



IN THIS ISSUE

"Barrington Moore's Centennial Legacy"

- 1 Editorial Note
Benjamin Smith and Staffan I. Lindberg
- 1 Why Do We Read Barrington Moore?
Daniel Ziblatt
- 1 Contribution of Barrington Moore
John D. Stephens
- 2 Moore as Sovietologist
Michael Bernhard and Jeffrey Kopstein
- 2 Lessons Lost?
Sheri Berman
- 3 The Uses and Abuses of Barrington Moore, Jr.
Richard Snyder
- 15 Section News
- 22 New Research
- 28 Editorial Committee

FROM THE EDITORIAL BOARD

From the editorial board of CD-APSA, we wish you all a Happy New Year and send our best wishes for a productive 2013. This year marks the 100th anniversary of a luminary scholar in our field, Barrington Moore, Jr. Fittingly, in this issue we present a collection of essays that explore Moore's influence on the field of democracy studies.

(continued on page 3)

WHY DO WE READ BARRINGTON MOORE? SOME REFLECTIONS ON THE SURVIVAL OF AN INTELLECTUAL ICON

Daniel Ziblatt, *Harvard University*



Underneath the elaborate and at times distracting mass of historical detail, one of the two most powerful and ironic insights that Barrington Moore offers the reader of his classic work, *Social Origins of Dictatorship and Democracy*, is that it is impossible to understand the different variants of the modern world in countries ranging from Britain and the United States to Russia, Germany, and Japan without understanding their *premodern rural inheritance*.¹ The hinge of history is not found, as scholars have long argued, in the central sites of modern industrial innovation, cities; nor are states and political regimes the outcome of the balance of power among urban citizens, that is between the working class and the bourgeoisie. Instead, it is the structure of rural society, what E.J. Hobsbawm once called that "great frozen ice cap" on development, which is the least "biodegradable" challenge for modernization. In the end, though the bourgeoisie is important, Moore taught us that it is above all *conflict in the countryside* that shapes how modern states are created.

Are such insights of Barrington Moore's still relevant today? At the fiftieth anniversary celebration of the "birthday" of the Committee on Social Studies, the influential and interdisciplinary social

1. I would argue that the second major insight of Barrington Moore is the tragic observation that though violence and democracy are antithetic in principle, violence may be necessary to dislodge entrenched and traditional interests to create democracy. This theme is developed by Michael Bernhard and Jeff Kopstein, "The Leninist Irony: Revolutionary Violence and Democratic Gradualism Revisited."

(continued on page 4)

THE CONTRIBUTION OF BARRINGTON MOORE'S *SOCIAL ORIGINS OF DICTATORSHIP AND DEMOCRACY* TO THE STUDY OF THE HISTORICAL DEVELOPMENT OF DEMOCRACY

John D. Stephens, *University of North Carolina, Chapel Hill*



I began to engage Moore's work seriously when I began teaching a course on the breakdown of democracy in Europe and Latin America when I was an assistant professor of sociology at Brown in the early 1980s. When I was a graduate student at Yale a decade earlier, Al Stepan and Juan Linz were working on their *Breakdown of Democratic Regimes*¹ volumes and I had taken a course with Linz on the breakdown of democracy in interwar Europe, which focused on the experiences of Italy, Austria, Germany, and Spain in that time period. The course and breakdown volumes focus only on a narrow time frame and only on cases of breakdown. The explanations offered were highly voluntaristic. I was struck at the time with the difference in the explanations offered in the breakdown volumes and the more structural and deterministic explanation which I had encountered in Moore's *Social Origins*.² Teaching the course at Brown gave me the opportunity to confront the

1. Juan Linz and Alfred Stepan, *The Breakdown of Democratic Regimes: Europe* (Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1978).

2. Barrington Moore, Jr., *Social Origins of Dictatorship and Democracy: Lord and Peasant in the Making of the Modern World*

(continued on page 7)

Articles

MOORE AS SOVIETOLOGIST: THE CONTRIBUTIONS OF REVOLUTIONARY VIOLENCE TO POST-COMMUNIST GRADUALISM

Michael Bernhard, *University of Florida*

Jeffrey Kopstein, *University of Toronto*



Who remembers Barrington Moore the Sovietologist? Hardly anyone. And yet it is our contention that this earlier work has a great deal to teach us about comparative democratization. Although still venerated for his seminal contributions as a theorist of paths to political modernity and the method that ultimately became known as comparative historical analysis, in fact his first works, written at the height of the Cold War, attempted to situate the Soviet regime type within the more familiar metanarrative of political development. *Soviet Politics -- the Dilemma of Power: the Role of Ideas in Social Change* (1950) identified the tension between ideological purity and the necessity of practical choices, even under Lenin's and Stalin's rule. Moore's second book *Terror and Progress USSR: Some Sources of Stability and Change in the Soviet Dictatorship* (1954), which appeared in the immediate aftermath of Stalin's death, speculated upon three possible futures for the Soviet Union after four decades of revolutionary chaos, repression, and war.

These books explored the paradoxes of regimes willing and able to use violence on their populations in the service of transformational goals. Moore's interest in violence in his earlier work anticipated the central motifs of his much more influential *Social Origins of Dictatorship and Democracy*.¹ Although the two earlier works on the Soviet Union did receive scholarly attention at the time of their publication, it is ironic that Moore's *Social Origins*, arguably one of the most influential books in the history of social science, was largely ignored by students of the communist regimes in Eastern Europe. A work that highlighted the importance of past violence to the successful consolidation of virtually all modern political regime types, including (indeed especially) democracy did not sit well with the Sovietologists, whether of the left or the right.

Why was this the case? For cold war liberals the idea of terror as a potential midwife of development violated basic morality. Mass murder, the

1. Barrington Moore, *Soviet Politics -- the Dilemma of Power: the Role of Ideas in Social Change* (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1950) and *Terror and Progress USSR: Some Sources of Change and Stability in the Soviet Dictatorship* (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1954); Barrington Moore, Jr., *Social Origins of Dictatorship and Democracy: Lord and Peasant in the Making of the Modern World* (Boston: Beacon Press, 1966).

(continued on page 9)

LESSONS LOST? WHAT *SOCIAL ORIGINS OF DICTATORSHIP AND DEMOCRACY* STILL HAS TO TEACH US ABOUT POLITICAL DEVELOPMENT

Sheri Berman, *Barnard College*



My comments will focus on *Social Origins of Dictatorship and Democracy*.¹ This was not the only (great) book Moore wrote, but it was the one that influenced political science most directly. It is, unfortunately, no longer obligatory reading for political science students, which is unfortunate since there is much that can still be learned from this amazing book.²

Social Origins was published in 1966, a time when the study of political development was dominated by modernization theory and it is critical to understand modernization theory if we want to understand what Moore was trying to do with *Social Origins*. To oversimplify somewhat, modernization theory has several critical features. First, the starting point of analysis is capitalist economic development; it is what gets the "ball" of political development "rolling." Second, the causal logic runs from economic development through social transformation to political outcomes. In particular, the argument is that economic development transforms societies in ways that lead to pressure for democratization and help consolidate democracy. Third, the key actors in modernization theory are the middle, and to a lesser degree, the working class; that is to say the groups most directly associated with capitalism; it is the strength and inclinations of these groups which determines political outcomes. Fourth, political development is fairly unilinear and predictable: once economic development takes off, ineluctable social transformations push towards democracy. Current developing nations, in this view, will more or less follow the path taken by their western predecessors. (Or, as Marx put it, "the country that is most developed industrially only shows to the less developed the image of its own future."). And a final, albeit implicit, feature of modernization theory is a view of political development as relatively unproblematic. That is, the most difficult challenge societies face is getting economic development started; however, once economic development takes off, a fairly predictable and straightforward process of political development naturally follows. Moore's *Social Origins* challenged each and every one of these features of modernization theory. Moore insisted, for example, that

1. Barrington Moore, Jr., *Social Origins of Dictatorship and Democracy: Lord and Peasant in the Making of the Modern World* (Boston: Beacon Press, 1966).

2. Many graduate students seem to get their Moore via a reading of Daron Acemoglu and James A. Robinson's *Economic Origins of Dictatorship and Democracy* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2006). This is unfortunate for many reasons.

(continued on page 12)

ZIBLATT, CONTINUED

(continued from page 1)

science undergraduate program at Harvard University that Barrington Moore himself co-founded along with political scientist Stanley Hoffmann and economist Alexander Gerschenkron, one proud alumnus of the program prodded his audience to reflect on whether Barrington Moore is still pertinent for our world. Professor Brad DeLong, Professor of Economics at University of California, Berkeley, asked his co-alumni: does the social studies program that has spawned the academic career of sociologists, political scientists, and economists across the globe, continue to be well served with Barrington Moore's "problematic" as its guiding star? If the central dilemma and question that engaged Moore and the generations of scholars to follow in his wake was the seismic, unsettled, and violent transition from agrarian to industrial society and the political reverberations of that transition, is this still a relevant problematic at the beginning of the twenty-first century? As DeLong sharply put it:

"The era of the modern history that the "Barrington Moore problematic" was created to grapple with has come to its end. Not only are the problems that it addresses no longer our biggest problems here in the North-Atlantic world—they appear to have been largely solved—our current monsters are arising from other sources. We thus need something more advanced that deals with problems we have not yet solved rather than those we have." ²

Is it possible that DeLong might be correct? In an age of terrifying climate change and melting ice-caps, a war on terrorism that threatens civil liberties, conflict over immigration in the west, high-tech industrial authoritarian states such as Singapore, and demographic collapse in many advanced democracies, to obsess over what Moore might have meant with the ambiguous term "labor repressive agriculture" in the 18th century Prussia, or whether the gentry was rising or falling in England in the 17th

century might strike some as the kind of inside-baseball "scholasticism" that Moore himself would decry. After all, in Moore's own 1953 essay "the new scholasticism," he warned against precisely this kind of scholarly life disengaged from the most pressing social problems. He wrote, "If social science drops the task of rational criticism of society from its program altogether, leaving it entirely to theology, journalism, and the Bohemian fringe, it can someday drown in a sea of verbiage, strewn with floating bits of meaningless data."³

The idea that Moore's central topic has simply fallen from the center of our intellectual agenda, superseded by more pressing concerns is certainly a challenge. In addition to this, however, there is a second type of challenge to Moore: even on his *own* terrain—the origins of dictatorship and democracy. Is it possible that his theoretical approach has been superseded by a more methodologically sophisticated, usually quantitative political economy that surpasses and encompasses Moore with a type of formal precision and quantitative support that leaves Moore quickly in its wake? Such a view is not simply one that simply admires the technical wizardry of modern political economy. Rather, we must remember the view of Max Weber himself in his essay *Science as Vocation*,

"In science, each of us knows that what he has accomplished will be antiquated in ten, twenty, fifty years. That is the fate to which science is subjected; it is the very meaning of scientific work, to which it is devoted in a quite specific sense... every scientific fulfillment raises new "questions"; it asks to be "surpassed" and outdated... scientific works certainly can last as "gratifications" because of their artistic quality, or they may remain important as a means of training. Yet, they will be surpassed scientifically... for that is our common fate, and more, our common goal."⁴

In an age when leading political economists, such as Carles Boix,⁵ Daron Acemoglu and James Robinson⁶ have self-consciously borrowed from, but elaborated the insights of Moore with formal mathematical models and quantitative evidence, seeking, in effect, to absorb Moore's own arguments, have we reached that point with Barrington Moore? Would Weber suggest that if we read Moore today we are being at best intellectual historians, or even worse, perhaps engaging in a curious form of intellectual nostalgia or antiquarianism that Weber himself would disapprove of?

Not Just an Intellectual Icon: The Reasons We Continue to Read Barrington Moore

There are, thus, two reasons we might believe that we ought not to continue to flatter Barrington Moore with the attention that we do: first, perhaps his world no longer exists; second, perhaps his work has been surpassed. Yet, we continue to read Barrington Moore. Why? There are, to my mind, two outstanding reasons that *compel* us to continue to give Barrington Moore careful attention despite these critiques; indeed, these two reasons should convince us that the concerns raised above are unwarranted and ultimately short-sighted. These are the following:

*First, *the Moore problematic has not disappeared; rather, it has replicated itself across the globe.* Professor DeLong might be correct that questions of repressive rural social structure that sit at the heart of Barrington Moore's analysis have faded from the North-Atlantic world. However, the North-Atlantic world has, in turn, not faded from its impact on the globe. Put differently, through the instrumental, invidious, and coercive interventions of European

Heinrich Gerth and C. Wright Mills, eds., *From Max Weber: Essays in Sociology* (New York: Routledge, 1952 [1991]): 138.

5. Carles Boix, *Democracy and Redistribution* (Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press, 2003); Carles Boix, "Democracy, Development, and the International System," *American Political Science Review* 105 (November 2011): 809-828.

6. Daron Acemoglu and James Robinson, *Economic Origins of Dictatorship and Democracy* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2006)

2. Brad DeLong, "The Barrington Moore Problematic and its Discontents," 25 September 2010, <http://delong.typepad.com/sdj/2010/09/the-barrington-moore-problematic-and-its-discontents.html>.

3. Barrington Moore, "The New Scholasticism and the Study of Politics," *World Politics* 6 (October 1953): 122-138.

4. Max Weber, "Science as Vocation," in Hans

colonialism, Europe has in part intentionally, in part unintentionally *replicated itself*, its social structures and its accompanying social and political syndromes throughout the world. One example can illustrate this point. Between 1880 and 1940, as described in Imran Ali's revealing work *Punjab Under Imperialism* (1988) the British Empire's interventions in the British Punjab transformed society in fundamental ways.

Chief among these, and not fully appreciated to date, is the massive canal colonization project that built the world's most massive network of perennial canals that led to cultivation in rainless tracts of land that had previously been agricultural wastelands. Though one aim was the expansion of the productive agrarian frontier in the British Punjab, the British also had strategic or, more precisely, sociological aims, and distributed land to key groups, bolstering the power of, and in some places, creating a new Junker-type agrarian hierarchy that lived on large estates, adopted the manners of a landed elite, closely intertwined itself with the military, and was represented by a political party with the same name as the British Tory Party itself after 1880: the Unionist Party.⁷ In short, a quasi-replica society had been created which in turn, in the last twenty years, has generated some of the worst and most violent political syndromes of repressive landholding societies, as Moore's (1966) analysis might expect. Indeed, one source of popular mass support for Taliban in locations such as the Swat Valley in Pakistan is the assault on wealthy landlords, which has ranged from calls for land reform to intense violence directed against landlords themselves.⁸

In short, it is in no small part because European societies replicated themselves that the "Moore problematic" suddenly is not only relevant for understanding of key problems facing the globe today; it becomes a crucial analytical lens without which our comprehension of the social bases of

7. On the relationship of landed elites to the military, see Tai Yong's *The Garrison State: Military, Government and Society in Colonial Punjab, 1849-1947* (Thousand Oaks, Calif: Sage, 2005).

8. Jane Perlez, "Taliban Exploit Class Rifts in Pakistan" *New York Times*, 16 April 2009, http://www.nytimes.com/2009/04/17/world/asia/17pstan.html?pagewanted=all&_r=0.

terrorism in Asia would be substantially diminished. More broadly, Barrington Moore remains relevant anywhere where agrarian elites dominate politics and shape the nature of the revolutionary political reactions.

*Second, *Moore is not simply "encompassed" by recent work in political economy because his argument, though sharing some attributes with these works, is theoretically distinctive.* For example, in their groundbreaking work, Carles Boix, Daron Acemoglu and James Robinson and others seek to understand the determinants of democracy and dictatorship with simplified but useful models of society in which classes—the rich, the poor, the middle class—fight over resources and hence, over political regimes to distribute those resources. Socioeconomic development is thought to promote democratization by dissolving the power of the holders of immobile assets (i.e. land), and by altering levels of socio-economic inequality. Democracy is an indirect fight over redistribution and the political rules of a society determine who the median voter is; and how much power its elected officials actually possess. Since landed elites sit atop immobile assets that can be easily expropriated if land inequality is high, the stakes of democratization become heightened: the opponents of democracy resist more, fearing expropriation; the advocates of democracy fight harder for democracy because their targets are much more ripe for attack.

