

**Political Science 581**  
**Thursday 2:00-4:40 ~ Term: Fall 2014**  
**Instructor: James Johnson**  
**Harkness 312 ~ x5-0622 ~ [jd.johnson@rochester.edu](mailto:jd.johnson@rochester.edu)**  
**TA: David Gelman ~ [dgelman@ur.rochester.edu](mailto:dgelman@ur.rochester.edu)**

This year the seminar will focus on broad matters in the theory of democracy. It has three aims:

- (a) To help make you modestly literate regarding some important topics in contemporary political theory as well how these derive from writings published prior to say, 1980;
- (b) To get you to think about the foundations of our discipline, in particular the putative dichotomy between facts and values that most political scientists take for granted;
- (c) To familiarize you with a range of strategies for justifying or criticizing political arrangements or policies.

You have three primary tasks. First, you must actively engage in discussion in class. I want to make it clear that I expect active classroom participation - no reminders, no warnings, no cajoling. That means you need to have something to say – it should be smart and on point. *That* means you need to read and think in between class meetings. While that may sound patronizing, past experience suggests that I need to say such things bluntly. Participation will count for 10% of your grade.

Second, over the course of the term each student must submit 5 short papers that address in a critical way some aspect of or problem with the assigned reading. These papers are due in class on the day that the relevant reading has been assigned and *I will not accept them at any other time.* They may be no more than three typed pages long. Your performance on these papers will account for 30% of your grade for the course. You can write on any topic you like (or that interfere least with your other commitments) but to insure that you **do not** wait until the final weeks of the term I expect each of you to submit *at least* two of these assignments prior to week eight.

Finally, you must write three take-home assignments. The latter will be distributed and due on the dates indicated on the schedule below. I will pose a question or questions or propose a topic and you will respond, drawing on assigned readings. (Consider this part of “the violence inherent in the system!”- see page 2 for the reference.) There will be a strict page limit – in the vicinity of 8-10 typed pages. ***I will not accept late papers absent the most dire extenuating circumstances.*** Each of the papers will be worth 20% of your grade.

## Background – What You Lack and What You Might Want

Many of you have little or no background in political theory. Should you feel the need to consult a basic survey of the subject, here are some reliable candidates:

Raymond Geuss. 2001. *History & Illusion in Politics*. Cambridge UP.

Jean Hampton. 1996. *Political Philosophy*. Westview Press.

Will Kymlicka. 2001. *Contemporary Political Philosophy: An Introduction*. Oxford UP.

Ian Shapiro. 2004. *The Moral Foundations of Politics*. Yale UP.

Jonathan Wolff. 2006. *An Introduction to Political Philosophy*. Oxford UP.

I list these in no particular order. Be warned – nearly all of the authors draw a sharper distinction between “normative” political theory and “positive” social science than I think is sustainable. And each has a point to make; they are not just reporting what this or that theorist or school of thought means.

I venture to guess that many of you suppose you have little or no interest in or need for acquaintance with political theory either. To state things bluntly, such a view is shortsighted. Consider this comment from a review<sup>1</sup> of a recent volume of interviews<sup>2</sup> with the most influential figures in the field of comparative politics over the past half-century:

Almost all the luminaries interviewed spent a substantial amount of time reading political philosophy, especially in their formative years. Classical works of social theory also get a great deal of attention first and foremost Max Weber, but also Emile Durkheim, Karl Marx, and some of his followers (notably, Antonio Gramsci). It seems that exposure to the classics of political and social theory promote the framing of important and enduring questions, though clearly this is not enough in itself. The academic work of many of these scholars seems to be motivated by solving problems about which they have strong normative concern, such as poverty (Przeworski, Bates), order (Huntington), powerlessness (Scott), violence (Moore), and despotism (nearly everybody interviewed). Empirically oriented university departments that believe political theory is best confined to departments of philosophy may inadvertently be depriving their graduate students of one of the very sources of inspiration for scientific study.

Perhaps, you don't aspire to set the intellectual agenda in your field. That is up to you. But the evidence seems to suggest that the “luminaries” who *have* set the agenda in political science tend to be well-versed in social and political theory. This observation, by the way, simply generalizes what one might say of Bill Riker, the patron saint of the Rochester department.

---

<sup>1</sup> Michael Bernhard. 2009. “Methodological Disputes in Comparative Politics,” *Comparative Politics* (July), page 511.

<sup>2</sup> Gerardo L. Munck and Richard Snyder. 2007. *Passion, Craft, and Method in Comparative Politics*, Baltimore, Johns Hopkins University Press.

## Required Readings

A baker's dozen books - marked \* - are required. I have not ordered them for this course at the bookstore. You should be able to obtain all the required books in paperback - and probably used – from your preferred e-purveyor. I recommend the editions I indicate here because the titles are deceiving – several of these are collections and I will ask you to read specific works.

