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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Aggregative (Majority rule)</th>
<th>Extra-aggregative (Deliberative)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Indirect</strong></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Representative)</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Direct</strong></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Participatory)</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Overview

1. Aggregation  
   a) Sortition

2. Extra-aggregation  
   a) Deliberation  
   b) Testimony

3. Summing-up
Lottery

- Everyone votes; one vote selected at random wins
  - NOT: equal opportunity for each individual to influence
  - NOT: equal outcome/satisfaction for each individual/group
  - RATHER: proportional opportunity for each view to be decisive

- Aristotle/Montesquieu: positions requiring ...
  - a) ... good sense and basic commitment to justice
    - Open to all, selected by lottery
  - b) ... “special talents”
    - Filled by the few, selected by election
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Legitimate procedures</th>
<th>FOR</th>
<th>AGAINST</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Minorities have a chance</td>
<td>If tiny minority wins, then is this fair to majority?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Desirable outcomes</td>
<td>Even majority have incentive to persuade others</td>
<td>What if extremist wins?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Equality versus proportionality

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Participation</th>
<th>Equal</th>
<th>Proportionate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Opportunity</td>
<td>Majority rule</td>
<td>Voting by estates</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Majority rule</td>
<td>Lottery</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>with no entrenched minorities</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outcomes</td>
<td>Majority rule</td>
<td>PR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>with no entrenched majority</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Overview

1. Aggregation
   a) Sortition

2. Extra-aggregation
   a) Deliberation
   b) Testimony

3. Summing-up
James Fishkin’s model of deliberative democracy

Political equality:

➢ Equal consideration of everyone’s preferences

Five features of good deliberation:

1. Informed – arguments supported by facts
2. Balanced – argument and counter-argument
3. Conscientious – participants willing to talk and listen
4. Substantive – judge arguments, not speakers
5. Comprehensive – all (significant) arguments heard
Joshua Cohen’s model of deliberative democracy

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Formal</th>
<th>Substantive</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(1) Continuity</td>
<td>(1) Common good</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(2) Legitimacy</td>
<td>(2) Individual autonomy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(3) Pluralism</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(4) Publicity</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(5) Capacity</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Joshua Cohen’s model of deliberative democracy

‘outcomes are democratically legitimate if and only if they could be the object of a free and reasoned agreement among equals’

1. Participants’ views:
   - regard each other as equals

2. Participants’ aims:
   - present considerations others have reason to accept, assuming fact of reasonable pluralism

3. Participants’ dispositions:
   - willing to listen to considerations proposed by others; willing to cooperate and act on results of deliberation
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Procedure</th>
<th>Aggregative democracy</th>
<th>Deliberative democracy - Fishkin</th>
<th>Deliberative democracy - Cohen</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cast votes</td>
<td>Make arguments, then cast votes</td>
<td>Give reasons, then cast votes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>One’s own preferences/beliefs</td>
<td>One’s own considered preferences/beliefs</td>
<td>Public reasons</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bargaining</td>
<td>Public discussion</td>
<td>Public reasoning</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Three sets of arguments against deliberation

1. Realism – feasibility?
2. Social choice theory – rationality?
3. Feminism – equality?
Four arguments against deliberation

1. **Aims**: find common voice
   - **Prob**: suppresses critical voices

2. **Content**: abstract ‘public’ reasons
   - **Prob**: excludes concrete identities/experiences

3. **Talking**: privileges some kinds of talk
   - **Prob**: excludes other kinds (e.g. “impassioned”)

4. **Dialogue**: adversarial/competition
   - **Prob**: aim to win debate, not to understand others’ personal perspectives
Dynamics of group deliberations

The effect of status hierarchies on juries:

1. Selection of foreperson
   - Speak first, sit at head of the table, claim experience

2. Which views accepted
   - Talkative promoter (quantity, not quality, of talking)

3. Style of discussion
   - Verdict-centred v. evidence-centred

4. Aims
   - Pressures of conformity
   - Fixed attitudes (e.g. conviction-prone)
James Fishkin’s model of deliberative democracy

Political equality:
- Equal consideration of everyone’s preferences

Five features of good deliberation:
1. Informed – arguments supported by facts
2. Balanced – argument and counter-argument
3. Conscientious – participants willing to talk and listen
4. Substantive – judge arguments, not speakers
5. Comprehensive – all (significant) arguments heard
### Alternative modes of political communication

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Deliberation</th>
<th>Testimony/Storytelling</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Points of view</strong></td>
<td>“Shared” world</td>
<td>Different worlds</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Goals</strong></td>
<td>Common voice</td>
<td>Critical voices</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Language</strong></td>
<td>“Rational”</td>
<td>Passionate</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Summing-up

The problem
- How should democracy be organised, to ensure all citizens participate as equals?

Three proposals
1. Aggregation
   - Count everybody’s vote
2. Deliberation
   - Listen to public reasons
3. Testimony
   - Listen to everybody’s story