

**URBDP 567**  
**Democracy, Citizenship, and Participation in the City**  
Spring 2011

Mark Purcell  
448E Gould Hall  
mpurcell@u.washington.edu  
<http://faculty.washington.edu/mpurcell>  
Tel. 206-543-8754

Office hours: by appointment (e-mail me!)

Class meeting times and location:  
Tuesday 3:30-6:20, Gould 208J

### **Introduction**

This course explores democracy and the city. More specifically, it examines the decisions that shape the geography of the city. Think of local examples like the redevelopment of South Lake Union, the Waterfront, or the Duwamish River cleanup. These projects will profoundly reshape both spatial and social relations in Seattle. How are the decisions being made in these cases? How democratic are they? How democratic should they be? How can they be made more democratically? In general, what role should “the public” or “the people” play in determining the future of the city?

In examining these kinds of questions, we will proceed in two phases. Phase One will put the question of democracy and cities into a larger theoretical context. We will learn about current debates in democratic theory in order to explore just what we mean when we say “democracy.” The meaning of the concept is not at all self-evident. It is critical to be clear what we mean when we use it.

Phase Two will explore some emerging trends and practices in urban democracy. These will include trends in urban planning, but they will also include trends in urban politics and policy more generally. Here the particular interests and expertise of the class participants will help shape the topics we explore.

### **Course Goals**

This course is a graduate seminar. Its goal is to provide you with the opportunity to step back and think through the question of democracy in cities. To that end, we will read about, discuss, and write about contemporary ideas, debates, and initiatives. The course is *not* designed to impart applied techniques that you can use to fill your “toolbox” for professional practice. It is designed instead to give you the *intellectual* tools to make informed and wise judgments about democratic theory and practice. Therefore, the course goals are to develop:

- Critical literacy in debates and practices surrounding democracy, citizenship, and participation in urban planning, politics, and policy
- Effective reading, writing, and discussion skills

The course will feature planning-related content, but not in such a way that non-planners won't find it relevant. The three disciplines of urban planning, policy, and politics are so closely related as to be mutually necessary to each other.

### **Student Responsibilities**

In thinking about how I am going to evaluate you, you need only to understand clearly what I expect from you in this class. For me the most important responsibility is to take your own education seriously. This means sincerely engaging the readings and reliably completing each assignment. It means attending each class, prepared and on time. It means impressing me with a sincere intellectual curiosity. Secondary to that, but only by just a little, is the quality of the work you produce.

### **Professor Responsibilities**

My responsibilities mirror yours: to take the class, the material, and your work seriously. That means ensuring a safe and respectful classroom, providing timely feedback, and being present and engaged at each class.

### **Course Readings**

- Course reader, available at Professional Copy and Print, 4200 University Way NE, 634-2689.

### **Assessment**

Your final assessment in this course will be based on your performance on the following:

---

<i>Item</i>	<i>Percent</i>	<i>Date due</i>
Participation	34	Every class
Reading Assignments	33	Every class
Final Paper/Project	33	Thursday, June 9

---

### **Academic honesty**

The University takes the offenses of cheating and plagiarism very seriously, and so do I. Cheating is taking advantage of the work of others. Plagiarism is representing the work of others as your own, without giving appropriate credit. If you are unsure what is OK or not OK, make sure to ask!

## CLASS SCHEDULE

### **WEEK 1**

Tuesday, March 29

#### Topic:

- Introduction to course

### **WEEK 2**

Tuesday, April 6(?)

#### Topics:

- Introduction to democracy

#### Reading:

- Owen, D. (2003) Democracy. In *Political concepts*. R. Bellamy and A. Mason, eds. New York, Manchester University Press, pp. 105-117.
- Cunningham, F. (2001) *Theories of democracy*. New York, Routledge, pp. 1-26.
- Purcell, M. (2008) *Recapturing Democracy*, New York: Routledge, pp. 1-74

#### Assignments:

Reading Assignment #1

### **WEEK 3**

Tuesday, April 12

#### Topics:

- Liberal Democracy
- Classic Pluralism

#### Reading:

- Evans, M. (2003) Liberalisms. In *Contemporary political thought*. A. Finlayson, ed. New York, New York University Press, pp. 113-125.
- Cunningham, F. (2001) *Theories of democracy*. New York, Routledge, pp. 27-100.

#### Assignments:

Reading Assignment #2

## **WEEK 4**

Tuesday, April 19

### Topics:

- Participatory Democracy
- Deliberative Democracy

### Reading:

- Cunningham, F. (2001) *Theories of democracy*. New York, Routledge, pp. 123-141.
- Cunningham, F. (2001) *Theories of democracy*. New York, Routledge, pp. 163-183.
- Gutman, A. and D. Thompson (2004) *Why deliberative democracy?* Princeton, Princeton University Press. pp. 1-63.

