

# SOCL930

## Policy, publics and expertise

### Module Handbook Lent term 2008

General information .....	2
Assessment arrangements .....	4
General reading .....	4
Week-by week syllabus and readings.....	5
1 Introduction.....	5
2 Contextualising crises of representation .....	5
3 Power and knowledge .....	6
4 The state and its publics .....	6
5 Performing publics.....	7
6 Trusting the experts.....	7
7 Demonstrating truth: the staging of science.....	8
8 When experts disagree: controversy and uncertainty.....	8
9 Neo-liberal governance: the case of the life sciences.....	9
10 Re-constructing the plurality of public grounds of truth.....	10

MA in Society, Technology and Nature  
Lancaster University,  
United Kingdom

## General information

*Lecturers*        **Bronislaw Szerszynski**, CSEC, Sociology  
Furness B149; tel: 592659; email: [bron@lancaster.ac.uk](mailto:bron@lancaster.ac.uk)

**Brian Wynne**, CESAGen, Sociology  
IAS D11; tel: 510839; email: [b.wynne@lancaster.ac.uk](mailto:b.wynne@lancaster.ac.uk)

**David Tyfield**, IAS  
IAS B Floor, tel: 510814; email: [d.tyfield@lancaster.ac.uk](mailto:d.tyfield@lancaster.ac.uk)

**Stephanie Koerner**, School of Arts, Histories and Cultures, University of Manchester  
Tel: 0161 275 0300; email: [stephanie.koerner@manchester.ac.uk](mailto:stephanie.koerner@manchester.ac.uk)

*Time*                Lent Term, Thursdays 14.00-16.30

*Venue*              *Fylde D31 – except for weeks 1 and 7 – see table below.*

Week	Date	Room
	17/01/200	
1	8	<b>IAS Meeting Room 1</b>
	24/01/200	
2	8	Fylde D31
	31/01/200	
3	8	Fylde D31
	07/02/200	
4	8	Fylde D31
	14/02/200	
5	8	Fylde D31
	21/02/200	
6	8	Fylde D31
	28/02/200	
7	8	<b>Fylde D33</b>
	06/03/200	
8	8	Fylde D31
	13/03/200	
9	8	Fylde D31
	20/03/200	
10	8	Fylde D31

## Course aims

Since Plato's argument in *The Republic* that society is best ruled by wise philosopher-kings, there has been much debate about the proper role of knowledge and expertise in politics. In this module we will continue this debate, drawing on a range of theoretical resources in the social and historical sciences and a number of contemporary examples, from nuclear power to the governance of the life sciences. In what should be lively seminar-based sessions, we will explore a range of questions, including the following:

- How can an exploration of the historical context of the emergence of modern society help shed light on contemporary controversies about risk, knowledge and uncertainty?
- Can reason and truth serve as an enlightened counter-force against arbitrary power – or is reason itself forged in the crucible of power?
- Does the displacement of judgement and discretion by codified, 'objective' knowledge tend to strengthen the power of elites, and further weaken already marginalised social groups? Or is it an antidote to the operation of sectoral interests, and a facilitator of democratic debate?
- How is the role of expertise in policymaking changing, and how might such changes relate to the rise of the 'knowledge economy' and an emphasis on technological innovation?
- What is the most important political role for science today - to shape policy decisions or merely to legitimate them through a form of public theatre?
- With the proliferation of independent expert bodies, a range of crucial policy issues are being placed outside the usual play of democratic politics. Is this a welcome development, or a dangerous depoliticisation?
- What role can and should the public play in policymaking in highly technical domains? Are the existing theories and practices of democratic politics adequate for the problems that arise in a highly technological, globalised, and culturally diverse world?

This module offers students a thorough grounding in a distinctively 'Lancaster' approach to understanding policymaking in the general domains of science, technology and innovation. It will introduce students to the debates and experiments that have taken place in the last 30 years around expert knowledge and lay understanding in relation to policy making, and the way that new ways of thinking about science and technology policy are beginning to inform policy processes and experiments in the governance of technoscience and the environment.

