

Edyta Sokalska

Uniwersytet Warmińsko-Mazurski w Olsztynie
ORCID: 0000-0003-0903-7726

**SEARCHING FOR A NEW FORMULA OF A STATE:
INTERNATIONAL DISCOURSE ON DELIBERATIVE
DEMOCRACY****Introduction**

The idea of civil society might be taken into closer consideration in a variety of contexts. The issue of civil society has become a fundamental element of the modern discussion on well governed state. International discourse searches for the appropriate forms of institutionalization corresponding to its essence. The importance of the subject matter became part of the transformation of the post communist regimes that were characterized by the distinctive dichotomy between a society and a state¹, as well as the European integration process, where the idea of civil society was reflected in formal and legal subjectivity of individuals².

The purpose of the activities of civil society is self-organization, which reflects the citizen's subjectivity and human dignity. Different understanding of civil society results from different perception of the relationship between an individual and the society, and the role of a state and its connections with varied social groups that act publicly. It should be taken into closer consideration that civil society assumes the active participation of citizens in public life directly or via some established institutions in order to promote and manifest the own interests and values, which are independent of the state institutions. Civil society fulfils itself in the conditions of the functioning of some autonomous social insti-

¹ A. Arato, *The Rise, Decline and Reconstruction of the Concept of Civil Society, and Directions for Future Research* [in:] *Civil Society, Political Society, Democracy*, eds. A. Bibic, G. Graziano, Lubljana 1994, p. 10.

² R. Kania, M. Kazimierzczuk, *Wstęp* [in:] *Spółeczeństwo obywatelskie. Historia, teoria, praktyka*, eds. R. Kania, M. Kazimierzczuk, Warszawa 2021, p. 9. For more about the historical development of the idea of civil society, see: M. Kazimierzczuk, *Ewolucja pojęcia idei społeczeństwa obywatelskiego* [in:] *Spółeczeństwo obywatelskie. Historia, teoria, praktyka*, eds. R. Kania, M. Kazimierzczuk, Warszawa 2021, pp. 14–30.

tutions, which are not controlled centrally by the state authorities. It is significant that self-government is an expression of civil society, and it is also an indication of the decentralization of modern public administration. It might be also perceived as the local form of organization of state structure that serves the realization of public interest, which goes beyond the local interest³.

It is significant that the idea of civil society has become one of the most important premises of deliberative (participatory) democracy. Social participation and strong civil society are unquestionable part of modern administration of the public sphere. The question concerning the best model of democracy is still present in the international political and scientific discourse.

The development of deliberative democracy has aroused curiosity concerning the instruments and forms that promote effective participation and deliberation in the field of local self-government and other areas. It is significant that 'participation' is a multidimensional term. Social participation might be understood as taking part of residents in collective actions and projects arising from the use of the resources of a given area, oriented at meeting the needs of people living there. Social participation can also be considered a method or effect, but then we ask how participation and its products shape the human being.

It is worth to emphasize that social participation is also linked to the notion of participation at the local level, which in turn determines the awareness of the civil society manifesting civil activity. On the other hand, civil activity consists in joint and conscious articulation, implementation and defense of interests, its needs or aspirations of a social group by its members. In the case of civil (social) participation, it is a phenomenon consisting in the participation of the community of inhabitants of a given town, commune, district, region, and even state in identifying and solving common needs and problems. The concept includes all manifestations of organizing or associating people who aim to satisfy their material and non-material needs, as well as the inclusion of people who carry out public tasks by governmental or local government authorities⁴.

The worldwide literature concerning the development of deliberative democracy and social participation is impressive. The representatives of science strive to answer the question how to make political authority legitimate. It should be taken into account that the publications of J.S. Dryzek⁵ and

³ E. Sokalska, *Challenges of the Polish local self-government in the context of the development of the civil society*, „Studia Politologiczne” 2020, No. 5, pp. 135–136.

⁴ J. Kacperska-Michota, *Partycypacja społeczna jako sposób wypowiedzi społeczeństwa obywatelskiego* [in:] *Spółeczeństwo obywatelskie. Historia, teoria, praktyka*, eds. R. Kania, M. Kazimierzczuk, Warszawa 2021, p. 241.

⁵ J.S. Dryzek, *Deliberative Democracy and Beyond: Liberals, Critics, Contestations*, New York 2000; *idem*, *Deliberative Global Politics: Discourse and Democracy in a Divided World*, Cambridge 2006; *idem*, *Democratic Political Theory* [in:] *Handbook of Political Theory*, eds.

J.S. Fishkin⁶ influenced the scientific and social perception of the phenomenon. The value of communication in a community as a sphere, in which an individual citizen has the opportunity to engage in common values and maximize the agreement through communication, was highlighted by such eminent philosophers as J. Rawls⁷ and J. Habermas⁸.