### Assignments:

Reading Assignment #3

## **WEEK 5**

Tuesday, April 26

### Topics:

- Radical Democracy/Radical Pluralism/Post-Marxism

### Reading:

- Fraser, N. (1990) Rethinking the public sphere: a contribution to the critique of actually existing democracy. *Social text* 25/26: 56-80.
- Mouffe, C. (2002) *Politics and passions: the stakes of democracy*. London, Center for the Study of Democracy.
- Laclau, E. and C. Mouffe (2000). Preface to the Second Edition of *Hegemony and Socialist Strategy*. New York, Verso: vii-xix.
- Mouffe, C. (1999) Deliberative democracy or agonistic pluralism? *Social Research* 66(3): 745-758.

### Assignments:

Reading Assignment #4

## **WEEK 6**

Tuesday, May 3

### Topics:

- Total Democracy/Direct Democracy/Anarchist Democracy

### Reading:

- Lummis, C. (1997) *Radical democracy*. Ithaca, Cornell University Press, pp. 14-44
- Hardt, M. and A. Negri (2004) *Multitude: War and Democracy in the Age of Empire*. New York, Penguin, pp. 306-312, 328-358.
- Day, R. (2005) *Gramsci is dead: anarchist currents in the newest social movements*. Ann Arbor, Pluto Press, pp. 1-18, 178-202.

### Assignments:

Reading Assignment #5

## **WEEK 7**

Tuesday, May 10

### Topics:

- Communicative Planning: Deliberative Democracy in action

### Reading:

- Forester, J. (2006) "Making Participation Work When Interests Conflict." *Journal of the American Planning Association* 72(4): 447-456.
- Innes, J. (2004) "Consensus Building: Clarifications for the Critics." *Planning Theory* 3(1): 5-20.
- Forester, J. (1999) Dealing with deep value differences. In *The consensus building handbook*. L. Susskind, S. McKernan and J. Thomas-Larmer, eds. Thousand Oaks, Sage, pp. 463-493.
- Forester, J. (1999) Reflections of the future understanding of planning practice. *International Planning Studies* 4(2): 175-193.

### Assignments:

Reading Assignment #6

## **WEEK 8**

Tuesday, May 17

### Topics:

- Participatory Budgeting: Participatory Democracy in action

### Reading:

- Fung, A. and E. Wright (2003) Thinking About Empowered Participatory Governance. *Deepening Democracy*. A. Fung and E. Wright. New York, Verso: 3-42.
- Baiocchi, G. (2003) Participation activism and politics: the Porto Alegre experiment. *Deepening democracy*. A. Fung and E. Wright, eds. New York, Verso: 45-76.

### Assignments:

Reading Assignment #7

## **WEEK 9**

Tuesday, May 24

### Topics:

- Social Movements: Radical Democracy in action

### Reading:

- Purcell, M. (2007) *Democratizing Cities: Neoliberalization and the Struggle for Alternative Urban Futures*. New York, Routledge, pp. 75-108, 135-155, 169-182.
- Fernandes, E. (2006) Updating the declaration of the rights of citizens in Latin America: constructing the "right to the city" in Brazil. In *International public debates: urban policies and the right to the city*. UNESCO, ed. Paris, UNESCO, pp. 40-52, 54.
- Right to the City Alliance (2007). Right to the city: notes from the inaugural convening. Los Angeles, Strategic Actions for a Just Economy.
- World Charter for the Right to the City (2005) Elaborated by multiple groups at the Social Forum for the Americas and the World Urban Forum.

### Assignments:

Reading Assignment #8

## **WEEK 10**

Tuesday, May 31

### Topics:

- Social Movements: Total/Direct/Anarchist Democracy in action

### Reading:

- Day, R. (2005) *Gramsci is dead: anarchist currents in the newest social movements*. Ann Arbor, Pluto Press, pp. 19-45.
- Subcomandante Marcos (2004) The hourglass of the Zapatistas, interviewed by G. Marquez and R. Pombo. In *A movement of movements*. T. Mertes, ed. New York, Verso, pp. 3-15.
- Adamovsky, E. (2003) Pots, pans, and popular power: the neighborhood assemblies of Buenos Aires. In *We are everywhere: the irresistible rise of global anticapitalism*. Notes From Nowhere, ed. New York, Verso, pp. 422-427.
- Will, B. (2003) Cultivating hope: the community gardens of New York City. In *We are everywhere: the irresistible rise of global anticapitalism*. Notes From Nowhere, ed. New York, Verso, pp. 134-139, 150-151.
- Colombo, P. and T. Mascarenhas (2003) We're nothing: we want to be everything. In *We are everywhere: the irresistible rise of global anticapitalism*. Notes From Nowhere, ed. New York, Verso, pp. 458-463.
- Sitrin, M. (2003) The power of the *piqueteros*: an interview with members of Argentina's movement of unemployed workers. In *We are everywhere: the irresistible rise of global anticapitalism*. Notes From Nowhere, ed. New York, Verso, pp. 472-481.

### Assignments:

Reading Assignment #9

## **EXAM WEEK**

Thursday, June 9, 4:30-6:20, same room

### Topics:

- Retrospective/Class Desire—the uprising in Tunisia, Egypt, Syria, Bahrain...

