

Chaire Unesco « Politiques urbaines
et citoyenneté »



UNESCO Chair on "Urban Politics
and Citizenship"



École nationale des Travaux
Publics de l'Etat



Call for Papers

Political participation and its challenges : territories, collective action and modes

International conference organised by the UNESCO Chair on
Urban Politics and Citizenship, Graduate School of Public
Works and UMR CNRS 5600, Lyon, 10 – 11 December 2007

Scientific Programme

Debates on participative democracy are taking shape within societies where the relationship between civil society and polity is rapidly being reconstructed (Marden, 2003; Rosanvallon, 2006). More specifically, a historically dated mode of political organisation is being called into question. It was long deemed inconceivable to dissociate polity and politics from the State, its institutions and its territory, controlled by means of a frontier and normative tools. This political model is currently being challenged. Over the last few years, participative democracy has become the subject of ever-increasing reflection in both political and academic circles. Basically, the general hypothesis – or even postulate – is that contemporary political

systems are tending towards pluralism. Local space, and cities in particular, are favourable ground for observation of the dynamics at work when the place of elected representatives and representative democracy is being questioned owing to a “deliberative constraint” imposed (Blondiaux and Sintomer, 2002), in countries of the “North” and “South” alike (Cornwall and Coelho, 2006; Domínguez and Jones, 2007; Shah, 2007; Tulchin and Ruthenburg, 2007).

Signs that a “state-centred” mode of political organisation was flagging had already been identified by the mid-1970s. At the time, M. Crozier, S. Huntington and J. Watanuki referred to a “crisis in [occidental] democracies” that was essentially revealed by the inability of States to cope with social demands. This “overload” of State machinery led to an incapacity to act, and as a result its functional legitimacy was brought into question (Crozier *and al.*, 1975). In the 1980s, with the “conservative revolution” in the United States and in Great Britain, issues related to this “crisis” disappeared from the agenda for a while, which can be partly explained by the recourse to liberal recipes based on deregulation and privatization.

It was not until the mid-1990s that further reference was made to a “crisis of modern democracies” brought about by globalization, the restructuring of States and major sociological transformations. The terminology used was also to change, and the “crisis of modern democracies” to become a “crisis of governability” requiring new tools of governance (Kooiman, 1993). This semantic change made it possible to emphasise that the “crisis” was not functional, and that it was not expressed only in terms of an “overload” of State machinery, but also at a twofold, more fundamental level, since both the very conditions in which public policies were produced and the legitimacy of political power were called into question. The dynamics underlying this twofold questioning had been brewing since the 1960s, and were the following:

- the reconsideration of a domination-based exercise of politics (Mayer, 2000);
- the questioning, on the one hand, of the primacy of political parties as authorities aggregating individual preferences, and on the other of electoral fidelity (Pharr and Putnam, 2000; Perrineau, 2003);
- the considerable rise over two generations in the level of education of occidental populations, and the consequent change in their relationship with knowledge and institutions (Giddens, 1990) ;
- criticism of a preference-aggregating system based on the legal-rational legitimacy monopolised by the State and its public authorities and the emergence of an ethos of deliberation (Habermas, 1997);
- censure of a liberal representation of the modern State, which is theoretically open to all the claims put forward by civil society. The fiercest early critics of this representation were Marxist authors who linked the crisis of the State with the changes brought about by capitalism (Brunhoff and Poulantzas, 1976). This criticism has since been echoed by certain political philosophers

who question the myth of the "benevolent neutrality of the State", notably in its treatment of political minorities (Kymlicka, 2001) ;

- basic lack of confidence in the capacity of the political realm to address both the problems of modern societies and the emergence of a civil society that claims greater say in the organisation of power (Keane, 1998);
- the fragmentation of policy-making systems subsequent to changes in the internal structure of the State caused by decentralizing reforms and federalist dynamics (Loughlin, 2001);
- the challenging of a policy-making system based on political representation (and therefore on the centrality of elected politicians) and on the primacy of the scientific expertise held by authorities sheltering behind their monopoly of things technical (Callon and al., 2001) ;
- the consolidation of new areas of collective action, notably urban regions where, as early as the 1970s, social movements had severely criticised 'top down' political integration (Hamel *and al.*, 2000);
- the redefinition of citizenship as liberal and universalist by social groups claiming community-based treatment that they deemed would make it possible to override policies which, in the guise of political liberalism, were based on discrimination against dominated groups (related to gender, language, ethnic origin, religious practices, sexual orientation, etc.) (Beiner and Norman, 2001). The fight for recognition and the symbolic and practical struggles between identities were increasingly structuring the political realm, to the apparent detriment of demands originating in class relations (Honneth, 1996);
- finally, with the development of gender studies and *cultural studies*, the criticism of liberal democracies became the trial and judgement of the white heterosexual Christian (male) politician who monopolises the system of representation and the State machinery for his own benefit (Vickers, 1984; Marques-Pereira, 1990).

