Many people are drawn to sociology because of moral concerns about social justice and the damaging effects of social conditions. While such concerns are reflected in much sociological research, usually this takes the form of the diagnosis and critique of existing institutions rather than the exploration of alternatives. A great deal of scholarship focuses on explaining the sources of social injustice and the causes and consequences of harmful social conditions; much less explores the design of alternatives to existing institutions that would help realize moral ideals of social justice and human flourishing. The idea of “real utopias” is meant to point sociology in this direction.

The expression “Real Utopias” is, of course, an oxymoron: Utopia means “nowhere” – a fantasy world of perfect harmony and social justice. When politicians want to summarily dismiss a proposal for social transformation as an impractical dream outside the limits of possibility, they call it “utopian”. Realists reject such fantasies as a distraction from the serious business of making practical improvements in existing institutions. The idea of real utopias embraces this tension between dreams and practice: “utopia” implies developing visions of alternatives to existing institutions that embody our deepest aspirations for a world in which all people have access to the conditions to live flourishing lives; “real” means taking seriously the problem of the viability of the institutions that could move us in the direction of that world. The goal is to elaborate utopian ideals that are grounded in the real potentials of humanity, utopian destinations that have accessible way stations, and above all utopian designs of viable institutions that can inform our practical tasks of navigating a world of imperfect conditions for social change.

Understood in this way, the idea of real utopias is a way of talking about practical institutional innovations that we can build in the world as it is that both prefigure emancipatory alternatives of a world that could be and move us in that direction. It thus identifies both a goal and a strategy.

This seminar will explore a wide range of real utopian institutional designs and proposals. The emphasis will be on institutional designs for which there are empirical cases, although we will spend some time talking about purely theoretical proposals as well.
Broad Objectives and Themes of the Seminar

1. **The broad theoretical context for studying real utopias.** Most of the semester will be spent on specific proposals and examples, but at the outset we will spend two weeks discussing the broader theoretical framework within which real utopias figure. These discussions will be anchored in my book *Envisioning Real Utopias*, but the discussions can certainly move beyond the specific framework I elaborate there.

2. **Empirical Cases.** Most of the substantive sessions of the seminar will be devoted to exploring a fairly wide range of empirical studies and theoretical discussions of real utopia institutions and issues. We will read these studies both for the substantive issues in a given kind of real utopia, but also as a way of refining methodological strategies for studying real utopias.

3. **Methodological issues.** The study of real utopias revolves around answering a series of questions. Here is a basic inventory:
   - **What is the problem the real utopia is meant to solve?** What are the harms generated by prevailing institutions and social structures that the real utopia is meant to ameliorate?
   - **Basic Institutional Design principles:** What are the general elements in the institutional design of the real utopia? What are the forms of variation in these design elements across instances?
   - **How it works on the ground:** How does it really work in practice? How does variation in details of design affect the way the real utopia operates in practice?
   - **Moral foundations:** What emancipatory aspirations/values are in play?
   - **Trade-offs of values:** What emancipatory values are in tension in a given institutional design?
   - **Effects of contexts:** What are the ways in which the effects of an institutional design depend on the broader context in which it works? Are there contextual conditions of sustainability/viability including culture/subjective conditions? Are their designs which are more tolerant of adverse contexts, more resilient to shocks?
   - **Synergies:** Sometimes the effects of a given institutional design are amplified or muted by the presence of other institutions. Basic income, for example, might increase the viability of worker cooperatives. It is important in thinking about real utopias to think about such synergetic interactions and configurations.
   - **Dynamics and contradictions:** A key problem in thinking about real utopias is how they function over time. This involves examining unintended consequences and various kinds of positive and negative feedback processes. Are there inherent contradictions in the design of an institution? Are there counter-measures to deal with these?
   - **Scalability, replicability, transferability:** In many cases a particular kind of real utopia may work well in isolated niches and local settings. The innovative experiments may be especially vibrant because of very high self-selection of the people who participate or the presence of charismatic leadership. As part of a vision of social transformation, however, it is important to know whether such experiments can be scaled up, replicated and diffused.
   - **From here to there:** A wide range of issues are raised by the problem of moving from isolated instances of real utopias to broad social transformation. Are hybrid forms possible, and do they constitute obstacles or way stations? What kinds of social forces and coalitions are potential advocates for different real utopias? What is the plausible interplay of symbiotic and interstitial strategic logics in transformation?
Assignments

Weekly Reading Interrogations

To facilitate discussions of the core readings, all participants are required to prepare a “reading interrogation” each week which will form the basis for the discussion. These interrogations are not meant to be mini-papers on the topics of the readings. Rather, they are meant to be think pieces, reflecting your own intellectual engagement with the material: specifying what is obscure or confusing in the reading; taking issue with some core idea or argument; exploring some interesting ramification of an idea in the reading. These memos do not have to deal with the most profound, abstract or grandiose arguments in the readings; the point is that they should reflect what you find most engaging, exciting or puzzling. Above all, they should clearly specify what you would most like to talk about in the seminar discussion. A good interrogation is one that poses a clear and discussable question – not a half a dozen different questions, but one focal question. (Since I use the memos to distill the seminar agenda, it is pretty frustrating when I have to read a memo several times in order to extract an agenda item from it.) There is no set length for these interrogations. It is fine (even preferable!) for them to be quite short – say 200 words or so – but longer memos (within reason – remember: everyone in the class will read them) are also OK. The interrogations should be written single-spaced in MS-Word.

These interrogations are due by MONDAY noon of each week so that I can assemble them into a single document, distill an agenda, and distribute these materials to all students by email by Monday night. (This is a real deadline; I simply will not have time to do this task if the interrogations arrive later than this). All students should read these interrogations before class meets on Tuesday afternoon. At the seminar when we get to a specific agenda item, students whose memos contributed to that issue will be asked to speak first on the topic.

Nearly all of the readings are available on the course website: https://ssc.wisc.edu/~wright/929-utopias-2018/. I have not ordered any of the books we will be reading because generally students can find them for less than the bookstores online.

Term paper: state of the art essays

Term papers in PhD seminars should be viewed as first drafts of something that you eventually would like to publish in some form or other. Even if the seminar is on a topic that is not part of your MA thesis or PhD dissertation agenda, still you should try to write something with an eye to publication. Since in the time constraints of a single semester it is generally not possible to complete an original research project, a good option is for a term paper to be an analytical state of knowledge essay about a specific topic. This is not simply a “review of the literature” essay. Rather, the point is to develop a framework for organizing the relevant literature in order to clarify the stakes in disagreements and the gaps in existing knowledge. This, in turn, can give focus to agendas for future research designed to adjudicate disagreements and fill those gaps.