### Reading:

- TBD

### Assignments:

Reading Assignment # 10

Final Paper is due during this period

## Reading Assignments

### Overview

For each discussion, you will prepare a reading assignment. This exercise provides you with an opportunity to develop your critical understanding of the particular issue. It also helps you process the ideas in the readings so you will be prepared to discuss them when we meet. There are two elements to this assignment:

**Understanding:** For *each* reading, you will state the author's main argument in a single sentence. Note: For the Cunningham readings, he is mainly reporting the arguments of other writers (e.g. when he summarizes liberal democracy), so for those readings state the main argument of the tradition he is discussing.

*Maximum 50 words for each reading*

**Reflection:** you will write your reaction to the readings for that day as a whole. This can be a critique of the arguments, a deconstruction of them, a new idea that you are excited about, an application of the ideas to a particular case...there are a range of appropriate ways to reflect on the reading.

*Optional Maximum 300 words*

There will be reading assignments for every class. They are worth 30% of your course grade. Each reading assignment will be graded on a scale of 0 (lowest) to 3 (highest). They should be entirely your own work.

### Format

The assignment should be typed and single-spaced. If it runs more than a page, use two sides of the paper to save trees. Make sure your **name** is on the page.

The assignment for a particular set of readings are due the day we discuss the readings. See the syllabus for specific dates.

If there is more than one reading, do the understanding exercise for all of them, and pick one or more or all for the reflection exercise.



## Participation

Participation makes up 34% of your course grade. It is important. And there is no way around participating. In a discussion format, each of you has a *responsibility* to others in the class to share your ideas and insights. The way this happens is by you speaking during class. If you do not share your questions and ideas with everyone, they can't benefit from what you have to offer. Each of you has important questions and ideas to share that we can all learn from. Therefore, since you all have something important to contribute, you all have a responsibility to contribute it. The intellectual value of this class (and any seminar) depends on the active and engaged participation of its members. Such participation depends on a sincere desire to learn and to learn from others. Hence the quality of the class rests on how well everyone meets their responsibility to participate. (Here the participatory democrats would stand up and cheer.)

You will be graded on participation class-by-class. Effective participation is not measured by sheer amount. If you make a few thoughtful and genuine contributions to a particular class, you will receive a good evaluation for that class. If you make 15 thoughtful and honest contributions to the class, you will receive a good evaluation for that class. If you consistently share your ideas and questions and concerns in a way that contributes to the quality of the discussion, you will receive a good grade for participation.

So, the strategy for participation is this: do not hesitate to share your thoughts. Do not think that they have to be fully formed and 100% defensible before you offer them. Do not think that they have to be brilliant or dazzling. Do not think that you can't contribute until you've read the book that intimidating guy in the corner referred to obliquely. Do not think you should remain quiet because you have different ideas about a topic than most others in the class (Iris Marion Young would say that's when we need you most). And, most importantly, do not think that you have to *know* before you speak. *Honest questions and true struggles within yourself that you have not yet resolved are a great way to contribute.*

Remember also that *listening* is as important as talking. Asking *genuine* questions (for which you have not already decided on an answer) is a good way to listen. If you ask a question that you do not already have an answer for, you will genuinely want to hear what your peers have to say. What we are shooting for are true *dialogues* in which you engage the comments and questions of others rather than following them up with unrelated comments and questions. We want to steer clear (more or less) of a series of unrelated monologues (cheer from the deliberative democrats). Be *curious* about what others have to say.

I understand that oral participation in class is a struggle for some. I am willing to explore any and all ways to help you participate. If you feel uncomfortable with speaking in class, you should come see or e-mail me so we can think of ways to make it more comfortable. I stand ready to help you find ways to speak, but the responsibility for participating is yours. Again, the structure of the class means there is no way around participation. The quality of learning in the class depends on it, and a large portion of your grade depends on it.

## Final Paper/Project

The idea of the final paper is to bring your own work into sustained and productive engagement with the ideas of the course, primarily as they are presented in the course readings. The goal of the project is not to develop your research skills, so you are encouraged not to do original research for this paper. Rather, you should use your existing research projects as the subject matter that you bring into dialogue with the course ideas. This framework is deliberately vague, because there are many ways this exercise can be carried out. It depends greatly on your topic and how you choose to engage the course ideas. So, the way this works best is an iterative process where you come up with an idea, I give you feedback, you come up with a refined idea, I give you more feedback, etc. On each step, below, I encourage you to go through this iterative process with me (and with your peers).

Step 1: select a topic (feedback, refinement, feedback, etc.)

Step 2: formulate a thesis (feedback, refinement, feedback, etc.)

Step 3: lay out a work plan (feedback, refinement, feedback, etc.)

Step 4: come up with an outline (feedback, refinement, feedback, etc.)

Step 5: write it (& I evaluate it)

The paper should have *at least* 15 pages of text. Ideally, you should think about this project as a potential working paper, conference paper, journal article, or other career-relevant product. The length of these products varies by format and discipline, so let your vision for what the paper will become guide you as to length (with the minimum of 15 pages as a baseline).