It is in the broad context of the questioning of a "state-centred" model of politics based on representative democracy, unshared scientific expertise, and a universalist conception of citizenship that the theme of participation has gradually established itself in the discourse of both academics and politicians.

This has been the basis for an increase in the number of theoretical studies on participative and deliberative politics that stress that the positions and preferences of the actors involved can be made to evolve in the course of these processes. Deliberative politics could fulfil an eminently educational function in that it could enable the evolution of the individual's expectations and oblige him to think "in terms of public interest and as a citizen" (Barber, 1997, p. 172). This theoretical interpretation of deliberative politics is of course rooted in the seminal works of J.

Habermas (Habermas, 1978, 1997), though it cannot be denied that the works of Machiavelli, Rousseau, de Tocqueville or J. S. Mill have largely contributed to what is, after all, a very positive interpretation. A certain number of North-American works have also supported this viewpoint (Bohman *and al.*, 1997; Elster, 1998; Macedo, 1999; Dryzek, 2002; Fishkin and Laslett, 2003; Parkinson, 2006).

There are also, however, a number of empirical studies that adopt a far more cautious analysis of the real impact of participative politics on the transformation of ordinary actors into active citizens (Blondiaux and Cardon, 2006). It has been established that by means of the deliberative arena, arguments and modes of expression are led to conform with a certain number of grammatical rules developed in the course of interchange within a given group (Cardon *and al.*, 1995; Cefaï and Joseph, 2002); these dominant rules compel participants to “dress” as a “good citizen” (Talpin, 2006). It is also established that participative politics are more than a zero sum game that sanctions the position of actors who are already dominant, and that it is also accompanied by learning processes - the learning, for example, of new modes of action for both institutional actors and the actors of civil society (Mazet, 1999; De Maillard, 2002; Hamel and Jouve, 2006). Between ideals and the trials of reality, participative politics currently face a number of challenges and vital issues. This conference proposes to analyse these questions by holding 6 workshops, each centred on a particular type of challenge. **In order to limit the field of study, and with the exception of workshop 1, the conference will focus on territorial and/or urban policies.**

Workshop 1 : Participative democracy and its role in building consent and self-meaning¹

What cultural system does the notion of participative democracy belong to? To what paradigmatic tendencies or ideological options does it pertain ?

According to a number of observers, the modern-day era is characterized by a radicalization of liberal, individualistic and judicialized democracy. This, they claim, is leading a number of basic precepts to be called into question, as witnessed by:

- a decline in the transcendence of polity and an exhaustion of the heteronomic model at the origin of regulative norms (Cohen-Tanugi 1992), which placed polity as anterior, exterior and superior to social rules (Gauchet 1998) ;
- a withdrawal of individuals to the private realm, compounded by a consumerist, distrustful and dissident conception of civic and community participation (Rosanvallon 2006) ;

¹ According to J.-J. Rousseau

- a media- and marketing-oriented practice of political functions (a democracy of opinion or even emotion), and a negotiated, contractualized practice of public action (Gaudin 1999) ;
- a decline in the holistic conception of society (i.e. the existence of an all-encompassing, determining social entity, of a whole that binds the constituent parts of the community) (Dubet and Martuccelli 1998) ;
- a fraying of social bonds and a crisis of the sense of belonging. For some people, this stirs a radical desire for emancipation; others feel themselves to be derelict, victims of exclusion; still others withdraw within their own community (Revault-d'Allones 2004) ;
- the decomposition of the substantialist idea of Good (i.e. the conviction that an objective, universally valid definition of good is possible). This is a corollary of the lack of authority on the part of public institutions (Dubet 1998 ; Renaut 2004), of the lack of credibility of political discourse, and of the diminished acceptability of the sacrifices to be made (Dupuy 1992) in the name of the general interest.

This is thought to be at the origin of the crisis in the idealistic conception that has underpinned the republican theory of democracy and justice since J-J. Rousseau, According to Rousseau, the representative mechanism was a means by which a general will was expressed, a will which transcended individual interests, and allied reason with virtue. But the current crisis in this holistic, polity-centred model has almost automatically led to the re-enhancement of the other idealism of political modernity: that the individual pursuit of self-interest can produce an optimization that will, thanks to free competition, be beneficial to all. This idealism owes much of its essence to J. Locke and the Scottish Enlightenment, and maintains that it is the market which embodies the encounter of reason and virtue. As a result, in the movement where axiological and epistemological individualism tends to supplant holistic, structuralist and functionalist interpretations of the social world, polity acquires *de facto* secondary status.

