

Citizen Politics: How and When Do Ordinary People Get Voice and Impact?

Version: August 2019. For updated reading lists check the e-learning site of the course.

Instructor: Gábor Tóka
Department of Political Science
Central European University

MA Program in Political Science
Fall semester 2019-20 (2 CEU credits, 4 ECTS)

Class meetings: on the Budapest campus. Nine classes at 3:30-5:10 on Wednesdays, three classes at 3:30-5:10 on Tuesdays (see detailed schedule below)

Office hours: as advertised on the sign-up sheet to book appointments:
gabortoka.youcanbook.me

Introduction

Probably no previous time in history saw as much citizen participation in local, national and global politics as ours. Yet the biggest policy choices of the day – think of climate change, migration, weapons control systems, or inequality, for instance – probably never before seemed so impenetrably insulated from the direct influence of individual citizens. How can we explain this paradox and what should we think of the prospects of genuine citizen input in the political process? What are the trends in citizen participation across the globe and why and how they may be changing?

These are some of the core questions that this course examines while considering various forms of citizen participation in the political process and the theoretical toolkits and models that the social sciences brought to shed light on them. We will explore what a variety of disciplines and conceptual frameworks identified about regularities, plausible causal connections, and interdependencies in a field that its specialists often consider among the most dynamic and exciting in contemporary social science. We shall see examples of intriguing ethnographic studies, breadth-taking historical overviews, imaginative use of statistics, impressive experiments and illuminating rational choice models bringing rather transparently and methodically constructed evidence to bear on complex, seemingly intractable questions. What is the motivation and (conscious or instinctive) goal of citizen participants in the political process? How frequently they engage in various activities, and how the action repertoire is narrowing or, maybe, widening in the digital age? What conventions, impact-maximizing or participant-satisficing practices they gave rise to? What kind of impact can be expected from one or another mode of citizens' political engagement, and what sets limit to it? When do the numbers matter and when it is something else that can maximize impact?

The course invites participants with a sound prior understanding of basic methodological issues in social research. The classes will be seminar-like and emphasize collective learning from in-class discussion and crowdsourcing of knowledge. A close and attentive reading of the assigned texts is crucial and is incentivized by the requirements.

Learning outcomes

- Familiarity with theories, concepts, empirical regularities and research strategies regarding citizen participation in politics. By the end of the course, participants should be able to give informed advice to advocacy groups, government agencies, political parties, and write informed analysis about individual political participation and social movements for news media and NGOs regarding ways of increasing the extensity, quality and impact of citizen engagement in particular issue domains
- Ability to propose, elaborate and persuasively argue for specific engagement tools in response to real world debates, with reference to the results of scholarly analyses and relevant normative concerns
- Reason analytically, apply abstract models to complex empirical situations and engage with different intellectual traditions, subfields, research designs and methodologies in the social sciences
- Improved ability to design high-quality academic or applied research in a rigorous and consistent manner
- Ability for effective oral presentation of scholarly thoughts, developing listening and discussion skills with initiative and autonomy in various professional contexts
- Improved understanding of the potential and limits of statistical analyses, case studies and experimental research especially with respect to the establishment of causality; improved appreciation of the potential of qualitative research and rigorous description

Course requirements and assessment

- Attendance and active class-room participation (15% of the final grade)
- Written responses to study questions (30% of the final grade)
- In-class presentations (10% of the final grade)
- Final paper (45% of the final grade)

Details:

The classes require active participation and careful preparation via reading the required materials and occasional online research. The meetings will typically be of the seminar-type, with multiple shorter presentations, followed and/or interrupted by Q&A and with discussion about the readings. For eight of the twelve sessions, participants will submit their short individual responses to a few study questions related to the readings before the day of the respective class. A good response will show that you covered the assigned readings, can apply the concepts they use, and are able to engage critically with their central arguments. There will be no need to demonstrate that you remember technical details and trivia. We will discuss possible answers and their merits in the subsequent class.

Every participant will make three separate two-minute contributions over the course based on applied online and library research regarding some current affairs developments closely related to the topic of the given week, plus a five-minute presentation of the outline of their final term paper supported by an appropriate handout or slideshow. A list of possible topics for two-minute contributions during the next class will be provided at the end of classes 2-6, 8, 10, and 11, but all participants are also encouraged to propose topics they would like to hear about or investigate. Who prepares a contribution and on what topic has to be agreed with the instructor at least five days before each class.