### *Learning outcomes*

On successful completion of this module students should be able to:

- demonstrate a critical understanding of policy and administrative worlds (in the domains of science, technology, genomics and environment) and trace their changing relationship to expertise and publics;
- appraise and value the relationship between policymaking and different forms of knowledge and expertise, both codified and uncoded;
- understand the significance of debates surrounding the public understanding of science, public engagement, and science-society dialogue in their historical and cultural context and assess their relevance and use for contemporary policy issues.

### *Reading*

During the last decade or so there has been a significant contribution from the social sciences and humanities in developing a more cultural, contextual approach to understanding the relationship between politics, science and public knowledge. It is especially important that you read the key readings, follow the arguments, attend all the lectures and participate in the seminars. It is always productive to reflect on what you read. This may take the form of detailed summarising, analysis of how this connects (or not) to current issues and how these are reported in the media, reflection in relation to personal experience, discussions with colleagues over coffee, and so on. You should develop your own personal interests through a range of cultural media and debate. In particular you should attune yourself to on-going cultural and media

debates through routine reading of broadsheets, political magazines, and relevant policy publications. The Web is an invaluable resource keeping in tune with such debates.

### *Seminar presentations*

Being able to explain ideas clearly to others is a key intellectual skill that the course aims to encourage. There are many ways of developing this skill within the module. In each of the seminars, students will be encouraged to make short presentations on selected issues arising from the seminar reading of the week. These will provide the springboard for group discussion of the lecture and associated readings. If you do a presentation, you should think about using handouts, the overhead projector, data projector or other forms of visual material. And make sure you don't just describe what the paper says but bring some of your own thoughts in.

### *Assessment arrangements*

The assessment of the course will consist of one research essay of up to 5,000 words. Two copies of this paper should be submitted to Jules Knight by 4 pm on Friday 25 April 2008, each with the appropriate completed cover sheet. A list of suggested essay topics will be distributed early in the term; any other essay topic must be appropriately related to the central themes and aims of the module, and will need to be approved by the course tutor. The paper will need to be in standard discursive essay form, with a bibliography and a pattern of argument that is much like the papers you will find in the readings for the module. The criteria for marking MA essays in Sociology are in the MA STN handbook.

### *General reading*

The following books have a wide relevance for the course:

- Dewey, John ([1954] 1991) *The Public and its Problems*, Athens, OH: Ohio University Press
- Ezrahi, Yaron (1990) *The Descent Of Icarus: Science And The Transformation Of Contemporary Democracy*, Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press. (RGYS)
- Foucault, Michel (2003) *'Society Must Be Defended': Lectures at the Collège De France, 1975-76*, tr. David Macey, London: Allen Lane.
- Jasanoff, Sheila (1990) *The Fifth Branch: Science Advisers as Policymakers*, Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Latour, Bruno (1993) *We Have Never Been Modern*, tr. Catherine Porter, Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Latour, Bruno and Weibel, Peter (eds.) *Making Things Public*. Cambridge MA: MIT Press. (RA7)
- Porter, Theodore (1995) *Trust in Numbers: The Pursuit of Objectivity in Science and Public Life*, Princeton, N.J.:Princeton University Press. (AKJ)
- Scott, James C. (1998) *Seeing Like a State: How Certain Schemes to Improve the Human Condition Have Failed*, New Haven, CT: Yale University Press. (KDP)

## *Week-by week syllabus and readings*

### **1 Introduction**

Tutors: Bronislaw Szerszynski and Brian Wynne

In this session we will hopefully get to know each other, and find out what we all want from the course. We will introduce some of the basic concepts necessary to understand the nature of the modern state and the formal policy process. We will then use the case of the recent UK government announcement on nuclear power to explore how decisions and commitments are made in reality. We will then use this as a springboard to start to lay out the issues that we will cover in the rest of course.

