Politics 212 surveys and compares the relationships of politics and the economy in China, India, Japan, South Korea and Taiwan. Among the various analytical themes we will weave together are:

§ the role of historical, pre-capitalist structures of political economy and class relations in shaping subsequent development;
§ state socialism vs. capitalism;
§ the effect of country size;
§ import-substitution strategies (emphasizing national self-reliance and active roles for the state in the economy) vs. neoliberalism and export-led development (emphasizing markets and integration with the world economy);
§ the plight of labor;
§ the plight of women;
§ the nature of the state and politics (state capacity and autonomy, the representative vs. the authoritarian state, interest representation [corporatism vs. pluralism], popular political movements, and “democratization”); and
§ the “Washington consensus” (emphasizing market-based globalization, Western-style “democratization”, and US global hegemony) vs. the “Beijing consensus” (emphasizing active state regulation of marketization, diversity of national political forms, and opposition to any global hegemony).

The course does not require previous study of economics. I will introduce in a non-technical way the economic concepts and theories needed to get at the issues that concern us. One goal of the course is to help you understand that matters of economics and political economy, which may appear dry and can take highly technical forms, are comprehensible to ordinary mortals; and, moreover, that they are flesh-and-blood issues of the profoundest significance to real people.

Before each class I expect you to complete readings that will cover the subject for the day. In class the material cannot be covered in anything approaching the fullness of what you need to know about it; ipso facto, classes cannot substitute for the reading. If you have not done the reading before class, you will not be able to get much out of that class session, and you will, unavoidably, feel lost.

Blogging is essential to Politics 212.

§ To encourage reflective reading, help you retain what you have read, and help me calibrate what we do in class, once each week I expect you to write on Blackboard a short response to questions I will have posed in advance about the works we are confronting. You’re also welcome to comment there at any time on what others in the class have written. Start a debate! You may also use the blog to raise questions on which you would like help.

§ I use the blogs to promote your learning, not to evaluate it. I want you to think and write your blogs freely and creatively, and to take risks. Therefore I do not grade them. But because I view them as very important for your learning, I do factor heavily into your final grade simply whether you have done them seriously and regularly. If you do 13 of them (which is an average of one per week), you’ve got an “A” for 40% of the course. (See page 3 below.)

§ Specifically, those of you with surnames beginning A-M should do so by the Sunday before class at 6:00 PM, and those with surnames M-Z by 6:00 PM Tuesday. The 6:00 deadlines are firm — indeed, I close the blog to new entries at that time (though the blogs remain visible) — for two reasons. First, that’s when I start preparing for class, and they are crucial to my doing so. Moreover, the blogs are a process, not a product; the whole point is to help you learn by doing them week-in, week-out, not at the end of the term in order to meet a requirement.

§ If you must miss or inadvertently have missed your appointed day, as will inevitably happen, just post a blog for another day that week; if you miss a week, just do two in a subsequent week. The spirit here is to do them regularly, but we can be flexible in doing so. You may, of course, respond more than once each week if you like; the more often you do, the more you will learn.

§ On each evening before class, prepare by taking a few moments to log in to the blog to read what everyone has written.
While I always try my best to be flexible and accommodate students’ needs, I will not allow you to make up missed blogs at the end of the term, for the reason stated in the third point above. So, to reiterate, if you fall a bit behind, just double up in subsequent weeks to catch up.

You will also write two open-book, take-home essays of approximately 1,500 words (≈ 6 pages) each. The schedule can be found in the course outline below. These papers do require you to demonstrate command of the material, but they are oriented mainly toward developing your engagement with and analysis and interpretation of it. To give you an idea of what to expect and to help you orient your reading and thinking, starting on page 7 below you will find the essay questions from the most recent offering of the course. You can expect many of the same issues to be treated this time around, probably with some of the same or similar questions.

