

Integrated Liberal Studies 275/ Community and Environment Sociology 375/ Sociology 496
Democracy and Expertise
Autumn 2012

Professor Daniel Kleinman
Office: 348 Agriculture Hall
Phone: 262-1044
email: dlkleinman@wisc.edu
Office Hours: By appointment

Class Sessions: Tues/Thurs 9:30-10:45AM
Location: 103 Meiklejohn House

As we move into a knowledge intensive economy, decisions about our social, economic, and political life are increasingly made by experts, and these decisions are often made on behalf of private and for-profit concerns. In this context, we need to ask questions like: When is it appropriate to cede decision-making authority to experts? Under what conditions can lay citizens intelligently participate in realms traditionally restricted to experts? Is participatory democracy possible in a knowledge intensive capitalist economy? If so, how and under what circumstances? Is it possible, in this context, to preserve or build a vibrant public sphere? Finally, what is the relationship between the increasingly specialized character of higher education and the problem of democracy and expertise? We will attempt to answer these questions in two ways. First, the bulk of course time will involve seminar-style discussion of readings about democracy, citizenship, and expertise. In addition, students will participate in a deliberative democratic forum on an issue of current public relevance, and each student will write her/ his final paper on some aspect of the deliberation process. The semester will begin with a set of readings by Alexander Meiklejohn, the inspiration for this course and the founder of the UW's Integrated Liberal Studies program.

Requirements

1) **Absence policy:** You are entitled to four absences throughout the semester. Each absence beyond the limit of four will result in lowering your course grade by one half grade: i.e., 5 absences turns an A into an AB; 6 absences turns an A into a B. If you are absent during the democratic forum (October 15), I will count this as five absences, unless you and I have discussed your absence beforehand. Since I do not distinguish between "excused" and "unexcused" absences, I suggest you keep your four absences on hold for illness or other unanticipated events that might interfere with your attendance. All of this said, should something dramatic in your life prevent you from doing a significant amount of work for the class, you should arrange to speak with me as soon as you are aware that you face substantial barriers to getting your work done in a timely fashion. I am sympathetic to students who approach life's challenges responsibly.

2) **Participation in class discussion** (10%): Although attendance is imperative, it is by no means sufficient. What you learn and the success of the course depends on your active engagement in class discussion. You need not always have something to say, but your consistent and informed participation in discussion is a course requirement.

3) **Five criticisms or brief assessments of readings** (“reactions”) (25%). These brief papers should be roughly two double spaced pages long and should illustrate your understanding and active engagement with the reading under consideration. Reactions must be emailed to me (dlkleinman@wisc.edu) by 5 p.m. the day before class meets to discuss the reading to which the reaction refers. These assignments will be graded across 3 dimensions: 1) Extent of understanding of the reading illustrated; often quoting from the relevant text or citing specific arguments in the reading is the best way to show understanding; (2) Extent and quality of engagement with arguments presented in the text. In this context, I will assess the degree to which you substantiate your agreements or disagreements with the author of our reading; (3) Quality of overall organization of the essay. You must space these papers out across the semester, writing two in September, one in October, and two in November. You may not write more than one paper for any given class session, and you may not write more than one paper per week. (You may not write any of your papers on the two films we will see together, and you may not write a paper on the talk by our guest speaker.) To give you the opportunity to fully understand what I seek in these response papers, you may revise your first submission in light of my assessment.

4) **Three two page papers (double-spaced) on key topics: democracy, citizenship, and expertise** (15%). The point of these papers is to get you to think about what you assume these terms mean. Since I am asking you to articulate your own understanding in advance of doing class reading, I will not evaluate what you write in terms of whether it is correct or incorrect. Instead, I will be assessing these papers in terms of the care with which you present your opinion and the clarity and organization with which you represent your perspective. We will discuss each assignment prior to beginning the unit on each topic. These are due to me in class on the date indicated on the syllabus. The details of each assignment are described in hand-outs with which I will provide you. You may rewrite one of these papers in light of my comments. Rewrites must be submitted no later than two weeks after I return the original paper.

