

**International Relations 219: Democracy in Latin America: Argentina,
Brazil, and Mexico**

University of Rochester

Spring 2013

Monday, 12:30 PM – 1:45 PM

Harkness 210

Instructor: Adam Cohon

Phone: 585-275-7855

Email: acohon@berkeley.edu

Office: Harkness 308

Office hours: Wednesday 9am-11am, or by prior appointment

This course examines the challenges facing three of Latin America's largest democracies, focused around three main topics: social policy, crime and violence, and environmental conservation. Before we address these topics, however, we review the actors and institutions that operate in each country. We discuss how political institutions in each country shape how policy is made and implemented. The course examines contemporary attempts to address each of the three challenges, and provides opportunity for students wishing to conduct research on related matters.

Course Materials:

All course materials will be posted onto Blackboard, or available through the University of Rochester library website. Assignments and reading questions will sometimes be emailed to you before class; check your inbox.

Course Requirements:

Students are expected to attend class regularly, do the assigned reading, complete all assignments, and participate in class discussions and activities. The assignments comprise in-class participation (30%), three 5-page research papers due at the beginning of class on **February 21** (15%), at the beginning of class on **April 4** (15%), and at 2 PM on **May 8** (15%) to my office or my mailbox on the third floor of Harkness Hall. Papers must be submitted in hardcopy format. There will also be a brief map quiz (5%) on **February 7**, and two in-class oral presentations on **March 5** (10%) and **April 30** (10%). There will be no make-ups for unexcused absences from oral presentation days.

Paper prompts will be handed out at least two weeks in advance of the deadline. Only the third paper assignment will require outside research.

Late work:

Assignments will be deducted 1/3 of a letter grade (from A to A-, B+ to B, etc.) for each 24 hours or fraction thereof that elapses between the due date and the submission of the assignment.

Absences:

There will be no make-up work for students who fail to turn in final projects on time or miss classes. Be sure to contact your peers for class notes. I am happy to discuss the material with you, but I do not offer individual recap sessions.

Excused absences are only granted for family or medical emergencies, and I will need documentation of the event or problem.

Grading scale:

- A ($93.0\% < x$)
- A- ($90.0\% < x \leq 93.0\%$)
- B+ ($87.0\% < x \leq 90.0\%$)
- B ($84.0\% < x \leq 87.0\%$)
- B- ($80.0\% < x \leq 84.0\%$)
- C+ ($77.0\% < x \leq 80.0\%$)
- C ($74.0\% < x \leq 77.0\%$)
- C- ($70.0\% < x \leq 74.0\%$)
- Non-passing grades ($x \leq 70.0\%$)

All students will receive an extra 2% on their grade if at least 95% of students in the class complete online course evaluations.

In-class participation:

I will try to lecture as little as possible, and develop in-class activities that allow students to discuss, re-consider, and critique the arguments and events we study. It is in your interest not to miss class.

Students should come to class prepared to discuss all readings assigned for that day and all previous days.

Re-grades:

Students should feel free to contact me about re-grades due to arithmetic errors. If students feel that grades were incorrectly given, they can re-submit the assignment to me with a memorandum of at least 250 words explaining why they thought they deserve a different grade. Requests for re-grades should be made within 72 hours after the results have been passed back. I reserve the right on re-grades to lower, raise, or maintain any grade.

Written work standards:

All written work should be in Times New Roman font, size 12, double-spaced, with 1" margins on all sides of the paper. Citations are mandatory, in either Chicago or MLA style. Five-page papers should be between 4.5 and 5.5 pages; points will be deducted for papers that are too short or too long. The bibliography at the end does not contribute to the page count. Place your name and paper title in a Header at the top of the page **only**.

Studying and work outside of class:

You are encouraged to discuss class readings and your research project with classmates for the examinations, and send me any questions. You may even trade drafts and outlines with your peers. All final work, however, should be your own. You will be held responsible for errors in citation and attribution.

Accommodations:

If you are entitled to accommodations, please coordinate these with the Center for Excellence in Teaching and Learning early in the semester. Their information and policies can be found at <http://www.rochester.edu/college/cetl/undergraduate/index.html> **I cannot make these arrangements for you; you must contact CETL (formerly LAS) yourself.**

Academic Honesty:

Conduct in class, during assignment, and in writing coursework should conform to the University's policies on academic honesty. The policy can be found at <http://www.rochester.edu/college/honesty>

Be sure to cite all your sources. When in doubt, add a footnote or endnote. In-text citations are acceptable. All papers should contain a bibliography at the end. Wikipedia is not considered a reliable source of information for this class, and should never be cited as an authority.

Any instance of plagiarism will result in zero credit for the assignment and referral of the student(s) involved to the College Board on Academic Honesty.