Every participant will submit a max. 3,000-word long term paper by 10 December. The papers will be case studies applying the theories, models and concepts discussed in the first part of the course to a single-country or cross-country development, event, citizen or social

movement initiative, as an example of individualized or collective citizen participation in politics. A list of possible topics will be provided in mid-October, but everyone can come up with their own ideas closely related to the topics covered in the course. The paper topic has to be discussed and agreed upon with the instructor by 30 October. The outline for the papers will be presented and discussed in class in November, and we will have discussions about your paper topic during office hours throughout the semester. Late submission of the paper will lead to a 3.5% per day deduction from the merit-based score on the paper. Regarding plagiarism and attendance, the departmental policies will apply.

Part I of course program: Theories, models, concepts and normative considerations

Classes 1 & 2 – Motivation: What can subjects and citizens of Leviathan do for political change and why would they bother? (Tuesday, October 1, and Wednesday, October 2)

The first week of the semester motivates the issue focus of the course and deals with organizational matters, like allocating some research tasks among participants. The first class comes without any mandatory reading (you will make up for that in subsequent weeks) and you will only be requested to read half a chapter from a heartbreaking but extremely entertaining and insightful book by a top-end BBC journalist for the second class. You will, however, form a number of smaller teams that will meet between the two classes to prepare your answers to a set of questions related to the reading and the movie that we are going to watch during the first class. If you want to make the most of the course you should, of course, also check out the recommended readings for this week too.

Based on the answers from the teams that you will form, the second class shall discuss the following questions: how Leviathan produces public goods and what alternative organization we can imagine fulfilling the same role? Was Mao Tse-Tung write suggesting that “Political power grows out of the barrel of a gun”? Can a Leviathan-like state completely disarm citizens and buy the loyalty of everyone who could launch effective protest? If yes, how, if not, why not? Conversely, can we eradicate Leviathan completely from social life, or do we have to accept that the “deep state” always remains there and rules some undisclosed aspects of our lives? What would you have done in place of the narrator of our mandatory reading if you found yourself in his place in the same story? And what if you found yourself in the place of the story’s heroine? What are the most promising options for lonely rebels against Leviathan: treason, tax evasion, draft dodging, sabotage, whistle-blowing, terrorism, peaceful protest, or what? What are the pros and cons of each course of action? Why do grievances, social displacement, marginalization and deprivation often fail to trigger protest? Why would Leviathan develop routines for treating citizens fairly, and accept their rights to meaningful political action?

Readings and audio-visual materials (# marks required):

- # Zviagintsev, Andrei (director). 2014. *Leviathan*. Motion picture. London: Fusion Media. (<https://www.imdb.com/title/tt2802154/>)
- # Pomerantsev, Peter. 2014. *Nothing Is True and Everything is Possible: The Surreal Heart of the New Russia*. New York: PublicAffairs, pp. 79-106.
- Biggs, Michael. 2005. "Dying Without Killing: Self-Immolations, 1963-2002." In *Making Sense of Suicide Missions*, edited by Diego Gambetta. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

- Hechter, Michael, Steven Pfaff, and Patrick Underwood. 2016. "Grievances and the Genesis of Rebellion: Mutiny in the Royal Navy, 1740 to 1820." *American Sociological Review* 81 (1): 165-189.
- Tyler, Tom R. 2006. "Afterword." In *Why People Obey the Law*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, pp. 269-294. URL: <http://assets.press.princeton.edu/chapters/p8230.pdf>
- Torgler, Benno. 2007. *Tax Compliance and Tax Morale: A Theoretical and Empirical Analysis*. Northampton, MA: Edward Elgar. URL: https://eprints.qut.edu.au/15324/1/15324_torgler_2008002003.pdf
- Sanborn, Joshua. 2002. *Drafting the Russian Nation Military Conscription, Total War and Mass Politics, 1905-1925*. DeKalb, IL: Northern Illinois University Press.
- Zürn, Michael. 2005. "Introduction: Law and Compliance at Different Levels." In *Law and Governance in Postnational Europe: Compliance Beyond the Nation-State*, edited by Michael Zürn and Christian Joerges. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, pp. 1-39.
- Ostrom, Elinor. 1990. *Governing the Commons: The Evolution of Institutions for Collective Action*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Greene, Samuel A. 2018. "Running to Stand Still: Aggressive Immobility and the Limits of Power in Russia." *Post-Soviet Affairs* 34 (5): 333-347.
- Chen, Jidong, Jennifer Pan, and Yiqing Xu. 2016. "Sources of Authoritarian Responsiveness: A Field Experiment in China." *American Journal of Political Science* 60 (2): 383-400.
- Qin, Bei, David Strömberg, and Yanhui Wu. 2017. "Why Does China Allow Freer Social Media? Protests versus Surveillance and Propaganda." *The Journal of Economic Perspectives* 31 (1): 117-140.
- Brownlee, Kimberley. 2013. *Conscience and Conviction: The Case for Civil Disobedience*. New York: Oxford University Press. DOI:10.1093/acprof:oso/9780199592944.001.0001
- Allen, Michael. 2017. *Civil Disobedience in Global Perspective: Decency and Dissent over Borders, Inequities, and Government Secrecy*. New York: Springer, pp. 129-144.

