Letter from the President

Ronald Rogowski, University of California, Los Angeles

The Field of Comparative Politics

In the course of writing some months ago a single-chapter survey of work in comparative politics since 1980, I had the chance to reflect on the extraordinary upheaval that has characterized our subject and our field in that time. We now attend much more than formerly to the links between economics and politics and between international events and domestic politics; we employ more frequently, and I hope more sophisticatedly, the insights of formal and economic theory; we have rediscovered, and have begun to analyze more coherently, the importance of institutions most prominently that elusive entity "the state," but also cabinets, legislative committees, courts, parties, regulatory agencies, and much more. External events have hastened the revival of other interests: in nationalism and ethno-linguistic cleavages, in transitions from authoritarian rule, and in the connection between politics and markets.

Rapid change both stimulates and disorients. Hope of achieving major new insights merges with a nagging dread of never catching up with the literature, with events. Disciplinarily, within departments, and individually, we must break old barriers, learn from each other (perhaps especially from the Young), and continually retrain. Fortunately;

(continued on page 2)
The job market is hardly exempt from this turmoil, as young Sovietologists (Russologists?) know firsthand. Still, the news on that front is only good, as Michael Brinbaum reported in the March issue of PS (pp. 100-105). 74 percent of all new PhDs or ABD candidates in comparative politics or area studies in academic year 1989-90 found jobs, and 28 percent of all placements entailed political science work in our field. (Unfortunately, these are the most recent data available.) That represented a sharp improvement over the recent past (e.g., in 1987-88, only 63 percent of candidates were successfully placed) and was an out-identical to the average record of successful placements for political science candidates generally. (72 percent within these data is a sharp reminder that the battle against gender discrimination is far from won in our field: 78 percent of male candidates were successful in comparative politics, but only 62 percent of female candidates were successfully placed. That disparity was worse than the average for political science as a whole (overall, 73 percent of men, 70 percent of women were successfully placed) in only one other field, public administration (where 82 percent of males, but only 55 percent of females, found jobs).

Changes at the National Science Foundation

Political Science generally, and comparative politics particularly, should be encouraged by recent changes in organization and orientation at the National Science Foundation. In October, a new Directorate for Social, Behavioral, and Economic Sciences was created from the old Directorate for Biological, Behavioral, and Social Sciences. In essence, this elevated to a somewhat higher status, immediately under the NSF Director, what had been the Division of Social and Economic Science. At the time, those who dealt with political science at NSF had turned their attention to the chronically low rate of applications from scholars in comparative politics. (All along, applications from comparatists have succeeded in increasing the mean acceptance rate—about 20 percent—as one form of the program, Bill Mishler (University of South Carolina) convened an advisory group under the chairmanship of Bob Bates, of Duke University) to recommend several measures. While some of these were still being debated within the program, I am personally convinced that comparatists will encounter at NSF a welcoming and helpful atmosphere. Work must, of course, be theoretically informed and empirically testable, but it is in fashion to be expressed in a positive way. It need not be quantitative. There is particular interest in research that addresses the questions of democratization and "marketization." For more information, contact Frank Scioli or Jim Campbell at NSF. Their BITNET addresses are: fscioli@nsf and jcampbell@nsf. If you are on INTERNET, add .binet to the above.

The Work of the Organized Section

The other officers and I have considered how the Section can best help in meeting the new situation we all face. For good or ill, we remain at the "brainstorming" stage. Among the ideas one or another of us has tossed around are: radical revamping and expansion of the Newsletter, perhaps along the lines of the in press product of the Legislative studies section; the offering of short courses on new methodologies at the APSA Annual Meetings; organizing "floating seminars" of some of our best colleagues in the field, who would stand ready to visit departments that could pay their way; capsule descriptions of important recent literature, either in the Newsletter or via e-mail, or both. M any of you will have better ideas, or will see fatal flaws in some of these I have just listed. We urgently need your views. Please e-mail them directly to me at: rogowski@polisci.ucsc.edu. Leave in mind, however, that our fiscal resources are extremely limited—our total budget is about $2000 annually.

Meantime, the normal work of the Section continues. I am delighted to announce that Adam Przeworski has agreed to serve as Program Chair for our panels at the 1993 APSA meetings. Your suggestions for panels or for individual papers should be directed to him. My Department of Political Science, University of Chicago, 1234 E. Madison Park, Chicago, IL 60615.