#### References

Dorfman, Paul (ed.) (2008) *Nuclear Consultation: Public Trust in Government*, Warwick: Nuclear Consultation Working group (<http://www.nuclearconsult.com/>) .  
Jessop, Bob (2002) *The Future of the Capitalist State*, Cambridge: Polity.  
Hill, Michael (1993) *The Policy Process: A Reader*, London: Harvester Wheatsheaf.  
Majone, Giandomenico (ed.) (1996) *Regulating Europe*, London: Routledge.

### **2 Contextualising crises of representation**

Tutor: Stephanie Koerner

Concerns with the relevance of hitherto 'excluded pasts' are generally thought of as restricted to areas of specialisation in anthropology and archaeology centring on 'peoples' said at one time to be 'without history'. However, unquiet pasts are of wider concern, especially amongst researchers who have begun to inquire into the bearing that the historical and cultural origins of modernity might have upon contemporary controversies over 'risk society', the authority of science, the role of democratic publics in shaping technological trajectories, the possibility of what Ulrich Beck calls 'cosmopolitan democracy', and a more general sense of 'crisis of representations'. In this session we will recontextualise such contemporary controversies and *aporia* in the *longue durée* of history, by drawing on case-study materials concerning aspects of the histories of religion, art, philosophy and science.

#### Readings

Benjamin, W. 1994 [1940]. 'Theses on the philosophy of history', in H. Arendt (ed.), *Illuminations: works of Benjamin*, 245-255. London: Fontana Press.  
Daston, L. 2000. 'Introduction: the coming into being of scientific objects', in L. Daston (ed.), *Biographies of Scientific Objects*. Chicago: University Chicago Press, 1-14.  
Habermas, J. 2003. 'From Kant to Hegel', in *Truth and Justification*, edited and translated by B. Fulmer. Cambridge: Polity Press, 131-173.  
Novotny, H. 2000. 'Transgressive competence. The narrative of Expertise'. *European Journal of Social Theory* 3(1): 5-21.  
Schaffer, S. 2002. 'The Devices of Iconoclasm', in Latour, B. and Weibel, P. (eds.) *Iconoclasm. Beyond the image wars in science, religion and art*. London: MIT Press, 498-515.  
Toulmin, S. 1990. 'Backing into the Millennium' and 'The Way Ahead', in *Cosmopolis. The hidden agenda of modernity*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1-5 and 175-180.

### 3 *Power and knowledge*

Tutor: Bronislaw Szerszynski

In this session we will look at the state as epistemology – as a way of seeing and knowing. Drawing particularly on the work of Michel Foucault, and his concept of ‘biopower’, we will look at the way that the modern state after the eighteenth century becomes progressively organised around the administration of the life process, and the way that the rise of standardised forms of measurement and statistics is bound up with the growing disciplinary power of the state.

#### Readings

- Agamben, Giorgio (1998) *Homo Sacer: Sovereign Power and Bare Life*, tr. Daniel Heller-Roazen, Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press.
- Arendt, Hannah (1958) *The Human Condition*, Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Flyvbjerg, Bent (1998) *Rationality and Power: Democracy in Practice*, tr. Steven Sampson, Chicago: University of Chicago Press. (RTmb)
- Foucault, Michel (1977) *Discipline and Punish: The Birth of the Prison*, London: Allen Lane.
- Foucault, Michel (1979) *The History of Sexuality Vol. 1: An Introduction*, tr. Robert Hurley, London: Allen Lane.
- Foucault, Michel (2003) *'Society Must Be Defended': Lectures at the Collège De France, 1975-76*, tr. David Macey, London: Allen Lane.
- Hacking, Ian (1990) *The Taming of Chance*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Hindess, Barry (1996) *Discourses of Power: From Hobbes to Foucault*. Oxford: Blackwell. (KCPA)
- Porter, Theodore (1995) *Trust in Numbers: The Pursuit of Objectivity in Science and Public Life*, Princeton, N.J.: Princeton University Press. (AKJ)
- Scott, James C. (1998) *Seeing Like a State: How Certain Schemes to Improve the Human Condition Have Failed*, New Haven, CT: Yale University Press. (KDP)

### 4 *The state and its publics*

Tutor: Bronislaw Szerszynski

What is the public? How has the form of the public, and its relationship to the political world, been transformed over the last few centuries? In this session we will look at the history of the public – the emergence of national publics, the rise (and fall) of the public sphere, and the various normative ideas of citizenship that have been dominant in different periods and polities.