Class 3 – The varied goals and effects of citizen participation (9 October 2019)

There is a perplexing variety of ways to think about citizen activism in idolizing, analytical, prescriptive and highly politically critical ways. In this class we will organize the different perspectives into a comprehensive checklist of possible objectives, side-effects and indirect contributions that will help us later in thinking through when and what kind of citizen participation to expect and with what kind of effects. We will also have a first look at the variety of ways citizens engage in political action across the world today and how frequent and extensive the most common forms are.

Readings and audio-visual materials (# marks required):

- # Bragg, Melvin, and guests. 2019. "The Gordon Riots." BBC4 "In Our Time" podcast. URL: <https://www.bbc.co.uk/programmes/m0004mbx>
- # Teorell, Jan. 2006. "Political Participation and Three Theories of Democracy: A Research Inventory and Agenda." *European Journal of Political Research* 45 (5): 787-810.
- # Sorochan, Cayley. 2016. "Participation as Ideology in Occupy Wall Street." In *The Participatory Condition in the Digital Age*, edited by Darin Barney, Gabriella Coleman, Christine Ross, Jonathan Sterne and Tamar Tembeck. Minneapolis, MN: University of Minnesota Press, pp. 21-41.

- Rucht, Dieter. 2007. "The Spread of Protest Politics." In *The Oxford Handbook of Political Behavior*, ed. by Russell J. Dalton and Hans-Dieter Klingemann. Oxford: Oxford University Press, pp. 708-723.
- Ekman, Joakim, and Erik Amna. 2012. "Political Participation and Civic Engagement: Towards a New Typology." *Human Affairs* 22 (3): 283–300.
- Hooghe, Marc. 2014. "Citizenship and Participation." In *Comparing Democracies 4: Elections and Voting in a Changing World*, edited by Lawrence LeDuc, Richard Niemi and Pippa Norris. London: Sage, pp. 58-75.
- Dalton, Russell J. 2005. *Citizen Politics: Public Opinion and Political Parties in Advanced Industrial Democracies*. 4th ed. Chatham, NJ: Chatham House, pp. 35-78.
- Murdie, Amanda, and Dursun Peksen. 2015. "Women and Contentious Politics: A Global Event-Data Approach to Understanding Women's Protest." *Political Research Quarterly* 68 (1): 180-192.
- Ostrom, Elinor. 1990. *Governing the Commons: The Evolution of Institutions for Collective Action*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Sabl, Andrew. 2002. "Community Organizing as Tocquevillean Politics: The Art, Practices, and Ethos of Association." *American Journal of Political Science* 46 (1): 1-19.
- Tilly, Charles. 2004. *Contention and Democracy in Europe, 1650-2000*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Peters, Yvette. 2018. *Political Participation, Diffused Governance, and the Transformation of Democracy: Patterns of Change*. Abingdon: Routledge.
- CitizensLab. 2017. *Mapping New Forms of Civic Engagement*. URL: https://issuu.com/citizenslab/docs/mapping_new_forms_of_civic_engageme
- Della Porta, Donatella. 2013. *Can Democracy Be Saved? Participation, Deliberation and Social Movements*. Cambridge: Polity Press.
- Page, Benjamin, and Martin Gilens. 2017. *Democracy in America? What Has Gone Wrong and What We Can Do About It*. Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press.
- Youngs, Richard. 2019. *Civic Activism Unleashed: New Hope or False Dawn for Democracy?* Oxford: Oxford University Press. DOI:10.1093/oso/9780190931704.001.0001
- Pateman, Carole. 1970. *Participation and Democratic Theory*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. URL: <https://doi.org/10.1017/CBO9780511720444>
- Barber, Benjamin R. 1984. *Strong Democracy: Participatory Politics for a New Age*. Berkeley, CA: University of California Press.
- Fishkin, James S., and Jane Mansbridge, eds. 2017. *The Prospects & Limits of Deliberative Democracy*. Thematic Issue of *Daedalus*, Volume 146, No. 3.
- Warren, Mark. 1992. "Democratic Theory and Self-Transformation." *American Political Science Review* 86 (1): 8-23.
- Putnam, Robert D., with Roberto Leonardi, and Raffaella Y. Nanetti. 1993. *Making Democracy Work: Civic Traditions in Modern Italy*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.
- Coleman, James S. 1988. "Social Capital in the Creation of Human Capital." *American Journal of Sociology* 94: S95-S120.
- Edwards, Bob, Foley, Michael W., and Mario Diani, eds. 2001. *Beyond Tocqueville: Civil Society and the Social Capital Debate in Comparative Perspective*. Hanover, NH: University Press of New England, pp. 1-16, 32-42, 221-280 .
- Brunnschweiler, Christa N., Colin Jennings, and Ian A. MacKenzie. 2012. "Rebellion against Reason? A Study of Expressive Choice and Strikes." URL: http://www.svt.ntnu.no/iso/WP/2012/7_rebellion.pdf

