The study of political economy emphasizes the role of capital in politics and policy making. Urban political economy focuses specifically on the relationship between the “local state” (urban and suburban governments) and capital, both local and global. However, this relationship does not exist in a local vacuum; the behavior of cities, states, and other nations as well as the actions of national and international capital have profound impacts on this relationship.

Many important questions will emerge during this term, particularly since this course is a survey of a broad subfield. Two classical questions of democratic theory provide an overarching framework for this course, however: Who governs, and whose interests are advanced? We are particularly concerned with whether capital dominates the local state and wields undue influence in agenda setting and policy making. Are elected officials pawns of capital or segments of capital, or is the relationship more nuanced? Do the public’s desires for patterns of residential development, work locales, and entertainment preferences set the agenda for capital in a democratic, “invisible-hand” manner? Does capital operate within parameters set by a regulatory state? Keeping in mind a desire for clarity and parsimony, how else might we describe the relationship between capital and the local state? These questions raise normative concerns about how political economy “ought” to be in an enlightened society and students should not be hesitant to proffer normative evaluations. In addition, questions are often listed on the syllabus accompanying particular readings. Every student should come to class prepared to answer these questions; quizzes may be given when the instructor deems them necessary.

In the 19th and 20th centuries, cities could emerge as manufacturing centers by outcompeting other locales within their region or nation. In the 21st century economy, manufacturing has become very mobile and the competition to attract it has become far more intense. Competition between the global North and South or between nation-states is arguably less intense these days than competition between cities across the globe. The leaders of many cities have recognized, sometimes quite belatedly, that they must find a new role in the international division of labor. The grand theme of this course is how cities, their leaders -- political, economic and, increasingly, cultural -- and their inhabitants cope with the new terrain that is a global economy not a national economy.

POSC 266 and 366 share a core reading list but there will be additional readings for the upper division course as well as more demanding
requirements. POSC 266 is designed for sophomores and those who do not want to embark on a self-directed research project; the majority of the grade will be based on midterm and end of term take-home exams (40% each and 20% for participation and assignments). POSC 366 should be taken by junior or senior Political Science majors seeking to fulfill the 300-level asterisk requirement of the major, by POEC concentrators for the capstone requirement, or by students ready and willing to meet the additional requirements listed on the syllabus as well as a research paper of about 25 pages (50% for final paper, 20% for participation and 30% for assignments).

**Format:** Being able to articulate ideas, respond to questions, and listen effectively to the criticisms of others are important life skills. My teaching philosophy stresses the value of proffering ideas and subjecting those ideas to examination. I seek to stimulate discussion and disagreement but never combat. Coming to class with a list of ideas from our readings that you feel merit discussion -- because they are significant, because they are incorrect or overdrawn, because they reshaped the way you think about something else, because they redound back to earlier discussions or an earlier text and because you want to nominate them as agenda items for our discussion -- is an excellent idea. If you wish to share these with me prior to class, you can send me e-mail and I will do my best to respond in a timely manner and perhaps incorporate your ideas into class. Written submission will not be a requirement unless class discussion falters. Considering that class participation is a non-negligible 20% of the grade, students should be sure that they can meet these requirements. Any form of academic dishonesty is ground for failure in the course. Students requiring academic accommodations should notify the instructor in writing.

For Juniors thinking about competing for a Junior Fellowship this summer, note the readings about Istanbul and China, two places that are at the forward margins of globalization.

**I. THEORY: Pluralism**


Master the four quadrants; grasp the insight of how salient problems of collective action are for Distributed Cost-payers and, conversely, how the paradox of collective action enables smaller coalitions of Concentrated groups to organize more readily; consider the critique of Pluralism regarding what type of policies are not investigated in light of this article. It would be helpful to look back at your textbook from POSC 122 for a discussion of pluralism, Madisonian democracy and the paradox of collective action.
II. Urban Growth Machine


In what way are the *problems of collective action* central to this argument? What is the role of the public and where do they stand on growth? Who are the members/actors of the Growth coalition?

366:


366: Is the Dallas experience typical, representative and where would it fit in the Savitch and Kantor typology?

III. History is Data Immersion

- *N. D. Bloom, Merchant of Illusion*, ch. 2 (“Reinventing the Capitalist City”) (Ohio State University Press, 2004).

IV. Why these Policies, what are they thinking?

- *C. Euchner, Playing the Field* (Johns Hopkins Press, 1993), ch. 2.
- D. Coates and B. Humphreys, “The Stadium Gambit,” *Regulation* 23:2
- Yewell, “Ball Boosters,” *City Pages*
- Keiser, “Take Me Out to the Ballgame,” *Le Monde*

366:

V. Why these Policies, what are they thinking?


• E. Strom, “Converting Pork into Porcelain.”


366:

• Holcomb, “Revisioning Place: De-Constructing and Re-Constructing the Image of the Industrial City.”

VI. Diffusion of the US Model


• Caglar Keyder, “Istanbul into the Twenty-First Century.” In *Orienting Istanbul: Cultural Capital of Europe?* Denis Gokturk, Levent Soysal and Ipek Tureli, eds. (Routledge 2010).


366:

• N. D. Bloom, *Merchant of Illusion*, ch. 6 (“American Midas: Rouse and Festival Marketplaces”) (Ohio State University Press, 2004).
VII. Spatial Fortification in Neoliberalism

- *G. MacLeod, “From Urban Entrepreneurialism to a ‘Revanchist City’?” In Spaces of Neoliberalism, N. Brenner and N. Theodore, eds., 254-76.
- D. Judd, “The Rise of the New Walled Cities,”

366:

VIII. Mike Davis, PLANET OF SLUMS

IX. Mike Davis, PLANET OF SLUMS

X. Global Gating: Implications for Economic Opportunity and Consequences for Community

- *S. Low, Behind the Gates, chs. 1, 6-7.

366:
Candan Cinar, “The New Address of Social Polarization in Istanbul: Gated Communities.”

XI:


366:

XII.
• Buntin, “Land Rush,” (Houston) Governing
• Flag Wars

XIII. Surplus Labor, Disorganized People, and State Power

366:

XIV. Patterns of Resistance, Or Not?
• P. Street, “Urban Neoliberal Racism ... Occupy Wall Street,”
• Keiser, “Collective Action and Voting ... Sports Stadium.”

366:

XV.
• FICTION AND SCHOLARSHIP. Novel selection should be commenced FOR POSC 266.


366:

XVI: FICTION AND SCHOLARSHIP
• POSC 266 PAPER Due date and discussion; 366 exempt

XVII: PRESENTATIONS ON 366 RESEARCH
XVIII:
- Jiang Xu and A. G. O. Yeh, “City Repositioning and Competitiveness [Guangzhou].”

***************