
**SCHOOL OF PUBLIC POLICY
UNIVERSITY OF MARYLAND**

**PUAF 698Q: Selected Topics in Public Affairs
Democracy and Democratization: Theory and Practice
Fall 2007**

Thursdays, 1:30 – 4:00pm
Van Munching Hall 1101

David A. Crocker

Senior Research Scholar
Institute for Philosophy and Public Policy
School of Public Policy
University of Maryland
3111G Van Munching Hall

Email: dcrocker@umd.edu; Phone: 301-405-4763; Cell: 240-678-6267
Office hour: Thursday: 4:15 – 5:30pm and other times by appointment

The course, offered on the 600 level, will be open to undergraduate seniors (with permission of instructor) and both M.A. and Ph.D. students throughout the university.

I. Aims of the Course: This course will focus on the theory and practice of democracy and democratization as well as related themes of civil society and civic engagement. In Part I, we will consider various theories that seek to understand and defend democratic governance. What is the nature of democracy in contrast to other forms of government – such as bureaucratic elitism, theocracy, and authoritarianism – and can democracy be defended against these other governmental arrangements? What are the strengths and weaknesses of various forms of democratic theory, for example, minimalist democracy (Schumpeter), liberal-representative democracy (Dahl -polyarchy), and deliberative democracy? What does each theory consider to be the causes, consequences, limits, and threats to democracy?

In Part II, the course will examine and evaluate the practice of democracy and especially institutional experiments in deepening and broadening democracy. Part III will assess theories that explain and justify transitions from authoritarianism to democracy as well as various approaches to democracy promotion.

II. Recommended Books (University Book Store, Internet):

- James Bohman, *Democracy across Borders: From Demos to Demoi* (Cambridge, MA: MIT Press, 2007) ISBN-13: 978-0-262-02612-3
- Robert A. Dahl, *Democracy and Its Critics* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1989). ISBN0-300-04938-2
- Larry Diamond, *Squandered Victory: The American Occupation and the Bungled Effort to Bring Democracy to Iraq* (Owl Books, 2006) (ISBN: 0-80508-008-2).

- John Gastil and Peter Levine, eds. *The Deliberative Democracy Handbook: Strategies for Effective Civic Engagement in the 21st Century* (San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 2005) ISBN: 0-7879-7661-X
- David Held, *Models of Democracy*, 2nd. ed. (Stanford: Stanford University Press, 1996) ISBN: 0-804-72861-5
- Charles Tilly, *Democracy* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2007) ISBN: 978-0-521-70153-2

III. Class Website: <http://www.wam.umd.edu/~dcrocker/Courses/PUAF698Q.html>

The syllabus, class roster, theoretical paper guidelines, and some readings are available on the website.

IV. Requirements (All papers should be sent electronically in a Word attachment by 5:00 p.m. on the due date):

1. Consistent Attendance and Participation (20%)

Students will come to class having read carefully the assigned reading. You should be prepared to summarize the reading's main arguments, raise at least one question of interpretation, identify at least one positive feature, and make at least one criticism of the reading. Participation in class discussion will be evaluated in relation to both quality and quantity (not too much nor too little).

2. Theoretical Paper(s) (40%)

All papers should be submitted electronically at no later than 9 a.m. on the due date. Papers should be double-spaced in 12 point font with consistent foot or end-noting.

- **Option I: Long (20-25 page) Final Term Paper (with option to revise) (40 % of final grade).**
 - Topic Proposal: One or two paragraph sketch of proposed topic (9/23).
 - Detailed three-page outline of paper plus bibliography (10/21).
 - Paper due (11/18), if you have chosen to revise.
 - Paper due (12/2), if you have not chosen to revise.
 - (Optional) revision of paper due (12/2). (If you chose to revise, the grade on the revision will replace the original paper's grade).
- **Option II: Four Short (5-6 page) Papers (10% each of final grade).** Each short paper should interpret and assess some narrow topic, position, problem, or argument in the reading assigned for the appropriate two-week or three-week period. Each paper may be revised on the basis of instructor's comments and criticisms. (If you choose to revise, the grade on the revision will replace the grade on the original paper).
 - Short Paper #1: Due: 9/16 (optional revision due: 9/23)
 - Short Paper #2: Due: 10/7 (optional revision due: 10/14)
 - Short Paper #3: Due: 10/28 (optional revision due: 11/4)
 - Short Paper #4: Due: 11/11 (optional revision due: 11/18)

