



## *Critical Elitism*

Democracies have a problem with expertise. Expert knowledge both mediates and facilitates public apprehension of problems, yet it also threatens to exclude the public from consequential judgments and decisions located in technical domains. This book asks: How can we have inclusion without collapsing the very concept of expertise? How can public judgment be engaged in expert practices in a way that does not reduce to populism? Drawing on deliberative democratic theory and social studies of science, ‘Critical Elitism’ argues that expert authority depends ultimately on the exercise of public judgment in a context in which there are live possibilities for protest, opposition and scrutiny. This account points to new ways of looking at the role of civil society, expert institutions, and democratic innovations in the constitution of expert authority within democratic systems. Using the example of climate science, ‘critical elitism’ highlights not only the risks but also the benefits of contesting expertise.

ALFRED MOORE is a research fellow at Cambridge University, at the Centre for Research in Arts, Humanities and Social Sciences. He has published in a wide range of journals, including Political Studies, Critical Review, the Journal of Political Philosophy, Episteme, Economy and Society, and Public Understanding of Science, among others.

## THEORIES OF INSTITUTIONAL DESIGN

## SERIES EDITOR

Robert E. Goodin  
*Research School of Social Sciences*  
*Australian National University*

## ADVISORY EDITORS

Russell Hardin, Carole Pateman, Barry Weingast, Claus Offe,  
Susan Rose-Ackerman, Keith Dowding, Jeremy Waldron

Social scientists have rediscovered institutions. They have been increasingly concerned with the myriad ways in which social and political institutions shape the patterns of individual interactions which produce social phenomena. They are equally concerned with the ways in which those institutions emerge from such interactions.

This series is devoted to the exploration of the more normative aspects of these issues. What makes one set of institutions better than another? How, if at all, might we move from the less desirable set of institutions to a more desirable set? Alongside the questions of what institutions we would design, if we were designing them afresh, are pragmatic questions of how we can best get from here to there: from our present institutions to new revitalized ones.

Theories of Institutional Design is insistently multidisciplinary and interdisciplinary, both in the institutions on which it focuses and in the methodologies used to study them. There are interesting sociological questions to be asked about legal institutions, interesting legal questions to be asked about economic institutions, and interesting social, economic, and legal questions to be asked about political institutions. By juxtaposing these approaches in print, this series aims to enrich normative discourse surrounding important issues of designing and redesigning, shaping and reshaping the social, political, and economic institutions of contemporary society.

*Other Books in the Series*

Brent Fisse and John Braithwaite, *Corporations, Crime and Accountability*

Robert E. Goodin (editor), *The Theory of Institutional Design*

Itai Sened, *The Political Institution of Private Property*

Mark Bovens, *The Quest for Responsibility: Accountability and Citizenship in Complex Organisations*

Bo Rothstein, *Just Institutions Matter: The Moral and Political Logic of the Universal Welfare State*

Jon Elster, Claus Offe, and Ulrich K. Preuss, *Institutional Design in Post-Communist Societies: Rebuilding the Ship at Sea*

Adrienne Héritier, *Policy-Making and Diversity in Europe: Escape from Deadlock*

Geoffrey Brennan and Alan Hamlin, *Democratic Devices and Desires*

Eric M. Patashnik, *Putting Trust in the US Budget: Federal Trust Funds and the Politics of Commitment*

Benjamin Reilly, *Democracy in Divided Societies: Electoral Engineering for Conflict Management*

John S. Dryzek and Leslie Templeman Holmes, *Post-Communist Democratization: Political Discourses Across Thirteen Countries*

Huib Pellikaan and Robert J. van der Veen, *Environmental Dilemmas and Policy Design*

Maarten A. Hajer and Hendrik Wagenaar (editors), *Deliberative Policy Analysis: Understanding Governance in the Network Society*

Jürg Steiner, André Bächtiger, Markus Spörndli, and Marco R. Steenbergen, *Deliberative Politics in Action: Analyzing Parliamentary Discourse*

Bo Rothstein, *Social Traps and the Problem of Trust*

Jonathan G. S. Koppell, *The Politics of Quasi-Government: Hybrid Organizations and the Dynamics of Bureaucratic Control*

Mark E. Warren and Hilary Pearse (editors), *Designing Deliberative Democracy: The British Columbia Citizens Assembly*

Graham Smith, *Democratic Innovations: Designing Institutions for Citizen Participation*

Keith Dowding and Peter John, *Exits, Voices and Social Investment: Citizens' Reaction to Public Services*

John Parkinson and Jane Mansbridge, *Deliberative Systems*

Cambridge University Press  
978-1-107-19452-6 — Critical Elitism  
Alfred Moore  
Frontmatter  
[More Information](#)

---

# Critical Elitism

Deliberation, Democracy and the Problem  
of Expertise

ALFRED MOORE  
*University of Cambridge*



CAMBRIDGE  
UNIVERSITY PRESS

Cambridge University Press  
978-1-107-19452-6 — Critical Elitism  
Alfred Moore  
Frontmatter  
[More Information](#)

## CAMBRIDGE UNIVERSITY PRESS

University Printing House, Cambridge CB2 8BS, United Kingdom  
One Liberty Plaza, 20th Floor, New York, NY 10006, USA  
477 Williamstown Road, Port Melbourne, VIC 3207, Australia  
4843/24, 2nd Floor, Ansari Road, Daryaganj, Delhi – 110002, India  
79 Anson Road, #06–04/06, Singapore 079906

Cambridge University Press is part of the University of Cambridge.

It furthers the University's mission by disseminating knowledge in the pursuit of education, learning, and research at the highest international levels of excellence.

