

Deliberative Democracy between Theory and Practice

Deliberative democrats seek to link political choices more closely to the deliberations of common citizens, rather than consigning them to speak only in the desiccated language of checks on a ballot. Sober thinkers from Plato to today, however, have argued that if we want to make good decisions, we cannot entrust them to the deliberations of common citizens. Critics argue that deliberative democracy is wildly unworkable in practice.

Deliberative Democracy between Theory and Practice cuts across this debate by clarifying the structure of a deliberative democratic system, and goes on to reevaluate the main empirical challenges to deliberative democracy in light of this new frame. It simultaneously reclaims the wider theory of deliberative democracy and meets the empirical critics squarely on terms that advance, rather than evade, the debate. Doing so has important implications for institutional design, the normative theory of democracy, and priorities for future research and practice.

Michael A. Neblo is an associate professor in the departments of Political Science and (by courtesy) Philosophy at the Ohio State University.





Deliberative Democracy between Theory and Practice

MICHAEL A. NEBLO

Ohio State University





CAMBRIDGE UNIVERSITY PRESS

32 Avenue of the Americas, New York, NY 10013-2473, USA

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 Information on this title: www.cambridge.org/9781107027671

© Michael A. Neblo 2015

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 2015

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

Library of Congress Cataloging in Publication Data Neblo, Michael A.

Deliberative democracy between theory and practice / Michael A. Neblo. pages cm

Includes bibliographical references and index.

ISBN 978-1-107-02767-1 (Hardback)

1. Deliberative democracy–Philosophy. I. Title.

JC423.N386 2015 321.8-dc23 2015027423

ISBN 978-1-107-02767-1 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.



For my parents, my wife, and my daughters
Respice, adspice, prospice.



. . .

And so I appeal to a voice, to something shadowy, a remote important region in all who talk: though we could fool each other, we should consider – lest the parade of our mutual life get lost in the dark.

For it is important that awake people be awake, or a breaking line may discourage them back to sleep; the signals we give – yes or no, or maybe – should be clear: the darkness around us is deep.

William Stafford, from "A Ritual to Read to Each Other"



Contents

List	t of Tables	page ix
List	t of Figures	xi
Ack	knowledgments	xiii
I	Introduction: Common Voices	I
	Why Deliberative Democracy?	3
	Challenges to Deliberative Democracy	7
	Transforming the Debate	8
	Plan for the Book	10
2	Form Follows Function	15
	A System of Democratic Deliberation	17
	"Organizational" Questions	2.5
	Inferentialism and Substantive Rationality	29
	Ways to Measure Deliberation	32
	Is Deliberative Democracy a Falsifiable Theory?	39
	Conclusion	49
3	Framing the Public: Do Citizens Have "Real" Preferences?	50
	Context Dependence, (Non-) Attitudes, and Preferences	53
	Same Difference	56
	Foundations, Webs, and Realizing What We Already Know	58
	Why the Problem Must Be Remediable	60
	Inferentialism as Estimating a Latent Construct	63
	The Scale of Framing Problems in Practice	64
	The Deliberative Frame	66
	Deliberation, Mobilization, and Representation	71
	Conclusion	76

vii



viii Contents

4	How Deliberation Counts: Talking, Voting, and Strategy in	
	Democratic Choice	78
	Instability, Ambiguity, and Manipulation in Democratic Choice	82
	Passing the Buck	85
	Buying into the Game	89
	Deliberation and the "One" Right Answer	91
	Coming to Be a Majority	95
	The Discursive Dilemma	98
	Rational Expectations	102
	Why Rules Are Rules	III
	Conclusion	116
5	Who Wants to Deliberate?	118
	Beyond Skepticism and Optimism about Deliberative Participation	120
	Conditional Preferences about Deliberative Participation	125
	Theory and Data on Deliberative Participation	129
	Deliberating with Members of Congress	138
	Interpreting Antideliberative Attitudes	145
	Why Some People Are Unwilling to Deliberate	148
	A Note on the Consequences of Deliberation	150
	Conclusion	151
6	A Few Days of Democracy Camp	152
	Citizen Competence as a Moral Problem for Democracy	157
	Citizen Competence as an Informational Problem for Democracy	159
	Attempts to Redeem the Public	161
	Surveying Deliberative Competence	172
	Deliberative Polling's Legitimation Crisis	179
	Public Opinion and Mini-Public Forums in the Deliberative System	185
	Conclusion	189
7	Conclusion: A Preface to Deliberative Democratic Theory	191
Rei	ferences	201
Index		211



