Political Participation and Deliberation
One-day Workshop

15 August 2013, 9.00 am- 5.00pm
ANZSOG Institute for Governance
Building 23, Level B, Room 5, University of Canberra
For further inquiries, please contact: selen.ercan@canberra.edu.au

9.00- 9.15 Welcome and Introduction

9.15- 10.45 SESSION 1: Enacting deliberation in forum and beyond
Chair: Dr Michael Jensen
Prof John Dryzek (ANU), Democratizing Global Climate Governance: A Deliberative Systems Approach
Dr Lain Dare (ANZSIG), Prof Jacki Schirmer (UC) and Dr Selen Ercan (ANZSIG), The Tasmanian forest peace process: A critique from a deliberative democracy lens
Dr Ian O’Flynn (Newcastle University, UK), Public Deliberation, Network Analysis and the Political Integration of Muslims in Britain

10.45- 11.00 Coffee Break

11.00- 12.45 SESSION 2: Alternative forms of political participation
Chair: Assoc. Prof Paul Fawcett
Prof David Marsh (ANZSIG), Overview of the literature
Prof Henrik Bang (ANZSIG), The Revolt of the Everyday
Dr Sadiya Akram (ANZSIG), Revolting Everyday Makers
Mr Max Halupka (ANZSIG), Clicktivism: Legitimising the Political Act

12.45 - 1.45 Lunch at Retro Café (participants need to pay for their own lunch)
1.45- 3.30  **SESSION 3: Assessing and improving democratic quality**

Chair: Dr Selen Ercan

Dr Nicole Curato (ANU) Deliberative capacity as indicator of democratic quality

Prof Mark Evans (ANZSIG) Towards Quality Public Participation

Dr Dugald Monra (ANZSIG) Small Things in Small Places: Grass Roots Consultation and Participation in Local Government

3.30- 3.45  **Coffee Break**

3.45- 5.00  **SESSION 4: Lessons, challenges and the way forward**

Brief comments from all participants and discussion led by Prof David Marsh

7.00-  **Workshop Dinner at La Posada (Civic)**

All participants are cordially invited to go to the dinner. Please note that the Institute is unable to sponsor this event and as such participants will need to pay for their own dinner.
Abstracts

Prof John Dryzek (ANU) Democratizing Global Climate Governance: A Deliberative Systems Approach (paper co-authored with Dr Hayley Stevenson)

Climate change presents a large, complex, and seemingly intractable set of problems that are unprecedented in their scope and severity. Given that climate change is generated and experienced globally (as well as locally), effective global governance would seem absolutely necessary to its resolution. Yet the kind of global governance we currently have so far seems unable to craft effective responses on anything like the time scale required. A further complication is that questions of legitimacy are just as important as those of effectiveness, and in today’s world, legitimacy increasingly means democratic legitimacy. We argue that a solution to these twin challenges can be found in deliberative democracy. This paper reports on a study in which used a deliberative systems approach to evaluate the legitimacy of existing climate governance and consider potential options for democratisation. The paper will justify the value of a deliberative systems approach; summarize the major findings of this study; and clarify the important role for civil society in improving the democratic legitimacy of global climate governance.

Dr Lain Dare and Dr Jacki Schirmer (UC) The Tasmanian forest peace process: A critique from a deliberative democracy lens (paper co-authored with Dr Selen Ercan)

The management of Tasmania’s forests is one of Australia’s most prominent environmental conflicts. Decades of contention regarding Tasmanian forest management has resulted in several attempts for peace, the most recent being the ‘forest peace process’ which culminated in the Tasmanian Forest Agreement (TFA). After three years of negotiation the Agreement has still not brought peace to the forests. Ongoing debate regarding the social and economic impacts of the TFA, and failures in the Agreement development process is continuing in Tasmanian parliament. This paper aims to evaluate the achievements and pitfalls of this process from a perspective of deliberative democracy. We focus on this perspective for two particular reasons. First, the deliberative perspective promises a way of achieving democratically legitimate outcomes even in the face of toughest disagreements and value conflicts. As such, it offers a suitable framework to analyse the ongoing debate over the management of forests in Tasmania. Second, by shifting the focus from outcome to the actual process of participatory processes, the deliberative perspective allows us to recognize the positive features of the forest peace process. We argue that despite the lack of resolution to conflict, the Tasmanian forest peace process illustrates the possibility of generating collective action in the face of deep value conflicts and the capacity for bottom-up driven initiatives to affect policy change. An analysis of the Tasmanian forest peace process from a perspective of deliberative democracy helps us to understand what went wrong in the process and how future processes could be designed to overcome these problems. These insights in turn
inform deliberative theory and provide key learning on deliberative democracy practices including practical limitations and benefits.

Dr Ian O’Flynn (Newcastle University, UK), Public Deliberation, Network Analysis and the Political Integration of Muslims in Britain (paper co-authored with Dr Manlio Cinalli)

In this paper, we examine the assumption that, insofar as actors deliberate well, political integration will follow. We do so specifically with respect to the political integration of Muslims in the field of ethnic relations in Britain, using data retrieved from two quality British broadsheets. Our approach has two components. First, we consider the quality of the deliberative interventions actors make, comparing Muslim actors with other actors. Second, we use measures drawn from network analysis to assess the level of political integration as indicated by the ties that those deliberative interventions forge. Our findings show that the link between how Muslim actors deliberate and their political integration in the field is more complex than one might assume. Although Muslims do not deliberate as well as normative deliberative theory says they should, empirically they are politically integrated, having forged diverse relationships that avoid the danger of polarisation.

