did you know that, each year, the U.S. spends five times as much on dogfood as on college books? Fight this statistic. The syllabus items should all be on reserve at the WWS Library, but they can be permanently valuable — and you will want to spend more time reading them than locating them. Purchase them, if you conceivably can. These are all astonishing bargains, when you consider their content. How could anyone interested in public affairs conduct a thoughtful life without, handy on the shelf, the items here and in the xerox set by Weber, Madison, Durkheim, Geertz, Schattschneider, Polanyi, Mannheim, Bendix, or Hirschman, for instance? The U-Store list, below, involves books from which assignments are considerable, or which are unrejectable bargains; so students will do well to buy these. As befits a seminar emphasizing classics, these are all paperbacks.

*State & Society Readings Set*, hereafter *SSRS*. (The books listed below are at the U-Store, but this set of readings is at Pequod Copy, 921-7888, at the U-Store.) *Items below designated "SSRS" are in this Readings Set, which is required for purchase. Please spend more time thinking about our texts, and less time trying to find them.*

**Hirschman, Albert, *Exit, Voice, and Loyalty***, Harvard paperback. Required purchase.

**Polanyi, Karl, *The Great Transformation***, Beacon paperback recommended to doctoral students (although assigned parts are in the *SSRS*).

Here is another short book that would help anybody's writing:

Strunk, Wm. & E.B. White, *Elements of Style*, Macmillan paperback (optional, but basic).

### ORAL AND WRITTEN SEMINAR ASSIGNMENTS

After the mid-seminar break each week, Lynn will survey the following week's assigned readings. The text lists may be amended (at students' suggestions) during the term. The amount of reading in different weeks varies according to students' likely work loads at those times. Early in the semester, the readings are longer than at the busy end of term.

Each student, probably during two weeks of the semester, will offer the whole group a 2-to-3-page-*maximum*, single-spaced interpretive précis on a relevant idea or topic that is not among the assigned readings. A student writing a précis for any week also gives a lively summary of its main thesis — *for no more than four minutes*.

The précis should be sent as an e-attachment to [ssd@princeton.edu](mailto:ssd@princeton.edu) ***no later than 3:00 p.m. on the day before the seminar.*** Make sure that your own copy arrives, as a check that it arrives on the screens of all our colleagues. Each seminar member should read it and bring it to our meeting with notes for comments. These précis become required texts on the syllabus. A summary of this sort might offer a country example of interest to the student. It might condense a theoretical work relevant to the assigned readings that week, e.g. by providing an alternative critical view. Long lists of supplemental readings for each week are on a roster to be distributed at an early seminar meeting; but these extra lists are only suggestive and omit many items they should include. Look under the lists for other weeks too — and you will find better works that are not on the list. Use anything good that can be loosely linked to the week's topics. Please do not choose a required syllabus text. Feel free to choose a work that you have previously liked or read for another course, or and certainly to choose an item in a language other than English. Country studies and comparative studies are equally welcome for these précis. Your two-pager might also sum up an experience or recommend a policy for a country of particular interest. Or you might want to tell about your own development experiences; for an example in this genre, see the précis by a previous student in this seminar, Carole Jolly, assigned below for the fourth week. In fact, see the syllabus and "State and Society Reading Set," described below, for many examples. Lynn need not approve your subject in advance.

At the top of your summary, if it uses a book or article(s), please type the *full bibliographical information* — city, publisher, and year for books — as well as *your name* and the numbers WWS 565/Pol 527 on the first page. Please do not make a separate title page. If you know what you will do for a précis, you might tell other contributors for that week. These short papers will not be graded, but they are important together with your oral participation in *all* weeks. If you are resource person for a week, giving a précis, please finish the reading early to allow yourself time for writing. Then separately, prepare a zesty, concise, c. 3- or 4-minute, oral presentation for our whole group about your topic. All seminar members should plan interventions to elucidate or criticize all assigned texts. Recommendations should be provocative and may involve assignments of advocacy work to groups or individuals in the seminar, if the recommender wishes. Students should begin each presentation with a clear single thesis sentence (or a question) that can frame the argument. This format will not prove restrictive.

### WEEKLY AGENDA

The syllabus urges you to assimilate main ideas, not details; so it designates pages that may be particularly important in our discussions. Many readings are well-written but implicitly opinionated; allow yourself time to criticize them. When assigned page numbers are in parentheses below, you are encouraged to skim. The order of assignments on the syllabus within each week is not random; please read down the list if you can. Quick, intensive thinking about theoretical texts is often more effective for learning than is a slow, lugubrious approach. Students who find they are not participating fully in class discussions are encouraged to write questions or lines of critique as they read, bringing these personal notes to seminars and using them. Sometimes assignments begin or end on pages where no obvious break occurs in the text — in such cases, please break between likely paragraphs.

At the end of the syllabus are pages of questions and issues that may arise each week. They are stapled ***in an order inverse to that of the course*** so that, if torn off consecutively, they are in proper order. These questions may amuse; but you should think of better ones to ask.



**\*\*Précis available at [ssd@princeton.edu](mailto:ssd@princeton.edu) by 3:00 p.m. on the day before the seminar.**

Note similarities between Schattschneider and Polanyi, who both contrast government and business functions as equal or unavoidable in development. Is Schattschneider's implicit extension of Polanyi's argument — when the former argues that the two natural parties in development can make the people sovereign after all — credible to you or not? What values do you find in Schattschneider, Dahl, or Huntington? Does Polanyi use history too selectively, to justify his own values? Or not? How does a model like Polanyi's or Schattschneider's apply to any country you know well?

Schattschneider has some rational-actionist aspects, but (on a non-excerpted page) he also claims that "As a moral system, democracy is an experiment in the creation of a community... democracy is about the love of people." What is this position?

The Przeworski article is amplified by his book, co-authored with three others, about *Democracy and Development*, which a student might want to précis. He looks at regime-type changes, which are rare events. In effect, he defines democracy as a top-of-system trait only.

Pareto is famous for many contributions, of which the 'circulation of elites' is just one. He never summarizes his ideas well, but you can apply the 'circulation' idea to many countries: those which have had alternating civilian and military rule, for example, or alternating rule of rightists and leftists.

**September 28      FUNCTIONAL SYSTEMS: CAN CLARITY HELP POLICY?**

If the seminar contains ten students or fewer, they may decide to meet for this and some later sessions at Lynn's house. See the attached map. If you are in doubt about the meeting place, 'phone Lynn at 924-1665 for any news. If you forget, come late!

(This is a needed week about systems theory, randomness, and their links to the idea of development. Please see how language-based epistemology shapes what happens, and perhaps how it can be put in perspective for the sake of allowing good actions.)

**GENERAL DEDUCTIVE THEORY AND ITS CRITICS**

- \*\*Oberg, K., "The Kingdom of Ankole in Uganda," 121-25, (126-30, 136-38), 150-62** in Fortes & Evans-Pritchard, eds., *African Political Systems*. GN490.F6 (plus pages of tragic journalistic update, showing how a nearby system [without a drum!] broke down). A 1940 colonial ethnography, and still revealing. *SSRS*.
- \*\*Durkheim, Émile, *The Division of Labor in Society*, stress 39-46, 54-56, 68-69, 396-398** (but also skim 226-29, 336-42, 396-409); these pages refer to the 1964 Free Press edition — but in the 1984 Free Press edition, used for the reading set, the pages are 1-17, 28-29, 68-69, 172-74, and 278-79, 329-340.) HD51.D98. *SSRS*.
- \*\*Aberle, D.F., Marion Levy, et al., "The Functional Prerequisites of a Society," SKIM 100-04** (quickly skim the other six pages; *Ethics* 60). Think about whether the claim here can be wholly avoided. *SSRS*.
- \*\*Dahrendorf, Ralf, "Out of Utopia: Toward a Reorientation of Sociological Analysis," (Reprint SOC-58 or *American Journal of Sociology* LXIV), 115-27.** A critique of functionalism as conservative. Are all uses of functionalism guilty? *SSRS*.
- \*\*Gleick, James, *Chaos: Making a New Science*, 8-9, 14-17, 27-29, 44-45, 70-71, 78-80, 94-99, [Mandelbrot picture after 114], 176-77** — all about systems at (or over) the edge of chaos. *SSRS*. "Chaos" software is available. Q172.5.C45G54.
- \*\*Cardoso, Fernando Henrique, and Enzo Faletto, *Dependency and Development in Latin America*, précis by Adriana Abdenur, 2 pp.** *SSRS*.
- \*\*Inglehart, Ronald, and Marita Carballo, "Does Latin America Exist? (And is There a Confucian Culture?): A Global Analysis of Cross-Cultural Differences," *PS* (March, 1997), pp. 34-46.** *SSRS*.