- Trabucco, Fabio Ratto. 2019. *The Human Rights Referendums in Central-Eastern European Union Countries Under the ECHR Protection*. Rome: Libellula.
- Aytaç, S. Erdem, and Susan C. Stokes. 2019. *Why Bother? Rethinking Participation in Elections and Protests*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Bernhard, Michael, Allen Hicken, Christopher Reenock, and Staffan I. Lindberg. 2015. "Institutional Subsystems and the Survival of Democracy: Do Political and Civil Society Matter?" V-Dem Working Paper 2015:4. Gothenburg: Varieties of Democracy Institute, Department of Political Science. URL: <https://tinyurl.com/y2h58l4x>

Class 4 – Triggers, facilitators, and alleged determinants of citizen participation (16 October 2019)

Various schools of thoughts emphasized somewhat different causes for the ebb and flow of citizen participation in politics, but they agree quite a bit on a broad list of plausible candidates. This class will review the somewhat patchy evidence on the matter as well as what is not trivial but in fact quite insightful and nuanced about explanations that refer to concepts like grievances, social problems, relative deprivation, social marginalization, connectedness, culture shift, opportunity structures, action repertoires, resource mobilization, cultural frames, institutions, club goods, selective incentives and cost factors.

Readings and audio-visual materials (# marks required):

- # Christensen, Henrik Seruo. 2013. "Institutional Incentives for Participation in Elections and Between Elections." In *Between-Election Democracy: The Representative Relationship after Election Day*, edited by Peter Esaiasson and Hanne Marthe Narud. London: ECPR Press, pp. 103-126.
- # King, Gary, Jennifer Pan, and Margaret E. Roberts. 2013. "How Censorship in China Allows Government Criticism but Silences Collective Expression." *American Political Science Review* 107 (2): 326-343.
- Koopmans, Ruud. 2007. "Social Movements." In *The Oxford Handbook of Political Behavior*, ed. by Russell J. Dalton and Hans-Dieter Klingemann. Oxford: Oxford University Press, pp. 693-707. OR WITH A LOT MORE DETAIL, QUESTIONS AND NUANCES: Edwards, Gemma. 2014. *Social Movements and Protest*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- McAdam, Doug. 1982. *Political Process and the Development of Black Insurgency, 1930-1970*. Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press, especially chapter 1.
- McCarthy, John D., and Mayer N. Zald. 1977. "Resource Mobilization and Social Movements: A Partial Theory." *American Journal of Sociology* 82 (6): 1212-1241.
- Tarrow, Sidney. 1994. *Power in Movement: Social Movements and Contentious Politics*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Tilly, Charles. 1995. *Popular Contention in Great Britain, 1758-1834*. Boulder, CO: Paradigm Publishers.
- McAdam, Doug, Sidney Tarrow, and Charles Tilly. 2001. *Dynamics of Contention*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Truex, Rory. 2016. *Making Autocracy Work: Representation and Responsiveness in Modern China*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press
- Chen, Xi. 2014. *Social Protest and Contentious Authoritarianism in China*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

- Skocpol, Theda, Marshall Ganz, and Ziad Munson. 2000. "A Nation of Organizers: The Institutional Origins of Civic Voluntarism in the United States." *American Political Science Review* 94 (3): 527-546.
- Zasimova, Liudmila, and Marina Kolosnitsyna. 2018. "Charitable giving and the future of NGOs in Russia: what can we learn from individual data?" *Post-Soviet Affairs* 34 (6): 412-429.
- Franklin, Mark N. 2004. *Voter Turnout and the Dynamics of Electoral Competition in Established Democracies since 1945*. New York: Cambridge University Press

Class 5 – Social values, political culture, and political participation (30 October 2019)

One influence on how much citizens participate in various political actions lies in the relatively stable, culturally embedded predispositions that orient individual citizens in politics. Studies of this particular factor proved remarkably successful in explaining some of the most striking changes that occurred in citizens' political participation in the last few decades. This week we are going to examine the potential and limits of these arguments, the known movers, patterns and direction of cultural change, and also contemplate the parallel but unrelated arguments about the history of violence in recent studies of human evolution.