5) **Citizenship Exercise** (10%). You will be provided with a sample of the questions used in the test given in the US for prospective citizens. You should “take the test,” and then write a brief (two pages double spaced) evaluation of it. Given the kind of person you think a US citizen should be, do the questions on this “test” adequately measure whether someone will be a good citizen? What is useful about the questions and what is problematic (provide examples of specific questions and evaluate them)? If you were developing a US citizenship test, what would it look like? What kinds of questions would you ask (provide examples) and why? These papers will be assessed according to the criteria I use on the topics essays (#4 above).

5) **Class Project** (40%). A central piece of this course will be your participation in a real time

democratic deliberative forum and writing an analysis of your experience as a participant in that process. On October 15th from 4 p.m. until approximately 7:30, we will hold our deliberative forum on university food service policies. Prior to the 15th, students will be expected to do several readings on issues of sustainability. All of these readings can be found in your reading packet (see below). When we gather on the 15th of October, you will discuss the readings, meet with experts on the topic, and then express your opinions on this important policy issue. You will be provided more detail on the organization of this forum prior to the -. Finally, if you are unable to attend this session, you and I must agree on an alternative assignment for this portion of the class. You must speak to me no later than September 15th, if you will be unable to participate on -. Barring illness or emergency, if you do not have permission from me to miss this session, you will receive a zero for this portion of the course.

In the class meeting on October 18th, we will discuss our deliberative forum. That discussion as well as the forum itself will provide the empirical material for your final paper. The paper will be an analysis of our deliberative forum. You should use the readings we have done across the semester as the analytical tools for your evaluation. I will use the criteria outlined below in evaluating your paper. This paper should be double-spaced and be approximately six pages long, not including your bibliography. I expect to receive a draft of this paper from you no later than November 15th. I will provide you with comments on your draft, and your final paper should reflect consideration of my comments. Your final paper is due electronically on December 14th by 4:30 p.m. If you would like me to return your paper to you with comments, you should provide me with a self-addressed stamped envelope by the last day of class.

6) On all writing assignments. Papers should be double spaced, and pages should be numbered. Your name and the date of submission should appear prominently on the paper. On your short submissions, quotations or other references to readings should be followed by citations (e.g. Barns, p. 201). The referencing style you use on your final paper is up to you, but it must follow some standard. Finally, careful editing is imperative. You should proofread for typos. More than three misspellings or three typos on any paper will lower your grade by one half grade (e.g. A to AB). Grammatical errors that I note on one of your submissions should not appear on subsequent assignments.

7) Improving your writing. Writing is one of the most important skills with which you will leave the University. You should take your writing seriously and work hard to improve it. The University has a Writing Center where trained graduate students and professionals will work with you on your papers and help you to make them better. I urge you to take advantage of this resource. The Writing Center is at 6171 Helen C. White (263-9305). You are advised to make an appointment in advance of your desire to meet with a member of the Writing Center. This is especially important at the end of the semester.

8) Academic honesty. You are responsible for understanding the University's standards for academic honesty. These are described on the University's website at <http://students.wisc.edu/saja/misconduct/UWS14.html>.

9) Grading. Sometimes the end of the semester comes and students indicate to me that they are not clear about how each course requirement figures into their final grade and/ or how I grade individual assignments. I believe that the description above is exceedingly clear. Indeed, drawing on what I say above, you should be able to determine your grade at any point during the semester. If there is something you are unsure about, it is your responsibility to talk to me. I am always available.

10) Grading Criteria for Papers (borrowed and adapted from the syllabi of Professor Aili Mari Tripp):

1. *Well defined statement of problem.* Does the paper start out with a clear question or a clear statement of the problem to be addressed?
2. *Originality of Ideas.* As appropriate, do your own views and voice come through clearly?
3. *Serious Engagement of Alternative Arguments.* As appropriate, do you seriously consider arguments other than those you make?
4. *Use of Evidence.* Are you clear about what the evidence is in the case you consider? Are you clear about the breadth of applicability of the evidence you cite? In other words, do you understand the extent to which it is appropriate to generalize from the evidence you draw on? Some evidence is better than other evidence. Do you provide an assessment of evidence quality, as appropriate?
5. *Clarity of Presentation.* Are your ideas clearly expressed? Is your paper focused or does it wander? Can a reader easily identify your main points? Are the ideas presented elaborated sufficiently? Are there sign-posts to guide the reader? Are terms defined?
6. *Grammar, Spelling, Citations, Format.* Have you footnoted or cited ideas and facts that are not your own? Of course, all quoted material should appear in quotation marks. All pages should be numbered. Your paper should have a title, and your name should appear on the paper. You should have margins of one inch all the way around. Your paper should be double spaced, and your paper should be stapled in the upper left-hand corner. There should be few spelling and/ or grammatical errors, and there should be clear transitions between sentences and paragraphs. Reaction papers should be submitted electronically. I would like to receive paper copies of all other assignments.
7. *Organization.* Is the paper organized effectively? Is the sequence of points made logical and clear? Does each paragraph have a central idea that a reader can easily identify?

