

Jim Fishkin

a) The overall conference had a dual, but modest imperfection if it was conceived as a full-blown dialogue between deliberative democracy and dispute resolution people. One of the other participants counted an imbalance of 20 dispute resolution people compared to six DD participants (hereafter I will use DR for Dispute Resolution and DD for Deliberative Democracy). As we all know, it matters greatly who is in the room. If one is greatly outnumbered it has a big effect on the implicit appearance of consensus and willingness to make points that go against it. With this crowd, this was not fatal, but it was a noticeable defect. Secondly, you included critics of DD but no critics of DR. So the set up was once again imbalanced. I know that some people did not show but I am not aware that any of them were critics of DR.

b) Your opening comments set up a fine frame for discussion. However, they did not, from my point of view, represent DD accurately at all. Three of your four points did not apply to our Deliberative Polling work. And the fourth did not apply to most other DD work. More specifically:

1. Deliberative Polling requires the use of neutral moderators for the small group discussions and the plenary sessions.
2. Deliberative Polling employs an advisory committee of stakeholders who supervise the briefing materials, the questionnaire, the agenda for the weekend, the choice of experts
3. Deliberative Polling is concerned, wherever possible with implementability. Our energy projects and the China projects (there are now more in planning) both exemplify implementability.
4. The DD literature mostly positions itself as aiming at consensus. This is part of the reason why it aims to replace voting (aggregative democracy) with consensus via deliberative democracy. My own work is an outlier in this respect in that while consensus is desirably, I work hard to collect opinions confidentially so that social pressure does not produce false consensus. But see my critique of Shapiro (sent earlier) who is taking the literature as it stands. Mansbridge played a role in framing the issue this way in *Beyond Adversary Democracy*. I think you will also find the contrast between aggregative and deliberative democracy mentioned in Cohen and in Gutmann and Thompson.

c) One of my key concerns is with who is doing the deliberating. Hence I found much of the discussion in which Lukensmeyer's America Speaks model was lumped with Deliberative Polling to be misleading. Both Dan Yankelovich and I employ random sampling. She employs self-selected samples (often recruited with an 800 number). I thought David Boher's comment was on point when he noted that a self selected sample can be packed by organized interests.

d) I thought that the panel I was on was framed (unintentionally) in such a way that it ruled out my concerns with DD. It moved from DD to "national level consensus building." It is posed in terms of an agreement among elites. While there is reference to involving the public in the first sentence, none of the questions about how the public might be involved are discussed in any of the prompts. But to us in the DD world, this is

a key question. Deliberative democracy is not a dialogue among elites; it engages the public. That is what makes it democracy rather than just deliberation.

e) The format of the conference did not permit enough of a sustained discussion of the different models that traffic under the banner deliberative democracy. Very different efforts and institutions were clumped together as if they were the same thing. Many have severe defects, from my standpoint, not just in terms of the recruitment of participants, but in how information is provided, how dialogue is sustained, how results are produced, how some connection to the policy process is nurtured. Hence I think we just began to scratch the surface of this discussion.

f) Also we could have benefited from a more robust discussion of the strategies for connecting a dialogue among the people to the policy or political process. In our own work, there is the role of the media, connections to referenda and elections, connections to a regulatory process, connections to actual government decision making (as in China), possibly the connections to commissions (conceived as an alternative to public hearings). We just scratched the surface again of the variety of possibilities.

g) On the other hand, I think it is clear that there are many possible synergies between DD and DR. I hope there will be more occasions to nurture this discussion. Congratulations on successfully holding the first of its kind.