**\*\*Sartori, Giovanni, "Concept Misformation in Comparative Politics," skim 1033-53,** in *American Political Science Review* 64:4 (December 1970). *SSRS*. Sartori, despite his Platonist preachiness, is recommended not just for students who take the Politics comps, but for anybody who wants both to appreciate and put perspective on generalization as a genre. Causation can be modeled in terms of many sizes of social collectivity, can't it? Isn't this also true along the different dimension Sartori raises, the "ladder" from specific to middle to broad claims about predicates? Note Sartori at p. 1050, top — and parallel half-recantations of all their main points (!) in Durkheim (whose two categories are just analytic, not concrete), Dahrendorf (p. 127), and Gleick (passim, or the top three graphs on p. 176).

**\*\*"Post-Functionalist Diagram," paired opposite analytic terms on two dimensions. SSRS.**

**\*\*Précis available at [ssd@princeton.edu](mailto:ssd@princeton.edu) by 3:00 p.m. on the day before the seminar.**

The Ankole reading may be the most mind-bending, because it suggests a "natural" system (a coherent set of definitions, from which you can deduce the links of social things to the material and ideal environments). Think about the drum. This system was devised by the people studied. Some of these readings may strike you as too abstract — but not after you catch the fire in each. Notice that Durkheim's two kinds of social integration are *analytic*, co-existing to some extent in any organization. They imply a choice between inspiring or coordinating action. One *or* the other of these options may prove effective for different policy problems. Does modernity link objectively with regime type? Check this out at: [http://hdr.undp.org/reports/global/2004/en/pdf/hdr\\_2004\\_back1.pdf](http://hdr.undp.org/reports/global/2004/en/pdf/hdr_2004_back1.pdf). (China hands may be interested in Franz Schurmann's book on *Ideology and Organization*, which renames Durkheim's options "human organization" and "technical organization.") Come to the seminar either able to show the inevitability of systems logic for thinking about action once a unit of analysis is chosen or able to show why thinking is clearer with a conflict model or a culturalist model. Or both. Compare these authors with Huntington, Polanyi, and later with Scott and Geertz. Gleick adds crucially to the discussion, because natural sciences are often taken as models for social study. The feminist Marilyn Waring, whom some may wish to read now even though she appears later on the syllabus, shows how much a system can neglect: more than half the people. Be ready to continue this discussion in culturalist (semi-)critiques of functionalism next week.

## **October 5                      HOW DOES CULTURE RELATE TO PURPOSEFUL CHANGE?**

The readings this week are many, even if short. The loads are lighter later. You have time!

If class size is less than 14, we may fit into the 5 Greenholm living room this week, t.b.a.

### **INTERPRETIVE APPROACHES**

**(\*\*Map of route to 5 Greenholm, to be used if seminar has fewer than 14 members.) SSRS.**

**\*\*Geertz, Clifford, "Deep Play" and skim parts of "Thick Description" in *The Interpretation of Cultures*, (skim 412-42), 443-53, skim 3-9, 15-19, 28-30. SSRS. GN315.G36. (And if you have the time and interest, read on Dilthey & Weber in H. Stuart Hughes, *Consciousness and Society*, 309-11. H51.H88 on reserve in WWS Library.) "Deep Play" is a famous, classic essay. Specify Geertz's method.**

**\*\*Alexis de Tocqueville on *Democracy, Revolution, and Society*, 73-77, (84-99, 163-65, 261), 262-64, 293-95, John Stone and Stephen Mennell, eds. SSRS. JC229.T7713. Note the University of Pennsylvania motto, "*Leges sine moribus vanae.*"**

**\*\*Jolly, Carole, "Culture and Development," a précis on Jolly's experience among women in Bolivia, 3 pp., and "Weavers Go Dot-Com, and Elders Move In" (an *NYT* article on women hammock weavers in Guyana), 1 p. SSRS.**

- \*\*Elder, Joseph, "Cultural and Social Factors in Agricultural Development,"** in N. Uphoff & W. Ilchman, eds., *The Political Economy of Development*, 46-54. SSRS. In WWS Library, JF60.U64. Tried to order at U-Store, but alas out of print.
- \*\*Elkins, David, and Richard Simeon, "A Cause in Search of its Effect, or What Does Political Culture Explain?"** *Comparative Politics* 11 January, 1979, skim 127-30, 135-46. SSRS. Please capture this argument with the full care in which it is offered. Note, for example, the short middle paragraph on p. 136.
- \*\*Gellner, Ernest, *Conditions of Liberty*, précis by Jakub Grygiel, 2 pp. SSRS.**
- \*\*Passell, Peter, "Why the Best Doesn't Always Win,"** 60-61, from *NYT Magazine*, May 5, 1996. SSRS.
- \*\*Madsen, Richard, *Morality and Power in a Chinese Village*, 1-17, 21-30. SSRS. BJ966.M3.** Is Madsen successful in his attempt to combine the culturalist and rational action approaches? Do his doubts about "ceremonies of struggle" come from an insight that any real and useful culture must be inconsistent, or just from Western pluralist prejudices? Does he find the "tentative" basis for judgement that he seeks? (Remember the struggle-for-identity vs. ceremony-for-understanding distinction, when you read Biko and others, next week.) Madsen, once in Maryknoll orders, uses universals to seek "particularity."
- \*\*Lenin, V.I., "On Bureaucracy," "Letter to the Congress," "Better Fewer, But Better," and "Last Letters,"** in Robert C. Tucker, ed., *The Lenin Anthology*, 714-18, 725-28, (and if you have time, 734-48). SSRS. This is assigned because it is the last testament of a political expert on the power of culture to shape development. Compare his earlier, confident "State & Revolution." 1627.2.577.0914.
- \*\*Bohannon, Laura, "Shakespeare in the Bush,"** reprinted from *Natural History* 75 (1966), SKIM 28-33. SSRS. If you have time/energy left, here's a (too tart?) dessert. Discussion of it might be postponed to next week.
- \*\*Précis available at [ssd@princeton.edu](mailto:ssd@princeton.edu) by 3:00 p.m. on the day before the seminar.** Someone might précis ideas from Daniel Kahneman's writings for this week.

Also relate this to next week's readings by Anthony Wallace and Ann Swidler.

Note especially Geertz's mention of the Brahmana ceremony, p. 452; this would be a contrasting symbol to organize another culturalist essay. Is this a lapse, because the difference between a violent cockfight and a quiet ordination implies functions? Does it parallel the Elkins & Simeon uncertainty, p. 136, on cultural limits to choice? If you have time, begin next week's readings too; they are related to these.

### **October 12 MOBILIZATION POLITICS or EFFICIENCY POLITICS?**

(If Lynn has distributed xeroxes of Levy, Scott, etc., they are not for this week but for later. The readings this time, starting with Mannheim, are longish — and among the best all term.)

#### **CONVICTION, CONSCIOUSNESS, & WILL**

- \*\*Mannheim, Karl, *Ideology and Utopia*, 1-8, 54-61, 261-63** in Harvest/Harcourt edition. SSRS. HM24.M32.
- \*\*Biko, Steve, "Black Consciousness and the Quest for a True Humanity,"** *I Write What I Like*, 87-98. SSRS. DT763.B48.
- \*\*Du Bois, W.E.B., *The Souls of Black Folks*, précis by Robin Spence, 2 pp. SSRS.** (This was originally written to go along with later readings by Levi and Banfield. Read it with Biko; remember it later too.)
- \*\*Alinsky, Saul D., *Rules for Radicals: A Practical Primer for Realistic Radicals*, précis by Taguchi Miyuki, 2 pp. SSRS.**
- \*\*Schurmann, Franz, *Ideology and Organization in Communist China*, 30-33, 68-73. SSRS.** 17241.193.843. (For students of China. Please forgive severe excerpting.)
- \*\*"Types of Organizational Leadership"** chart, with a Mannheimian vertical. SSRS.