Empirically, there is much to this argument. Lord Salisbury, the head of the British Conservative Party beginning in the 1880s, a landlord ensconced in a medieval gothic estate on thousands of acres, indeed himself put it this way,

"[Suffrage expansion] means that the whole community shall be governed by an ignorant multitude, the creature of a vast and powerful organization, of which a few half-taught and cunning agitators are the head. . . it means, in short, that the rich shall pay all the taxes, and the poor shall make all the laws"⁹

9. Cited in Daniel Ziblatt, *Conservative Political Parties and the Birth of Modern Democracy in Europe* (in progress).

Yet, as powerful as this view is, and as resonant it is of Moore, is not an argument that encompasses all of the insights of Moore; indeed, it relies on what we might think of as a much "stingier" view of society than Moore's. In brief, although Moore's emphasis on social classes and class-coalitions, in short his essential materialism, is usually taken to be its defining characteristic, I would assert, controversially, a different view. A careful reading of his case studies as well as his last chapter, "Epilogue: Revolutionary and Reactionary Imagery," suggests an alternative interpretation: a chief difference between contemporary political economy and Moore is the former's strict focus on the economic *distributional* consequences of patterns of landholding and inequality, whereas Moore places emphasis on the social structural or status consequences of different modes of organizing economic and political life in the countryside. For, Moore, as for scholars such as Boix and Acemoglu and Robinson, landholding inequality is a barrier to democracy but not only because of the fears of expropriation that it triggers. There is another element to the argument: In an age and context when land was the major source of wealth, power, and prestige, the nature of the relationship between landed elites and peasants shapes the *revolutionary potential* of the peasantry. Though Moore does not use this term directly, the degree to which landed elites use their material power to develop *ideological hegemony* over peasantry—via deference, caste distinctions, a doctrine of racial inequality, or any other status-reinforcing ideological constructs—bolsters the bulwarks *against* democracy. As Moore himself put it when discussing the enduring power of German landlords, the "Junkers managed to draw the independent peasants under their wing...with a combination of repression *and* paternalism."¹⁰ But, also crucially, such ideological hegemony combined with material power can trigger even more radical reactions to landed wealth. One example clarifies the logic of how a coercive apparatus can be strengthened with a status-reinforcing ideology in Moore's view: in the United States, it is when antebellum slavery became simultaneously more profitable and more vulnerable that

10. Moore, 1966: 225.

Ziblatt

landed elites in the U.S. South invented and elaborated doctrines of race and racial supremacy, often seeking religious justifications for their increasingly coherent ideological apparatus to bolster their power and the old regime that protected them.¹¹ The result was a strengthened non-democratic regime because key groups' social status was now bound up in the old regime that was no longer simply reducible to fights over redistribution. The reactions to slavery, when given an additional normative or moral meaning, also were radicalized. As Moore himself put it, diverging from much of contemporary political economy,

“Human beings individually and collectively do not react to an objective situation in the same way as one chemical reacts to another when they are put together in a test tube. This form of strict behaviorism is, I submit, plain wrong. There is always an intervening variable, a filter, one might say between people and an “objective” situation, made up from all sorts of wants, expectations, and other ideas derived from the past... what looks like an opportunity or a temptation to one group of people will not necessarily seem so to another group with a different historical experience and living in a different form of society.”¹²

In sum, the contributions of Barrington Moore remain timely and relevant. But more than that, with his emphasis on how the two master-variables of *class* and *status* intersect, Moore's analysis has a depth that can explain outcomes not predictable with a focus on socioeconomic stratification alone.

Concluding Thoughts and Remaining Puzzles

Yet, we should not just be content to praise Moore; it would be a mistake to place Barrington Moore's work in a kind of museum of antiquities, under glass, where we safely bring his work out on solemn commemorative occasions such as his 100th birthday, the 50th birthday of an academic program he co-founded,

11. Moore, *Social Origins*, 1966: 118, 122; Kenneth M. Stampp, *The Peculiar Institution: Slavery in the Ante-Bellum South* (New York: Knopf, 1956).

12. Moore, *Social Origins*, 1966: 485.

and other safe occasions to celebrate “the classics,” of social science. It is much more productive, and indeed, necessary to engage his work theoretically and empirically because on some questions he was wrong, and on other questions he was vague or incomplete. To understand even the trajectories of democracy and dictatorship in Europe alone, there remains important work to do; puzzles remain.

We can conclude therefore with reference to one remaining puzzle, central to my own current research, to illustrate that Moore's framework, even when it can't provide the answers, helps us frame our research questions. If one looks closely at agricultural census data from the 19th century in Britain and Germany, as economic historians have begun to do in recent years, a more complex picture begins to appear in place of Moore's useful but perhaps overly stark juxtaposition of the British and German cases; it turns out, both were cases of extremely repressive and inegalitarian rural social structures. In Britain, by the 1880s, landholding inequality, reached Himalayan levels and was in fact much more concentrated than in Germany—and even more concentrated than anywhere east of the Elbe River.¹³ Furthermore, tenant farmers as a portion of total agricultural employment were a larger group in Britain than in Germany in the 1880s; and landless labor as a portion of total agricultural employment was also higher.¹⁴ Yet, the puzzle remains that British democratization was famously much more settled than Germany's. It is correct that by the 1880s, given Britain's relatively advanced industrialization, British landlords had diversified their assets and now also relied on industrial income. However, as economic historians have also begun to examine probate records, it has also become clear that the extent of sectoral diversification before 1900 has likely been exaggerated. In short, Britain, like much of continental Europe, possessed and was constrained by highly inegalitarian rural social structure late into the

13. See Peter Lindert, “Who Owned Victorian England? The Debate over Landed Wealth and Inequality,” *Agricultural History* 61 (Autumn 1987): 25-51.

14. See Ziblatt, *Conservative Political Parties*.

nineteenth century. Thus, a puzzle remains: how is that Britain, sharing similar structural conditions with much of continental Europe, nonetheless followed a more settled or gradual route of democratization?

Rather than attempting to save Moore's paradigm by either a) referring to the scope of violence in the distant 17th century as the cause of the 20th century outcomes as Moore might, or b) constructing ever-more elaborate and refined conceptualizations and distinctions between “labor-repressive agriculture” and other forms of agriculture that Moore's analysis also might suggest, I would propose there is another route to go altogether; the solution may simply not be found in social, structural or economic variables at all. In a book I am currently completing, I analyze political parties and the role that political parties play in mediating interests in the process of democratization.¹⁵ I am attempting to demonstrate that the organization of political parties, in particular conservative political parties that represent landed elites, may exert an autonomous impact on how regimes develop; whether or not political parties representing that era's “authoritarian incumbents” are organized before democratization for a variety of reasons independent of political regime shapes how settled subsequent paths of democratization are. The key pivot of regimes, I believe, may lie in the hands of the political parties representing the old regime. Moore's work helps us identify the problems we have yet to definitely solve; we may have to look elsewhere for solutions.

In sum, Barrington Moore is both relevant, has yet to be superseded and remains a major source of intellectual inspiration for his supporters and critics alike. That is why we still read Barrington Moore.

Daniel Ziblatt is professor of government at Harvard University.

15. Daniel Ziblatt, *Conservative Political Parties*.

two explanations in a systematic way. Each time I taught the course I researched the historical development of democracy in additional European countries not covered in Moore, beginning with Sweden and the other Nordic countries which I had been studying in my work on social democracy.

During my years at Brown, my wife and co-author, Evelyne Huber (then Stephens) and I discovered that we had a common view of the historical development of democracy with my department colleague, Dietrich Rueschemeyer, and just as I was departing Brown for Northwestern in 1985, we decided to write a book together on the topic. Evelyne and I handled the comparative historical analysis of circa 40 countries in Europe, the Americas, and the Antipodes. Evelyne wrote the chapter on South America, and we co-wrote the chapter on Central America and the Caribbean. My contribution to that book was a chapter on advanced industrial countries and originally that was just an article about Europe.³ Moore's *Social Origins* was the most important inspiration for our comparative historical analysis both methodologically and theoretically.

In the course of writing the book, Evelyne and I were members of a faculty seminar on Latin America at Northwestern. Most other members of the seminar were historians. Evelyne and I raised the Moore thesis on the role of labor repressive agriculture as a way to understand the agonies of Latin American democracy. The historians, Frank Safford in particular, responded by saying that we should focus our reading on this aspect of Moore's argument. Then he and Evelyne organized a conference in which they asked the best historians on late-19th century agrarian class relations in Latin America to come and discuss the Moore thesis for their cases. In addition to enriching the chapters of *Capitalist Development and Democracy* on South and Central America and the Caribbean, that conference resulted in a 1995 book on Latin America edited by (Boston: Beacon Press, 1966).

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

Evelyne and Frank.⁴ In this short essay, I will outline what we think we learned about the strengths and weaknesses of Moore's analysis in the course of working on the book with Dietrich and on the edited book.

When I was at the Kellogg Institute at Notre Dame in 1987, I wrote a working paper, which was a draft of my chapter and which was later published in the *American Journal of Sociology* in 1989.⁵ The title of that working paper and article was "Democratic Transition and Breakdown in Western Europe, 1870-1939: A Test of the Moore Thesis." I sent it to Barrington Moore in December of 1987 when I was still at Kellogg. Moore responded in February of 1988. Obviously the reference to a statistical test says something about what he thought about a lot of the quantitative analysis of that period, so it is appropriate that I begin with methodology.

Moore's Methodological and Theoretical Contribution

There are no passages in *Social Origins* which explicitly discuss methodology or theory, so one has to examine what he did and infer his methodological approach and theory from what he did. What did he do? First, he researched a large number of cases; eight counting Germany and Russia. Second, he worked on them in very long term historical depth and third, the analysis is cross-regional. The book is a classic application of what Skocpol⁶ later termed the analytical comparative historical method. On one hand, his approach gives one the ability to identify cause through establishing agency. It examines which historical actors did what in which historical periods. But it also examines structural causes due to the very long time span and the variation across the cases. Take, for example, his arguments about the existence of labor

4. Evelyne Huber and Frank Safford, eds., *Agrarian Structure and Political Power in Latin America: Landlord and Peasant in the Making of Latin America* (Pittsburgh: University of Pittsburgh Press, 1995).

5. John D. Stephens, "Democratic Transition and Breakdown in Western Europe, 1870-1939: A Test of the Moore Thesis." *American Journal of Sociology* 94 (March 1989): 1019-1076.

6. Theda Skocpol, "A Critical Review of Barrington Moore's *Social Origins of Dictatorship and Democracy*," *Politics and Society* 4 (Fall 1973): 1-34.

repressive landlords: If one shortens the time frame or truncates the case selection by just examining the authoritarian cases as in the Linz and Stepan's *Breakdown of Democratic Regimes* volumes, one will not see the effect of the structural factors.

Moore's work shows why the comparative historical method is unearthing causation in the study of long-term macro political change. In his essay, "Aligning Ontology and Methodology in Comparative Politics," Hall⁷ correctly argues that causation in the real world is highly complex, characterized by multiple paths to the same outcomes, complex interaction effects, path dependent effects, reciprocal causality, and diffusion, and one is not likely to uncover these causal processes with techniques like multiple regression or any other statistical technique for that matter. By contrast, the comparative historical method is ideally suited to uncover such causal complexity.

Theoretically, *Social Origins* is the pioneer of class-analytic macro-comparative historical sociology, what Goldthorpe derisively terms "Grand Historical Sociology" in his early 90s article. In Goldthorpe's view these works (in addition to Moore, Skocpol, Anderson and Mann), are post hoc descriptions and not testable theories. There is no question that Moore's theory is inductively developed, but it does generate testable hypotheses. Mahoney's chapter in Mahoney and Rueschemeyer's 2003 volume, *Comparative Historical Analysis in the Social Sciences*, presents two hypotheses (basically the ones I discuss below) derived from Moore and lists 21 different books and articles which attempt to test the hypotheses or, perhaps more correctly stated, to use Moore's explanation for political developments in other countries and time periods. The first hypothesis is on the role of labor repressive agriculture in the development of modern authoritarian regimes. In Moore's work this appears as an alliance between the central state and landlords in the pursuit of labor control. In Latin

7. Peter Hall, "Aligning Ontology and Methodology in Comparative Politics," in James Mahoney and Dietrich Rueschemeyer, *Comparative Historical Analysis in the Social Sciences* (New York: Cambridge University Press, 2003): 373-406.

Stephens

America, it is very clear you did not need the central state if you could control the local state, you still could control the movement of labor. Second, the labor force does not need to be legally bound to the land. This point is actually unclear in Moore. Some of the critiques point out that that this kind of labor repressive agriculture did not exist in, say, Germany by the time he is talking about it. So we argued that dependence on a large supply of cheap labor is the key. I want to point out here that new rational choice analysts, like Boix and Acemoglu and Robinson, do not test the thesis of labor dependence against their favorite explanation, which is that land is an immobile asset, which, in their view, explains the particular reactionary role or posture of landlords.

We have argued that differences in the political posture of large estate ranchers and plantation owners shows that the need for a large supply of labor is the critical variable, because in both cases the land is immobile, but in only one case you end up on an authoritarian trajectory. Thus, we found that this aspect of Moore's work holds robustly for a large number of cases and time periods.

Second, the most well-known argument of our 1992 book is that *Social Origins* says nothing about the role of the working class parties and unions in democratic transitions in Europe. In a sense, Moore stopped his analysis too soon, with the establishment of mid-19th century political contestation, when you still had property qualifications for voting and/or no cabinet responsibility to popularly elected parliaments. The transition to democracy at least in the sense of universal male suffrage and cabinet responsibility to parliament comes later, in the last decades of the 19th century and first two decades of the 20th century. As a specialist on the Nordic countries, especially Sweden, my reading of the history indicated to me that the working class movement was the single most important actor pushing for democratic transition.

In *Social Origins*, the bourgeoisie appears as the most important agent of pushing for democracy. In our comparative historical analyses, we did not find this to be the case. One problem here is the fuzziness of the concept of bourgeoisie in Moore:

One does not really know if he has a very narrow, classically Marxist, captains of industry kind of definition or if he means by bourgeoisie all the middle classes, including people who are not propertied, so professionals, managers, and so on. Again, in this case, his analysis stopped too soon. Such groups were very rarely the agents of full democracy in Europe and one sees this even more clearly in Latin America.

One of the central points of Skocpol's⁸ classic critique of Moore was that the state and war are radically missing from the analysis. The autonomous role of the military in the development of democratic and authoritarian regimes in Latin America is so obvious that no analyst could ignore it. With regard to the historical development of democracy in Europe, Tilly reminds us that wars not only created pressure to enfranchise soldiers who were asked to fight the wars but also to politically incorporate taxpayers who were asked to pay for the wars. With regard to the industrial working class, it is no accident that World War I was such an important conjuncture for achievement of universal male suffrage.

"Revolution from above," Moore's German path of development in which an alliance of large landholders, the state and a politically dependent bourgeoisie modernizes and industrializes a nation is a rare occurrence. Landlords do not care about economic growth if it is a threat to their current class relationships. This is especially true if they do not have to worry about war. A central motivation in German industrial development was the building up of armaments industries. More broadly in Europe, where war was a constant threat in the 19th century and the first half of the 20th, landlords could be brought onboard for a national project of industrial development in order to build the nation's military capacity. However, if you look at Latin American landlords in the 19th and 20th centuries, where war was rarely a threat, the class relationships so asymmetrically favored them that they opposed anything that might upset them. That included mass education. As Engerman and Sokoloff⁹ show, the

8. Skocpol, *A Critical Review*, 1973.

9. Kenneth L. Engerman and Stanley L. Sokoloff, "History Lessons: Institutions, Factor Endowments,

large landholding areas of the Americas became areas of economic backwardness, despite natural resource endowments in many cases, precisely because they failed to develop mass education.