Carrying out a resolution of last year's Section Business Meeting, I have appointed Margaret Levi (University of Washington) to head a select committee to consider proposals that the Section might award. That committee is now in contact with the various departments in September; we urge you to approach Professor Levi immediately with any thoughts you may want to express. She, too, can be reached conveniently by e-mail at mlevi@u.washington.edu.

I look forward to seeing as many of you as possible at the upcoming Section Business Meetings in Chicago. We need your input, there is no one informally. Please let us hear from you.
**Business Meeting:** The annual business meeting of the section was held during the 1991 meetings of the American Political Science Association in Washington, D.C. The section president, Ronald Rogowski, began by noting that we are now one of the largest sections within the APSA, with nearly 900 members. This reflects the broadening international interests of many political scientists and their perceived need for more exchange with their colleagues.

The selection committee of the section announced the nomination of Peter Lange and David Collier for the two vacant seats on the section's executive committee. They were approved by acclamation. In addition, it was announced that W. Phillips Shively had agreed to serve as the section's program coordinator for the 1992 APSA meeting. The executive committee also warmly acknowledged Bob Bates' excellent job in coordinating section panels for the 1991 meeting.

Under new business, the president and executive committee proposed the formation of a committee to develop section awards to recognize outstanding scholarship in the field of comparative politics. Margaret Levi agreed to chair the committee. After some discussion, the committee was charged to consider methods for recognizing outstanding books and articles in comparative politics, papers presented at the section's APSA panels, and graduate student scholarship.

The meeting also discussed the financial status of the section. The secretary-treasurer reported that with present membership levels we can afford to issue two newsletters a year, but this would leave us with only minimal funds for additional activities. A variety of fund-raising options were discussed, including accepting advertisements in the newsletter and other subventions to support section activities. The executive committee agreed to explore these options.

In a discussion of membership priorities, section members introduced three proposals concerning the section's relationship with the APSA and the funding of section and APSA activities:

1) We should express our conviction to the APSA that excessive resources are committed to non-peer reviewed articles in *PS*. These resources should be redirected to organized section activities.
2) The present $3 (for the APSA) to $2 (for the section) split of section dues should be reversed, with $3 coming to the section and $2 going to the APSA.
3) Graduate Student section dues should be reduced from $5 to $3, with $1 of the dues coming to the section and $2 going to the APSA.

Each of the proposals was unanimously supported by the members attending the meeting. The section president was directed to communicate these views to the APSA Council.

There being no further business, the meeting was adjourned.

**Constitutional Reform:** As the tide of democratization sweeps the world, the CP section moved to balance these currents. The 1991 business meeting passed a resolution calling for the selection committee to nominate a single candidate for vice president of the section, instead of proposing two names for competitive election as was the existing procedure. As required by section by-laws, this proposal was put to the members in a mail ballot.

The ballots were distributed with the 1991 newsletter and the votes were tabulated by the secretary-treasurer. Although suffering from a low turnout, the constitutional change was passed by the voting members.

Adam Przeworski will serve as Program Chair for our panels at the 1993 APSA meetings. Your suggestions for panels or for individual papers should be directed to:

Adam Przeworski  
Department of Political Science  
University of Chicago  
1234 E. Madison Park  
Chicago, IL 60615.
Section 21: Comparative Politics

Chair: W. Phillips Shively, University of Minnesota

21-1 Political Economy of the State
Chair/Discussant: David R. Cameron, Yale University
"Foreign Debt and the Politics of State Reorganization in Australia, New Zealand, and Denmark: the 1980s" Herman Schwartz, University of Vienna
"The Rentier State and Pressure Groups" Hootan Shambayati, University of Utah

21-2 Issues in the Study of Political Change
Chair/Discussant: James Caporaso, University of Washington
Papers "Development Paradoxes: Between the Theory-Oriented and the Policy-Oriented" Stephen Chin, University of Minnesota, Duluth
"The Myth of Democracy: Europe Reflected in the Mirror of Third World" Sandra Halperin, University of Pittsburgh
"Rethinking Elocution? Lipset, Dahl, Huntington and Skocpol and Redemocratization in Argentina and Brazil" Anthony O'Regan, University of California, Santa Barbara

21-3 Comparative Analysis of Revolutions
Chair/Discussant: Mark Lichbach, University of Colorado
Papers "Crisis in the Study of Revolution" Scott Conley, University of California, Berkeley
"Revolutions: Discursive Interpretations, Symbolic Conflict and the Palestinian Intifada" Deborah L. Wheeler, University of Chicago
"Rationality, Revolution and Reassurance" Mark Wickham-Jones, University of Bristol