Tables

5.1	Hypothetical Willingness to Deliberate	page 136
5.2	Participation in Deliberative Sessions with Members	
	of Congress	139
5.3	Percent Citing Reasons for Not Wanting to Deliberate	149





Figures

2.1	The Deliberative System	page 18
5.1	Separablility of Interest in Politics and Change	
	in Corruption	127
5.2	Separablility of Interest in Deliberation and Change	
	in Corruption	т28





Acknowledgments

Psychologists have found that expressing gratitude makes us happy. I have incurred so many debts of gratitude over years of work on this project that making a final account of them has been one of the happiest tasks of my professional life.

My teacher, Lynn Sanders, inspired and supported this project, starting with its distant ancestor in my first year of graduate school at the University of Chicago. Her critique of deliberative democracy structured the challenge that I have been trying to meet ever since. Mark Hansen and Charles Larmore were magnificent co-chairs for a dissertation that constantly threatened to split apart; they provided the kind of intellectual, professional, and personal support that allowed me to take risks. Michael Dawson was particularly helpful in guiding me to link the empirical and normative dimensions of the dissertation. Jürgen Habermas was extremely generous with his time, encouragement, and advice, especially as it relates to his own work.

Several friends and colleagues at Chicago read, commented on, and argued about the ideas that I developed in my thesis. First among them was Adam Maze, who twice stayed up all night with me to see a chapter through. Scott Blinder, Jake Gersen, Chris Rohrbacher, David Mandell, Chad Cyrenne, Andrew Rehfeld, Fonna Forman, and Eric Schlieser all read one or more chapters and provided valuable feedback as well as the kind of intellectual and personal friendship that make graduate school fun. Though we only overlapped one year at Chicago, Mattias Iser has remained a dear friend and valued colleague ever since.

I was fortunate to spend a very stimulating year teaching in Yale's Ethics, Politics, and Economics Program. The students in my deliberative



xiv

Acknowledgments

democracy seminar helped me to begin the process of transforming a technical dissertation into a more broadly engaging book. The late Robert Dahl was wonderfully insightful in criticizing my work over two of the most enjoyable lunches of my life. Many thanks also to Ian Shapiro, Geoffrey Garrett, and John McCormick for their hospitality and intellectual engagement during my stay.

My two years at the University of Michigan as a Robert Wood Johnson Scholar in Health Policy Research were enormously generative. I am grateful to the foundation for its support, and the host faculty at Michigan, especially Skip Lupia who, ever since, has been the best mentor one could hope for. More recently, I have been fortunate to spend the last two years as a visiting Fellow at Northwestern University's Institute for Policy Research. Many thanks to Jamie Druckman, David Figlio, Dan Galvin, Bonnie Honig, Fay Lomax Cook, and Jackie Stevens for their support and hospitality during my stay. In between, I spent a very productive month as a scholar in residence at the Kettering Foundation. Thanks to Derek Barker, Connie Crockett, John Dedrick, Alice Diebel, Libby Kingseed, Mindy LaBreck, David Matthews, Noëlle McAfee, David McIvor, Marie Sims, and Hal Sounders for their kindness and support.