There is no strict page limit, but generally a paper like this would be in the 10,000 word range. If you need more time to finish the paper, I am willing to give you an Incomplete for the seminar, but I will need a commitment for a realistic firm date by which you will give me the paper.

Timeline for term papers:

- February 13: Select topic
- February 27: Preliminary bibliography
- April 3: Sketch of the framework for analysis
- April 16-20: Intensive writing week, no seminar session
- April 28: Presentation of paper at weekend workshop
- May 8: Hand in paper OR give me a firm date by which it will be finished
Partial list of potential topics for term papers

Production
1. Worker-owned enterprises: cooperatives and ESOPs
2. Platform cooperativism
3. Co-determination, workplace democracy, works councils, worker self-directed enterprise
5. Mutual Aid Networks, solidarity economy
6. Urban agriculture with community land trusts

Finance
7. Solidarity finance
8. Micro-finance (progressive vs exploitative forms)
9. Crowd-sourced financing of projects (crowdfunding): Kickstarter, Indigogo, etc.
10. Democratizing finance, public banks, radicalized credit unions

Distribution
11. Unconditional basic income
12. Open-access intellectual property: creative commons, copy-left, etc.
13. Consumer cooperatives (possible real utopian forms?)
14. Open-source pharmaceutical
15. Local currency systems
16. Equal exchange, fair trade certification (grassroots versions)
17. Supply chains
18. Libraries as a real utopia

Democracy
20. Participatory budgeting
21. The Quebec social economy council
22. Policy juries
23. Sortition: Citizen assemblies, citizens referenda review panels, legislature by lot

Community and the Environment
24. Ecovillages, Transition towns
25. Green economy, eco-socialism
26. Intentional communities
27. Co-housing

Other topics
28. Economy for the common Good: balance sheet metrics
29. Corporate social responsibility; social enterprises; B-corps; etc. (can these be “real utopias“?)
30. Real Utopia Websites (Beautiful solutions, Participedia, etc.)
31. Urban design, architecture: real utopian use of space and design
32. Gender division of labor: institutions that promote deep gender equality
33. Multiculturalism and identity: real utopia initiatives, models, institutions
34. Education (K-12) or Universities
35. Physical disabilities

Wikipedia Writing Project
In addition to the term paper, there will be a Wikipedia writing project in which students use their research for the term paper to either write a new Wikipedia entry or add substantially to an existing Wikipedia article. Instructions for how to do this will be given in class on January 30.
**WEEKEND WORKSHOP/RETREAT ON REAL UTOPIAS AND ANTI-CAPITALISM**

**APRIL 28-29, 2018**

On the last weekend of the semester – April 28-29 – The Havens Center is organizing a two-day workshop on Real Utopias and Anti-capitalism at Upham Woods, a beautiful University of Wisconsin facility on the Wisconsin River about an hour north of Madison.

The workshop will have three different kinds of sessions:

1. **Term project presentations by students in the Sociology Department Real Utopias Seminar.** This will be organized this like an academic conference to give students practice in organizing punchy talks for a professional meeting. These discussions will take place on Saturday, April 28.

2. **Strategies of Anti-capitalism for the 21st century.** There will be one two-hour session on Sunday to explore the problem of alternative strategies for transcending capitalism in 21st century conditions. This will be based on a book manuscript by Erik Olin Wright, *How to be an Anticapitalist for the 21st Century.*

3. **Other presentations & topical discussions.** On Sunday, there will also be time (up to about four hours) for additional discussions and presentations, by other people at the workshop, on any topics connected to social justice, social change, and alternative futures. Any format is possible: standard presentations of a paper; a short introduction to a topic for discussion; a panel on some theme. The presentations can be very informal; the idea is to open-up space for dialogue on ideas and issues of interest to participants. Anyone interested in giving a presentation on any topic should contact Erik at eowright@wisc.edu.

In addition to the academic sessions, the retreat will also include a gourmet potluck and party Saturday evening – with music, dancing, singing, general carousing. Spouses/partners, friends and children are also welcome to come for the weekend – there are nice activities in the area for children while the workshop is in session (including indoor water Parks in Wisconsin Dells).

The cost will be roughly $50, including meals and lodging. Subsidies are available if needed.

The workshop will begin at 10:00 a.m. on Saturday, April 28, and end at 4 p.m. on Sunday, April 29.
# Seminar Sessions Schedule

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Topic</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Session 1. January 23</td>
<td>The big picture: real utopias within Emancipatory Social Science</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Session 2. January 30</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Session 3. February 6</td>
<td>Debate on Parecon</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Session 4. February 13</td>
<td>Unconditional Basic Income</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Session 5. February 20</td>
<td>Democratizing Finance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Session 6. February 27</td>
<td>Worker cooperatives</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Session 7. March 6</td>
<td>Democratizing the corporation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Session 8. March 13</td>
<td>Participatory budgeting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Session 9. March 20</td>
<td>Sortition Legislature</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Session 10. April 3</td>
<td>Peer-to-peer mutualism and Digital co-operativism</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Session 11. April 10</td>
<td>additional topics list</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Session 12. April 17</td>
<td>-- research week --</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Session 13. April 24</td>
<td>Web-based real utopia projects: beautiful solutions collective</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Session 14. April 28-29</td>
<td>Weekend retreat workshop</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>May 1</td>
<td>No seminar: finish research papers</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Weekly reading assignments

Most readings are available at: https://ssc.wisc.edu/~wright/929-utopias-2018/

Sessions 1 & 2. The Big Picture: Real Utopias within Emancipatory Social Science

Most of this seminar will be spent studying theoretical models and empirical cases of specific kinds of real utopias. In these first two sessions, we will explore the more abstract task of locating the problem of real utopias within a broader agenda of emancipatory social science.

Emancipatory social science, as I explain in Envisioning Real Utopias, seeks to produce scientific knowledge about the social world that can contribute to the elimination of social oppression and the creation of the conditions for human flourishing. This endeavor recognizes the importance of systematic scientific knowledge – not just philosophy and moral criticism – about how the world works for this goal, and is anchored in the claim that human emancipation depends upon the transformation of the social world, not just the inner self.