There have been various reactions to this loss of confidence in the abilities of polity to institute social realm by the identification of all to a great national whole, and to the resulting crisis in the intelligibility and governability of social life. One of these reactions has been a sovereigntist re-awakening, the other the participative approach. Whereas the former has so far been short-lived, the amplification of the latter seems to reveal how profoundly these issues are currently being called into question, and represents an attempt to reconstruct political legitimacy at grass root level by involving individuals in the field. This fight against complexification (Luhmann 1999) and the destruction of hierarchical organisation (Gauchet 2002) affect first and foremost political authority, arousing in some actors the fear that the world will become mundane and the future uncontrollable. It requires a search for new modes of legitimation. What could be done to induce citizens to adhere to public authority

and consent to the collective burden? What could be done to make them feel concerned with the affairs of the city, and bring individuals and groups to be identified and recognised, in both their distinctive characteristics and their common humanity?

The aim of this workshop is to explore the cognitive universe, its postulates, its requisites and its axioms; to investigate its system of reference, its schemas of reasoning, its justifications and its arguments. For this is the framework for the notion of participative democracy; this is where it finds its meaning and acquires its operative scope. In other words, what is the theory of social realm and model of justice underlying participative democracy? What political philosophy is participative democracy based on? Whilst a notion or practice is currently in vogue, what makes it possible to translate this notion into practical measures? This, in fact, means asking ourselves how participative democracy, as an ideal, was constituted, substantiated, authorised and disseminated.

Workshop 2 : The “experts” of participative politics

Today, participative democracy is not just a matter of discourse; it is borne out in practice. Citizens share in decision-making and public debate in an increasing number of ways, including citizens juries, consensus conferences, deliberative surveys, participative town planning workshops, public debates, and participative assessments. A profound change in modes of public action seems to be taking place, centred on an injunction to participate (Blondiaux and Sintomer, 2002).

In this context, a large number of actors have specialised in the management and leadership of participative procedures. For certain “ordinary” citizens, this specialisation involves a process of political socialization that enables them to familiarize themselves with the “grammar” and political codes of participation. By doing so, they become, so to speak, unofficial “liaison officers” of the authorities. This has been accompanied by a veritable professionalization of their activities, thus causing some observers to speak of a market of participation (Blatrix, 2000 ; Nonjon, 2005). Issues related to participative politics are thus no longer the domain of politicians or associations, but also of professional agencies and consultants with a variety of profiles (former social workers, urban policy project managers, architects, planners, management and marketing consultants, research consultants, non-governmental organisations, etc.). Their motivations are varied, and their militant involvement often more than relative. In both cases, it would appear that these “professionals” of participative politics are neither passive nor neutral in the procedures they conduct, or in constructing a social demand for participation (Blatrix, 2000). Often central to these procedures, the “professionals” contribute to the creation and broadcasting not only of categories of analysis but also of participative

practices. Thus they play an active part in the social success of participative democracy.

There have as yet been few studies focusing specifically on the milieu of the “experts” and “professionals” of participative politics (Blatrix, 2000, Carrel, 2005, Nonjon, 2006), or “democratic engineering”, as it has been called (Blondiaux and Cardon, 2006). On this account, the main aim of contributions to this workshop will be to gain deeper knowledge of the milieu and to query its existence.

Questions will centre on two main fields:

- The first will cover the sociology of the actors involved (ordinary citizens who have become either experts or professionals in the domain of participative politics): who are the “professionals” of participation (their social background and evolution, training and education, involvement in militant movements, etc.)? Where do they practise? What do they do? What are their sources of knowledge? Given the heterogeneousness of their practices and the diversity of their profiles (one of their outstanding features being that they are united neither by title, mode of recruitment, nor by a common professional organisation), is it possible to identify rationales for their specialisation?
- The second focuses on the role of these “professionals” in the construction and tissue of participative policies. More particularly, what are the effects of calling in this type of actor? How do these professionals contribute to the legitimization and institutionalization of participative democracy? What breathing space do they really have with respect to public institutions?

This workshop therefore aims to initiate a debate on the very terms “Expert citizens” and “professionals”. More broadly, it aims to discuss what an investigation of their practices can teach us about today’s contrasting conceptions of what participative democracy should be.

Workshop 3 : Participative democracy and social movements

From the point of view of collective action and social movements, the theme of democracy is as topical as ever. However, it is no longer referred to in the same terms as those used by the actors of the 1960s. In those days, the demands submitted by social movements to the political system were often of a radical or utopian nature, and challenged the status and hierarchichal foundations underpinning its functioning. For some years now, these demands have become more diversified. In some respects, they are also more pragmatic, without necessarily being less radical. Finally, owing to the *pluralism* of political space, they involve more categories of

actors and concern a multiplicity of scales, from the local to the global, which were not given much consideration in the past. This has led people to take a fresh view of the possible enlargement of the space of democracy (Friedmann, 2002).