21-4 Comparative Studies of Political Opposition
Chair: Robert Melson, Purdue University
Papers "Liberalism and the Limits to State Formation and State Control in the Middle East" Jill Crystal, University of Michigan
"Explaining Human Rights Violations" James M. McCormick, Iowa State University
Neil J. Miller, University of New Mexico
"Repression and Freedom in the Eighties: A Pooled Cross-Sectional Test of Contending Theories" Steven C. Poe, University of North Texas
C. Neal Tate, University of North Texas

Disc: Conway Henderson, University of South Carolina, Spartanburg

21-5 Comparative Analysis of Markets and Liberalization
Chair/Discussant: Henry Bienen, Princeton University
Papers "The Dilemmas of Social Policy Reform in Czechoslovakia and Hungary" Erich G. Frankland, University of Oklahoma
Robert H. Cox, University of Oklahoma
"Market Attitudes in East and West" David S. Mason, Butler University
"The Politics of Economic Liberalization: Argentina and Brazil in Comparative Perspective" Robert A. Packenham, Stanford University

21-6 Strategic Placements of Parties in Party Spaces
Chair/Discussant: Herbert Kitschelt, Duke University
Papers "To Moderate or to Polarize? Center Parties and Center Tendencies in Denmark and the Netherlands" Reuven Y. Hazan, Columbia University
"Military Parties in Post-Authoritarian Regimes" Deborah Le-Norden, University of California, Berkeley

21-7 Implications of Democratization, and Failure to Democratize
Chair/Discussant: Thomas D. Lancaster, Emory University
Papers "Democracy and Human Rights in Less Developed Countries" David Louis Cinagranelli, SUNY, Binghamton
"Distorted Politics: The Failure to Democratize" Manus Midlarsky, Rutgers University
Roundtable: Teaching Introductory Comparative Politics in an Age of Change

Chair: Joseph L. Klesner, Kenyon College
Chih Hau, Cornell College
John McCormick, University of Chicago
Michael Mitchell, Arizona State University
Jennifer Widner, Harvard University
David Wilfson, Georgia Institute of Technology
Frank L. Wrenn, Purdue University

Roundtable: Lipset and Democracy: New Perspectives

Chair: Gary Marks, University of North Carolina
Larry D. Snodgrass, Hoover Institution
Juan Linz, Yale University
Philippe Schmitter, Center for Advanced Study in the Behavioral Sciences
William Schneider, American Enterprise Institute
Kaare Strom, University of California, San Diego

Ideas and the Politics of Economic Policy Paradigm Shifts

Chair: Peter Johnson, McGill University
Papers:
* "Policy Change in Chile and Great Britain" Hector Schamis, CIEPLAN
* "Constraints on the Role of Ideas in Policy Making in Germany and the United States" Peter Johnson, McGill University
* "Ideas and Economic Policy Change in Latin America" Kathryn Sikkink, University of Minnesota

Disc: Peter Hall, Harvard University

The Study of Transitions to Democracy and the Crisis, Choice and Change Model

Chair: Ray Taras, Tulane University
Papers:
* "The Crisis, Choice and Change Model from the Perspective of the Intellectual Development of the Comparative Field and Theories of Democratic Transition" Gabriel A. Almond, Stanford University
* "Adapting the Crisis, Choice and Change Model to the Study of Democratic Transitions" Scott C. Flanagan, Florida State University
* "Requisites for Successful Democratization: Nineteenth Century British and French Cases" Robert J. Mundt, University of North Carolina, Charlotte

Disc: Thomas Remington, Emory University

European Social Democracy: Decline or Transition?