Finally, Moore argues strongly in *Social Origins* that a revolutionary break from the past is an essential feature of the path to democracy. This is in part a product of Moore's exclusion of the small countries from the analysis. Moore argues in the preface that the determinants of the politics of small countries lay outside of their borders, an argument which Stein Rokkan, otherwise a great admirer of *Social Origins*, was highly critical of for obvious reasons. If you examine the modern histories of the small countries in Europe, the Nordic countries, the Benelux countries, and Switzerland, you will find not the revolutionary break from the past. And in my view, this is because these were small landholding countries and you did not need to break the power of landlords because they were not really a very powerful force at all.

John D. Stephens is the Gerhard E. Lenski, Jr. Distinguished Professor of Political Science and Sociology at the University of North Carolina, Chapel Hill.

and Paths of Development in the New World." *Journal of Economic Perspectives* 14 (Summer 2000): 217-232.

Bernhard and Kopstein

BERNHARD AND KOPSTEIN, CONTINUED

(continued from page 2)

destruction of civil society, the expropriation of private property, the creation of the Gulag, and the wanton destruction of human and physical capital could not be justified, even in the service of higher political ends. For those on the left, who were more sympathetic to the aims of the regime, the reminder that progress had come at incalculable human cost was best ignored or forgotten. Moore, on the other hand, put violence at the very center of his analysis of political development more generally.

It is worth recalling that the *Origins'* first chapter on England carries the subtitle "The Contribution of Violence to Gradualism." The subsequent chapter on France highlights the importance of terror in ensuring a decisive break with the premodern order. And, in the following chapter, Moore's much neglected case study of the United States, the Civil War is depicted as the "real" American Revolution. He argues that without it the United States would have been left with a society divided between a highly industrialized North and a slave-owning "Junker" dominated South, much more akin to Wilhelmine Germany than Edwardian England. He reiterated this point on liberal democracy succinctly and forcefully in his next book:

"The Revolt of the Netherlands, the Puritan Revolution, the French Revolution, and the American Civil War did help to break down in each case a different historical set of institutional obstacles to the establishment of Western liberal democracy, though it is of course impossible to prove that they were necessary to bring about this result. From the standpoint of a general commitment against human suffering there is nothing attractive about violence per se. Nor does the limited degree of "success" in past violence prove that present and future violence is good, inevitable, and necessary."

In short, the road to democracy was not evolutionary but paved in blood. Half a century after the fact, perhaps we, too, have the luxury of considering the role of violence in democratic development with the cool eye of social scientists. Moore himself does not rule this out as a possibility:

"When de Tocqueville wrote about the French Revolution, he could present a reasonable case to the effect that the change had not been worth the cost in human suffering; a century later we can see the situation differently and have at least some grounds for concluding that without the French Revolution French history might well have taken a turn in the general direction of fascism. A hundred years hence there might be similar arguments about the Bolshevik Revolution."²

Given the obvious impact of Moore's study of the Soviet Union on *Social Origins*, it is ironic that his ideas were all but ignored by scholars who shared his scholarly pedigree.³ In fact, the main arguments of *Social Origins* were taken up primarily by student of Western Europe, Latin American, and to some extent Asia. Examining the scholarship inspired by Moore in comparative historical analysis (CHA), we wish to describe three waves.

First, we briefly document how CHA initially downplayed the experience of Soviet-type regimes and their attendant violence in political development. Second, we show that scholars have more recently moved to reintegrate this experience into their theoretical purview. Third, we identify the features of a wave of scholarship that is just emerging.

The First Wave: Paige and Skocpol
Emblematic of the first wave of scholarship that attempted to extend Moore's insights about the role of political violence and development were the works of Theda Skocpol and Jeffrey Paige. They focused on violence and revolution but in somewhat different ways. Paige's work examines the structures of agrarian production in the developing world, in particular how patterns of land-holding and labor allocation

2. Both quotations are from Barrington Moore, *Reflections on the Causes of Human Misery and Upon Certain Proposals to Eliminate Them* (Boston: Beacon, 1969): 28, 29.

3. There are some notable exceptions to this. One particularly fine book that uses comparative historical analysis to discuss how different patterns of post-Stalinist normalization affected pattern of extrication from communism is Grzegorz Ekiert's *The State Against Society: Political Crises and Their Aftermath in East Central Europe* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1996).

promote revolutionary behavior, a politics of reform, or the agrarian status quo. But his work is less concerned with the effect of violence than with its causes. Nevertheless, Paige strongly builds on Moore's discussion of peasant and landlord by examining when this relationship produces a revolutionary overthrow of state power. In this regard he shares much in common with both James Scott and Edward Friedman.⁴

Skocpol, while also concerned with the origins of revolutionary violence in agrarian structures, pays more explicit attention to the impact of violence. Once revolutionaries seize power in states (France, Russia, China) weakened by superior challengers in the international system, they find themselves constrained by the limits of state power and turn to the violent extraction of new resources from their domestic populations. Her study is one of the few to grant Soviet type regimes a prominent place in the metanarrative of political development. She does so by making the Stalinist consolidation of state power the endpoint of her study of Russia. And for a long time this endpoint is where CHA confined its interest in Europe East of Elbe. Communism yielded a strong state, capable of survival in a hostile world, and that is what we needed to know. This limited focus produced an understanding of political development that ignored the impact of an alternative form of modernity to liberal democratic capitalism which persisted for over seventy years and ruled over 300 million Europeans.

The Second Wave: Class Politics and Regime Outcomes in Western Europe and Latin America

The second major wave of CHA coincided with the global wave of democratization in the 1980s and 1990s. It thus focused more exclusively on regime outcomes, democracy or dictatorship. This work revised and expanded Moore by providing accounts of the pathways to regime outcomes as a politics of class competition rather than a deterministic set of antecedent social conditions. The portion of Moore's work most germane to

4. Jeffrey Paige, *Agrarian Revolution* (New York: Free Press, 1975) and Theda Skocpol, *States and Social Revolutions* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1979); James Scott, *The Moral Economy of the Peasant* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1976) and James Friedman, *Backward toward Revolution* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1974).

this task was the relative power of social classes and whether they entered into coalitions with each other. This literature also enlarged the range of relevant classes beyond the bourgeoisie, the aristocracy and the peasantry. It paid more careful attention to the middle and working classes. And it focused primarily on Western Europe and Latin America, where revolution was not always at the center of action. In shifting to class coalitions as the primary dependent variable, these scholars shifted away from the Sovietological Moore of revolutionary violence to the Gerschenkronian Moore who dissected the logic behind the "Iron and Rye" alliance of Junkers and Krupps.

In the study of Europe, the role of class coalitions in regime outcomes is best represented by the work of Gregory Luebbert on the interwar period. In non-liberal politics, the alliance choice of family farmers determined whether a country became social democratic or fascist. If working class parties attempted to organize the rural proletariat, family farmers perceived this a threat to their livelihood, made common cause with the urban middle classes, which resulted in fascism. Where working class parties confined themselves to urban areas, family farmers and industrial workers did not find themselves in competition, made common cause, and the result was social democracy. For Luebbert, fascism's violence seems to be a product of its fruition and not part of its rise.⁵

In Latin America, Collier and Collier focus on a somewhat different set of regime outcomes in analyzing the difference between civilian and military rule in eight Latin American cases, from which they ultimately identify four different kinds of competitive party systems: polarized, integrative, stable, and stagnant. This is an argument about the legacy of the timing of the incorporation of the newly emerging and radicalized working classes into the polity. This incorporation process continued to affect the nature of the regime in all eight countries over the next several decades. Like Luebbert, the Colliers' Moore is the Moore of class alliances shaping political outcomes.

5. Alexander Gerschenkron, *Bread and Democracy in Germany* (Berkeley and Los Angeles: University of California Press, 1943); Gregory Luebbert, *Liberalism, Fascism, or Social Democracy* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1991).

Rueschemeyer, Stephens, and Stephens are the most territorially ambitious of the scholars in this wave of CHA. They cover the advanced industrial countries, Latin America, and the Caribbean. For them, democracy is an unintended product of capitalism. With its complex social structures capitalism gives rise to a range of civil society actors who depending on circumstances support democracy or cast their lot in the defense of an authoritarian status quo. These scholars pay careful attention to how, under different circumstances, the bourgeoisie, the middle classes, the working class, and peasantry combine either to open or close the political arena. The one constant in all their accounts is the negative influence of large landowners.⁶

All three of these now classic works lack the perspective of the Sovietological Moore in two ways. First, the variable that drives regime outcomes is the cooperation and conflict of class actors, rather than how violence transforms the nature of society and its class and ethnic structures, and how that transformation shapes potential political outcomes. And second, not surprisingly their range of cases does not extend to the very place where this kind of violence was pervasive and an inescapable and central fact of politics. Luebbert excludes Eastern Europe due to the traditional nature of rule there. And Rueschemeyer, Stephens, and Stephens consider it only in passing in their introduction and conclusion rather than making it a focus of their analysis. The Colliers, of course, restrict themselves to Latin America.

The Third Wave: The Unintended Consequences of State Violence

There is currently a third wave of research in the comparative historical mode. As the paradigm has expanded, the agenda has become diverse, encompassing a range of new projects such as understanding regime transformations as a path dependent process reaching back to the origins of modernization; or reconceptualizing democratization in Western Europe as a long-term piecemeal process; or reevaluating the role

6. Ruth Berins Collier and David Collier, *Shaping the Political Arena: Critical Junctures, the Labor Movement, and Regime Dynamics in Latin America* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1991); Dietrich Rueschemeyer, Evelene Huber Stephens, and John Stephens, *Capitalist Development and Democracy* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1992).

of religious, ethnic, and political actors in addition to class actors in comparative historical analysis of regime origins.⁷ A reconsideration of the Sovietological Moore—the Moore which focuses on the transformative violence of some 20th century dictatorships—may provide us a way to reintegrate the experience of the communist world into the broader project of accounting for regime outcomes. To be sure, students of the communist world did engage in some measure of academic self-ghettoization, even if some bemoaned this fact and others attempted to break out. All, however, failed to connect the dots between Moore's earlier and later work.

Of course, scholars interested in the post-communist region immediately understood the potential importance of the legacies of decades of communist rule.⁸ But the focus remained on the deleterious effects of one-party dominance, ideological uniformity, and Stalinist economic planning on successful democratization. All of these legacies continue to impose important developmental challenges. What gets lost, we believe, in focusing too closely on the "bad" legacies of Leninism is Moore's keen sense of the long term impact of targeted social violence on political trajectories. In particular, considering the cases of East-Central Europe, it is remarkable how resilient democracy has been, or even where backsliding has occurred, how inhospitable the terrain is for would-be authoritarians. Given the inexperience of the post-communist political elites, the rapid collapse of the post-communist economies, and the profound reconfiguration of the region's geopolitics, it would not have been surprising had these countries quickly returned to the "equilibrium path" of dictatorship of the 1920s and 1930s. Yet this did not occur. Many scholars have pointed to the role of

7. James Mahoney, *The Legacies of Liberalism: Path Dependence and Political Regimes in Central America* (Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 2002), Sheri Berman, "Civil Society and the Collapse of the Weimar Republic," *World Politics* 49 (April 1997): 401-429, and Giovanni Capocchia and Daniel Ziblatt, "The Historical Turn in Democratization Studies: A New Research Agenda for Europe and Beyond," *Comparative Political Studies* 43 (August-September 2010): 931-968. The Capocchia and Ziblatt essay introduces a special issue to the journal that touches on many of these issues.

8. Kenneth Jowitt, *New World Disorder: The Leninist Extinction* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1993).

Bernhard and Kopstein

the EU in securing democratic change in countries with no history of competitive politics. Even so, as important as external factors were to regime outcomes, the first several postcommunist states admitted into the EU were already well functioning democracies (Hungary, Poland, Czech Republic, Slovenia) prior to accession. Clearly the EU, as well as other forms of Western leverage and linkage, played a more important role in stabilizing less unambiguous cases (e.g. Romania, Bulgaria, Croatia, Serbia). And in some areas such ties have proved insufficient (Ukraine, Belarus). While the EU was neither a necessary nor a sufficient condition for democratization in the region, we believe that it made democratic outcomes more likely in many cases, and serves as a potential buffer against backsliding into authoritarianism. Given this more nuanced perspective, it is important to understand the deeper social structural changes wrought by communism itself in accounting for why EU democratic conditionality was so widely embraced or at least mimicked.

Our claim is not that democracy is the “highest” and “final” stage of communism or that this outcome was in any way the intention of communist leaders. Far from it. But the legacies of communism were mixed and we wish to point to two areas where the effects of violence are something that Moore surely would have appreciated: the class structure and ethnic composition.

Communism not only leveled incomes in the region but, perhaps more importantly, destroyed the basis of status societies virtually everywhere it ruled. It is worth recalling Tocqueville’s characterization of the United States as essentially a country of equality, by which he meant not primarily equality of condition but equality of status: poor Americans did not view rich Americans as their social betters. Part of what made democracy unworkable in places such as interwar Poland and Hungary was that these were societies of deep status inequalities, the kind of inequalities that are not easily overcome by money alone. The elites of these countries were clubbish and essentially impenetrable by ordinary people. Of course, 40 years of communist violence and tyranny was probably more than developmentally “needed” (with all due caution regarding the functionalist logic

implicit in this word) -- and could probably have been dispensed with altogether in the Czech lands (and may not have been “enough” in Central Asia). But just as Ralf Dahrendorf argued for the case of the Nazis, the ironic effect of communism was to destroy the traditional bases of authoritarian rule and bequeath the successor regimes social structures much more favorable to democracy than had existed before 1945.

The legacy of communism in terms of social structure was the creation of two large and highly educated urban classes who had experienced adequate provision of modern human needs satisfaction for at least two generations. These were a large blue collar working class and an extensive white collar class of professionals and semi-professionals. In the countryside, communism left behind a highly uniform peasantry whether concentrated on large collective or state farms, smallholders, or both. The social structures that made the area so unfit for democracy -- the existence of latifundia, large emisserated peasantries, small middle classes highly dependent on state employment, and a small working class isolated in a few islands of modernity had long passed. Democracy was ultimately installed when these societies already had a modern social structure, rather than when that transformation was going on, as in Western Europe or Latin America.⁹ This long-term impact of communism is one that Moore surely would have appreciated and that would have fit neatly into the framework provided in *Social Origins*.

If traditional social structures undermined democracy in interwar East-Central Europe, so too did the persistence of other “pre-modern” cleavages, especially ethnic cleavages and the resulting politics of conflict. Ironically, Communism in some locations “solved” this problem, too, by reshuffling ethnic groups and borders without regard for conventional moral

9. Ralf Dahrendorf, *Society and Democracy in Germany* (Garden City: Doubleday, 1965). For a more explicitly Moorean take on these issues and an empirical test of its validity see Michael Bernhard, “Democratization in Germany: A Reappraisal,” *Comparative Politics* 33 (July 2001): 379-400. These arguments are elaborated at length in Michael Bernhard, “The Moore Thesis: What’s Left after 1989?” presented at the “International Conference -- Post-Soviet Space: Twenty Years after Collapse of Communism,” The European Forum, Hebrew University of Jerusalem. May 16-17, 2011.

restraints. Like their Nazi rivals, Communist regimes were what Amir Weiner refers to as ethnic gardening states.¹⁰ Their net effect was to leave East-Central Europe ethnically more homogenous (though where ethnic diversity persisted, so too did ethnic conflict in the postcommunist era). Although cross national research has failed to find a consistent relationship between ethnic homogeneity and democracy, it is hard to believe that it is not easier and cheaper to construct a democracy when there are fewer ethnic groups demanding accommodative resources, and one suspects that the inconsistency of results are more statistical artifacts than accurate reflections of reality. Again, like other forms of violence, this effect is certainly not one to be celebrated, much less emulated, but it is one to be noted and which fits neatly into Moore’s interest in the impact of pre-modern political cleavages for subsequent democratic development.