This being the case, what assessment can be made of the action of social movements with respect to participative democracy? What effective impact has it had on issues of social justice and citizenship? If one considers the ongoing influence of the élites on public decisions, and their ability to affect the political system as a whole (Walzer, 2004), is it not necessary to reconsider the capital so often granted to citizen action by observers of the political scene? Finally, in what terms should we consider the contribution of social movements to democracy, in the light of the demand for participation that has so often characterized their action (della Porta, 2005)?

One thing is certain: over the last forty years, the action of social movements has converged on more than one account with that of participative democracy. Take, for instance, demands to bring new values and new themes into the public space: gender, the body, health, the environment, the recognition of ethnic and cultural diversity. All of these have been backed by the new social movements (Offe, 1997). Consider, too, demands for the democratization of public management (Rui, 2004), not to mention the introduction of new forms of mutual aid, social recognition and solidarity in the field of civil society (Bacqué, Rey and Sintomer, 2005). And yet, looking back, the impact of the action of social movements does not always seem to have been positive. Many researchers have highlighted its counter-productive nature (Dalton and Kuechler, 1990), whereas others have insisted on its ambivalence (Blanc, 1996 ; 2005).

It is therefore difficult to maintain that our societies are more democratic today than they were in the early or mid 1960s. However, that does not mean that the growing presence of social actors in the public realm has been useless. In many respects, it has made it possible to attract the attention of public opinion to social injustices that were previously unknown or that had been left aside in favour of traditional inequalities defined in terms of class relations. This has made it possible to take the measure of the heightened importance of social and cultural diversity and pluralism (Jouve and Gagnon, 2006). Similarly, we have started to understand how necessary it is to interconnect demands for recognition and those related to the redistribution of wealth (Fraser, 2003) in order to promote social justice.

In the light of the action led by social movements, and taking into account both the changes in their demands and the minor influence of certain of their past demands given the democratization of the public realm and of state management, what assessment can be made of the commitment of the actors in social movements ? What is more, should national differences not be taken into account? What can we learn, in this respect, from recent research on social movements? To what extent have we

witnessed a renewal of the grammar of collective action over the last 40 or 50 years? What terms could be used to describe the action of social movements with respect to the challenges of participative democracy, or even with regard to the necessary interconnection between participative and representative democracy?

The study of collective action and of social movements from the angle of participative democracy raises numerous questions that this workshop will attempt to address by considering prevailing debates within the sociology of social movements, and notably by taking into account both analytical models and the impact of the action. The aim of the workshop is chiefly to assess, at least in part, the contribution of social movements to the renewal of participative democracy. In what terms can we consider the influence of social movements on democracy? To what extent have social movements aided understanding of the context and challenges encountered by civil society in the face of democratic stakes? Though not exhaustive, these questions will serve as a starting point for reflection on these and other issues.

Workshop 4 : Public action and its different “publics”: analyzing the many forms of citizen participation

Works on participative politics generally stress the limited effects of so-called participative authorities or procedures in the democratization of public action. As citizen protests are perceived as constraints to which policy-makers must respond for fear that public action may prove a failure, consultative procedures are thought mainly to encourage the consent of the protesters, by giving them the impression that they have been partners to a pre-existing decision. From this viewpoint, partnership and consensus may well tend to mask political domination and a return to order (Donzelot and Epstein, 2006; Sintomer and De Maillard, 2007).

One can nonetheless wonder whether this view is not linked to a focusing on certain contexts of action and/or special categories of relations between public institutions and their public. Regardless of the evident diversity inherent to research approached from varying disciplinary angles and raising different issues, work on “citizen participation” appears to be characterized by two main tendencies. A first approach favours the study of “exceptional” public decisions that are met locally by controversy and protest (Blatrix, 2000; Rui, 2004). However, public action in general cannot be likened to this type of “major” decision, nor even to decision-making processes which are merely the visible part of the ways in which collective issues are dealt with (Massardier, 2003; Gaudin, 2004). From this point of view, it is necessary to determine whether choosing to focus on decisions which by definition are hardly “reversible” or “debatable” does not lead to an underestimation of the ability of civil society to influence the substance of public action (Barthe, 2002; Le Naour, 2007). The second approach uses specific procedures or authorities (referendums, neighbourhood councils, citizens juries, etc.) as a basis to understand the concrete

impact of practices that aim to associate citizens more closely with public action. By studying these projects, reforms and so-called participative systems, this approach can then follow one of two paths. On the one hand it can use the study to identify the concrete effects of these projects, reforms and systems on the work of public actors, modes of action of protest groups, or actual results of public action. On the other, it can draw up typologies so as to classify instances of participative democracy according to a scale of intensity or to their objectives (Bacqué *and al.*, 2005). But highlighting the most proceduralized forms of participation entails the risk a) of underestimating the variety of ways in which citizens can “participate” in the handling of collective issues, and b) of disregarding, in particular, the importance of informal exchanges which can develop outside these *ad hoc* procedures.

