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**Course Description and Objectives**:

Does democracy promotion work? How would we know? Is democracy promotion ethical? Why do most U.S. presidents say that promoting democracy is in the American national interest? How and under what conditions do their actions in office live up to their rhetoric?

In this course, we will learn what political science can tell us about these and other questions. Democracy promotion takes many forms, including military intervention, economic sanctions, membership conditionality in international organizations, and foreign aid. Since the 1980s, the U.S. government has spent billions of dollars – many times more than any other country – promoting democracy in more than one hundred countries. Arguably, its efforts have played an important role in helping people-powered movements bring democracy to countries such as Poland and Serbia. Yet these efforts have also been sharply criticized from a variety of perspectives. Some people argue that democracy promotion is an unwelcome form of foreign meddling, perhaps akin to what the U.S. itself experienced during the 2016 election. Others point out the inconsistencies and hypocrisies in the democracy promotion policies of the United States and international organizations. Yet others criticize from a different angle, accepting democracy promoters’ motives but suggesting that their efforts fall short when it comes to implementation.

Your work in this class will help you understand the history and contemporary practice of democracy promotion as well as the debates that surround it. We will read cutting-edge social science research on the topic as well as materials written by and for the people who are involved in the practice of democracy promotion around the world. We will reflect on the readings together in class, and you will also do so in a variety of forms of writing. Many of the readings are challenging, and some of them use statistics, but prior knowledge of the topic or of statistics is not required.

**Requirements**: This seminar has three requirements.

1. Class participation (20% of final grade): I expect you to attend class and hope you will participate in our discussions. I welcome your comments and questions. I have found that active participation is the best way to learn the material. If you feel confused or lost, you are not the only one. You will do everyone a favor if you jump in and ask a question. If you have difficulty speaking up in class, please come see me. I have some strategies we can talk about for increasing your participation. Remember that if you hear yourself speak once during the first week it will be far easier to speak later. Finally, please be aware that I may call on students to share their thoughts periodically to help enliven our discussions.

2. Response papers (40% of final grade): You should write 8 1-2-page (double-spaced) response papers, which will be due at 5pm on Mondays before class via Canvas. Please pick whichever weeks you prefer. You should pick two of the readings for the week, briefly summarize them, and critically analyze their contribution. It is important for the summaries to be *brief* so that you can concentrate most of your effort on explaining to what extent you agree with the authors (and why) and on raising questions and ideas to be discussed in class.

*Note*: I have provided possible discussion questions on the syllabus for the assigned readings. You should use these questions to help you prepare for class. If you wish, you may use them as springboards for your response papers, but that isn’t required.

3. Final paper (40% of final grade): You should write an 8-12-page (double-spaced) final paper, which is due at 5pm on Thursday, December 13 via Canvas. You should choose one of the following essay prompts. If you want to write a paper on another topic related to the course, that it also fine, but please talk to me about your proposed topic as soon as possible and certainly no later than October 26.

1. Policymakers and practitioners want to know if democracy assistance programs are effective. Propose a design for original research that you might undertake in the future that would evaluate the effects of an ongoing democracy assistance program that you have identified through online research (e.g., finding a program described on the USAID website). You should develop a hypothesis, explain why testing it is important, and propose a quantitative and/or qualitative research design (including proposing data and plans for analysis) that would test your hypothesis.
2. Is U.S. democracy promotion different under President Joseph Biden than it was under President Donald Trump? You should choose some facet of U.S. democracy promotion (e.g., foreign aid programs in Central and Eastern Europe) and conduct research to establish how, if at all, who occupies the presidency has changed the content or effects of this policy. What do you conclude about democracy promotion or foreign policy more generally based on your research?

**Readings:** It is my aim to assign texts that represent the breadth of the academic literature on democracy promotion as well as some of the more policy-oriented writings on this topic. The readings come from a variety of perspectives and use a variety of methods. I expect you will find some arguments more persuasive than others and look forward to hearing about that. I have also included optional readings for students interested in delving deeper into specific topics.