The broad domain of emancipatory social science contains a variety of different theoretical traditions that vary in the form of oppression on which they focus. Marxism revolves around the analysis of class oppression and its ramifications, especially in capitalist societies; feminism is centered on gender oppression; critical race theory is centered on racial oppression; and so on. All of these traditions are internally heterogeneous, with different currents emphasizing varying combinations of cultural, political and economic structures and processes. And while there is no unified emancipatory social theory that fully integrates the analysis of all these diverse forms of oppression, there is increasingly an effort – under the rubric “intersectionality” – to understand their interactions.

A fully developed emancipatory social science, regardless of the form of oppression that is its central concern, needs to engage four main tasks:

1. Elaborating the normative foundations of the idea of social emancipation. To make the claim that a particular form of social relation is oppressive implies that it violates some moral standard. This is more than simply claiming the social relation harms the interests of the oppressed, but that such harms violate important moral values.

2. The diagnosis and critique of existing society in terms of those normative foundations. This is the focus of much – perhaps most – empirical research by scholars working within various currents of emancipatory social science. Feminist research has produced an enormous body of scholarship demonstrating the diverse ways in which male domination creates harms in the lives of women; critical race theory demonstrates the depth and ramifications of the effects of racism; and so on.

3. An account alternatives to the world as it is in light of this diagnosis and critique. Alternatives need to be discussed in terms of three criteria: their desirability, viability, and achievability. Desirability provides an account of how an alternative embodies the values elaborated in the normative foundations. Viability demonstrates that the alternative, if it were achieved, would actually work and be sustainable. Perhaps the most common source of skepticism over proposals for radical social change is: “sounds good on paper, but it will never work.” The “sounds good on paper” reflects the apparent desirability of the proposal; the “it will never work” affirms its nonviability. Finally, achievability concerns the problem of assembling the necessary social forces to actually produce the alternative. A proposal for social change may be desirable and viable and yet not achievable for all sorts of reasons.
4. *A theory of social transformation*. The diagnosis and critique tells us why we want to leave the world in which we live. The theory of alternatives gives us some clarity on the destination. A theory of transformation specifies the obstacles, dilemmas and strategies we face in getting from here to there.

My approach to these issues is very much embedded in the Marxian tradition. This means that my primary concern in studying real utopias revolves around the problem of transcending capitalism. This does not mean, however, that the general problem of real utopias is limited to alternatives to capitalism and its class relations. There can be environmental real utopias, gender real utopias, democracy real utopias, and so on.

**Reading:**


**Supplementary reading for the second session:**


**Session 3. Participatory economics: debate with Robin Hahnel**

The idea of “real utopias” is both a way of talking about specific kinds of institutions and their transformation and about the vision for the broader transformation of entire socio-economic systems. Mostly our focus in the seminar will be on specific institutions. This week we will look at a prominent model of a systemic alternative to capitalism: a participatory economy or as it is sometimes called “parecon.” This idea has been developed over the past two decades or so through the collaboration of two economists, Michael Albert and Robin Hahnel. The most widely read book laying out the model is by Michael Albert, *Parecon* (Verso: 2004). Robin Hahnel’s more recent elaboration of the core ideas, *Of the People, By the People: the case for a participatory economy*, is more succinct and lays out the central principles of the institutional design in a less strident manner.

Parecon envisions an economic system organized according to the following basic principles:

1. All significant economic decisions are made through a democratic process governed by the principle that people should be empowered to affect decisions proportionately to the extent that they are affected by those decisions.
2. This democratic principle extends to production decisions, investment decisions and consumption decisions, both for households and communities (i.e. public goods consumption).
3. The democratic decisions are made in a fully participatory manner under a principle of subsidiarity – that is, that the decision should be made at the lowest level possible within a nested structure of councils.
4. The coordination of these decisions takes place through a system of iterated participatory planning, which is described in some detail in the book.
5. This structure of planning replaces markets as a mechanism of economic coordination and integration. Markets disappear completely in a fully realized participatory economy.

6. Along with these principles of radical democratic participation, a participatory economy also embodies a radical egalitarian distribution of income based on two principles: (1) Remuneration is exclusively on the basis of effort (rather than skills or contribution or productivity), and (2) adequate basic income to meet needs is given to anyone unable to work.

While I strongly endorse the values underlying this model, I am skeptical about the viability of some of its institutional design principles. In this session, we will examine a debate between parecon and my arguments for democratic market socialism.

Reading:


Additional readings about Parecon


Robin Hahnel, *Of the People, By the People: the case for a participatory economy* (Soapbox, 2012)


Session 4. Unconditional Basic Income

Unconditional basic income (UBI) is a proposal to give every legal resident of a territory an income sufficient to live above the poverty line without any work requirement or other conditions. Nearly all existing public programs of income support would be eliminated. Minimum wage laws would also be eliminated since there would no longer be any reason to prohibit low-wage voluntary contracts once a person’s basic needs are not contingent on that wage. UBI opens up a wide array of new possibilities for people. It guarantees that any young person can do an unpaid internship, not just those who have affluent parents who are prepared to subsidize them. Worker co-operatives would become much more viable since the basic needs of the worker-owners did not depend on the income generated by the enterprise. This also means worker cooperatives would be better credit risks to banks, making it easier for cooperatives to get loans. UBI, if it could be instituted at a relatively generous level, would move us decisively towards the egalitarian principle of giving everyone equal access to the conditions to live a flourishing life.

UBI has never been instituted in a comprehensive manner, although there have been a number of limited experiments in UBI and some examples of partial basic incomes (such as the Alaska Permanent Fund in which state revenues from oil royalties are distributed to Alaska citizens on an equal per capita basis, which in most years comes to a bit over $1000/person). As a result, most of the debate over UBI revolves around theoretical issues. These can be grouped under two broad headings: (1) Desirability. Supposing we could get a UBI and that it was sustainable, would it in fact be desirable? Some people argue that in fact a UBI is exploitative: the lazy exploit the hard working, for there will be some people who choose to live entirely off of the UBI without contributing anything. UBI seems to contradict some basic notions of reciprocity and fairness. (2) Viability: The central issue here is that UBI potentially would have a variety of problematic macro-economic effects on labor supply, tax rates and investment
rates. If everyone wants to be a couch potato, then a basic subsistence grant means that no one will enter the labor force. Clearly there is some low level of UBI which is viable: everyone in the United States could get $1000/year without this creating self-destructive dynamics. The viability question is thus: what is the maximum level of income at which an unconditional basic income is economically sustainable? Is it high enough to trigger the desirable effects of UBI?