Chair/Discussion: Peter Hall, Harvard University
Papers:
* "Class Structure and Social Democratic Party Strategy" Herbert Kitschelt, Duke University
* "Fordism and Social Democracy in Comparative Perspective" Jonas Pontusson, Cornell University
* "Social Democracy and the Welfare State" John Stephens and Evelyne Huber Stephens,

Northwestern University

“What’s Wrong with Social Democracy?”
Michael Wallerstein, University of California, Los Angeles

Coup Against Moene, University of Oslo

Democratization Through Political Culture/Approaching Political Culture Through Democratization

Chair: Peter McDonough, Arizona State University
Papers:
* "Democratization and Political Culture in Central and Eastern Europe" Laszlo Bruszt and Janos Simon, Hungarian Academy of Sciences
* "Democratization and Political Culture in Brazil" Jose Alvaro Moises, University of Sao Paulo
* "Democratization and Political Culture in Korea" Doh C. Shih, Sangamon State University
* "Democratization and Political Culture in the United Kingdom" Myung Chey, Seoul National University
* "Democratization and Political Culture in Japan" Kwang-Woong Kim, Seoul National University

Disc: Russell J. Dalton, University of California, Irvine

Comparative Political Method and the Study of Women and Politics

Cospresented with Women and Politics section

Chair: Karen Beckwith, College of Wooster
Papers:
* "Comparative Citizenship: Women in Post-1945 Canada, France, and the United Kingdom" Jane Jenson, Carleton University
* "The Challenge of Developing the Comparative Study of Western and Third World Women" Mervat Hatem, Howard University

Cospresented with Women and Politics—Comparative to what?

Michelle St.-Germain, University of Arizona

21-15

Federalism, Nationalism and Ethnicity

Cospresented with Federalism section

Chair: Stephen L. Schechter, Russell Sage College
Papers:
* "Soviet Federalism after the Coup: Can Federalism Cope with Rampant Nationalism?" Sue Davis, Emory University
* "American and Soviet Perspectives on Federalism: A Cross-National Analysis" Sarah F. Liebeschutz, SUNY, Brockport
* "Barbara Jancar-Webster, SUNY, Brockport"
* "Non-ethnic Separatism in Federal Systems: An Australian Case" Dean E. McHenry, Jr., Claremont Graduate School

Disc: Paul T. Neil, Eastern College
The German Marshall Fund of the United States

Richard Biernacki, Department of Sociology, University of California, San Diego. *A Topography of the Imagination: The Symbolic Foundations of State and Nation in Germany.* The study will examine the German public's use of political ritual and symbolism in conceiving their attachment to a national community since reunification. It will compare memorials to the past and annual local celebrations of unity in eastern and western Germany.

Ted Dumore, Department of Politics, New York University. *Immigrants, Refugees, and Political Reaction: National Policy and Anti-Immigrant Violence in Germany, 1892-1983.* This project will study the reciprocal relationship between governmental policy and political violence in Germany surrounding the issues of immigration and refugees. Part of a broader European study, this project will focus on how Germany responds to these challenges to national identity and political stability.

Kurt von Mettenheim, Department of Political Science, University of Pittsburgh. *Delegation and Realignment: Trends toward Direct Democracy among German Voters?* This project will examine the implications of rapidly shifting public opinion and the sway of party elites over social movements during "reunification-through-elections" in 1990, both for prevailing views of German public opinion and broader theories of electoral representation and democratic theory.

Thomas Childers, Department of History, University of Pennsylvania. The project will analyze political identity and political mobilization in the age of mass politics in Germany, 1890-1990. It will seek to determine how class, religion, region, generation, and gender have been politically constructed over time, with special focus on the social language of politics.

Ralph Della Cava, Department of History, Queens College, City University of New York. The Roman Catholic Church has been engaging in the rebuilding of its churches, institutions, and monastic presence throughout Central and Eastern Europe since the fall of the Berlin Wall. The project focuses on this complex process of "reincorporation" of some 70 million nominal believers, and its effects on the re-making of contemporary Europe.

Janet Geile, Heller Graduate School of Social Welfare, Brandeis University. This study compares West and East German women's lives with women's changing life patterns in the United States. If the American trend toward multiple roles is also found among younger German women, the shift may indicate an adaptation to increasing uncertainty in modern industrial societies.

Peter Haus, Department of Political Science, University of Massachusetts at Amherst. A study of the evolution of international efforts to control European acid rains, the project focuses on the policies by which international environmental policy coordination occurs, the factors which influence national choices for foreign environmental policy, and the broader socioeconomic and structural parameters within which such patterns persist.

Herbert Kitschelt, Department of Political Science, Duke University. Kitschelt will examine the political alternatives that party elites in Belgium, Czechoslovakia, Hungary, and Poland present to their electorate and the consequences of such appeals for political cleavages and party organizations. The project employs elite interviews and questionnaires to test theories of party system formation.