3. Practicum Paper (15-20 page) (40 %): Due December 16. See Guidelines and Options

VI. Course Outline:

Part I: Models of Democracy

Week 1 (8/30) Introduction (Guest Lecturer: Stephen Schwenke)

- Course Aims, Books, Requirements, Outline
- Challenges to Democracy and Democratization: Theory and Practice

Week 2 (9/6): Classical Democracy

- Dahl, *Democracy and Its Critics*, Introduction, ch. 1
- Held, *Models*, Preface to Third Ed., Introduction, ch. 1
- Joshua Ober, "Learning from Athens," *Boston Review*, March-April 2006, website or <http://bostonreview.net/BR31.2/ober.html>

Week 3 (9/13): Republicanism

- Held, *Models*, ch. 2
- Dahl, *Democracy and Its Critics*, ch. 2

Short Paper #1 Due 9/16

Week 4 (9/20) Critics of Democracy: Anarchism and Guardianship

- Dahl, *Democracy and Its Critics*, ch. 3-5

Short Paper #1 Revision Due 9/23

Long Paper Topic Proposal 9/23

Week 5 (9/27): Two Forms of Classic Liberal Democracy: "Protective Democracy" and "Developmental Democracy"

- Held, *Models*, chs. 3

Week 6 (10/4): Marxism vs. Competitive Elitism (Democratic Minimalism)

- Held, *Models*, chs. 4-5

Short Paper #2 Due 10/7

Week 7 (10/11): Dahl: Democracy as Polyarchy

- Dahl, *Democracy and Its Critics*, chs. 7-8, 15-16
- Held, *Models*, ch. 6

Short Paper #2 Revision Due 10/15

Week 8 (10/18): Post War and Post Cold War Polarization: Legal Democracy vs. Participatory Democracy

- Held, *Models*, chs. 7-8
- Held, *Models*, ch. 5

Long Paper 3-page Outline Due 10/21

Week 9 (10/25): Deliberative Democracy

- Held, *Models*, ch. 6
- Gastil and Levine, chs. 1-2
- Ian Shapiro, “Enough of Deliberation: Politics is About Interests and Power” in Stephen Macedo, ed., *Deliberative Politics: Essays on Democracy and Disagreement*, pp. 28-38, [website](#).
- Lynn Sanders, “Against Deliberation,” *Political Theory* 25: 347-76.

Short Paper #3 Due 10/28

Week 10 (11/1) Cosmopolitan and Transnational Democracy

- Held, *Models*, chs. 10-11
- Bohman, *Democracy across Borders* Intro., chs. 1-2, conclusion

Short Paper # 3 Revision due, 11/4

Part II: Democratic Transition, Practice, and Promotion

Week 11 (11/8): Democratization and De-Democratization

- Tilly, *Democracy*, Preface, chs. 1-3

Short Paper #4 Due 11/11

Week 12 (11/15): Trust Networks and Democratic Hope

- Tilly, *Democracy*, chs. 6-8

Short Paper # 4 Revision due 11/18

Long Paper due (with option to revise) 11/18

Week 13 (11/29) Deliberation and Public Judgment

- Gastil and Levine, *Deliberative Democracy Handbook*, ch. 3, 5, 7
- David A. Crocker, “Deliberative Participation in Local Development.”

Long Paper Revision due 12/2

Long Paper (with no option to revise) due 12/2

Week 14 (12/6): Deliberative Governance

- Gastil and Levine, *Deliberative Democracy Handbook*, chs. 10, 11, 12, 16, 17, 18

Week 14 (12/13): Promoting Democracy in Iraq?

- Diamond, *Squandered Victory*, chaps. Intro, 1-2, 5 (only 103-117)-6, 8-11

Practicum Paper due December 16

VII. Practicum Paper

1. Practicum Paper Guidelines:

A. Aims:

The practicum paper is an important part of the course's aim to integrate democratic theory and practice. The paper also expresses and contributes to the University of Maryland and the School of Public Policy's growing commitment to engage in our surrounding communities – local, county, state, national, and world..