The purpose of the article is to present the European experience concerning the development of deliberative democracy. The main questions the present study strives to answer are: In what directions has the international scientific discourse on deliberative democracy developed? What shortcomings of this form of government are diagnosed at the local level in the context of the experience of European countries? In the first part of the article, an overview of some global trends relating to the evolution of deliberative democracy will be presented. The shortcomings of the deliberative system identified in the context of international research will be considered in the second part of the publication. In this particular study, the comparative and formal-dogmatic methods were applied to address the research questions and then, to reach some conclusions. Unfortunately, since the modest scope of the article does not allow for an exhaustive treatment of the subject, the present work is contributory in nature.

International debate on the directions of deliberative democracy

It can be observed that during a thirty-year worldwide debate on the development of deliberative democracy, any unified ‘school’ or current were established⁹. In line with the development of the discourse, it was becoming more internally diverse. Advocates of deliberative democracy differ when answering the question of what kind of communication is conceived as deliberative, where and at which level deliberation should take place, who should participate in de-

G.F. Gaus, Ch. Kukathas, London 2004; *idem*, *Democratization as Deliberative Capacity Building*, „Comparative Political Studies” 2009, Vol. 42(11), pp. 1379–1402.

⁶ J.S. Fishkin, *The Voice of the People: Public Opinion and Democracy*, New Haven 1995; *idem*, *Democracy and Deliberation: New Directions for Democratic Reform*, New Haven 1993; *idem*, *When the People Speak. Deliberative Democracy and Public Consultations*, New York 2011.

⁷ J. Rawls, *A Theory of Justice. Revised Edition*, Oxford–New York 1999.

⁸ J. Habermas, *The Theory of Communicative Action*, Vol. I: *Reason and the Rationalization of Society*, Beacon Press, Boston 1984; *idem*, *Political Communication in Media Society: Does Democracy Still Enjoy an Epistemic Dimension? The Impact of Normative Theory on Empirical Research*, „Communication Theory” 2006, Vol. 16(4), pp. 411–426.

⁹ About the term and development of deliberative democracy, see more: E. Sokalska, *Deliberative democracy in the time of crisis: participatory instruments at the local level and their limitations (some remarks)*, „Journal of Modern Science” 2020, Vol. 2(45), pp. 227–230.

liberation and how. They also present different points of view on the expected outcomes of deliberation¹⁰.

Although there is some overlap in certain solutions, methodologies, and tools, several stages can be identified in the deliberative democracy discourse. The first generation of explorers of deliberative democracy were concerned with the normative theory. J. Habermas highlighted the legitimacy of collective decisions through the discursive character of their decision-making procedures. In his early works, J.S. Dryzek presented a radical concept of discursive democracy allowing for a transnational or supra-state view on democracy. The considerations of J. Cohen also fall within the above current¹¹. Something that was common to this current it was the articulation of the need to push forward deliberative democracy on a mass scale, and the preference for a vision of deliberative democracy formed normatively, something that had not actually been possible on a mass scale before.

The second generation of scholars was concerned with defining deliberation more broadly in order to consequently create a model more 'sensitive' to the heterogeneity, pluralism, and complexity of contemporary democracies¹². Their field of interest included the requirement of rational arguments and consensus in deliberation, which consequently brought deliberative democracy theory closer to other issues related to multiculturalism, environmental politics, or feminism¹³. Representatives of the second generation raised issues of potential inequalities during discourse, and the possibility of instrumentalization or strategic use of deliberation by its influential participants. In this way, deliberation brought deliberative democracy closer to the real world of dilemmas and conflicts, while giving deliberation a more practical meaning and making it more 'mature'.

Unlike their predecessors, the third generation of participants of the scientific discourse on deliberative democracy does not shy away from detailed institutional designs and empirical analysis of deliberative practices. The research on institutional mechanisms in order to develop actual deliberation is promoted. Within this current, there are theories more oriented towards practical solutions,

¹⁰ See also Polish subject related literature presented: E. Sokalska, *W poszukiwaniu idealnej formuły państwa: blaski i cienie demokracji deliberatywnej na poziomie lokalnym (wybrane uwagi)* [in:] *Spółczesność obywatelska. Historia, teoria, praktyka*, eds. R. Kania, M. Kazimierczuk, Warszawa 2021, pp. 208–211; *eadem, Flaws and Advantages of the Polish Local Self-Government in the 21st Century: Social Consultations at the Local Level*, „Lex Localis” 2021, Vol. 19, No. 1, pp. 19–37.

¹¹ J. Cohen, *Deliberation and Democratic Legitimacy* [in:] *The Good Polity: Normative Analysis of the State*, eds. A. Hamlin, P. Pettit, Oxford 1989, pp. 17–35.

¹² The works of M. Deavaux (*A Deliberative Approach to Conflicts of Culture*, „Political Theory” 2003, Vol. 31(6), pp. 780–807) or the letter works of J.S. Dryzek (*Deliberative Democracy...*) might be mentioned here.