This workshop will analyse the different modes of participation (formal and informal) and their incidence on the content of public policies at a territorial level. From the point of view of a change in political order, what modes are most effective in influencing these policies? If participation is to be efficient, we know it must be supported by a certain degree of organisation and structure within civil society. How does this degree of organisation interfere with the modes of participation already in practice?

The differential in the capacity of civil society stakeholders to commit themselves personally and/or collectively to participative practices has been well documented. Far less, however, has been written on the link between the “selection” process of “ordinary citizens” and types of participation modes. We will take various modes of participation into account, and use them to focus on their impact on this process. Who participates, and in what forms? How effective are they in terms of access to public institutions? Recent North-American studies have shown the emergence of “clubs” of individuals who interpellate the authorities and set themselves up as their “partners” (Crawford, 2006). If such a process, which is clearly derived from collective action, exists, what are its sociological and cultural dynamics? What social groups use this type of approach? How is it justified? How do other social groups, who are not associated with this sort of initiative (or are not invited to do so) succeed (or not) in engaging in mediation with local public institutions? Does mediation with the authorities bring in third parties who therefore have the status of “representatives” of civil society (elected representatives, social workers, etc.)? Over and above the actors who hold a *de facto* institutional position, what socio-political processes lead to the construction of “third parties” that are recognised as legitimate by the authorities? How is the status and function of “representatives” of civil society acquired? How is the process affected by the nature of decisions engendering participative exercises, and by the stakes involved?

Workshop 5 : When participative democracy challenges scales

One of the characteristics of the current problems facing urban spaces and their development, be they related to environment, employment or security, is their multi-scalar dimension. In other words, these problems are local, regional, national and even global in dimension, and this must be taken into account both in order to understand them and to develop and implement appropriate policies with which to address them. At the same time, the practice of space in today's urban populations shows greater differentiation and probably greater social contrast than previously. This has been enhanced by an increase in spatial mobility for certain social groups, a mobility which has multiplied territories of belonging and uses (for example the fact that people no longer work and live in the same area).

Modern-day society has witnessed the development of procedures and tools for the participation of the population in urban affairs in at least three forms: i) the forming of local institutions (infra-municipal, municipal and – more rarely – supra-municipal). They can be neighbourhood committees, users' committees, or development councils that supposedly enable civil society to give its opinion on the development of urban policies; ii) the development of direct democracy procedures such as referendums or initiatives launched mainly at a neighbourhood or local community level (e.g. towns or villages), and iii) the involvement of citizens, firms and associations in the preparation and development of the principal documents for urban planning and strategy (master plans, economic development plans, major urban projects, strategic planning, etc.) (Jouve and Lefèvre, 2005).

The principal characteristics of these procedures, institutions and tools are that they are in most cases conceived and implemented at reduced scales, essentially those of the neighbourhood or municipality. The result is a hiatus between on the one hand, the local relevance of the scale of the urban problems and stakes, and on the other the relevance of the various forms of participation of civil society (Salet and Gualini, 2007). This hiatus can be even greater if one considers the formal rules of participative democracy (who has the right to participate? What topics are broached? What are the territorial scales of the questions raised?). For it often happens that these rules do not necessarily select the people or organisations most concerned by the problems and policies to be treated (e.g. the classic case in which only residents can participate whereas the problems raised are of equal, if not greater, concern to people who work in the area but do not reside there).

Given that there are probably few studies of this question, the aims of the workshop are as follows:

- To provide data for an inventory of the procedures and tools that exist at a supra-municipal level (metropolitan or regional) and of their effective use by the populations concerned;
- To present and analyse the innovative practices implemented to take spatial scales and their interconnection into account, notably but not exclusively in the formal rules for the participation of the population;
- To identify the impact of the question of scale on effective population participation, on the content of debates with respect to the issues raised, on the nature of the participants, etc.

Workshop 6 : Empowerment: its contribution and limits

The notion of “participation” has multiple meanings and represents many different forms of reality, as well as differences in the extent to which ordinary citizens are taken into account and integrated in the decision-making process. The classification given by S. Arnstein (Arnstein, 1969), with its three levels of participation, is of relevance here. The first, most cynical level corresponds to practices whose aim is to “educate” participants, considering that relations between politics and civil society are structurally asymmetrical. The aim of the second level, that of “symbolic cooperation”, is to transmit information, but elected representatives are not obliged to take the opinions expressed into account. In the best of cases, urban policy in France can be situated at this level. The third level – and the most interesting in terms of an ability to influence the content of public policies – is by definition the most difficult to attain, for it requires complete reconsideration of traditional forms of mediation between civil society and public institutions. “Empowerment”, a term which cannot be translated into French, belongs to this level. Basically, it refers to the process by which an individual or a group acquires the means to reinforce its ability to act and to become emancipated (Bacqué, 2005). It is a practice which inverts the balance of power between State and civil society, notably the most disadvantaged social groups. It is one of the cornerstones of urban policies, or rather of what is left of them, in the United States.