We could identify other “positive” legacies of communist violence, but our point would be the same and remains indebted to Moore’s initial sense of irony. “Good” effects are sometimes produced by “bad” causes. This insight which came to fruition in his *Social Origins* sprung from his earlier Sovietological work and his keen understanding of 20th century tyrannies. Just as England’s violent 17th century may have contributed to its 18th and 19th century gradualism, so too may the violence of 20th century European communism have contributed to the relative moderation of the politics of transformation in the 21st century post-communist world. It is true that following a decade of chaos in the 1990s, Russians ran back to an authoritarian order. But Putin and his successors and imitators elsewhere in the East Slavic world should not be mistaken for Czars. They are now in charge of deeply modern societies that do not accept the current order unquestioningly. This insight derives directly from the Sovietological Moore’s work, re-attention to which may well be useful for comparativists studying other regions of the world.

Michael Bernhard is Raymond and Miriam Ehrlich Eminent Scholar of Political Science at University of Florida. Jeffrey Kopstein is professor of political science at University of Toronto.

10. Amir Weiner, “Nature, Nurture, and Memory in a Socialist Utopia: Delineating the Socio-Ethnic Body in the Age of Socialism,” *American Historical Review* 104 (October 1999): 1114-1155.

BERMAN, CONTINUED

(continued from page 2)

analyses of political development had to begin *before* the onset of industrial capitalism with an analysis of pre-capitalist agrarian relations. Concomitantly, Moore argued that not workers and capitalists, but rather lords and peasants were the key actors in the modern political drama. In particular, Moore showed us that the way in which rural classes related to each other before the transition to industrial capitalism profoundly affected subsequent economic development and hence the power and position of the capitalist classes; these factors, in turn, powerfully shaped the nature of political development. Moore also challenged modernization theory's view of modernization itself. Most famously, Moore argued against modernization theory's view of political development as unilinear, predictable and straightforward. Instead, Moore noted that even within the West there had been at least three different paths to the modern world—the democratic, the fascist and the communist—each of which presented a “solution” to the problem of the transition to modernity.

These parts of Moore's analysis are fairly well-known and remain influential. Indeed, much contemporary political science theorizing about political development continues to incorporate them, e.g. analysts who focus on large landowners, immobile resources (like land), the importance of socio-economic inequality, or the relevance of class coalitions, all work in the shadow of *Social Origins*. And yet, despite this, I think we have lost a full appreciation for the power and insights of *Social Origins*. In particular, one aspect of *Social Origins* that seems to me to have been largely lost is Moore's insistence that the political, social, and economic realms are fundamentally and inexorably linked. In Moore's view, any attempt to understand political outcomes by looking at factors from any one of these realms is to deeply misunderstand the nature and process of political development. We all know that Moore would have had little patience with social scientists that focus on short-term or narrow factors like political leaders, elections or electoral systems, political arrangements, political parties, or even political transitions since for Moore, such things were ephemeral or epiphenomenal. But Moore would

probably have been frustrated as well with those who focus exclusively on any one factor inherent in his analysis (e.g. inequality, or the role and power and any one particular socioeconomic group or class alliance) since according to *Social Origins* “modernization” must be understood as a social, economic and political process. From this perspective, different political regimes must be seen as the outcome or product of different underlying social *and* economic realities, broadly defined. Or to put this insight another way: political regimes “match” or “fit” underlying socioeconomic realities; when they don't, they are doomed to fail. This is why, for example, Moore never even mentions the Weimar Republic (much less Hitler) in his analysis of National Socialism—because it was destined to collapse. Why? Because the underlying socio-economic reality in Germany in 1918 was not suitable for democracy.³

This incredibly broad, holistic perspective on political development is one that political science has largely lost today. And it is one absent from American political discourse more generally. If you buy Moore's perspective, you would not expect democracy to work (or work very well) in places where profoundly traditional or pre-modern socio-economic structures and relationships remain. Moore would, I believe, find foolish the idea that you could layer a democratic political system on to an underlying traditional or pre-modern socio-economic reality.

Social Origins thus pointed in a profoundly pessimistic direction, after the optimism of modernization theory.⁴ Not only because it leads to much lower expectations for

3. It should be noted that for Moore “failure” does not necessarily equal “collapse,” it might also just mean functioning in a profoundly suboptimal way. This seems to me the underlying message of his Indian case, i.e. democracy exists in India but the underlying socioeconomic reality of Indian society means that its political system has not functioned or had the effects which we may have hoped or expected. (One wonders what Moore would think of India today.)

4. Of course, Moore made this point along with Samuel Huntington in *Political Order in Changing Societies* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1968). Although they differed in their analyses of why this was the case, both agreed that modernization was itself an extremely difficult and often violent process.

democracy in the developing world, but also because of its insistence that the transition from “pre-modern” to “modern” is always a difficult and violent one. It doesn't matter whether you take a gradual, legal route like that of England, or a fascist path like Germany or Japan, or a communist path like China or the Soviet Union. Modernization involves eradicating traditional social and economic classes, relationships, and structures and this cannot be done without pain and suffering.⁵

In conclusion, then, although we still continue to work with many of Moore's insights embedded into our analyses of political development, others have been lost. In particular, Moore leads us to question the prospects for democracy in parts of the world where pre-modern social and economic structures remain. Can we ever truly understand the functioning and fate of any type of political regime without paying careful attention to underlying social and economic realities? *Social Origins* also raises critical questions about violence. For example, when, if ever, does violence play a positive role in history? That is to say, when does violence work to get rid of the hindrances to democracy and when is it just destructive? *Social Origins* also posits important questions about critical junctures: why, occasionally, do countries change “paths”? And, is it possible to achieve such “course switching” without massive violence? These are admittedly big questions but as *Social Origins* teaches us, they are ones we need to grapple with if we want to gain fuller understandings of political development today.

Sheri Berman is professor of political science at Barnard College.

5. Michael Bernhard and Jeffrey Kopstein make a similar point in their paper and it may indeed have been Moore's background as a Sovietologist that made him sensitive to this point.

SNYDER, CONTINUED

(continued from page 3)

Why are we still discussing Barrington Moore more than 45 years after the publication of *Social Origins*, his *magnum opus*? Frankly, if you take that one book, *Social Origins*, away from Moore, this symposium would not exist, because Moore would surely have faced the usual fate of scholars and scholarship, which is to be forgotten. Yet we remember Moore because of his *Social Origins*, even though it is a flawed book in many ways. Its core hypotheses, for example that democracy depends on a strong bourgeoisie and that an anti-peasant coalition of labor-repressive landed elites with a weak bourgeoisie, exemplified by the “marriage of iron and rye” in 19th century Germany, leads to authoritarianism, do not hold up very well beyond Moore’s own cases.⁵ Moreover, subsequent research has marshaled new data on the countries covered in *Social Origins* that show Moore’s claims to be empirically shaky even for his selected cases. In addition to these problems of external and internal validity, the book is methodologically unreflective and even primitive by today’s standards. Indeed, in their recent assessment of the evolution of the field of comparative European politics, Giovanni Capoccia and Daniel Ziblatt classify Moore as part of the old, “second generation,” of comparative historical analysis, characterized by macroscopic, class analytic theoretical frameworks and the neglect of transnational factors, such as international diffusion and flows.⁶ According to Capoccia and Ziblatt, the work of Moore and of other second-generation scholars has been supplanted

5. James Mahoney, “Knowledge Accumulation in Comparative Historical Research: The Case of Democracy and Authoritarianism,” in James Mahoney and Dietrich Rueschemeyer, eds., *Comparative Historical Analysis in the Social Sciences* (New York: Cambridge University Press, 2003).

6. Giovanni Capoccia and Daniel Ziblatt, “The Historical Turn in Democratization Studies: A New Research Agenda for Europe and Beyond,” *Comparative Political Studies* 43 (August/September 2010): 931–68.

by a new, third generation, which turned out far more attuned to how non-class factors, such as religious conflict, ethnic cleavages, political parties and the international diffusion of ideas, shaped democratization in Europe and beyond.

Despite its shortcomings, *Social Origins* is still a classic. Yet, should social sciences have classics? According to Max Weber, himself a prodigious producer of classics, “In science, each of us knows that what he has accomplished will be antiquated in ten, twenty, fifty, years. That is the fate to which science is subjected... Every scientific ‘fulfillment’ raises new ‘questions’; it asks to be ‘surpassed’ and outdated.”⁷ The philosopher of science, Thomas Kuhn, makes Weber’s point more succinctly: “Science destroys its past.”⁸ The physiologist Claude Bernard provides an apt organic metaphor to convey a related idea, asking “What use can we find in exhuming worm-eaten theories or observations made without proper means of investigation?” And A. N. Whitehead offers the dictum, “A science which hesitates to forget its founders is lost.”⁹ As this symposium itself affirms, the field of comparative politics has hesitated to forget Barrington Moore. Is comparative politics therefore lost?¹⁰

I think not. Classics, even flawed ones like *Social Origins*, can give good value. Of course, they can be abused. Scholasticism is one form of abuse, and many students will

7. Max Weber, “Science as a Vocation,” in H. Gerth and C. Wright Mills, eds., *From Max Weber: Essays in Sociology* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1946), 138.

8. As quoted in John S. Dryzek and Stephen T. Leonard, “History and Discipline in Political Science,” *The American Political Science Review* 82 (December 1988): 1245–60.

9. The Bernard and Whitehead quotations are from Merton, “The Uses and Abuses of Classical Theory,” 28 and 33.

10. There are, of course, important prior questions: Is comparative politics a science? And, if so, what kind of science is it?

say that assigning all 500 pages of *Social Origins* is abusive, too. Still, *Social Origins* provides a powerful and compelling model of intellectual excellence. Scholars and students alike need such models to help them define standards toward which to strive. Moreover, as John Stephens shows in his contribution to this symposium, Moore’s Marxist-inspired class-analytic theoretical framework spurred a productive research program on democracy. And Sheri Berman highlights how Moore offers a valuable model of the fruitfulness of integrated social science which comfortably straddles politics, culture, society, and economy, rather than segregating them in disciplinary silos. Despite its many weaknesses, *Social Origins* is a remarkable and enduring achievement, most notably in terms of its theoretical ambition and empirical scope, but also with regard to its use of irony. Moore was attuned to ironies in history, and an eye for irony is important because it alerts us to unintended consequences.

Concerning the book’s impressive scope, spanning eight countries across Europe and Asia and covering centuries of history, Moore had initially planned to cover a far broader range of cases. According to Moore, “I actually started *Social Origins* with a much more ambitious plan, an overly ambitious plan. I was going to study a wider range of countries, not just ones with an agrarian class structure, but also ones with an industrial social structure, and maybe even a couple of others.”¹¹ The fact that *Social Origins* was a scaled down version of a maniacally overstretched plan, and not an expansion of a smaller, more measured one, provides insight not just into Moore’s ways of working. It also sheds light on the temperament that can drive scholars to tackle huge questions like explaining the different routes countries take to modernity.

11. Gerardo L. Munck and Richard Snyder, *Passion, Craft and Method in Comparative Politics* (Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 2007), 97.

Snyder

Another productive use of Moore stems from the nature of his career trajectory, which was characterized by productivity and innovation sustained across more than six decades. Specifically, and for this reason I am especially fond of Moore, he offers hope for the middle-aged scholar. He published his best known work, *Social Origins*, at the age of 53, having started working on it ten years earlier. During the first two decades of his career, Moore's work evolved through three distinct stages. Although *Social Origins* is a cross-regional comparative historical analysis, Moore had previously focused on a single country, Russia, publishing two books on Soviet politics. And prior to that, he did quantitative cross-national work. In fact, his dissertation even had a world scatter plot, and his first article was published, tellingly, in the journal *Sociometry*.¹² It bears emphasis that Moore's dissertation was barely approved by his committee and provided, as Moore puts it, a "very rocky start" to his career. I often share this story about Moore's inauspicious start with graduate students when they are feeling down about their work. So, Moore provides hope both for young and middle-aged scholars.

Moore and the Role of Area Studies in the Era of Globalization

Although Moore is best known for his broadly comparative research, he was, as Michael Bernhard and Jeffrey Kopstein remind us in their contribution, also an area specialist on Russia. His first two books were on Russia, and he worked at Harvard's Russian Research Center during much of his career. Indeed, based on Moore's prior trajectory of research focused on Russia, one would have hardly predicted he would ever produce a cross-regional comparative book like *Social Origins*. When I asked Moore about the surprising evolution of his research from a single-country to a broadly comparative focus, he replied:

"I couldn't stand the idea of being a Russia specialist, especially after looking at some of the people who were becoming Russia specialists. Many were very narrow and simultaneously conceited. I didn't like them and didn't think much of them. I find that country specialists are often pretty unbearable."¹³

Although Moore was dismissive of the pretentious parochialism to which area studies are susceptible, I am confident he would concur that we do need to know something about something. That is, we need depth. A careful reading of the copious footnotes in *Social Origin* underscores the impressive historical depth of Moore's research. His second big book, *Injustice*, is mostly an in-depth historical case study of class relations and workers' attitudes in one country, Germany.¹⁴ Deep contextual knowledge of the history, culture, and language of places is, of course, the strong suit of area studies.

Yet depth alone was not sufficient for Moore: depth without breadth led to pretentious parochialism. Indeed, a hallmark of Moore's work is its ability to comfortably combine depth with breadth. We can draw inspiration for rethinking area studies for the contemporary era of globalization from Moore's depth without parochialism and breadth without false universalism. The parochialism, conceited or not, often associated with traditional area studies is passé in our increasingly interconnected globe. Still, despite exaggerated claims that we now live in a "flat" homogenous world, profound cultural, socioeconomic, and political differences persist and emerge anew across and within regions. Grasping these differences and their implications for human wellbeing, in turn, requires the rooted contextual

knowledge produced by area studies. Globalization thus creates a dual demand for knowledge that, like Moore's work, is both broad and deep, alert to cross-regional patterns and commonalities, yet also carefully attuned to contextual specificities.

I suspect Moore would endorse the proposition that understanding today's pressing human problems, from climate change, to economic inequality and exclusion, to urban violence, requires area studies with a comparative and global vision. He would therefore support what we might call "globalized area studies." Still, given his ornery tendencies, Moore may instead have reacted negatively to my brief for globalized area studies, writing acerbically in the margins, "product differentiation." But worrying about whether Moore would approve is surely an abuse of Moore. So, let's not worry about it.

Richard Snyder is professor of political science at Brown University.

12. Barrington Moore, Jr., "Social Stratification: A Study in Cultural Sociology." Ph.D. dissertation, Yale University, 1941

13. Gerardo L. Munck and Richard Snyder, *Passion, Craft and Method in Comparative Politics* (Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 2007), 96.

14. Barrington Moore, Jr., *Injustice: The Social Bases of Obedience and Revolt* (White Plains, NY: M.E. Sharpe, 1978).

SECTION NEWS

Call for Nominations: Section Awards at APSA Annual Meeting:

The Comparative Democratization Section will present five awards for scholarly work at the 2013 APSA annual meeting in Chicago: the Linz Prize for Best Dissertation, and Best Book, Best Article, Best Field Work, and Best Paper prizes. Members are strongly encouraged to submit nominations (including for several awards self-nominations) to the appropriate committees listed below. Please also forward this information to colleagues and graduate students. We ask you to note the eligibility criteria, deadlines for submissions, and materials that must accompany nominations; direct any queries to the committee chairs.