All materials for the course will be available through Course Reserves on Canvas or links from the syllabus.

**Course Policies:** I will adhere to several common-sense policies consistently over the course of this seminar to ensure fairness and equal opportunity for all students. I am using the course policies suggested by the Center for Teaching and Learning with only a few modifications.[[1]](#footnote-1) If you have any questions about the course policies, please ask.

Academic integrity is a core institutional value at Yale. It means, among other things, truth in presentation, diligence and precision in citing works and ideas we have used, and acknowledging our collaborations with others. In view of our commitment to maintaining the highest standards of academic integrity, the Undergraduate Regulations ([http://catalog.yale.edu/undergraduate- regulations/policies/definitions-plagiarism-cheating/](http://catalog.yale.edu/undergraduate-%20regulations/policies/definitions-plagiarism-cheating/)) and the Graduate School Code of Conduct specifically prohibits the following forms of behavior: cheating on examinations, problem sets and all other forms of assessment; falsification and/or fabrication of data; plagiarism, that is, the failure in a dissertation, essay or other written exercise to acknowledge ideas, research, or language taken from others; and multiple submission of the same work without obtaining explicit written permission from both instructors before the material is submitted. Students found guilty of violations of academic integrity are subject to one or more of the following penalties: written reprimand, probation, suspension (noted on a student’s transcript), or dismissal (noted on a student’s transcript).

Grading policies: I will accept late assignments, but they will be penalized by 1/3 of a letter grade for every 24-hour period or part thereof (e.g., an A paper will be reduced to an A- paper if handed in 20 hours late). I understand that illnesses and other emergencies are unfortunately part of life and will grant extensions when a “dean’s excuse” is provided. If you have questions about your grades, please come to my office hours or make an appointment to discuss in person.

Disability disclosure: If you have already established accommodations with the Resource Office on Disabilities (ROD), please communicate your approved accommodations to me at your earliest convenience so we can discuss your needs in this course. If you have not yet established services through ROD, but have a temporary health condition or permanent disability that requires accommodations (conditions include but are not limited to: mental health, attention-related, learning, vision, hearing, physical or health impacts), you are welcome to contact ROD at 203-432-2324 to make an appointment. General information for students can be found on the Student Information page of the Resource Office on Disabilities’ website (<https://rod.yale.edu/student-information)>. ROD offers resources and coordinates reasonable accommodations for students with disabilities and/or temporary health conditions. Reasonable accommodations are established through an interactive process between you, your instructor(s), and ROD. It is important to Yale University to create inclusive and accessible learning environments consistent with federal and state law.

Commitment to an inclusive learning environment: The university adheres to the philosophy that all community members should enjoy an environment free of any form of harassment, sexual misconduct, discrimination, or intimate partner violence. If you have been the victim of sexual misconduct, we encourage you to report this. If you report this to a faculty/staff member, they must notify our college’s Title IX coordinator about the basic facts of the incident (you may choose to request confidentiality from the University). If you encounter sexual harassment, sexual misconduct, sexual assault, or discrimination based on race, color, religion, age, national origin, ancestry, sex, sexual orientation, gender identity, or disability please contact the Title IX Coordinator, Stephanie Spangler, at [stephanie.spangler@yale.edu](mailto:stephanie.spangler@yale.edu) or 203.432.4446 or any of the University Title IX Coordinators, who can be found at <http://provost.yale.edu/title-ix/coordinators>.

Communications: Essential course materials can be found on the website via Canvas. Important announcements will also be made in class and by e-mail. Please do your best to keep up to date and check with me and/or other students should you have any concerns or believe that you have missed something. The best way to get in touch with me is via e-mail at [sarah.bush@yale.edu](mailto:sarah.bush@yale.edu). I do my best to respond to messages quickly. You can expect me to respond to your e-mails within 24 hours during the week, but if you contact me after 8pm, don’t count on hearing from me until the next day.