¹³ S. Elstub, *The Third Generation of Deliberative Democracy*, „Political Studies Review” 2010, Vol. 8(3), p. 298.

namely the design of deliberative institutions and their empirical analysis. Therefore, a large part of the literature is devoted to various participatory practices, e.g. participatory budgets.

Noteworthy is the approach proposed by J.S. Fishkin in a 1995 publication, where he presents the idea of so-called deliberative pools, i.e. a representative sample of citizens from a given area, such as those living in an administrative unit, to participate in deliberating on a particular problem or project¹⁴. Fishkin's proposal initiated a debate on the promotion of deliberative practices through small community groups (mini-publics), while at the same time, looking for a suitable method to systematically study the deliberation process and identify the required parameters of institutional arrangements. A micro rather than macro approach to deliberation can be identified here. The objects of exploration are small communities and institutions removed from the wider discursive environment in which they operate¹⁵. Nevertheless, it has become necessary to return to a holistic concept of deliberative systems, and the need to perceive the deliberation not just as isolated, local practices but as coherent macro-scale activities.

In recent years, the concept of a deliberative system, where deliberation is conceived as communication occurring in multiple, sometimes partly overlapping spaces, where the need for interaction between these spheres is emphasised, has gained renewed importance. In this respect, deliberation is not confined only to the forum interested in structure, which was the focus of the scholarly community's reflections on deliberative democracy in the 1990s, and defined by J.S. Dryzek as the 'deliberative turn'¹⁶.

The growing range of literature on deliberative systems reflects the degree of interest in the above issue¹⁷. The works deal with both the practical application of deliberative elements and theoretical considerations of proposed solutions in order to increase the representativeness of citizens, to involve them more broadly in the decision-making process at various levels, and to increase the legitimacy of taken decisions. The actions following this direction pave the way for a new conceptualisation of the interaction between public opinion and the 'decision-making moments' of deliberation¹⁸.

In addition to the values in terms of theoretical solutions, the deliberative system approach also provides new methods in the study of the practice of deliberation in contemporary democratic systems, and it provides some original an-

¹⁴ J.S. Fishkin, *The Voice of the People...*, *passim*.

¹⁵ S. Chambers, *Rhetoric and Public Sphere: Has Deliberative Democracy Abandoned Mass Democracy?*, „Political Theory” 2009, Vol. 37(3), pp. 323–350.

¹⁶ J.S. Dryzek, *Deliberative Democracy...*, *passim*.

¹⁷ H.K. Perna, *Deliberative future visioning: utilizing democracy theory and practice in futures research*, „European Journal of Futures Research” 2017, Vol. 5(3), pp. 23.

¹⁸ S. Elstub, S. Ercan, R.F. Mendonça, *The Fourth Generation of Deliberative Democracy*, „Critical Policy Studies” 2016, Vol. 10(2), p. 140.

swers to questions such as how to analyse and explore the relationship between mini-communities and the wider community, how to identify connections and information transfer in different fields of deliberative activity, or what standards there should be applied when assessing the deliberative values of the system as a whole. Besides some practical and conceptual references to deliberative systems, scientific reflection also pays attention to some potential problems of deliberation, and it raises momentous questions that need to be addressed at the level of contemporary developments¹⁹. Currently, the international scientific discourse is evolving towards the interest in the relationship between constituent elements and a holistic deliberative system, perspectives on the institutionalisation of deliberative systems and methodological difficulties for empirical analysis²⁰.

A research symposium “Deliberative Systems in Theory and Practice” on identifying contemporary deliberative systems resulted in the publication of *Deliberative Systems in Theory and Practice*²¹ and a series of articles in a scientific journal “Critical Policy Studies”. S. Elstub (School of Geography, Politics and Sociology, Newcastle University), S. Ercan (Institute of Governance and Policy Analysis, University of Canberra) and R.F. Mendonça (Department of Political Science, Federal University of Minas Gerais) are of the opinion that a new phase of deliberative democrats’ interest in deliberative system design is taking place today. Although it requires more in-depth theoretical considerations and empirical research, the systems approach to deliberative democracy promotes a new way of thinking about public deliberation.

Political scientists suggest that inclinations towards both theoretical and practical research herald the fourth generation of deliberative democracy²². This new research approach is linked to the so-called ‘systemic turn’²³, which consists of three factors that can be considered important in the development process of deliberative democracy: the search for opportunities to develop and promote deliberation on a mass scale; the growing interest in the division of tasks and activities between participants within the system; the introduction of a certain continuum to the criterion of deliberation linking the multiplicity of institutions and the processes that occur between them. Contemporary manifested emphasis on these three elements makes it possible to distinguish the representatives of the fourth generation of deliberative democracy from previous currents.

¹⁹ S.A. Ercan, C.M. Hendriks, J. Boswell, *Studying Public Deliberation after the Systemic Turn: The Crucial Role of Interpretative Research*, „Policy and Politics” 2015, pp. 2–3.

²⁰ For further reading, see: S.A. Ercan, J.S. Dryzek, *The Reach of Deliberative Democracy*, „Policy Studies” 2015, Vol. 36(3), pp. 241–248.