Readings and audio-visual materials (# marks required):

- # Dalton, Russell J., and Doh Chull Shin. 2014. "Reassessing the Civic Culture Model." In *The Civic Culture Transformed: From Allegiant to Assertive Citizens*, ed. by Russell J. Dalton and Christian Welzel. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, pp. 91-115.
- # Dalton, Russell J., and Christian Welzel. 2014. "Political Culture and Value Change." In *The Civic Culture Transformed: From Allegiant to Assertive Citizens*, ed. by Russell J. Dalton and Christian Welzel. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, pp. 1-16.
- # Welzel, Christian, and Alejandro Moreno Alvarez. 2014. "Enlightening People: The Spark of Emancipative Values." In *The Civic Culture Transformed: From Allegiant to Assertive Citizens*, ed. by Russell J. Dalton and Christian Welzel. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, pp. 59-88.
- McAdam, Doug. 1986. "Recruitment to High-Risk Activism: The Case of Freedom Summer." *American Journal of Sociology* 92 (1): 64-90.
- Wrangham, Richard. 2019. *Goodness Paradox: Virtue & Violence in Human Evolution*. New York: Pantheon.
- Pinker, Steven. 2011. *The Better Angels of Our Nature: Why Violence Has Declined*. New York: Viking Books.
- Muller, Edward N., and Karl-Dieter Opp. 1986. "Rational Choice and Rebellious Collective Action." *The American Political Science Review* 80 (2): 471-488.
- Klosko, George, Edward N. Muller, and Karl Dieter Opp. 1987. "Rebellious Collective Action Revisited." *American Political Science Review* 81 (2): 557-564.
- Zhong, Yang. 2018. *Political Culture and Participation in Urban China*. London: Palgrave Macmillan.
- van der Meer, Tom W. G., Jan W. van Deth, and Peer L. H. Scheepers. 2009. "The Politicized Participant: Ideology and Political Action in 20 Democracies." *Comparative Political Studies* 42 (11): 1426-1457.
- Tóka, Gábor, and Tania Gosselin. 2010. "Persistent Political Divides, Electoral Volatility and Citizen Involvement: The Freezing Hypotheses in the 2004 European Election." *West European Politics* 33 (3): 608-633.

- Almond, Gabriel A., and Sidney Verba. 1963. *The Civic Culture: Political Attitudes and Democracy in Five Nations*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.
- Almond, Gabriel A., and Sidney Verba, eds. 1980. *The Civic Culture Revisited: An Analytic Study*. Boston, MA: Little, Brown and Co.
- Dalton, Russell J., and Doh Chull Shin. 2014. "Reassessing the Civic Culture Model." In *The Civic Culture Transformed: From Allegiant to Assertive Citizens*, edited by Russell J. Dalton and Christian Welzel. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, pp. 91-115.
- Barnes, Samuel H., and Max Kaase, eds. 1979. *Political Action: Mass Participation in Five Western Democracies*. London: Sage.
- Jennings, M. Kent, and Jan W. van Deth, eds. 1989. *Continuities in Political Action: A Longitudinal Study of Political Orientations in Three Western Democracies*. Berlin: Walter de Gruyter.
- Klingemann, Hans-Dieter, and Dieter Fuchs, eds. 1995. *Citizens and the State*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Inglehart, Ronald, and Christian Welzel. 2005. *Modernization, Cultural Change and Democracy: The Human Development Sequence*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Inglehart, Ronald, and Pippa Norris. 2009. *Cultural Convergence*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Hofstede, Geert, Gert Jan Hofstede, and Michael Minkov. 2010. *Cultures and Organizations: Software of the Mind*. 3rd ed: McGraw-Hill.
- Gibson, James L. 2007. "Political Intolerance in the Context of Democratic Theory." In *The Oxford Handbook of Political Behavior*, ed. by Russell J. Dalton and Hans-Dieter Klingemann. Oxford: Oxford University Press, pp. 323-341.
- Fuchs, Dieter. 2007. "The Political Culture Paradigm." In *The Oxford Handbook of Political Behavior*, ed. by Russell J. Dalton and Hans-Dieter Klingemann. Oxford: Oxford University Press, pp. 161-184.
- Inogouchi, Takashi. 2007. "Clash of Values across Civilizations." In *The Oxford Handbook of Political Behavior*, ed. by Russell J. Dalton and Hans-Dieter Klingemann. Oxford: Oxford University Press, pp. 240-258.
- van Deth, Jan W. 2007. "Norms of Citizenship." In *The Oxford Handbook of Political Behavior*, ed. by Russell J. Dalton and Hans-Dieter Klingemann. Oxford: Oxford University Press, pp. 402-417.

***Class 6 – What modes of citizen participation have (more) political impact?
(6 November 2019)***

This class deal with impact assessment and explores the reasons for such assessment being particularly difficult for citizen-initiated political actions, like the multiplicity of effects and goals, the poorly defined universe of cases, the collinear attributes of the various modes of participation, and the abundance indirect and long-term effects. We shall see what politicians think about the effectiveness of various modes of claim making and what other evidence shows. We will particularly focus on why peaceful actions are more likely to succeed than violent protest, and what aspect of protests can substitute for big numbers.