Civility and respect in our academic community: Yale University supports and wants to foster a civil, respectful, and open-minded climate so that all of us can live and work in an environment free of harassment, bias-motivated behaviors, unfair treatment, and fear. By committing to working with our better selves, we can work, in all our communities, towards greater mutual understanding of the questions that guide our inquiries. The university expects all members of our community to refrain from actions or behaviors that intimidate, humiliate, or demean persons or groups or that undermine their security or self-esteem based on traits related to race, ethnicity, country of origin, religion, gender identity/expression, sexual orientation, age, or physical or mental ability, including learning and/or developmental disabilities and past/present history of mental disorder or other category protected by state or federal law.

Recording: No portion of the class may be recorded or transmitted using audio, still, or moving image recording devices without my express written consent or appropriate documentation from the ROD.

Covid: We are still navigating life and learning amidst a pandemic. I am committed to being as flexible as possible as the situation evolves.

**Class Schedule with Assigned Readings**

*subject to revision*

**I. INTRODUCTION AND CONCEPTS**

**Class 1 – Conceptual Foundations**

*Required readings:*

Coppedge, Michael, et al. 2011. “Conceptualizing and Measuring Democracy: A New Approach.” *Perspectives on Politics* 9(2): 247-267.

Donnelly, Jack. 1999. “Human Rights, Democracy, and Development.” *Human Rights Quarterly* 21: 608-632.

Gunitsky, Seva. 2015. Competing Measures of Democracy in the Former Soviet Republics. In *Ranking the World: The Politics of International Rankings and Ratings,* ed. Alexander Cooley and Jack Snyder. New York: Cambridge University Press, pp. 112-150.

*Optional readings:*

Bush, Sarah Sunn. 2017. “The Politics of Rating Freedom: Ideological Affinity, Private Authority, and the Freedom in the World Ratings.” *Perspectives on Politics* 15(3): 711-731.

Giannone, Diego. 2010. “Political and Ideological Aspects in the Measurement of Democracy: The Freedom House Case.” *Democratization* 17(1): 68-97.

Girod, Desha M., Stephen D. Krasner, and Kathryn Stoner-Weiss. 2009. “Governance and Foreign Assistance: The Imperfect Translation of Ideas into Outcomes.” In *Promoting Democracy and the Rule of Law: American and European Strategies*, edited by Amichai Magen, Thomas Risse, and Michael A. McFaul. London: Palgrave Macmillan, pp. 61-92.

Hobson, Christopher and Milja Kurki, eds. 2012. *The Conceptual Politics of Democracy Promotion*. London: Routledge.

*Possible reflection questions:*

* Which approaches to conceptualizing and measuring democracy in the readings do you find most compelling?
* Which measures would you use to evaluate the effectiveness of U.S. democracy promotion?
* Do you think “democracy” is different than “human rights”? In what ways do you think they differ conceptually? In practice?
* What assumptions about “democracy” do U.S. policy makers make? How have those assumptions changed over time?

**II. HISTORY**

**Class 2 – Historical Roots**

*Required readings:*

Bouchet, Nicholas. 2013. “The Democracy Tradition in U.S. Foreign Policy and the Obama Presidency.” *International Affairs* 89(1): 31-51.

Ikenberry, G. John. 2000. America’s Liberal Grand Strategy: Democracy and National Security in the Post-war Era. In *American Democracy Promotion: Impulses, Strategies, and Impacts,* ed. Michael Cox, G. John Ikenberry, and Takashi Inoguchi. Oxford: Oxford University Press, pp. 103-126.

Monten, Jonathan. 2005. “The Roots of the Bush Doctrine: Power, Nationalism, and Democracy Promotion in U.S. Strategy.” *International Security* 29(4): 112-156.