Course Readings

The books from which we will read substantial parts are available for purchase at Rainbow Bookstore Cooperative (426 W. Gilman, 257-6050). (They are marked below with an asterisk.) I will also try to have these books on reserve at College Library in Helen C. White. Most of the readings do not come from books. They are available in the form of a course reader available at the Social Sciences Copy Center in the Sewell Social Sciences Building, 1180 Observatory Drive, Room 6120. I will have a course reader on reserve at College Library.

Calendar

September 4

Introduction to Course

September 6

Education for Citizenship

Required Reading

Alexander Meiklejohn. 1981. "The American College and American Freedom" and "Adult Education: A Fresh Start." In *Alexander Meiklejohn: Teacher of Freedom*, edited by Cynthia Stokes Brown. Berkeley, CA: Meiklejohn Civil Liberties Institute.

Derek Bok. 2006. "Preparation for Citizenship." In *Our Underachieving Colleges*.

September 11

Democracy

short paper due: What is democracy? I will provide a handout on this assignment.

September 13, 20, 25, 27

Democracy: Reading and Discussion

Required Reading

Robert Dahl. 1998. *On Democracy*. New Haven, CT: Yale University Press.* Parts 2 and 3 are required. Part 4 is highly recommended.

John Gastil and William Keith. 2005. "A Nation that (Sometimes) Likes to Talk: A Brief History of Public Deliberation in the United States." In John Gastil and Peter Levine (eds.), *The Deliberative Democracy Handbook*. Jossey-Bass.

Mark Button and David Rayfe. 2005. "What Can We Learn from the Practice of Deliberative Democracy?" In John Gastil and Peter Levine (eds.), *The Deliberative Democracy Handbook*. Jossey-Bass.

Joshua Cohen. 1999. "Deliberation and Democratic Legitimacy." In James Bohman and William Rehg, eds. *Deliberative Democracy: Essays on Reason and Politics*, (Cambridge: MIT Press, 1997),

Archon Fung and Erik Olin Wright. 2003. "Thinking About Empowered Participatory Governance." Pages 3-42 in Archon Fung and Erik Olin Wright (eds.). 2003. *Deepening Democracy: Institutional Innovations in Empowered Participatory Governance*. London: Verso.

Joshua Cohen and Joel Rogers. 2003. "Power and Reason." Only pages 241-255 in Archon Fung and Erik Olin Wright (eds.). 2003. *Deepening Democracy: Institutional Innovations in Empowered Participatory Governance*. London: Verso.
Cornell West. 2004. *Democracy Matters: Winning the Fight against Imperialism*. New York: The Penguin Press. Chapter 3.

Caroline Levine. 2007. *Provoking Democracy*. Chapter 1, pages 1-35. Blackwell Publishers

Lyn Sanders. 1997. "Against Deliberation," *Political Theory*, 25:3.

Optional Reading

Benjamin Barber. 1984. *Strong Democracy: Participatory Politics for a New Age*. Berkeley, CA: University of California Press. Selected chapters available on reserve.

Michael P. Brown. 1997. *Replacing Citizenship: AIDS Activism and Radical Democracy*. Guilford.

John S. Dryzek. 2000. *Deliberative democracy and beyond: liberals, critics, contestations*. New York : Oxford University Press.*

Jon Elster (ed.). 1998. *Deliberative Democracy*. Berkeley, CA: University of California Press. Introduction (pages 1-18) and Chapter 1 (Diego Cambetta, "Claro! An Essay On Discursive Machismo" (pages 19-43).

David Held. 1987. *Models of Democracy*. Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press. Pages 143-204.

