

GP: So, let's start with the basics. Could explain a little about the Deliberate Polling? In general lines.

JF: Sure. An ordinary poll shows what the people are thinking but they are usually not thinking very much for several reasons. They suffer from rational ignorance, one vote in millions. They have a vague impression of sound bites and headlines. There are a lot of forces in society that may be trying to manipulate the opinions with advertising and propaganda. If they apparently have opinions even in good polls those polls may be phantom opinions because they never like to say they don't know like the public affairs act of 1975 which people offered opinions about but it didn't exist. Also the opinions suffer from the effect that they have freedom they have choice they can go and talk only to the people they already know live in the neighborhoods they want live in and go to the websites they want go to. That may represent the viewpoints they may already agree with. People who tend to think like themselves. How do they ever get exposed to the other points of view. Or other points of view. So the DP is a poll of a population before and after its had a chance to really engage with the issues in good conditions: carefully developed briefing materials that represent different points of view that have been vetted by an extensive stakeholder adviser process that has cons and pros of the process and then small group discussions moderated by people who offer no hint of their own point of view but who facilitate a relatively equal discussion. And then questions developed in small groups to competing experts who offer their own rival points of view which can be weighed by the sample. No experts give speeches, they only respond to the people. And then in the end the people give their views in confidential questionnaires that relieves them from the social pressures of consensus, like in a jury, so that they can actually tell us what they really think. 2/3 or more of the questions we ever pose in DPs, we've done in 23 countries, about 70 projects, maybe a little more around the world, 2/3 or more of the opinions change significantly. So, the opinions at the end of the day when people have thought about are different from their initial top of the head sounds bites headlines from the beginning. So DP attempts to improve democracy in this way. I think democracy should be about the will of the people, but people have to have an opportunity in a genuine thoughtful way. The will of the people should not be the result of the manipulation, it should be the result a thoughtful way of the reasons for doing one thing or another. To do that people need a public space where they can get together and hear and discuss different points of view. Randomly assigned small groups with discussion extensive ones. One, two or more days. Where people discuss the issue in depth and describe what they come to really think. These considerate judgments. If we can make them consequential for public policy we will (re)connect the will of the people and the results. So the context should be a context where policy makers and decision makers should be actually interested in listening to the will of the people. Where the people in a representative and thoughtful ways can come to their conclusion. So it's a very simple ideology. But like many simple ideologies there a lot of complexities to making it work and to defending it and developing it, but that's the basic ideology. I think that in any place around the world where it can be developed it will add to legitimacy it will improve policy and will make citizens feel more empowered and more informed. So all of that should be good for democracy for the policy makers who gain legitimacy when they respond to the public will. So it is actually good for everybody. Of course every complicated policy has winners and losers. And in some policies there will be losers. But it should be good for the community as whole. And notice also that it can be done in any scale. Because you don't need a bigger sample or bigger population So it can be done locally, regionally, nationally or even internationally as you saw from EU project. So it's scalable, it's simple ideology. I wish I had thought of it. I thought I had thought of it but in fact the basic idea goes back to the ancient Athenians who was actually the centerpiece of their democracy and all of that was lost in the dust of history for centuries, 24 hundred years, but it was good idea. My job is to use modern social sciences and then define the context where it can be made an empowering factor for the people.

GP: Ok, so what would you say deliberative democracy actually is, you know, as compared to other forms of democracy. In the book, you talk about the trilemma of democratic reform. How would you compare it in this context.