1. Juan Linz Prize for Best Dissertation in the Comparative Study of Democracy:

Given for the best dissertation in the Comparative Study of Democracy completed and accepted in the two calendar years immediately prior to the APSA Annual Meeting where the award will be presented (2011 or 2012 for the 2013 Annual Meeting). The prize can be awarded to analyses of individual country cases as long as they are clearly cast in a comparative perspective. A hard copy of the dissertation, accompanied by a letter of support from a member of the dissertation committee should be sent to each member of the prize selection committee.

Deadline: March 15, 2013

Committee Chair:

Allen Hicken
Associate Professor of Political Science
University of Michigan
7642 Haven Hall
505 South State Street
Ann Arbor, MI 48109-1045
ahicken@umich.edu

Committee Members:

Daniel Gingerich
Assistant Professor of Politics
University of Virginia
S254 Gibson Hall
1540 Jefferson Park Ave

Charlottesville, VA 22904
dwg4c@virginia.edu

Nic Cheeseman

University Lecturer in African Politics,
Oxford University
African Studies Centre
13 Bevington Road, Oxford, OX2 6LH
United Kingdom
nicholas.cheeseman@politics.ox.ac.uk

2. Best Book Award

Given for the best book in the field of comparative democratization published in 2012 (authored, co-authored or edited). Copies of the nominated book should be sent to each committee member in time to arrive by March 15, 2013. Books received after this deadline cannot be considered.

Deadline: March 15, 2013

Committee Chair:

David Samuels
Distinguished McKnight University
Professor
Department of Political Science
267 19th Ave. South, 1414 SSB
University of Minnesota
Minneapolis, MN 55455
dsamuels@umn.edu

Committee Members:

Rachel Beatty Riedl
Assistant Professor
Department of Political Science
Northwestern University
208 Scott Hall
601 University Place
Evanston, IL 60208
r-riedl@northwestern.edu

James Melton

Lecturer in Comparative Politics
Department of Political Science
University College London
The Rubin Building
29/30 Tavistock Square
London, WC1H 9QU
UNITED KINGDOM
j.melton@ucl.ac.uk

3. Best Article

Single-authored or co-authored articles focusing directly on the subject of democratization and published in 2012 are eligible. Nominations and self-nominations are encouraged. Copies of the article should be sent by email to each of the committee members.

Deadline: March 15, 2013

Committee Chair:

Milan Svobik
Associate Professor
Department of Political Science
University of Illinois
420 David Kinley Hall MC-713
1407 W Gregory Drive
Urbana, IL 61801
msvobik@illinois.edu

Committee Members:

Svend-Erik Skaaning
Associate Professor
Aarhus University
Department of Political Science
Bartholins Allé 7
Building 1331, room 219
8000 Aarhus C
Denmark
skaaning@ps.au.dk

Leonardo R. Arriola

Assistant Professor
Department of Political Science
University of California, Berkeley
210 Barrows Hall
Berkeley, CA 94720-1950
larriola@berkeley.edu

4. Best Field Work:

This prize rewards dissertation students who conduct especially innovative and difficult fieldwork. Scholars who are currently writing their dissertations or who complete their dissertations in 2012 are eligible. Candidates must submit two chapters of their dissertation and a letter of nomination from the chair of their dissertation committee describing the field work. The material submitted must describe the field work in detail and should

provide one or two key insights from the evidence collected in the field. The chapters may be sent electronically or in hard copy directly to each committee member.

Deadline: March 15, 2013

Committee Chair:

Leonard Wantchekon
Professor of Politics
Princeton University
230 Corwin Hall
Princeton, NJ 08544-1012
lwantche@princeton.edu

Committee Members:

Oeindrila Dube
Assistant Professor of Politics and Economics
New York University
19 West 4th Street
New York, NY 10012-1119
odube@nyu.edu

Gwyneth McClendon
Postdoctoral Associate and Lecturer
Yale University
115 Prospect Street
Rosenkranz Hall, Rm 217
New Haven, CT 06520
gwyneth.mcclendon@yale.edu

5. Best Paper Award

Given to the best paper on comparative democratization presented at the previous year's APSA Convention. Papers must be nominated by panel chairs or discussants. Nominated papers must be sent by email to each committee member listed below.

Deadline: March 15, 2013

Committee Chair:

Zachary Elkins
Associate Professor of Government
University of Texas at Austin
BAT 4.120
Campus Mail Code: A1800
Austin, TX 78712
zelkins@austin.utexas.edu

Committee Members:

Daniel Ziblatt

Professor of Government
Harvard University
Center for European Studies
27 Kirkland St.
Cambridge, MA 02138
dziblatt@gov.harvard.edu

Joseph Wright
Jeffrey L. Hyde and Sharon D. Hyde Early
Career Professor in Political Science
Pennsylvania State University
233 Pond Lab
University Park, PA 16802
jgw12@psu.edu

Call for Papers: Electoral Authoritarianism and Democratization in Africa

The Zeitschrift für Vergleichende Politikwissenschaft /Comparative Governance and Politics has issued a call for papers for a special issue on "Electoral Authoritarianism and Democratization in Africa." The editors welcome comparative analyses as well as theory-driven case studies on the topic of electoral authoritarianism and democratization in Africa. Potential contributions might focus on any of the following themes: the political economy of electoral authoritarianism; the role of the military in Africa after the third wave of democratization; civil society as regime supporting or regime challenging; the push and pull of "linkage and leverage"; the two-level game of electoral and regime politics; the democratizing power of elections; electoral authoritarianism and the Arab Spring in Northern Africa; the interplay of informal and formal institutions; defective democracies; the distinction between competitive and hegemonic authoritarianism. Scholars interested in participating in the workshop in Hamburg and in contributing to the special issue should contact by the end of February 2013: Matthijs Bogaards (m.bogaards@jacobs-university.de); Sebastian Elischer (elischer@leuphana.de) and the German Institute of Global and Area Studies (elischer@giga-hamburg.de).

Free Access to the January 2013 Comparative Politics:

The editors of Comparative Politics have graciously offered free online access to the January 2013 issue of their journal to all CompDem members. You will find directions to access the issue below. To access the journal, please visit www.ingentaconnect.com/content/cuny/cp and enter the username and password: comp2013/access2013. Please note this offer expires on March 31, 2013.

Research Position Available at the University of Gothenburg's Varieties of Democracy Program:

The University of Gothenburg in Sweden is accepting applications for a research position in the Varieties of Democracy (V-Dem) program. More information about the position, application instructions, and candidate qualifications can be obtained by visited. www.gu.se/english/about_the_university/announcements-in-the-job-application-portal/?languageId=0&disableRedirect=true&id=19144&Dnr=524504&Type=E. Please note the application deadline is February 18, 2013.

AmericasBarometer Datasets Now Available Online for Free Download:

On December 1, 2012, the Latin American Opinion Project (LAPOP) released the AmericasBarometer 2012 survey data. The data, collected in the most countries using smart phone technology, includes 41,632 interviews conducted in 26 countries in the Americas. Thanks to generous support from supporters such as USAID, the Tinker Foundation, and Vanderbilt University, on Dec. 1 LAPOP also announced free access to all AmericasBarometer datasets, from 2004 to 2012, on its website: <http://www.vanderbilt.edu/lapop/free-access.php>. Subscribers continue to receive premium services, including extensive merged datasets and technical support. In early 2013, the Insights series, which provides an analysis of key data gathered by the AmericasBarometer, resumed; anyone can sign up to receive these pithy reports by sending an email to insight@lapop.org

Section News

mail.americasbarometer.org.

NEWS FROM MEMBERS:

Claire Adida, assistant professor of political science, University of California, San Diego, was given an award for writing the best article in African Politics for 2011 for her October 2011 *Comparative Political Studies* piece entitled “Too Close for Comfort? Immigrant Exclusion in Africa.” The award was bestowed by the African Politics Conference Group.

Leonardo R. Arriola, assistant professor of political science, University of California, Berkeley, published *Multiethnic Coalitions in Africa: Business Financing of Opposition Election Campaigns* (Cambridge University Press, 2012). Combining cross-national statistical analyses of African countries with case studies of Kenya and Cameroon, the book shows that opposition politicians are unlikely to form cross-ethnic electoral alliances where incumbents can use their influence over finance to control business—the main funder of opposition in poor countries.

Mr. Arriola also published “Protesting and Policing in a Multiethnic Authoritarian State: Evidence from Ethiopia”

Michael Bratton, University Distinguished Professor of Political Science, Michigan State University, recently edited *Voting and Democratic Citizenship in Africa* (Lynne Rienner, 2013), which uses a decade of research from the Afrobarometer project to explore voting behavior, mass attitudes toward elections, and other aspects of popular participation in new democracies. Section members **Pippa Norris**, McGuire Lecturer in Comparative Politics at the John F. Kennedy School of Government, Harvard University, **Carolyn Logan**, assistant professor of political science, Michigan State University, and **Devra Moehler**, assistant professor of communication, University of Pennsylvania, also contributed chapters to the volume.

Michael Buehler, assistant professor of political science, Northern Illinois University, has published “Revisiting the Inclusion-

Moderation Thesis in the Context of Decentralized Institutions: The Behavior of Indonesia’s Prosperous Justice Party in National and Local Politics” in an upcoming issue of *Party Politics*. Based on primary sources and in-depth interviews with party members in Indonesia, the article argues that socio-structural factors shape the internal power dynamics of Islamist parties and affect their long-term capacity to adopt more moderate behavior.

Maxwell A. Cameron, professor of political science and director of the Centre for the Study of Democratic Institutions, University of British Columbia, edited *New Institutions for Participatory Democracy in Latin America: Voice and Consequence* (Palgrave-Macmillan, 2012) with Eric Hershberg and Kenneth Sharpe. The book, also available in Spanish as *Nuevas Instituciones de Democracia Participativa en América Latina: La voz y sus consecuencias* (Facultad Latinoamericana de Ciencias Sociales, 2012), contains essays drawing on fieldwork to examine how increased direct participation in Latin America’s democracies has changed and potentially consolidated representative institutions.

Javier Corrales, professor of political science, Amherst College, published “Chavismo after Chávez” in the January 2013 *Foreign Affairs Online* and “How Chávez Does Business” in the October 2012 *Foreign Affairs Online*, and has one forthcoming article, “Venezuela’s Succession Crisis.” in the February 2013 *Current History*. He also has a forthcoming book with Carlos A. Romero, *U.S.-Venezuela Relations since the 2000s: Coping with Middlelevel Security Threats* (Routledge, 2013). His articles examine Chavez’s various strategies for maintaining support for his political system among the population and the private sector, as well as the succession crisis his illness has created. His upcoming book will update his previous work on actors and forces influencing the US-Venezuela bilateral relationship.

Aurel Croissant, professor of political science, Heidelberg University (Germany),

David Kuehn, Philip Lorenz, and Paul W. Chambers published *Struggling for Civilian Control in Democratizing Asia* (Palgrave MacMillan, 2013). Based on a new conceptual and theoretical framework, the authors trace the development of civil-military relations and democracy in seven newly democratized countries of East, Southeast, and South Asia.

Kim Yi Dionne, assistant professor of political science, Texas A&M University, published “Constitutional Provisions and Executive Succession: Malawi’s 2012 Transition in Comparative Perspective” with Boniface Dulani in the January 2013 *African Affairs*. The authors analyze data on executive power transfers since 1961 to ascertain which factors result in constitutional transfers of power. They then apply their model to the death of Malawian President Mutharika and the constitutional transfer of power that followed, despite extra-constitutional plots seeking to supplant then Vice President Banda.

Todd Eisenstadt, professor of government, American University, edited *Latin America’s Multicultural Movements and the Struggle between Communitarianism, Autonomy, and Human Rights* (Oxford University Press, 2013) with Michael S. Danielson, Moisés Jaime Bailón Corres, and Carlos Sorroza. The book offers a selection of empirically-based chapters examining debates over multicultural rights in Latin America, authored by respected scholars of Latin American politics.

John P. Entelis, professor of political science, has been elected chair of the political science department at Fordham University. In 2012, he was awarded Fordham University’s Social Science Undergraduate Teaching Award. At the Fez Forum on Sustainable Development in Morocco, which was held December 6–11, 2012, he presented a paper on “Crafting Democracy: Political Learning as a Precondition for Sustainable Development in the Maghreb (Algeria, Morocco, Tunisia).”

M. Steven Fish, professor of government, University of California at Berkeley; **Kenneth**

Section News

M. Roberts, senior associate dean of arts and sciences, Cornell University; **Thomas Pepinsky**, assistant professor of government, Cornell University; **Dan Slater**, associate professor of political science, University of Chicago; and **Steven Levitsky**, professor of government, Harvard University started a new organization, BanGuns, to advocate for stricter gun control legislation in the U.S. Their website is available at www.bangunsusa.org and a petition to members of the U.S. government is available at www.tiny.cc/banguns.

Edward L. Gibson, professor of political science, Northwestern University, published *Boundary Control: Subnational Authoritarianism in Federal Democracies* (Cambridge University Press, 2012). The book presents a theory of “boundary control” to explain the interplay between democratic federal governments and authoritarian provincial governments. Using case studies from the nineteenth century American South, modern Argentina, and present-day Mexico, the author shows how incumbents and opposition movements interact within democratic federal systems existing alongside authoritarian subnational governments.

Sheena Chestnut Greitens, PhD candidate, Harvard University will join the Harvard Academy for International and Area Studies in 2013–2014 as an Academy Scholar. In 2014, she will become an assistant professor of political science at the University of Missouri.

Mihaiela Ristei Gugiu recently joined the department of political science’s faculty at the Ohio State University as a lecturer. Ms. Gugiu, P. Cristian Gugiu, and Robert Baldus published “Utilizing Generalizability Theory to Investigate the Reliability of the Grades Assigned to Undergraduate Research Papers” in the *Journal of MultiDisciplinary Evaluation*. In addition to examining the reliability of grades assigned to written reports, the paper illustrates the use of Generalizability Theory, specifically the fully-crossed two-facet model, for computing interrater reliability

coefficients.

Henry E. Hale, associate professor of political science and international affairs, George Washington University, and Timothy J. Colton contributed a chapter entitled “Why Do Political Systems Become Party Systems? Addressing a Cross-National Puzzle through Subnational Survey Data” to *Russia’s Regions and Comparative Subnational Politics*, edited by William Reisinger (Routledge, 2013). Mr. Hale also published “Dinamika praviashchego rezhima v Rossii” [Regime Dynamics in Russia] in the July–October 2012 *Pro et Contra*.

John Harbeson, Professor Emeritus of political science, City College of New York, edited *Africa in World Politics: Reforming Political Order* (Westview, 2013) with Donald Rothchild. The volume includes essays by leading scholars of African politics examining challenges to state capacity in Africa, including new chapters on terrorism and the AIDS crisis.

Marc Morjé Howard, professor of government, Georgetown University, received his J.D. from Georgetown University Law Center and passed the New York Bar Exam. In addition to his ongoing research in the area of comparative democratization and authoritarianism, he recently received a Senior Faculty Research Fellowship from Georgetown in support of his new project that examines American prisons and punishment in comparative perspective.

In May, **Susan D. Hyde** was promoted to associate professor (with tenure) at Yale University.

Debra Javeline, associate professor of political science, University of Notre Dame, and Vanessa A. Baird published “Institutional Persuasion to Support Minority Rights in Russia” in the Winter 2013 *Demokratizatsiya*, in which the authors examine how public support for minority rights can be increased. Using data from two surveys of Russians,

they show that institutions have the potential to persuade about a quarter of otherwise intolerant Russians to move toward supporting rights and cite deference to authority among the intolerant as a characteristic significantly related to the potential to be persuaded to support rights.