²¹ S. Elstub, S. Ercan, R.F. Mendonça, *Deliberative Systems in Theory and Practice*, Routledge 2019.

²² S. Elstub, S. Ercan, R.F. Mendonça, *The Fourth Generation...*, p. 139.

²³ *Ibidem*, p. 143.

The conviction of the need to secure the operation of deliberative democratic norms on a mass scale, and the recognition of the need for broader discourse structures to achieve this goal is a clear feature of the new systems approach demonstrating the departure from third-generation thought, where emphasis was placed on promoting democratic deliberation at the micro level, which ultimately highlighted a certain deficit of isolated small communities²⁴. Hence, the new systems approach seeks connections between micro-communities, institutions, and planes more broadly. To understand the ‘modus operandi’ of deliberative systems, both spatial and temporal dimensions should be taken into account. Different participants in deliberative processes have different qualities and skills, but also certain limitations, e.g. in terms of professional knowledge. The formal as well as the informal background or setting of the deliberation should be taken into account simultaneously during the discourse. The tasks during deliberation should be appropriately distributed among the participants.

It is significant that such distribution will enable a holistic approach to deliberation. The integrated model of deliberation (micro, macro, and hybrid forum, formal and informal debates) will ensure its effectiveness²⁵. In conclusion, participants of the discourse on deliberative democracy, who can be described as fourth generation, propose a systems approach, seeing potential in addressing theoretical as well as empirical problems of deliberative practice. They emphasize the need for empirical research that contradicts the claim that components of society that do not participate in deliberation can perform important systemic functions more effectively than participants in deliberative processes. Hence, it becomes a challenge to investigate and consider what criteria should be adopted, and how deliberation should be carried out at the broad (central, state-wide) level, so that the activities are to some extent compatible, and at the same time constitute a continuum of activities undertaken at the micro (local community) level.

Deficiencies of deliberation in the context of international experience

Proponents of deliberative democracy see the creation of situations, in which citizens are given the opportunity in a debate or other form of deliberation to influence political decisions, as a field for reaching consensus on important social issues. Participants in deliberation are able to undertake such actions that contribute to the broader legitimacy of political decisions through various forms of social and civil dialogue, through free debate, during which

²⁴ S. Chambers, *Deliberation and Mass Democracy* [in:] *Deliberative Systems – Deliberative Democracy at the Large Scale*, eds. J. Parkinson, J. Mansbridge, Cambridge 2012, p. 54.

²⁵ See more: C.M. Hendriks, *The Politics of Public Deliberation: Citizen Engagement and Public Advocacy*, New York 2011, *passim*.

positions that differ even significantly from each other can be presented, while emphasising that even if full consensus cannot be reached on a topic, at least areas of controversy will be accurately identified. It will be advantageous in the context of their future identification. Therefore, among the benefits of deliberative democracy might be identified: the increased legitimacy of collective decisions, as decisions are based on a broad and comprehensible discussion among citizens, and they will consequently be more valued and respected; the multifaceted consideration of a given issue; the opportunity to learn the positions of different parties; the minimisation of citizen divisions due to the perception of issues in a broader context and the transcending of particular interests of individual social groups and individuals²⁶. By the mutual process of getting to know the parties of the deliberation, hostile relations characterised by mutual dislike resulting from a lack of trust and knowledge of the other party are eliminated. At the same time, the deliberation process promotes the formation of partnerships between groups and forces pursuing often diverse policies.

In addition to the above-mentioned benefits of deliberative politics, it should also be noted that the process of increasing involvement of citizens and their organisations in decision-making processes also has positive effects for the state administration itself. Social organisations and citizens define important social problems and reflect on ways of solving them, thus providing detailed information that can have a strong influence on the government's final decisions. In their guide to participation, D. Długosz and J.J. Wygnański list six outcomes for the government that participation brings: the better information of the social environment about its plans; the better understanding of citizens' needs, thus a chance to better meet them through a more accurately addressed supply of public services; the more precise definition of priorities and the better allocation of the resources at hand; quick information about emerging problems before they grow to a significant size; the drawing up of a 'map' or profile of the public problem that one wants to solve; the more reliable justification and support for the actions of public authorities²⁷.

Deliberative democracy, together with its tools, is nowadays also subjected to critical analysis. In the discourse on deliberative democracy, its shortcomings and deficiencies as well as its potential dangers are pointed out. Długosz and

²⁶ Cf. A. Bua, E. Escobar, *Participatory-Deliberative Process and Public Agendas: Lessons for Policy and Practice*, „Policy Design and Practice” 2018, Vol. 1(2), p. 131; H.K. Perna, *Deliberative future...*, pp. 1–2; A. Lupia, A. Norton, *Inequality is Always in the Room: Language & Power in Deliberative Democracy*, „Dædalus. Journal of the American Academy of Arts & Sciences. The Prospects and Limits of Deliberative Democracy” 2017, Vol. 146(3), p. 64.