I will evaluate your work according to the following weightings:

- Blog postings: 40%
- Papers: 30% each
- Active listening and participation in class: A “fudge factor”

Please take careful note of these proportions. They reflect my conviction that the daily process of the course is even more important to your learning as the two papers you will write. In the past students who assumed that the papers were their only major responsibilities for the course have been unpleasantly surprised at the end of the semester.

Americans spend five times as much on dog food as on college books. Politics 212 is doing its part to right our priorities. Please purchase:

- Marc Blecher, *China Against the Tides* (third edition only)
- Stuart Corbridge and John Harriss, *Reinventing India*
- Thomas Gold, *State and Society in the Taiwan Miracle*
- Barrington Moore, *Social Origins of Dictatorship and Democracy*
- T. J. Pempel, *Régime Shift*
- Lloyd and Susanne Rudolph, *In Pursuit of Lakshmi*
- William Strunk and E. B. White, *Elements of Style*
- Jung-en Woo, *Race to the Swift*

In addition, if you can afford them, I recommend purchasing these books, from which we will be reading several chapters:

- *Pranab Bardhan, Awakening Giants, Feet of Clay*
- Barbara Entwisle and Gail E. Henderson, eds., *Re-Drawing Boundaries: Work, Households and Gender in China*
- Elizabeth Perry, ed., *Putting Class in Its Place* (out of print, but may be available from used book sellers)

Only one or two copies of these books are available on reserve, so obviously you cannot rely on them for your regular reading.

The same “reform” movement that is ruining primary and secondary education is now taking aim at us, requiring faculty to list “learning goals” for all courses. These are being used to measure what we’re doing, all the better to encourage still further the growing hegemony of market forces in education. Thus, I am obliged to tell you that the goal of *Political Economy of Development in Asia* is for you to learn about the political economy of development in Asia, and to get some practice reading, writing and thinking systematically.
SCHEDULE OF CLASSES, TOPICS AND ASSIGNMENTS

February 5: Historical Roots of Indian Capitalism and Representative Politics

February 7: Institutionalization and Import Substitution in Nehruvian India
Stuart Corbridge and John Harriss, *Reinventing India*, chapters 1-3.
Lloyd and Susanne Rudolph, *In Pursuit of Lakshmi*, chapter I.

February 12: Deinstitutionalization (Indira Gandhi & Sons) and Political Economy in India, 1966-91
Corbridge and Harriss, chapters 4-5.
Rudolphs, chapter 4 & 6-8.

February 14: Economic “Reform” in India, 1991 to the present
Corbridge and Harriss, chapters 6-7.

February 19: Labor and Agrarian Politics in India
Screen *Occupation: Millworker* (via Blackboard).
Rudolphs, chapter 10, 12 & 13.

February 21: Gender in India; Social and Political Movements in India
Corbridge and Harriss, chapters 8-9 and conclusion.

February 26: Historical Roots of Chinese Socialism
Moore, chapters 4 and 9.
Marc Blecher, *China Against the Tides*, chapter I.

February 28: Maoist Political Economy
Blecher, chapter 2 and pp. 129-145.

March 5: Structural Reform in China
Blecher, chapter 3 and pp. 145-165.
Screen *All Under Heaven* (from Blackboard).

FIRST ESSAY TOPICS DISTRIBUTED.

March 7: Industrial and Agrarian Politics in China
Marc Blecher, “Hegemony and Workers’ Politics in China” (on Blackboard).
March 12: Gender in China
   Screen *Small Happiness* (from Blackboard).
   Blecher, pages 119-125.
   Entwisle and Henderson, eds., *Re-drawing Boundaries*, chapters 5-9 (on Blackboard).

March 14: India and China Compared
   Pranab Bardhan, *Awakening Giants*, chapters 1, 2 and 10 and Afterword to the Paperback Edition (on Blackboard).

**MARCH 16: FIRST PAPER DUE**

**MARCH 19-21: FALL BREAK**

March 26: Historical Roots of Japanese Political Economy
   Moore, chapters 5 & 8.