Sung Chull Kim, Humanities Korea Professor of Peace and Unification Studies, Seoul National University, and N. Ganesan edited *State Violence in East Asia* (University of Kentucky Press, 2013), in which contributors to the volume analyze many of the most notorious cases of state sanctioned atrocities, including the Japanese army’s Okinawan killings in 1945, Indonesia’s anticommunist purge in 1965–1968, Thailand’s Red Drum incinerations in 1972–1975, Cambodia’s Khmer Rouge massacre in 1975–1978, Korea’s Kwangju crackdown in 1980, the Philippines’ Mendiola incident in 1987, Myanmar’s suppression of the democratic movement in 1988, and China’s Tiananmen incident.

Maria Koinova recently became an associate professor of politics and international studies, Warwick University in the United Kingdom. Her article, “Four Types of Diaspora Mobilization: Albanian Diaspora Activism for Kosovo Independence in the US and the UK” was published online in *Foreign Policy Analysis* in July 2012.

Harshan Kumarasingham, Alexander von Humboldt research fellow, University of Potsdam, published *A Political Legacy of the British Empire—Power and the Westminster System in Post-Colonial India and Sri Lanka*, (I. B. Tauris, 2013). The book analyzes and compares the cultural effects of the “Westminster” political model on post-colonial India and Sri Lanka during their first decade of independence.

Todd Landman, professor of government and director of the Institute for Democracy and Conflict Resolution, University of Essex, is working on a project in Ukraine that allies the State of Democracy framework

Section News

to Ukraine in an effort to initiate a reform process that is citizen-led. The framework has 90 search questions and has been applied in over 25 countries, including old and new democracies, and rich and poor countries. The project involves the Institute for Democracy and Conflict Resolution, the Westminster Foundation for Democracy, the International Institute for Democracy and Electoral Assistance in Stockholm, and Kings College London. The Ukrainian partner is the People First Foundation. More information about the project can be found at www.idcr.org.uk/projects/democracy-assessment-in-ukraine.

Adrienne LeBas, assistant professor of government, American University, was awarded the 2011 Best Book Prize by the African Politics Conference Group at the 2012 Annual Meeting of the African Studies Association in November for her book, *From Protest to Parties: Party-Building and Democratization in Africa* (Oxford University Press), which will be released in paperback this spring.

Staffan I. Lindberg, associate professor of political science, University of Gothenburg and University of Florida, received a grant from Riksbankens Jubileumsfond for networking, capacity building, and conferences for the Varieties of Democracy (V-Dem) project at the University of Gothenburg. As a first activity, Mr. Lindberg and Project Coordinator Natalia Stepanova (University of Gothenburg) conducted a workshop in Bishkek, Krgyzstan on January 13–14, 2013, with the V-Dem Regional Manager for Central Asia, Professor Medet Tulegenov (American University in Central Asia), and a series of the V-Dem Country Coordinators for Central Asia. The next workshop will be held at University of Gothenburg for Regional Managers of Northern Europe and the Baltic Republics, on January 28–29, 2013, followed by workshops in to be held in Burkina Faso, Republic of Congo, Zambia, Hungary, Portugal, Kosovo, and Philippines during the Spring.

Mr. Lindberg received several other grants:

as co-PI (with Hennie Kotze, Bo Rothstein, and Sören Holmberg) for a project on “South African World Values Survey” funded by the Wallenberg Foundation for 2013–2014; as PI for a “Varieties of Democracy” project on data collection in 19 European countries in the form of a sub-grant from Skaaning, SE et al. at Aarhus University for 2013; and as PI for a “Varieties of Democracy” project to conduct research, data collection, and postdoc fellowships funded by the Swedish Research Council for 2013–2016.

As of January 1, 2013, **Levi Marsteintredet** is an associate professor of Latin American area studies, University of Oslo. He recently published “Explaining Variation of Executive Instability in Presidential Regimes: Presidential Interruptions in Latin America” in the *International Political Science Review*, in which he analyzes 14 presidential interruptions in Latin America between 1980 and 2010 and explains that contrary to the prevailing belief that all interruptions are equal in terms of antecedents and aftermath, the cases of interruption are, in fact, heterogeneous on these issues due to two variables: the opposition’s primary motivation for challenging the president and the degree of undemocratic behavior demonstrated by the president and opposition during the crisis.

Erik Martinez Kuhonta, associate professor of political science, McGill University, and Aim Sinpeng published “From the Street to the Ballot Box: The July 2011 Elections and the Rise of Social Movements in Thailand” in the December 2012 *Contemporary Southeast Asia*. Using fieldwork gathered from observation of Thailand’s July 2011 election, the authors analyze that election and the central role played by social groups, including the Red Shirt and Yellow Shirt movements.

Fabrice Lehoucq, is a visiting fellow at the Kellogg Institute, University of Notre Dame, where he is working on a book on the development of regime trajectories in twentieth century Latin America. He recently published *The Politics of Modern Central*

America: Civil War, Democratization, and Underdevelopment (Cambridge University Press, 2012). The book analyzes the origins and consequences of civil war in Central America. Mr. Lehoucq argues that the inability of autocracies to reform themselves led to protest and rebellion throughout the twentieth century and that civil war triggered unexpected transitions to non-military rule by the 1990s.

Jennifer McCoy, professor of political science, Georgia State University, published *International Mediation in Venezuela* with Francisco Diez (US Institute Peace, 2011), available in Spanish as *Mediación Internacional en Venezuela* (Buenos Aires: Editorial Gedisa, 2012). The book analyzes the Venezuelan political conflict during the period from 2002 to 2004 and the international role in trying to resolve it, as well as the evolution of the political regime between 2004 and 2012.

Ellen Mickiewicz, James R. Shepley Professor of Public Policy and Professor of Political Science, Duke University, published (in Russian) *Television, Power and Society—Kazakhstan* (Aspect Press, 2013), in which she examines the way the Russian public makes sense of television news by using focus groups in four Russian cities. Rather than studying fleeting preferences for particular shows or personalities, Ms. Mickiewicz looks at what cognitive instruments are used to make sense of televised news.

Jennifer Murtazashvili, assistant professor of public and international affairs, University of Pittsburgh, was the primary investigator and principal author of “Survey on Political Institutions, Elections, and Democracy in Afghanistan,” a November 2012 report published by Democracy International with support from the U.S. Agency for International Development. The report represents one of the most comprehensive studies of democracy, elections, and governance in Afghanistan and consists of a nationally-representative sample

Section News

of public opinion, interviews, and focus group discussions, as well as several survey experiments.

Olena Nikolayenko, assistant professor of political science, Fordham University, contributed the chapter “Tactical Interactions between Youth Movements and Incumbent Governments in Post-Communist States” to *Research in Social Movements, Conflicts, and Change*, edited by Lester Kurtz and Sharon Erickson Nepstad and published by the Emerald Group in 2012. In the chapter, Ms. Nikolayenko examines how movement strategies and state countermoves affected the level of youth mobilization in Azerbaijan, Belarus, Georgia, Serbia, and Ukraine during recent nonviolent youth movements.

Anastassia Obydenkova, Ramon y Cajal Researcher, Pompeu Fabra University of Barcelona, published “The Impact of External Factors on Regime Transition: Lessons Learned from the Russian Regions” in the July–September 2012 *Post-Soviet Affairs*, in which the author aims to untangle the international dimensions of regime transition by singling out foreign trade and the role of external anti-democratic factors. Ms. Obydenkova also published “Democratization at the Grassroots: The European Union’s External Impact” in the April 2012 *Democratization*, in which she examines the role of the European Union in the formation of different outcomes of sub-national regime transitions in Russia. Finally, Ms. Obydenkova published a review essay entitled “Comparative Democratization: National-International Nexus of Analysis in Post-Communist Regime Transition” in the August 2012 *Europe-Asia Studies*.

Subhasish Ray was appointed an assistant professor of political science at the National University of Singapore in the Fall of 2012. He previously served as a visiting assistant professor of political science at the University of Rochester.

In June 2013, **Marie-Eve Reny**, currently a postdoctoral research fellow in the department

of political science at the University of Chicago, will become an assistant professor of comparative politics at the University of Montreal.

Rachel Beatty Riedl, assistant professor of political science, Northwestern University, and postdoctoral fellow, Yale Program on Democracy, recently published “Political Parties and Uncertainty in Developing Democracies” in the August 2012 *Comparative Political Studies* with Noam Lupu. The article is a theoretical introduction to a special edition on political parties in the developing world. Ms. Riedl also recently published “Transforming Politics, Dynamic Religion: Religion’s Political Impact in Contemporary Africa” in the October 2012 *African Conflict and Peacebuilding Review*, in which she argues that increasing political liberalization, internal fragmentation, and increasing associational pluralism have caused religious organizations to seek new methods of competing in the political arena.

Sebastian Royo has been promoted to Vice-Provost of Student Success at Suffolk University. He recently published “How Did the Spanish Financial System Survive the First Stage of the Global Crisis?” in *Governance*, in which he analyzes the impact of the global crisis on the Spanish financial system between 2008 and 2010 and shows that, overall, the performance of the largest Spanish financial institutions was positive.

Carsten Q. Schneider, associate professor and director of the Center for the Study of Imperfections in Democracies, Central European University, published *Set-Theoretic Methods for the Social Sciences* (Cambridge University Press, October 2012) with Claudius Wagemann. The book presents basic and advanced issues in (comparative) social research based on the notions of sets and aiming at unraveling set relations. Qualitative Comparative Analysis (QCA) is discussed in detail and standards of good set-theoretic research spelled out. An online appendix provides practical exercises, including the use of software packages such as R and Stata.

Schneider also published “Comparative Politics in Central and Eastern Europe: Mapping Publications over the Past Twenty Years” in the advance online publication of the June 2012 *European Political Science* with Daniel Bochsler and Mihail Chiru. Using original data on articles from the most relevant journals in eleven Central and Eastern European countries, they find, among other things, that comparative politics is marginal in the discipline of political science, that the use of off-the-shelf data predominates, that most articles employ qualitative methods loosely defined, and that international co-authorship remains an exception.

Svend-Erik Skaaning, associate professor of political science, Aarhus University (Denmark), has been awarded research funding from the Danish Council for Independent Research to carry out a project on democratic deepening and regression. Moreover, together with Jørgen Møller, Mr. Skaaning received the Frank Cass Prize for the best article published in *Democratization* in 2011 for “Stateness First?”

Skaaning and Møller also recently published *Democracy and Democratization in Comparative Perspective: Conceptions, Conjectures, Causes, and Consequences* (Routledge, 2012), in which the authors present and discuss prevalent understandings of democracy from ancient Greece to the present, the spread of modern democracy, four clusters of explanations (modernization, social forces, transitology, and international factors), and the influence of democracy on conflict, economic development and redistribution. Finally, Møller and Skaaning published “Regime Types and Democracy Sequencing” in the January 2013 *Journal of Democracy*.

Sherrill Stroschein, senior lecturer in politics, University College London, published *Ethnic Struggle, Coexistence, and Democratization in Eastern Europe* (Cambridge University Press, July 2012), in which he claims that multi-ethnic societies were able to democratize successfully and effectively despite their fragmented nature because a system of

Section News

“sustained protest” led to minority concessions not otherwise possible. Stroschein maintains that this system created a deliberative process which moderated the demands of various ethnic groups.

Natasha Borges Sugiyama, assistant professor of political science, University of Wisconsin-Milwaukee, published *Diffusion of Good Government: Social Sector Reforms in Brazil* (University of Notre Dame Press, December 2012). The book examines how innovative social sector reforms spread throughout Brazil after the 1980s, concluding that ideology and professional norms played a much more significant role than electoral incentives.

Hiroki Takeuchi, assistant professor of political science, Southern Methodist University, published “Political Economy of China’s Trade Protection in the 1990s” in the January 2013 *International Relations of the Asia-Pacific*. He has several forthcoming articles, including “Representation and Local People’s Congresses in China: A Case Study of the Yangzhou Municipal People’s Congress,” co-authored with Tomoki Kamo in the Spring 2013 *Journal of Chinese Political Science*, “Economic Assistance, Central-Local Relations, and Ethnic Regions in China’s Authoritarian Regime,” co-authored with Stan Wok-Hui Wong in the March 2013 *Japanese Journal of Political Science*, and “Vote-Buying, Village Elections, and Authoritarian Rule in Rural China: A Game-Theoretic Analysis,” forthcoming in the January-April 2013 *Journal of East Asian Studies*. He also contributed an article, “Sino-Japanese Relations: A Japanese Perspective,” to the collection *Sino-Japanese Relations: Rivals or Partners in Regional Cooperation?* (World Scientific Publishing Company, 2012), edited by Niklas Swanstrom and Ryosei Kokubun. His recent articles focus on Chinese Political Economy, especially at a local level. The edited volume to which he has contributed includes essays describing the Chinese and Japanese perspectives on their bilateral relationship and the prospects for increased cooperation.

Gunes Murat Tezcur, associate professor of political science, Loyola University Chicago, contributed a chapter entitled “Democratic Struggles and Authoritarian Responses in Iran in Comparative Perspective” to *Middle East Authoritarianisms*, edited by Steven Heydemann and Reinoud Leenders (Stanford University Press, 2013). The chapter analyzes the reasons for the failure of the reformist movement in Iran. It moves beyond structural arguments to suggest that the ruling elite’s management of electoral uncertainty without opting for total repression was key to its resiliency.

Alexei Trochev, associate professor of political science, Nazarbayev University, published an article “Suing Russia at Home” in the September–October 2012 *Problems of Post-Communism*, in which he argues that despite Russia’s turn away from democracy and deep cynicism about the judiciary, Russians are increasingly suing the federal government and often winning. The regime tolerates this situation and pays out court-ordered monetary awards because it has opposing priorities: ensuring social harmony while rewarding bureaucratic loyalty. Mr. Trochev also edits the journal *Statutes and Decisions*, the latest issue of which analyzes the course of police reform in Russia.

Rachel Vanderhill, visiting assistant professor of international relations, Wheaton College, published *Promoting Authoritarianism Abroad* (Lynne Rienner Publishers, 2013). In this book, Ms. Vanderhill critically examines how states support authoritarianism abroad by influencing elite strategies and capabilities. She demonstrates that the effectiveness of external involvement and the eventual regime outcome, depend not only on the nature and extent of outside support—either liberal or illiberal—but also on the interaction between these external factors and the conditions in the recipient state. Through examining Russian, Venezuelan, and Iranian support for authoritarian regimes, the book presents

a comparative analysis that illuminates both successful and failed attempts to promote authoritarianism.

Michael Wahman, postdoctoral fellow, University of Texas at Austin, has been awarded a two-year postdoctoral grant from the Swedish Research Council for a project on African electoral corruption. The study will research sub- and cross-national variation in electoral corruption across Africa, asking where, how, and why elections are manipulated in competitive authoritarian regimes. The project will commence in the summer of 2013 at the University of Essex’s government department. Mr. Wahman also authored the article “Opposition Coalitions and Democratization by Election” in the January 2013 *Government and Opposition*.

Kurt Weyland, Lozano Long Professor of Latin American Politics, University of Texas at Austin, published “Diffusion Waves in European Democratization: The Impact of Organizational Development” in the October 2012 *Comparative Politics*, in which he examines how waves of political regime contention in Europe have slowed down through history even as they have achieved more success in triggering advances toward democracy. Mr. Weyland also published “The Arab Spring: Why the Surprising Similarities with the Revolutionary Wave of 1848?” in the December 2012 *Perspectives on Politics*.

