

## **David Kahane**

I'm still wishing for an intelligible map of the intersections and divergences between conflict resolution and deliberative democracy, in theory and practice. I suspect cross-fertilization between the fields would be much helped by a clearer sense -- however provisional -- of how each field characterizes itself (including its key internal complexities and contests) in connection with key questions raised in the meeting (e.g. who needs to be at the table, legitimacy, institutionalization). I definitely had thoughts on this terrain-sketching from the DD side, and suspect that others could take a good stab at it from the DR side.

I continue to be intrigued by the widely varying degrees of confidence, on both the DD and the DR sides, in how well certain favored methods of participant selection (e.g. statistical sampling, conflict assessment) can achieve representative fairness, and/or normative process legitimacy. Or to describe it from the other side, I'm intrigued by how some people in both the DD and DR communities are much more focused on the persistence and inevitability of exclusion and remainders than are others.

I wish we'd had more time to explore pragmatic concerns about acknowledging the necessary injustice of DD and DR processes, together with the endlessly recursive quality of deliberation. (The idea that "Inevitable Injustice Associates" might not get much CR work.) How can openness of process, and awareness of the persistent question of exclusion, be built into DD and DR processes while still allowing these to meet the needs of sponsors, and the requirements of efficiency/implementability? (I think it can be done....)

I was fascinated of discussions around stakeholder vs. 'unaffiliated citizen' involvement, and around the pragmatic and principled arguments for each. I also found myself promoting the possible advantages of stakeholder-based processes for enabling voice for marginalized groups --something I hadn't formulated before, and need to think about further.

I come away with the sense that the key political challenge facing both communities is this (and here I think I'm building on something Michael said): How can we help to foster the public space and capacity needed to sustain the long-term, internally complex deliberative processes required to meet a range of challenges, including those of social justice.

Finally, I dearly hope that we will be able to find ways of building on this weekend's meeting, perhaps even with another gathering of DD and DR researchers and practitioners. If we do plan another meeting (and I'd be pleased to be part of this planning), we might aim to include a great deal more geographical diversity, which I think would reconfigure discussions in very fruitful ways.