²⁷ D. Długosz, J.J. Wygnański, *Obywatele współdecydują. Przewodnik po partycypacji społecznej*, Warszawa 2005, pp. 12, 14.

Wygnański are of the opinion that citizen participation in decision-making is neither easy nor cheap, and it faces many problems: the lack of public knowledge about the programmes being implemented; the slowness of decision-making procedures associated with the involvement of many actors; the representation by officials of the interests of a narrow clientele rather than the general interest, partisan lobbying instead of a broad social debate; the dependence of offices on ‘discursive’ partners. In certain situations, therefore, participation in making the right decision should be limited rather than encouraged²⁸.

J.L. Fernández-Martínez (Instituto de Estudios Sociales Avanzados-Consejo Superior de Investigaciones Científicas, Córdoba), P. García-Espín (Universidad de Granada) and M. Jiménez-Sánchez (Universidad Pablo de Olavide, Sevilla) in their article *Participatory Frustration: The Unintended Cultural Effect of Local Democratic Innovation* put forward the opinion that most studies on participatory processes highlight only the positive sides of deliberation in the context of the relationship between public authorities and civil society²⁹. Departing from the so-called ‘Albert Hirschman cycle’, which is a diagnosis of fluctuations in the American political system, stating that since the industrial revolution American society has undergone regular cycles of interest or inclination towards either private interest or the public good³⁰, the researchers identify four reasons leading to frustration at the involvement of citizens in institutional participatory processes. They identify them as: exaggerated expectations of participants in the deliberation process; failures in the practical application of projects undertaken; low effectiveness of deliberation in the context of solutions adopted; lack of logical continuation of courses of action previously undertaken, both at the micro and macro levels.

With the increasing popularity of participatory practices in Europe, the development of deliberative practices at the local level in Spain has been gaining momentum for the past two decades. The authors studied the development of participatory activities at the local level in six Spanish urban areas (the case study included three participatory budgets and three advisory councils). In many cases, citizens’ initial involvement in the deliberation process depended on whether the projects under consideration were, in their perception, worthwhile and whether, in the final perspective, their participation could result in tangible

²⁸ *Ibidem*, p. 14. See also other Polish subject related literature, e.g. *Dialog obywatelski: formy, mechanizmy, bariery i perspektywy rozwoju*, eds. M.M. Sienkiewicz, M. Sidor, Lublin 2014; *Prawo a partycypacja publiczna. Bilans monitoringu 2012*, ed. P. Sobiesiak-Penszko, Warszawa 2013.

²⁹ J.L. Fernández-Martínez, P. García-Espín, M. Jiménez-Sánchez, *Participatory Frustration: The Unintended Cultural Effect of Local Democratic Innovations*, „Administration & Society” 2019, pp. 1–31.

³⁰ A.O. Hirschman, *Shifting Involvements: Private Interest and Public Action*, Princeton 1982, *passim*.

solutions that were beneficial to them. ‘Participatory frustration’, which resulted as a consequence of their activity, was revealed as a result of the lack of harmony between the initial expectations of the deliberation participants and the final actions of the local administration. The qualitative researchers, identifying participatory frustration, raised dissatisfaction, disappointment, discouragement, irritation or insufficiency visible as a consequence of their social action as its relevant attributes with regard to the participants in the participation. In some cases, the lack of prior experience of the participants was perceived to imply expectations that were detached from reality. Other reasons for participatory frustration were also pointed out, such as a lack of detailed knowledge and incompleteness of information on the issues under consideration, a belief that the requirements of the participants in public consultations would be fully acceptable, a sense of illusory and marginal influence on the decisions of the local administration or a lack of decision-making dynamics.

B. Cross from Wuhan University, in his article *Deliberative Systems Theory and Activism*, reflects on the thesis that sometimes appears in political science publications that activism (social, individual or institutional) is not well regarded in deliberative democracies³¹. Deliberative democracies are faced with the dilemma of whether to restrict the activities of activists (demonstrations, protests or happenings), which will consequently exacerbate conflicts, or to neutralise their actions through normative solutions. Cross is of the opinion that the deliberative system in its essence is nevertheless able to solve this problem. By focusing on the quality of deliberation at the macro level, the deliberative system does not require that activists are constrained or have to act only through deliberative techniques. On the contrary, he puts forward the thesis that non-deliberative methods can enhance the quality of deliberation by being improved through the inclusion of new tools. Demonstrations or street demonstrations are capable of generating more public attentiveness than traditional tools beneficial to the deliberative system. The inclusion of this type of activity in the deliberative system may thus prove to be a pathway towards minimising the discrepancy between deliberative democracy and activism³².

It should be taken into consideration that J.S. Dryzek is also of the opinion that non-deliberative methods should complement the deliberative system. He makes use of the term ‘systemic test’. In his perception, the systemic test requires that other than deliberative tools should play some instrumental part in order to rationalize the realization of deliberative democracy purposes³³.