An excellent paper will both apply class readings and critical discussion to a government, nongovernmental, or community agency and test out or evaluate these same concepts in the light of what the group investigated is doing (or failing to do). To what extent, if any, do some key concepts and theories studied in the course illuminate the aims, problems, options, and optimum course of action of the group studied? To what extent, if any, does the experience of the group studied provide a basis for supporting, criticizing, modifying, or rejecting scholarly or theoretical concepts?

Your paper will be handed in to your professor for comments, revision, and a grade. But you also may choose to provide your group with a copy in the hopes that an “outsider” perspective may prove useful to the group itself. (For both opportunities and dangers of “outsider” perspectives, see David A. Crocker, “Cross-cultural Criticism and Development Ethics,”

<http://www.puaf.umd.edu/IPPP/reports/vol24summer04/vol24summer04.pdf>)

Consequently, the practicum papers should be closely linked to class readings and critical discussions so that the practicum experience contributes to the critical reflection and scholarly part of the course and is not an independent exercise. The general problem with the university's involvement in community engagement is that such engagement gets hived off from the reflective and critical components. To see how this danger might be avoided, consider the following example. If a student is doing a practicum in a homeless shelter, he/she may survey clients and get a sense of their attitude towards government: whether it is a venue for democratic protest, an appeaser and a source of support and solace for the client, or part of the problem that made him/her homeless in the first place. Can we discern in these approach the difference between a “negative liberty” or a 'positive/civic liberty' attitude?! What difference, if any, might it make if the homeless person participated in the shelter's decision-making and links to local government? To further the sort of integration we seek, each group will frame a theoretical question that they hope to (begin to) answer (or reframe or dissolve?) in their engagement and paper.

Hence, there are two opposite pitfalls to avoid: (1) An uncritical and unreflective report on a unit with little reference to the scholarly concepts and classroom approaches to democratic theory and practice; (2) A overly theoretical paper that fails to apply and test out theories and concepts in relation to the unit you are engaging and the context in which it is operating. Taking seriously what Dewey means by “critical intelligence” will help you avoid both pitfalls.

B. Steps and Dates:

1. From the list of governmental units and nongovernmental agencies, please pick three and list in the order of your preference. Or come up (by yourself or with two others in the class) with your own idea for an organization or government entity to study. **Email your preferences to Professor Crocker by Sunday, September 23.**
2. I will put each of you in groups of two or three members and announce your groups by class time, September 27

3. I will contact each of the 8 or so groups to be studied, explain the course and practicum paper, and (hopefully) enlist them in the project.
4. You should convene your group as soon as possible and make contact with the group contact person (knowing that we will already have paved the way for your engagement).
5. There is no hard-and-fast recipe for learning about and from your group; being able to understand its history, challenges, problems, options; and being in a position to produce a good analytical and evaluative paper. Among the possibility strategies are: (1) read relevant documents produced by or about your group; (2) interview various leaders, rank and file, members, and “clients” or beneficiaries, rival groups; (3) attend group meetings or work sessions; (4) engage in “participatory action research” (“*investigacion-accion*”) by becoming part (if invited) of at least one “public action” of your group (e.g., voter registration, public protest, public forum).
6. Paper Topic proposal: Your team should deliberate together and decide on at least one (theoretical) question they hope their practicum question to answer. Give us a brief paragraph in which you clarify the question and why you think it might be important. One outcome is that the practicum experience may be such that the initial question is not so much answered as reframed or dissolved on the basis of the group’s experience. **Due date: Sunday, Oct. 14.**
7. **Practicum Paper Due: December 13.**

C. Strategy and Ethics

1. Some groups may be happy to have an outsider do a practicum paper on them. But providing you this opportunity will cost them time and energy that they could be using on other projects. What’s in it for them? What are your obligations to the group you are studying? They may welcome an outsider analysis, evaluation, and set of recommendations as a means of stimulating internal deliberation. Hence, you may want to write your paper knowing that they will receive a copy. The group might want you to volunteer some time to their activities (and this might be part of your “participatory action research”). A couple of hours a week might be worth considering and not too onerous for you. Anything more than that, and we should consider providing you with an independent reading course (for 1-2 hours) with credit to be received next semester.
2. Practicum Assignments 2004. This list will be revised and updated for 2007, but it should give you some idea of the options. See Gastil and Levine, *Deliberative Democracy Handbook* for other suggestions. Some of the best papers from 2004 will be made available.
 1. **CASA of Maryland** (Natasha Sacouman, David Garcia)
 310 Tulip Ave.
 Takoma Park, MD 20912
 Gustavo Torres, Executive Director
 301-270-3609
<http://www.casademaryland.org>
info@casamd.org
 CASA of Maryland is a community organization that was founded in 1985 by Central American refugees and North Americans. CASA was created in response to the

human needs of the thousands of Central Americans arriving to the D.C. area after fleeing wars and civil strife in their countries of origin. While CASA was established to meet the special needs of the Central American population, we serve immigrants from virtually every country in Latin America, as well as Africans, Asians and U.S. citizens, as needed.