Fiona Yap, associate professor of public policy, Australian National University, is one of the editors of the new journal, *Asia and the Pacific Policy Studies*, the flagship publication of the Crawford School of Public Policy at ANU. The journal aims to break down barriers across disciplines and generate policy impact.

NEW RESEARCH

Journal of Democracy

The January 2013 (Volume 24, no. 1) issue of the *Journal of Democracy* features a cluster of articles on “China at the Tipping Point?”, a debate on Arab democracy or Islamist revolution, as well as individual articles on Egypt, Georgia, corruption, Mexico, democratic sequencing, southeast Asia, and Papua New Guinea. The full text of selected articles and the tables of contents of all issues are available on the *Journal’s* website.

Debate

I. “Arab Democracy or Islamist Revolution?” by Hillel Fradkin
Although Olivier Roy and others argue that current circumstances will push ascendant Islamist parties in a democratic direction, Egypt’s Muslim Brotherhood remains committed to the revolutionary goals that have animated it since its beginnings.

II. “There Will Be No Islamist Revolution” by Olivier Roy
The Muslim Brotherhood is no longer a revolutionary movement, but rather a conservative one.

China at the Tipping Point?

As a result of deep changes that have been taking place in China, the resilience of the PRC’s authoritarian regime is approaching its limits. The state apparatus is still strong, but it must deal with an increasingly contentious, nimble, and resilient civil society.

I. “Foreseeing the Unforeseeable” by Andrew J. Nathan

II. “Authoritarianism and Contestation” by Zhenhua Su, Hui Zhao, and Jingkai He

III. “Top-Level Reform or Bottom-Up Revolution?” by Cheng Li

IV. “Goodbye to Gradualism” by Tiancheng Wang

V. “The Rising Cost of Stability” by Xi Chen

VI. “The Turn Against Legal Reform” by Carl Minzner

VII. “The Troubled Periphery” by Louisa Greve

VIII. “From ‘Fart People’ to Citizens” by Perry Link and Xiao Qiang

“Egypt: Why Liberalism Still Matters” by Michele Dunne and Tarek Radwan
Egypt’s liberals, though they do not dominate political life and perhaps never will, remain a crucial force in shaping the country’s politics.

“Controlling Corruption Through Collective Action” by Alina Mungiu-Pippidi
Political competition by itself does not curb corruption. Societies must also have a combination of values, social capital, civil society, and civic culture in order to impose effective normative constraints on corruption.

“A New Chance for Georgian Democracy” by Charles H. Fairbanks, Jr. and Alexi Gugushvili
In October 2012, Georgia’s government lost power in an election, and peacefully stepped aside. But can a country with Georgia’s troubled history capitalize on this surprising achievement?

“Mexico’s 2012 Elections: The Return of the PRI” by Gustavo Flores-Macías
In July voting, the PRI regained control of the presidency that it had held for seven decades prior to the year 2000. Is this a “new” PRI, or will it return to its old authoritarian ways?

“Regime Types and Democratic Sequencing” by Jørgen Møller and Svend-Erik Skaaning
How should we define the stages of democracy and their sequencing? Although some scholars argue that the rule of law should come first,

today it should be viewed as the final piece of the liberal-democratic puzzle.

“Southeast Asia: In the Shadow of China” by Benjamin Reilly
Given Southeast Asia’s relatively high level of socioeconomic development, we might expect it to be a showcase of democracy. Yet it is not. To grasp why, one must look to deeper factors of history and geography.

“Papua New Guinea: From Coup to Reconciliation” by R.J. May
A 2011 power struggle spawned a crisis that marred Papua New Guinea’s unbroken record of democratic rule. Has the country found its way back?

Democratization

The December 2012 (Vol. 19, no. 6) *Democratization* features articles on Central America and civil society, democratization and the illegalization of political parties in Europe, historical legacies in Tanzania, and Thailand’s middle class voters.

“Central America, Civil Society and the ‘Pink Tide’: Democratization or De-Democratization?” by Barry Cannon and Mo Hume

“Democratization and the Illegalization of Political Parties in Europe” by Angela K. Bourne

“Historical Legacies, Clientelism and the Capacity to Fight: Exploring Pathways to Regime Tenure in Tanzania” by Richard Whitehead

“Modernization, Ethnic Fractionalization, and Democracy” by Carsten Jensen and Svend-Erik Skaaning

“Why Did Thailand’s Middle Class Turn against a Democratically Elected Government? The Information-Gap Hypothesis” by Kai Jäger
The October 2012 (Vol. 19, no. 5)

Democratization is a special issue on Democracy, Democratization, and Climate Change.

“Democracy, Democratization and Climate Change: Complex Relationships” by Peter Burnell

“Democracy, National Responsibility and Climate Change Justice” by Ludvig Beckman

“Who Is Greener? Climate Action and Political Regimes: Trade-Offs for National and International Actors” by Marianne Kneuer

“Uncertainty and the Epistemic Dimension of Democratic Deliberation in Climate Change Adaptation” by Thomas C. Hilde

“Participatory Democracy Meets the Hard Rock of Energy Policy: South Africa’s National Integrated Resource Plan” by Richard Calland and Smita Nakhooa

“The Hidden Costs of Carbon Commodification: Emissions Trading, Political Legitimacy and Procedural Justice” by Edward A. Page

“Democratizing Climate Finance Governance and the Public Funding of Climate Action” by Liane Schalatek

“Addressing Climate Change and Promoting Democracy Abroad: Compatible Agendas?” by Christopher Hobson

SELECTED JOURNAL ARTICLES ON DEMOCRACY

This section features selected articles on democracy that appeared in journals received by the NED’s Democracy Resource Center, October 1–January 1, 2013.

American Political Science Review, Vol. 106, no. 4, November 2012

“Sources of Bias in Retrospective Decision Making: Experimental Evidence on Voters’ Limitations in Controlling Incumbents” by Gregory A. Huber, Seth J. Hill, and Gabriel S. Lenz

“Tying Your Enemy’s Hands in Close Races: The Politics of Federal Transfers in Brazil” by Fernanda Brolo and Tommaso Nannicini

“The Adverse Effects of Sunshine: A Field Experiment on Legislative Transparency in an Authoritarian Assembly” by Edmund Malesky, Paul Schuler, and Anh Tran

“Democracy’s Dignity” by Josiah Ober

“On the Demos and Its Kin: Nationalism, Democracy, and the Boundary Problem” by Arash Abizadeh

American Political Science Review, Vol. 106, no. 3, August 2012

“The Autocratic Legacy of Early Statehood” by Jacob Gerner Hariri

“Inequality and Regime Change: Democratic Transitions and the Stability of Democratic Rule” by Stephan Haggard and Robert R. Kaufman

“Putting Inequality in Its Place: Rural Consciousness and the Power of Perspective” by Katherine Cramer Walsh

“Gender Inequality in Deliberative Participation” by Christopher F. Karpowitz, Tali Mendelberg, and Lee Shaker

“Collective Action, Clientelism, and Connectivity” by Mahvish Shami

“Rule Creation in a Political Hierarchy” by Clifford J. Carrubba and Tom S. Clark

“Benchmarking across Borders: Electoral Accountability and the Necessity of

Comparison” by Mark Andreas Kayser and Michael Peress

Central Asian Survey, Vol. 31, no. 3, September 2012

“From Clan Narratives to Clan Politics” by Svetlana Jacquesson

“Beyond Resistance and Nationalism: Local History and the Case of Afaq Khoja” by Rian Thum

Communist and Post-Communist Studies, Vol. 45, nos. 3–4, September–December 2012

“Disintegration of the Soviet Union and Democracy Development. Twenty Years Later: Assessment. Quo vadis?” by the Editors

“Russia under Putin: Titanic Looking for its Iceberg?” by Lilia Shevtsova

“Introduction: Civil Society in Contemporary Russia” by Alfred B. Evans Jr.

“Russian Labor: Quiescence and Conflict” by Elena Vinogradova, Irina Kozina, and Linda Cook

“Protests and Civil Society in Russia: The Struggle for the Khimki Forest” by Alfred B. Evans Jr.

“Complaint-Making as Political Participation in Contemporary Russia” by Laura A. Henry

“Advocacy Beyond Litigation: Examining Russian NGO Efforts on Implementation of European Court of Human Rights Judgments” by Lisa McIntosh Sundstrom

“Subversive Institutions, Informal Governance, and Contemporary Russian Politics” by Vladimir Gel’man

“Russia’s Openness to the World: The

New Research

Unpredicted Consequences of the Country's Liberalization" by Vladimir Shlapentokh

"The Ukrainian Immobile State Two Decades after the Disintegration of the USSR" by Taras Kuzio

"The Sources of Continuity and Change of Ukraine's Incomplete State" by Serhiy Kudelia

"Twenty Years as an Independent State: Ukraine's Ten Logistical Inconsistencies" by Taras Kuzio

"Ukraine's 'Muddling Through': National Identity and Postcommunist Transition" by Mykola Riabchuk

***Comparative Political Studies*, Vol. 46, no. 1, January 2013**

"Religion and Coalition Politics" by Jóhanna Kristín Birnir and Nil S. Satana

"The Source of Turnout Decline: New Values or New Contexts?" by André Blais and Daniel Rubenson

***Comparative Political Studies*, Vol. 45, no. 12, December 2012**

"The Rise of Outsiders in Latin America, 1980–2010: An Institutionalist Perspective" by Miguel Carreras

"Welfare Policy Expansion in Botswana and Mauritius: Explaining the Causes of Different Welfare Regime Paths" by Marianne S. Ulriksen

"Religion in Politics: How Does Inequality Affect Public Secularization?" by Ekrem Karakoç and Birol Başkan

"The Myth of Consociationalism? Conflict Reduction in Divided Societies" by Joel Selway and Kharis Templeman

"Turnout Under Semipresidentialism:

First- and Second-Order Elections to National-Level Institutions" by Robert Elgie and Christine Fauvelle-Aymar

"Preferences in Context: Micro Preferences, Macro Contexts, and the Demand for Social Policy" by Jane Gingrich and Ben Ansell

***Comparative Political Studies*, Vol. 45, no. 11, November 2012**

"Does the Quality of Democracy Matter for Women's Rights? Just Debate and Democratic Transition in Chile and South Africa" by Denise M. Walsh

"Opposition Parties and the Urban Poor in African Democracies" by Danielle Resnick

"Interest Group Influence in Authoritarian States: The Political Determinants of Chinese Exchange Rate Policy" by David A. Steinberg and Victor C. Shih

***Current History*, Vol. 112, no. 750, January 2013**

"The Governance Gap" by Joshua Lustig and Alan Sorensen

"Why the World Should Worry About Europe's Disarray" by Jan Zielonka

"The Inequality Challenge" by Uri Dadush and Kemal Dervis

"The Mixed News on Poverty" by Anirudh Krishna

***East European Politics*, Vol. 28, no. 4, December 2012**

"Introduction: A New Look at Social Movements and Civil Society in Post-Communist Russia and Poland" by Kerstin Jacobsson and Steven Saxonberg

"Does the EU Help or Hinder Gay-Rights Movements in Post-Communist Europe? The Case of Poland" by Conor O'Dwyer
"Civil Society and the State Intertwined:

The Case of Disability NGOs in Russia" by Christian Fröhlich

"State-Sponsored Civic Associations in Russia: Systemic Integration or the 'War of Position?'" by Elena Chebankova

"International Administration and Institutional Autonomy in Bosnia and Herzegovina and Kosovo" by Niels van Willigen

"Parties, Regime and Cleavages: Explaining Party System Institutionalisation in East Central Europe" by Fernando Casal Bértoa

***Human Rights Quarterly*, Vol. 34, no. 4, November 2012**

"The Domestic Mechanisms of Compliance with International Human Rights Law: Case Studies from the Inter-American Human Rights System" by Courtney Hillebrecht

"Measuring National Human Rights: A Reflection on Korean Experiences" by Jeong-Woo Koo, Suk-Ki Kong, and Chinsung Chung

"Interrogating the 'Gap' Between Law and Justice: East Timor's Serious Crimes Process" by Lia Kent

***International Political Science Review*, Vol. 33, no. 5, November 2012**

"The Duration and Durability of Cabinet Ministers" by Jörn Fischer, Keith Dowding, and Patrick Dumont

"Ethnofederalism, Separatism, and Conflict: What Have We Learned from the Soviet and Yugoslav Experiences?" by Arman Grigoryan

"The Rhetoric and Reality: Radicalization and Political Discourse" by Jonathan Githens-Mazer

***Journal of Modern African Studies*, Vol. 50, no. 5, December 2012**

“Party Factions and Power Blocs in Ghana: A Case Study of Power Politics in the National Democratic Congress” by George M. Bob-Milliar

“Electrifying the Base? Aid and Incumbent Advantage in Ghana” by Ryan C. Briggs

“Museveni and the 2011 Ugandan Election: Did the Money Matter?” by Jeffrey Conroy-Krutz and Carolyn Logan

“Free Market Economy, ‘Developmental State’ and Party-State Hegemony in Ethiopia: The Case of the ‘Model Farmers’” by René Lefort

***Middle East Journal*, Vol. 66, no 4, Autumn 2012**

“No EEZ Solution: The Politics of Oil and Gas in the Eastern Mediterranean” by James Stocker

“A ‘Saudi Spring?’: The Shi’a Protest Movement in the Eastern Province 2011–2012” by Toby Matthiesen

“Institutional and Ideological Re-construction of the Justice and Development Party (PJD): The Question of Democratic Islamism in Morocco” by Ashraf Nabih El Sherif

***Middle East Policy*, Vol. 19, no. 4, Winter 2012**

“Change Without Progress in the Middle East” by Chas W. Freeman Jr.

“The UAE, the ‘Arab Spring’ and Different Types of Dissent” by Ingo Forstenlechner, Emilie Rutledge and Rashed Salem Alnuaimi

“The Political Costs of Qatar’s Western Orientation” by Justin Gengler

“Economic Sanctions on Authoritarian States: Lessons Learned” by Katerina

Oskarsson

“How Turkey’s Islamists Fell out of Love With Iran” by H. Akin Ünver

“Hezbollah’s Survival: Resources and Relationships” by Ora Szekely

“Salafism in Tunisia: Challenges and Opportunities for Democratization” by Stefano M. Torelli, Fabio Merone, and Francesco Cavatorta

***Orbis*, Vol. 57, no. 1, Winter 2013**

“The EU, the Muslim Brotherhood and the Organization of Islamic Cooperation” by Leslie S. Lebl

“Is the New Middle East Stuck in Its Sectarian Past? The Unspoken Dimension of the ‘Arab Spring’” by Yoel Guzansky and Benedetta Berti

***Orbis*, Vol. 56, no. 4, Fall 2012**

“Tunisia’s Jasmine Revolution & the Arab Spring: Implications for International Intervention” by Peter J. Schraeder

***Pacific Affairs*, Vol. 85, no. 3, September 2012**

“The Mobile Phone in India and Nepal: Political Economy, Politics and Society” by Robin Jeffrey and Assa Doron

***Party Politics*, Vol. 19, no. 1, January 2013**

“Why Mobilize Support Online? The Paradox of Party Behaviour Online” by S. Cardenal Ana

“The Asymmetrical Structure of Left/Right Disagreement: Left-Wing Coherence and Right-Wing Fragmentation in Comparative Party Policy” by Christopher Cochrane

“Towards a Classification of the World’s Democratic Party Systems, Step 1: Identifying the Units” by Grigorii V. Golosov

***Party Politics*, Vol. 18, no. 6, November 2012**

“Defining and Measuring Niche Parties” by Markus Wagner

“Immigration, Left and Right” by Sonia Alonso and Sara Claro da Fonseca

“Ideological Misfits: A Distinctive Class of Party Members” by Emilie van Haute and R. Kenneth Carty

“Perceptions of Political Party Corruption and Voting Behaviour in Poland” by Kazimierz Slomczynski and Goldie Shabad

“Impact of Electoral Volatility and Party Replacement on Voter Turnout Levels” by Joseph W. Robbins and Lance Y. Hunter

***Political Science Quarterly*, Vol. 127, no. 3, Fall 2012**

“Making Migrant–Government Partnerships Work: Insights from the Logic of Collective Action” by Gustavo A. Flores-Macías

***Representation*, Vol. 48, no. 4, December 2012**

“Ballot Structure, District Magnitude and Constituency–Orientation of MPs in Proportional Representation and Majority Electoral Systems” by Jean-Benoit Pilet, André Freire, and Olivier Costa

“Change the Seats, Change the Participation? Parliamentary Redistricting and Constituency Turnout” by Charles Pattie, Ron Johnston, and David Rossiter

“Non-Electoral Political Representation: Expanding Discursive Domains” by Rousiley C. M. Maia

“Where Does the Mechanism Collapse? Understanding the 2008 Romanian Electoral System” by Sergiu Gherghina and George Jigla

New Research

"The 2011 Elections in Poland: Defining a New Cleavage" by Jacek K. Sokołowski

Washington Quarterly, Vol. 36, no. 1, Winter 2013

"The 2011 Protests: Were they about Democracy?" by Dawn Brancati

"Working with China to Promote Democracy" by Baogang He

"International Order and Global Swing States" by Richard Fontaine and Daniel M. Kliman

"Mobile Phones: Uplifting Weak and Failed States" Robert I. Rotberg and Jenny C. Aker

World Politics, Vol. 64, no. 4, October 2012

"The Origins of Positive Judicial Independence" by Lisa Hilbink

"Party Systems and Government Stability in Central and Eastern Europe" by Florian Grotz and Till Weber

"Sino-Capitalism: China's Reemergence and the International Political Economy" by Christopher A. McNally

SELECTED NEW BOOKS ON DEMOCRACY

ADVANCED DEMOCRACIES

Caesar in the USA. By Maria Wyke. University of California Press, 2012. 306 pp.