*Optional readings:*

Green, Brendan Rittenhouse. 2012. “Two Concepts of Liberty: U.S. Cold War Grand Strategies and the Liberal Tradition.” *International Security* 37(2): 9-43.

Melia, Thomas O. 2006. “The Democracy Bureaucracy.” *American Interest* 1(4): 122-130.

*Possible reflection questions:*

* What is new and what is old about contemporary U.S. democracy promotion?
* To what extent is democracy promotion a key part of American grand strategy? How does democracy promotion relate to other U.S. foreign policy objectives?
* There are many different tools of democracy promotion. What are their advantages and disadvantages?

**Class 3 – Regime Change into Democracy Promotion**

*Required readings:*

Abrams, Elliott. 2017. *Realism and Democracy: American Foreign Policy After the Arab Spring*. New York: Cambridge University Press. Introduction (pp. 1-91).

O’Rourke, Lindsey A. 2018. *Covert Regime Change: America’s Secret Cold War*. Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press. Chapters 1 and 5 (pp. 1-21, 97-124).

Søndergaard, Rasmus Sinding. 2019. “A Positive Track of Human Rights Policy”: Elliott Abrams, the Human Rights Bureau, and the Conceptualization of Democracy Promotion. In *The Reagan Administration, the Cold War, and the Transition to Democracy Promotion*, ed. Robert Pee and William Michael Schmidli. Cham, Switzerland: Palgrave Macmillan, pp. 31-50.

*Optional readings:*

Bubeck, Johannes and Nikolay Marinov. 2017. “Process or Candidate: The International Community and the Demand for Electoral Integrity.” *American Political Science Review* 111(3): 535-554.

Downes, Alexander B. and Jonathan Monten. 2013. “Forced to be Free?: Why Foreign-Imposed Regime Change Rarely Leads to Democratization.” *International Security* 37(4): 90-131.

Hartmann, Hauke. 2001. “U.S. Human Rights Policy under Carter and Reagan, 1977-1981.” *Human Rights Quarterly* 23(2): 402-430.

Laber, Jeri. 2005. *The Courage of Strangers: Coming of Age with the Human Rights Movement*. New York: PublicAffairs.

Levin, Dov H. 2016. “When the Great Power Gets a Vote: The Effects of Great Power Electoral Interventions on Election Results.” *International Studies Quarterly* 60(2): 189-202.

*Possible reflection questions:*

* To what extent do you see continuity between early Cold War efforts at regime change and late Cold War democracy promotion?
* How would you categorize aid to dissidents in an authoritarian regime: democracy promotion, election interference, both, neither?
* Returning to the question of the relationship between democracy promotion and advancing human rights: do you view these as overlapping aims or something else?

**Class 4 – The Post-Cold War Moment**

*Required readings:*

Börzel, Tanja A., and Thomas Risse. 2009. Venus Approaching Mars? The European Union’s Approaches to Democracy Promotion in Comparative Perspective. In *Promoting Democracy and the Rule of Law*, edited by Amichai Magen, Thomas Risse, and Michael A. McFaul. London: Palgrave Macmillan, pp. 34-60.

Bush, George W. 2003. “Remarks at the 20th Anniversary of the National Endowment for Democracy.” Available at <http://www.ned.org/george-w-bush/remarks-by-president-george-w-bush-at-the-20th-anniversary>.

McFaul, Michael. 2004. “Democracy Promotion as a World Value.” *The Washington Quarterly* 28: 147-163.

Mendelson, Sarah E. 2001. “Democracy Assistance and Political Transition in Russia: Between Success and Failure.” *International Security* 25: 68-106.

Rich, Roland. 2001. “Bringing Democracy into International Law.” *Journal of Democracy* 12: 20-34.

*Optional readings:*

Carothers, Thomas. 1999. *Aiding Democracy Abroad: The Learning Curve*. Washington, DC: Carnegie Endowment for International Peace.