March 28: The Japanese Postwar Conservative Régime
   Screen *The Pacific Century* (from Blackboard). You can stop when the film starts to mention Japanese influence in Thailand and the rest of SE Asia, though if you continue a bit further there is some interesting material about the electoral system. All in all it’ll take about an hour to watch — and a most worthwhile hour.

April 2: Japanese Crisis and Change in the 1990s
   Pempel, chapters 5-6.

April 4: Labor Politics in Japan

April 9: Political Economy in Taiwan from the Sixteenth Century through 1949

April 11: Political Economy in Modern Taiwan
   Gold, chapters 5-8.
April 23, 8:35 AM: State and Society in Taiwan: Labor and Environmental Politics
James Reardon-Anderson, Pollution, Politics and Foreign Investment in Taiwan: The Lukang Rebellion (on Blackboard; book on reserve).

APRIL 23, 8:00-9:15 PM, KING 227: Democratization in Taiwan

April 25, 8:35 AM: South Korean Political Economy, I
Jung-en Woo, Race to the Swift, chapters 1-3

APRIL 25, 8:00-9:15 PM, KING 227: South Korean Political Economy, II
Jung-en Woo, Race to the Swift, chapters 4-5

April 30: South Korean Political Economy, III
Jung-en Woo, Race to the Swift, chapters 6-7

May 2: State and Society in South Korea

May 7: Democratization in South Korea
Charles K. Armstrong, “The Politics of Transition in North and South Korea”, N.B. READ ONLY PAGES 5-16 (on Blackboard).
Dorothy J. Solinger, “Ending One-Party Dominance: Korea, Taiwan, Mexico” (on Blackboard).
Charles Armstrong, “Contesting the Peninsula” (on Blackboard).
SECOND ESSAY TOPICS DISTRIBUTED

May 9: Course Conclusion
Li Xin, Kjeld Erik Bredsgaard and Michael Jacobsen, “Redefining the Beijing Consensus: Ten General Principles” (on Blackboard).

SATURDAY, MAY 19, 4:00 PM: SECOND ESSAYS DUE
ESSAY QUESTIONS FROM
THE MOST RECENT OFFERING OF THE COURSE

FIRST ESSAY TOPICS

1. India experienced a peaceful transition to capitalism and parliamentary democracy, while China underwent a revolutionary transition to a state socialist economy. In what ways do the differences between the agrarian structures (i.e., village-level economic, social and political structures) and structures of the state and of state-society relations of pre-1947 India and pre-1949 China help explain the differences in their pathways of transformation since the middle of the twentieth century? In what ways is such a mode of explanation limited by political or conjunctural (i.e., accidental or exogenous) factors?

2. In the Nehru period there was some interest in adopting Chinese measures of economic organization and development (Rudolphs, pp. 315-318). Going beyond this small issue and the limited discussion of it on those pages, account for this interest (however limited), discuss the historical, political and political-sociological reasons why the state never got serious about it, and speculate on how feasible and effective such a set of policies would have been in India had the state tried to pursue them more seriously. Then compare with China, analyzing what it had that India lacked that enabled it to undertake collectivization successfully. Conclude with some comments on what's at stake here.

3. The Rudolphs argue that successful economic development can be consistent with a representative (“democratic”) state. Yet in China the decidedly illiberal state has been absolutely essential in mobilizing resources for and directing economic development. Discuss, paying equal attention to both cases, and drawing out the implications.

4. Compare the processes, outcomes, and political aspects (including prerequisites and/or effects) of import-substitution industrialization in India and China, and comment on what the comparison illuminates.

5. The Rudolphs speak of political deinstitutionalization and the rise of demand politics in India. This also happened in China, both in the Maoist period and, in very different ways, under structural reform, during both of which popular political movements have captured the world’s attention. In each country, what do these political processes have to do with economics? Conclude with a comparison of India and China in these terms, and comment on why all this matters.