Course Outline

I reserve the right to drop or replace readings to better direct learning and sharpen the focus of the course. I will probably do so. All readings are required unless otherwise noted.

I. Case background: Post-Transition Democracies

1. January 17

Introduction

2. January 22

Brazilian politics to 1989; Argentine politics to 1983; Mexican politics to 2000

O'Donnell, Guillermo. 1988. "Challenges to Democratization in Brazil," *World Policy Journal* 5(2): 288-300.

3. January 24

Brazilian politics since 1989; Argentine politics since 1983; Mexican politics since 2000

Levitsky, Steven. 1998. "Crisis, Party Adaptation, and Regime Stability in Argentina," *Party Politics* 4(4):445-470.

Klesner, Joseph L. 2005. "Electoral Competition and the New Party System in Mexico," *Latin American Politics and Society* 47(2): 103-142.

II. Subnational Authoritarianism and Incomplete Democratic Transitions

1. January 29

Authoritarian enclaves

Gibson, Edward L. 2005. "Boundary Control: Subnational Authoritarianism in Democratic Countries," *World Politics* 58(1): 101-132.

Lawson, Chappell. 2000. "Mexico's Unfinished Transition: Democratization and Authoritarian Enclaves in Mexico," *Mexican Studies/Estudios Mexicanos* 16(2): 267-287.

2. January 31

Clientelism

Brusco, Valeria, Marcelo Nazareno and Susan Stokes. 2004. "Vote Buying in Argentina," *Latin American Research Review* 39(2): 66-88.

Fox, Jonathan. 1994. "The Difficult Transition from Clientelism to Citizenship: Lessons from Mexico," *World Politics* 46(2): 151-184.

3. February 5
Democratic deepening

Harbers, Imke. 2007. "Democratic Deepening in Third Wave Democracies: Experiments with Participation in Mexico City," *Political Studies*. 55(1): 38-58.

Goldfrank, Benjamin and Aaron Schneider. 2006. "Competitive Institution Building: The PT and Participatory Budgeting in Rio Grande do Sul," *Latin American Politics and Society* 48(3): 1-31.

4. February 7
Review section

Map quiz at the beginning of class, February 7

III. Federalism and Budget Constraints

1. February 12
Theories and types of decentralization

Falleti, Tulia G. 2010. *Decentralization and Subnational Politics in Latin America*. New York: Cambridge University Press. Ch. 1

Ardanaz, Martín, Marcelo Leiras, and Mariano Tommasi. 2010. "The Politics of Federalism in Argentina and its Effects on Governance and Accountability." Manuscript, Columbia University, July.

2. February 14
Soft and hard budget constraints

Rodden, Jonathan. 2008. *Hamilton's Paradox: The Promise and Peril of Fiscal Federalism*. New York: Cambridge University Press. Ch. 8

Remmer, Karen L. and Erik Wibbels. 2000. "The Subnational Politics of Economic Adjustment: Provincial Politics and Fiscal Performance in Argentina," *Comparative Political Studies*. 33(4): 419-451.

IV. Political Party Systems and Candidates

1. February 19
Party institutionalization

De Luca, Miguel, Mark P. Jones, and María Inés Tula. 2002. "Back Rooms or Ballot Boxes? Candidate Nomination in Argentina," *Comparative Political Studies* 35(4): 413-436.

Samuels, David. 2006. *Ambition, Federalism, and Legislative Politics in Brazil*. New York: Cambridge University Press. Ch. 3

2. February 21
Rise of the left

Etchemendy, Sebastian and Ruth Berins Collier. 2007. "Down but Not Out: Union Resurgence and Segmented Neocorporatism in Argentina (2003-2007)," *Politics and Society* 35(3): 363-401.

Flores-Macías, Gustavo. 2008. "Statist v. Pro-Market: Explaining Leftist Governments' Economic Policies in Latin America," *Comparative Politics* 42(4): 413-433.

Essay Number 1 due in paper form at the beginning of class, February 21

3. February 26
Legislative success and the executive

Jones, Mark et al. 2002. "Amateur Legislators – Professional Politicians: The Consequences of Party-Centered Electoral Rules in a Federal System," *American Journal of Political Science* 46(3): 656-669.

Alston, Lee and Bernardo Mueller. 2006. "Pork for Policy: Executive and Legislative Exchange in Brazil," *Journal of Law, Economics and Organization* 22(1): 87-114.

4. February 28
Review section

5. March 5
In-Class Presentation #1: Promises Candidates Make

6. March 7
No class

SPRING BREAK

V. Drug Epidemics and Wars

1. March 19
Mexico

O'Neil, Shannon. 2009. "The Real War in Mexico," *Foreign Affairs* July/August.

