

Political Science 913/Urban Studies 913
Urban Political Process
Spring 2013

Instructor: Joel Rast
Time: Tuesdays, 4:30-7:10
Location: NWQ, Room G575

Office: NWQ 5585
Office Hours: Wednesdays, 1:00-2:30
Phone: 229-2737
Email: jrast@uwm.edu

Course Overview

The field of urban politics has gone through significant changes during the past several decades. During the 1960s and 1970s, cities across the nation experienced economic stagnation and fiscal crisis as industries and middle-class residents migrated to the suburbs. Urban economic restructuring gave rise to new theoretical approaches to urban politics emphasizing structural sources of business power resulting from the increased mobility of business enterprises. Many urban theorists argued that capital mobility had produced a dramatic shift in the balance of political power in cities, dimming the prospects for policies that address the interests of neighborhood organizations, low- and moderate-income city residents, and other non-business groups.

More recent scholarship takes into account the phenomenon of urban economic restructuring, while in many cases moving beyond the economic determinism of much of the earlier literature. Many of these newer studies conclude that various types of governing arrangements are possible in contemporary cities, including regimes that are responsive to the needs of less wealthy city residents. Although scholars continue to debate these issues, there is a growing consensus that the distribution of political power in cities can take a number of different forms.

This course is divided into three parts. Part I is primarily theoretical. This part of the course traces the development of the field of urban politics during the past several decades and examines major theoretical debates in the field.

Part II consists of case studies of four cities: San Francisco, Chicago, New York, and New Haven. The case studies will help us further articulate the theoretical frameworks introduced in Part I of the course. We will examine the relationship between urban political theory and the case studies in part from a Kuhnian perspective (see Thomas Kuhn, *The Structure of Scientific Revolutions*), observing carefully the “fit” between the cases and the expectations produced by our theoretical models.

Part III of the course is devoted to student research. In this part of the course, students will develop a case study of their own focusing on some aspect of urban political development in Milwaukee. This part of the course is somewhat experimental. We will work out the details through a collaborative process as the semester gets underway, but this is basically how I see it

working: Milwaukee has gone through three distinct periods of political development since World War II, which largely overlap with the administrations of four postwar mayors—Frank Zeidler (1948-1960), Henry Maier (1960-1988), John Norquist (1988-2003), and Tom Barrett (2004-present). These three periods might be labeled (1) *Milwaukee socialism* (Frank Zeidler), (2) *urban economic restructuring* (Henry Maier), and (3) *the postindustrial city* (John Norquist and Tom Barrett). Each of these three periods featured a distinctive governing agenda for Milwaukee driven in part by outside pressures such as macroeconomic change and federal urban policy and in part by local political conditions.

To facilitate your development of the Milwaukee case studies, I plan to divide the class into four student research groups, each focusing on one or more of these three historical periods. Members of each group may collaborate in carrying out the research (for example, sharing archival materials, copies of city planning documents, newspaper clippings, etc.). However, each student will write his or her own paper individually. The papers should be theoretically grounded. That is, students should use one or more of the theoretical perspectives covered in Part I of the course to help frame their research questions. Three class sessions at the end of the semester will be devoted exclusively to a combination of planning and coordination of efforts by research groups and updates on research findings.

Course Requirements

Class Participation: Since this class is a graduate seminar, your participation in our weekly meetings will be critical to making the class a success. I will devote a minimal amount of time to lecturing. In Parts I and II of the course, most of our class time will be spent providing you with the opportunity to respond to the readings. If students come to class well prepared, our seminar discussions should be lively and thought provoking. In the research portion of the course (Part III), it is expected that all students will contribute equally to the efforts of research groups. Free riding will not be tolerated.

Response Papers: During Parts I and II of the course, I would like each of you to prepare a 1-2 page (single-spaced) reaction to the readings each week. During weeks where the readings consist of a set of articles, feel free to synthesize the readings and treat them thematically rather than responding to each reading individually. A key purpose of the response papers is to facilitate your participation in the seminar. Therefore, as you prepare them, consider questions or issues raised by the readings that you would like to see discussed in class. Response papers may include a brief summary of the book/article's key arguments, but they should focus primarily on *reacting* to the material rather than summarizing it.