Readings and audio-visual materials (# marks required):

- # Marien, Sofie, and Marc Hooghe. 2013. "Is Anyone Listening? The Perceived Effectiveness of Electoral and Non-Electoral Participation." In *Between-Election Democracy: The*

- Representative Relationship after Election Day*, edited by Peter Esaiasson and Hanne Marthe Narud. London: ECPR Press, pp. 35-52.
- # Chenoweth, Erica, and Maria Stephan. 2011. "Why Civil Resistance Works: The Strategic Logic of Nonviolent Conflict." *International Security* 33 (1): 7-44.
- # York, Steve (director). 2002. *Bringing Down A Dictator*. (Documentary film.) Washington DC: York Zimmerman Productions. <https://www.imdb.com/title/tt0799956/>
- Dan, Wang. 2019. "30 Years After Tiananmen: The Meaning of June 4th." *Journal of Democracy* 30 (2): 31-37.
- Cortright, David. 2006. *Gandhi and Beyond: Nonviolence for an Age of Terrorism*. Boulder, CO: Paradigm Publishers, pp. 191-221.
- Giugni, Marco, and Maria T. Grasso. 2019. *Street Citizens: Protest Politics and Social Movement Activism in the Age of Globalization*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Tilly, Charles. 2004. *Social Movements, 1768-2004*. Boulder, CO: Paradigm Publishers.
- McAdam, Doug, Sidney Tarrow, and Charles Tilly. 2001. *Dynamics of Contention*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- DiGrazia, Joseph. 2013. "Individual Protest Participation in the United States: Conventional and Unconventional Activism." *Social Science Quarterly*: n/a-n/a.
- Zorell, Carolin V. 2019. *Varieties of Political Consumerism: From Boycotting to Buycotting*. Cham: Springer.
- Piven, Frances Fox, and Richard A. Cloward. 1979. *Poor People's Movements: Why They Succeed, How They Fail*. New York: Vintage.
- Sharp, Gene. 2012. *From Dictatorship to Democracy: A Conceptual Framework for Liberation*. New York: New Press.
- Popovic, Srdja, and with Matthew Miller. 2015. *Blueprint for Revolution: How to Use Rice Pudding, Lego Men, and Other Nonviolent Techniques to Galvanize Communities, Overthrow Dictators, or Simply Change the World*. New York: Spiegel & Grau.
- Chenoweth, Erica, and Maria Stephan. 2011. *Why Civil Resistance Works: The Strategic Logic of Nonviolent Conflict*. New York: Columbia University Press.

Part II of course program: case studies and recent developments

Class 7 – Student presentations (12 November 2019)

Students present outlines of their term papers

Class 8 – Empowered participation initiatives and citizen consultations (13 November 2019)

An impressive variety of apparently new forms of engaging and empowering citizens in the political process emerged in recent years. This class takes a closer look at some notable examples and examines how, when, and at what cost they achieve normatively desirable objectives. In particular, we will examine participatory budgeting, community engagement in policing and education board decisions, consensus conferences, citizen juries, citizen assemblies, deliberative polls and mini-publics. Ultimately, we shall ask if there are any natural limits to civil society engagement in policy making and how much is desirable.

Readings and audio-visual materials (# marks required):

- # Channel 4. "Crime in the United Kingdom." (Television documentary of the first ever deliberative poll.) See also <https://cdd.stanford.edu/1994/the-first-deliberative-polling-crime-in-the-united-kingdom/>
- # Baiocchi, Gianpaolo, Patrick Heller, and Marcelo Kunrath Silva. 2008. "Making Space for Civil Society: Institutional Reforms and Local Democracy in Brazil." *Social Forces* 86 (3): 911-936.
- # Fagotto, Elena, and Archon Fung. 2006. "Empowered Participation in Urban Governance: The Minneapolis Neighborhood Revitalization Program." *International Journal of Urban and Regional Research* 30 (3): 638-655.
- Salamon, Lester. "Of Market Failure, Voluntary Failure, and Third-Party Government: Toward a Theory of Government-Nonprofit Relations in the Modern Welfare State." *Journal of Voluntary Action Research* 16, no. 1/2: 35-61.
- Vivek, S. 2009. *Delivering Public Services Effectively: Tamil Nadu and Beyond*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Fung, Archon. 2004. *Empowered Participation: Reinventing Urban Democracy*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.
- Baiocchi, Gianpaolo, and Ernesto Ganuza. 2017. *Popular Democracy: The Paradox of Participation*. Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press.