Lindau, Juan. 2011. "The Drug War's Impact on Executive Power, Judicial Reform, and Federalism in Mexico," *Political Science Quarterly* 126(2): 177-200.

2. March 21
Argentina

Rossi, Diana, et al. 2011. "Changes in time-use and drug use by young adults in poor neighborhoods of Greater Buenos Aires, Argentina, after the political transitions of 2001-2002: Results of a Survey," *Harm Reduction Journal* 8(2)

Auyero, Javier. 2007. *Routine Politics and Violence in Argentina: The Gray Zone of State Power*. New York: Cambridge University Press. Ch. 1-2

3. March 26
Brazil

McCann, Bryan. 2007. "Criminal Networks in Urban Brazil." *Georgetown Journal of International Affairs* Summer/Fall: 13- 19.

Tierney, Julia. 2012. "Peace Through the Metaphor of War: From Police Pacification to Governance Transformation in Rio de Janeiro," M.A. Thesis in Urban Planning, MIT. Ch. 1-3

4. March 28
Review section

VI. Environmental Protection and Regulation

1. April 2
Brazil

Ames, Barry and Margaret Keck. 1997. "The Politics of Sustainable Development: Environmental Policy Making in Four Brazilian States," *Journal of Interamerican Studies and World Affairs* 39(4): 1-40.

Mueller, Bernardo. 2009. "The Fiscal Imperative and the Role of Public Prosecutors in Brazilian Environmental Policy," *Law and Policy* 32(1): 104-126.

2. April 4
Mexico

Essay Number 2 due in paper form at the beginning of class, April 4.

Díez, Jordi. 2006. *Political Change and Environmental Policymaking in Mexico*. New York: Routledge, Ch. 4

Pacheco-Vega, Raul. 2005. "Democracy by Proxy: Environmental NGOs and Policy Change in Mexico" in A. Romero and S. West, eds. *Environmental Issues in Latin America and the*

Caribbean. Dordrecht: Springer. 231-249.

3. April 9
Argentina

Aguilar, Soledad. 2002. "Environmental Non-Government Organizations in Argentina". *Reviel* 11(2): 225-234.

Reboratti, Carlos. 2008. "Environmental Conflicts and Environmental Justice in Argentina" in David Carruthers, ed. *Environmental Justice in Latin America: Problems, Promise, and Practice*. Cambridge: MIT Press. 101-116.

Amengual, Matthew. 2013. "Pollution in the Garden of the Argentine Republic: Building State Capacity to Escape from Chaotic Regulation." Working paper, MIT Sloan School.

4. April 11
Review section

VII. Social Inclusion: Addressing Poverty and Inequality

1. April 16
Brazil: *Bolsa Familia* and "*Lulismo*"

Zucco Jr., Cesar. 2008. "The President's 'New' Constituency? Lula and the Pragmatic Vote in Brazil's 2006 Presidential Election," *Journal of Latin American Studies* 40(1): 29-49.

Valencia Lomeli, Enrique. 2008. "Conditional Cash Transfers as Social Policy in Latin America: An Assessment of their Contributions and Limits," *Annual Review of Sociology* 14: 475-499.

Hunter, Wendy and Natasha Borges-Sugiyama. 2009. "Democracy and Social Policy in Brazil: Advancing Basic Needs, Preserving Privileged Interests," *Latin American Politics and Society* 51(2): 29-58.

2. April 18
Argentina: Populism and "*Kirchnerismo*"

Levitsky, Steven and M. Victoria Murillo. 2008. "Argentina: From Kirchner to Kirchner." *Journal of Democracy* 19(2): 16-30.

Calvo, Ernesto and M. Victoria Murillo. 2006. "The New Iron Law of Argentine Politics? Partisanship, Clientelism, and Governability in Contemporary Argentina" in Steven Levitsky and M. V. Murillo, eds. *Argentine Democracy: The Politics of Institutional Weakness*. University Park, PA: Penn State Press. Ch. 9.

3. April 23

Mexico: *Oportunidades* and the Informal Sector

Molyneux, Maxine. 2006. "Mothers at the Service of the New Poverty Agenda: Progres/Oportunidades, Mexico's Conditional Transfer Programme," *Social Policy and Administration* 40(4): 425-449.

Levy, Santiago. 2008. *Good Intentions, Bad Outcomes: Social Policy, Informality, and Economic Growth in Mexico*. Washington: Brookings Inst. Press. Ch. 1, 3, 8, 9.

4. April 25

Review section

5. April 30

In-Class Presentation #2: Future Challenges

Essay Number 3 is due to my faculty box or office in Harkness Hall by 2 PM on May 8th, the final exam date set by the Registrar.