Guilhot, Nicolas. 2005. *The Democracy Makers: Human Rights and International Order*. New York: Columbia University Press.

Obama, Barack. 2009. “The President’s Speech in Cairo: A New Beginning.” Available at <https://obamawhitehouse.archives.gov/issues/foreign-policy/presidents-speech-cairo-a-new-beginning>.

Reagan, Ronald. 1983. “Address to Members of the British Parliament” (“Westminster Address”). Available at <https://www.heritage.org/europe/report/20-years-later-reagans-westminster-speech>.

*Possible reflection questions:*

* What is the relationship between democracy promotion in U.S. foreign policy and democracy promotion in international institutions?
* How have the rationales for democracy promotion changed over time? Are the post-Cold War justifications more or less convincing?
* What are the causal claims that are embedded in policymakers’ justifications for democracy promotion? Do we know if they are true? How would we?

**Class 5 – The Color Revolutions**

*Required readings (includes film):*

Beissinger, Mark R. 2007. “Structure and Example in Modular Political Phenomena: The Diffusion of Bulldozer/Rose/Orange/Tulip Revolutions.” *Perspectives on Politics* 5(2): 259-276.

Bunce, Valerie J. and Sharon L. Wolchik. 2007. “Defeating Dictators: Electoral Change and Stability in Competitive Authoritarian Regimes.” *World Politics* 62(1): 43-86.

Film: “Bringing Down a Dictator” (56 minutes). Available at <https://vimeo.com/143379353>.

*Optional readings:*

Levitsky, Steven and Lucan A. Way. 2010. *Competitive Authoritarianism: Hybrid Regimes after the Cold War*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. Chapters 3 and 5 (pp. 87-129, 183-235).

Mitchell, Lincoln A. 2004. “Georgia’s Rose Revolution.” *Current History* 103: 342-348.

Mitchell, Lincoln A. 2006. “Democracy in Georgia Since the Rose Revolution.” *Orbis* 50(4): 669-676.

*Possible reflection questions:*

* Did democracy promotion play a causal role in the Color Revolutions? How do you know?
* To what extent were democracy promotion efforts in the cases under study interventions in favor of the democracy process (regardless of its outcome) vs. interventions in favor (or against) specific candidates and parties?
* What were the most decisive elements of Western support for the movement that brought down Milosevic?
* Do you see analogies between the Color Revolutions and the Arab Spring? What is similar/different?

**Class 6 – Authoritarian Backlash**

*Required readings:*

Chaudhry, Suparna. Forthcoming. “The Assault on Civil Society: Explaining State Repression of NGOs.” *International Organization*.

Christensen, Darin and Jeremy Weinstein. 2013. “Defunding Dissent: Restrictions on Aid to NGOs.” *Journal of Democracy* 24(2): 77-91.

Darden, Keith A. 2017. “Russian Revanche: External Threats & Regime Reactions.” *Daedalus* 146(2): 128-141.

Feldstein, Steven. 2020. *The Rise of Digital Repression: How Technology is Reshaping Power, Politics, and Resistance*. New York: Oxford University Press. Chapters 1 and 4 (pp. 1-21 and 96-133). \*\*Feldstein will be a guest speaker in this class\*\*

Simpser, Alberto and Daniela Donno. 2012. “Can International Election Monitoring Harm Governance?” *Journal of Politics* 74(2): 501-513.

*Optional readings:*

Daxecker, Ursula E. 2012. “The Cost of Exposing Cheating: International Election Monitoring, Fraud, and Post-Election Violence in Africa.” *Journal of Peace Research* 49(4): 503-516.

Driscoll, Jesse and Daniel F. Hidalgo. 2014. “Intended and Unintended Consequences of Democracy Promotion Assistance to Georgia after the Rose Revolution.” *Research & Politics* 1(1): 1-13.