Michele Lamont, Department of Sociology, Princeton University. Drawing on 300 interviews with working and upper-middle-class women living in the New York and the Paris suburbs, this study explores working class cultural resistance and distinctiveness, as well as the salience of class, race, ethnic, and religious boundaries for white and minority working class men.

Vedat Milor, Department of Sociology, Brown University. The research examines why Eastern European countries follow radically different paths to privatization of large-scale enterprises. Through case study analysis of significant privatization episodes it identifies (a) the socio-political bases of pro-privatization coalitions; (b) the role of the state in privatizations; and (c) the socio-economic consequences of different privatization strategies.

Ann Orloff, Department of Sociology, University of Wisconsin, Madison. Systems of public social provision (the "welfare state") shape gender interests, identities and relationships, and affect the resources available to women and men. Using a conceptual framework drawing on mainstream and feminist scholarship, the project will systematically compare the gender content of social provision in Britain, the United States, Canada and Australia since 1900.

Wayne Sandholtz, Department of Political Science, Scripps College. With the 1991 treaty on monetary union, European Community governments agreed to give up national currencies and monetary policies. The EC will create instead one currency and a common central bank. This project will discover the political choices and bargains behind this unprecedented sacrifice of sovereignty.

Lowell Turner, Industrial and Labor Relations School, Cornell University. The widely recognized and successful West German industrial relations model has come under intense new stress. This is a study of contemporary German unions and works councils as they grapple with the twin challenges of German unification and European economic integration.
Democratization in Europe

Political Science 229E
Hans-Dieter Klingemann and
Russell Dalton, University of California, Irvine

This course examines the process of democratization in Europe during this century, starting with the first democratic transitions following World War II, and the focusing on the recent transitions to democracy in Central and Eastern Europe.

We examine several alternative theoretical models of the democratization process, and then apply these models to the European experience. Special interest is devoted to the cultural foundations of democracy, the role of political parties and party systems in facilitating the transition, and the factors affecting the choice of constitutional structures. Students in the course are also invited to participate in a research workshop on "Institutions and the Democratic Process."

This is primarily a readings and discussion course, thus we will cover a large amount of literature at each weekly session. There are two required texts for the course:


In addition, a core packet of assigned readings from the journal articles and single book chapters is available at the Clone Factory. Also, a set of book with longer readings (e.g., several chapters) are on reserve in the UCI Main Library. There is a lot to read, but consider this your good fortune to experience so much of the literature in a single term.

There are two basic requirements for the seminar: First, you are expected to read all of the assigned readings and a critical discussion of the readings in the weekly sessions. Second, you are expected to write an original article-length research paper on some aspect of the democratization process in Europe. Individual consultations will be arranged to discuss the paper topics and possible research resources. The final grade in the seminar will give equal weight to these two components of the course. There are no written exams.

Week One: Course Introduction and Planning Session
J. Roland Pennock, Democratic Political Theory, ch. 1.

Week Two: Postwar Democratic Transitions in Western Europe
John Herz, From Dictatorship to Democracy (1982). ch. 1, conclusion, and one national chapter.


Additional Readings:


Juan Linz and Alfred Stepan, The Breakdown of Democratic Regimes, chs. 1-4, 14, 15.


Week Three: The Winds of Change in the Soviet Union (Sergei Plekanov lecture)


Additional Readings:


Week Four: Revolutionary Change in Eastern Europe


Jeff Goodwin and Valerie Bunce, "Eastern Europe's 'Revolutions' in Comparative and Theoretical Perspective."

Additional Readings:


Week Five: The Social-Structural Model


Tam Vanhanen, "The Level of Democratization Related to Socioeconomic Variables in 147 States in 1980-1985," *Scandinavian Political Studies* 1989:95-

Additional Readings:


Week Six: The Actor-Centered Model


Additional Readings:


Building Democracies

Week Seven: Developing a Democratic Political Culture


Additional Readings:

J. Roland Pennock, Democratic Political Theory, pp. 236-259.
Ronald Inglehart, Culture Shift in Advanced Industrial Society, ch. 2 and 8.


Week Eight: Institutions and the Democratization Process (Conference)


Additional Readings:


Giuseppe Di Palma, Crafting Democracy, chaps. 6 and 7.

Week Nine: The Construction of Party Systems


Week Ten: Electoral Alignments


Week Eleven: Economics and Markets


Additional Readings:


Supplemental Sources


Dennis Dunn, ed. Religion and Nationalism in Eastern Europe (Boulder: Lynn Reimer Press).