JF: Well, DD emphasizes political equality and deliberation, that combination. And you see in the book I talk about other combinations: mass participation avoiding tyranny of the majority, these are important factors in democracy also. In fact, I think DD will also avoid tyranny of the majority b/c I think when people really deliberate on the merits they are very unlikely to take away the rights of other people. they are going to have very thoughtful responses, but that's an empirical question if it works out that way. The fear of the mob, the fear of tyranny of the majority was what led Madison and the American founder to a kind of elite deliberation by representatives, b/c they were afraid of the mischiefs of faction might take away the rights of others. The so-called Shays' rebellion in Massachusetts where angry farmers actually rebelled violently just before the constitutional convention. So fear of the mob has long been a problem of democracy. Also, fear of the people's/ fear of the mob is also a motivator in party competition democracy. Schumpeter who was the biggest advocate of it, you know, escaped from the Germans to America, and was very concerned that too much mass participation, b/c the public may do bad things. He thought that parties competing with campaign tactics, but he said it's, don't of think of that as the will of the people (I think, once you take away the will of the people... as a concern). He thought the parties would sell their campaigns/candidates the way ads agencies sell products. That's not deliberative or thoughtful. Campaign it's just win or win. So, in thickening (?) misleading the people doesn't matter. So I think democracy has to be about the will of the people so it's about deliberating. The rule of deliberating is weighing the competing arguments so without the will of the people democracy has lost its heart. That brings it alive. I think that if we create conditions where the people can think and form and decide what they really want to do considering all the competing reasons, and that's all we've been talking about, such a simple idea, we can make that consequential. Then we've restored an important part of democracy. So DD emphasis deliberation and political quality. PD emphasizes mass participation and political equality. But you can have mass participation without much deliberation at all, you can actually just have mobilizing groups who haven't really thought of the issues, but they want their solution. So mass participatory democracy is... some ppl think the more a legitimate the system is the more mass participation. But I want thoughtful deliberation by the people. The other form of democracy is deliberation by elites I think there's a great... it is in trouble in representative bodies b/c of enforced party discipline. and parties want to win elections. So a lot of the representatives I talked to don't really have a chance to deliberate b/c the party whips tell them what to do. The party say you have to vote this way ... . Madison envisioned representatives who would decide on the merits and a lot of modern representatives don't have that chance. So there may not be as much deliberation by representatives. The main forms of democracy are: party competition democracy, representative deliberation by elites, mass participatory democracy and deliberative democracy. And only DP has the merit that it represents the will of the people as determined by the ppl themselves. And so it's very hard to do that with all the people because all the people are not even paying attention but you can do it with a scientific sample and make it consequential.

F: Could emphasize a little more about participation, since it is so often put forward as a solution to democratic problems? What would you say that the drawbacks of the participatory model are.

JF: Well, the drawbacks of the parti... participation is an important democratic value.

F: I mean, in the book you talk about participatory distortion, in that sense.

JF: First, I want to say that participation is an important democratic value, I have no doubt about that. People will even learn with their participation. And the act of participation can be a kind of consent. But the question is that who participation. People who participate are just one mobilized group representing one POV. Then they don't speak of the whole comm. they just speak for that perspective and that is participatory distortion. The only perfect way to get out of participatory distortion is to have a random sample that is therefore undistorted b/c is a representative sample. One of the things I believe in a lot of participatory mechanisms is that people are often mobilized to support a predetermined conclusion. Mobilized to go to the meeting to make that the streets in our neighborhood or paved. These are all worthy goals but it's not deliberative democracy that's participatory democracy. And how does that compare to the streets of other parts of the city being paved and what the need for those are and which other public services are most urgent. That ought to be deliberated about for the pros and cons of all the needs but when people are mobilized just get this kind of result they don't want to listen to the other results, b/c they have been told to the public meeting and participate in that in order to get that result for that place. So PD has a lot of merit but the limits is that it doesn't represent the whole comm. and it may be more about mobilization than deliberation.

F: So, Brazilian political debate is widely seen as very polarized, and in the book you talk about single-peakedness. And I wanted you to comment on how do you think your research can contribute to this scenario.