Readings

Bruce Ackerman, Anne Alstott and Philippe van Parijs, Redesigning Distribution, volume V, Real Utopias Project (Verso, 2006)

Philippe van Parijs, “Basic Income: a simple and powerful idea for the twenty-first century,” 3-42

Erik Olin Wright, “Basic Income, Stakeholder grants, and Class Analysis”, 91-100

Barbara Bergman, “A Swedish style Welfare State or Basic Income: which should have priority?” 130-142

Choose two other chapters to read from Redesigning Distribution

Philippe van Parijs, “The Universal Basic Income: why utopian thought matters and how sociologists can contribute to it,” Politics and Society, 41-2, June 2013, pp. 171-182

Erik Olin Wright, "Basic Income as a Socialist Project" (Basic Income Studies, issue #1, 2006)

The Ontario Coalition Against Poverty (OCAP), “Basic Income In The Neoliberal Age” Socialist Interventions Pamphlet No. 17, December 2017. Pdf download available at: https://socialistproject.ca/pamphlets/basic-income-neoliberal-age/

Session 5. Democratizing Finance

Finance poses a particularly sharp challenge to the idea of “real utopia”. Proposals for real utopias are different from simple ameliorative reforms that just try to improve conditions of life in the world as it is; real utopias try to begin the task of transcending the existing structures of domination and inequality by building pieces of an emancipatory alternative of a world that could be within the spaces where this is possible in the world as it is. The question for finance then is this: what institutional designs for a more democratic and egalitarian finance system can be instituted in the present that plausibly prefigure a radically democratic economy beyond capitalism?

Criticisms by political progressives of the financial systems of capitalist economies are familiar: the system disproportionately benefits the rich and powerful and contributes to growing inequality within contemporary capitalist societies; existing financial systems misallocate investments towards speculation and away from projects that would broadly benefit society as a whole; financial institutions, especially those controlling vast amounts of capital, expose large numbers of people to risks not of their choosing; and the dynamics of financial markets concentrate power in the hands of the wealthy, thus more broadly undermining democracy. These are powerful criticisms.

What critics on the left generally lack is a comparable understanding of the sorts of changes in financial institutions that would best advance emancipatory values. To be sure, there are many solid ameliorative proposals for financial reforms that would significantly improve things within capitalist systems. What is lacking are systematic discussions of institutional design by radical critics of capitalism whose visions are not simply to make capitalism work better, but to transcend capitalism. Progressive critics of capitalism have much to say about transforming power relations within firms (e.g. worker cooperatives or stakeholder boards of directors), redesigning the system of income distribution (e.g. unconditional basic income), democratizing democracy (e.g. participatory
budgeting or sortition assemblies), new forms of post-market productive cooperation (e.g. Peer-to-
peer collaborative production), and many other aspects of economic and political institutions. But
about finance, there is generally little beyond standard views of the need for strong regulation and
breaking up banks that are “too big to fail”.

Like many real utopian innovations, there is a certain kind of inherent tension in trying to create real
utopia Financial institutions within capitalism: to be viable, replicable and scalable, they must in some
sense or other “fit in” to a capitalist environment. Alternative institutions that function entirely on the
margins of society can survive without being functionally compatible with capitalism. But alternatives
that aspire to become significant elements within the “economic ecosystem” generally need to have
some sort of symbiotic relation to capitalism. Thus, even as they embody design principles that
express democratic-egalitarian values, real utopian finance institutions – if they are to avoid
marginality – must also successfully interface with capitalism. And this, of course, also poses the
potential of being absorbed by capitalism. One particularly interesting example of this tension is
“Crowdfunding” finance, which both enables bottom-up, grassroots funding of projects, but also can
be a vehicle for enhancing the effectiveness of ordinary capitalist venture capital.

This session will explore some of the parameters of the problem of democratizing finance but
exploring the proposals developed by Fred Block and Robert Hockett for a Real Utopias Project
conference in July 2018.

Readings

“Principles and Institutions for Democratic Finance”, Real Utopias Project
Robert C. Hockett, “Finance without Financiers”
Fred Block, “Financial Democratization and the Transition to Socialism”
Mary Mellor, “Money for the People,” Great Transition Initiative (August 2017),
http://www.greattransition.org/publication/money-for-the-people. [Try also to read some of the discussion
around this paper on the website: http://www.greattransition.org/publication/roundtable-money ]
of thinking about money and income” and Ch 10. “Towards sustainability and economic democracy”. Available
at UW library ProQuest: https://ebookcentral.proquest.com/lib/wisc/detail.action?docID=3386477

Additional Reading
Marguerite Mendell and Rocío Nogales, “Solidarity Finance: An Evolving Landscape,” Universitas Forum, Vol. 3,
No. 2, June 2012
31-56
Kevin Lawton and Dan Marom, The Crowd-funding revolution (McGraw Hill,2013). Chapter 5, “the rise of
crowdfunding” and Chapter 9, “Infrastructure and ecosystems” pp. 47-66121-144
Session 6. Worker cooperatives

Perhaps the oldest vision for an emancipatory alternative to capitalism is the worker-owned firm. Capitalism began by dispossessing workers of their means of production and then employing them as wage-laborers in capitalist firms. The most straightforward undoing of that dispossession is its reversal through worker-owned firms. In most times and places, however, worker cooperatives are quite marginal within market economies, occupying small niches rather than the core of the economic system. One striking exception is the Mondragon Cooperative Corporation in the Basque region of Spain, a conglomerate of over 100 separate worker cooperatives that produce a wide range of goods and services including high-end refrigerators, auto parts, bicycles, industrial robots and much more. The cooperatives in the conglomerate have weathered the severe Spanish economic crisis much better than conventional capitalist firms.

In this session we will explore worker cooperatives as real utopias. Tom Malleson builds an argument for worker cooperatives as a realization of broader ideas of economic democracy. His purpose is to explore the philosophical foundations for the idea that economies should be organized in a democratic manner and then show how worker cooperatives embody this ideal. Henry Hansman offers sympathetically skeptical analysis of the prospects of worker-owned firms, highlighting the ways in which complexity and size may make democratic governance inefficient and costly.