Other Readings: In *Monty Python & the Holy Grail* there is a famous scene where King Arthur engages in heated debate over the notion of sovereignty with a handful of very contentious, muddy peasants. The peasants announce that they belong to an “autonomous collective,” a “self-governing anarcho-syndicalist commune” and so have little regard for the pretenses of centralized monarchical authority. I find their arguments persuasive. (See: <http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=-8bqQ-C1PSE&feature=related> if you are unfamiliar with this canonical argument.) I anticipate this course will operate in much the same way as that scene. You can think of me as King Arthur and think of yourselves as the contentious peasants. That does *not* mean you should think of David Gelman as the coconut-shell clapping lackey! That *does* mean you will need to act as a self-governing collective. Each week you students will “take it in turns” (by some method of your own devising) to insure the availability for the following week of any of the relevant reading materials not available via e-journals from the library. This will require that the chosen ones ascertain which readings are not easily available on the web, obtain those readings from me, copy them if necessary (at my expense), and make sure they are available to the entire class. I have nearly all the papers assigned here in pdf format. All that will mean coordinating with David.

## Class Schedule

### Week One (September 4)

Introduction.

### Week Two (September 11)

\* Hilary Putnam. 2002. *The Collapse of the Fact/Value Dichotomy & Other Essays*. Harvard UP. ISBN-13: 978-0674013803

W.V.O. Quine. 2004 [1951]. “Two Dogmas of Empiricism.” In *Quintessence*. Harvard UP. [Chapter 2]

### Week Three (September 18)

\* Daniel Hausman. 2012. *Preference, Value, Choice & Welfare*. Cambridge UP.

Partha Dasgupta. 2005. "What Do Economists Analyze and Why: Values or Facts?" *Economics and Philosophy* 21:221-278.

Hilary Putnam & Vivian Walsh. 2007. "A Response to Dasgupta." *Economics and Philosophy* 23:359-364.

Partha Dasgupta. 2007. "Reply to Putnam and Walsh." *Economics and Philosophy* 23:365-372.

Hilary Putnam & Vivian Walsh. 2007. "Facts, Theories, Values And Destitution In The Works Of. Sir Partha Dasgupta," *Review of Political Economy* 19:181-202.

#### **Week Four (September 25) ~ First Writing Assignment Distributed**

\* Jean-Jacques Rousseau. 1968. *The Social Contract and Other Later Political Writings* Penguin.

Kim Lane Scheppele and Jeremy Waldron. 1991. "Contractarian Methods in Political and Legal Evaluation," *Yale Journal of Law & the Humanities* 3:195-230.

Bernard Grofman & Scott Feld. 1988. "Rousseau's General Will," *American Political Science Review* 82:567-76.

David Estlund, *et al.* 1989. "Democratic Theory and the Public Interest," *American Political Science Review* 83:1317-40.

Christian List and Robert E. Goodin. 2001. "Epistemic Democracy: Generalizing the Condorcet Jury Theorem," *Journal of Political Philosophy* 9:276-306.

Elizabeth Anderson. 2007. "The Epistemology of Democracy," *Episteme* 3:8-22.

#### **Week Five (October 2) ~ First Writing Assignment Due**

\* Karl Marx . 1996. *Later Political Writings* (Cambridge Texts in the History of Political Thought). Cambridge University Press. ISBN-10: 0521367395.

John Roemer. 1998. "Why The Poor Do Not Expropriate the Rich," *Journal of Public Economics* 70:399-424.

Ian Shapiro. 2002. "Why the Poor Don't Soak the Rich," *Daedalus* 131:118-28.

Charles Lindblom. 1982. "The Market as Prison," *Journal of Politics* 44:324-36.

G.A. Cohen. 2001. "Why Not Socialism?" In *Democratic Equality*. Edited by E. Broadbent. University of Toronto Press.

### **Week Six (October 9)**

\* John Stuart Mill. 2008. *On Liberty and Other Essays* (Oxford World's Classics). Oxford University Press. ISBN-10: 0199535736

Benjamin Constant. 1804. "The Liberty of the Ancients as Compared to that of the Moderns." In *Political Writings*. Cambridge UP.

Phillip Pettit. 1991. "Consequentialism." In Peter Singer, ed., *A Companion to Ethics*. Blackwell Publishers.

Mark Warren & Nadia Urbinati. 2008. "The Concept of Representation in Contemporary Democratic Theory," *Annual Review of Political Science* 11: 387-412.

Bernard Manin. 1994. "The Metamorphoses of Representative Government," *Economy and Society* 23:133-71.

### **Week Seven (October 16)**

\*John Dewey. 1927. *The Public & Its Problems*. Swallow Press. ISBN-10: 0804002541.

Charles S. Peirce. 1877. "The Fixation of Belief." In *The Pragmatism Reader*. Edited by Robert Talisse & Scott Aikin. Princeton University Press.

Charles S. Peirce. 1878. "How to Make Our Ideas Clear." In *The Pragmatism Reader*. Edited by Robert Talisse & Scott Aikin. Princeton University Press.

