



POLS 829
Deliberative Democracy in Canada and Abroad: Theory & Practice
Fall 2015

INSTRUCTOR: Jonathan Rose
EMAIL ADDRESS: jonathan.rose@queensu.ca
OFFICE: Mackintosh-Corry C330
OFFICE PHONE: 613-533-6225
WEB PAGE: jonathanrose.ca
OFFICE HOURS: see <http://jonathanrose.ca/contact/>
CLASS TIME: Thursday 2:30 to 5:30 PM, Mackintosh-Corry B 313

Academic integrity comprises the five core fundamental values of honesty, trust, fairness, respect and responsibility (<http://www.academicintegrity.org/icai/home.php>). These values are central to the building, nurturing and sustaining of an academic community in which all members of the community will thrive. Adherence to the values expressed through academic integrity forms a foundation for the “freedom of inquiry and exchange of ideas” essential to the intellectual life of the University (see the Senate Report on Principles and Priorities). Students are responsible for familiarizing themselves with the regulations concerning academic integrity and for ensuring that their assignments conform to the principles of academic integrity. Information on academic integrity is available in the Arts and Science Calendar: see Academic Regulation 1 (<http://www.queensu.ca/artsci/academic-calendars/regulations/academic-regulations/regulation-1>) and from the instructor of this course. Departures from academic integrity include plagiarism, use of unauthorized materials, facilitation, forgery and falsification, and are antithetical to the development of an academic community at Queen’s. Given the seriousness of these matters, actions which contravene the regulation on academic integrity carry sanctions that can range from a warning or the loss of grades on an assignment to the failure of a course to a requirement to withdraw from the university.

Students are advised that incomplete standing will be granted only with the permission of the chair of undergraduate or graduate studies (as appropriate) and only where there is a clear demonstration of need. Applications for “Incomplete” standing must be made in the first instance to the instructor on the form available in the General Office. The simple fact of non-submission of work does not constitute an application and will result in a grade of zero for that assignment.

Students who feel that there are reasons to have their grades reviewed should follow the steps set out in the Faculty of Arts and Science’s Regulation 11, “Review of Grades and Examinations” (<http://www.queensu.ca/artsci/academic-calendars/regulations/academic-regulations/regulation-11>).

Copyright of Course Materials

This material is copyrighted and is for the sole use of students registered in this course. This material shall not be distributed or disseminated to anyone other than students registered in this course. Failure to abide by these conditions is a breach of copyright, and may also constitute a breach of academic integrity under the University Senate's Academic Integrity Policy Statement.

Students with Disabilities

Queen's University is committed to achieving full accessibility for persons with disabilities. Part of this commitment includes arranging academic accommodations for students with disabilities to ensure they have an equitable opportunity to participate in all of their academic activities. If you are a student with a disability and think you may need accommodations, you are strongly encouraged to contact the Queen's Student Accessibility Services (QSAS) office (formerly the Disability Services Office) and register as early as possible. For more information, including important deadlines, please visit the QSAS website at:

<http://www.queensu.ca/studentwellness/accessibility-services>

GRADING SCHEME:

All components of this course will receive letter grades which, for purposes of calculating your course average, will be translated into numerical equivalents using the Faculty of Arts and Science approved scale:

Arts & Science Letter Grade Input Scheme

Assignment mark	Numerical value for calculation of final mark
A+	93
A	87
A-	82
B+	78
B	75
B-	72
C+	68
C	65
C-	62
D+	58
D	55
D-	52
F48 (F+)	48
F24 (F)	24
F0 (0)	0

Your course average will then be converted to a final letter grade according to Queen's Official Grade Conversion Scale:

Queen's Official Grade Conversion Scale

Grade	Numerical Course Average (Range)
A+	90-100
A	85-89
A-	80-84
B+	77-79
B	73-76
B-	70-72
C+	67-69
C	63-66
C-	60-62
D+	57-59
D	53-56
D-	50-52
F	49 and below

Course Description

Deliberative democracy can be understood in a number of different ways but has at its core the increased role of the citizen in democratic governance. This role is premised on the ideal of a reasoning citizen and that better quality outcomes emerge from citizens at the centre of policy-making. There is a vast range of how we define increased citizen participation in policy-making and similarly, there is a wide range of how we might understand or measure the reasoning citizen. Many of the assumptions of deliberative democrats challenge traditional ideals of the capacity of the public and more specifically the public's ability to reason well. Are the assumptions of those twentieth century theorists who are sceptical of the public's ability wrong? Or is deliberative democracy an impossibility or perhaps even not desirable?