2. **Advocacy Institute** (Erinn Mansour, Yan Liu, Jennifer Runnels)

1629 K St., NW, Suite 200
Washington, DC 20006-1629
Phone: 202-777-7575

www.advocacy.org

Founded in 1985, the Advocacy Institute works to make social justice leadership strategic, effective, and sustainable in pursuit of a just world.

3. **Inter-American Development Bank** (Guillermo Cantor, Ana Luiza Farias)

Various units are promoting good governance and more inclusive, deeper democracy in Latin America. Contact: Edmundo Jarquin, Head, State, Governance, and Civil Society Division, Department of Sustainable Development (202-623-2067); Isabel Licha, Inter-American Institute for Development, IADB (202-623-3437); Bernardo Kliksberg, Latin American Initiative for Social Capital, Ethics, and Development (202-623-3765; www.etica@iadb.org).

4. **The World Bank** (Bob Lamb, Billy Varettoni, Chunli Shen)

Anna Amato, Friday Morning Group (Values for Development Group)
E-mail: aamato@worldbank.org
Website: www.worldbank.org/fmg

Katherine Marshall
Director and Counselor to the President
Development Dialogue on Values and Ethics
202-473-6923 (tel)
202-522-7524 (fax)
202-438-5093 (cell)

“Participation and Civic Engagement Team” under Social Development Department in the World Bank. The team works on civic empowerment issues including civic engagement in public expenditure management.

<http://www.worldbank.org/participation/web/index.htm>

5. **AmericaSpeaks** (Karla Lopez).

America Speaks (www.americaspeaks.org) organizes large-scale public deliberations, including the Listening to the City events (which are an integral part of Washington, DC's annual budget process), and the deliberations on rebuilding the World Trade Center site, which caused the whole plan to be fundamentally changed. This would be a good group for anyone who is interested in deliberation – from a practical perspective. Director: Carolyn Luckensmeyer (See Peter Levine)

6. **Centers for Medicare and Medicaid Services** (Carlos Cano, Gabriela Schwarz, Shanti Gonzales)

Program to integrate patient advocates into the process for determining Medicare coverage (reimbursement) of new medical technologies.

Six to twelve patient/public advocates would be selected through the standard nomination process to be members of the Medicare Coverage Advisory Committee (MCAC). Each panel chosen to address a specific question regarding the evidence supporting a new health technology would have an advocate assigned. Patient advocate representatives could also be convened as a stand-alone subcommittee to address specific patient-centered issues. In addition, CMS staff could consult with individual participants from the selected pool on an ad-hoc basis. The representatives of the public would be trained by CMS in the coverage process and assessment of clinical evidence to effectively participate on the MCAC panel vis-à-vis clinical and methods experts. Clinical evidence is set against a background of values and judgment. The proposal has the potential to stimulate evidence-based dialogue on controversial issues by explicitly incorporating patient viewpoints and a broad societal perspective as a backdrop for CMS coverage decisions. Enhanced quality and acceptability of our decisions may result. If successful, the program could be expanded to other policy areas. Contact: Class member, Carlos Cano.

7. **Center for Islam and Democracy** (Myra Hamid, Anamika Broomes, Mary Marchal, Laryssa Chomiak)
8. **Citizens for Global Solutions** (Tony Fleming, Paul Lord)
Citizens works to educate Americans about their rights and responsibilities as global citizens: “We envision a future in which nations work together to abolish war, protect our rights and freedoms, and solve the problems confronting humanity that no nation can solve alone. This vision requires effective democratic global institutions and norms that apply the rule of law while respecting the diversity and autonomy of national and local communities.”
9. **Lake Barcroft Community Organization** (Becca Thorpe, Mike Spivey, Jeremy Boss)
10. **Democratization in Afghanistan** (Ghafoor Liwal)