John Higley and Richard Gunther, eds. Elites and Democratic Consolidation in Latin America and Southern Europe.

Gerd Meyer and Franciszek Ryszka, eds. Political Participation and Democracy in Poland and Western Germany (Warsaw, 1991).


The Concept of Power

Political Science 273
Professor Margaret Levi, University of Washington

The focus of this course is on the concept of power. We shall investigate several different perspectives on what power is. Our aim, however, is to learn how to analyze relationships of power within actual historical and contemporary settings. To that end several of the books offer empirical problems for us to consider.

It is expected that students will keep up with the reading and participate in the discussion. The course will be run according to a form of the Socratic method. This means that the professor will often act a devil's advocate in order to encourage thoughtful, well-reasoned student arguments. It also means that students can be expected to be called upon from time to time if they are not already participating.

The written requirements of the course are two short papers (3-5 pages) and one long paper (10-15 pages).

Week One: Friedrich Engels, The Origin of the Family, Private Property, and the State

This is one of the principal statements of the classical Marxist theory of power. Even though the Soviet Union is changing its ideology and even though communists throughout the world are beginning to revise or even reject communism, Marxism survives as a social science. Mill, Engels, and Lenin raised issues and developed approaches that remain crucial tools for social science research.

Week Two: C. Wright Mills, The Power Elite

C. Wright Mills is a famous American sociologist of the 1950s and 1960s. Building on certain Marxist insights, he developed an analysis of power in America. He claimed that the United States was dominated by a "Military Industrial Complex." His view was the centerpiece of considerable subsequent research as scholars tried to support Mills' perspective or offer alternatives.

Week Three: Steven Lukes, Power: A Radical View

Steven Lukes is an important English social theorist. In this short book, he outlines the two major perspectives that were offered as critiques and alternatives to Mills. He then offers a further alternative that is influenced by Antonio Gramsci, the Italian Marxist theorist who developed the notion of hegemony.

Weeks Four and Five: Michel Foucault, Discipline and Punishment

On the continent of Europe, a different analytical tradition developed. The writers in this tradition, e.g., Althusser, Poulantzas, and Habermas, also offered perspectives on power. The most important of these is that in the work of Michel Foucault, a French Philosopher. Foucault is less concerned with the powerful than with how the non-powerful are affected and might affect the nature of power.

Weeks Six and Seven: James C. Scott, Weapons of the Weak

Scott, a contemporary political scientist, shares the concerns of Lukes and Foucault with the power (or powerlessness) of the weak person. He rejects, however, the notion of hegemony as a useful tool. Moreover, his approach is inductive and comparative. He develops his ideas only after investigating concrete instances.

Weeks Eight and Nine: Kristin Luker, Abortion: The Politics of Motherhood

We end the readings with a book that permits us to apply the concepts developed earlier in the course. Luker, a sociologist, explores the transformation of abortion from a medical to a political issue with consequences for power over the decision to abort, on the one hand, and over policy formation, on the other.
Comparative Welfare States

PS 2373/PIA 258/HIST 2049
Professor Douglas Ashford, University of Pittsburgh

The seminar is an historical and political introduction to the internal dynamics of the modern state since approxi- mately the century. The sessions are roughly divided into thirds: conceptual and theoretical approaches to the comparison of welfare states; historical and political foundations of the welfare states; and the development of five or six major social policy areas since the war.

Students will be asked to make short, critical presentations of the materials and to write a term paper. The paper should be genuinely comparative in at least one of three ways: Two time periods for one country; two countries at similar time periods (defined in suitable terms); or two policy areas (suitable defined) across two or more countries. A one page summary of the paper and major readings to be used will be required at mid-term.

Required books:


1. Introduction:


Ashford, The Emergence of the Welfare State, pp. 1-29.


2. Push Theories of the Welfare State


Ashford, The Emergence of the Welfare State, pp. 30-105.


3. Pull Theories of the Welfare State:


4. British Origins:


R. Hennock, from old section 4.


5. French Origins:


6. German Origins:


7. Swedish Origins:


9. Wartime Foundations:


10. Pensions:


11. Health:

Ashford, *Social Democratic Visions*, ms., ch. 5.


12. Unemployment:

Leon Lindberg, *Stress and Contradiction in Modern Capitalism*, 1975, chs. 1, 2, and 3.


Peter Lange, et al., eds., *Unions, Crisis and Change*.

13. Poverty:


