

The Swedish Program - Fall 2019
Public Policy in Comparative Perspective

Prof. Frank Anechiarico
Maynard-Knox Professor of Government and Law
Hamilton College

Introduction

What is the common good? Once we define it, how do we accomplish it, effectively and efficiently? These gateway questions lead to many others.

In order to understand the way that various social and political values are included or excluded in the making and administration of public policy, we will focus this term on a particular topic, public integrity and corruption prevention: those laws, regulations and practices in a given country that establish categories and standards for identifying, detecting and preventing corruption. We will focus on the way that corruption is dealt with in Sweden and the United States.

The constituent elements of this course: philosophy (ethics), economics (the assessment of costs and benefits), and politics (power and influence) are all involved in understanding whether corruption is controlled or flourishes. Like all problems of public policy, we must understand corruption, before we can decide what to do about it.

Intended Learning Outcomes

- Ability to *reason ethically* about public policy issues
- Understanding of the *costs and benefits of competing models* of public service provision
- Experience in professional *written and spoken presentation* of policy analysis
- Acquiring an *informed, cross-national perspective* on policy making
- Substantive understanding of *issues related to public integrity and corruption control*

Reading

Staffan Andersson (2011) *National Integrity System of Sweden*, Executive Summary (Berlin: Transparency International).

Staffan Andersson and Frank Anechiarico (forthcoming) *Corruption and Corruption Control: Democracy in the Balance* (New York: Routledge).

Robert K. Merton (1957) "Bureaucracy and Personality" in Merton, *Social Theory and Social Structure* (Glencoe, Ill.: Free Press, 195-206).

Thom Reilly (2016) *The Failure of Governance in Bell, California: Big-Time Corruption in a Small Town* (Lanham, Md.: Lexington/Rowman Littlefield).

Michael J. Sandel (2009) *Justice: What's the Right Thing to Do?* (New York: Farrar, Straus and Giroux).

Carly E. Schall (2016) *The Rise and Fall of the Miraculous Welfare Machine: Immigration and Social Democracy in Twentieth-Century Sweden* (Ithaca, N.Y.: ILR Cornell University Press)

Diane Vaughan (1999) "The Dark Side of Organizations: Mistake, Misconduct, and Disaster," *Annual Review of Sociology*, 25: 271-305.

Assignments

Corruption Scandal Briefing, oral and written (25%)

Assignments

Scandal Briefing, oral and written (25%)

The instructor will issue a list of three-person teams by the third week of the term. Each team will select a corruption scandal from a list, or they may suggest one. The briefings will begin in the latter part of the term.

The goal of the oral briefing is to use course readings and additional research (JSTOR and Lexis Nexis) to brief the course on the scandal.

- By 6pm the day before the presentation, the team should post on the **Briefing Discussion Board** a 1-2 page narrative of the scandal.

The oral briefing should not detail the scandal, but address the following:

- What were the causes of the scandal?
- What anticorruption rules and institutions, which appear to be applicable to the corrupt behavior in question, were in place at the time of the scandal?
- What were the most important consequences of the scandal
 - For government efficiency?
 - For government effectiveness?
 - For democratic governance?
- What was the "outcome" of the scandal and what lessons can we learn from it?

The briefing should last no more than 15 minutes and should be presented by both members of the team.

A jointly written version of the brief (7 pages) is due in class, one-week after the oral presentation.

Final Paper (25%)

Select one of the following elements from the scandal briefing, as the basis for an 8 page paper:

- Causes

- Relevant Anticorruption Rules and Institutions
- Consequences (efficiency, effectiveness and/or democratic governance)
- Prevention, Deterrence and/or Punishment

What is the most important public policy question raised by the element you selected? (It might be a question of justice, efficiency, feasibility, leadership or a question entailed by one of these.) Use course readings and other scholarship (5 sources) to explore the question and to evaluate the ways it has been answered up to now.

Midterm Examination (25%)

Final Examination (25%)

Participation

This course is interactive. Please come prepared to raise and answer questions, which may be put to the class at large or to individuals. High quality participation can add as many as three, bonus points to a student's final course average.

Here are guidelines for course participation:

- Students may not engage in *ad hominem* attacks, nor make disrespectful comments of any kind.
- Ideological or partisan positions on any of the issues under consideration are each student's private business and are not relevant to discussion.
- Students may use laptop computers in class, *during the last 15 minutes* of each session only.
- Please arrive for class several minutes early and avoid leaving the room during class
- Remain focused!

Course Schedule

Reading schedule by week:

- Sandel ch. 1- 3.
- Sandel, chs. 4-7.
- Sandel, complete; Andersson, "National Integrity System of Sweden" complete.
- Schall, chs. 1-3
- Schall, complete; Robert Merton, "Bureaucracy and Personality"
Briefing Team 1.
- Vaughan, complete.
Briefing Team 2; MIDTERM EXAM
- Andersson and Anechiarico, chs. 1, 2
Briefing Team 3

- VIII. Andersson and Anechiarico, chs. 3, 4
Briefing Team 4
- IX. Andersson and Anechiarico, chs. 5, 6
Briefing Team 5; FINAL PAPER DUE
FINAL EXAM
- X. Andersson and Anechiarico, complete.
Briefing Team 6
- XI. Reilly, chs. 1-4
Briefing Team 7
- XII. Reilly, complete
Briefing Team 8