#### Readings

- Anderson, Benedict (1983) *Imagined Communities: Reflections on the Origin and Spread of Nationalism*, London: Verso. (RAV)
- Ankersmit, Frank R. (2001) 'Representational Democracy: An Aesthetic Approach to Conflict and Compromise', *Common Knowledge* 8(1): 24-46  
([http://muse.jhu.edu/demo/common\\_knowledge/v008/8.1ankersmit.html](http://muse.jhu.edu/demo/common_knowledge/v008/8.1ankersmit.html)).
- Arendt, Hannah (1958) *The Human Condition*, Chicago: University of Chicago Press. (AKJ)
- Dewey, John ([1954] 1991) *The Public and its Problems*, Athens, OH: Ohio University Press (not in library)

- Emirbayer, Mustafa and Mimi Sheller (1999) 'Publics in History', *Theory and Society*, 28(1), pp. 145-197. (K6)
- Habermas, Jürgen (1989) *The Structural Transformation of the Public Sphere: An Inquiry into a Category of Bourgeois Society*, Oxford: Polity Press. (KBP)
- Marres, N. (2005) "Issues spark a public into being: A key but often forgotten point of the Lippmann-Dewey debate", pp. 208-217 in Latour, B. and Weibel, P. (eds.) *Making Things Public*. Cambridge MA: MIT Press. (RA7)
- Putnam, Robert D. (1993) *Making Democracy Work: Civic Traditions in Modern Italy*, Princeton: Princeton University Press.
- Schudson, Michael (1998) *The Good Citizen: A History of Civic Life*, New York: Martin Kessler Books. (NEB)
- Schudson, Michael (2001) 'Politics as cultural practice', *Political Communication*, 18(4): 421 – 431. (Not in library)
- Sennett, R. (1986), *The Fall of Public Man*, London: Faber and Faber. (KCI)

## 5 *Performing publics*

Tutor: Bronislaw Szerszynski

In recent decades a variety of interpretations of deliberative democracy have begun to inform policy processes, centring on programmes to encourage and cultivate 'two-way public (local, indigenous)–expert' involvement in deliberating decisions about investments in techno-science research and its instrumentalisation. In this session we will look at these new forms of public engagement, and how they construct different forms of publics and public knowledges.

- Barnett, C. (*forthcoming*, 2008) "Convening publics: The parasitical spaces of public action", in *The Handbook of Political Geography*, K. Cox, M. Low and J. Robinson (eds.). London: Sage.
- Dryzek, J. S. and Tucker, A. (2007) "Deliberative innovation to different effect: Consensus conferences in Denmark, France, and the United States", 27 April 2007. Forthcoming in *Public Administration Review*.
- Hagendijk R. and Irwin A. (2006) "Public Deliberation and Governance: Engaging with Science and Technology in Contemporary Europe", *Minerva* 44(2): 167-184.
- Horlick-Jones, Tom et al. (2007) *The GM Debate: Risk, Politics and Public Engagement*, London: Routledge. (HHPC)
- Lezaun, J. (2007) "A Market of Opinions: The Political Epistemology of Focus Groups", pp. 130-151 in *Market Devices*, Callon, M., Millo, Y. and Muniesa, F. (eds.). Oxford: Blackwell.
- Lezaun, J. and Soneryd, L. (2007) "Consulting citizens: Technologies of elicitation and the mobility of publics", *Public Understanding of Science* 16: 279-297.
- Osborne, T. (2004) "On Mediators: Intellectuals and the Ideas Trade in the Knowledge Society", *Economy and Society* 33(4): 430-47.
- Reynolds, L. and Szerszynski, B. (with Kousis, M. and Volakakis, Y.) (2007) *GM Food – The Role of Participation in a Techno-Scientific Controversy*, final report of WP6, Work Package 6, of the EC project *Participatory Governance and Institutional Innovation* (PAGANINI) (available at <http://www.univie.ac.at/LSG/paganini/output.htm>).