Readings


Case studies (read at least one of these):


Matt Hancock, Compete to Cooperate: the cooperative district of Imola (Bacchilega editore, 2007), The Imola Model, pp. 53-93 (only odd-numbered pages)

Other readings on worker ownership


Richard Wolff, Democracy at Work: A Cure for Capitalism (Chicago: Haymarket, 2012);

Next System Project -- Possibilities and proposals:


Session 7. Democratizing the Corporation

Few problems are more daunting for supporters of radical economic democracy than the large multinational corporation. What would it mean for a corporation like Toyota or Exxon or Foxconn or Boeing to be organized democratically? One possibility would be break up these huge corporations, reducing their size to the point where they could be turned into worker-cooperatives. But does this really make sense? Often these firms have significant economies of scale which would be lost, and it is certainly not clear that having many aircraft companies small enough to be viable worker cooperatives is the optimal way of organizing aircraft or automobile production. Another possibility would be for these corporations to be nationalized and become state enterprises. This was certainly the old state socialist model. But this too creates all sorts of problems if the firms are global corporations. So, what is the “real utopian” model for large corporations, including multinationals?

Isabelle Ferreras has proposed a strikingly original approach to this problem in her book *Firms as Political Entities: Saving Democracy through Economic Bicameralism* (Cambridge University Press: 2017). Here idea is this: Just as in Britain in the 19th century the state had two chambers, one representing landowners – the House of Lords – and the other representing the people – The House of Commons – the modern corporation should also be governed by a bicameral board of directors, a chamber of share owners who contribute their capital to the firm and a chamber of workers who contribute their labor to the firm.

I am hoping to have a Real Utopias Project conference on this proposal sometime in 2019 or 2020. Isabelle Ferreras will be a Havens Center visiting lecturer during the week of March 6, giving two lectures, 4-5:30 on March 6 and March 7, and then a regular Havens Center open forum seminar on Thursday, March 8. She is preparing a draft of a Real Utopias essay that will eventually serve as the anchor essay for a volume in the Real Utopias Project series. Our seminar on March 6 will serve as an intense workshop on this essay. Instead of the usual weekly interrogation, for this week the written commentaries on the essay should be directed as feedback on the essay for Isabelle.

Reading


Isabelle Ferreras, “Democratizing the Corporation”, draft essay, Real Utopias Project (unpublished mss, 2018)
Session 8. Participatory Budgeting

Participatory budgeting (PB) is a transformation of the way urban budgets are created. Instead of city budgets being created by technical experts working with politicians, the budget is created by ordinary citizens meeting in popular assemblies and voting on budget alternatives. In the model of PB initiated in the Brazilian city of Porto Alegre in the early 1990s by the Brazilian Workers Party, neighborhood assemblies throughout the city are empowered to debate budgetary priorities, to propose specific kinds of budgetary projects and then to choose delegates to a citywide budget council who bring all of the proposals from the different neighborhood assemblies together and reconcile them into a coherent city budget. This basic model has spread to many other cities in Latin America and elsewhere, most recently in a novel form to some city council districts in Chicago and New York. The result is a budget much more closely reflecting the democratic ideal of equal access of citizens to participate meaningfully in the exercise of power.

Participatory budgeting has become, perhaps, the iconic example of a real utopian institutional design for deepening democracy. It is also an example which has been copied and modified in many places, so there are now many empirical cases. As a result there is considerable empirical research exploring how it works, why it often fails to deliver on its aspirations, what might be the prospects for a deepening and expanding of its goals. In this session we will both explore the underlying principles of PB and the dilemmas which it faces in its real implementation in diverse ways and contexts.

Readings


Gianpaolo Baiocchi and Ernesto Ganuza, "Participatory Budgeting as if Emancipation Mattered", Politics & Society, 2014. 42(1) pp. 29-50

Additional Reading on Participatory budgeting


Yves Sintomer, Carsten Herzberg and Giovanni Allegretti, *Learning from the South: participatory budgeting worldwide* (Bonn: InWEnt gGmbH, 2010)

Session 9. Sortition

In recent years there have been a number of extremely interesting initiatives to introduce different kinds of random assemblies into democratic processes. The conventional way of understanding the idea of representative democracy is that representation is accomplished by citizens choosing political officials
through elections to represent them in legislative and executive office. An alternative notion of representation would select political decision-makers through some kind of random selection process. This is more or less how juries are selected in many countries, and it was how certain legislative bodies were selected in Ancient Athens. The question, then, is whether such Random Selection Citizens Assembly – typically referred to as a “sortition legislature” by theorists of democracy -- might be desirable and workable in the world today. Do they help solve certain difficult problems in conventional democratic institutions? Are they an alternative to electoral democracy or a supplement? What specific purposes might they be used for? What design problems do they face?

The next book in the Real Utopias Project series published by Verso revolve around a specific proposal for a bicameral legislature consisting of one elected chamber and one sortition chamber. The readings for this week consist of this proposal, followed by a selection of the commentaries that will be in the book.

Readings

John Gastil and Erik Olin Wright lead essay, “Legislature by Lot”
Erik Olin Wright, “Postscript: The Anti-capitalist arguments for sortition”
Yves Sintomer, “From Deliberative to Radical Democracy”
Terrill Bouricius, “Why Hybrid Bicamerailism is not right for sortition”
David Owen and Graham Smith, “The circumstances of Sortition”
Tom Malleson, “Should Democracy Work Through Elections or Sortition?”
Pierre-Etienne Vandamme, et.al., “Intercameral Relations in a Bicameral Elected and Sortition Legislature”

Session 10. Peer-to-peer mutualism and digital cooperativism

The Internet and the digital information revolution open up a vast terrain for real utopian experiments. Wikipedia is perhaps the best known example. No one would have thought it was possible until it happened: Several hundred thousand people around the world actively cooperate without pay to write and edit what has become the world’s largest encyclopedia (over 5.5 million English language entries in 2018, and at least some version of Wikipedia in over 100 languages) which is made available without charge to anyone in the world who has access to the internet. Wikipedia is an example of a more general model of non-hierarchical cooperative economic activity: peer-to-peer distributed production with open source property rights. Yochai Benkler explores the potential for such new collaborative forms of networked production in his book *The Wealth of Networks* and in his more recent essay in *Politics & Society*. Trebor Scholz looks more specifically about the possibilities for new forms of cooperative work as a response to the Uberization of work in the digital economy.

Readings


Yochai Benkler, “Practical Anarchism”, *Politics & Society*, 41:2, June 2013, pp. 213-251


Video: [https://vimeo.com/152492035](https://vimeo.com/152492035)
Session 11. To be selected from additional topic list
Beginning on p.17 of the syllabus there is a list of additional topics. The seminar will select one of these for the April 10 session.