Prof Henrik Bang (ANZSIG), The Revolt of the Everyday

The notion of the Everyday Maker has gained some ground in political sociology and political science as an exemplar of a new, local, informal, lowly organized, ad hoc and ‘hit’ and ‘run’ kind of participation that connects reflexive individuals in various projects online as well as offline, often proceeding ‘below the radar’ of those participating in ‘big’ politics whether as ‘insiders’ (such as formal authorities and political parties) or as ‘outsiders’ (such as ‘big’ social movements and voluntary associations). Today, however, everyday making seems on the rise nearly everywhere as ‘ordinary’ political beings’ rebellion against the increasing professionalization of political life as mediatized politics, celebrity politics, a negotiated economy, new public management, policy deliberation by the ‘vanguard’ and more. New movements such as Occupy Wall Street, the Arab Street, and the Turkish revolting against authoritarian trends suggest that Everyday Making is neither new nor reserved for connective reflexive individuals. Rather it has its origin in a political action community composed of laypeople who ‘can’, ‘will’ and ‘know’ how to ‘make a difference’ at all levels from the local to the global. Everyday makers do not see themselves as ‘outsiders.’ They situate themselves right inside ‘the political’ as co-constituents of the ways policies are collectively articulated and performed for society. Their insistence of doing small and big things together in virtue of one’s reciprocal acceptance and recognition of difference is worthy of much more explicit attention from established researchers and policy makers. It challenges the dominant view that ‘experts always know best’. It is also represents quite an untapped resource for easing the contemporary tension between interest politics and sustainable policy by creating new spaces for a political lay-engagement which is not just duty driven or influence oriented.
Dr Sadiya Akram (ANZSIG), Revolting Everyday Makers

This paper argues that rioters are politically motivated actors who have real political grievances. Further, I argue that the de-politicisation of rioting is intimately related to the atheoretical nature of much of the literature in this field. Through a discussion of the rioter in the extant literature, I suggest that this literature fluctuates between normative and empirical accounts of rioting and that much of it is overtly value-laden. Important shifts are identified in this literature, most notably a move away from conceptualising rioting in terms of a ‘crowd mind’, towards an understanding, which acknowledges the importance of context. There has also been a move towards agency in this literature, which acknowledges the political grievances of rioters, yet both of these issues remain underdeveloped.

Mr Max Halupka (ANZSIG), Clicktivism: Legitimising the Political Act

The development of collaborative Web 2.0 applications, more user-friendly graphical user interfaces (GUI), and the proliferation of cheap internet capable technologies have helped the internet emerge as a driving force in engagement. In this, a growing trend in acts of impulsive political participation, often classified as either clicktivism or slacktivism, has taken root as the predominant means of online engagement. These acts have largely been marginalised by the extant literature, and as a result, ignored within the wider participatory debate. This article seeks to legitimise clicktivism as a political act through the development of a systematic heuristic. In addition to this, the article explores the continued popularity of clicktivism through an analysis of three different positions: a narrative of success; moral balancing and solidarity; and a project oriented identity. This analysis highlights the significance of clicktivism in relation to the wider political participation literature. As such, the article outlines the role of clicktivism in furthering the debate on observed declines in formal avenues for civic engagement.

Dr Nicole Curato (ANU), Deliberative Capacity as Indicator of Democratic Quality

The theory and practice of democracy have moved on from the paradigm of electoral democracy to conceptualising alternative models that can facilitate democratic deepening in different contexts. Methodology should follow too. In this piece, I build on Leandro Morlino’s framework which takes a step towards a pluralised assessment of democratic qualities but remains largely hinged on the electoral model of democracy. I suggest that Morlino’s heuristic tools can be further sharpened by incorporating a deliberative democratic criterion. I provide an empirical illustration through the Philippine case – a country that already exhibits formal features of electoral democracy but fails to translate democratic impulses to democratic deepening.
Prof Mark Evans (ANZSIG), Towards Quality Public Participation

This paper proceeds from quite a simple observation; although participation has become an essential ingredient in public policy decision-making and delivery in Europe, the problems of participation in practice are not widely understood. It therefore conducts a meta-analysis of leading participatory practices in Europe to identify the ingredients of quality participation. It argues that public participation which recognizes the importance of design and the need to share power can radically improve the quality of democratic life. It can contribute to creating more active citizens, help in the management of complex problems in public service design and delivery, foster new collaborative relationships required for 21st century governance, and develop political literacy, skills, confidence, and ambition in the citizenry.

Dr Dugald Monro (ANZSIG), Small Things in Small Places: Grass Roots Consultation and Participation in Local Government

Community participation in local government has received considerable attention in recent years. In Australia this has arisen for three reasons; the adoption of a governance approach to local governments, a desire for participatory democracy, and the amalgamation of councils leading to a reduction in local area representation. This presentation reports on a project currently underway that examines existing participation arrangements in one municipality. The project includes interviews with Councillors and members of the local community consultative bodies (CCBs) that are a feature of consultation arrangements in the municipality. The main reason given by participants for interest in participation is that of representation, especially for small communities. The current elected Council structure does not by itself enable local issues in all of the 49 distinct communities in the Municipality to be placed on the agenda. A high proportion of issues considered by the Community Consultative Bodies (CCBs) are local, such as roads, footpaths and cycleways, and the state of the grass on the local oval. The importance of such small issues was stressed by both Councillors and CCBs. Participants considered CCBs to be reasonably effective in representing communities on these issues. However this type of structure raises issues for participation for other reasons than local representation and for consideration of broader rather than local issues. Criticisms of such approaches include doubts about how representative such bodies are, and that they encourage narrow sectional interests rather than the good of the community as a whole. This presentation considers the validity of these criticisms for the municipality under study and concludes that they are partially, but not entirely, justified. If small communities are to receive effective representation, CCBs, or some similar structure, will be required. The challenge, currently being considered in the Municipality, is how to improve the broader consultation and participation arrangements while retaining effective representation of small communities.