Class 9 – Student presentations (19 November 2019)

Students present outlines of their term papers

Class 10 – Digital technologies in social movements and the internet's impact on transforming the public sphere (20 November 2019)

Technological utopias and dystopias about politics go back for hundreds of years, and it is unwise to question the impact of, say, the invention of printing by Gutenberg on political developments around the world. In our time, internet-based communications raised many hopes and fears about how they may impact politics, and this is what this class considers by looking at the impact of e-democracy, online mobilization, and the digitalized public sphere. We shall also consider the impact of the internet on political preference formation (e.g., the availability information and misinformation, discussion and silencing, sorting and isolation, cross-pressures and echo chambers), and participation (citizen journalism and watchdogs, e-petitioning, e-consultation, e-deliberation, e-polling, e-voting, e-donation).

Readings and audio-visual materials (# marks required):

- # Fung, Archon, Hollie Russon Gilman, and Jennifer Shkabatur. 2013. "Six Models for the Internet + Politics." *International Studies Review* 15 (1): 30-47.
- # Kosack, Stephen, and Archon Fung. 2014. "Does Transparency Improve Governance?" *Annual Review of Political Science* 17 (1): 65-87.
- # Margolis, Michael. 2007. "E-Government and Democracy." In *The Oxford Handbook of Political Behavior*, ed. by Russell J. Dalton and Hans-Dieter Klingemann. Oxford: Oxford University Press, pp. 765-782 (ch. 41).
- Gibson, Rachel, and Marta Cantijoch. 2013. "Conceptualizing and Measuring Participation in the Age of the Internet: Is Online Political Engagement Really Different to Offline?" *The Journal of Politics* 75 (3): 701-716.

- Bennett, W. Lance, and Alexandra Segerberg. 2013. *The Logic of Connective Action: Digital Media and the Personalization of Contentious Politics*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Bimber, Bruce A., Andrew J. Flanagin, and Cynthia Stohl. 2012. *Collective Action in Organizations: Interaction and Engagement in an Era of Technological Change*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Barney, Darin, Gabriella Coleman, Christine Ross, Jonathan Sterne, and Tamar Tembeck, eds. 2016. *The Participatory Condition in the Digital Age*. Minneapolis, MN: University of Minnesota Press, pp. vii-xxxix.
- Anduiza, Eva, Michael James Jensen, and Laia Jorba. 2012. *Digital Media and Political Engagement Worldwide: A Comparative Study*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Xenos, Michael, Ariadne Vromen, and Brian D. Loader. 2014. "The Great Equalizer? Patterns of Social Media Use and Youth Political Engagement in Three Advanced Democracies." *Information, Communication & Society* 17 (2): 151-167.
- Theocharis, Yannis, and Will Lowe. 2016. "Does Facebook Increase Political Participation? Evidence from a Field Experiment." *Information, Communication & Society* 19 (10): 1465-1486.
- Schlozman, Kay Lehman, Sidney Verba, and Henry E. Brady. 2010. "Weapon of the Strong? Participatory Inequality and the Internet." *Perspectives on Politics* 8 (2): 487-509.
- Lu, Yanqin, and Jessica Gall Myrick. 2016. "Cross-Cutting Exposure on Facebook and Political Participation." *Journal of Media Psychology* 28 (3): 100-110.
- Boulianne, Shelley. 2015. "Social media use and participation: a meta-analysis of current research." *Information, Communication & Society* 18 (5): 524-538.

Class 11 – Litigation and legislative input from citizens (27 November 2019)

This class uses the example of fights against gerrymandering electoral districts in US elections to explore how appeals to courts and various ways of involving citizens in policy making through digital tools can alter political outcomes. We will consider if these routes can empower citizens across the board or merely reinforce inequalities of income, social status and the like on the political process. The topic generated literally hundreds of scholarly works (you can learn more about that in the *Elections and Democracy* course) and the reading list below is merely meant to give a very simple and basic introduction to its complexity so that we can undertake our own research in class into how citizens themselves got in recent years engaged in policy-making on the issue via some fascinating – but not necessarily very successful – initiatives making use of imaginative legal arguments, some extremely old methods as well as digital technology, big data, and cloud computing.

Readings and audio-visual materials (# marks required):

- # Han, Kirsten. 2019. "The Guessing Game for Singapore's Elections." *The Interpreter blog of The Lowly Institute*, July 16. <https://www.lowlyinstitute.org/the-interpreter/guessing-game-singapore-elections>
- # [FiveThirtyEight]. 2017-2018. "The Gerrymandering Project." Podcast series by the FiveThirtyEight data journalism blog. URL: <https://fivethirtyeight.com/tag/the-gerrymandering-project/>
- # Cooper, Michael. 2010. "How to Tilt an Election through Redistricting." *The New York Times*, September 26.

