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. The course will integrate a seminar-style reading/discussion format with class participation in a deliberative democratic forum. 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 20), I will count this as four 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 one to one and a half 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 illustrate understanding; (2) Extent of engagement with arguments presented in the text; (3) Quality of overall organization of the essay. I will assess the extent to which you substantiate your agreements or disagreements with the author of our reading. You may write these papers on any readings you wish; however, you may not write more than one paper for any given class session. Additionally, I would encourage you to space your writing of these short papers throughout the semester. 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 one to 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 a handout 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 (one to 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 20, from 4 p.m. until approximately 7:30, we will meet with a graduate class taught by Professor Diana Hess. Students from the two classes will be organized into four groups and will deliberate on a topic which Professor Hess and I will determine. Prior to the 20th, students will be expected to do several readings on the topic. I will provide these readings to you. When you gather on the 20th, you will discuss the readings, meet with experts on the topic, and then express your opinions on this important policy question at the intersection of science and politics. You will be provided more detail on the organization of this forum on the
20th. With your permission, Professor Hess and I may use this deliberative forum as a subject for our research. Thus, while you are learning the value and limitations of deliberation, we will be learning too. We will discuss this in further detail on the 20th. 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 10th, if you will be unable to participate on the 21st. 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 26, 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 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 17 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. In addition, I will try to have these books and others which you might want to read are on reserve at Helen C. White. Most of the readings do not come from books. They, along with course
assignments and the syllabus, can be found at:
https://www.library.wisc.edu/course-pages/viewer/show/3632

September 2
Introduction to Course

September 7
Education for Citizenship
Required Reading

Derek Bok. 2006. “Preparation for Citizenship.” In Our Underachieving Colleges.

September 9
No Class

September 14
Democracy
short paper due: What is democracy? I will provide a handout on this assignment.

September 16, 21, 23, 28
Democracy: Reading and Discussion
Required Reading


MIT Press, 1997),


Optional Reading


September 30, October 5
A Dramatic Portrait of Deliberation
Film: “12 Angry Men”
Followed by Discussion

October 7
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 12

Citizenship and Civic Engagement: Discussion of Readings

Required Reading


Optional Reading

October 14

Citizenship and Civic Engagement: The Government View

Your paper on the citizenship test will be due in class. We will discuss the government test and your reaction to it. I will provide a handout on the writing assignment.

October 19

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.

October 20

Deliberative Forum: Democracy in Action
Approximate Time: 4-7:30 p.m.
Location: TBA
Readings will be provided in advance.

October 21

No Class

October 26

Debriefing: Discussion on Our Deliberative Forum
October 28
Deliberative Polling
Required Reading

November 2
Consensus Conferences: A Mode of Deliberation
Required Reading


November 4 & 9
The Role and Status of Experts: Reading and Discussion
Required Reading


Optional Reading


Steven G. Brint. 1994. In an Age of Experts: The Changing Role of Professionals in


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


November 11 and 16
Science and Technology in a Democracy
Required Reading


Optional Reading

November 18
Democracy and the Media: Community Radio
Guest Speaker: Norm Stockwell, WORT-FM

November 22
Democratic Participation in Expert Realms: Case Studies

Required Reading
Steven Epstein. 2000. “Democracy, Expertise, and AIDS Treatment Activism.” In


**Optional Reading**


**November 25. Thanksgiving: No Class**

**November 30**

**Democratic Participation in Expert Realms: Case Studies**

**Required Reading**


**December 2**

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

**Required Reading**


**December 7 & 9**

**Democracy and Expertise in Film**

Viewing and Discussing “Lorenzo’s Oil”
December 14

Democracy in the 21st Century: The Place of the Internet

Required Reading


Optional Reading