Session 12. No seminar meeting: work on research papers

Session 13. Web-based real utopia projects
The Internet is not simply a utility that has facilitated the cooperative p2p collaborations as a new form of the relations of production. The web has also been a domain for to disseminate information about real utopias. This week the Havens Center will host a visit by the developers of the website Beautiful Solutions -- https://solutions.thischangeseverything.org/ -- which is an exceptionally rich site for ideas about real utopias.

Students in the Real Utopias seminar should, if at all possible, attend the presentation by the Beautiful Solutions collective, Tuesday, April 24. They will also come to our seminar.

There are no set readings for this week. What I would like participants in the seminar to do is spend several hours exploring the Beautiful Solutions website and at least a few of the other websites listed below. At the seminar I would like to have two complementary kinds of discussions: (1) a discussion about the form of these websites: what works best; what is a problem; what might be the role of websites like this in a broad strategy of social transformation; etc. (2) a discussion of some of the substantive ideas you encounter in your exploration of the sites.

Real Utopia information websites:

Beautiful Solutions: https://solutions.thischangeseverything.org/
Participedia: https://participedia.net/
The Next System Project: http://thenextsystem.org/
Great Transition Initiative: http://www.greattransition.org/
Yes Magazine: http://www.yesmagazine.org/
Autonomy Institute: http://www.autonomyinstitute.org/
Additional Topics

The seminar will select one of the following topics for session 11 on April 10. It would also be possible to substitute one of these sessions for a topic already on the agenda if there is a consensus in the seminar for a switch of topics. For some of these topics the readings are quite underdeveloped. If a topic is chosen I will augment the readings in time for the session.

1. Environmental Real Utopias: Transition towns, Ecovillages, Plenitude

It hardly needs saying that environmental crises pose among the biggest challenges in the world today. For many progressives, in fact, it is the most urgent problem humanity faces because of the specter of global warming and environmental collapse, but even if one pulls back from the more apocalyptic visions of an uninhabitable planet, there is no question that environmental issues – global warming, peak oil, ground water depletion, dispersed chemical toxicity and contamination, etc. – will increasingly generate great harms.

In this session, we will discuss what can be thought of as real utopian responses to these challenges: ways of building alternative institutions that foster sustainable ways of life. Our focus will not primarily be on the array of critical state policies needed to deal with the environment. These are obviously of great importance, and it is implausible that a solution to environmental problems – or even a tolerable adaptation to a deteriorating environment – can be done without significant involvement of affirmative state action. Our focus, instead, will be on possible bottom-up real utopian responses to environmental challenges. We will give particular attention to what is sometimes called the “Transition town movement” which focuses on community initiatives to enhance sustainability. As Rob Hopkins, founder of the transition movement, explains in The Transition Companion, the background assumption for the movement is: “If we wait for governments, it’ll be too little, too late. If we act as individuals, it’ll be too little. But if we act as communities, it might be just enough, just in time.” Whether or not community action will be “just enough” is debatable, but nevertheless such projects could help create conditions under which it might then become possible to mobilize more effectively for larger scale, government involvement at the more macro level. In any case, this reflects one type of real utopian response to social transformation around environmental issues.

Readings


Other reading

2. Environmental Real Utopias: Participatory environmental governance

What kind of new institutions would make possible robust, sustainable, collective forms of environmental governance? One view is that what we ultimately need is strong, technocratic, top-down regulation that imposes new environmentally-sound rules of the game on both business and citizens. Only by insulating technically competent regulation from popular pressure will it actually be able to impose the needed sacrifices for serious environmental mitigation. This view is challenged by advocates of radical democracy. Over time seemingly insulated technocratic state apparatuses will become responsive to the priorities of elites, especially capitalist elites, and will not pursue environmental policies that bring together social justice and environmental sustainability. Only by deepening popular empowerment through a real democratization of environmental governance will it be possible to sustain, over the long haul, the needed changes. What we need is some form of empowered participatory environmental governance. This session will discuss Frank Fischer’s proposals for an institutional design to accomplish this.

Reading:
Frank Fischer, *Climate Crisis and the Democratic Prospect: participatory governance in sustainable communities*. (Oxford University Press, 2017), especially Part III and IV.

Other reading
Next System Project: Possibilities and Proposals
Richard Smith. “Six Theses on Saving the Planet” https://thenextsystem.org/six-theses-on-saving-the-planet

3. Time Banking

There is a longstanding argument in anarchist strands of progressive social movements that money is central to the destructive dynamics of the modern world. This intuition is also embodied in folk sayings like “money is the root of all evil” and in some Marxist accounts of communism, in which money no longer plays any role in the economy. At a theoretical level, this diagnosis is closely connected to the general critique of markets and commodification, the idea that when exchange processes and prices are governed by market competition, this inevitably generates exploitation, alienation, and domination.

One response to this understanding of money has been to create alternative currencies rooted in the idea of the equivalence of labor time. Such time-based currency is also seen as a way for local communities to take more control over their local economic environment, particularly in contexts of high unemployment and marginalization. The basic idea of the simplest local currency systems is that people exchange hours of service to each other. When you perform a service you accumulate hours in a time bank, which you can then spend on other people’s services. The currency is thus denominated in labor-time units. Such a system can be used in a very restrictive way in, for example, in activities like babysitting cooperatives, or more extensively for a much wider variety of services. In a few cases, as in the BonNetzBon local currency (BonNetzBon = GoodNetworkVoucher) in Basel, Switzerland, the local currency has an established exchange rate with the official currency and is used to facilitate broader forms of credit and exchange within the social economy

Reading
4. **Everyday Utopia**

There is an anarchist utopian tradition that imagines that utopias can be built through sheer voluntary self-creative activity, without any real involvement of the state. This involves things like Local Exchange Trading Systems (LETS), Community Gardens, Co-housing, as well as a wide range of community-based social provisioning. Sometimes such initiatives are seen as completely irrelevant to progressive social transformation, and sometimes indeed they do seem more like retreats from activism than a strategy for social change. But such initiatives can also be part of a larger agenda. In any case, it is worth looking at them from the perspective of real utopias.