Research Paper: The research paper should identify and address a research question that focuses on some aspect of urban political development in Milwaukee. The context for the paper should be one or more of the historical periods associated with the Zeidler, Maier, Norquist, and Barrett administrations (see above). The papers should be roughly 20 pages in length (double-spaced). They will be due at the end of the semester. A one-page (single-spaced) summary of your proposed paper project will be due on March 26. I will provide additional guidelines for the paper later in the semester.

The breakdown of your final course grade will be determined as follows:

- Research Paper 70 %
- Response Papers 20 %
- Class Participation 10 %

Required Books:

Clarence Stone, *Regime Politics: Governing Atlanta, 1946-1988*. Lawrence, KS: University Press of Kansas, 1989 [ISBN 0700604162; price: \$16.95 new].

Richard DeLeon, *Left Coast City: Progressive Politics in San Francisco, 1975-1991*. Lawrence, KS: University Press of Kansas, 1992 [ISBN 070060555X; price: \$17.95 new].

Richard Lloyd, *Neo-Bohemia: Art and Commerce in the Postindustrial City*, second edition. New York: Routledge, 2010 [ISBN 9780415870979; price: \$26.06 new].

Alexander J. Reichl, *Reconstructing Times Square: Politics and Culture in Urban Development*. Lawrence, KS: University Press of Kansas, 1999 [ISBN 0700609504; price: \$19.95 new].

Douglas Rae, *City: Urbanism and Its End*. New Haven: Yale University Press, 2003 [ISBN 0300095775; price \$20.16 new].

All books are available at the UWM bookstore and have been placed on 2-hour reserve at the Golda Meir Library. Additional readings are on electronic reserve.

Class Schedule

Part I: Theorizing the City

January 22: Course Overview

- No reading assignment

January 29: Structuralism and Its Critics

- Susan Fainstein, "The Changing World Economy and Urban Restructuring." In S. Fainstein and S. Campbell, eds., *Readings in Urban Theory*. Oxford: Blackwell, 1996.
- Edward W. Soja, "Economic Restructuring and the Internationalization of the Los Angeles Region." In M. P. Smith and J. Feagin, eds., *The Capitalist City*. Oxford: Blackwell, 1987.
- Paul Peterson, "The Interests of the Limited City." From Paul Peterson, *City Limits*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1981.
- Paul Kantor, "The Dependent City: The Changing Political Economy of Urban Economic Development in the United States." *Urban Affairs Quarterly* 22: 493-520, 1987.
- Kenneth K. Wong, "Economic Constraint and Political Choice in Urban Policymaking." *American Journal of Political Science* 32: 1-18, 1988.
- Todd Swanstrom, "Semisovereign Cities: The Politics of Urban Development." *Polity* 21: 83-110, 1988.

February 5: The City as a Growth Machine

- Harvey Molotch, "The City as a Growth Machine: Toward a Political Economy of Place." *American Journal of Sociology* 82: 309-332, 1976.
- David Wilson and Jared Wouters, "Spatiality and Growth Discourse: The Restructuring of America's Rust Belt Cities." *Journal of Urban Affairs* 25: 123-138, 2003.
- Judith T. Kenny, "Making Milwaukee Famous: Cultural Capital, Urban Image, and the Politics of Place." *Urban Geography* 16: 440-458, 1995.
- Mark Purcell, "The Decline of the Political Consensus for Urban Growth: Evidence from Los Angeles." *Journal of Urban Affairs* 22: 85-100, 2000.
- Mark Schneider and Paul Teske, "The Antigrowth Entrepreneur: Challenging the 'Equilibrium' of the Growth Machine." *Journal of Politics* 55: 720-736, 1993.
- Harvey Molotch, "The Political Economy of Growth Machines." *Journal of Urban Affairs* 15: 29-53, 1993.

February 12: Urban Regime Theory (Part 1)

- Clarence Stone, *Regime Politics: Governing Atlanta, 1946-1988*, chapters 1-8.