## 6 *Trusting the experts*

Tutors: Bronislaw Szerszynski and David Tyfield

In this session we will look more closely at issues raised by the changing role of experts advising policymakers – what Sheila Jasanoff calls the ‘fifth branch of government’, after the legislature, executive, judiciary and the media.

Collins, Harry and Evans, Robert (2002) ‘The Third Wave of Science Studies: Studies of Expertise and Experience’, *Social Studies of Sciences*, 32 (2): 235-96.

Collins, Harry and Evans, Robert (2007) *Rethinking Expertise*, Chicago: University of Chicago Press

Daston, Lorraine (1992) ‘Objectivity and the escape from perspective’, *Social Studies of Science*, 22(4): 597-618.

Jasanoff, Sheila (1990) *The Fifth Branch: Science Advisers as Policymakers*, Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Scott, James C. (1998) *Seeing Like a State: How Certain Schemes to Improve the Human Condition Have Failed*, New Haven, CT: Yale University Press. (KDP)

Porter, Theodore (1995) *Trust in Numbers: The Pursuit of Objectivity in Science and Public Life*, Princeton, N.J.: Princeton University Press. (AKJ)

## 7 *Demonstrating truth: the staging of science*

Tutor: Brian Wynne

Harry Collins (1988) introduced a distinction between experiment and demonstration. An experiment is arranged in order to test a hypothesis, with the capacity to surprise the experimenter, while a demonstration is about arranging a convincing public performance in which the demonstrator knows the result in advance. In this session we will use this distinction as the starting point of a discussion of the social role of science in politics. As we asked in the introduction to the handbook, what is the most important political role for science today - to shape policy decisions or merely to legitimate them through a form of public theatre?

Ezrahi, Yaron (1990) *The Descent Of Icarus: Science And The Transformation Of Contemporary Democracy*, Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press. (RGYS)

Collins, H.M. (1988) Public Experiments and Displays of Virtuosity: The Core-Set Revisited, *Social Studies of Science* 18(4): 725-48. (AK6)

Goffman, E. (1959), *The Presentation of Self in Everyday Life*, revised and expanded edition, London: Doubleday. (KBH)

Hilgartner, Stephen (2000) *Science on Stage: Expert Advice as Public Drama*, Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press. (AKD1b)

Shapin, Stephen (1995). *A Social History of Truth: Civility and Science in Seventeenth-Century*, Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Shapin, Stephen and Schaffer, Simon (1989) *Leviathan and the Air-Pump: Hobbes, Boyle and the Experimental Life*, Princeton University Press.

## 8 *When experts disagree: controversy and uncertainty*

Tutor: Brian Wynne

In contemporary society, expert authority is assumed to rest on the authority of disciplined methods of knowledge-production, combined with specialist experience and skills. This is supposed to produce a singular and reliable account of the world, upon which the public authority of policy commitments and decisions can rest. Yet expert conflict and endemic controversy swamps many if not virtually all significant public commitments and their intellectual justifications. That scientific and related expert knowledge is pervaded with "uncertainty" is often admitted as a lamentable limitation of the public authority of such expertise, and public misunderstandings of such uncertainty are often given responsibility as the causes of controversy. Many different understandings of "expert uncertainty" have been advanced as ways of attempting to explain public policy conflicts, and this session will review various of these, including those which (i) conclude with effective reinforcement of belief in a single proper way of describing the world, eg what are the risks of X or Y technology? And those which (ii) alternatively emphasise the essential contingency of expert (scientific) knowledge devoted to public issues such as the acceptability of a particular technology or trajectory. How uncertainty or contingency are limited and stability is partially created by modes of framing of the recognised problem is also explained using salient examples

Readings (key reading in bold):

**Brian Campbell, "Uncertainty as Symbolic Action in Disputes Among Experts", *Social Studies of Science*, (1985), vol. 15, pp.429-453.**

Brian Wynne, "Uncertainty and Environmental Learning: reconceiving science and policy in the preventive paradigm", *Global Environmental Change*, vol. 2, July 1992, pp. 1-21.