[www.cambridge.org](http://www.cambridge.org)

Information on this title: [www.cambridge.org/9781107194526](http://www.cambridge.org/9781107194526)

DOI: 10.1017/9781108159906

© Alfred Moore 2017

This publication is in copyright. Subject to statutory exception and to the provisions of relevant collective licensing agreements, no reproduction of any part may take place without the written permission of Cambridge University Press.

First published 2017

*A catalogue record for this publication is available from the British Library.*

*Library of Congress Cataloging-in-Publication Data*

Names: Moore, Alfred James, author.

Title: Critical elitism : deliberation, democracy, and the problem of expertise / Alfred Moore, University of Cambridge.

Description: 1st Edition. | New York : Cambridge University Press, 2017. |

Series: Theories of institutional design

Identifiers: LCCN 2016049751 | ISBN 9781107194526 (hardback)

Subjects: LCSH: Democracy—Philosophy. | Expertise. | Elite (Social sciences) |

BISAC: POLITICAL SCIENCE / History & Theory.

Classification: LCC JC423 .M675 2017 | DDC 321.8—dc23

LC record available at <https://lcn.loc.gov/2016049751>

ISBN 978-1-107-19452-6 Hardback

Cambridge University Press has no responsibility for the persistence or accuracy of URLs for external or third-party Internet Web sites referred to in this publication and does not guarantee that any content on such Web sites is, or will remain, accurate or appropriate.

Contents

<i>Acknowledgements</i>	<i>page viii</i>
Introduction	1
1 Two Faces of Epistemic Democracy	18
2 Democracy and Problem of Expertise	34
3 Political and Epistemic Authority	59
4 The Problem of Judgement	76
5 Contestation	95
6 Consensus	118
7 Institutional Innovations	147
Conclusion	179
<i>References</i>	188
<i>Index</i>	211

## *Acknowledgements*

This book could not have been written without the help, advice and support of a great many colleagues and friends. Most of the research and writing was done with the support of a Marie Curie research fellowship on ‘Epistemology and Democracy in Complex Societies’, funded by the European Community’s Seventh Framework Programme (FP7/2007–2013) under grant agreement n° 237230. I must first of all give thanks to James Knowles and Graham Parkes for helping to make this possible and to Patrick O’Mahony for tireless support in thinking through and developing the substance and structure of the research project. I would like to give particular thanks to Mark Warren for providing guidance and encouragement throughout this project and for hosting me at the University of British Columbia’s (UBC) Centre for the Study of Democratic Institutions. I would like to thank Michael M. Burgess, Kieran O’Doherty, Aubin Calvert, Michael McKenzie and everybody on the Face to Face research team for giving me my first direct experience of a deliberative minipublic in the field of scientific governance and to Peter Danielson for giving me space to work with the group at the W. Maurice Young Center for Applied Ethics at UBC. Invaluable support in putting together a workshop on Scientific Authority in Democratic Societies at UBC’s Peter Wall Institute for Advanced Studies was provided by Rebecca Monnerat and David Moscrop, with thanks also to Emily Tector at Situating Science Canada for support in funding and publicising the event. I would also like to thank Archon Fung for hosting me as a Democracy Fellow at the Ash Center for Democratic Governance and Innovation at Harvard University’s Kennedy School of Government during the autumn of 2012, where I found a rich, varied and engaging intellectual atmosphere. More recently, I have had the good fortune to work with a wonderful group of scholars in the conspiracy and democracy research group at the Centre for Research in the Arts, Social Sciences, and Humanities at the University of Cambridge.

*Acknowledgements*

ix

I have benefitted from critical discussion and feedback on various papers and presentations that have become part of this book by a great many wonderful scholars, including John Beatty, James Bohman, Michael Burgess, Lisa Disch, Albert Dzur, Robert Evans, David Guston, Maarten Hajer, Sheila Jasanoff, Stephen Turner, Mark Warren and all the participants in the workshop on scientific and political authority at UBC. I would like to thank Clark Miller for inviting me to present part of this work at an interdisciplinary workshop on Epistemic Democracy at Arizona State University; to Henrick Friberg-Fernros and Johan Karlsson Schaffer and all the participants at their workshop ‘Deliberation after Consensus: Democracy, Epistemic Quality and Public Discourse’ at the Centre Franco-Norvégien en Sciences Sociales et Humaines in Paris; and to Cathrine Holst for inviting me to present at the conference ‘Why Not Epistocracy? Political Legitimacy and the Fact of Expertise’ at the ARENA Centre at the University of Oslo. For their collaboration in earlier work and their ongoing support, I want to thank Ingolfur Blühdorn, Kathrin Braun, Svea-Luise Herrmann, and Sabine Könniger. For comments and feedback on parts (and in some cases the whole) of this work I am grateful to André Bächtiger, Mark Brown, Sean Gray, Andrew Knops, Hélène Landemore, Melissa Lane, Stephan Lewandowsky, Michael MacKenzie, Nayanika Mathur, Valeria Ottonelli, John Parkinson, David Runciman and Mark Warren. I owe a debt of gratitude to John Beatty for being an invariably sharp, subtle and generous intellectual collaborator. Michael MacKenzie has, for his sins, read almost all of this work in its many stages of development and has been a patient and critical intellectual companion throughout this project. Mark Warren has read parts of the manuscript and various iterations of the overall argument and offered judicious and insightful advice on its development, as well as providing mentorship during, and beyond, my time at UBC. I want to thank Mark Brown for reading the manuscript in its entirety and giving valuable and detailed feedback. I want to express my gratitude to Robert Goodin and to John Haslam at Cambridge University Press for supporting this project and to the anonymous reviewers at Cambridge University Press both for their insightful criticism and useful advice on how to strengthen the manuscript. Any remaining mistakes, weaknesses and omissions are, of course, my own. Finally, I must thank my family, and Wendy in particular, for everything.