Richard E. Sclove. 1995. *Democracy and Technology*. New York: Guilford Press.

September 18—no class

October 2

Deliberative Polling

Required Reading

James Fiskin and Cynthia Farrar. 2005. "Deliberative Polling: From Experiment to Community Resource." In John Gastil and Peter Levine (eds.), *The Deliberative*

Democracy Handbook. Jossey-Bass.

October 4

Consensus Conferences: A Mode of Deliberation

Required Reading

Maria Powell and Daniel Lee Kleinman. 2007. "Building Citizen Capacities for Participation in Technoscientific Decisionmaking: The Democratic Virtues of the Consensus Conference Model." *Public Understanding of Science*.*

Kleinman, Daniel Lee, Jason Delborne, Ashley Anderson. Forthcoming. "Engaging Citizens: The High Cost of Citizen Engagement in High Technology." *Public Understanding of Science*.*

October 9, 11

A Dramatic Portrait of Deliberation

Film: "12 Angry Men"
Followed by Discussion

October 15 (Monday)

Deliberative Forum on UW-Madison Food Policy

Time: 4-7:30

Location: Union South

Required Readings

Jack Kloppenburg, Jr., John Hendrickson, and George W. Stevenson. 1996. Coming in to the foodshed. *Agriculture and Human Values* 13(3): 33-42. (10 pages)

UW-Madison Sustainability Initiative Task Force: Food. 2010. (5 pages)

Home-field advantage, On Wisconsin magazine, Spring 2011 (8 pages)

Carlson, Scott. Colleges Chew On Local Food Phenomenon. *The Chronicle of Higher Education*. 2008. (4 pages)

Laura B. DeLind. 2010. "Are Local Food and the Local Food Movement Taking Us Where We Want to Go? Or Are We Hitching Our Wagons to the Wrong Stars?" *Agriculture and Human Values*. (11 pages)

McWilliams, James. 2012. The Myth of Sustainable Meat. *The New York Times*. (4 pages)

October 16

No class

October 18

Discussion about deliberative forum

October 23

Citizenship and Civic Engagement: Your Views

short paper due: What is citizenship? What does it mean to participate in civic life? I will provide a handout on this assignment.

October 25

Democracy and the Media: Community Radio

Guest Speaker: Norm Stockwell, WORT-FM

October 30

Citizenship and Civic Engagement: Discussion of Readings

Required Reading

Robert Putnam. 1995. "Bowling Alone: America's Declining Social Capital," *Journal of Democracy*, 6.1: 65-78.

Robert Putnam. 1995. "Tuning In, Tuning Out: The Strange Disappearance of Social Capital in America," *PS: Political Science and Politics*, @ 28: 4: 664-683.

Frederick Solt. 2008. Economic Inequality and Democratic Political Engagement. *American Journal of Political Science*, 52: 1: 48-60.

Optional Reading

Theda Skocpol and Morris Fiorina (eds.). 1999. *Civic Engagement in American Democracy*. Washington, DC: Brookings Institution Press.

November 1

Citizenship and Civic Engagement: The Government View

Your paper on the citizenship test will be due in class. See #5 above for an explanation of the assignment. We will discuss the government test and your reaction to it.

November 6

The Status and Roles of Experts

short paper due: What is an expert? What should the role of experts be in contemporary society? I will provide a handout on this assignment.

November 8 and 13

The Role and Status of Experts: Reading and Discussion

Required Reading

Harry M. Collins and Robert Evans. 2002. "The Third Wave of Science Studies:

Studies of Expertise and Experience,” *Social Studies of Science* 32: 2: 235-296.

Suryanarayanan, Sainath and Daniel Lee Kleinman. 2012. “Be(e)coming Experts: The Controversy Over Insecticides in the Honey Bee Colony Collapse Disorder.”

Optional Reading

Alvin J. Goldman. 2006. “Expertise: Which Ones Should You Trust? Pages 14-38 in Evan Selinger and Robert P. Crease (eds.), *The Philosophy of Expertise*. New York: Columbia University Press.

Michael Schudson. 2006. “The Trouble with Experts—and Why Democracies Need Them.” *Theory and Society* 35: 491-506.