- # Altman, Micah, Karin Mac Donald, and Michael McDonald. 2005. "Pushbutton Gerrymanders? How Computing Has Changed Redistricting." In *Party Lines: Competition, Partisanship, and Congressional Redistricting*, edited by Thomas E. Mann and Bruce E. Cain. Washington, DC: The Brookings Institution.
- # Altman, Micah, Brian Amos, Michael P. McDonald, and Daniel A. Smith. 2015. "Revealing Preferences: Why Gerrymanders are Hard to Prove, and What to Do about It." Available at SSRN: <https://ssrn.com/abstract=2583528>.
- The Brennan Center for Justice. n.d. "Redistricting." [Thematic webpage with encyclopedic content.] New York: New York University School of Law. URL: <https://www.brennancenter.org/issues/redistricting>
- James, Michael Rabinder. 2015. "Two Concepts of Constituency." *Journal of Politics* 77 (2): 381-393.
- Ho, Dale E. 2018. "Something Old, Something New, or Something Really Old? Second Generation Racial Gerrymandering Litigation as Intentional Racial Discrimination Cases." *William & Mary Law Review* 59 (5).
- Fried, Charles. 2019. "A Day of Sorrow for American Democracy." *The Atlantic*, July 3. URL: <https://www.theatlantic.com/ideas/archive/2019/07/rucho-v-common-cause-occasion-sorrow/593227/>
- Elmendorf, Christopher S. 2018. "From Educational Adequacy to Representational Adequacy: A New Template for Legal Attacks on Partisan Gerrymanders." *William & Mary Law Review* 59 (5)
- Migurski, Michal, Eric McGhee, Simon Jackman, Nicholas Stephanopoulos, and Ruth Greenwood. n.d. "PlanScore." URL: <https://planscore.org/#!2016-ushouse>
- Duchin, Moon. 2018. "Gerrymandering Metrics: How to measure? What's the baseline?" URL: <https://arxiv.org/abs/1801.02064>
- Handley, Lisa. 2018. "Electoral Systems and Redistricting." In *The Oxford Handbook of Electoral Systems*, edited by Erik S. Herron, Robert J. Pekkanen and Matthew S. Shugart. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Class 12 – Contemporary efforts at democratizing conventional politics (4 December 2019)

There are many more or less controversial attempts at transforming the conventional channels of democratic politics into more genuinely participate tools of democracy around the world today. Political parties like Podemos in Spain and the Movimento 5 Stelle in Italy make extensive use of digital tools to facilitate the direct involvement of member in party decisions, while Barack Obama's 2008 and Bernie Sanders' 2016 election campaigns in the US featured massive innovations in how a mass base can make a difference in politics via its sheer numbers and decentralized action. Meanwhile, plenty of initiatives target the increased use of party primaries, referenda and direct elections for various offices in the way of deepening representative democracy, and thoughtful proposals seek ways of effectively beating the influence of corporate donations in party politics. In this class we consider the achievements, potential and possible limits to success in these initiatives.

Readings and audio-visual materials (# marks required):

- # Montin, Stig. 2006. "Mobilizing for Participatory Democracy? The Case of Democracy Policy in Sweden." In *Participatory Democracy and Political Participation: Can Participatory Engineering Bring Citizens Back In?*, edited by Thomas Zittel and Dieter Fuchs. Abingdon: Routledge, pp. 187-201.

- # Offe, Claus. 2017. "Referendum vs. Institutionalized Deliberation: What Democratic Theorists Can Learn from the 2016 Brexit Decision." *Daedalus* 146 (3): 14-27.
- Scarrow, Susan E. 2007. "Political Activism and Party Members." In *The Oxford Handbook of Political Behavior*, ed. by Russell J. Dalton and Hans-Dieter Klingemann. Oxford: Oxford University Press, pp. 636-654 (ch 34).
- Han, Hahrie, and Elizabeth McKenna. 2015. *Groundbreakers: How Obama's 2.2 Million Volunteers Transformed Campaigning in America*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Bond, Becky, and Zack Exley. 2016. *Rules for Revolutionaries: How Big Organizing Can Change Everything*. White River Junction, VT: Chelsea Green Publishing.
- Gerbaudo, Paolo. 2018. *The Digital Party: Political Organisation and Online Democracy*. London: Pluto Press.
- Vromen, Ariadne. 2017. *Digital Citizenship and Political Engagement: The Challenge from Online Campaigning and Advocacy Organisations*. London: Palgrave.
- Lawless, Jennifer L., and Richard L. Fox. 2015. *Running from Office: Why Young Americans are Turned Off to Politics*. Oxford: Oxford University Press
- Lessig, Lawrence. 2011. *Republic, Lost: How Money Corrupts Congress — and a Plan to Stop It*. New York: Twelve.