Fighting for the Speakership: The House and the Rise of Party Government. By Jeffrey A. Jenkins and Charles Steward III. Princeton University Press, 2013. 476 pp.

Making Civics Count: Citizenship Education for a New Generation. Edited by David E. Campbell, Meira Levinson, and Frederick M. Hess. Harvard Education

Press, 2012. 320 pp.

The Most Fundamental Right. Edited by Daniel McCool. Indiana University Press, 2012. 404 pp.

That's Not What They Meant! Reclaiming the Founding Fathers from America's Right Wing. By Michael Austin. Prometheus, 2012. 253 pp.

The Parties Respond: Changes in American Parties and Campaigns. Third Edition. Edited by Mark D. Brewer and L. Sandy Maisel. Westview, 2013. 369 pp.

The Politics of Voter Suppression: Defending and Expanding Americans' Right to Vote. By Tova Andrea Wang. Cornell University Press, 2012. 197 pp.

Politics, Society, Self. By Geoff Gallop. UWA Publishing, 2012. 325 pp.

A Presidential Nation: Causes, Consequences, and Cures. By Michael A. Genovese. Westview, 2013. 238 pp.

Was Hitler a Riddle? Western Democracies and Western Socialism. By Abraham Ascher. Stanford University Press, 2012. 243 pp.

We the People: A Brief Introduction to the Constitution and Its Interpretation. By Donald C. Dahlin. Palgrave Macmillan, 2012. 186 pp.

EASTERN EUROPE AND THE FORMER SOVIET UNION

Capital, Coercion, and Postcommunist States. By Gerald M. Easter. Cornell University Press, 2012. 241 pp.

Crisis and Quality of Democracy in Eastern Europe. Edited by Miodrag A. Jovanovic and Đorđe Paviaevia. Eleven International, 2012. 160 pp.

The Improvised State: Sovereignty, Performance and Agency in Dayton Bosnia. By Alex Jeffrey. Wiley-Blackwell, 2013. 205 pp.

The Man Without a Face: The Unlikely Rise of Vladimir Putin. By Masha Gessen. Riverhead, 2012. 314 pp.

Wheel of Fortune: The Battle for Oil and Power in Russia. By Thane Gustafson. Belknap Press of Harvard University Press, 2012. 662 pp.

LATIN AMERICA AND THE CARIBBEAN

Afterlives of Confinement: Spatial Transitions in Postdictatorship Latin America. By Susana Draper. University of Pittsburgh Press, 2012. 238 pp.

Fifty Years of Revolution: Perspectives on Cuba, the United States, and the World. Edited by Soraya M. Castro Mari-no and Ronald W. Pruessen. University Press of Florida, 2012. 423 pp.

Party-System Collapse: The Roots of Crisis in Peru and Venezuela. By Jason Seawright. Stanford University Press, 2012. 293 pp.

The Politics of Modern Central America: Civil War, Democratization, and Underdevelopment. By Fabrice Lehoucq. Cambridge, 2012. 204 pp.

MIDDLE EAST

Beyond the Arab Spring: Authoritarianism and Democratization in the Arab World. By Rex Brynen et al. Lynne Rienner, 2012. 349 pp.

Democracy Prevention: The Politics of the U.S.-Egyptian Alliance. By Jason Brownlee. Cambridge University Press, 2012. 279 pp.

Islam, Secularism and Liberal Democracy: Toward a Democratic Theory for Muslim

Societies. By Nader Hashemi. Oxford University Press, 2009. 280 pp.

Of Empires and Citizens: Pro-American Democracy or No Democracy at All? By Amaney A. Jamal. Princeton University Press, 2012. 276 pp.

COMPARATIVE, THEORETICAL, GENERAL

Deliberative Democracy: A Critical Introduction. By Zsuzsanna Chappell. Palgrave MacMillan, 2012. 190 pp.

Democracy at Large: NGOs, Political Foundations, Think Tanks, and International Organizations. Edited by Boris Petric. Palgrave MacMillan, 2012. 280 pp.

The Democratic Imagination: Envisioning Popular Power in the Twenty-First Century. By James Cairns and Alan Sears. University of Toronto Press, 2012. 211 pp.

Democratization and Research Methods. By Michael Coppedge. Cambridge University Press, 2012. 357 pp.

Demokratie: Theorien, Foren, Entwicklungen. By Samuel Salzborn. UTB, 2012. 153 pp.

The Edinburgh Companion to the History of Democracy. Edited by Benjamin Isakhan and Stephen Stockwell. Edinburgh University Press, 2012. 557 pp.

Electronic Democracy. Edited by Norbert Kersting. The World of Political Science: The Development of the Discipline Book Series. Barbara Budrich, 2012. 203 pp.

Elite Statecraft and Election Administration: Bending the Rules of the Game? By Toby S. James. Palgrave MacMillan, 2012. 281 pp.

Ethnic Conflicts: Their Biological Roots in Ethnic Nepotism. By Tatu Vanhanen. Ulster

Institute for Social Research, 2012. 309 pp.

Facilitating Dialogue: USIP's Work in Conflict Zones. Edited by David R. Smock and Daniel Serwer. USIP Press, 2012. 173 pp.

Framing Democracy: A Behavioral Approach to Democratic Theory. By Jamie Terence Kelly. Princeton University Press, 2012. 157 pp.

Gender and Politics: The State of the Discipline. Edited by Jane H. Bayes. The World of Political Science: The Development of the Discipline Book Series. Barbara Budrich, 2012. 216 pp.

Global Governance. By Timothy J. Sinclair. Polity, 2012. 197 pp.

Good Government: The Relevance of Political Science. Edited by Soren Holmberg and Bo Rothstein. Edward Elgar, 2012. 354 pp.

The Great Lie: Classic and Recent Appraisals of Ideology and Totalitarianism. Edited by F. Flagg Taylor IV. ISI, 2011. 658 pp.

Innovation Economics: The Race for Global Advantages. By Robert D. Atkinson and Stephen J. Ezell. Yale University Press, 2012. 431 pp.

International Security and Gender. By Nicole Detraz. Polity, 2012. 255 pp.

On Global Justice. By Mathias Risse. Princeton University Press, 2012. 465 pp.

Peace Economics: A Macroeconomic Primer for Violence-Afflicted States. By Jurgen Brauer and J. Paul Dunne. USIP Press, 2012. 155 pp.

Political Power: The Development of the Field. Edited by Mark Haugaard

and Kevin Ryan. The World of Political Science: The Development of the Discipline Book Series. Barbara Budrich, 2012. 216 pp.

Promoting Authoritarianism Abroad. By Rachel Vanderhill. Lynne Rienner, 2013. 217 pp.

Radical Approaches to Political Science: Roads Less Traveled. By Rainer Eisfeld. Barbara Budrich, 2012. 267 pp.

Rule of Law After War and Crisis: Ideologies, Norms and Methods. By Rochard Zajac Sannerholm. Cambridge University Press, 2012. 276 pp.

Social Movements and the New State: The Fate of Pro-Democracy Organizations when Democracy Is Won. By Brian K. Grodsky. Stanford University Press, 2012. 205 pp.

Two Cheers for Anarchism: Six Easy Pieces on Autonomy, Dignity, and Meaningful Work and Play. By James C. Scott. Princeton University Press, 2012. 169 pp.

The World of Political Science: A Critical Overview of the Development of Political Studies Around the Globe: 1990–2012. Edited by John Trent and Michael Stein. Barbara Budrich, 2012. 188 pp.

Editorial Committee

APSA-CD

is the official newsletter of the American Political Science Association's Comparative Democratization section. Formerly known as CompDem, it has been published three times a year (October, January, and May) by the National Endowment for Democracy's International Forum for Democratic Studies since 2003. In October 2010, the newsletter was renamed APSA-CD and expanded to include substantive articles on democracy, as well as news and notes on the latest developments in the field. The newsletter is now jointly produced and edited by faculty members of the University of Florida's Department of Political Science and the International Forum.

The current issue of APSA-CD is available here. A complete archive of past issues is also available.

To inquire about submitting an article to APSA-CD, please contact Staffan I. Lindberg, Benjamin Smith or Melissa Aten.

Editorial Board Members

Executive Editors



Staffan I. Lindberg is an associate professor of political science at the University of Florida. He is also PI (with John Gerring and Michael Coppedge) the Varieties of Democracy (V-Dem) project; a research fellow at the Quality of Government Institute, and an associate professor of political science at the University of Gothenburg in Sweden. His research focuses on state building, political clientelism, political parties, legislative-executive relations, women's representation, voting behavior, elections, and democracy in Africa. He is the author of *Democracy and Elections in Africa* (Johns Hopkins University Press, 2006) and the editor of *Democratization by Elections: A New Mode of Transition?* (Johns Hopkins University Press, 2009).



Benjamin Smith is an associate professor of political science at the University of Florida. His research focuses on ethnic conflict, regime change, and the politics of resource wealth. His first book, *Hard Times in the Land of Plenty: Oil Politics in Iran and Indonesia*, was published in 2007 by Cornell University Press, and his articles have appeared in *World Politics*, the *American Journal of Political Science*, *Studies in Comparative International Development*, the *Journal of International Affairs*, and other journals and edited volumes. Dr. Smith is currently working on a book exploring the long-term factors that shape the success of separatist movements.

Members



Kate Baldwin is an assistant professor of political science at the University of Florida. She studies state-building, clientelism, and the political economy of development with a regional focus on sub-Saharan Africa. Her current research projects seek to understand the political consequences of involving non-state actors, such as traditional chiefs and non-governmental organizations, in the provision of goods and services.



Michael H. Bernhard is the inaugural holder of the Raymond and Miriam Ehrlich Eminent Scholar Chair in Political Science at the University of Florida. His work centers on questions of democratization and development both globally and in the context of Europe. Among the issues that have figured prominently in his research agenda are the role of civil society in democratization, institutional choice in new democracies, the political economy of democratic survival, and the legacy of extreme forms of dictatorship.



Petia Kostadinova is an assistant professor of political science at the University of Illinois Chicago (UIC). Dr. Kostadinova's main area of research involves the role of citizens' preferences, and media's transmission of these preferences, in shaping social and economic policies in the post-communist countries. A second stream of research focuses on the social and economic policies of the European Union. Prof. Kostadinova's research has been published in *Europe and National Economic Transformation: The EU After the Lisbon Decade*, Mitchell Smith, ed, the *European Journal of Communication*, the *Central European Journal of Communication*, and is forthcoming in *East European Politics* and *Journalism & Mass Communication*.



Bryon Moraski is an associate professor of political science at the University of Florida. His research considers the politics of institutional choice, institutional development, and the influence of short-term electoral incentives on long-term political trajectories. His first book, *Elections by Design: Parties and Patronage in Russia's Regions* (Northern Illinois University Press, 2006) explores the origins of Russia's sub-national legislative electoral systems. He has published numerous book chapters and articles, including works in *The American Journal of Political Science*, *Government and Opposition*, and the *Journal of Politics*. He is currently completing a co-authored book manuscript with William Reisinger (University of Iowa) that examines the links between federal elections and gubernatorial (s)election in Russia and their influence on the country's post-Soviet trajectory.

Editorial Committee



Conor O'Dwyer is an associate professor of political science at the University of Florida. His book *Runaway State-Building: Patronage Politics and Democratic Development* examines the relationship between party-building and state-building in new democracies, looking specifically at the relationship between party competition and patronage politics in postcommunist Eastern Europe. His latest research examines the European Union's use of conditionality to promote more liberal minorities policies in postcommunist states. Specifically, it examines the EU's role in the contentious politics of homosexuality in postcommunist societies. Looking beyond just policy adoption, it examines the impact of EU-sponsored minority-rights policies: do they lead to shifts in attitudes regarding religious difference, national belonging, and minority rights?



Philip Williams is the director of the Center for Latin American Studies and a professor of political science and Latin American Studies at the University of Florida. He also co-directs the Latin American Immigrants in the New South project. His research interests include religion and politics, transnational migration, democratization, social movements, and civil-military relations. His latest book, *A Place to Be: Brazilian, Guatemalan, and Mexican Immigrants in Florida's New Destinations*, was published by Rutgers University Press in 2009 and his articles have appeared in numerous academic journals, including *Comparative Politics*, *Latin American Perspectives*, *Latin Studies*, and the *Journal of Latin American Studies*.



Leonardo A. Villalón is an associate professor of political science at the University of Florida. His research has focused on Islam and politics and on democratization in West Africa, particularly Senegal, Mali, and Niger. He is the author of *Islamic Society and State Power in Senegal* (Cambridge University Press, 1995) and co-editor of *The African State at a Critical Juncture: Between Disintegration and Reconfiguration* (Lynne Rienner, 1998) and *The Fate of Africa's Democratic Experiments: Elites and Institutions* (Indiana University Press, 2005), as well as of numerous articles and book chapters on politics and religion in West Africa.

Managing Editor

Melissa Aten-Becnel is the senior research and conferences officer at the National Endowment for Democracy's International Forum for Democratic Studies and associate director of the Network of Democracy Research Institutes. She earned an M.A. from The George Washington University's Elliott School of International Affairs, where she focused on foreign policy and Central Europe.

Editorial Assistant



Adam Bilinski received a B.A. in International Relations at the University of Warsaw (Poland) and M.A. in Social Sciences from the University of Chicago. Currently he is a PhD student in Political Science at the University of Florida with specialization in comparative politics. His research interests include the problems of survival of democracy, electoral revolutions and democracy promotion. He is currently working on his dissertation, which evaluates how pre-democratization historical legacies (in the form of pre-democratization regime discontinuities and regime type both in independent states and colonies) conditioned the probability of survival of once-established democracies.

forum
International Forum for Democratic Studies

UF UNIVERSITY of
FLORIDA

APSA

The International Forum for Democratic Studies
1025 F Street, NW, 8th Floor
Washington, DC 20004