**Reading**


5. **The idea of “Utopia” in social theory and politics**

The idea of utopia has played a significant, if often contradictory, role in the history of social thought, cultural expression, and political movements. Sometimes the idea of Utopia is affirmed as a way of charting the direction for emancipatory social transformation and motivating people to struggle for a better world: It is an expression of hope, of longing, even of the emancipatory moments in the world as it is that foreshadow the world as it might be:

> A map of the world that does not include Utopia is not worth even glancing at, for it leaves out the one country at which Humanity is always landing. And when Humanity lands there, it looks out, and, seeing a better country, sets sail. Progress is the realization of Utopias. -- Oscar Wilde, *The Soul of Man under Socialism*

> Utopia lies at the horizon.
> When I draw nearer by two steps, it retreats two steps.
> If I proceed ten steps forward, it swiftly slips ten steps ahead.
> No matter how far I go, I can never reach it. What, then, is the purpose of utopia?
> It is to cause us to advance. -- Eduardo Galeano

There is nothing like dream to create the future. Utopia today, flesh and blood tomorrow. -- Victor Hugo

Utopia is the process of making a better world, the name for one path history can take, a dynamic, tumultuous, agonizing process, with no end. Struggle forever. -- Kim Stanley Robinson, *Pacific Edge*

...I take as a point of departure the possibility and desirability of a fundamentally different form of society--call it communism, if you will--in which men and women, freed from the pressures of scarcity and from the insecurity of everyday existence under capitalism, shape their own lives. Collectively they decide who, how, when, and what shall be produced. Michael Burawoy, *Manufacturing Consent:*

In Utopia, where every man has a right to everything, they all know that if care is taken to keep the public stores full, no private man can want anything; for among them there is no unequal distribution, so that no man is poor, none in necessity; and though no man has anything, yet they are all rich; for what can make a man so rich as to lead a serene and cheerful life, free from anxieties. -- Thomas more, *Utopia*

None of the abstract concepts comes closer to fulfilled utopia than that of eternal peace. -- Theodor Adorno, *Minima Moralia*
Literature is my Utopia. Here I am not disenfranchised. No barrier of the senses shuts me out from the sweet, gracious discourses of my book friends. They talk to me without embarrassment or awkwardness. - Helen Keller

But mostly, the invocation of “Utopia” is a way of attacking political opponents for pursuing self-defeating, destructive fantasies:

Every daring attempt to make a great change in existing conditions, every lofty vision of new possibilities for the human race, has been labeled Utopian. -- Emma Goldman

It may be that the best we can hope for when it comes to utopias is that they be held at arm’s length and regarded as aesthetic constructions, in which various proportions are neatly worked out, contradictions eliminated, and outside intrusions minimized. They are fictions, artifacts of culture. And we should be wary if they ever become much more. — Edward Rothstein, *Visions of Utopia*

Nearly all creators of Utopia have resembled the man who has toothache, and therefore thinks happiness consists in not having toothache.... Whoever tries to imagine perfection simply reveals his own emptiness. -- George Orwell, *Why Socialists Don’t Believe in Fun*

If people would forget about utopia! When rationalism destroyed heaven and decided to set it up here on earth, that most terrible of all goals entered human ambition. It was clear there’d be no end to what people would be made to suffer for it. -- Nadine Gordimer, *Burger’s Daug*

I can imagine no man who will look with more horror on the End than a conscientious revolutionary who has, in a sense sincerely, been justifying cruelties and injustices inflicted on millions of his contemporaries by the benefits which he hopes to confer on future generations: generations who, as one terrible moment now reveals to him, were never going to exist. Then he will see the massacres, the faked trials, the deportations, to be all ineffaceably real, an essential part, his part, in the drama that has just ended: while the future Utopia had never been anything but a fantasy. -- C.S. Lewis, *The World’s Last Night*

Utopia is a mixture of childish rationalism and secularized angelism. -- Emil Cioran, *History & Utopia*

The search for Nirvana, like the search for Utopia or the end of history or the classless society, is ultimately a futile and dangerous one. It involves, if it does not necessitate, the sleep of reason. There is no escape from anxiety and struggle. — Christopher Hitchens, *Love, Poverty, and War: Journeys and Essays*

Utopia is a dream that builds hope; utopia is a nightmare that creates fear. This contentious cultural and political history of utopian discourses is one of the background contexts for this seminar.

This session will explore some of the themes in this history of social thought by focusing mostly on Ruth Levitas’ book *Utopia as Method*. She traces the ways in which the idea of utopia, broadly understood as the belief that another (and better) world is possible, is present in different ways throughout the history of social theory in general and sociological theory in particular. She proposes as specific way of using this thread of social theory as a “method” for understanding theory and studying the world. While this way of exploring the idea of utopia in a very different way from my approach in *Envisioning Real Utopias*, I think we ultimately share the same fundamental aspiration: to develop theoretical tools that facilitate emancipatory social science.

**Reading**

Ruth Levitas, *Utopia as Method* (Palgrave MacMillan,
Other reading on Utopia in social theory


6. Utopia in literature

The idea of utopia has figured in interesting ways in literature, both as an explicit theme in novels and as an implicit idea. In the best literary utopian novels, the utopia can be treated as a kind of thought experiment: what would be the dilemmas facing people living in such a world. In others, the exposition is more like propaganda trying to make a vivid case for a utopian possibility.

Possible reading

- Edward Bellamy, *Looking Backward*
- William Morris, *News from Nowhere*
- Marge Percy, *Woman at the Edge of Time*
- Ursula LeGuin, *The Dispossessed*
- Charlotte Perkins Gilman, *Herland*
- Thomas More, *Utopia*
PRINCIPLES FOR SEMINAR DISCUSSIONS

The following guidelines are intended to facilitate seminar discussions. Some of them may sound obvious, but from past experience it is still important to make them explicit.

1. READINGS. Do the readings carefully. There is a strong tendency in seminars, particularly among articulate graduate students, to turn every seminar into a general “bull session” in which participation need not be informed by the reading material in the course. The injunction to discuss the readings does not mean, of course, that other material is excluded from the discussion, but it does mean that the issues raised and problems analyzed should focus on the actual texts assigned for the week.

2. LISTEN. In a good seminar, interventions by different participants are linked one to another. In many seminar discussions, however, each intervention is unconnected to what has been said before. Participants are more concerned with figuring out what brilliant comment they can make rather than listening to each other and reflecting on what is actually being said. In general, therefore, participants should add to what has just been said rather than launch a new train of thought, unless a particular line of discussion has reached some sort of closure.