This course is divided into two sections. In the first half, we unpack the theoretical foundations of deliberative democracy and attempt to determine the core values of deliberative democrats. To what flaw does deliberative democracy respond? What are the *sine qua non* that make a successful deliberative experiment? Each week in our readings we will work towards creating criteria that define deliberative democracy. In the second half of the course we will apply these criteria to case studies both within Canada and elsewhere in an attempt to see how successful the case studies are based on the criteria that we have developed.

Students will write a paper on a case study of their choosing and assess it using the principles and criteria we have identified in the first half of the course. While all the readings are

available on-line through Stauffer or sent as a PDF, one book has been ordered that is an excellent introduction to some Canadian case studies:

Genevieve Fuji Johnson, *Democratic Illusion: Deliberative Democracy in Canadian Public Policy* (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 2015).

We will also rely on a second book as a ‘warm-up’ exercise for the beginning of each class. Copies of chapters will be provided:

Amy Gutmann and Dennis Thompson, *Democracy and Disagreement* (Boston: Harvard University Press, 1996)

Course Format:

The course will follow a deliberative model where all students will be encouraged to participate and learning will be collaborative. On the first day we will decide collectively the method of evaluation using the suite of traditional evaluative tools such as a research essay, article review, participation and/or presentation.

The Theoretical Foundations of Deliberative Democracy:

September 17

Introduction to the Course

There is no reading but we will learn about deliberative practices by doing deliberation. So, in this first class we will discuss evaluation and class format with the class collectively deciding the mode of the class, due dates and weighting of assignments.

TUESDAY, September 22 6 PM

What are the core elements of deliberative democracy?

Amy Gutmann & Dennis Thompson, *Democracy and Disagreement* (Boston: Harvard University Press, 1996), Introduction and Ch. 1, “The Persistence of Moral Disagreement”, 11-52. Hereafter referred to as Gutmann & Thompson.

Simone Chambers, “Deliberative Democratic Theory”, *Annual Review of Political Science*, 2003 (6) 307-26.

Amy Guttman & Dennis Thompson, *Why Deliberative Democracy?* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2004), Ch. 1, “What Deliberative Democracy Means”, 1-56.

Michael X. Carpini, Fay Lomax Cook & Lawrence Jacobs, “Public Deliberation, Discursive Participation and Citizen Engagement: A Review of the Empirical Literature”, *Annual Review of Political Science* 7 (2004), 315-44.

September 24

Principles of Deliberative Democracy (Andrew)

Guttmann & Thompson, Chapter 2, “The Sense of Reciprocity”, 52-95

Guttmann & Thompson, *Why Deliberative Democracy?*, Ch. 2, “Moral Conflict and Political Consensus”, 64-95 and Ch. 3, “Deliberative Democracy beyond Process”, 95-125

Genevieve Fuji Johnson, *Democratic Illusion: Deliberative Democracy in Canadian Public Policy* (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 2015), Ch. 1, “The Hope for and Illusion of Deliberative Democracy”, 3-24

October 1 (Ashley)

Citizens’ Competence

Guttmann & Thompson, Chapter 3, “The Value of Publicity”, 95-128

Claus Offe, “Micro-aspects of Democratic Theory: what makes for the Deliberative Competence of Citizens in Alex Hadenuys [ed.], *Democracy’s Victory and Crisis* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1997), 81-105.

The importance of Random Selection

Guttmann & Thompson, Chapter 4, “The Scope of Accountability”, 128-65

Oliver Dowlen, *Sorted: Civic Lotteries and the Future of Public Participation* (Toronto: MASS LBP, 2008). 37 page book available free from MASSLBP.

Jamie Griffin, Tarik Abdel-Monem, Alan Tomkins, Amanda Richardson & Stacia Jorgenson (2015), “Understanding Participant Representativeness in Deliberative Events: A Case Study Comparing Probability and Non-Probability Recruitment Strategies” in *Journal of Public Deliberation* (11:1), , 1-28.

Graham Smith, *Democratic Innovations: Designing Institutions for Citizen Participation* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2009), Ch. 3, “Mini-publics: Assemblies by Random Selection”, 72-111.

Lyn Carson & Brian Martin, *Random Selection in Politics* (New York: Praeger, 1999). This is a suggested resource.

The Practice of Deliberative Democracy

October 8

How does Deliberative Democracy Work in Practice?

Guttmann & Thompson, Chapter 5, “The Promise of Utilitarianism”, 165-99

Archon Fung, “Survey Article: Recipes for Public Spheres: Eight Institutional Design Choices and their Consequences”, *Journal of Public Philosophy* 11:3, 338-67

Mark Button and Kevin Mattson, “Deliberative Democracy in Practice: Challenges and Prospects for Civic Deliberation”, *Polity*, 31:4, 609-37.