Dupuy, Kendra, James Ron, and Aseem Prakash. 2015. “Who Survived? Ethiopia’s Regulatory Crackdown on Foreign-Funded NGOs.” *Review of International Political Economy* 22(2): 419-456.

Finkel, Evgeny and Yitzhak M. Brudny. 2012. “Russia and the Colour Revolutions.” *Democratization* 19(1): 15-36.

*Possible reflection questions:*

* Under what conditions do autocrats try to coopt vs. restrict democracy assistance?
* What took autocrats so long to crack down on democracy assistance? Is the backlash to democracy promotion a sign of democracy assistance’s success?
* Is there such a thing as autocracy promotion? What is it?

**III. TOOLS OF DEMOCRACY PROMOTION**

**Class 7 – Conditionality**

*Required readings:*

Donno, Daniela. 2010. “Who Is Punished? Regional Intergovernmental Organizations and the Enforcement of Democratic Norms.” *International Organization* 64(4): 593-625.

Kelley, Judith G. 2004. “International Actors on the Domestic Scene: Membership Conditionality and Socialization by International Institutions.” *International Organization* 58(3): 425-457.

Meyerrose, Anna. 2020. “The Unintended Consequences of Democracy Promotion: International Organizations and Democratic Backsliding.” *Comparative Political Studies* 53(10-11): 1547-1581.

Serhan, Yasmeen. 2020. “The EU Watches as Hungary Kills Democracy.” *The Atlantic*. Available at <https://www.theatlantic.com/international/archive/2020/04/europe-hungary-viktor-orban-coronavirus-covid19-democracy/609313/>.

*Optional readings:*

Donno, Daniela. 2013. “Elections and Democratization in Authoritarian Regimes.” *American Journal of Political Science* 57(3): 703-716.

Gray, Julia. 2009. “International Organization as a Seal of Approval: European Union Accession and Investor Risk.” *American Journal of Political Science* 53(4): 931-949.

Levitsky, Steven and Lucan A. Way. 2006. “Linkage versus Leverage: Retinking the International Dimension of Regime Change.” *Comparative Politics* 38(4): 379-400.

McFaul, Michael. 2010. *Advancing Democracy Abroad: Why We Should and How We Can*. Lanham, MD: Rowman & Littlefield. Chapter 6 (pp. 209-234).

Vachudova, Milada Anna. 2005. *Europe Undivided: Democracy, Leverage, and Integration after Communism*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

*Possible reflection questions:*

* What advantages and disadvantages do international organizations have as democracy promoters vis-à-vis states?
* When does it make sense for the United States to work through multilateral institutions vs. going it alone?
* It is difficult for states to get admitted to international organizations with membership conditions, but international organizations rarely kick out or suspend countries that are backsliding on democracy. If arguments about conditionality are correct, why don’t we see more backsliding, suspensions, and expulsions?

**Class 8 – Aid**

*Required readings:*

Bush, Sarah Sunn. 2015. *The Taming of Democracy Assistance: Why Democracy Promotion Does Not Confront Dictators*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. Chapters 1 and 5 (pp. 3-21, 106-130).

Finkel, Steven E., Aníbal Pérez-Liñan, and Mitchell A. Seligson. 2007. “The Effects of U.S. Foreign Assistance on Democracy Building, 1990-2003.” *World Politics* 59(3): 404-439.

National Research Council, Committee on Evaluation of USAID Democracy Assistance Programs. 2010. *Improving Democracy Assistance: Building Knowledge Through Evaluations and Research.* Washington, DC: National Academies Press. Summary (pp. 1-16).

*Optional readings:*

Brown, Stephen. 2011. “‘Well, What Can You Expect?’: Donor Officials’ Apologetics for Hybrid Regimes in Africa.” *Democratization* 18(2): 512-534.

National Research Council, Committee on Evaluation of USAID Democracy Assistance Programs. 2010. *Improving Democracy Assistance: Building Knowledge Through Evaluations and Research.* Washington, DC: National Academies Press. Chapters 3-5 (pp. 71-150).