S.O. Funtowicz and J.R. Ravetz, "Three Types of Risk Assessment and the Emergence of Post Normal Science," in Sheldon Krinsky and David Golding, eds., *Social Theories of Risk* (London: Praeger, 1992), pp. 251-273.

D. Nelkin, "The Public Face of Science: What Can We Learn from Disputes," in D.H. Guston and K. Keniston, eds., *The Fragile Contract* (Cambridge, MIT Press, 1994), pp. 101-117.

K. Shrader-Frechette, *Burying Uncertainty*, (1993), esp. chapter 3, pp.27-38

D. Nelkin (ed), *Controversy* (several case-studies of expert controversy over technologies)

T.J. Pinch, "Testing—One, Two, Three ... Testing!": Toward a Sociology of Testing," *Science, Technology and Human Values* 18:25-41 (1993).

H. Collins and T. Pinch, *The Golem at Large* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1998), Chapter 1 ("A Clean Kill? The Role of Patriot in the Gulf War"), pp. 7-29.

## 9 *Neo-liberal governance: the case of the life sciences*

Tutor: David Tyfield

The growth of the life sciences to pre-eminence over the last few decades has occurred in parallel with some profound changes in the global political economy. One that is particularly important is the rise to dominance of a neoliberal global economic regulatory architecture and the penetration of neoliberal logics into governance across the world. The life sciences have themselves been profoundly shaped by this trend. In this seminar we will examine the implications of this process,. The seminar will consist of an introduction to the changing political economy of science towards a neoliberal regime and more in-depth examinations of two case studies, namely the governance of genetically modified organisms and the increasing importance of intellectual property.

## Reading

- Boyle, J. (1996) *Shamans, Software and Spleens: Law and the Construction of the Information Society*, Cambridge (MA) and London: Harvard University Press.
- Boyle, J. (2003) 'The Second Enclosure Movement and the Construction of the Public Domain', *Law and Contemporary Problems* 66:33-73.
- Eisenberg, R. (1996) 'Public Research and Private Development: Patents and Technology Transfer in Government-Sponsored Research', *Virginia Law Review* 82: 1663-1727.
- Etzkowitz, H. and L. Leydesdorff (2000) 'The Dynamics of Innovation: A Triple Helix of University-Industry-Government Relations', *Research Policy* 29(2):109-123.
- Kay, L. (1998) 'Problematizing Basic Research in Molecular Biology', in A. Thackray (ed.), *Private Science: Biotechnology and the Rise of the Molecular Sciences*, Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press.
- Kenney, M. (1986) *Biotechnology: the University-Industrial Complex*, London and New Haven (RI): Yale University Press.
- Kleinman, D. (1998) 'Pervasive Influence: Intellectual Property, Industrial History, and University Science', *Science and Public Policy* 25(2):95-102.
- Kleinman, D. (2003) *Impure Cultures – University Biology and the World of Commerce*, Madison: University of Wisconsin Press.
- Levidow, L., J. Murphy & S. Carr (2007) 'Recasting "Substantial Equivalence": Transatlantic Governance of GM Food', *Science, Technology & Human Values* 32: 26-64.
- Mirowski, P. and E.-M. Sent (2002) 'Introduction' in P. Mirowski and E.-M. Sent (eds) *Science Bought and Sold*, Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Mirowski, P. & E.-M. Sent (forthcoming) 'The Commercialization of Science and the Response of STS', in E. Hackett, J. Wacjman, O. Amsterdamska and M. Lynch (eds.), *New Handbook of STS*, Cambridge (MA): MIT Press.
- Rai, A. (1999) 'Regulating Scientific Research: Intellectual Property Rights and the Norms of Science', *Northwestern University Law Review* 94:77-152.
- Rai, A. and R. Eisenberg (2003) 'Bayh-Dole Reform and the Progress of Biomedicine', *Law and Contemporary Problems* 66:289-314.
- Stirling, A. (2005) 'Opening up or Closing down: Analysis, Participation and Power in the Social Appraisal of Technology', in M. Leach, I. Scoones and B. Wynne (eds) *Science and Citizens: Globalization and the Challenge of Engagement*, London: Zed.
- Winickoff, D., S. Jasanoff, L. Busch, R. Grove-White & B. Wynne (2005) 'Adjudicating the GM Food Wars: Science, Risk, and Democracy in World Trade Law', *Yale Journal of International Law* 3: 81-122.
- Wright, S. (1998) 'Molecular Politics in a Global Economy', in A. Thackray (ed.), *Private Science: Biotechnology and the Rise of the Molecular Sciences*, Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press.