³¹ B. Cross, *Deliberative systems theory and activism*, „Critical Review of International and Political Philosophy” 2019, 26 February, pp. 1–18.

³² *Ibidem*, p. 2.

³³ J.S. Dryzek, *Foundations and Frontiers...*, *passim*.

K. Ahlstrom-Vij (University of London) in his article *Why Deliberative Democracy is (Still) Untenable* argues that although deliberative democracy and the idea of social participation are very attractive from the point of view of democratic decision-making and its social legitimacy, there are also objections gathered around the conviction that deliberative democracy is a majority democracy, and that the majority is often incompetent in matters of governance or decision-making and politically ignorant³⁴. Even if a part of the uninformed on a given issue are instructed and educated, the result of deliberation will still show that those taking part in deliberation generally duplicate the opinions or position of the majority. Ahlstrom-Vij defines a phenomenon he calls ‘widespread incompetence’, when deliberating citizens ‘take on’ the ignorance and lack of knowledge of others on a given issue, acquiescing to the decisions of the incompetent majority³⁵. In the perception of S. Chambers (University of Toronto), deliberative democracy fosters the development of citizens’ competence³⁶.

One of the identified disadvantages of deliberation is that deliberation undermines the competitiveness of proposed policy agendas. In addition, institutions that should work to support and promote deliberation are easily filled with people with over-inflated preferences on issues. Deliberation is merely a backdrop for the negotiation of solutions favourable to them³⁷.

N. Curato (University of Canberra), M. Hammond (Keele University) and J.B. Min (College of Southern Nevada) do not prejudge whether deliberative democracy is an influential and inspiring or a weak political project that does not fully correspond to countering the crisis of representative democracy. They are of the opinion that this type of democracy offers the possibility of confronting clashing different forms of coercive power³⁸. I. Shapiro (Yale University) opts for the thesis that, although agreements through deliberation seem to be unattainable, deliberation supports and intensifies the motivation for different social and political parties to work together to reach a preferred consensus. Citizens in deliberative democracies are better informed about local issues that directly affect them, and decisions made through deliberation are of ‘higher quality’³⁹. Some of

³⁴ K. Ahlstrom-Vij, *Why Deliberative Democracy is (Still) Untenable*, „Public Affairs Quarterly” 2012, Vol. 26(3), pp. 199–220.

³⁵ *Ibidem*, p. 199.

³⁶ S. Chambers, *Human Life is Group Life: Deliberative Democracy for Realists. Critical Review*, „A Journal of Politics and Society” 2018, Vol. 30(1–20), pp. 36–48.

³⁷ I. Shapiro, *Collusion in Restraint of Democracy: Against Political Deliberation*, „Dædalus. Journal of the American Academy of Arts & Sciences. The Prospects and Limits of Deliberative Democracy” 2017, Vol. 146(3), p. 77.

³⁸ N. Curato, M. Hammond, J.B. Min, *Power in Deliberative Democracy. Norms, Forums, Systems*, Palgrave Macmillan 2019, p. v–vi.

³⁹ I. Shapiro, *Collusion in Restraint...*, p. 77.

those conducting research on the transformation of representative democracy into deliberative democracy emphasize the psychological mechanisms during deliberation, when social preferences may be re-evaluated, and group identities may change in the deliberative participants⁴⁰.

Concluding remarks

Dissatisfaction with the current form of democracy stimulates research to improve it. The existing mechanisms of democracy have not proved to be reliable enough to be continued without any modernization. The ‘deliberative turn’ in a democratic state presupposes a model of civil society, where, through various forms of social activity, citizens aware of their rights participate not only in social discourse, but have a real impact on the directions of state policy at both central and local levels. Social consultations other forms of dialogue have become the basic form of dialogue here. Social participation has been treated differently according to individual approaches, and it has become a part of public life. Thanks to different methods and tools of social participation, the legitimacy of the actions of local and central authorities might be strengthened. Experimental forms of social participation have undoubtedly become one of the reasons for the popularity of deliberative democracy. The turn towards deliberation was linked to the belief in the possibility of a wider participation of citizens in the democratic decision-making process.

The contemporary research approach to deliberative democracy referred to as the ‘systemic turn’ exposes three factors: the search for opportunities to develop and promote deliberation on a mass scale; the emphasis on the division of tasks and activities among participants within the system; the introduction of a certain continuum to the criterion of deliberation linking the multiplicity of institutions and the processes that occur among them. It is significant that many researchers confirm that thanks to deliberative methods and tools, the legitimacy of local government activities is strengthened. Identified shortcomings of deliberative democracy at the local level (potential institutional neutralization of activists’ activities, participatory frustration or widespread incompetence of citizens participating in deliberation) have become contribution to the discussion on the further directions of development of this form as well as possibilities for its improvement.

⁴⁰ L.M. Batalha, S. Niemeyer, J.S. Dryzek, J. Gastil, *Psychological Mechanisms of Deliberative Transformation: The Role of Group Identity*, „Journal of Public Deliberation” 2019, Vol. 15(1), pp. 1–20.