*Possible reflection questions:*

* What are the main challenges associated with evaluating the effectiveness of U.S. democracy assistance? How, if at all, can they be overcome?
* What are the main barriers to effective democracy assistance according to the readings?
* How closely is democracy assistance linked to other objectives in U.S. foreign policy?

**Class 9 – Election Observers**

*Required readings:*

Bush, Sarah Sunn and Lauren Prather. 2018. “Who’s There? Election Observer Identity and the Local Credibility of Elections.” *International Organization* 72(3): 659-692.

Hyde, Susan D. 2011. “Catch Us If You Can: Election Monitoring and International Norm Diffusion.” *American Journal of Political Science* 55(2): 356-369.

Hyde, Susan D. and Nikolay Marinov. 2014. “Information and Self-Enforcing Democracy: The Role of International Election Observation.” *International Organization* 68(2): 329-359.

Kelley, Judith G. “D-Minus Elections: The Politics and Norms of International Election Observation.” *International Organization* 63(4): 765-787.

*Optional readings:*

Kelley, Judith G. 2012. *Monitoring Democracy: When International Election Observation Works and Why It Often Fails*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.

Luo, Zhaotian and Arturas Rozenas. 2018. “The Election Monitor’s Curse.” *American Journal of Political Science* 61(2): 148-160.

*Possible reflection questions:*

* How and under what conditions do election observers improve election integrity?
* Election observers’ jobs are both technical and political. What complications does that dual role create?
* Election observers have multiple audiences: domestic and international, elite and citizen. Which election observers do you think are most credible, and to whom?

**Class 10 – Gender**

*Required readings:*

Abu-Lughod, Lila. 2002. “Do Muslim Women Really Need Saving? Anthropological Reflections on Cultural Relativism and Its Others.” *American Anthropologist* 104(3): 783-790.

Bush, Sarah Sunn. 2011. “International Politics and the Spread of Quotas for Women in Legislatures.” *International Organization* 65(1): 103-137.

Donno, Daniela, Sara Fox, and Joshua Kaasik. 2021. “International Incentives for Women’s Rights in Dictatorship.” *Comparative Political Studies* Online First.

Foust, Joshua and Melinda Haring. 2012. “Who Cares How Many Women Are in Parliament?” *Foreign Policy*. Available at <http://foreignpolicy.com/2012/06/25/who-cares-how-many-women-are-in-parliament/>.

*Optional readings:*

Fallon, Kathleen M., Liam Swiss, and Jocelyn Viterna. 2012. “Resolving the Democracy Paradox: Democratization and Women’s Legislative Representation in Developing Nations, 1975-2009.” *American Sociological Review* 77(3): 380-408.

Inglehart, Ronald and Pippa Norris. 2003. “The True Clash of Civilizations.” *Foreign Policy* 135: 62-70.

Sundstrom, Lisa McIntosh. 2005. “Foreign Assistance, International Norms, and NGO Development: Lessons from the Russian Campaign.” *International Organization* 59(2): 419-449.

Terman, Rochelle. 2017. “Islamophobia and Media Portrayals of Muslim Women: A Computational Text Analysis of U.S. News Coverage.” *International Studies Quarterly* 61(3): 489-502.

*Possible reflection questions:*

* Is the number of women in a national parliament a good yardstick for the effectiveness of democracy promotion? What is the relationship between gender equality and democracy?
* What cultural assumptions are built into democracy promotion? Do these cultural assumptions undermine the effectiveness of democracy promotion?
* Why have democracy promoters become more attentive to questions of gender? Is this a welcome development?

1. See <https://ctl.yale.edu/sites/default/files/basic-page-supplementary-materials-files/sample_syllabus_language.pdf> and <https://ctl.yale.edu/DiversityStatements> for original texts. [↑](#footnote-ref-1)