- \*\*Tocqueville, Alexis de, précis of *The Old Regime and the French Revolution* by Barbara Buckinx, 2 pp. SSRS.
- \*\*Stepan, Alfred, *Rethinking Military Politics: Brazil and the Southern Cone*, ix-xvii, 3-19, 132-45. SSRS.
- \*\*Schmitter, Philippe, "Still the Century of Corporatism?" *Review of Politics* 1 (January 1974), quickly pp. 85, 93-98, 105-09, 126-28 (other parts if time). SSRS.
- \*\*Gaventa, John, "Three Faces of Power: A Framework for Advocacy," chart, 1 p. SSRS.
- \*\*Herbst, Jeffrey, "The Status of African Democratization (August 1999), 1 p. SSRS.
- \*\*PLUS précis available at [ssd@princeton.edu](mailto:ssd@princeton.edu) by 3:00 p.m. on the day before the seminar. (A précis about concepts of hegemony in John Gaventa, *Power and Powerlessness in an Appalachian Valley* would be superb. Or Steven Lukes, *Power: A Radical View*, or more on Pareto's theory of elite circulation would be apt. Send an e-mail to [ssd@...](mailto:ssd@...) if you plan these. You might also review Machiavelli, *The Prince*, Mentor edition, 7-18, 31-127. Also, if you have not seen it, look at Sheldon Wolin, *Politics and Vision*, chapter 10, "The Age of Organization and the Sublimation of Politics," pp. 352-434; 7504.983.)

### November 2 "BACKWARDNESS" FROM PSYCHOLOGY? FROM CONTEXTS?

This list is fit for a post-break week, *long* but readable. Allow leisure for it.

#### ACTION IN "UNDERDEVELOPED" COMMUNITIES

- \*\*Levi, Carlo, *Christ Stopped at Eboli*, approx. 3-4, (5-29 very quickly), 76-9, 139-43, 158, (196-207), 249-54. DG975.L78xL43.+ (Several readings this week may be provided to students in xerox form.)
- \*\*Banfield, Edward, *The Moral Basis of a Backward Society*, skim at great speed, perhaps pages (17-26, 35-42, 83-109, 155-66). HN479.B22. (Banfield had read Levi's book, so p. 35 claims.)
- \*\*Putnam, Robert, *Making Democracy Work*, précis by Alex Sokolowski. SSRS.
- \*\*Scott, James C., *Weapons of the Weak: Everyday Forms of Peasant Resistance*, xv-xix, 37-47, 147-51, photos on 162-63, 212-19, 248-67, 286-87, 292, 314-18, 346-50. On reserve, HD890.6.Z63S36.+ Alternatively, if you have less time this week, look at Scott's essay "Everyday Forms of Resistance," in Forrest D. Colburn, ed., *Everyday Forms of Peasant Resistance*, 3-30. Do "hidden transcripts" deny "preference falsification"? Is "falsified" consciousness a repressed report of it?
- \*\*Popkin, Samuel, *The Rational Peasant*, 252-67. SSRS. HD1513.V5P66. (Under what conditions, suggested by Mancur Olson, does collective action occur? Does Popkin's application of those conditions to the Vietnamese case bring him, despite his preferences, closer to Scott?)
- \*\*Marx, Karl, "The Eighteenth Brumaire of Louis Bonaparte," 594-99, 606-09, 615-17. Read quickly in the rush of its prose for style more than content, in Robert C. Tucker, ed., *The Marx-Engels Reader*, 2nd Ed. SSRS. HX39.5.M374.
- \*\*Feder, Ernest, *Perverse Development*, 92-99, 130-33, 275-77. SSRS. On unprofitable grain.
- \*\*Shiva, Vandana, *The Violence of Green Revolution*, 197-213. SSRS. On progressive greed.
- \*\*Moore, Barrington, *Social Origins of Dictatorship and Democracy*, précis by Joseph Noto. SSRS. What type of regime does the Green Revolution promote? "Fascist"?
- \*\*Kuran, Timur, "Now Out of Never: The Element of Surprise in the East European Revolution," skim 7-48, in Nancy Bermeo, ed., *Liberalization and Democratization: Changes in the Soviet Union and Eastern Europe*. SSRS. JN96.A2L53.1992. Is "falsified preference" a "hidden transcript"? Enjoy this!
- \*\*Précis available at [ssd@princeton.edu](mailto:ssd@princeton.edu) by 3:00 p.m. on the day before the seminar.

To make policy or understand politics, we need to know intentional not just contextual causes — but since intentions ('culture') are most useful to actors as flexible/inconsistent and often unreported ('hidden'), what method can we use to find these causes?

(Outside reports might include policy recommendations sensitive to insights in the analytic texts — as is the main principle in Frances Moore-Lappé and Joseph Collins, *World Hunger: Twelve Myths*, HD9000.6.L36.+ , a book that you might have time to skim. See the agenda notes for a list of these myths.)

## **November 9                      WHAT USES HAVE "MODERN" AUTHORITY/COMPLIANCE?**

### **TYPES AND USES OF LEGITIMATE POWER**

- \*\*On land reforms: John Montgomery, Tai Hung-chao, Bernard Gallin, and Tsutomu Uchi in *The Political Economy of Development*, in Norman Uphoff and Warren Ilchman, eds., 449-59 (later, more quickly, 295-303, 317-28). SSRS and in WWS Library, JF60.U64.**
- \*\*Weber, Max, "Politics as a Vocation," in *From Max Weber: Essays in Sociology*, translated by H.H. Gerth & C.W. Mills, 77-82, 118-28 (83-118 later, if you have time). HM51.W38. SSRS.**
- \*\*Hughes, H. Stuart, *Consciousness and Society*, 287-91, 304-25, 329-35. SSRS. H51.H88 — out of print, but try to buy it if you want a real education. Wonderful book.**
- \*\*Weber, Max, *The Protestant Ethic and the Spirit of Capitalism*, 13-25, 47-53, 70-71, 78-82, 87-92, 179-83. Tr. T. Parsons. SSRS. HN31.W38.+**
- \*\*Bendix, Reinhard, *Max Weber: An Intellectual Portrait*, 83-92, 138-43, 179-82, 258-63, 290-303, 329-35, 352-5, 391-5, 404-7, 424-46, 464-5. SSRS. HM22.G3W42.+ (These page numbers refer to either the Anchor Press edition or the new University of California Press edition.)**
- \*\*Evans, Peter B., "Predatory, Developmental, and Other Apparatuses," 561-87, *Sociological Forum* 4:4. SSRS.**
- \*\*Etzioni-Halevy, Eva, *The Knowledge Elite and the Failure of Prophecy*, précis by Adam Webb, 2 pp. SSRS.**
- \*\*Michels, Robert, *Political Parties: A Sociological Study of the Oligarchical Tendencies of Modern Democracy*, re-skim 333-71, as for a previous week.**
- \*\*Précis available at [ssd@princeton.edu](mailto:ssd@princeton.edu) by 3:00 p.m. on the day before the seminar.**

## **November 16                      WHAT MAKES GROUPS CONFLICT OR COOPERATE?**

### **IDENTITIES: ETHNIC, SUBETHNIC, INCOME, GENDER, KINSHIP, LANGUAGE, RELIGIOUS, URBAN/RURAL, REGIONAL**

- \*\*Anderson, Benedict, *Imagined Communities: Reflections on the Origin and Spread of Nationalism*, rev. ed., 4-7, 36-46, then peruse the book, looking probably at 62, 86-87, 100, 132-34, 141-49. SSRS. JC311.A656.1991. Note that on p. 154 Anderson also claims, "What the eye is to the lover...language...is to the patriot." What differences between him and Young? What is your view of the origin of ethnicity?**
- \*\*Young, Crawford, *The Politics of Cultural Pluralism*, read quickly 3-13, (23-49), 60-65, 109, (142-49, 505-28). SSRS. (After Young's distinctive ideas, e.g. his differences with Geertz, you might dip into some of the rich ethnographic materials, e.g. [101-21, 134-5, 150-3] or other sections.) JF60.Y67.**
- \*\*Mueller, John, "The Banality of Ethnic War," précis by Maya Tudor, 2 pp. SSRS.**

- \*\*Snyder, Jack, *From Voting to Violence: Democratization and Nationalist Conflict*, 32-41, 322-25, 339-53. Read if/after Lynn provides this. SSRS.**
- \*\*Greenfeld, Liah, *Nationalism: Five Roads to Modernity*, 3-17, 487-91. SSRS.** Please evaluate Greenfeld's historical method, and also the (separate) suggestions that politics and economics are constituted differently, that capitalism can easily coexist with authoritarianism, and that an idea creates modernity.
- \*\*Poulton, Hugh, *Top Hat, Grey Wolf, and Crescent: Turkish Nationalism and the Turkish Republic*, précis by James Meyer. SSRS.**
- \*\*Horowitz, Donald, *Ethnic Groups in Conflict*, précis by Erik Mobrand. SSRS.**
- \*\*Laitin, David, "Hegemony and Religious Conflict: British Imperial Control and Political Cleavages in Yorubaland," précis by Eric McGlinchey. SSRS.**
- \*\*Hirschman, Albert, "Changing Tolerance for Income Inequality in the Course of Economic Development," *World Development* I:12, 1973, 24-36. SSRS.**
- \*\*Précis available at [ssd@princeton.edu](mailto:ssd@princeton.edu) by 3:00 p.m. on the day before the seminar.**

Outside projects might concern any topic in ethnic change, class, the political effects of urbanization, or group conflict. Non-theoretical facts are also worth attention, especially the worldwide geographic distribution of people by languages and language types, as well as the religious geography of the world. Lynn will make no apologies for bringing maps, not just concepts, to the seminar.

## November 23                    HOW CAN ORGANIZATIONS BE MADE MORE RESPONSIVE?

### IMPLEMENTATION

- \*\*Hirschman, Albert, *Exit, Voice, and Loyalty*, 1-47, (48-75), 76-126. HM131.H494 or HM131.H566.+**
- \*\*"Policies for Organizational Responsiveness" page on stopping 2 types of decline. SSRS.**
- \*\*Hirschman, Albert, "Against Parsimony: Three Easy Ways of Complicating some Categories of Economic Discourse," *Economics and Philosophy*, 1 (1985), 7-21 quickly. SSRS. (What recommendations are implicit in these three? Explore long-term choices about scarce/depletable resources, not just short-term choices about entropic/self-repletable resources.)**
- \*\*Hirschman, Albert, "The Search for Paradigms as a Hindrance to Understanding, (skim 342-53), 354-60 in *A Bias for Hope*. SSRS. HC125.H55 on reserve. Recall Banfield.**
- \*\*Hirschman, Albert (with Charles Lindblom), "Economic Development, Research and Development and Policy Making: Some Converging Views," in Hirschman, *A Bias for Hope*, 63-84. SSRS. HC125.H55.**
- \*\*Hirschman, Albert, *The Passions and the Interests: Political Arguments for Capitalism Before its Triumph*, précis by Scott Bradford. SSRS. (Alternatively, you might read Hirschman's "The Concept of Interest," in *Rival Views of Market Society*, that no single kind of motive, including interest, can explain all human action.)**
- \*\*Anon. précis of Hirschman, *Getting Ahead Collectively: Grassroots Experiences in Latin America*. SSRS. Or you could read 1-101 quickly; HN110.5.Z9C6257.+**
- \*\*Tuchman, Barbara, *The March of Folly*, précis by Jon Stoloff. SSRS.**
- \*\*Précis available at [ssd@princeton.edu](mailto:ssd@princeton.edu) by 3:00 p.m. on the day before the seminar.**

(Note especially the reasons for random entropy in Hirschman's theory, i.e. tendencies toward institutionalizing dissent to make "voice" ineffective, and toward competitive collusion so that those who "exit" have nowhere to go. Consider how Hirschman's micro-organizational analysis relates to his emphasis on "blessings in disguise" and bumps in the development of nations, i.e. much larger collectivities.)

(Outside readings might cover any number of topics in policy implementation [e.g. in Merilee Grindle's book] or other works by Hirschmann -- or best yet, proposals or studies on ideas that succeeded or failed because of implementation.)

**November 30                    GROWTH FROM LABOR, CAPITAL, BIAS, ENTERPRISE?  
CHANGE OVER TIME IN NOTIONS OF DEVELOPMENT**

- \*\*Rostow, W.W., "The Take-Off into Self-Sustained Growth," J. Finkle & R. Gable, eds., *Political Development and Social Change*, 2nd ed., 141-49 is enough. (Reprinted from *Economic Journal* 66.) Rostow's fn. 14 quotes Lewis interestingly. SSRS. 7543.349.1971.**
- \*\*Lewis, Arthur, "Economic Development with Unlimited Supplies of Labour," (Reprint E-189; or *The Manchester School of Econ. and Soc. Studies*, 1954), look at this classic, and take another look if you have previously done so, (139-56), 157-60, 167-69, 176-77, 183-84, 189-91. SSRS.**
- \*\*Hirschman, Albert (with Charles Lindblom), "Economic Development, Research and Development and Policy Making: Some Converging Views," in Hirschman, *A Bias for Hope*, 63-84. In previous week; reconsider now too! HC125.H55.**
- \*\*"Washington Consensuses?" on the World Bank vs. Ndulu & van de Walle, précis by Tyler Dickovick. SSRS.**
- \*\*Schumpeter, Joseph, *Capitalism, Socialism, and Democracy*, part II, précis by Joseph Noto. SSRS. Does static equilibrium ensure the search for new products, markets, methods of production, sources of factors, or ways of organizing industries? Is Schumpeter like Schattschneider, concerning intellectuals?**
- \*\*Rodrik, Dani, *Introduction to In Search of Prosperity*. SSRS.**
- \*\*"Hayek's Incomplete Victory," *Wilson Quarterly* (Spring 2004), 3 pp., book review by Francis Fukuyama. SSRS.**
- \*\*Pasuk Phongpaichit, "Self-Reliance," *Newsweek*, 2000, p. 77), 1 p., SSRS.**
- \*\*Sen, Amartya, "Development: Which Way Now?" *Economic Journal* (93), 745-46, 754-60. SSRS.**
- \*\*Précis available at [ssd@princeton.edu](mailto:ssd@princeton.edu) by 3:00 p.m. on the day before the seminar.**

Rostow's [earlier, Nurkse's] emphasis on capital is subsumed in Lewis's model, which is a systems growth model. It can be modified to account additional factors. Hirschman [Geertz's colleague] offers a non-systems alternative. What other possibilities do you see? Note the logical structure of Lewis's presentation. We need a précis on Gershenkron!

**December 7                    WHAT DEVELOPMENT QUESTION ARE YOU RESEARCHING?**

This session will be organized like a panel at a conference. Members will give preliminary briefings on their research for the very short seminar paper discussed below. ***Please begin your briefing with a clear, concise thesis or question.*** If you wish, you might send that sentence, in an e-mail to seminar colleagues at [ssd@princeton.edu](mailto:ssd@princeton.edu) before the meeting. This would naturally contain a verb; it should not be just a noun phrase. You can feel absolutely free to change your thesis or question later, for the actual paper; but you will need some method to catch your listeners' ears by showing why they too are interested in your topic. The oral presentations will not be graded. The goal is for seminar participants to help each other by suggesting better ways to conceptualize the papers of fellow members. Do not write the whole paper before your briefing, so that ideas from your fellow students can improve the final product. Make the oral presentation bold, clear, and zippy — even if not yet complete. The length of time for it will depend on the number of students in the seminar, and it will be announced later.

If Lynn has loaned you a book during the term, but you have not returned it yet, please do so now. If at *any* later time you find a book of his on your shelf, please send it back even if you are embarrassed to do so because of lateness.

## PAPER

A variety of brief papers is possible in this seminar. Some students will want to expand one of their earlier précis for this project. Each paper should have a specific focus, but it should also use theories from this syllabus, if possible. Titled sections can show your paper's logic. **State the problem or hypothesis of the essay clearly near its beginning.**

Papers must be short, *ten pages absolute maximum*, double-spaced, and better if more concise. Different WWS and Politics departmental rules and timings of graduate exams require an early due date that will not be ideal for everyone but should apply for all: Thursday, January 6, by 4:00 to the desk of Ms. Rita Alpaugh, near 221 Bendheim. Penalties have to apply, not for lateness but for lack of development planning. Papers should also be posted to [ssd@princeton.edu](mailto:ssd@princeton.edu). For those who have urgent business in Moorea then, e-mailing alone would be enough; but if you're in town, please do the printing (and be sure to paginate). Please do not call to ask for an extension, but include information about any disease or disaster on a separate note with the paper. This is not a large project; so it should take precedence over others on your busy agenda. ***Please definitely paginate, because Lynn's later typed comments will refer to page numbers.*** Think about using subheads. Please apply a normal 12-point font; if you employ a tiny typeface, your teacher will go blind even sooner than is likely anyway. Please spell-check your paper before a final **single-sided** printing. Whenever you refer to a source, in the footnote please include full bibliographic data.

M.P.A. and M.P.P. students know that all work must be completed by the due dates, since that program allows no INC grades. This rule is such a blessing — it is quite undisguised — that no-one in the seminar need be excluded from its benefit.

Papers should try the same stylistic boldness that informs our syllabus texts. *Elements of Style*, by William Strunk and E.B. White, is required, especially pages 15-33 and 70-73. Those who are interested might also consult <http://www.columbia.edu/acis/bartleby/strunk>. The book, however, should also be kept handy. You may already have a copy. It is in the Library, at PE1408.5772.1979b.

## WEEKLY PARTICIPATION AND GRADING

Informed participation, suggesting that each week's readings have been studied critically, will be an important part of the evaluation in this course. Be voracious in absorbing as much as you can from the texts — they will repay such study — and be bold in speaking about their problems and ideas during class. The way to receive an "A" in this seminar is not just by writing, but by helping to inform our whole group's conversations about texts and the issues that inspired the syllabus authors.

In the past, students have asked about grading; and these questions are reasonable since letters have to be filed. The précis projects might each count roughly one-ninth in the grade, and the final paper should count no more than two of these. The large remainder depends on faithful reading of texts as shown by informed, relevant participation in all weeks. No mechanical system will be used in grading, but the seminar can work only if all members come well-prepared to its sessions. The sole useful purpose of grades is to give incentives for that end. Auditing the seminar would generally be inappropriate, because listening would be an insufficient response to the values and problems that concern our syllabus authors. Any auditors

would be expected to speak and to submit normal précis to the group, although not the final paper.

### AMENDMENTS

The seminar may decide to alter parts of this syllabus. Many of the texts are well-written (as social science goes), and the general applicability of their arguments inspires work on them. But new ideas about this list are very welcome. Please raise suggestions for amendment as early in the term as may be convenient.

### CONTACTING THE INSTRUCTOR

Lynn's office hours are listed on the first page of this syllabus and are at 221 Bendheim. If you come to that door and see that Lynn is talking with someone else, by all means knock and make your presence known. When he is not in the office, *never hesitate to 'phone him at 924-1665*. The office number, 258-4839, is good only when Lynn happens to be there. He has e-mail, but please do not use it to set up appointments. Scheduling is best done in a two-way interaction, e.g., by telephone to 924-1665.

*attachments in inverse order of weeks — and to be torn off in that order, for each week, from the paper version of the syllabus:*

*(N.B.: In this web version of the syllabus, these questions are not in reverse order.)*

Weekly agendas of questions to consider.

"Student Information Sheet" (fill in before class, if possible).

**\*\*"Notions on Writing"** citing page numbers in *The Elements of Style* ends the SSRS.

Lynn may use letters or numbers from it on some of your final papers.

# DOES DEMOCRACY COME FROM CONFLICTS OF MARKET & LABOR?

This a tentative list of questions for the seminar meeting, ordered but incomplete. Students will add other issues, e.g. by using précis. Try to comment on one issue at a time. PLEASE REFER TO OUR TEXTS AND TO CASES YOU KNOW.

Which commodity markets are natural; which, made by states?

Are capitalism & socialism complements? If so, why the fuss?

Why does the complementarity not arise more often in public?

**Karl Polanyi's** anthropological material: what implications?

Do struggles between conservative Paretan "lions" and reformist Paretan "foxes" provide a common substance of politics in many developing countries?

Does state support of market pricing of labor, ecology, and earnings lead to political regulation of these markets?

(& cf. Schumpeter, Capitalism, Socialism, & Democracy.)

How do **POLANYI** or **SCHATTSCHEIDER** treat the

--definition of "state"? business as a power network?

--rates, periods & content of development in specific countries (England, US, China...)?

--any links between specialization and freedom?

When is democracy (=polyarchy?) possible?

**Schattschneider** on whether individual self-interest or memory of conflict/love is the basis of democracy.

What does Schatt owe to Machiavelli? to St. Francis?

If democracy comes from conflict, why so many ideals?

How do **you** define democracy? (cf. Madison, Dahl, Schatt)

Is democracy an ideal? a set of traits? a direction?

How are "parties" different from "interest groups"?

Is Dahl's equation (the chance of polyarchy depends on costs of suppression minus costs of tolerance) OK?

Does **DAHL** suggest authoritarianism precedes "polyarchy"?

Does **HUNTINGTON** like democracy much? What doubts in him?

Can intellectuals be democrats? Can reason justify rule?

Can constitutions be valuable, even when badly violated?

**RUSTOW** stresses diverse possible transitions? Right?

**DI PALMA** furthers and refines this idea – how?

**PRZEWORSKI & LIMONGI** show a "kink" in democratization.

(Any IR specialist might raise Mansfield & Snyder now.)

Can the US & other democracies effectively support new ones?

in China? Turkey? Philippines?! Nicaragua? Iraq? Israel?..  
Admin'tion of Justice Program; Nat'l Endowment for Democ'y  
Michael Doyle conjectures that modern democracies (w/ rights, elections) seldom fight each other. If so, why?

Dahl's policies? Huntington's? **UN RIGHTS DECLARATION'S?**

Are dual aspects of "development" and "democracy" parallel?:

Does "**labor**" = **participation**-->protecting land, labor, money in compassionate community w/ low state costs of dissent?

Does "**market**" = **contest**[ation]-->privacy of rational actors in efficient "society" w/ high state costs of suppression?

If so, is democratization an inherent aspect of development?

Two "equilibria"?: **labor vs. capital** in the social economy, **talent vs. integrity** (or vanity!) in the political elite.

# CAN FUNCTIONS CLARIFY DEVELOPMENT?

## Does the notion of a "functional" system generate sectors by epistemology?

**ABERLE, Levy, et al.** on boundary conditions, clear definitions, theory  
(Talcott Parsons, The Social System) "AGIL" & intellectual ambition!  
The main model of "social system" generates sectors by epistemology:

## See the accompanying chart, a field of functions generated by preferences for types of data:

facts or norms, individual/small group or collective.  
Traits come from equilibrium as system adapts to its environs – loosely?  
(Much social science [and all economics] follows quasi-biological logic.)  
(Quiet **OBERG** on the Ankole is inductive; the drum communicates meaning.)  
Is functionalism just for clear definitions? Or a eulogy to status quo?  
Do epistemological modes hang up policy making, or help it, or both?

## Does thinking about "development" inevitably imply a system, changing in time?

**DURKHEIM** on modern solidarity, how we survive an end of community.

## Can systems theory account for individuals, change, conflicts, revolutions?

**DAHRENDORF** on utopias, **CARDOSO & FALETTO** on world-system dependency.  
(Note Wallace's periodization: individual stress, then cultural distortion, maze-way  
revitalization. How general is this model?)  
(Note Chalmers Johnson's systems approach to Revolutionary Change.)  
(Note Lewis Coser's arguments on The Functions of Social Conflict.)  
Is Marx a systems theorist?

## Does "system" achieve clear definitions at the cost of cultural realism?

Does **SARTORI** suggest that high levels of abstraction aren't always best?  
**GLEICK** that simple definitions can make unpredictable complex systems?  
**INGLEHART** that modernization & post-mod empirical indices link to cultures?  
Does "policy" imply hierarchy? Are functionalists necessarily for it? (no!)

## d DURKHEIM distinguish community from society so very intently?

people as they are the SAME	people as DIFFERENT AND COMPLEMENTARY
["understanding" ( <u>Verstehen</u> )]	["ideal types" (also cagey Weber)]
will, consciousness-->change	context, ecology-->change
for mobilization politics	for efficiency politics
"mechanical" solidarity	"organic" solid'y (skip D's words!)
criminal law->symbol sanctions	civil law->restitutions (Durkheim)
ethic of ultimate ends	ethic of responsibility (Weber)

Attached are two related charts,  
one on policy uses of such categories in China's Great Leap Forward.  
another on a "field of functions," framing adjectives from many analysts

Can the seminar see what the functionalists (from whom most current theorists are descended, no matter how much they may deny it) did, **for the purpose of moving on**, to put these adjectival categories behind us for the sake of getting to action that is shaped by phenomena and problems, not just by the words used to think about them?

# WHAT CAN CULTURE TELL US ABOUT DEVELOPMENT?

How do you want to define/use the idea of "culture" in actual situations?

Is this idea useful for policymaking -- or well designed to prevent it?

**GEERTZ** proposes a symbolist approach. How does he define "culture"?

What is his method, and how does it differ from a systems approach?

(Geertz has written many "systems" books too, notably the ecological study on *Agricultural Involution* in Indonesia, and *Islam Observed*, comparing Morocco with Indonesia. But *The Social History of an Indonesian Town, Negara: Balinese Theatre-State, Local Knowledge*, and other recent books are all "phenomenological" or "human science." In a co-authored book on Morocco, the symbol is the bazaar, the *suq*.)

How consistent is "culture"? Does Geertz's method relate to **TOCQUEVILLE'S**?

**BOHANNAN** makes a vivid case. What are its virtues or faults?

**ELKINS & SIMEON** suggest they admire Geertz, but is their definition of "culture" like his? Is it more useful, because it implies consistency in culture? Useful for whom: scientist or actor? Are Elkins & Simeon right to claim that cultural explanations are "second order"? What is the import of this claim? Is their mode of thinking relevant (or necessary?) to any policymaking?

Can a symbol "cause" anything, or does one need a system for that?

Do you agree with Geertz's cautions against causal logics?

(Compare Jim Scott's *Moral Economy of the Peasant*, Sam Popkin's books.)

**JOLLY** (a former student in 565) and **hammock weavers** speak to culture's power.

**MADSEN** vows to unify the culturalist & rationalist methods. Does he succeed?

**ELDER** on "social factors" in agricultural development.

Does this gainsay Geertz's point? If not, why?

Elder shows old attitudes do not necessarily stop development, but new institutions may help it. How does this relate to Geertz?

Does a symbolist approach to culture imply symbols can't change?

(Cf. McClelland's "high need achievers," Hagen's "creative personalities"? Also cf. Kusum Nair, *Blossoms in the Dust*.)

**LENIN**, late in life, deplored bureaucrats, Stalin, and implicitly the way they subverted the rationale for social violence and discipline that his "organizational weapon" had earlier created.

How do you think Geertz would treat technocratic places? Would he bother?

Are cultural explanations basically different from "structural" ones, or do they just cite slower-changing, less precipitating causes?

(White may discuss causes of Cultural Revolution violence, and approaches to account for them in example explanatory frames.)

Can you link all this to the much-mooted Derrida or Foucault? Is there hope of knowledge safe from deconstructionists? Should there be?

Why does not "the best" always win? Should it?

What is the use of "second-order explanations" or "interpretations"?

Would **GEERTZ**, who seeks *fictiô*, "something made," fully disagree with **ELKINS & SIMEON**'s critique? Or just partly? (Have you read Hobbes?)

What would the text-readers/symbolists/interpreters think of your using their method for policy? "Poetry makes nothing happen," perhaps; but does this catch the problem? Is it that developers become more interested in scientific sureness than results for people; they may make policy without seeking meanings behind "utiles" they presume? Can poetry make better things happen?

If so, what is the method of finding the "meanings" of affected people, so as to make development in particular projects appropriate?

# HOW CAN GROUP CONSCIOUSNESS HELP OR HINDER DEVELOPMENT?

## When does ideology make a universal claim? Is it weak when it doesn't?

**KARL MANNHEIM** on the biosocial origins of ideas and consciousness  
– and for a functionalist definition of ideology.

Is any philosophical, non-functional approach to ideology valid?

What does Mannheim imply about policy rationales? On mobilization?

**STEVE BIKO** on "Black Consciousness and the Quest for a True Humanity"

What universalist claim does Biko make? How? Why does he bother?

**VINOBA BHAVE** shows a modern use for pre-modern ideas in India.

How generalizable is his method? Did it work where he used it?

(Seminar members should cite cases they know: Ghana? Malaya? India? Brazil?  
Mexico? China? Germany? Morocco? Russia? Others.)

(Frantz Fanon & Sartre on the instability & usefulness of tradition.)

(Joseph Levenson on Chinese "national essence" in a "museum," and how Western  
invasions--ideas & guns--made Confucianism inflexible.)

(Fouad Ajami on The Arab Predicament) (How Shi'ism has now changed!)

(Edward Said on Orientalism, which is an Occidental habit.)

## Are the answers to pretentious ideology and practices just their inverses?

### What does the majority mobilization – feminism – show about all campaigns?

**VIRGINIA WOOLF** on sexism, "country," education, religion, work, money.

Is observing values enough for development science? Is there any  
way of accounting efficiency along with other development ideals?

**MARILYN WARING** on destructive production, unaccounted production....

**CHOWDRY & NELSON** on a global view of progress/regress in women's aims.

**PIVEN & CLOWARD** on movements. Are all politics articulated in public?

Under what conditions do poor peoples' movements win?

**ALINSKY** suggests procedures for "practical radicals" – will they work?

### What formal similarities, particularist & universalist, are in these texts?

Does **SWIDLER** define cultural conditions for mobilization or a lack of it?

**WALLACE** treats "mazeways" in stress and "organismic" psychology among  
Iroquois following Handsome Lake (ayatollahs' Iran? Mao's China?...)

### How does administrative (de-)centralization to various levels link to choices of mobilization or efficiency politics?

Lynn may talk about Schurmann and Selznick, "organizational weapons" as invasive,  
not adaptive, systems--decentralizing to middle, not low, bureaucracy levels  
(e.g. '57-'58 urbanites to Chinese towns).

Various seminar members will speak of administrative decentralization in countries  
they know: To what level? What groups benefit? What development follows?

When does this work well, & when not?

### How can individual leaders help develop new social ideologies (or do they)?

This session might go beyond assigned texts into some psychology.

Erik Erikson (despite his sexism?!) tries to relate personality changes to national  
changes: Luther in Germany, Gandhi in India.

Someone might describe Erikson's 8 life stages/problems/biological issues (from  
oral-sensory trust in infants to facing death) and the creation of social  
ideologies. The stages are noted here:

Trust/communicating, autonomy/walking, initiative/controlling,  
industry/learning, identity/opting occupation, intimacy/marrying,  
regeneration/parenting, "identity vs. despair"/dying.

Young Man Luther's spasm; Gandhi's Truth; Zhou's aunt, Mao's father.

(Other examples, from other countries?) Does all this really matter?

### Most national politics are written as if ideals and leaders mattered a lot.

But have all elites an interest in this notion we should doubt?

When do you want to support people's interests in ideology? When not?

# HOW ARE CONSTITUENCIES LED? FACTIONS, LARGE AND SMALL

## What is the most useful definition of "faction"?

(By **motives** of people who join ["eating"]; by **structure**.)

**MADISON, NICHOLAS, and SCOTT** provide explicit definitions by internal & external traits of factions or faction sets.

**What use has each of these definitions?** Do you know cases like the Iroquois Longhouse moieties, which stabilize conflict? Govindapur? Scots? McCoys vs Hatfields in Kentucky? Japanese Diet? US Congress?

(Chinua Achebe, if you have read him, provides an implicit definition of "faction" too. Speak of him!)

Here's hoping that students with expertise in specific countries will chip in: on Japan, possible differences between Guatemala and Chile, France, India....

And China!

## How can a stateless society exist? Are the priests chiefs?

**WALTER MILLER** (Fox manitus, definition of power) Nuers' "leopard-skin 'chief'"; Tallensi sky/earth. Lucy Mair (Ft. Jamieson Ngoni "snowball state").

States monopolize coercion, but "power=coercion+authority" or "power=A's ability to make B do what B wouldn't do."

Is Schattschneider right to say much for non-state actors? Are there non-coercive AND non-authoritative societies?

## How do states grow? Medievalist Stephenson on Charlemagne's edict about the obligations of lords to their vassals.

## How do factions or other coercive systems modernize?

Recall **MARX** on Louis Bonaparte and "potatoes" as support. Were Hitler, Stalin, and others modernized peasant heroes?

**STEPAN** explains Southern Cone military-to-civilian change.

**SCHMITTER** asks whether corporatism is a modern politics.

**EVANS** accounts for "predatory" and "developmental" states.

## How are factions ordered? Does this affect constitutions?

**MICHELS** proposes that pure democracy is unfeasible. Right? Lipset and Lijphart write about constitutional choices.

Can parties or intellectuals order them? "Kalasha" parties (like India's top-down rock-hewn temple) made by leader

Can constitutional structure do it? **James Madison's** hope.

Is this too idealistic or problematic? **Achebe, Wolin...**

Throughout the seminar, please contribute on cases you know.

**TILLY** on similarities between organized crime and states.

Other topics that may come up in the seminar room are:

Andrew Walder on "Communist Neo-Traditionalism."

Nat Thayer on Kono Chûji, *kyôenkai*; & on Tanaka Kakuei.

## Do factional patterns let elites exploit small farmers?

**BATES's** rational action analysis shows how governments create/control political groups, & channel resources away from groups they cannot control. Critiques?

What policies would reduce this exploitation of the weak?

## Do epistemological hopes of proving norms from behavior blind political scientists to hegemony?

Is it obeyed unconsciously or just carefully? See **GAVENTA** (& Lukes) now, and Scott, implicitly Gramsci, & others next week.

# USING THE STRENGTH OF THE "WEAK"

## How do Banfield, and then Levi, describe what peasants think about order?

Are they "AMORAL FAMILISTS," or "passive" or "active" -- or what else?

Do they always "maximize the short-run advantage of the nuclear family;  
[and] assume all others will do likewise"?

(Eric Hobsbawm, Primitive Rebels, on Ukraine, Andalusia, Sicily....)

What does Levi say on PEASANT HISTORY, memories of Rome & civilization?

We can again raise Richard Madsen, Morality & Power in Chinese Village  
(and Marvin Harris, Cows, Pigs, Wars, and Witches, etc.).

How do the approaches that you see in these books relate to the systems and  
culturalist approaches treated in earlier weeks?

Do you think these applications of the methods were thoughtful?

The next step, as usual, is action:

## What policy recommendations arise from different views of peasants' needs?

What do you think of BANFIELD's policy recommendations for Montegrano?

(Luke 14, "compel them to come in." Montegrano & St. George, Utah)

What of LEVI's stress on "autonomy" to solve the problem of the South?

What does WWS do with his idea that "the state is the obstacle"?

Can you say the peasants have a "policy"? If so, to what end?

## Are "the weak" really weak, in Scott's view? What exactly is he saying?

In what ways is (or isn't) Scott a systems theorist? A culturalist?

What does Scott say about Green Revolution, or combine-harvesters?

What does econ say about villagers closing the gate to paddy trucks?

Or about low rents to kinsmen, and so forth?

Is "early capitalism" in Sedaka as disturbing as Scott makes out?

Does "routine resistance" amount to policy, revolution, or what?

What are "false consciousness" and "hegemony"? Why is the Malayan resistance so  
Islamic? (Has Scott left Chinese out of scene?)

Why does Scott, who takes "class" seriously, attack Marxist Gramsci?

Why were Geertz & Hirschman happy to have Scott write this book at the Inst. for  
Advanced Studies? Persuade WWS/Politics to hire him?

Does Scott's Weapons lose his earlier accent on structures?

Does SAM POPKIN solve this problem -- or not? Look at his pp. 252-55.

## Do most people repress their own politics? Does TIMUR KURAN suggest most preferences are inexplicit, unknowable most of the time? How does this relate to the issue in MARX's 18th Brumaire?

Pauline Roseneau explores the uses and limits of postmodern social science.

This might be focussed by reference to a proposal not among our texts:

### What can end hunger?

#### Putting 12 "myths" (described by Moore-Lappé) as positive propositions:

1. distributing the abundance (there is no basic shortage)
2. managing better (not just avoiding generally rare natural disasters)
3. ending the insecurity of the poor (not reducing their population)
4. protecting the environment (not exploiting it)
5. giving food to the needy (not just growing more with new technology)
6. helping small producers (big ones have non-market advantages on m'ket)
7. letting govt respond to individual preferences to eat (market doesn't)
8. putting freedom of LDC traders first (and freedom of trade second)
9. tapping the potential of revolt among the poor (not ignoring it)
10. having U.S. aid the poor (not urban elites [usually don't send food])
11. realizing most Americans benefit if THE poor get rich (we don't lose)
12. realizing free civil liberties reduce hunger (and don't increase it)

Empirically, what problems can you find in any of these ideas?

If none (or few), how can they be given more attention?

# IS MODERN AUTHORITY A WINNER?

Weber is careful of basic options. Read Weber and Bendix to see how they handle big issues--or to catch lapses in them.

## Do policies (eg. land reform) come from needs for legitimacy?

TAI Hung-chao and other authors on land reform.  
The Taiwanese case, and the KMT's need for legitimacy.  
When does MONTGOMERY say land reform "works"? Why?

## What, for Weber, is development? Underdevelopment is usual.

Where did industrial growth "begin"? Among whom? Why?  
(Lynn on the Naitô speculation about post-Sung China.)  
WEBER'S WAY TO FIND A CAUSE: suggest (by imagining) a factor that, if missing, leads to a new result.  
Allow both material and ideal factors, note ideas AND correlations between phenomena, make comparisons.  
This "hypothetical analysis" has what virtues & faults?

## What is "legitimate authority"? Does it change as below?

charisma --> tradition --> legal-rationality  
normative --> coercive --> utilitarian **compliance**  
prophets --> "kadi" judges --> bureaucratic **leaders**  
Are these analytical, progressive, or cyclical--or all 3?  
Why three types only? (Look at the "field of functions"?)  
(Amitai Etzioni will be cited on compliance types.)

## Why does Weber think legal-rationality wins? Is he right?

Why do so many doubt the value of legal-rationality?  
Do you join HUGHES or BENDIX, stressing this doubt?

## What is the state? Just coercive? No "perfectionism" in it?

Weber: study it as a structure, for itself  
(leaders may be too inefficient to control bureaucrats)  
Marx: an executive committee of the ruling class.  
neo-Marxists: some combination of these two views.

## Do Weber's ideal types wrongly suggest cultural consistency?

Does political socialization occur mainly in non-public environments, under different authority types?

## Do you agree w/ Weber's stress on a "values" vs. "ends" gap?

Are the ethics of principles and the ethics of results really the only two kinds of ethics?  
If so, what is the good of each for a person in dev't?

## Are mobilization movements countereffective for their goals?

Huntington's ratio: mobilization/institutionalization.  
Does socioeconomic modernization reduce "the art of associating together"--and so lead to regress?  
What of Huntington's recommendations: stratification, limiting communications, minimizing competition, compartmentalizing or localizing power, one party. What of results in Japan, Taiwan, Ivory Coast...?  
Any "democratic rationality"? (Cf. Haggard, Kohli.)

## Does Weber really reconcile:

"ideal-type" deductive "natural science" epistemology  
with "Verstehen" inductive "human science",  
coercive (state) with legitimate (social) power,  
"class" with "status group," market with socialization?

# WHY DO GROUPS CONFLICT OR COOPERATE?

## Aspects of ethnicity: What do you mean by an ethnic group?

**KINSHIP**--but real/mythic, comes in layers (Han/Taiwan)  
**LANGUAGE**--but Swiss/Austrian/German...India's ethnicity  
**RELIGION**--in Pakistan, Ireland; but China? most Africa?  
**REGION**--important, correlated w/ the above (Zimbabwe..)  
Will **any** human trait do, in some context, to make ethnicity?  
Why does **YOUNG** stress "identity roles"?  
When can people be in two ethnic groups concurrently?  
(Raymond Leach on the Political Systems of Highland Burma.)  
Is ethnicity **primordial** (given, as in Geertz), or **contextual** (decided by individuals or elites, Young or Anderson), and/or perhaps **multiple** (Wang Gungwu)?

## Is ethnicity natural or created? Does it arise from policy?

**YOUNG** (Geertz and Achebe); colonial policy creates tribes.  
**ANDERSON**'s imagined communities. Is language that vital?  
**GREENFELD**'s view that envy creates different nationalisms.  
**PARETO** might treat nationalist elites' circulation only?  
**GELLNER**'s that modernizing states built new patriotisms.  
Does **MUELLER** trump them, stressing personal benefits to some leaders of using violence to make ethnicity?

## Can ethnicity be effectively reduced by policy? Should it?

(On topics like the English Language Amendment and U.S. bilingual education, "melting pot"/"salad bowl.")

## Are THE POOR an ethnic group? Is GENDER an ethnicity?

## How does development affect the division of income groups?

(Maybe on Simon Kuznetz, the rise of non-agricultural income, the rise of high-income savings, and the brevity or length of a widening inequality phase Also, cross-sectional vs. longitudinal analysis.)

## What causes ethnic conflict? (And what obviates it?)

--"ranked" & "unranked" structures (Donald Horowitz)  
--guarantees (Lebanon? Eretz Israel? Malaysia?)  
--institutional/economic/numerical strengths of groups?  
--group cohesiveness? (Madras Tamils, DMK, Brahmins)  
--group mobility (cosmopolitan nationalists)

## Albert Hirschman goes to opera at Met: the "tunnel effect."

Is there evidence for the **HIRSCHMAN** "tunnel effect"?  
Is this realistic, reductionist, hopeful--or all these?  
What really happens after of the tunnel-effect lag?

## Has 5-to-8-per-cent-per-annum urbanization been disruptive?

Wayne Cornelius (or J. Nelson) on non-disruptiveness of immigrants, on radicalism in middle, not poor, classes.

## Has the post-Westfalia notion of the state made ethnicity?

Mencius vs. Grotius Is cultural pluralism modern?  
It is endemic. Learn ethnic maps, languages, more.

## Is an "instrumental" definition of ethnicity the right one?

# HOW CAN PROTESTS & PROBLEMS BECOME INCENTIVES TO IMPROVEMENT?

## What happens, when performance declines in an organization?

What's usual, for example, in Japan? The U.S.? Third World?

## Does Hirschman refute or refine the premises of most economics?

Relying on the old human science/natural science distinction,  
he suggests that **loyalty --> voice dominant, exit residual;**  
and **lack of loyalty --> exit dominant, voice residual.**  
Is Hirschman right to say that loyalty or "inelastic demand" (lack of  
exit options) is what leads to voice?  
Does credibility of exit raise voice (p. 87)? Berlin example.  
Is Hirschman really proposing a theory of legitimacy here?  
Are "second-order preference" commitments so important that  
theories too parsimonious for them are wrong?  
If so, an early thing to ask about an organization, before making policy  
for it, is: Are the members loyal? Will they stay to correct  
it, rather than leave it?

## Is voice less effective than (or as effective as) Hirschman makes out?

What policies decrease the likelihood that voice will be mainly ritual  
rebellion, mere Saturnalia, "letting off steam"?  
(Possible examples: George Ball in Johnson's cabinet; LW on the Princeton  
Library Committee; the Alcohol Abuse Coordinator.)  
What will you **really** be doing, when you take official jobs later?

## What do "inverted sequences" in (intimate-scale) development show?

Is Hirschman just pro-collectivist? What exactly is his stance?  
Does he expect any sure theory, even for "linkages" (not to  
mention system).  
What policies raise the entry price (and loyalty) in a community?

## Why are large-scale "sequences" so prevalent and obvious in nations?

Shades of the watershed years in **Polanyi** and **Schattschneider**.  
(On Shifting Involvements over time between Passions & Interests.)  
Why do communal understandings of propriety & corruption change?  
Where is "equilibrium," if the invisible hand has bad arthritis?

## What can economics and political science respectively let us know?

What does Hirschman mean by "possibilism"?  
What is his problem with incrementalism? Is he right?  
Is this stance pro-theoretical (pro-vision) or anti-theoretical (anti-  
consistency of definitions)?  
Why stress "linkages" in economics? (Does this trump **Gleick**?)

## Under what conditions is monopoly (no exit) better than competition?

Is Hirschman's criticism of school vouchers right?  
Is he right that competition (no exit) can in many cases "comfort" the  
inefficient competitor? (Does he like irony too much?!) )

## Is voice less modern than exit? Or on the contrary, is it more modern?

Does development make voice more useful, because of more linkages?  
If "each recovery mechanism is itself subject to decay," is  
development also entropy?

## Would TUCHMAN like Hirschman's model? (Most historians doubt models - but is Hirschman just an economist?)

# WHAT CREATES EQUITABLE GROWTH? Capital, Labor, Bottlenecks, or Entrepreneurship? Wage Differentials or Foreign Trade? Inconsistent Policy or "Monoeconomics"?

## WHAT GENERATES ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT, AND WHAT IS ITS PROPER DEFINITION?

You can think of today's problem in terms of an equation, with "development" (perhaps just output/capita, but perhaps also including other kinds of goods) stated as a function of capital, labor (or perhaps these two linked together, à la Lewis), entrepreneurship, etc.

## Stalin (Bismarck + genrô) as MAJOR influences on development economics.

Nurkse et al. thus called for a "big push" of capital investment by either private or state capitalists.

ROSTOW periodized this, and especially the earlier "take off," for the UK, US...; he seeks a "launch sector" w/ special traits.

Other sociologies seeking the "preconditions" of dev't/modernity.

## ARTHUR LEWIS's Model: What it says; how it incorporates capitalists.

How does agricultural or industrial productivity rise (graphs!)?

Can wage rates explain the LDC/DC division sufficiently?

More (?) questions that apply in many policy cases:

Does new industrial technology absorb labor at a high rate?

What happens to labor when agricultural technology changes?

Does Lewis's model incorporate earlier ones based on capital?

## Do both the (capital) and (labor + capital) models imply smooth growth?

What of HIRSCHMAN's (bottlenecks/bias + labor + capital) model?

Is Hirschman reductionist too, compared to Weber on entrepreneurs?

What are advantages & disadvantages of the anti-systemic approach?

## Is entrepreneurship (not capital, labor, bias) the spur to growth?

For China's recent growth, isn't Schumpeter the likeliest guru?

If so, is mainstream neoclassical economics reformable? Did it produce reasonable or dismal results in Russia, for example?

## Do you recommend a consistent policy, based on LDC growth experience?

Latin America's policies have been styled as interventionist, import-substituting, and inward-oriented; East Asia's are often styled liberal, export-promoting, and outward-oriented. Using these or other examples (India, Russia...), what exact kind of economic development policy do you espouse?

What do you think of the "Africas" of the World Bank, ODC, OAU?

## Do mainstream economists explain long-term growth? Does Schumpeter?

Why do some countries that try to "get the prices right," as the USSR did under Jeffrey Sachs, end up in disaster?

Why do some that have messy property systems, as the PRC does, have governments that depend on growth for legitimacy?

## Is economics a "science"? (Recall doubts of Marilyn Waring on this.)

What difference would an answer to this question make? To what extent have changes in economic development theory been basic? Or just incremental?

Does Fukuyama suggest HAYEK didn't think economics scientific?

## Should we seek a "monoeconomics" for both LDCs and DCs?

Why and why not?

## What kind of political economy will be useful for helping people and countries to develop?

(NEXT WEEK, BE SURE TO BEGIN YOUR TALK WITH A CLEAR THESIS OR PROBLEM.)