Bibliography

- Ahlstrom-Vij K., *Why Deliberative Democracy is (Still) Untenable*, „Public Affairs Quarterly” 2012, Vol. 26(3).
- Arato A., *The Rise, Decline and Reconstruction of the Concept of Civil Society, and Directions for Future Research* [in:] *Civil Society, Political Society, Democracy*, eds. A. Bibic, G. Graziano, Lubljana 1994.
- Batalha L.M., Niemeyer S., Dryzek J.S., Gastil J., *Psychological Mechanisms of Deliberative Transformation: The Role of Group Identity*, „Journal of Public Deliberation” 2019, Vol. 15(1).
- Bua A., Escobar E., *Participatory-Deliberative Process and Public Agendas: Lessons for Policy and Practice*, „Policy Design and Practice” 2018, Vol. 1(2).
- Chambers S., *Deliberation and Mass Democracy* [in:] *Deliberative Systems – Deliberative Democracy at the Large Scale*, eds. J. Parkinson, J. Mansbridge, Cambridge 2012.
- Chambers S., *Human Life is Group Life: Deliberative Democracy for Realists*, *Critical Review*, „A Journal of Politics and Society” 2018, Vol. 30(1–20).
- Chambers S., *Rhetoric and Public Sphere: Has Deliberative Democracy Abandoned Mass Democracy?*, „Political Theory” 2009, Vol. 37(3).
- Cohen J., *Deliberation and Democratic Legitimacy* [in:] *The Good Polity: Normative Analysis of the State*, eds. A. Hamlin, P. Pettit, Oxford 1989.
- Cross B., *Deliberative systems theory and activism*, „Critical Review of International and Political Philosophy” 2019, 26 February.
- Curato N., Hammond M., Min J.B., *Power in Deliberative Democracy. Norms, Forums, Systems*, Palgrave Macmillan 2019.
- Deveaux M., *A Deliberative Approach to Conflicts of Culture*, „Political Theory” 2003, Vol. 31(6).
- Dialog obywatelski: formy, mechanizmy, bariery i perspektywy rozwoju*, eds. M.M. Sienkiewicz, M. Sidor, Lublin 2014.
- Długosz D., Wygański J.J., *Obywatele współdecydują. Przewodnik po partycypacji społecznej*, Warszawa 2005.
- Dryzek J. S., *Foundations and Frontiers of Deliberative Democracy*, Oxford 2010.
- Dryzek J.S., *Deliberative Democracy and Beyond: Liberals, Critics, Contestations*, New York 2000.
- Dryzek J.S., *Deliberative Global Politics: Discourse and Democracy in a Divided World*, Cambridge 2006.
- Dryzek J.S., *Democratic Political Theory* [in:] *Handbook of Political Theory*, eds. G.F. Gaus, Ch. Kukathas, London 2004.
- Dryzek J.S., *Democratization as Deliberative Capacity Building*, „Comparative Political Studies” 2009, Vol. 42(11).
- Elstub S., Ercan S., Mendonça R.F., *Deliberative Systems in Theory and Practice*, Routledge 2019.
- Elstub S., Ercan S., Mendonça R.F., *The Fourth Generation of Deliberative Democracy*, „Critical Policy Studies” 2016, Vol. 10(2).
- Elstub S., *The Third Generation of Deliberative Democracy*, „Political Studies Review” 2010, Vol. 8(3).
- Ercan S.A., Dryzek J.S., *The Reach of Deliberative Democracy*, „Policy Studies” 2015, Vol. 36(3).
- Ercan S.A., Hendriks C.M., Boswell J., *Studying Public Deliberation after the Systemic Turn: The Crucial Role of Interpretative Research*, „Policy and Politics” 2015.
- Fernández-Martínez J.L., García-Espín P., Jiménez-Sánchez M., *Participatory Frustration: The Unintended Cultural Effect of Local Democratic Innovations*, „Administration & Society” 2019.