Many of the authors on *empowerment* in the field of urban politics, or to a greater extent in that of social economy, highlight the truly subversive nature (in the sense of the transformation of political order) of these new practices whose aim is to transfer power and the ability to act to the actors in civil society, notably to the fringes made most vulnerable by contemporary economic change. Faced with States that are unable to cope with the number of social problems to solve (inequality, poverty, social exclusion, delinquency, etc.) one of the alternatives today is *empowerment*, adorned with all the merits of participative democracy practices in the noblest of senses. To all extents and purposes, when it comes to the transformation of contemporary States *empowerment* is the equivalent of the Rationalization of budgetary choices at the time of the setting up of Keynesian States in the 1960s: a

diagnosis of the “reality” of the current situation, a framework for the world, and a method for its transformation. Its impact on the organisation of Polity may well be considerable, for “power in this domain is not a question of having, but of having built. Power is built by those who devote themselves to it; the aim is not to take the power of others, but to add to it by acting as a counter-power. It is unlimited, composed of constituents that aggregate and get along as a result of negotiatory procedures” (Mével and Donzelot, 2003).

The aim of this workshop will be to examine the real impact of *empowerment* with respect to the objectives above, and particularly to investigate the socio-political, economic or institutional conditions that affect the development of practices related to *empowerment*. Special attention will be paid to the link between *empowerment* and transformations in the welfare state, for it is clear that *empowerment* practices lead to a redefinition of both the frontiers between the State and civil society and their respective responsibilities, or, as J. Jenson has put it, to the reformulation of regimes of citizenship (Jenson *and al.*, 2007). *Empowerment*, therefore, leads to a re-thinking of citizenship regimes in liberal democracies. The clarification of the stakes involved will be the particular objective of this workshop.

March 2007

Scientific committee

Marie-Hélène Bacqué (Université d'Evry), Loïc Blondiaux (Université Lille 2), Philippe Genestier (UMR CNRS 5600), Mona Harb (Université Américaine de Beyrouth), Olivier Ihl (Institut d'Etudes Politiques de Grenoble), Aziz Iraki (Institut National d'Aménagement et d'Urbanisme, Maroc), John Flint (Sheffield Hallam University), Pierre Hamel (Université de Montréal), Bernard Jouve (UMR CNRS 5600), Vladimir Kolossov (Université de Moscou), Françoise Lafaye (UMR CNRS 5600), Christian Lefèvre (Université Paris 8), Laurent Lepage (Université du Québec à Montréal), Gaspar Mairal Buil (Université de Saragosse), Emmanuel Négrier (Université de Montpellier, CNRS), Anaïk Purenne (UMR CNRS 5600), Franck Scherrer (Institut d'Urbanisme de Lyon), Peter Simmons (University of East Anglia), Yves Sintomer (Université Paris 8), Marie-Gabrielle Suraud (Université Toulouse 3).

Venue : Ecole Normale Supérieure Lettres et Sciences Humaines - Lyon

Dates : 10-11 December 2007

Deadline for proposals : 30 May 2007

Practical information : A title and an abstract (maximum 1 page in French or in English) giving the number of the workshop in which you wish to participate, your affiliation, your status (doctoral student, lecturer and researcher, researcher) and your e-mail address, to be sent to chaire-unesco@entpe.fr

During the conference, the working languages will be French and English. Simultaneous translation facilities will be arranged.

Papers (in French or in English) which have been accepted should be sent as a Word document (40 000 – 45 000 signs) by 15 November 2007 to chaire-unesco@entpe.fr

Prize : At the end of the conference, a Prize of 1000 euros will be awarded by the UNESCO Chair on “Urban politics and citizenship” to the best contribution made by a doctoral student.