Grading rubric for weekly participation grades

	A (Above Standards) 100%	B (Meets Standards) 90%	C (Approaching Standards) 80%	D (Below Standards) 70%	E (No credit) 0%
Reading (50 points)	Student has carefully read and understood the readings as evidenced by familiarity with main ideas, supporting evidence and secondary points. Comes to class prepared with questions and critiques of the readings.	Student has read and understood the readings as evidenced by grasp of the main ideas and evidence. Comes prepared with questions and critiques of the readings.	Student has read the material, but comments often indicate that he/she misunderstood or forgot many points or has not thought about questions or critiques of the readings.	Student comes to class unprepared, as indicated by unwillingness or inability to answer basic questions or contribute to discussion.	Non-attendance
Listening (50 points)	Always attends to what others say as evidenced by regularly building on, clarifying, or responding to their comments.	Generally attends to what others say as evidenced by periodically building on, clarifying, or responding to their comments.	Does not regularly listen well as indicated by the repetition of comments or questions presented earlier, or frequent non sequiturs.	Behavior frequently reflects a failure to listen or attend to the discussion as indicated by repetition of comments and questions, non sequiturs, off-task activities.	Non-attendance

Grading rubric for all presentations

	A (Above Standards) 100%	B (Meets Standards) 90%	C (Approaching Standards) 80%	D (Below Standards) 70%
Completeness (10 points)	All parts of the assignment are addressed.	A minor part of the assignment is unaddressed or it is unclear how the speaker is addressing it.	A major part of the assignment is unaddressed or it is unclear how the speaker is addressing it.	Two or more major parts of the assignment are unaddressed or it is unclear how the speaker is addressing them.
Clarity (10 points)	Ideas are provided in a logical order that makes it easy to follow the speaker's train of thought.	Ideas are provided in a fairly logical order that makes it reasonably easy to follow the speaker's train of thought. The presentation has an argument. There is discussion of accurate, relevant evidence and examples bolstering that argument but key evidence is missing or inaccurate.	A few ideas are not in an expected or logical order, making the presentation a little confusing.	Many ideas are not in an expected or logical order, making the presentation confusing.
Point of view (30 points)	The presentation has an argument and a thorough discussion of accurate, relevant evidence and examples bolstering that argument.	The presentation has an argument and at least one piece of accurate, relevant evidence is offered.	An argument and at least one piece of accurate, relevant evidence is offered.	There is no argument in the presentation or the evidence and examples are inaccurate, vague and/or irrelevant and/or are not explained.
Creativity and energy (40 points)	The presentation engages the audience and highlights all important facts and ideas in a memorable manner.	The presentation mostly engages the audience and highlights many important facts and ideas in a memorable manner.	The presentation does not engage the audience, although it does present information.	The presentation is unengaging and uninformative.
Q&A (10 points)	Provides thoughtful answers to audience questions.			Provides inadequate answers to audience questions.

Grading rubric for all written papers

	A (Above Standards) 100%	B (Meets Standards) 90%	C (Approaching Standards) 80%	D (Below Standards) 70%
Completeness (10 points)	All parts of the assignment are addressed.	A minor part of the assignment is unaddressed or it is unclear how the author is addressing it.	A major part of the assignment is unaddressed or it is unclear how the author is addressing it.	Two or more major parts of the assignment are unaddressed or it is unclear how the author is addressing them.
Clarity (10 points)	Ideas are provided in a logical order that makes it easy to follow the author's train of thought.	Ideas are provided in a fairly logical order that makes it reasonably easy to follow the author's train of thought.	A few ideas are not in an expected or logical order, making the essay a little confusing.	Many ideas are not in an expected or logical order, making the essay confusing.
Support (30 points)	Every point in the argument is supported with valid inferences from evidence or logic.	Minor points are unsupported or supported with invalid inferences from evidence or logic.	A major point is unsupported or supported with invalid inferences from evidence or logic.	More than one major point is unsupported or supported with invalid inferences from evidence or logic.
Research (40 points)	More than 5 sources, of which at least 3 are peer-review journal articles or scholarly books. Sources include both general background sources and specialized sources. Politicized or popular sources are acknowledged as such when they are used.	5 sources, of which at least 2 are peer-review journal articles or scholarly books. Politicized or popular sources are acknowledged as such when they are used.	5 sources, of which at least 2 are peer-review journal articles or scholarly books. Politicized or popular sources are used without adequate comment.	Fewer than 5 sources, or fewer than 2 of 5 are peer-reviewed journal articles or scholarly books.
Source documentation (10 points)	Correct attributions are provided for all quotations, non-trivial facts, and original research.			Correct attributions are not provided for all quotations, non-trivial facts, and original research.