Mark Brown, Justus Lentsch, and Peter Weingart. 2005. “Representation, Expertise, And the German Parliament: A Comparison of Three Advisory Institutions.” Pages 81-100 in Sabine Maasen and Peter Weingart (eds.), *Democratization of Expertise? Exploring Novel Forms of Scientific Advice in Political Decision-Making—Sociology Of the Sciences, vol. 24*. The Netherlands: Springer.

Harry Collins and Robert Evans. 2007. *Rethinking Expertise*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Thomas Gieryn. “Boundaries in Science.” In Sheila Jasanoff, et al (eds.). 1995. *Handbook of Science and Technology Studies*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage. E-reserve.

Steven G. Brint. 1994. *In an Age of Experts: The Changing Role of Professionals in Politics and Public Life*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.

Frank Fischer. 1990. *Technocracy and the Politics of Expertise*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Thomas Haskell (ed.). 1984. *The Authority of Expertise: Studies in History and Theory*. Bloomington, Indiana University Press. Selections on electronic reserve.

Brian Martin (ed.). 1996. *Confronting the Experts*. SUNY.

Raphael Sassower. 1993. *Knowledge without Expertise: On the Status of Scientists*. SUNY.

November 15 and 20 Science and Technology in a Democracy

Required Reading

Richard Sclove. 1995. *Democracy and Technology*. New York: Guilford. Chapters 1

and 3.

Sandra Harding. 2000. "Should Philosophies of Science Encode Democratic Ideals?" In Daniel Lee Kleinman (ed.). *Science, Technology, and Democracy*. Albany, NY: SUNY Press.*

Daniel Sarewitz. 2000. "Human Well-Being and Federal Science: What's the Connection?" In Daniel Lee Kleinman (ed.). *Science, Technology, and Democracy*. Albany, NY: SUNY Press.*

Optional Reading

Yaron Ezrahi. 1990. *The Descent of Icarus: Science and the Transformation of Contemporary Democracy*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press. *

November 22—Thanksgiving

November 27

Democratic Participation in Expert Realms: Case Studies

Required Reading

Steven Epstein. 2000. "Democracy, Expertise, and AIDS Treatment Activism." In Daniel Lee Kleinman (ed.). *Science, Technology, and Democracy*. Albany, NY: SUNY Press.*

Neva Hassenian. 2000. "Democratizing Agricultural Knowledge Through Sustainable Farming Networks." In Daniel Lee Kleinman (ed.). *Science, Technology, and Democracy*. Albany, NY: SUNY Press.*

Optional Reading

Phil Brown and Edwin J. Mikkelsen. 1990. *No Safe Place: Toxic Waste, Leukemia, and Community Action*. Berkeley, CA: University of California Press.

Alan Irwin. 1995. *Citizen Science: A Study of People, Expertise, and Sustainable Development*. New York: Routledge.

Louis Kaplan. 2000. "Public Participation in Nuclear Facility Decisions: Lessons from Hanford." In Daniel Lee Kleinman (ed.). *Science, Technology, and Democracy*. Albany, NY: SUNY Press.*

Steve Kroll-Smith, Phil Brown, and Valerie J. Gunter (ed.). 2000. *Illness and the Environment: A Reader in Contested Medicine*. New York: New York University Press.

November 29

Democratic Participation in Expert Realms: Case Studies

Required Reading

Phil Brown. 1987. "Popular Epidemiology: Community Response to Toxic Waste-Induced Diseases in Woburn, Massachusetts and Other Sites." *Science, Technology and Human Values* 12: 3-4: 76-85.

Brian Wynne. 1992. "Misunderstood Misunderstandings: Social Identities and Public Uptake of Science." *Public Understanding of Science* 1:3: 281-304.

December 4

Science and Technology in a Democracy: What's at Stake?

Required Reading

Daniel Lee Kleinman. 2000. "Democratizations of Science and Technology." In Daniel Lee Kleinman (ed.). *Science, Technology, and Democracy*. Albany, NY: SUNY Press.*

December 6

Open Office Hours

I will be in our classroom during our regular class hours, and I will be available to talk to students 1-on-1 about their papers.

December 11 and 13

Democracy and Expertise in Film

Viewing and Discussing "Lorenzo's Oil"

December 14

Paper Due