February 19: Urban Regime Theory (Part 2)

- Clarence Stone, *Regime Politics*, chapters 9-12.
- Richard Gendron, "Forging Collective Capacity for Urban Redevelopment: 'Power To,' 'Power Over,' or Both?" *City & Community* 5: 5-22, 2006.
- Joel Rast, "Governing the Regimeless City: The Frank Zeidler Administration in Milwaukee, 1948-1960." *Urban Affairs Review* 42: 81-112, 2006.
- Clarence Stone, "The Atlanta Experience Re-examined: The Link between Agenda and Regime Change." *International Journal of Urban and Regional Research* 25: 20-34, 2001.
- Royce Hanson, Harold Wolman, David Connolly, Katherine Pearson, and Robert McManmon, "Corporate Citizenship and Urban Problem Solving: The Changing Civic Role of Business Leaders in American Cities." *Journal of Urban Affairs* 32: 1-23, 2010.

February 26: The Political Economy of the Postindustrial City

- Richard Florida, "Cities and the Creative Class." *City & Community* 2: 3-19, 2003.
- Jamie Peck, "Struggling with the Creative Class." *International Journal of Urban and Regional Research* 29: 740-770, 2005.
- Jeffrey Zimmerman, "From Brew Town to Cool Town: Neoliberalism and the Creative City Development Strategy in Milwaukee." *Cities* 25: 230-242, 2008.
- J. Peter Byrne, "Two Cheers for Gentrification." *Howard Law Journal* 46: 405-432, 2003.
- Tom Slater, "The Eviction of Critical Perspectives from Gentrification Research." *International Journal of Urban and Regional Research* 30: 737-757, 2006.
- Peter Eisinger, "The Politics of Bread and Circuses: Building the City for the Visitor Class." *Urban Affairs Review* 35: 316-333, 2000.

Part II: Case Studies

March 5: San Francisco

- Richard DeLeon, *Left Coast City: Progressive Politics in San Francisco, 1975-1991*.

March 12: New York City

- Alexander J. Reichl, *Reconstructing Times Square: Politics and Culture in Urban Development*.

March 19: Spring Break

- No assignment

March 26: Chicago

- Richard Lloyd, *Neo-Bohemia: Art and Commerce in the Postindustrial City*.

April 2: New Haven (Part 1)

- Douglas Rae, *City: Urbanism and Its End*, pp. 1-211.

April 9: New Haven (Part 2)

- Douglas Rae, *City: Urbanism and Its End*, pp. 215-432.

Part III: Milwaukee ResearchApril 16: Research Workshop

For this class, we will break out into four small groups. Each person will have a chance to provide an overview of his/her project and then identify any problems that he/she is having that group members could potentially help resolve. For example, you might be having problems trying to figure out how to frame your case study theoretically. Or maybe you are having trouble identifying archival materials that allow you to develop the narrative of your case. Whatever the issues are that you present to the group, do your best to pick ones that group members can realistically help you with. For example, time management may be a major concern, but it's not something that members of your group are likely to be much help with.

Plan to spend about 20-25 minutes on each person's project. This is also a good opportunity to share information about sources you have identified that members of your group could use.

To prepare for this session, please post your project abstracts on the course D2L site at least two days before class. Students should read the abstracts of all members of their group before coming to class.

April 23: Research Workshop

The principal objective of this class is to continue to work through research problems that students are experiencing. We will again break down into small groups and consider each student's project individually. Also, be sure to share information about sources you have identified since last week that other group members could use.

To prepare for this class, please post a message on the D2L site at least two days before class describing at least one problem you are wrestling with in your research. Students should read and consider all posts from members of their own group before coming to class.

April 30: Research Workshop

The objective of this class is to provide feedback on drafts of papers or portions of papers, once again working in small groups. It is expected that by this date, students will have completed a draft of at least a portion of the final paper.

To prepare for this class, please post a draft of your paper or a portion of your paper on the D2L site at least two days before class. Students should come to class having read and written comments on the drafts of all members of their group.

May 7: Class Presentations