At Ohio State University, I am fortunate to have had a series of supportive chairs: Paul Beck, Kathleen McGraw, Herb Weisberg, and Rick Herrmann have all fostered my growth as a scholar in ways big and small. My current and former colleagues at Ohio State have been a constant source of stimulation over the years. Many thanks to Sonja Amadae, Greg Caldeira, Clarissa Hayward, Don Hubin, Ben McKean, Jennifer Mitzen, Tom Nelson, Irfan Noroodin, John Parrish, Piers Turner, Inés Valdez, Craig Volden, Alex Wendt, Alan Wiseman, and Jack Wright. I have been fortunate to have the support of several terrific research assistants. I am grateful to Michael Dunkin, Deirdre McMahon, Boris Krupa, Daniel Davis, Daniel Blake, Bobby Gulotty, Christina Xydias, Nick Felts, Danny Lempert, and Cameron DeHart. The graduate students in two seminars in which we read portions of this manuscript also provided stimulating feedback for which I am grateful.

Two current colleagues at Ohio State stand out for special thanks. Eric MacGilvray and William Minozzi read multiple drafts of the whole manuscript and provided invaluable comments as well as friendship and moral support. If it is true that an argument is not really an argument until it is rendered clearly, then William and Eric are nigh unto coauthors of



Acknowledgments

xv

this book. I have become so dependent on their advice that I was tempted to ask them to edit these very sentences.

Speaking of coauthors: Chapter 5 draws substantially on an article I wrote with David Lazer, Kevin Esterling, Ryan Kennedy, and Anand Sokhey. Collaborating on that paper and the broader project of which it is a part has been one of the real highlights of my career so far, and I am grateful to all of them for their continuing collegiality and friendship.

Several colleagues beyond Ohio State commented on one or more chapters and provided enormously valuable feedback. Sincere thanks to André Bächtiger, Jim Bohman, Lisa Disch, John Dryzek, JimFishkin, Chad Flanders, Chris Karpowitz, Jim Johnson, George Marcus, Marco Steenbergen, Jurg Steiner, Dennis Thompson, Mark Warren, and especially Jenny Mansbridge for helping to make often clumsy and mistaken arguments better. They are all, of course, innocent of the clumsiness and errors that remain.

Thanks also to the folks at Cambridge University Press. Lew Bateman and Eric Crahan (then at Cambridge) took an early interest in my manuscript, and Debbie Gershenowitz, Dana Bricken, and Elizabeth Shand had the patience and professionalism to see it through. Portions of Chapters 2, 5, and 6 draw on work originally published, respectively, in the *Swiss Political Science Review*, the *American Political Science Review*, and the *Critical Review*. Thanks to Wiley-Blackwell, Cambridge University Press, and Jeffrey Friedman for permission to reprint that work. I am happy to acknowledge the Evans Scholars Foundation, the National Science Foundation, the Mellon Foundation, and the Kettering Foundation for financial and material support at different points throughout my career. Thanks also to all those who participated in my surveys and recruited others to do so (especially Bernie Goss and Jack Scanlon).

When people make the ubiquitous snide joke about in-laws, I simply have no frame of reference (despite having an extra seventeen brothers and sisters, thirteen nieces and nephews, and two parents by marriage). I am grateful to the McMahons, who have never been anything but loving and kind to me. John Neblo and Laura McNabney, my own brother and sister, and their families have supported me with love and good humor over the (too) many years that it has taken to complete this book.

My parents, Joanne and John Neblo, were my first and best teachers. They may not have always understood why I decided to leave a good job to go back to graduate school, but their love and support never depended



xvi

Acknowledgments

on what I did in any case. I hope that they know how much anything worthwhile that I have managed to do depended on their love.

Finally, my deepest thanks to Eileen McMahon. As years of loving patience with this project justly gave way to years of loving impatience, the love somehow managed to grow. Thank you for that miracle, and for the even greater miracles of Anna and Kate, who came late in this process, but made it infinitely more joyful.