3. TYPES ON INTERVENTIONS. Not every seminar intervention has to be an earth-shattering comment or brilliant insight. One of the reasons why some students feel intimidated in seminars is that it seems that the stakes are so high, that the only legitimate comment is one that reveals complete mastery of the material. There are several general rules about comments that should facilitate broader participation:

   • No intervention should be regarded as “naive” or “stupid” as long as it reflects an attempt at seriously engaging the material. It is often the case that what seems at first glance to be a simple or superficial question turns out to be among the most intractable.

   • It is appropriate to ask for clarification of readings or previous comments as it is to make a substantive point on the subject matter.

   • If the pace of the seminar discussion seems too fast to get a word in edgewise it is legitimate to ask for a brief pause to slow things down. It is fine for there actually to be moments of silence in a discussion!

4. BREVITY. Everyone has been in seminars in which someone consistently gives long, overblown speeches. Sometimes these speeches may make some substantively interesting points, but frequently they meander without focus or direction. It is important to keep interventions short and to the point. One can always add elaborations if they are needed. This is not an absolute prohibition on long statements, but it does suggest that longer statements are often too long.

5. EQUITY. While acknowledging that different personalities and different prior exposures to the material will necessarily lead to different levels of active participation in the seminar discussion, it should be our collective self-conscious goal to have as equitable participation as possible. This means that the chair of the discussion has the right to curtail speaking by people who have dominated the discussion, if this seems necessary.

6. SPONTANEITY vs. ORDER. One of the traps of trying to have guidelines, rules, etc. in a discussion is that it can squelch the spontaneous flow of debate and interchange in a seminar. Sustained debate, sharpening of differences, etc., is desirable and it is important that the chair not prevent such debate from developing. I generally adopt what I call the one-hand/two-hand rule: When participants want to say something, they raise one hand and I put them on a list. If they want to respond to what has just
been said and jump the queue, they can raise two hands. It is important, of course, to not use this as a way of raising entirely new issues, but engaging directly what was just said.

7. ARGUMENTS, COMPETITIVENESS, CONSENSUS. A perennial problem in seminars revolves around styles of discussion. Feminists have often criticized discussions dominated by men as being aggressive, argumentative, and competitive. Men, on the other hand, have at times been critical of what they see as the “feminist” model of discussion: searching for consensus and common positions rather highlighting differences, too much emphasis on process and not enough on content, and so on. Whether or not one regards such differences in approaches to discussion as gender-based, the differences are real and they can cause problems in seminars. My own view is the following: I think that it is important in seminar discussions to try to sharpen differences, to understand where the real disagreements lie, and to accomplish this is it generally necessary that participants “argue” with each other, in the sense of voicing disagreements and not always seeking consensus. On the other hand, there is no reason why argument, even heated argument, need by marked by aggressiveness, competitiveness, put-downs and the other tricks in the repertoire of male verbal domination. What I hope we can pursue is “cooperative disagreement”: theoretical advance comes out of disagreement, but hopefully our disagreements can avoid being antagonistic conflicts.

8. CHAIRING DISCUSSIONS. In order for the discussions to have the kind of continuity, equity and dynamics mentioned above, it is necessary that the discussion be led by a “strong chair.” That is, the chair has to have the capacity to tell someone to hold off on a point if it seems unrelated to what is being discussed, to tell someone to cut a comment short if an intervention is rambling on and on, and so on. The difficulty, of course, is that such a chair may become heavy-handed and authoritarian, and therefore it is important that seminar participants take responsibility of letting the chair know when too much monitoring is going on.

9. REFLEXIVITY. The success of a seminar is a collective responsibility of all participants. Professors cannot waive magic wands to promote intellectually productive settings. It is essential, therefore, that we treat the process of the seminar itself as something under our collective control, as something which can be challenged and transformed. Issues of competitiveness, male domination, elitism, bullshit, diffuseness, and other problems should be dealt with through open discussion and not left to the end of the seminar. Please let me know if you have concerns of any sort, and it is always appropriate to raise issues with our collective process.
The following information is required to be included in Syllabi by the University of Wisconsin

**Accommodations.** Please send the instructor an email by the end of the second week of the course if you are eligible for special arrangements or accommodations for testing, assignments, or other aspects of the course. This may be the case if English is your second language or you experience a physical or psychological condition that makes it difficult for you to complete assignments and/or exams without some modification of those tasks. Accommodations are provided for students who qualify for disability services through the McBurney Center. Their website has detailed instructions about how to qualify: http://www.mcburney.wisc.edu/. Provide a copy of your accommodations request (VISA) to the instructor by the end of the second week of class. We try to reserve rooms and proctors by the third week in class, so we must know of all accommodations by then.

If you wish to request a scheduling accommodation for religious observances, send an email by the end of the second week of the course stating the specific date(s) for which you request accommodation; campus policy requires that religious observances be accommodated if you make a timely request early in the term. See the university’s web page for details: https://kb.wisc.edu/page.php?id=21698

**Academic honesty.** As with all courses at the University of Wisconsin, you are expected to follow the University’s rules and regulations pertaining to academic honesty and integrity. The standards are outlined by the Office of the Dean of Students at http://www.students.wisc.edu/dosoacademic-integrity/

According to UWS 14, academic misconduct is defined as:

- seeks to claim credit for the work or efforts of another without authorization or citation;
- uses unauthorized materials or fabricated data in any academic exercise;
- forges or falsifies academic documents or records;
- intentionally impedes or damages the academic work of others;
- engages in conduct aimed at making false representation of a student’s academic performance;
- assists other students in any of these acts.

For a complete description of behaviors that violate the University’s standards as well the disciplinary penalties and procedures, please see the Dean of Students website. If you have questions about the rules for any of the assignments or exams, please ask your instructor or one of the TAs.

**Departmental notice of grievance and appeal rights.** The Department of Sociology regularly conducts student evaluations of all professors and teaching assistants near the end of the semester. Students who have more immediate concerns about this course should report them to the instructor or to the chair, 8128 Social Science.

**Department learning objectives.** Beyond the specific substantive and methodological content I will cover in this course, I have designed this course to achieve the following instructional objectives designated as priorities by the Department of Sociology:

1. Students will demonstrate a broad understanding of major theories, methodologies, and research findings in the sociological literature.
2. Students will evaluate social science literature and employ most appropriate methods and practices in their own research.
3. Students will develop analytical thinking skills that enable them to evaluate information pertinent to their research question.
4. Students will communicate in a clear, organized engaging manner, using language, methods, and critical tools appropriate to the social sciences.