## **10 Re-constructing the plurality of public grounds of truth**

Tutors: Stephanie Koerner and Brian Wynne

In this session we will explore the wider significance of debates around dualist characterisations of expert knowledge and lay understanding in policy making. Over the last decade or so much political theory and philosophy attention has come to focus on themes of 'deliberative democracy,' the 'limits of pluralism', and the attribution of radically discrepant experiences of the world that we live in today to incommensurate conceptual schemas or world views. Unfortunately, highly problematic dualist interpretations of these ideals and involvements continue to proliferate – a problem that is especially widespread under circumstances where the

roles assigned to experts of advising on 'matters of fact' have become ambiguously enmeshed in decisions on what the 'matters of concern' most important to governance institutions and agencies ought to be.

Such issues link with many of the other themes and areas covered in the module, and will provide a good way of wrapping up the course. So in this session we will:

- (a) explore the backgrounds and current state of debates around 'new cosmopolitan' approaches to 'public participation' in governance, 'indigenous knowledge' and the 'limits of pluralism';
- (b) consider the relevance to these debates of the long history of arguments for the achieved roles of poet-orators rather than the status conventionally ascribed to philosopher kings as a pedagogical and political ideal; and
- (c) examine how the notion of 'public grounds of truth' can correct an unhelpfully dualistic contrast between 'indeterminate public communications and practices' and the supposedly timeless placeless 'logos' of techno-scientific expertise pose for realising anything like the ideals of deliberative democracy.

### Readings

Beck, U. 2004. 'The Truth of Others'. *Common Knowledge* 10(3): 430-449.

Bohman, J. 2003. 'Reflexive Public Deliberation. Democracy and the limits of pluralism'. *Philosophy and Social Criticism* 29(1): 85-105.

Jasanoff, S. 2003. 'Technologies of Humility: citizen participation in governance science'. *Minerva* 41: 223-244.

Koerner, S. 2004. 'Agency and views beyond meta-narratives that privatise ethics and globalise indifference', in A. Gardner (ed.), *Agency uncovered: archaeological perspectives on social agency, power and being human*. London: UCL Press, 211-240.

Lash, S. 1994. 'Reflexivity and its Doubles: structure, aesthetics community', in U. Beck, A. Giddens, and S. Lash (eds.), *Reflexive modernisation. Politics, tradition and aesthetics in the modern social order* Cambridge: Polity Press, 110-173.

Latour, B. 2004. 'Whose cosmos, which cosmopolis?' *Common Knowledge* 10(3): 450-462.

Latour, B. 2004. 'Why has critique run out of steam? From matters of fact to matters of concern'. *Critical Inquiry* 30(2).

Means, Angelia K. 'Narrative Argumentation: Arguing with Natives', *Constellations* 9(2): 221-245.

Wynne, B. 1996. 'May the sheep safely graze? A reflexive view of the expert-lay knowledge divide', in S. Lash, B. Szerzynski, and B. Wynne (eds.), *Risk, environment and modernity. Towards a new ecology*. London: Sage, 44-83.

Young, Iris (2001) 'Activist Challenges to Deliberative Democracy', *Political Theory*, 29(5): 670-690.