Citizen Juries & Participatory Budgeting

Ned Crosby and Doug Nethercut, “Citizens Juries: Creating a Trustworthy Voice of the People” in John Gastil and Peter Levine, *The Deliberative Democracy Handbook* [eds.], (New York: Jossey Bass, 2005), 111-120

Lyn Carson, “Improving Public Deliberative Practice: A Comparative Analysis of Two Italian Citizens’ Jury Projects in 2006” *Journal of Public Deliberation* (2006) 2:1, 1-20.

The *Journal of Public Deliberation*, 8:2, (2012) has a special issue devoted to participatory budgeting. From this issue read Brian Wampler & Janette Hartzkarp, “Participatory Budgeting: Diffusion and Outcomes Across the World” 1-6. In addition, read one article from the “Theoretical Approaches and Founding Principles” and one from either “Global Diffusion” or “Adoption and Adaptation at the Global Level”

October 15 or October 22

No class

November 5

The Promise of Deliberative Polling

Guttmann & Thompson, Chapter 6, “The Constitution of Deliberative Democracy”, 199-230

James Fishkin and Cynthia Farrar, “Deliberative Polling: From Experiment to Community Resource” in John Gastil and Peter Levine, *The Deliberative Democracy Handbook* [eds.], (New York: Jossey Bass, 2005), 68-80

Who makes Decisions?

Amy Lang, “Agenda-setting in Deliberative Forums: Expert Influence and Citizen Autonomy in the British Columbia Citizens’ Assembly” in Mark Warren & Hilary Pearse, [eds.] *Designing Deliberative Democracy: The British Columbia Citizens’ Assembly*, (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2008), 85-106.

Patrick Fournier, Henk van der Kolk, R. Kenneth Carty, André Blais, Jonathan Rose, *When Citizens Decide: Lessons from Citizen Assemblies on Electoral Reform* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2011), Ch. 6, “Did the Participants Decide by Themselves?”, 94-113

November 12

Citizens’ Assemblies: Promises and Perils (Trevor)

Guttmann & Thompson, Chapter 7, “The Latitude of Liberty”, 230-273

Patrick Fournier, Henk van der Kolk, R. Kenneth Carty, André Blais, Jonathan Rose, *When Citizens Decide: Lessons from Citizen Assemblies on Electoral Reform* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2011), Ch. 1, “Power to the People?”, 1-21; Ch. 2, “Why Citizen Assemblies and How did they Work?”, 21-51

Dennis Thompson, “Who Should Govern Who Governs? The role of Citizens in Reforming the Electoral System” in Mark Warren & Hilary Pearse, [eds.] *Designing Deliberative Democracy: The British Columbia Citizens’ Assembly*, (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2008), 20-50.

André Blais, R. Kenneth Carty and Patrick Fournier, “Do Citizens’ Assemblies Make Reasoned Choices?” in *ibid.*, 127-45

November 19

Criticisms of Deliberative Models (Jacob)

Guttmann & Thompson, Chapter 8, “The Obligations of Welfare”, 273-307

Iris Marion Young, “Activist Challenges to Deliberative Democracy” *Political Theory*, 29:5 (2001), 670-90

Lynn M. Sanders, “Against Deliberation” *Political Theory*, 25:3 (1997), 347-76

James A. Gardner, “Shut up and Vote: A Critique of Deliberative Democracy and the Life of Talk, 63 *Tennessee Law Review* (1996), 421-51

Any two of the following three:

Susan Stokes, “Pathologies of Deliberation”, Jon Elster [ed.], *Deliberative Democracy* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1998), 123-40.

Adam Przeworski, “Deliberation and Ideological Domination” in *ibid.*, 140-61.

James Johnson, “Arguing For Deliberation: Some Skeptical Considerations” in *ibid.*, 161-85

November 26

Evaluating Deliberative Models (Patricia)

Guttmann & Thompson, Chapter 9, “The Ambiguity of Fair Opportunity”, 307-46 and Conclusion, 346-73.

Heather Pincock, “Does Deliberation Make Better Citizens?” in Tina Nabatchi, John Gastil, G. Michale Weiksner & Matt Leighninger, *Democracy in Motion: Evaluating the Practice and Impact of Civic Engagement* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2012), 135-63.

Bo Kinney, “Deliberation’s Contribution to Community Capacity Building” in *ibid.*, 163-181.

John Gastil, Katie Knobloch & Meghan Kelly, “Evaluating Deliberative Public Events and Projects” in *ibid.*, 205-33.

December 3 and TBA

Presentation of Case Studies

Course summation

In the final class we will leave some time for a roundtable discussion. We will examine the themes of the course and re-evaluate our criteria developed over the first half. This will be an opportunity to step back and examine some of the larger questions which might include the following:

Is deliberation possible?

Is deliberation desirable?

What are the conditions that lead to its success?

When does it fail?

What limitation does it respond to?