JF: Look, the two diff. things. Polarization and this problem that you mentioned single-peakedness. Polarization: all over the world there seems to be increasing polarization among party elites and to some degree among the people themselves. Among the ppl themselves to a lesser degree prob. b/c changes in the media/ social media, cable news, talk radio and highly selected and misleading media sources and the loss of what is called the inadvertent exposure, that is, if everybody is watching the same general news cast then when you tune in you would be exposed to things you haven't chosen to be exposed to. You can go exactly to the stories you want. So the people may be more polarized then they were, and the parties are more polarized, and this applies in so many countries. Now, one of the things we found if you take a random sample of the ppl they are more open to discussion and less polarized than the organized groups they speak for. I really noticed this in Northern Ireland where the groups that spoke for the Protestants and the Catholics were highly rigid, but the ppl themselves, if you have a random sample, even though they had sort of the same views, they were much more open to discussing them and they were able to move together in some ways. So, I think that DP is a plausible response to polarization. The organized groups are always worried that the most extreme people will criticize or topple them, stray it all, you see. But the people aren't running for office, the people just want to actually solve the issues, so they are much more open-minded.

Now, the single-peakedness, let me tell you what that is about. This is a slightly technical discussion, and the technical discussion is if there is an issue for which there more than two choices, if there are three choices, then it's possible to have cycles. The Marquis de Condorcet discovered this in the XVIIIth century. It was generalized in the Arrow Possibility Theorem in the XXth century, for which he won a Nobel Prize. It's a possibility that applies to democracies everywhere as a theoretical challenges, but it depends as theoretical challenge on the distribution of opinions. If there's a pattern about the preferences which Duncan Black called single-peakedness it is that if there is an underlying dimension along which you can array the preferences, whatever your first choices along that dimension, your choice about the other solutions will depend on how far from that choice. If you are way on the left you will first prefer the first on the left then the next closest and vice-versa. If you are way on the way you

will want the closest to the middle. But if you have a pattern where there more than two peaks, then you can get these reversals, the voting can go back from A to B, to C and back to A again. So, if you have this underlying dimension so that you can guarantee there's no cycles why the cycles important? They undermine democracy you think that public support should say if  $A > B$ ,  $B > C$ , then  $A > C$ , but suppose that's not the case and you can go round and round you can manipulate the outcome, then you can manipulate the agenda., so it's very disturbing. It's transitivity as a fundamental thing, if it is the other way around it becomes very confusing and it democracy seems to lose its rationale. The will of the people seems to be meaningless. Well, I have colleagues who have become famous for talking about how the cycles are just covered up by the fact it's called structure induced equilibrium, we don't give people three choices, we give them two to take a simple example. You vote in referendum, it's yes or no. You have two parties, you don't really have three parties (then you can't have a cycle). **The rules of Congress (get or don't) manipulated, so there are only two choices.** So that therefore the secret vulnerability of democracy is these cycles, so we covered it up and nobody ever notices. There have been some studies that say, well, the cycles aren't as near as prevalent as that and that is not going to happen. Another thing we have discovered: is that when ppl deliberate together they develop the underlying dimension that makes the cycle impossible. They come to a shared understanding, but about what the issues are (a basic understanding). Any underlying dimension. Electrical utility in Texas. Cheapest v. greenest v. in between. Properties of diff. choices after discussion there was this underlying dimension and ppl may organize their preferences along this dimension so the cycles become impossible. Example of how deliberation protect the coherence of democracy against the threat of the cycles. How prevalent they actually are is a big empirical debate. Sure protection is the single-peakedness that has been proven for 30 years, and one thing that brings about that is deliberation.

F: Let me just wrap this up: what do you think the effects of deliberative polling are in general manner?

JF: It makes democracy more meaningful b/c it connects the public choices to the will of the people. By doing so it closes the gap bet. public decisions and the public who have to live with the decisions, and that creates legitimacy, which is one of the things that are lacking. Trust and legitimacy. Parliaments have records low approval rates around the world. I'm sure that all over Brazil is the same as around the world. It's b/c ppl don't think that gvts are not delivering the essential benefits that they think gvt should provide as part of the social contract. Need to close this gap ppl - decision. Deliberative democracy is the practical method to do that. Also, I think that it makes better citizens b/c the citizens who participate continue their interest in knowing how to improve society and so. You get better policy (from the perspective of the citizens); more legitimacy; a system that delivers trust and legitimacy.