John Dewey. 1939. "Creative Democracy: The Task Before Us." In *The Essential Dewey: Volume 1 - Pragmatism, Education, Democracy*. Edited by L. Hickman & T. Alexander. Indiana University Press.

Richard Bernstein. 1986. "John Dewey On Democracy—The Task Before Us." In *Philosophical Profiles: Essays In A Pragmatic Mode*. University of Pennsylvania Press.

Jack Knight & James Johnson. 2007. "The Priority of Democracy: A Pragmatist Approach to Political-Economic Institutions and the Burden of Justification," *American Political Science Review* 101: 47-61.

### **Week Eight (October 23)**

\* Debra Satz. 2010. *Why Some Things Should Not Be For Sale: The Moral Limits of Markets*. Oxford UP.

Michael Sandel. 2013. "Market Reasoning as Moral Reasoning: Why Economists Should Re-engage with Political Philosophy," *Journal of Economic Perspectives* 27:121-40.

Timothy Besley. 2013. "What's the Good of the Market?" *Journal of Economic Literature* 51:478-495.

Wendy Brown. 2014. "Review of Sandel & Satz," *Political Theory* 42:355-76.

### **Week Nine (October 30)**

\* Michel Foucault. 1979. *Discipline & Punish: The Birth of the Prison*. Vintage.

James Johnson. 1997. "Communication, Criticism & the Postmodern Consensus," *Political Theory* 25:559-583.

James Scott. 2010. "The Trouble with the View from Above"  
<http://www.cato-unbound.org/2010/09/08/james-c-scott/the-trouble-with-the-view-from-above/print/>

### **Week Ten (November 6) ~ Second Writing Assignment Distributed**

\* Kenneth Arrow. 1970. *Social Choice & Individual Values*. Yale UP.

Joseph Schumpeter. 1947. *Capitalism, Socialism & Democracy*. Harper. (232-303)

Adam Przeworski. 1999. "Minimalist Conception of Democracy: A Defense." In *Democracy's Value*. Edited by Ian Shapiro & Casiano Hacker-Cordon. Cambridge University Press.

Gerry Mackie. 2009. "Schumpeter's Leadership Democracy," *Political Theory* 37:128-153.

Isaiah Berlin. 1958 [1969] "Two Concepts of Liberty" In *Four Essays on Liberty*. Oxford UP.

James Johnson. 2014. "Models Among the Political Theorists," *American Journal of Political Science*. 58:547-60.

**Week Eleven (November 13) ~ Second Writing Assignment Due.**

\* William Riker. 1988. *Liberalism Against Populism*. Waveland.

Partha Dasgupta & Eric Maskin. 2008. "On the Robustness of Majority Rule," *Journal of the European Economic Association* 6:949–973.

Jack Knight & James Johnson. 1994. "Aggregation & Deliberation: On the Possibility of Democratic Legitimacy," *Political Theory* 22:277-96.

Jane Mansbridge, *et al.* 2010. "The Place of Self-Interest and the Role of Power in Deliberative Democracy," *Journal of Political Philosophy* 18: 64-100.

Dmitri Landa & Adam Meirowitz. 2009. "Game Theory, Information & Deliberative Democracy," *American Journal of Political Science* 53:427-44.

Gerry Mackie. 2006. "Does Democratic Deliberation Change Minds?" *Politics, Philosophy and Economics* 5:279-303.

**Week Twelve (November 20)**

\* John Rawls. 2001 *Justice as Fairness*. Harvard UP.

Amy Gutman & Dennis Thompson. 2004. *Why Deliberative Democracy?* Princeton UP, 1-94.

Joshua Cohen. 2009. *Philosophy, Politics, Democracy*. Harvard UP, 326-86.

Joshua Cohen. 2010. "For a Democratic Society." In *The Arch of the Moral Universe*. Harvard UP, 181-230.

Jon Simmons. 2010. "Ideal and Non-Ideal Theory," *Philosophy & Public Affairs* 38:5–36.

Susan Orr & James Johnson. 2014. "Ideals and Institutions in Democratic Theory: Some Consequences of 'the Secret Ballot'" (Unpublished Manuscript: University of Rochester).

David Estlund. 2014. "Utopophobia," *Philosophy & Public Affairs* 42:113-34.

**Week Thirteen (November 27) ~ No Class – Happy Thanksgiving!**

**Week Fourteen (December 4)**

\* Amartya Sen. 2011. *The Idea of Justice*. Harvard UP.

Laura Valentini. 2011. "A Paradigm Shift In Theorizing About Justice? A Critique Of Sen," *Economics and Philosophy* 27: 297 - 315.

Debra Satz. 2012. "Amartya Sen's The Idea Of Justice: What Approach, Which Capabilities?" *Rutgers Law Journal* 43:277-93.

**Week Fifteen (December 11) ~ Final Assignment Distributed**

\* Elizabeth Anderson. 2010. *The Imperative of Integration*. Princeton UP.

*Symposium on Anderson*. *Political Studies Review*, 2014 12(3):345-82.

**Finals Week (December 19) ~ Final Assignment Due**