Bibliography

- Arnstein S. R., 1969. "A Ladder of Citizen Participation", *Journal of the American Institute of Planners*, 35 (4), p. 216-224.
- Bacqué M.-H., 2005. "L'intraduisible notion d'empowerment vue au fil des politiques urbaines américaines", *Territoires*, (460), p. 32-35.
- Bacqué M.-H., Rey H. and Sintomer Y., 2005, *Gestion de proximité et démocratie participative: une perspective comparative*, Paris, Découverte.
- Barber B. R., 1997, *Démocratie forte*, Paris, Desclée de Brouwer.
- Barthe Y., 2002. "Rendre discutable. Le traitement politique d'un héritage technologique", *Politix*, (57), p. 57-78.
- Beiner R. and Norman W., 2001, *Canadian political philosophy: contemporary reflections*, Oxford, Oxford University Press.
- Blanc M, 1996, « Politique de la ville et démocratie locale. La participation : une transaction le plus souvent différée », *Les Annales de la Recherche Urbaine*, (68-69), p. 98-106.
- Blanc M, 2005, « Participation et démocratie », *Espaces et Sociétés*, 123, (4), p. 167-180.
- Blatrix C., 2000, La "démocratie participative", de mai 68 aux mobilisations anti-TGV. Processus de consolidation d'institutions sociales émergentes, Thèse de doctorat, Université Paris I, Science politique, Paris.
- Blondiaux L. and Cardon D., 2006. "Dispositifs participatifs", *Politix*, (75), p. 3-9.
- Blondiaux L. and Sintomer Y., 2002. "L'impératif délibératif", *Politix*, (57), p. 17-36.
- Bohman J., Cohen J. and Rehg W., 1997, *Deliberative democracy: essays on reason and politics*, Cambridge, Mass., MIT Press.
- Brunhoff S. d. and Poulantzas N., 1976, *La Crise de l'Etat*, Paris, Presses Universitaires de France.
- Callon M., Lascoumes P. and Barthe Y., 2001, *Agir dans un monde incertain: essai sur la démocratie technique*, Paris, Seuil.
- Cardon D., Heurtin J.-P. and Lemieux C., 1995. "Parler en public", *Politix*, (31), p. 5-19.
- Carrel M., 2005, *Faire participer les habitants ? La politique de la ville à l'épreuve du public*, Thèse de doctorat, Université de Paris V, Sociologie, Paris.

Cefaï D. and Joseph I., sous la direction de, 2002, *L'héritage du pragmatisme. conflits d'urbanité et épreuves de civisme*, La Tour d'Aigues, Ed. de l'Aube.

Cohen-Tanugi L, 1992, *Le droit sans l'Etat*. Paris, PUF.

Cornwall A. and Coelho V. S. P., 2006, *Spaces for change? the politics of citizen participation in new democratic arenas*, London; New York, Zed Books.

Crawford A., 2006, "Policing and security as 'club goods': the new enclosures? " in J. Wood and B. Dupont (dir.), *Democracy, Society and the Governance of Security*, Cambridge, Cambridge University Press, p. 111-138.

Crozier M., Huntington S. P. and Watanuki J., 1975, *The Crisis of Democracy*, New York, New York University Press.

Dalton R. J. and Kuechler M, 1990, *Challenging the Political Order : New Social Movements in Western Democracies*, Cambridge, Polity Press.

De Maillard J., 2002. "Les associations dans l'action publique locale: participation fonctionnalisée ou ouverture démocratique?" *Lien social et politiques*, (48), p. 53-65.

Della Porta D, 2005, « Deliberation in Movement: Why and How to Study Deliberative Democracy and Social Movements », *Acta Politica*, Vol. 40, p. 336-350.

Domínguez J. I. and Jones A., 2007, *The construction of democracy: lessons from practice and research*, Baltimore, Johns Hopkins University Press.

Donzelot J. and Epstein R., 2006. "Démocratie et participation: l'exemple de la rénovation urbaine", *Esprit*, 326 p. 5-34.

Dryzek J. S., 2002, *Deliberative democracy and beyond: liberals, critics, contestations*, Oxford, Oxford University Press.

Dubet F, 2002, *Le déclin de l'institution*. Paris, Seuil.

Dubet F. and Martuccelli D, 1998, *Dans quelle société vivons-nous ?* Paris, Seuil.

Dupuy J.-P, 1992, *Le sacrifice et l'envie*. Paris, Hachette.

Elster J., 1998, *Deliberative democracy*, Cambridge, Cambridge University Press.

Fishkin J. S. and Laslett P., 2003, *Debating deliberative democracy*, Malden, MA, Blackwell.

Fraser N, 2003, « Social Justice in the Age of Identity Politics: Redistribution, Recognition, and Participation » in Fraser, N. and A. Honneth (dir.), *Redistribution or Recognition. A Political-Philosophical Exchange*, London, Verso.