6. “A high capacity state requires a high level of autonomy from society. Moreover, both are necessary for economic development.” (Kurt Remarque [😊]) Comment, comparing India and China, and drawing out the implications.

7. In both India and China, industrial labor is politically weak. Compare the reasons why this is so, relating the issue to relevant wider aspects of each country’s political and economic system and policies. What does the comparison teach us?

8. Corbridge and Harriss speak of “passive revolution” as both a description and a prescription for political change in India. What is it, and how did it play out in India? Does it help explain something important about the structural reforms in China? Whether it does or doesn’t, what, if anything, does the comparison illuminate?

9. Why has India’s economic reform been so much more limited than China’s? What, if anything, might this have to do with the way each country undertook import substitution industrialization? With their political systems (including, perhaps, régime types, mixes of demand and command politics, state capacity, state autonomy)? What’s at stake here?
10. Women have benefited and but also suffered more than men as a result of economic
development in both India and China. Compare the two cases, showing in each how the
outcomes result from aspects of the wider political economy. What are the lessons here?

II. Write out your own question, discuss it with me, and then respond to it in writing.

SECOND ESSAY TOPICS

1. In what ways do the similarities and differences between the pre-capitalist agrarian and
political structures of Japan and either pre-1947 India or pre-1949 China help explain
some of the salient similarities or differences in their subsequent pathways of
transformation? In what ways is such a mode of explanation limited? What’s at stake here?

2. Discuss the effects of imperialism on economic development in China and/or India on
the one hand and Taiwan and/or South Korea on the other. What’s at stake here?

3. Japan, Taiwan and South Korea have all possessed states with high capacity to mobilize
resources for economic development. They have differed somewhat with respect to the
autonomy of the state from social forces, though all have sought to exclude workers
politically (albeit in different ways and with different levels of success), and their
relations with their bourgeoisies and farmers have differed. Choose one or at most two
cases, and compare the state-society relationship with that in India or China. Then analyze
the effects of all this on some important aspects of economic development.

4. The Rudolphs argue that successful economic development can be consistent with
representative politics. Yet in Taiwan and South Korea decidedly illiberal states have been
absolutely essential in mobilizing resources for and directing economic development.
Compare Taiwan and/or Korea on the one hand and India on the other, drawing out the
significance of the question.

5. Compare the conditions of possibility, political rationales, and specific means of
implementation of import substitution industrialization in India or China on the one hand
and Taiwan and/or South Korea on the other. Why does any of this matter?

6. Evaluate the processes, problems and political implications of export led-development
in a large country such as India and/or China on the basis of your studies of smaller and
more homogeneous countries such as Japan and/or Taiwan and/or South Korea. What’s the
significance of this comparison?

7. Discuss the process and economic implications of “democratization” (i.e., the transition
from authoritarian politics to a representative, multi-party system) in Taiwan and/or South
Korea, and compare with India and, if you like, Japan. What does the comparison explain?

8. Discuss the implications of “democratization” (i.e., the transition from authoritarian
politics to a representative, multi-party system) in Taiwan and/or Korea for the prospects
of a similar change in China.

9. Discuss the mechanisms that have subordinated labor in India or China on the one hand
and Japan and/or Taiwan and/or South Korea on the other. Then address one or more of
the following questions: Do different strategies of labor subordination have different
historical origins? Different political or economic effects on workers? On economic
development? Do they have different implications for political change? Whatever
question(s) you choose, explain why any of this matters.
10. All the countries we studied this semester received foreign aid and investment at certain key stages in their development. Evaluate its effect on shaping the political economy of India and/or China on the one hand and Japan and/or Taiwan and/or Korea on the other. Pay attention to what was affected (institutions, policies or both), how significant the effect was, and, if it fits with your approach, how it interacted with political nationalism (at the elite or mass levels or both). Place your response in the context of the other important factors shaping development that we have studied. What's the wider significance here?

II. Write out your own question, discuss it with me, and then respond to it in writing. It should involve a comparison of at least one case from the first half of the course with at least one from the second.