

Introduction to Comparative Politics, POLS 102-03
Spring 2010, Professor Langohr
First Paper Assignment – Due in class Thursday, February 11

This paper should be five pages long, double-spaced, have one-inch margins, and be in a font no smaller than 11-point. The paper cannot be longer than three or four lines on a sixth page; after that I will stop reading. All late papers will be graded down 5 points (1/2 of a grade) per late day unless your class dean contacts me to explain why you cannot turn the paper in on time. Put your name ONLY on a cover sheet which you put as the LAST page of your paper. I NEED ONE HARD COPY OF YOUR PAPER, AND ONE COPY E-MAILED AS AN ATTACHMENT TO vlangohr@yahoo.com

You are an employee at Holy Cross Development Agency (HCDA), a group which advises countries with authoritarian regimes how to democratize. HCDA asks you to give advice on the case of Candyland, a poor country ruled by President Peanut Butter Cup (PBC).

The country's economy used to be based entirely on growing sugar cane, but recently factories producing Pez dispensers have sprung up in the capital city. PBC, hoping to encourage industrialization, promised that the government would supply factories with water and worker housing and give tax breaks to new factory owners. The promise of tax breaks was not effective in encouraging factory ownership: Candyland's Tax Bureau has no data on how much income citizens make and so most citizens pay almost no tax. The largest factory which did open, Diadrug, produced an anti-diabetes medication which was contaminated and killed many people. The offer of water pipes was more attractive, but most of the pipes which were supposed to serve the new factories actually went to urban areas where there is no industrial development, and the worker housing has not been built. It is unclear how long the factories will be able to be profitable in these conditions, but the promise of higher wages is beginning to draw more farmers to the capital for work.

Most of Candyland's wealth is owned by members of an ethnic group called the Jujubes which makes up about 25% of the population, while the Candy Canes (35%), and the Gumdrops (40%) are generally impoverished farmers or workers in Jujube-owned fields and factories. The Jujubes are the only literate people in Candyland. The small size of the Jujube population and the group's monopoly on Candyland's wealth has made them strongly supportive of PBC, a Jujube, who constantly tells them that any transition to democracy would end their privileged status. The Jujubes are nervous about the future, because PBC is old and has no obvious successor; when the previous president died there were violent clashes between different leaders who sought power until PBC triumphed.

In the paper you need to do EACH of the following, in the following order:

- 1) Explain, using Freedom House standards, what the obstacles to Candyland's becoming a "Free" country are. Using the information in "Political Background on

Candyland” as your source of information, note specifically what needs to change in Candyland for it to be “Free.” The easiest way to do this will be by reading the information in “Political Background” while having your Freedom House Political Rights and Civil Liberties checklist next to you and noting each place where Candyland’s practices deviate from FH standards. Note EACH such deviation. This section should be no more than one-and-a-half pages.

You then decide to invite Seymour Martin Lipset and Samuel Huntington, and Donald Emmerson to speak at a seminar on Candyland’s chances for democratization (Lipset) and stability (Huntington). **In answering Questions #2 and #3, disregard the “Political Background on Candyland” information and use only the information on Candyland provided on Page 1 of this paper topic.**

- 2) Lipset will first say why he is optimistic or pessimistic about Candyland becoming a democracy, AND explain what he thinks Candyland should do to increase chances for democratization. Huntington will speak next, explaining 1) whether he is optimistic or pessimistic NOT ABOUT CANDYLAND’S CHANCES FOR DEMOCRACY, but the country’s chances for STABILITY 2) and whether he agrees with Lipset’s suggestions and why (would he think that Lipset’s suggestions on increasing the chances for democracy would increase or decrease Candyland’s chances for STABILITY)? You are not being asked to give your own assessment of Candyland’s chances for democracy or stability, just the assessments and specific suggestions of these three authors. In this part of your paper you can write in the first person as if you are recording each person’s speeches verbatim, or you can write in the third person as if you are merely summarizing speakers’ words.
- 3) Once the authors have discussed ways to transform Candyland into a stable democracy, your boss wants YOU to tell her whether YOU think a presidential or a parliamentary system would best suit Candyland. What do you suggest? (NOTE: do NOT just rehearse general arguments about why presidential or parliamentary systems are better, but make an argument about why the system that you choose would best suit Candyland’s particular circumstances. In deciding which system is best, make sure to consider whether the choice of a parliamentary system would result in a majority-party or a coalition government.) Your boss reminds you that in countries with several different ethnic groups one of the best ways to ensure a new democracy’s stability is to make sure that each group is well-represented and feels that it has power in the new system, and that no one group can completely dominate the others and leave them unable to affect policy.

CITATIONS: Since you are only using readings that we have done in class, you can cite them with the last name of the author and page number (Huntington, 10). Make sure that any exact quote is in quotation marks and footnoted with a page number; if you cite particular figures, they should also have page number citations.

Political Background on Candyland

Candyland's political system combines a presidency and a legislature. There are three main political parties - the Candy Canes, the Gumdrops, and the Jujubes - and most members of each of the respective ethnic groups vote for the party represented by their group (for example, most Candy Canes vote for the Candy Cane party, etc). There are few credible reports of vote tampering in legislative elections, and throughout the year the parties, each of which has its own daily newspaper, publish critiques of the government and expose corruption and other problems in the country. Attempts by the parties to hold peaceful anti-government demonstrations, however, have generally been met with violence from government police, and there are many credible reports of meetings of the Candy Cane and Gumdrop parties being broken up violently.

In past decades Candyland's president was elected in free elections, but when the previous president died in office, several Gumdrop and Jujube politicians fought to succeed him. Each politician's supporters fought with weapons in the streets to support their candidate until Peanut Butter Cup, the current President, won. Since that time presidential elections have been suspended, and President PBC appears to intend to stay in office until his death as well.

Candyland is a poor country with high unemployment. The legislature has allocated large sums of money to local governments to build factories which would offer jobs, but local officials have often awarded the contracts to build these factories to family members and have diverted much of the money for themselves. In the few factories that exist, workers allege that they are badly mistreated and have sought to form unions to better protect their interests. Candyland law allows unions, but in practice factory owners, with government support, have sought to prevent workers from joining unions, particularly through the deployment of thugs who beat up union leaders. Workers have reported the thugs and factory owners to the police and have tried to sue the factory owners to force them to obey the law and allow the unions to form. To date this has been unsuccessful, as pressure from the President on the Supreme Court has prevented the Court from finding in favor of the workers despite the clear violation of the law.