- Friedmann J, 2002, *The Prospect of Cities*, Minneapolis, University of Minnesota Press.
- Hamel P. and Jouve B., 2006, *Un modèle québécois? Gouvernance et participation dans la gestion publique*, Montréal, Presses de l'Université de Montréal.
- Gauchet, M, 1998, *La religion dans la démocratie*. Paris, Gallimard
- Gauchet M, 2002, *La démocratie contre elle-même*. Paris, Gallimard.
- Gaudin J. P., 2004, *L'action publique: sociologie and politique*, Paris, Presses de Sciences Po: Dalloz.
- Gaudin J.-P, 1999, *Gouverner par contrat*. Paris, Presses de Science Po.
- Giddens A., 1990, *The consequences of modernity*, Stanford, Stanford University Press.
- Habermas J., 1978, *L'espace public*, Paris, Payot.
- Habermas J., 1997, *Droit et démocratie: entre faits et normes*, Paris, Gallimard.
- Hamel P., Lustiger-Thaler H. and Mayer M. (dir), 2000, *Urban movements in a globalising world*, London, Routledge.
- Honneth A., 1996, *The struggle for recognition: the moral grammar of social conflicts*, Cambridge, Mass., MIT Press.
- Jenson J., Marques-Pereira B. and Remacle E. (dir), 2007, *L'état des citoyennetés en Europe et dans les Amériques*, Montréal, Presses de l'Université de Montréal.
- Jouve B. and Gagnon A.-G. (dir), 2006, *Les métropoles au défi de la diversité culturelle*, Grenoble, Presses Universitaires de Grenoble.
- Jouve B. and Lefèvre C., 2005, "Métropoles confisquées: élites économiques et grands élus aux commandes", in A. Da Cunha *and al.* (dir.), *Enjeux du développement durable*, Lausanne, Presses Polytechniques et Universitaires Romandes, p. 405-424.
- Keane J., 1998, *Civil society: old images, new visions*, Stanford, Stanford University Press.
- Kooiman J. (dir), 1993, *Modern Governance*, London, Sage.
- Kymlicka W., 2001, *La citoyenneté multiculturelle: Une théorie libérale du droit des minorités*, Montréal, Boréal.
- Le Naour G., 2007, "La qualification de plaintes de riverains en savoirs utiles: une géométrie variable", in T. Le Bianic and A. Vion (dir.), *Action publique et légitimités professionnelles*, Paris, LGDJ, à paraître.

Loughlin J. (dir), 2001, *Subnational Democracy in the European Union. Challenges and Opportunities*, Oxford, Oxford University Press.

Luhmann N, 1999, *Politique et complexité*. Paris, éd. du Cerf

Macedo S., 1999, *Deliberative politics: essays on democracy and disagreement*, New York, Oxford University Press.

Marden P., 2003, *The Decline of Politics. Governance, Globalization and the State*, Aldershot, Ashgate.

Marques-Pereira B., 1990. "L'Etat-providence, providence de l'État à l'égard des femmes?" *Recherches féministes*, 3 (1), p. 11-26.

Massardier G., 2003, *Politiques et action publiques*, Paris, Colin; Dalloz.

Mayer M., 2000, "Urban Social Movements in an era of Globalisation", in P. Hamel, H. Lustiger-Thaler and M. Mayer (dir.), *Urban Movements in a Globalising World*, London, Routledge, p. 141-157.

Mazet P., 1999, "Participation des habitants et politiques publiques délibératives: pour une approche critique de la démocratie locale", in C. Neveu (dir.), *Espace public et engagement politique*, Paris, L'Harmattan, p. 83-113.

Mével C. and Donzelot J., 2003. "Empowerment: une notion qui fait fureur aux États-Unis... Applicable en France?" *Les cahiers du DSU*, (37), p. 40-41.

Nonjon M., 2005, « Professionnels de la participation : savoir gérer son image militante, *Politix*, (70), p. 89-112.

Nonjon M., 2006, *Quand la démocratie se professionnalise. Enquête sur les experts de la participation*, Thèse de doctorat, Université de Lille2, Science Politique, Lille.

Offe C, 1997, *Les démocraties modernes à l'épreuve* (Textes réunis et présentés par Yves Sintomer and Didier Le Saout), Paris, L'Harmattan.

Parkinson J., 2006, *Deliberating in the real world: problems of legitimacy in deliberative democracy*, Oxford; New York, Oxford University Press.

Perrineau P., 2003, *Le désenchantement démocratique*, La Tour d'Aigues, L'Aube.

Pharr S. J. and Putnam R. D. (dir), 2000, *Disaffected democracies: what's troubling the trilateral countries?* Princeton, N.J., Princeton University Press.

Renaut A, 2004, *La fin de l'autorité*. Paris, Flammarion.

Revault d'Allones M, 2002, *Le dépérissement de la politique*. Paris, Flammarion.

- Rosanvallon P., 2006, *La contre-démocratie. Essai sur la société de défiance*, Paris, Seuil.
- Rui S., 2004, *La démocratie en débat: les citoyens face à l'action publique*, Paris, A. Colin.
- Salet W. G. M. and Gualini E., 2007, *Framing strategic urban projects: learning from current experiences in European urban regions*, Milton Park, Abingdon; New York, Routledge.
- Shah A., 2007, *Participatory budgeting*, Washington, D.C., World Bank.
- Sintomer Y. and De Maillard J., 2007. "The limits of local participation and deliberation in the French "Politique de la Ville"", *European Journal of Political Research*, p.
- Talpin J., 2006. "Jouer les bons citoyens", *Politix*, (75), p. 13-32.
- Tulchin J. S. and Ruthenburg M., 2007, *Citizenship in Latin America*, Boulder, Lynne Rienner Publishers.
- Vickers J. (dir), 1984, *Taking sex into account: the policy consequences of sexist research*, Ottawa, Carleton University Press.
- Walzer M, 2004, *Politics and Passion. Toward a More Egalitarian Liberalism*, New Haven & London, Yale University Press.