- Fishkin J.S., *Democracy and Deliberation: New Directions for Democratic Reform*, New Haven 1993.
- Fishkin J.S., *The Voice of the People: Public Opinion and Democracy*, New Haven 1995.
- Fishkin J.S., *When the People Speak. Deliberative Democracy and Public Consultations*, New York 2011.
- Habermas J., *Faktyczność i obowiązywanie* [in:] *Teoria dyskursu wobec zagadnień demokratycznego państwa prawnego*, Warszawa 2005.
- Habermas J., *The Theory of Communicative Action*, Vol. I: *Reason and the Rationalization of Society*, Boston 1984.
- Habermas J., *Political Communication in Media Society: Does Democracy Still Enjoy an Epistemic Dimension? The Impact of Normative Theory on Empirical Research*, „Communication Theory” 2006, Vol. 16(4).
- Hendriks C.M., *The Politics of Public Deliberation: Citizen Engagement and Public Advocacy*, New York 2011.
- Hirschman A.O., *Shifting Involvements: Private Interest and Public Action*, Princeton 1982.
- Kacperska-Michota J., *Partycypacja społeczna jako sposób wypowiedzi społeczeństwa obywatelskiego* [in:] *Spoleczeństwo obywatelskie. Historia, teoria, praktyka*, eds. R. Kania, M. Kazimierczuk, Warszawa 2021.
- Kania R., Kazimierczuk M., *Wstęp* [in:] *Spoleczeństwo obywatelskie. Historia, teoria, praktyka*, eds. R. Kania, M. Kazimierczuk, Warszawa 2021.
- Lupia A., Norton A., *Inequality is Always in the Rom: Language & Power in Deliberative Democracy*, „Dædalus. Journal of the American Academy of Arts & Sciences. The Prospects and Limits of Deliberative Democracy” 2017, Vol. 146(3).
- Perna H.K., *Deliberative future visioning: utilizing democracy theory and practice in futures research*, „European Journal of Futures Research” 2017, Vol. 5(3).
- Prawo a partycypacja publiczna. Bilans monitoringu 2012*, ed. P. Sobiesiak-Penszko, Warszawa 2013.
- Rawls J., *A Theory of Justice. Revised Edition*, Oxford–New York 1999.
- Shapiro I., *Collusion in Restraint of Democracy: Against Political Deliberation*, „Dædalus. Journal of the American Academy of Arts & Sciences. The Prospects and Limits of Deliberative Democracy” 2017, vol. 146(3).
- Sokalska E., *Challenges of the Polish local self-government in the context of the development of the civil society*, „Studia Politologiczne” 2020, Vol. 57.
- Sokalska E., *Deliberative democracy in the time of crisis: participatory instruments at the local level and their limitations (some remarks)*, „Journal of Modern Science” 2020, Vol. 2(45).
- Sokalska E., *W poszukiwaniu idealnej formuły państwa: blaski i cienie demokracji deliberatywnej na poziomie lokalnym (wybrane uwagi)* [in:] *Spoleczeństwo obywatelskie. Historia, teoria, praktyka*, eds. R. Kania, M. Kazimierczuk, Warszawa 2021.
- Sokalska, E., *Flaws and Advantages of the Polish Local Self-Government in the 21st Century: Social Consultations at the Local Level*, „Lex Localis” 2021, Vol. 19, No. 1.
- Spoleczeństwo obywatelskie. Historia, teoria, praktyka*, eds. R. Kania, M. Kazimierczuk, Warszawa 2021.

Summary

The idea of civil society has become one of the most important premises of deliberative democracy. The question concerning the best model of democracy is still present in the international political and scientific discourse. The contemporary research approach to deliberative democracy

referred to as the 'systemic turn' exposes three factors: the search for opportunities to develop and promote deliberation on a mass scale; the emphasis on the division of tasks and activities among participants within the system; the introduction of a certain continuum to the criterion of deliberation linking the multiplicity of institutions and the processes that occur among them. It is significant that many researchers confirm that thanks to deliberative methods and tools, the legitimacy of local government activities is strengthened. Identified shortcomings of deliberative democracy at the local level (potential institutional neutralization of activists' activities, participatory frustration or widespread incompetence of citizens participating in deliberation) have become contribution to the discussion on the further directions of development of this form as well as possibilities for its improvement.

Keywords: deliberative democracy, deliberation, social participation, civil society, legitimization

W POSZUKIWANIU NOWEJ FORMUŁY PAŃSTWA: DYSKURS MIĘDZYNARODOWY NAD DEMOKRACJĄ DELIBERATYWNĄ

Streszczenie

Idea społeczeństwa obywatelskiego stała się jedną z najważniejszych przesłanek demokracji deliberatywnej. Pytanie dotyczące najlepszego modelu demokracji jest wciąż obecne w międzynarodowym dyskursie politycznym i naukowym. Współczesne podejście badawcze do demokracji deliberatywnej, określane jako „zwrot systemowy”, eksponuje trzy czynniki: poszukiwanie możliwości rozwoju i promocji deliberacji w skali masowej; nacisk na podział zadań i działań pomiędzy uczestników w ramach systemu; wprowadzenie pewnego kontinuum do kryterium deliberacji łączącego wielość instytucji i procesów, które wśród nich zachodzą. Znamienne jest, że wielu badaczy potwierdza, że dzięki metodom i narzędziom deliberacyjnym wzmacnia się legitymizacja działań samorządu terytorialnego. Zidentyfikowane mankamenty demokracji deliberatywnej na poziomie lokalnym (potencjalna instytucjonalna neutralizacja działań aktywistów, frustracja partycypacyjna czy powszechna niekompetencja obywateli uczestniczących w deliberacji) stały się przyczynkiem do dyskusji nad dalszymi kierunkami rozwoju tej formy, a także możliwościami jej doskonalenia.

Słowa kluczowe: demokracja deliberatywna, deliberacja, partycypacja społeczna, społeczeństwo obywatelskie, legitymizacja